



## REVIEWS

---

Edward C. Riley. *La rara invención. Estudios sobre Cervantes y su posteridad literaria*. Barcelona: Crítica, 2001. 286 pp. ISBN: 84-843-2177-0.

La editorial Crítica acaba de publicar en su nueva colección “Letras de humanidad,” dirigida por Gonzalo Pontón Gijón, *La rara invención. Estudios sobre Cervantes y su posteridad literaria*, del ilustre cervantista Edward C. Riley, fallecido pocos días antes de que el volumen saliera a la venta. El libro se convierte, de esa manera, en un homenaje póstumo al autor del famoso ensayo *Cervantes’s Theory of the Novel*, del que tanto han bebido las últimas generaciones de cervantistas.

*La rara invención* reúne por primera vez, y en un solo volumen, quince estudios que el autor consideró como sus trabajos fundamentales sobre el cervantismo y que ahora salen traducidos al castellano, casi todos por primera vez. A este propósito no está de más señalar la traducción de Mari Carmen Llerena, que consigue trasladar de manera lograda los distintos matices argumentativos de cada estudio.

Algunos de los artículos son ya muy conocidos (como, por ejemplo, el célebre “‘El alba bella que las perlas cría’: la descripción del amanecer en las novelas de Cervantes,” en el que se analiza el uso irónico de un tópico clásico), otros no tanto; en conjunto, la antología abarca un período de más de cuarenta años (1956-1999) en los que la fecundidad del profesor Riley ha dado muestra de un agudo sentido crítico.

La primera parte del volumen, y la más amplia, está dedicada al *Quijote*, y toca asuntos tan significativos como el baile de disfraces y el problema de la identidad de los diferentes personajes de la novela (“Quién es quién en el *Quijote*. Una aproximación al problema de la identidad”)—cuyo perspectivismo puede considerarse como el origen de algunos de los desarrollos de la literatura del siglo XX—o tan sorprendentes como la función que desempeñan los varios tipos de equipaje en la narración (“Bultos, envoltorios, maletas y portamanteos. Un detalle de la técnica narrativa de Cervantes”). Particularmente sugerente es el ensayo titulado “Tres versiones de la historia de don Quijote” donde Riley—reelaborando

temas ya tocados en su *Teoría de la novela en Cervantes*—desmenuza admirablemente la crónica de Cide Hamete, la continuación de Avellaneda y la historia idealizada de su vida que imagina el propio don Quijote para ilustrarnos sobre la técnica narrativa cervantina y la intersección e interdependencia de los varios planos interpretativos en el *Quijote*.

Aparte de los ensayos sobre características generales de la novela, los hay también dedicados a temas más específicos. Por ejemplo, el análisis de un episodio de la segunda parte del *Quijote* sobre los agujeros y su importancia formal y simbólica al final de las peripecias del protagonista (“El simbolismo en el *Quijote* (segunda parte, capítulo 73)”), el examen de un pasaje de la segunda parte de la novela a la luz del *Quijote* apócrifo (“‘Uñas de vaca o manos de ternera.’ Cervantes y Avellaneda”) o el estudio del episodio de la cueva de Montesinos (“Metamorfosis, mito y sueño en la cueva de Montesinos”) como recreación interior del propio don Quijote que pone en evidencia la drástica disparidad entre mundo mítico (terreno del *romance*) y mundo empírico (ámbito de la novela realista o *novel*).

Muy interesantes son también los dos artículos finales de esta sección, dedicados al análisis comparatista (“¿Qué ha sido de los héroes? El *Quijote* y algunas de las grandes novelas europeas del siglo XX”) y a la cultura de la imagen (“Don Quijote, del texto a la imagen”). En el primero, Riley traza algunos paralelismos entre don Quijote y los protagonistas de cinco grandes novelas del siglo XX—el *Ulises* de Joyce, *El proceso* de Kafka, *1984* de Orwell, *La peste* de Camus y *Tiempo de silencio* de Martín-Santos—, constatando una difuminación de la idea tradicional del heroísmo. En el segundo, publicado originalmente en la revista *Cervantes*, analiza de manera aguda e indudablemente amena la extraordinaria pervivencia iconográfica de la pareja don Quijote/Sancho en nuestros días, desde los dibujos de Picasso a los ceniceros para turistas de la Costa del Sol, éxito que se debe, entre otras causas, a la asociación carnavalesca de dos figuras arquetípicas y a la tradición de la pareja de cómicos, tan importante desde la *commedia dell'arte* hasta hoy.

Con todo, de esta primera sección la aportación más novedosa es sin duda el ensayo dedicado a la figura de Pasamonte (“‘Sepa que yo soy Ginés de Pasamonte’”), el único inédito de la antología, fruto de una disertación que Riley hizo en Barcelona a finales de 1999, en el marco de las *Lecturas del Quijote*, ciclo anual de conferencias nacidas como complemento de la edición del *Quijote* por el Instituto Cervantes, bajo la dirección de Francisco Rico. El artículo analiza detalladamente las varias apariciones del personaje a lo largo de las dos partes de la novela y capta la evolución de Pasamonte desde el galeote autor de su propia biografía picaresca (en contraposición a la nueva novela realista propuesta por Cervantes) a su transformación en maese Pedro, que lo aleja del estereotipo determinista del pícaro, con lo

que Cervantes vuelve a reafirmar su oposición a las restricciones genéricas.

A la primera sección, dedicada enteramente a los problemas que suscita el *Quijote* y al análisis de la novela, sigue otra no por más breve menos interesante, compuesta por dos artículos bastante conocidos, el primero de los cuales es el único del volumen que ya había sido traducido al castellano ("Una cuestión de género"). En él, Riley traza una importantísima distinción entre *romance* y *novel* y analiza toda la producción cervantina a la luz de estos dos géneros en prosa. El segundo artículo ("La novela de caballerías, la picaresca y la primera parte del *Quijote*") ahonda una vez más en las complejas relaciones entre el *Quijote* y otros tipos de ficción en prosa, especialmente el género picaresco, para subrayar la elevada consciencia crítica de Cervantes.

Tres artículos dedicados a las *Novelas ejemplares*, en especial al "Coloquio de los perros," concluyen el volumen. En "Cervantes y los cínicos ('El licenciado Vidriera' y el 'Coloquio de los perros')," Riley identifica para el personaje de Vidriera una posible fuente de inspiración en el filósofo cínico Diógenes Laercio y en la filosofía cínica en general, de la que rastrea algunos elementos también en Cipión y Berganza. A continuación, el autor estudia las fuentes literarias del "Coloquio de los perros" ("Los antecedentes del 'Coloquio de los perros'") desde las clásicas *Metamorfosis* de Apuleyo, pasando por los diálogos lucianescos y el más cercano *Baldo*. Finalmente, Riley nos desvela en el artículo de cierre ("Cervantes, Freud y la teoría narrativa psicoanalítica") un curioso episodio de nuestra cultura contemporánea, al detallar el profundo interés sentido por Sigmund Freud por Cervantes en general y por el *Coloquio de los perros* en particular, lo que jugó un papel, al parecer no desdeñable, en la elaboración de su método psicoanalítico. El estudio intenta desentrañar los paralelismos entre la novela cervantina y el psicoanálisis freudiano en tanto que diálogo, a la luz de la teoría narrativa.

En definitiva, el volumen recientemente editado puede sin duda considerarse como un instrumento muy provechoso para el que quiera ver reunidos en forma de libro—y en lengua castellana—algunos de los ensayos más sugerentes de Riley. El hecho de que la publicación de *La rara invención* haya coincidido prácticamente con la desaparición de su autor le confiere, además, el valor de postrero homenaje a quien, con su fina agudeza crítica, tanto ha hecho por el cervantismo.

Patrizia Campana  
Depto. de Filología Española  
Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona  
08192 Bellaterra  
iflcp@cc.uab.es

Jean Canavaggio. *Cervantes, entre vida y creación*. Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2000. 253 pp. ISBN: 84-88333-41-2.

El Centro de Estudios Cervantinos acaba de publicar un interesante libro de Jean Canavaggio, *Cervantes entre vida y creación*. No estamos ante un volumen que recoja trabajos inéditos: todos sus capítulos han sido publicados anteriormente por el autor: “Los diecinueve trabajos aquí reunidos se publican en su estado original, con la única excepción del primero, cuyo título—‘La nueva biografía de Cervantes’—sustituye el que tenía inicialmente” (9). El artículo más antiguo, “Un compañero de cautiverio de Cervantes: don Fernando de Ormaza,” es de 1966. El más reciente, “Aproximación al proceso Ezpeleta” (en la nota 1 del libro leemos, quizá por error, “Expeleta”),<sup>1</sup> procede del homenaje de la Asociación de Cervantistas a José María Casasayas, hace algo más de cinco años. El autor ha agrupado los artículos seleccionados en tres grupos, relativos a la biografía, al teatro y a la narrativa de Cervantes. Nos parece de especial interés la recuperación de los textos referidos a la vida del autor de *Don Quijote*, y al estudio de su teatro. Lamentablemente este último apartado parece seguir despertando entre los estudiosos menos interés que otros, al menos si tenemos en cuenta que el libro de Canavaggio *Cervantes dramaturge, une théâtre à naître*, de 1977, apenas ha sido objeto de traducciones, salvo

---

<sup>1</sup> Son numerosas las erratas que el lector se encuentra a lo largo del texto: *Cervantes dramaturge* por *Cervantes dramaturge* (11), *henos de creer* por *hemos de creer* (58), *respecto a las normas* por *respeto a las normas* (68), *dedicatorio* por *dedicatario* (68), *asejna* por *ajena* (72), 197 por el año 1977 (72), *Le pacte autobiographique* por *Le pacte autobiographique* al referirse a la obra de Lejeune (75 n. 10), a lo largo de las págs. 73–83 se utiliza alternativamente *Caporali* y *Caporale*, *los Morisco* por *los Moriscos* (91), es frecuente el uso del término *economía* (quizá por influencia del francés *économie*) con el sentido de “estructura” (110, 111, 114 y 234); *oir* por *oír* (118), *otros destino* por *otros destinos* (125), *su compañeros* por *sus compañeros* (126), *las pastoral* por *la pastoral* (126), *...histórico*, *En...* por *...histórico*, *En...* (131), *itaiana* por *italiana* (132), *terra incognita* por *terra incognita* (132), una referencia bibliográfica del propio Canavaggio mal citada (132), *suelen gozan* por *suelen gozar* (138), *este manera* por *esta manera* (139), *angedutet* por el participio *angedeutet* en una cita alemana sobre Brecht (166), *los mueble* por *los muebles* (169), *Zwischenpiele* por *Zwischenspiele* (170), falta puntuación en las dos primeras líneas del último párrafo de la pág. 171, *los convencionalismo* por *los convencionalismos* (172), *del mimo modo* por *del mismo modo* (172), errada transcripción del verso *por la rnisrna muerte* (*por la misma muerte*, 192), *critica* por *crítica* (207), *los interrogantes del rector* por *los interrogantes del lector* (217), *se acompaña* por *se acompaña* (223), *cada más por cada vez más* (232), etc.

algunos fragmentos al italiano y al español, mientras que su biografía cervantina, publicada en Francia en 1986, ha sido traducida a cuatro idiomas hasta el momento.

Canavaggio subraya ante todo la intención de diferenciar sus propios trabajos biográficos sobre Cervantes de los estudios tradicionales. Así, advierte: "Me he lanzado en una aventura totalmente nueva para mí: no la de explicar a Cervantes, sino la de contar a Cervantes o, más bien, como diría Paul Veyne, la de contarle mejor" (17). Tras referirse a algunos de los estudios tradicionales sobre la vida de Cervantes, especialmente los de Mayáns, Vicente de los Ríos, Pellicer, José María Asensio, Pérez Pastor y Rodríguez Marín, concluye en que "ninguno de estos beneméritos investigadores ha intentado reconstruir la concatenación de unos acontecimientos cuyo interés, para nosotros, depende de cómo se incorporan a la misma sustancia del vivir cervantino" (20). Tal es el objetivo de Canavaggio: el rigor de los datos, el emplazamiento en el contexto y en la época del escritor y, como él mismo confiesa, "un último objetivo, pero no de poca monta: ir al encuentro de Cervantes" (24).

De nuevo es cuestión de referencia la ascendencia judía y la homosexualidad atribuidas a Cervantes: "Rosa Rossi, desde un enfoque metodológico más amplio, nos propone una explicación más ambiciosa del 'caso' Cervantes, en el cruce del análisis semiológico y de la antropología cultural. Esta explicación, huelga decirlo, ha suscitado varios reparos y, personalmente, no la puedo hacer mía por tres razones que considero fundamentales. En primer lugar, el conjunto de datos en el que trata de fundamentar su tesis no me parece suficientemente establecido. Las mil presunciones que tenemos de la supuesta 'raza' de Cervantes—empezando por lo que se sabe de la estirpe cordobesa de los Torreblanca, de donde procedía su abuela materna—no equivalen a una auténtica prueba, la cual, hasta la fecha, no se ha encontrado. Tampoco queda comprobada la homosexualidad de quien no nos ha dejado un solo escrito de carácter íntimo, y sobre el cual escasean los testimonios directos" (27). Las conclusiones de Canavaggio respecto a los estudios biográficos cervantinos son muy prudentes, y se limitan con frecuencia a reconocer las dificultades reales de "ir más allá." De la vida de Cervantes apenas se conservan "proyecciones objetivadas y mediatizadas por una escritura." Reservas y reticencias determinan por el momento la labor de sus biógrafos.

Con "Cervantes en primera persona" (65–72), el autor encabeza una serie de capítulos destinados a indagar en la presencia formal de Cervantes en sus textos literarios. Las referencias a la teoría literaria resultan aquí muy frecuentes, y quizá hubiera sido necesario actualizar algunos datos, al menos los de una bibliografía que, sobre la cuestión relativa al ' = autor en el texto, ha avanzado mucho a lo largo de los últimos años, dentro

y fuera del cervantismo. La referencia bibliográfica más reciente que aquí se cita es la de John J. Allen ("The Narrator, The Reader, and *Don Quixote*"), que data de 1976. Desde entonces a nuestros días han sido numerosos los autores, entre ellos nombres de primera fila, que se han ocupado de esta cuestión.<sup>2</sup> El análisis de Canavaggio, que data de 1977, se limita esencialmente a los prólogos de las obras cervantinas, insistiendo sobre todo en los de *Don Quijote*, *La Galatea* y *Persiles y Sigismunda*. Temas afines han sido abordados por Heinz-Peter Endress por lo menos desde 1979.<sup>3</sup> En definitiva es cuestión ésta que requeriría una actualización de ideas y de bibliografía. La conclusión final del capítulo no deja de ser sencilla: "Cervantes en primera persona no es una persona real y verdadera. Es un ser imaginario: elaborado, claro está, con elementos sacados de la experiencia del manco de Lepanto, pero engendrado por un 'decir' específico y establecido como tal por la mirada del lector" (70).

En "La dimensión autobiográfica del *Viaje del Parnaso*" (73-83), Canavaggio establece interesantes contrastes y analogías entre el *Viaje del Parnaso* de Cervantes y el *Viaggio in Parnaso* (1582) de Cesare Caporali, de nuevo afloran de forma recurrente conceptos de teoría literaria, desde los que se trata de proponer una lectura del *viaje* cervantino como una autobiografía, a partir de los criterios establecidos por Philippe Lejeune en 1975 en *Le pacte autobiographique*. De nuevo el paso del tiempo hace mella en

---

<sup>2</sup> Vid. al respecto, entre otros, Ruth El Saffar, "Voces marginales y la visión del ser cervantino," *Anthropos* 88-89 (1989): 59-63; Santiago Fernández Mosquera, "Los autores ficticios del *Quijote*," *Anales Cervantinos* 24 (1986): 47-65; R. M. Flores, "The Rôle of Cide Hamete in *Don Quixote*," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 59 (1982): 3-13; R. M. Ford, "Narración y discurso en el *Quijote*," *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos* 430 (1986): 5-16; George Haley, "The Narrator in *Don Quixote*: A Discarded Voice," *Estudios en honor a Ricardo Gullón* (Lincoln, NE: Society of Spanish and Spanish-American Studies, 1984), 173-83; José Manuel Martín Morán, "La función del narrador múltiple en el *Quijote* de 1615," *Anales Cervantinos* 30 (1992): 9-65; Colbert I. Nepaulsingh, "La aventura de los narradores del *Quijote*," *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas*, ed. Alan M. Gordon y Evelyn Rugg (Toronto: Dept. of Spanish and Portuguese, U. Toronto, 1980), 515-18; James A. Parr, *Don Quixote: An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse* (Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1988); Fernando Romo Feito, "Hermenéutica de Cide Hamete Benengeli: Perspectivas," *Anales Cervantinos* 33 (1997): 117-31; Laura Rosana Scarano, "La perspectiva metatextual en el *Quijote* de Cervantes," *Anales Cervantinos* 24 (1986): 47-65 y 123-36; y F. de Toro, "Función del yo narrativo y del autor implícito. *Don Quijote* como deconstrucción de modelos narrativos," *Cervantes, su obra y su mundo. Actas del I Congreso Internacional sobre Cervantes*, ed. Manuel Criado de Val (Madrid: EDI-6, 1981), 635-51.

<sup>3</sup> "Rhetorik und Reden im *Don Quijote*," en *Festschrift für Rupprecht Rohr zum 60. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg: Groos, 1979), 302-27.

algunas observaciones.<sup>4</sup> Las cuestiones relativas a la pragmática literaria han evolucionado mucho en las dos últimas décadas, y en relación con la obra de Cervantes de manera singular. Es terreno muy resbaladizo la cuestión del narrador en las obras cervantinas. El autor del *Quijote* también se sirve en el *Viaje del Parnaso* de recursos muy sofisticados para construir en la ficción literaria un personaje que el lector del poema identifica inmediatamente con el autor. Los metalenguajes teóricos han derrochado un sinnúmero de términos para tratar de poner orden en este juego de papeles entre autor, narrador y personaje, con poco éxito, francamente, y además han confundido con demasiada frecuencia la autenticidad de la vida real con las formas estéticas—y lúdicas—de la ficción. A partir de la autonominación cervantina en el texto del *Viaje*, y siempre en referencia a Cesare Caporali, Canavaggio habla de “autobiografía,” y advierte que “reivindicando sin rodeos la paternidad del autodiscurso, el autonarrador, si bien no llega a deshacer el esquema heredado de Caporali, va alterando, de manera sistemática, el código elaborado por su inspirador” (76). En verdad, el recurso del autor que se personaliza ficcionalmente con su propio nombre (si se sirviera de uno ajeno estaríamos ante un heterónimo) en la fábula literaria, como sabemos, está introducido por Dante desde su viaje imaginario por los reinos de ultratumba. Es indudable que la literatura no contiene nada que no haya sido vivido, pero tampoco nada que necesariamente haya sido vivido tal y como se vivió. Acaso el propio Canavaggio parece equilibrar el alcance de sus propios argumentos, de forma un tanto confusa, sin embargo, al afirmar que “la obliteración episódica del autodiscurso [*sic*] resulta tanto más insidiosa cuanto que el *yo* que asume existencialmente el vivir cervantino no es, hablando con propiedad, el sujeto exclusivo del discurso” (80).

En el capítulo titulado “El desenlace de *La Numancia*: tradición y originalidad” (97–108), Canavaggio contrasta algunas de las fuentes históricas que han podido influir en Cervantes a la hora de configurar la fábula de la tragedia *Numancia*, especialmente en relación con el episodio del suicidio del joven Bariato. Canavaggio considera que, en este episodio,

---

<sup>4</sup> El propio Canavaggio reconoce en otro lugar la conveniencia de actualizar algunas páginas. Así, por ejemplo, a propósito del capítulo titulado “La España del *Quijote*” (85–93), confiesa en nota final que “este estudio parte de un estado de la cuestión que convendría actualizar” (93, nota 21). En otros lugares, por ejemplo, se afirma que “el teatro cervantino nos ofrece una imagen atractiva que, hasta el presente, no ha retenido la atención de la crítica” (156). En efecto, una afirmación de este tipo sin duda podría ser válida en 1972, cuando se escribió por vez primera, pero probablemente hoy día deba ser objeto de consideración, dada la renovación que los estudios cervantinos han experimentado durante los últimos veinte años.

Cervantes “se aleja deliberadamente de la tradición consagrada por la historiografía clásica, según la cual, al penetrar en la ciudad al final de un largo asedio, Escipión no encontró a ningún superviviente.... El episodio de Bariato constituye pues una infidelidad cometida *in extremis* por un poeta preocupado por seguir con exactitud al historiador escrupuloso al que había toma como guía” (97). La documentación y los datos que Canavaggio aporta en este artículo, que data de 1979, es sin duda de gran valor, pero algunas ideas acusan inevitablemente el paso de algo más de dos décadas.

Si la escritura de la historia da lugar a un discurso verificable en la realidad de los hechos, la invención literaria no es, francamente, un discurso verificable en la escritura de las fuentes históricas. La composición de la *fábula* literaria, desde luego, no debe serlo. La literatura es un discurso formalmente explicable y semánticamente abierto, pero nunca verificable o falseable en la realidad histórica. La descripción historiográfica de las fuentes, necesaria y útil, no debe inducirnos a considerar la escritura cervantina como un discurso verificable en la tradición histórica, del mismo modo que no es posible estudiar de forma imparcial el teatro de Cervantes si supeditamos sus posibles aciertos y fracasos a una relación de afinidad o adecuación a la fórmula teatral de la comedia lopesca.

Por otro lado, afirmar hoy día que “Cervantes no dudó, como buen discípulo de Aristóteles, en distanciarse del desenlace impuesto por la historiografía oficial” (104) es afirmación que requiere explicaciones demoradas. En primer lugar, por las diferencias esenciales entre literatura e historia, a las que acabamos de referirnos. Y en segundo lugar, porque hoy por hoy resulta mucho más discutible que en cualquier época pasada el hecho de que Cervantes pueda ser considerado *sin más* como un “buen discípulo de Aristóteles.” Las mejores obras de Cervantes están escritas al margen de la preceptiva aristotélica. Los escritos del filósofo griego son insuficientes—lo eran ya en el siglo XVI—para comprender el alcance y el significado de la literatura cervantina. *La Numancia* es superior e irreductible a la *Poética* de Aristóteles y a la teoría helénica de la tragedia. El *Quijote*—y una vez más *La Numancia*—son obras que requieren para su interpretación una teoría literaria moderna, que poco o nada tienen que ver con la aristotélica, hecha y rehecha para la percepción e interpretación de un mundo antiguo, que en absoluto es el mundo al que se refiere Cervantes. Sólo con la difusión de la obra de G. E. Lessing (*Laokoon*, 1766), a fines de la Ilustración europea, comienza a configurarse con cierta solidez una nueva interpretación de la poética aristotélica, que la Edad Contemporánea ha tomado con frecuencia como referente.

“La cautiva cristiana, de *Los tratos de Argel* a *Los baños de Argel*” (109–21) es quizá uno de los capítulos más estimables del volumen. Estudia aquí

Canavaggio la construcción en las comedias cervantinas del personaje de la esclava cristiana cautiva de los berberiscos. Se centra en *Los tratos de Argel* y *Los baños de Argel* de Cervantes, y en *Los cautivos de Argel* de Lope de Vega. Acierta especialmente Canavaggio al describir la estética del teatro cervantino como una expresión verosímil de la complejidad de la vida real. El virtuosismo de Cervantes consiste precisamente el alcanzar estos logros a través de una literatura en cierto modo, y paradójicamente, idealista, como es casi toda la literatura de la España aurisecular, tal como la consideraba Karl Vossler en su ensayo de 1930, "Die Bedeutung der spanischen Kultur für Europa."<sup>5</sup> Sostenía allí el romanista alemán que la literatura española de los Siglos de Oro era una literatura esencialmente idealista, a través de cuyas intensas fisuras y grietas emanaban, incontenibles, fuertes expresiones de realismo. En palabras de Canavaggio, en relación con el prototipo de personaje aquí estudiado, "esta incorporación progresiva de toques de realidad en el seno de una ficción de corte tradicional responde, por lo visto, a una finalidad precisa: contribuye a completar y corregir la primera impresión producida por una heroína cuya función en el seno de la acción no consigue informar el conjunto de los rasgos distintivos, modelando así una imagen variopinta de la cautiva cristiana" (114).

En "Los pastores del teatro cervantino: tres avatares de una Arcadia precaria" (123–36), se ocupa Canavaggio de las formas de la pastoral en la creación literaria cervantina, concretamente en *La Galatea*, "El coloquio de los perros," *La casa de los celos*, *El laberinto de amor* y *Los baños de Argel*. Sostiene Canavaggio que Cervantes experimenta una evolución en el tratamiento de los temas pastoriles, observable desde sus obras tempranas, como *La Galatea*, hasta sus piezas dramáticas de 1615: "No extraña, por tanto, que esta pastoral impura llegue a disolverse en una fábula caballeresca también tratada de modo irónico, pero que, a pesar de todo, conserva hasta el desenlace una mayor *vis comica*" (127). Canavaggio apunta aquí hacia una inversión del mito pastoril, o mejor, hacia una disolución en la prosa del siglo XVII de las utopías renacentistas. El tratamiento de que es objeto la pastoral en obras como "El coloquio de los perros" o *La casa de los celos* revela que el público ya no se deleita en la contemplación de un mundo bucólico que se ha vuelto pura fantasía. Creo que Canavaggio acierta al advertir la distancia que separa a Cervantes de Lope, una vez más, en el tratamiento de la pastoral en el teatro. En relación con este "rival a quien [Cervantes] no quiso nunca imitar," Canavaggio advierte que el

---

<sup>5</sup> *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 8 (1930): 33–60. Reed. en *Südliche Romania*. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1940. 402–17. Trad. española de Carlos Clavería: "Trascendencia europea de la cultura española." *Algunos caracteres de la cultura española*. 4ª ed. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1962. 89–151.

autor del *Quijote* jamás asimiló influencia alguna de obras lopescas como *Belardo el furioso*, *El verdadero amante* o *La pastoral de Jacinto*, piezas que llevaron a las tablas temas bucólicos tratados con un discreto verismo.

En "Tristán y Madrigal, bufones *in partibus*" (136–45), Canavaggio estudia el supuesto personaje cómico en el teatro de Cervantes. Canavaggio demuestra que las manifestaciones de la comicidad encarnadas en determinados personajes del teatro cervantino son tan ajenas a las gracias del bobo renacentista como a los "donaires del gracioso lopesco." Sugiere incluso que el personaje cómico característico del teatro de Cervantes constituye en sí mismo un paradigma que no puede agotarse en las explicaciones de un teatro meramente experimental. Tristán en *Los baños de Argel* y Madrigal en *La gran sultana* constituyen los ejemplos más genuinos: "cautivos cristianos los dos, ni son señalados como bufones en el reparto de figuras, ni llevan, por supuesto, los atributos tradicionales del loco de corte.... Con sus correspondencias temáticas, sus registros contrapuestos y sus varios niveles de comicidad, semejante perspectivismo no podía incorporar al bobo renacentista, encasillado en secuencias episódicas y comportamientos predefinidos, ni al gracioso lopesco, confidente y consejero de un galán con quien el bufón cervantino, atento a preservar su autonomía, no se resuelve nunca a unir su destino" (138 y 145).

Respecto a las tentativas metateatrales cervantinas, considera Canavaggio que "inscriben efectivamente el teatro en el teatro: *Los baños de Argel*, *La entretenida* y *Pedro de Urdemalas*," además de "El retablo de las maravillas." También sería posible identificar este recurso en algunos momentos de "El viejo celoso" y *El rufián dichoso*, así como en varios episodios de *Don Quijote* y, sobre todo, en el cuadro segundo de la jornada segunda de *La Numancia*, donde tiene lugar la escena de los augurios, que puede considerarse vivamente como ejemplo de teatro en el teatro. El pueblo numantino, y concretamente los personajes de Morandro y Leoncio, acude al sacrificio y ritual que se ofrece a los dioses con objeto de conocer cuál será el destino de Numancia. El pueblo asiste como espectador a la contemplación de un ritual trágico, un sacrificio a los dioses, en el seno de la acción principal de la tragedia. La acotación que indica funcionalmente la composición y actuación de la comitiva resulta por sí misma suficientemente expresiva, pues dispone los mecanismos necesarios para representar la teatralización del sacrificio dentro de la teatralización de la tragedia (*Numancia*, II, vv. 789 y ss.). Creo que Canavaggio acierta cuando afirma que "se reconocerá aquí sin esfuerzo el motivo clásico del teatro del mundo. Si Calderón le dará más tarde la amplitud que conocemos, Cervantes, antes que él, ya había percibido su interés: prueba de ello un episodio bien conocido del *Quijote*" (158), la aventura del carro o carreta de Las Cortes de la Muerte. Parece seguro que Cervantes es el primer autor español que utiliza consciente-

mente en su dramaturgia el procedimiento del metateatro como un recurso estético.

Jesús G. Maestro  
Avda. García Barbón 48-B  
Portal 4, Piso 3º K  
36201 Vigo  
jesus\_maestro@hotmail.com

Arsenio Lope Huerta. *Los Cervantes de Alcalá*. Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 1998. 189 pp. ISBN: 84-88333-23-4.

La familia de los Cervantes es, por la rebusca de datos que iluminan la vida de Miguel, la mejor documentada de la España del siglo XVI. Pocas figuras hay de siglos anteriores cuya intimidad conozcamos mejor: la familia real y la de algunos “grandes,” como los duques del Infantado, de quienes tenemos noticia de generación en generación. Cuando salimos de este ámbito privilegiado y limitado, hay sólo figuras sueltas aquí y allá cuya vida ha podido conocerse con algún detalle: el Conde de Villamediana, Francisco de los Cobos, religiosos como el cardenal Cisneros o Santa Teresa. Pero informarnos de una familia entera, a través de tres o cuatro generaciones, a lo largo de casi un siglo, la que podemos estudiar fácilmente es la cervantina. Es una familia que se mueve por varios escenarios, desde Valladolid a Cabra, desde Cuenca a Sevilla, y también desde el mundo de los altos funcionarios—alcalde de Córdoba—hasta la clase media baja, el triste mundo del “cirujano” Rodrigo de Cervantes.

Si bien se ha estudiado algo a sus hermanas, faltaba un estudio de conjunto de la familia de Miguel. También, aunque su abuelo paterno y su hija han merecido atención reciente, de Krzysztof Sliwa y un servidor, no es así en los casos de su padre Rodrigo y de su hermano homónimo, compañero del cautiverio argelino. Lope Huerta, antiguo alcalde de Alcalá de Henares, nos ofrece en este modesto pero sensato libro una presentación de la Alcalá donde nació Miguel, y sendos capítulos dedicados a su padre y a sus hermanos que sobrevivieron la infancia: Andrea, Luisa y Rodrigo. Un total de cinco parientes, todos nacidos allí. Algunos de ellos, naturalmente, pasaron mucho más tiempo en la ciudad universitaria que el joven Miguel.

El libro no presenta ningún dato del todo desconocido; se basa completamente en fuentes publicadas y se describe no como “un trabajo de investigación, sino de recopilación y, en muchos casos, aun de interpreta-

ción" (10). Sobre todo se emplea a Astrana, combinado con los historiadores alcaláinos y un conocimiento a fondo del ambiente local. No pretende darnos conclusiones ni datos nuevos, pero sí una presentación de la familia de Miguel y de las circunstancias de su vida familiar. Dos ejemplos: En tiempos de su abuelo, el licenciado Juan de Cervantes, "los Cervantes llevaron un tren de vida que los igualaba con el de las más ricas y nobles familias alcaláinas. Amigos de justas, fiestas y carreras, hicieron que Rodrigo [el padre de Miguel] se acostumbrara pronto a ellas y que la ruina, la separación y la decadencia, le mordieran su espíritu amargándole prácticamente el resto de su vida. Pero lo cierto es que su padre [Juan] les abandonó" (p. 54). El padre Rodrigo era el más desdichado de sus hermanos. Sin embargo, "la vida de Rodrigo es, como la de casi toda su familia, un ir y venir por un sinnúmero de ciudades y lugares de aquella España. Parecería que la vida nómada y la itinerancia, ya creemos haberlo señalado, son dos características comunes a todos los Cervantes con muy escasas excepciones" (55, énfasis mía). De allí, el andariego Miguel, sin hogar fijo aparte del de Catalina, no parece sino continuar la práctica de su padre y abuelo.

Daniel Eisenberg  
Excelsior College  
7 Columbia Circle  
Albany, NY 12203  
daniel.eisenberg@bigfoot.com

Hans-Jörg Neuschäfer. *La ética del Quijote: función de las novelas intercadas*. Madrid: Gredos, 1999. 122 pp.

Erich Auerbach's chapter on *Don Quixote* in *Mimesis*, "The Enchanted Dulcinea," both pleases and perplexes Hans-Jörg Neuschäfer. Neuschäfer applauds Auerbach's efforts to discredit the Romantics' idealistic reading of Cervantes' masterpiece, but it troubles him that Auerbach focuses his analysis primarily on the interaction between Don Quixote and Sancho Panza. Auerbach, explains Neuschäfer, champions the type of realist fiction that displays a concern for the commoner, that serves as a type of social statement, that problematizes real social conditions, that forces readers to examine the ethics of the society depicted by the novel. As seen by Neuschäfer, Auerbach concludes that *Don Quixote* does not display this type of ethical and social problematization: (1) the society surrounding Don Quixote is well structured; it is the demented knight who is out of place, and, once he recovers his sanity, he returns to the established,

accepted, and unchallenged order; (2) the knight's plight represents a comedy, not a tragedy; he, thus, serves more as a dismissible caricature than as a serious character. Neuschäfer states that he does not entirely disagree with Auerbach's conclusions with regard to the affairs of the knight and his companion. He does, however, question Auerbach's decision to apply his findings to the entire novel without considering the significance of the non-Quixote related events, the so-called interpolated tales. Had Auerbach included these tales in his study, suggests Neuschäfer, his interpretation might have been quite different.

The story of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, misinterpreted for years by the Romantics, explains Neuschäfer, is a tale of pride and humility. Don Quixote, as lunatic knight, haughtily seeks to force his standards on others, to improve the world and humanity, to redeem a fallen society. This deeply blasphemous arrogance does not call into question societal ethics; Cervantes, claims Neuschäfer, uses the knight's arrogance to ridicule personal excess and non-conformity, not to question social establishments. On the other hand, Don Quixote as reasonable gentleman, as Alonso the Good, demonstrates humility and compassion, understanding and tolerance. These positive qualities manifest themselves particularly in the gentleman's relationship with his squire, companion, and eventually friend, Sancho Panza. It is this pacific, conformist Don Quixote who endears himself to his readers, according to Neuschäfer, and who also triumphs, in the end, over the arrogant knight. The literary model set forth by Don Quixote closes the door to the era of epic heroes insulated from the world around them and opens a new era of literary heroes who will exemplify the social and moral difficulties associated with human relationships.

Although Neuschäfer concedes that the narrative of the knight's adventures represents a comedy when viewed in isolation from the interpolated tales, he maintains that moral messages not fully developed in the larger story of Don Quixote are highlighted and fleshed out in the interpolated tales, stories which often, despite their Christian background, have a tragic quality and outline individual ethical behavior. He insists that one can read *Don Quixote* without the interpolations, should one so choose, but that the interpolations, which serve as exemplary tales, significantly alter the interpretation of the core events.

In Part I of *Don Quixote* the interpolated tales reiterate Don Quixote's chief ethical flaw: the desire to force others to conform to his absurd, idealistic view of life. Neuschäfer explains that Don Quixote's outrageous actions all occur within the realm of illusion. The problems that he attempts to resolve (the case of Andrés, the episodes with Maritornes, the distress of the Princess Micomicona, etc.) are grounded not in contemporary reality but rather in the idealism of the fictional world that he seeks to reconstruct.

When faced with true moral injustices worthy of rectification (the slandering of the reputation of Marcela, the infractions of Don Fernando regarding Dorotea and Luscinda), Don Quixote becomes, literally, a bystander, completely ineffectual. If the analysis were to end here, suggests Neuschäfer, one could justifiably conclude that *Don Quixote* is nothing but a farce. As Neuschäfer argues, however, we should notice that the interpolated tales underscore precisely the real ethical issues that Don Quixote, in his delusion, is unable to resolve. Don Quixote's irrational love for Dulcinea and his ridiculous attempts to force others to validate his illusion are replayed in the "real" desires that Grisóstomo feels for Marcela, or in the "real"—within the bounds of the fictional frame—desires of Anselmo to test the faithfulness of his wife. Although Don Quixote's actions may be dismissed as comic, the interpolated events contain an element of tragedy: Grisóstomo dies; Lotario, Anselmo, and Camila also die. They seem, truly, to serve as negative examples of moral problems faced by individuals of the day. Thus, when considered in conjunction with the main story, these supposedly extraneous tales cast new possibilities for interpretation of the central narrative.

Part II, states Neuschäfer, is less prone to contain incidental material, for reasons well explained by the prologuist. Neuschäfer believes, however, that the governorship of Sancho Panza, if not entirely disconnected from the main story (in which, it could be argued, he himself plays a role equally as important as his lord), functions, like the interpolated events of Part I, as an exemplum. The events experienced by Sancho Panza underscore the right and ability of people to direct the affairs of their own lives and not to have people like Don Quixote (or here, we might add, the Duke) dictate their options and decisions. Also, Neuschäfer reminds us, in Part II we find the insertion of real social problems overlooked by Auerbach: (1) the exile of the *moriscos*, with all the accompanying economic, interpersonal, religious, and ethical intricacies, as demonstrated in the episodes involving Ricote and his daughter Ana Félix; and (2) the insertion of Roque Guinart, the good-hearted thief and wise sinner, whose very presence and open rebellion echoes social difficulties of the day. Both these episodes, explains Neuschäfer, serve to underscore the true, gentle, and wise nature of the temporarily insane Alonso Quixano the Good, and to prepare for the knight's reconversion to sanity and reality at the conclusion of the text.

Neuschäfer's study aptly articulates the important connection between the main narrative of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza and the episodes often deemed non-essential interspersed throughout the text. He makes a clear case for considering the interpolated tales as exempla that fortify and reiterate with seriousness the moral issues, flippantly depicted through the antics of the deranged *caballero*. Perhaps Neuschäfer could have gone even

further in disproving Auerbach's position: Carroll B. Johnson, for example, in *Cervantes and the Material World*, deftly demonstrates the presence of the material world not only in the interpolated tales but also in the central narrative, particularly, in Sancho's preoccupation with salary. Nevertheless, *cervantistas* will welcome the opportunity to review Neuschäfer's superb explanation of Cervantes' ingenious ability to interweave plot and episode both thematically and structurally, thus interconnecting the underlying moral issues and outlining an acceptable contemporary social ethic, particularly with regard to individuals and interpersonal relationships.

Eric J. Kartchner  
Foreign Languages and Literatures  
Southern Methodist University  
Dallas, TX 75205  
ejk@mail.smu.edu

Maria Caterina Ruta. *Il Chisciotte e i suoi dettagli*. Palermo: Flaccovio, 2000. 257 pp.

This book consists of ten previously published essays that treat problems which *cervantistas* have pondered for a long time. Whatever the familiar topic—the apocryphal second part, story intercalation, theatricality, myth versus reality—Ruta's work is carefully researched and pleasingly methodical. To introduce a topic, she often (though not always) begins with the origins of key words or concepts; or she merely isolates a definition of a word, such as *amistad*, *visualidad*, *beldad*, *teatro*, *apócrifo*. Then, after surveying the scholarship on the theme in question, she sensitively chooses her critical path. For example, Don Quijote's library: After discussing the books he bought and read Ruta comes to the conclusion that the *Quijote* is not a parody or an intertextual recreation of an earlier genre, but that "the intent of the *Quijote* is the *Quijote*," as Morón Arroyo has said. She finds that Cervantes wholeheartedly depended on the autodidacticism of a bookish character searching for a new direction for what the author believed was the prototypical "historia maravillosa, imaginativa." A sound judgment on Ruta's part, though she sometimes unnecessarily relies on the voice of another critic for a conclusion.

In her chapter on the mythic structure of the *Quijote* she offers the

following pattern of action: equilibrium, equilibrium broken, probing, disorder. Ruta explains that there is much tension between Don Quijote's original thinking and the anti-intellectual climate surrounding him, which obfuscates his objectives. In Part I he is scoffed at by persons of higher social class, but in Part II he sees the world more objectively. Ruta finds that the literary antitheses of life-death, *cuerto-loco*, action-inaction, which lie beneath the plot, match the mentality of the hero who refuses to respond to the predominant social forces.

Regarding the Avellaneda continuation, Ruta first sorts out the differences between *continuación*, *imitación*, and *obra apócrifa* and then asks what Avellaneda's work legitimately may be labeled. Using recent criticism as her point of departure, she deduces that parody would best explain Cervantes' motive for including Avellaneda in Part II. Avellaneda's Don Álvaro Tarfe is incarnated in Cervantes' book so that the characters of the two authors may confront one another on the same turf, thus to prove that Cervantes' are genuine while Avellaneda's are mere simulations. No matter the opinion one has about Avellaneda, there is little doubt that by calling attention to the apocryphal author, Cervantes simultaneously, and perhaps intentionally, documents the popularity of his own Part I. Readers and listeners enjoyed Part I as valuable entertainment, while Avellaneda's response to it was a failed attempt at correcting it.

Ruta's chapter on the visual nature of the *Quijote* ("lo sguardo") treats an aspect of Cervantes' style that suffers from a lack of critical inquiry (as E. C. Riley has said). The *Quijote* was for some—notably Ortega y Gasset—a book with an incomparable visual sense. Ruta recapitulates the movement and the sights of the *Quijote*'s narrative to prove its sensitivity to the contemporary landscapes, whether concrete or imaginary, natural or fabricated, terrestrial or marine. She then reviews the problem of realism in the Renaissance, the object-subject doubleness of reality and the artist's coming to terms with it by combining the world of the senses with the forms and ideas beyond that world. This approach results in the broadening of the scope of her remarks about the fusion of detail and Cervantes' ability to select the extraneous matter from that detail and to root it out by casting irony upon it.

Detail and its role in defining verisimilitude is a central issue of the *Quijote*. Ruta concludes that Cervantes was keenly aware of people and things of his environment, and for that reason, the loaded term "detail" intervenes in her study. Cervantes struggles with detail, from the first page of his novel. In many ways detail can be seen as a subterfuge diverting the reader who is sincere about discovering Cervantes' specific intentions; or from another perspective, detail may be a point of departure for building a case for the illusion of truth in the *Quijote*.

Among Ruta's other incursions into the interpretation of the *Quijote* are the interpolated stories and the role that women play in them. Ruta is correct in concentrating upon the dramatic nature of the *Quijote* (where once again the visual has an important part to play)—that is, on its theatricality as the narrator guides the audience with words related to the verb *ver* through his literary journey. The Maese Pedro episode epitomizes this approach, but Cervantes' theatricality is highlighted from the earlier chapters, like the Grisóstomo-Marcela interlude, in which Marcela's *coup de théâtre* occurs upon a rock overlooking Grisóstomo's tomb. While the theatrical increases in intensity in Part II, Ruta claims that it is present from the beginning, because Cervantes' worldview is one in which the unifying center has lost its force. The shift occurred because Cervantes ceded to individuals who draw the spectators' attention with their shocking conspicuousness. Theatricality thus enhances the feminine perspective, because Dorotea impressively shields her honor with a profound knowledge of the dramatic that leaves her spectators (especially Don Fernando) reeling.

"Lo brutto delle donne" is a chapter that examines the decomposition (or perhaps it is better to call it the ultimate evolution) of the Petrarchan extreme into a form that adjusts itself to the reality that Cervantes believed he had to confront in the *Quijote*. Such disintegration of ideals creates obstacles for Don Quijote. Ruta reviews the Petrarchan influences in Europe and earlier in Spain, and she then applies the Petrarchan principles to the women in the *Quijote*. The pages devoted to Dulcinea are especially well worth reading. Her image, which changes from Part I to Part II, stands in contrast to the portraits of Marcela, Dorotea, Claudia Jerónima, and Ana Félix, who break away from traditions built upon moral premises and physical conventions, which they subvert with their unusual candor and attractiveness. Ruta appropriately concentrates on Dorotea in this chapter because of her boldness and because of Cervantes' use of minute detail in the narrative of her story and in the ornateness and seductive quality of her physical postures and poses.

Sancho's rustic portrayal of Dulcinea as Aldonza of course runs contrary to the Petrarchan ideas of his master. As Part II moves along, this sometimes grotesque feature, which Ruta refers to as "lo brutto," prevails not only in the figure of Dulcinea emerging in El Toboso, but also in the characterization of Altisidora, Doña Rodríguez, and the Dulcinea of Montesinos' cave. Here, the Petrarchan code begins to be scrambled, such that caricature, like the Petrarchan antithesis Maritornes, becomes an aspect of Cervantes' style and technique that did not offend the aesthetic sensibilities of his public.

Generally, Ruta's approach with solidly based semantic probing and

Cervantes' challenge to literary tradition, her judicious application of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theory, and her highly discriminating choice of cited texts all contribute to a balanced and sober study of the *Quijote* that is thought-provoking and gratifying.

Dominick Finello  
Foreign Language  
and Literature Department  
Rider University  
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648  
finello@rider.edu

Diana de Armas Wilson. *Cervantes, the Novel, and the New World*.  
Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. 270 pp.  
ISBN: 0-19-816005-4.

During the first week of my course on Cervantes, I mention to students that had the author of *Don Quixote* been granted the employment he sought in the Indies in the 1590s, in all likelihood the class they are about to begin would not exist and the long text before them never would have been written. Cervantes' request was denied, however, and rather than becoming a wealthy *indiano*, he became instead the progenitor of the modern novel.

In her new study, Diana de Armas Wilson has decided to transport Cervantes and his writings to the New World and, more important perhaps, she has chosen to situate the New World firmly in the literary and political reality that was Cervantes' Spain. These initial moves—in effect to think against the grain of artificial disciplinary boundaries that have separated peninsular and Latin American studies—are in themselves a major contribution to the field of early modern Spanish research. For although literary scholars have long known that Habsburg Spain was an imperial power, they have been unwilling to investigate the ways in which empire permeated the discursive field of Spanish writing and how cultural forms and styles thought to be European in origin were in fact the hybrid offspring of the colonial experience. The fact that Sancho Panza glibly remarks that any black subjects he may find on his *ínsula* will be sold into slavery—to mention only one of the many fascinating examples cataloged by Wilson—already catapults us out of Europe and into the Atlantic world that stretched from Seville to Lisbon to West Africa, the Caribbean and

back again. Although Cervantes never traversed any of these transatlantic (or transpacific) routes, they nonetheless constituted an integral part of his creative geography. Situated next to the inns and palaces of Andalucía and Castilla, the soldiers' barracks of Naples, and the dank bagnios of North Africa were islands filled with "bárbaros," gold, and human sacrifice.

Wilson begins her study with an inventory of references to America found in the Cervantine opus. Each of these references on its own might render a sustained analysis, and Wilson offers a number of suggestive models for further research. Her contribution here, however, is more general insofar as she proposes to construct an inclusive theory of intertextuality that might move us, as she puts it, from "inventory to interpretation" (30). According to Wilson, the "Americanist Cervantes" must be understood both through his literary relationships with New World *cronistas* as well as through the geographical and spatial relations that structure his texts and biography. In this first chapter, then, Wilson expands and enriches the image of a "traveling Cervantes," an image previously fashioned into a different variation by Steven Hutchinson in his *Cervantine Journeys* (1992).

In Chapter Two, "The Novel about the Novel," Wilson enters the heavily trampled terrain of debates about the origins of the novel. In response to theories disseminated by professors of English literature, most notably Ian Watt in his influential *Rise of the Novel* (1957), Wilson argues (correctly in my opinion) that the most productive approach to the issue is to trace the "multiple rises of the novel" or, to put it another way, the intersecting genealogies of what today we understand to be the modern narrative form. Given the premise of Wilson's project, one is struck by the "European" focus of this chapter where the proposed shift to New World concerns is reduced momentarily to the level of thematics. But in a sense the entire second chapter is a prelude to Wilson's reading of Cervantine allusions to America and their intertextual relationship to *Robinson Crusoe*. Thus the title of Chapter Three: "The Novel as 'Moletta': Cervantes and Defoe."

It is in the third chapter that Wilson makes one of her more potentially ground-breaking assertions. Because the texts of both Cervantes (especially in *Persiles y Sigismunda*) and Defoe are intimately linked through an imaginary populated by islands and cannibals (that is, the discursive and material realities of the English and Spanish colonial projects), Wilson argues that the novel must be seen as the product of early modern global relations and not isolated national identities or even the rise of particular classes or ideologies such as individualism. Once we understand that Defoe had more than a passing knowledge of Spanish writers, among them Las Casas and Cervantes, the process of what Wilson calls "imperial mime-

sis" becomes easier to appreciate. This assertion offers a promising new direction for comparative Spanish-English studies at a time when traditional approaches to the discipline of comparative literature have been exhausted. In fact, and here Wilson might have productively expanded the context for her chapter to include relevant historiography, English colonialism in its early stages imitated Spanish colonial practices not only in the literary realm but in the real-life domain of population control and economic exploitation. Historian Nicholas Canny, for example, has convincingly shown that already in the occupation of Ireland, colonizers such as Sidney and Spenser were well-versed in Spanish colonial strategies. As one English ideologue claimed, Spain in America had "invented good laws and statutes for the brideling of the barbarous and wicked, and for the maintayning and defending of the just."

Chapter Four deploys a number of contemporary theories of "hybridity" that have grown out of disparate critical traditions. By drawing upon the Bakhtin school in Russia, post-structuralist inspired "post-colonial" texts by writers such as Homi Bhabha, the work of Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz, and more recent studies by Latin American critics Antonio Cornejo Polar, Ángel Rama, and Néstor García Canclini, Wilson argues that the novel as a mixed form may have flourished in geographical spaces that tolerated "hybridity." The potential danger here is to mix and match thinkers who, despite their shared interest in transculturated cultural phenomena, were in fact developing very different intellectual and political projects that share little beyond the umbrella concept of heterogeneity. Although her theoretical excursions might have been better coordinated, Wilson's basic point is well-taken: Cervantes' extended narratives represent a multilingual reality, and thus reveal the global reach of Spanish culture and its indebtedness to the dialectical exchange between metropolis and colony. Wilson's contention that Cervantes' use of the Nahuatl word "cacao" in "La gitanilla" may be the first in Spanish literature is interesting, yet I suspect that by the time Cervantes composed the *Novelas ejemplares*, Americanisms were part of the standard lexicon in some regions of the peninsula, especially in cities like Sevilla which had close ties to America and which Cervantes knew well. Already in Hernando Colón's *Vida del Almirante* (1535), to cite only one early example, we find anecdotes in which Europeans sarcastically comment on the function of cacao as currency in Amerindian cultures.

Chapter Five traces the resonances of chivalric literature throughout the Cervantine opus and throughout Spanish imperial rhetoric. The influence of the *libros de caballerías* on Don Quixote is well-documented. In this chapter, Wilson convincingly argues that *Amadís de Gaula* and other chivalric texts played a key role in the thinking of real-life *conquistadores*.

Her reading of the Felician de la Voz episode in *Persiles y Sigismunda* is especially noteworthy. Chapter Six develops the argument of the preceding chapter by reopening the issue of Cervantes' relationship to early modern utopian writing. According to Wilson, Cervantes picks up the mantle of Thomas More in which "utopia" serves as a pretext for social critique directed at European institutions, i.e. "to condemn—or, rather, to benevolently satirize—imperial, ducal, or gubernatorial corruption, both at home and abroad" (141).

In her final two chapters, Wilson outlines the more properly literary correspondences between Cervantes and two American writers: Alonso de Ercilla and Inca Garcilaso. This section of the book has the feel of more traditional influence studies in which biographical parallels and shared sources, themes, and stylistic tropes form the basis for comparative readings. Nevertheless, Wilson's assertion that Cervantes' gloss, in the *Persiles*, on Ercilla's and Garcilaso's "barbarians" is in fact a strong "parody of the discourses of Iberian expansionism" (181) is persuasive and potentially generative for future studies that might "repoliticize" Cervantes according to the terms of his particular time and place. Perhaps most promising of all is the concluding section on translation and the figures of Transila (a fictional character in the *Persiles*) and La Malinche (the historical indigenous woman Malintzin Tenépal associated with the conquest of Mexico) where Wilson begins a highly original analysis of the ways in which conquest and conversion in their earliest stages rely heavily on a gendered division of cultural labor.

*Cervantes, the Novel, and the New World* is a welcome addition to the Cervantes bibliography and will serve as a source of inspiration for younger scholars who wish to continue the on-going renewal of Spanish peninsular studies. It also will be of interest to comparatists and Latin American colonial experts who will find in it a preliminary cartography for connecting the multiple global circuits that made up Spanish imperial culture.

George Mariscal  
Dept. of Literature  
University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093  
gmariscal@ucsd.edu

Georgina Dopico Black. *Perfect Wives, Other Women. Adultery & Inquisition in Early Modern Spain*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001. xx + 307 pp.

This book is about reading, of both words and bodies. Georgina Dopico Black's analyses of three texts, Fray Luis de Leon's *La perfecta casada*, Calderón's *El médico de su honra*, and Sor Juana's *Los empeños de una casa*, are approached from elegant theoretical and historical perspectives. They lead her, and us, to reevaluate these texts (and others) in light of the cultural contexts and anxieties they reveal. Her discussions begin with broad readings of Body and Soul—"a site subject to the scrutiny of a remarkable array of gazes: inquisitors, theologians, religious reformers, confessors, poets, playwrights and, not least among them, husbands" (xiii-xiv), in order to discover the intersections of these readings of Self and Other, of body as text, and the legibility or illegibility of signs, moving from somatic to semiotic. For Dopico, the enormous volume of conduct manuals in sixteenth-century Spain and of adultery-honor plays in the seventeenth century must signify more than a popularity of the genres. Rather, their prevalence points to a way of seeing, a way of reading signs in the world, and are connected to it in a more complex and closer way than one might have supposed before reading this extraordinary book. The anxieties that the texts reveal about women's bodies point to "larger cultural and political questions, to the difficulties and the dangers of reading, to the tenacious interconnectedness of gender, religion, race, nation, and interpretation" (xiv).

In Chapter 1 ("Visible Signs: Reading the Wife's Body in Early Modern Spain") Dopico sets forth her principal premises, theories, and methods of inquiry. She discusses the central role of three sacraments of transformation and their importance to Counter-Reformation theology, politics, and aesthetics: the one-flesh doctrine of matrimony, the transubstantiation of the Eucharistic host, and the Jewish or Moslem conversion to Christianity, all three of which are subject to inquisitorial surveillance and discipline. The problem in each of these three transformations is that they either do or could conceivably retain vestiges of their former self. The married woman loses the identifier of virtue—her virginity—and therefore any infidelity cannot be immediately detected via her body. Although she has become "one" with her husband and through marriage to him has acquired a status of virtue and honor, she also acquires the capacity for "adulterous agency" because of the illegibility of her body in this regard. In a similar way, although the host is transformed from bread to the body of Christ in the sacrament of the mass, it still retains a "breadlike" appear-

ance that can cast doubt on its essence. Similarly, the religious convert could possibly retain an essence of his former religious self even after he has converted, although appearances might indicate that his conversion has been complete and sincere. In each of these cases—wife, host, *converso*—what were particularly threatening were “the doubts these violations cast on the efficacy of the sacrament” (adulterous agency, breadlike properties, impure blood) as vestigial traces of an Otherness. Throughout her study, Dopico Black traces and analyzes shifts in reading, which go from the somatic (the body of the wife) to the semiotic (the illegibility or indeterminacy of signs and what is concealed beneath the surface), to an intersection of the two in the politico-cultural sphere (a substitutability between the wife’s body and the *converso*/morisco body). If the body is treated as a text or an institution, then concerns over the excesses of interpretation and the impossibility of really knowing a body or a text must arise, especially in the body of a wife. Although it adapted to changing circumstances, the Inquisition served as the instrument of national centralization, and maintained certain basic constants: “a preoccupation with uncovering hidden truths, often achieved through reading and/or disciplining the body, the use of informants, secret proceedings, appeals to rhetoric of contamination and cleansing, confessional imperative, and, above all, a compulsion towards surveillance as most reliable means to contain Otherness” (4).

In Chapter 2, “Pasos de un peregrino’: Luis de León Reads the Perfect Wife,” Dopico discusses *La perfecta casada* as a paradigm of the conduct manual, but situated within the context of newly emerging cultural identities, and centered in the concept of the early modern subject/agent. If a conduct manual is to help a woman refashion herself, this perfectibility presupposes an agency which is in itself troublesome. By emphasizing the artificiality of makeup, for example, Fray Luis warns that it makes a woman into something “other” than what she is in essence. His preoccupation “betrays his critical anxieties over reading and misreading... Charges of adultery, whorishness, and monstrosity imputed against the made-up, wandering *casada*—changes that can readily be applied to the text itself—are all reducible, at some level, to charges of illegibility” (58). However, Dopico proposes to read *La perfecta casada* as a “meditation about interpretation and its mirages...and what is more, a reflection on interpretation vehemently grounded in a historical moment in which the stakes of reading were remarkably high” (52), as Fray Luis himself well knew. Dopico points out inconsistencies in Fray Luis’s ordering of sources and, especially, in his problematic use of similitudes and analogies, which involve “a precarious crossing...of the tenuous line that separates essence from appearance.” (78) In other words, by linking “parecer” and “ser” in an intent to “facilitate

legibility," "the conflation of the two terms...instead mask[s] a prioritization of appearance (or even accident) over essence that could be extremely disruptive for the treatise as a whole." This of course has grave consequences when translated to the body of the wife, since "el ser honesta/perfecta" can be confused with the appearance of being so, or vice versa. Dopico points out that in giving instructions on how to become *like* a perfect wife, Fray Luis provides "instructions for succeeding at just this type of deception." (81). The chapter is rich in suggestive mis/readings and comments on Fray Luis's analogies and tropes, culminating in a compelling commentary on the manual's final exemplary figure, Judith, as exemplary agent, "mujer varonil", and "castradora" (105-07). Dopico Black summarizes her own reading of *La perfecta casada* as a "defiant test in its advocacy of interpretive plurality and in its challenge to inquisitorial norms of reading" (107), while at the same time maintaining an appearance of orthodox adherence.

In Chapter 3, "The Perfected Wife: Signs of Adultery and the Adultery of Signs in Calderón's *El médico de su honra*," Dopico examines the aforementioned play as a paradigm of the adultery/honor drama "genre," and brilliantly applies her arguments along two lines. In the first, she follows earlier work that applies to the husband a role of inquisitor, whose attention is focused on the "diseased" body of the wife, who "enacts the role of inquisitor reading for *limpieza de sangre*" in "a three-stage trajectory (containment, inquisition, textualization)" (116). Then Dopico takes on the problem of il/legibility of the signs that the husband mis/reads, and in so doing underscores the inherent problems of any inquisitorial undertaking. She argues that Calderón's theater did not reinforce or support the dominant social ideologies of *limpieza de sangre*, inquisitorial tactics, and honor, but rather contested them.

In Chapter 4, "Sor Juana's *Empeño*: The Imperfect Wife," Dopico turns to Sor Juana's play for an "Americanist" rereading of the problems of marital and racial purity, of honor, of desire, and of the legibility or illegibility of the Other's body. This chapter was less compelling than the previous, perhaps because she seemed more to suggest than to argue her points. Dopico offers readings of *Los empeños* that uncover strategies of resistance through "gender illegibility" (174), exemplified by the cross-dressing Castaño in *Los empeños de una casa*. Dopico suggests that anxieties over boys playing women on the early modern Spanish (and by extension Colonial) stage points to a same-sex desire between Pedro and Castaño that is "almost impossible to overlook." The point is less convincingly presented than others, especially in terms of the contemporary context of the play, which would convey more comicity than desire, not necessarily "threatening, at some level, to the stability of a heterosexual code of desire and

binary signification" or even suggesting that "not only gender but also sex" is a "superficial inscription that does not go beyond its performance or remit to an unconstructed natural given" (197). Dopico suggests that "the title of Sor Juana's play can already be read as a kind of transvestism of the title of Calderón's 1650 *comedia*, *Empeños de un acaso*," and is more than a "seemingly insignificant linguistic shift" but rather "exploits the dramatic possibilities of the early modern analogy between the female body and the house that contains her" (183); the concept is intriguing, but one wonders if a contemporary of Sor Juana would have read it so. The many questions Dopico raises suggest future revisions of literary categories and periods, not to mention mechanisms of interpretation and reading, in particular, for reading the bodies of wives and Others in both European and American contexts.

Dopico began Chapter 1 with a lengthy quote from *Don Quijote I*, 33, a fragment of Lotario's attempt to persuade Anselmo of the power of the sacrament of marriage to unite two different persons into one single flesh, two souls into one will: "Aunque Dios creó a nuestro primer padre en el Paraíso Terrenal... así el marido es participante de la deshonra de la mujer por ser una misma cosa con ella." Although Dopico's study does not deal with any Cervantine text in detail, it nonetheless suggests new perspectives on the themes of marriage, the female body, and the legibility of somatic, semiotic, and cultural signs that will prove illuminating and highly pertinent to many of Cervantes' works, such as the "Curioso impertinente," "El celoso extremeño," and others.

Throughout this fascinating book, Georgina Dopico Black elegantly articulates and outlines the complicated questions, connections, cruxes, and cross-sections involved in proving her theses. The intricacy of the critical apparatus and the necessary terms pertinent to her arguments do not obfuscate her insights. The book is clearly written, the result of clear thinking. The author's reiterations and clarifications guide the reader through her arguments, highlighting connections between her points, and clarifying the premises that serve as the basis of her discussion, so that readers who do not enjoy complete familiarity with the texts or the contexts should be able to make good use of this book, one which should be on everyone's "must read" list.

Susan Paun de García  
Dept. of Modern Languages  
Denison University  
Granville, OH 43023  
garcia@denison.edu

Charles D. Presberg. *Adventures in Paradox: Don Quixote and the Western Tradition*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001. 250 pp.

In *Adventures in Paradox*, Charles Presberg contends the following two points: 1) although it caught on later there than in the rest of Europe, paradox was cultivated in Spain with an unsurpassed exuberance; 2) Cervantes' *Don Quixote* contains a compendium of Western paradox as well as many innovations in the field. The study draws upon a variety of works, from Classical to Baroque, and engages a good deal of the critical literature, particularly that bearing upon key issues in *Don Quixote* related to paradox. Presberg weighs in on topics like the reliability of narrators and sources, the relationships Cervantes posits between the author and the reader, "hard" vs. "soft" readings of don Quixote, and the don Quixote vs. don Diego de Miranda controversy. As one might expect, the focus on paradox foregrounds many traits we have come to associate with Cervantes: parody, irony, ambivalence, anti-dogmatism, and so forth.

Presberg's use of contemporary theory is eclectic, with a healthy focus on the primary literary texts as well as the abundant works on paradox by Classical and Renaissance writers. He discusses and makes productive use of figures and concepts such as Plato's Silenus, Aristotle's opposition of nature and art, and Erasmus's Folly. The parallels he highlights between paradox and Renaissance poetics provide a useful way of conceptualizing and understanding the vogue of such rhetoric in the period: concern with earthly, contingent matters, mixed forms, temporality and "process," satire that ostensibly contradicts received opinion. Indeed, one of Presberg's points is that paradox could be far more than a rhetorical exercise—that, in more complex writers, it can be characterized as a mode of thought. As with other conceptual frameworks, a danger with Presberg's approach is that it can lead him to characterize nearly any work or "utterance" that is not somehow completely intelligible and conclusive as "paradoxical"; on the other hand, the five categories of paradox he proposes seem useful, and while many of his conclusions involve a sort of rephrasing of previous critical observations, some offer fresh and valuable insight into Cervantes' art.

The first part of the study provides an overview of paradox from Antiquity to the Renaissance, with brief discussions of Plato, Cusanus, and Erasmus. Beginning with the *Parmenides*, Presberg discusses the foundations and development of some of his basic operating concepts: *serio ludere*, *discordia concors*, *via negativa* and "resolution in mystery." Also included in this section are observations on the varied incorporation of such ideas into

Christian thought, for example in Neoplatonism and Mysticism. Presberg mentions St. Francis of Assisi as a pivotal figure who anticipates the less abstract and intellectual, more earthly and practical concerns of Christian humanism.

Predictably, Erasmus' *Moriae Encomium* represents a sort of pre-Cervantine culmination of Western paradox. Presberg fruitfully sustains the Erasmian thread in his later discussion of Cervantes, particularly with regard to the spirit of self-deprecation, ambivalence toward convention and authenticity, and the wisdom of folly; I also agree with him that Erasmus's comic masterpiece does not completely resolve the tensions it sets forth in its first two sections. I occasionally felt, however, that Presberg overplays his hand, indulging in suggestive minutiae at the expense of clarity. The following is a representative passage:

In such a text as Erasmus's *Folly*, the reader faces contradictions at every turn between what the protagonist says and what she seems to mean on a multiplicity of "issues"; between what she states either ironically or straight and what the author or the reader or both may take to be valid on the same subject. In addition, the original texts that she and, through her, the author, deploy in their inventive (and self-serving?) *imitatio* exert pressure on the declamation and on the "whole" text (including what is unstated). Thus, the "new" text both asserts and parodically disputes the validity of its original(s), thereby opening up countless other levels of inter- and extratextual debate. In what Terence Cave aptly calls the "cornucopian" texts of the Renaissance, a true plurality of contrary "voices," opinions, and apparent truths engage in a struggle—now gamelike, now warlike—for simultaneous occupation of the same textual platform, somehow occupied by none and all. (32)

Such writing strikes me as more elaborate than illuminating, and the intense awareness of textual tropes, unreliable narrators (and ulterior authorial motives?), etc., suggests a text so infused with paradox as to elude interpretation. A passage like the one cited above—and there are many—would require substantial "decompressing" and clarification.

A discussion of Rojas, Antonio de Guevara, and Pero Mejía serves to illustrate the cultivation of paradox in Renaissance Spain, and to further elaborate different categories and effects of paradox. The principle of *contienda* in *Celestina* exemplifies a version of *discordia concors*, and Presberg argues for an open-endedness to Rojas' *Tragicomedia* that is paradoxical and thus inimical to the traditional didacticism set forth in its prologue. Guevara's *Menosprecio de corte* is, according to Presberg, a work that undermines

itself while foregrounding the issue of self-knowledge. And while Mejía employs a rather conventional, un-ironic paradox, his writings attend to the tension between *usus et experientia*, theory and practice. The stage is thus set to examine Cervantes' "synthesis and refashioning" of Western paradox.

In a critique and refinement of the categories set forth in Rosalie Colie's masterful study, *Paradoxia Epidemica*, Presberg offers five more or less distinct "strains": ontological, cosmological, psychological, axiological, and logical paradox. These categories do help the reader grasp the variegated realm of paradox, although the distinctions and types do not always remain clear in the heat of textual commentary. Presberg first applies his categories to the Prologue of part I, which, containing every type of paradox, functions as an illustrative analogue to the tone and narrative dynamic of *Don Quixote* as a whole. Presberg makes much of distinguishing Cervantes the author from the narrator of the prologue, whom he characterizes as a naive reader and writer. This focus yields some conclusions that seem sound if unremarkable: for example, we must guard against taking the narrator's words as straightforward propositions, univocal statements of authorial purpose. On the other hand, the lack of resolution inherent in much paradox provides an illuminating lens through which to appreciate how Cervantes manages to seemingly come down on both sides of an issue—parody and praise of historical and poetic discourse, for example (an interesting variation on a tendency that Borges called *magias parciales*). The characterization of the author / reader relationship as *coincidentia oppositorum* also seems apt, as does the observation that the ultimate effect is an unprecedented bestowal of responsibility on the reader.

Perhaps Presberg is inclined to overstate Cervantes' confidence in his readers. In order to strengthen his argument regarding the naiveté of the prologue's narrator, whom he likens to don Quixote, he asks, "Is it at all plausible to think that in creating his protagonist, the author of *Don Quixote* shares, rather than ridicules, such a social and moral 'concern'? Is it really plausible to hold that Cervantes thinks that some readers of *Don Quixote*, like the protagonist and, perhaps, the 'second author,' the narrator and his friend need to be thoroughly disabused of the opinion that the romances are historically true?" (152). While it is rather easy to make Cervantes a kindred spirit to our most modern ideas and sensibilities, Presberg's question is somewhat anachronistic. Such "concerns" were treated as quite serious and legitimate by many respected and influential thinkers of Cervantes' time, including Juan Luis Vives. More importantly, Cervantes' writings quite frequently address just these concerns: the range of readers at Juan Palomeque's inn, and the rather sophisticated canon of Toledo come readily to mind, as do "El retablo de las maravillas" and a good part

of the *Novelas ejemplares*, including the prologue, "El licenciado Vidriera," "El coloquio de los perros," and "El celoso extremeño." Granted, these passages often contain much irony and "paradox"; but they also most definitely contain a sincere preoccupation on the part of Cervantes with a very complicated phenomenon—the mysteries of aesthetic engagement and "belief," including the moral and social implications of such activity. For a scholar who elsewhere insists upon the fusion of the aesthetic and the moral in Cervantes (228), such a contention on the part of Presberg is a bit peculiar. Finally, we must not forget that much of the "game" here and elsewhere has as much to do with Cervantes *educating* as with "liberating" the reader, and perhaps even more to do with bestowing upon himself increased artistic freedom.

The final section of the book focuses on the ambivalent relationship between don Quixote and don Diego de Miranda. Skirting a confrontation that has polarized some modern critics, Presberg does not fully endorse or condemn either character, and he insightfully examines the way each character, through a subtle interchange of words and deeds, draws out the virtues and flaws of the other. Particularly interesting is Presberg's contention that don Diego's experience with the "insane" hidalgo propels the wealthy country gentleman toward self-knowledge and potential modification. As elsewhere, Presberg makes some good use here of the dialogic principle in paradox: the lack of neat resolution does not always mean aporia and stasis, but can lead to negotiation and broader, more nuanced understanding. For while paradox often functions by subverting the categories, codes, and models upon which we rely for knowledge and identity, Presberg wisely observes that the result of this is not necessarily relativity or radical skepticism. His study provides insight into how Cervantes shows us that imitation and conventions are perhaps unavoidable, and can in fact be quite beneficial, even productive of knowledge. A key consideration, as Presberg argues, lies in the extent to which Cervantes' characters, narrators, and readers are consciously aware of the artifice and limitations involved in the forms and ideas they adopt, as well as the degree to which they are able to reflect upon and modify their beliefs accordingly, in an imperfect process of confusion and enlightenment. This is surely one of the most profound lessons Cervantes offers to his discreet readers.

Michael Scham  
Dept. of Modern and Classical Languages  
Univ. of St. Thomas  
St. Paul, MN 55105  
msscham@stthomas.edu

David R. Castillo. *(A)wry Views: Anamorphosis, Cervantes, and the Early Picaresque*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue UP, 2001. xiii + 182 pp.

In the study under review, Castillo adds to the familiar critical discussions of perspectivism and the double-voiced narrative structure in Cervantes and the picaresque by elaborating a critical approach that borrows from theories applied to the visual arts. As the author states at the outset, "In this study, I connect the perspectivistic drive of several Golden Age texts with the aesthetics of anamorphosis, also known as the curious, magic, or secret perspective" (1). In setting up the critical framework for his commentary, Castillo relies upon the works of E. H. Gombrich (*Art and Illusion*, but quoted in the Spanish version, *Arte e ilusión*) and Jurgis Baltrušaitis (*Anamorphic Art*), but also draws heavily on the work of J. A. Maravall and, most revealingly, Slavoj Žižek. At the risk of oversimplification, I would suggest that Castillo begins with an elaboration of the already well-documented perspectivistic approach and, stressing the mechanisms and putative goals of literary irony, then endeavors to illuminate the ideological content and implications of the works under examination.

After the brief "Introduction" (1–17), the book proceeds in two main parts: Part I, "The Picaresque," and Part II, "Cervantes." The section on the picaresque divides into three chapters: "Putting Things in Anamorphic Perspective: The Case of *Lazarillo*," "The Gaze of an-Other in *Guzmán de Alfarache*," and "Look Who's Talking! *Justina* and Cultural Authority." Part II, dealing with Cervantes, is also divided into three chapters: "*Don Quixote*: A Case of Anamorphic Literature," "*Persiles*, or The Cervantine Art of Looking Down and Awry," and "A 'Symptomatic' View of the Honor System in Cervantes's Theater." The brief conclusion (131–38) is followed by five pages of visual examples (including Holbein's "The Ambassadors" and Velázquez's "Las meninas").

While Castillo's choice of picaresque texts may seem a bit limited and in some ways odd (e.g., why not a section on the *Buscón*, a text rich in visual and anamorphic possibilities?), his treatment of the three books selected is supple and sensitive. The commentary on *Lazarillo*, in particular, is suggestive. Castillo underscores the emergence of a certain relationship between the subject and *fortuna* (25) to distinguish the protagonist's painful experience of fortune from a supposedly more traditional and inclusive view. Throughout *Lazarillo de Tormes*, as Castillo reads it, the importance of the young (and the older) protagonist's viewing of his world is held to be crucial to the narrator-protagonist's effort to situate the reader in his suffered, experienced world: "By means of his self-portrait, the narrator-protagonist of *Lazarillo de Tormes* invites the reader to identify with his

drive to achieve power and recognition in a society that has relegated him [Lázaro] to the status of social excrescence" (26).

Perhaps the best summary of Castillo's approach to this work is the following: "Lázaro's refusal to recognize himself in the sum of his representations—how the Other sees and evaluates him—is ultimately the expression of his unwillingness to lay down his weapon, to lower his oblique gaze in a sacrificial act of acceptance of his designated place in the Father's world. Hence, the narrative voice of *Lazarillo* consistently reveals the point of the split between the representations of the *pícaro* in the Other's view—his objective existence—and the marginal or oblique position from which Lázaro sees them—his being-desire, his *persona*" (29). Admittedly this is contentious and contested territory, and not all readers may agree with the notion of a consistently distanced and separated socio-critical voice that Castillo imputes to the anonymous author's complex narrator (e.g., some may disagree with the statement that "one thing he [Lázaro] would never do is identify with the postures of authority, for he knows too much" [30]). But the commentary on the role of a "critical gaze" in the book strikes me as one of the strongest sections of the study as a whole.

The chapter on Mateo Alemán's *Guzmán de Alfarache* sees the doubleness of voice and vision as part of the overall pattern and thrust of the narrative to dramatize both the early, fallen experience and the protagonist's later awareness based upon his redemptive transformation. As Castillo succinctly puts it (referring to the moment of Guzmán's awakening): "One can see in retrospect that this is the moment of birth of the narrative voice. From this point of view, the text appears, not as the discourse of the *pícaro*'s life, his persona, or desire—as in *Lazarillo*—but rather, as the discourse of the *pícaro*'s death, and his regeneration in the voice of a preacher" (38). This conception of the novel is consistent with Castillo's view of the contrast between *Guzmán* and *Lazarillo*: "In our discussion of the anonymous *Lazarillo de Tormes*, we saw how the narrator-*pícaro* projected himself (his desire) in a 'subjective' testimony that unveiled the constitutive lack in the Other—i.e., the mark of the contingency and violence of the social order. By contrast, the narrator-watchtower in *Guzmán de Alfarache* fixes on the *pícaro*'s guilt, and thus, retells his story from the point of view of the dominant social groups" (48).

By way of transition to his chapter on López de Úbeda's *Pícara Justina*, Castillo again emphasizes the issue of the all but inevitable doubleness of voice in the picaresque and makes a distinction of degree. In effect, while "*Guzmán*'s 'dialogism' reminds us of the fact that what we see depends on our point of view, even as the narrator privileges the experience of 'desengaño' from a morally correct watchtower perspective...[,] the critical

possibilities of the 'center-periphery dialogics' of the picaresque...will unfold in a more decisive manner in López de Úbeda's *La pícaro Justina*" (53). Castillo pays due attention to the obvious and much debated issue of the book's feminist vs. misogynist implications (55–63), as well as noting the challenges to interpretation posed by the structure and devices of the text itself. As he points out, "The meaning of *La pícaro Justina* is indeed a most difficult historiographic problem, for the difficulties connected to the picaresque 'dialogism' are enhanced here by the author's carnivalesque game of disguises, his flamboyant cross-dressing, and his playful superimposition of perspectives. These baroque excesses may be said to accentuate the dialogic structure of the text to the point of narrative dismembering and burlesque self-deconstruction" (57). Above all, for Castillo the salient feature of this text, which is also its challenge to the reader, is the particular "spin" on subjectivity that arises inescapably from both the baroque complexity of form and the narrator's insistence upon her own "way of seeing" (64).

The three chapters devoted to Cervantes deal respectively, with *Don Quixote*, *Persiles y Sigismunda*, and the question of *honra* (in its dimension as identity and the familiar problematic of *limpieza de sangre*) in selected works of Cervantes' drama. This section takes as its starting point the assumption of a pervasive irony at work in the texts. For Castillo the presence of irony, parody, and even the burlesque is fundamental, given the relevance of such "play" in the phenomenon of anamorphosis in the realm of the visual arts; he thus finds, beyond irony, elements of the parodic and the burlesque in texts or parts of texts where some readers might find their presence less obvious. The treatment of anamorphosis in *Don Quixote* (73–93) is somewhat brief but nonetheless quite suggestive. Principally, Castillo deals with examples of the irony of clashing verbal or rhetorical styles, e.g., between Don Quijote and Sancho (78 ff.), the elements of irony and even parody in the language and action of the Grisóstomo and Marcela episode, and finally the contrast of certain critical views of the whole question of Cervantes as an ironic writer. In this last aspect, Castillo juxtaposes the sharply divergent attitudes of the arch-conservative Spanish writer Ernesto Giménez Caballero (*Genio de España*, 1932) and those of Walter Benjamin (85–93), noting that both critics acknowledge the pervasiveness and power of Cervantine irony, but that for the Spanish conservative this was an alarming and subversive phenomenon, while for the early Marxist critic it was a positive and liberating force (86). In effect, the main thrust of this chapter is to begin with the concept of the ironic, anamorphic view and then, from this starting point, move to a more free-ranging discussion of the possibilities of an ideological reading.

The chapter on *Persiles y Sigismunda* is in many ways the most provoca-

tive section of the commentary on Cervantes. In contrast to the idealist and “Christian allegory” readings (Forcione *et al.*), for Castillo the *Persiles* “is a counter-utopian narrative...that is, an anamorphic mirror that inverts or, at the very least, distorts the symbols of Counter-Reformation culture” (94–95). It is crucial to point out here that Castillo does not reject totally the possibility of reading the text for and as Christian allegory, but rather he insists upon the validity of a contrary and additional, more revealing reading (97). Key to Castillo’s treatment of *Persiles* is allowing the possibility that many of the more violent and grotesque passages may be read as parody and black humor (104–05). But even where a humorous or parodic intention and/or reading is not possible, the straightforward view should not, he insists, be our only one: “our familiarization with the workings of perspective anamorphosis allows us to devise oblique or distorted images of Counter-Reformation culture even in those episodes and situations that do not seem particularly humorous” (105). Then, after citing Žižek’s concept of the criticism of ideology (*The Sublime Object of Ideology*) and how it allows us, as Žižek puts it, “to recognize in it [the element that holds the ideological edifice together] the embodiment of a lack, of a chasm of nonsense gaping in the midst of ideological meaning,” Castillo asserts that “such is precisely the effect—if not necessarily the intention—of much of Cervantes’s writing, including *Los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda*” (106).

This clearly expressed assertion brings us to one of the key critical and no doubt debatable issues of Castillo’s study. For some readers, the differences between “the effect” (a more or less subjective possibility of reading) and “intention” (however difficult or easy to recover, a putative purpose of the author) may not be all that consequential, if one takes as a premise the belief that the “ideological” element will surface, in any case. But for others, this may be an issue of contention. While Castillo’s final chapter—dealing with Cervantes’ drama and especially with the famous *entremés*, “El retablo de las maravillas” (see especially 120–30)—makes what I consider a convincing case for the clearly intended socio-critical function of irony, both verbal and (given that it is theater) visual, I would suggest that other parts of his study, notably the treatment of *Persiles*, will be received with markedly different reactions, depending upon one’s critical stance vis-à-vis ideological readings.

(A) *wry Views* is a clearly written, lively, and refreshingly accessible study of the three picaresque texts and the selected works by Cervantes. Although, given its relative brevity and the particular works chosen for commentary, the book is more suggestive than exhaustive, it nonetheless offers incisive readings and it points to further possibilities of analysis. Perhaps most noteworthy, meanwhile, is the cross-disciplinary application of visual art theory and of the historically well-grounded phenomenon of

the secret perspective to textual commentary, on one hand, and the lucid explication and application of the Žižekian approach to ideological reading, on the other. Castillo's book not only offers challenging readings of its own, but will also stimulate new and provocative discussion of both the canonical works and its own interpretations.

William H. Clamurro  
Dept. of Foreign Languages  
Emporia State University  
Emporia, KS 66801  
clamurw@emporia.edu

## Reply by James Iffland

First, I would like to thank Theresa Sears for her detailed and conscientious probing of my recent *De fiestas y aguafiestas: risa, locura e ideología en Cervantes y Avellaneda*. I also would like to respond, however, to some of the objections she raises regarding my approach.

To Sears' question, "Which came first, the theory or the text?" (218), I can answer that the text definitely came first.

As for Sears' question as to whether I am aware of the different theories regarding the ultimate ideological and political impact of festivals such as Carnival (218), I might point out that I have been aware of them for over twenty years (see Iffland, "Apocalypse Later"). Moreover, I speak about them in *De fiestas y aguafiestas* (e.g., 167–68). Citing Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, I point out specifically that Bakhtin's original theories are inadequate in their portrayal of a quintessentially liberating role for Carnival ("there is no a priori revolutionary vector to carnival and transgression," 168).

Regarding Carnival's being a "moment not a movement" (218), Sears is right to a large degree. My point was that it is a "moment" which can become particularly nasty when dominated groups use it to rise up against those whom they perceive as their oppressors (see the examples I cite [e.g., 168–69], including from very recent times). The carnivalizing "world-upside-down" can also prolong itself occasionally as a very dangerous political movement—see Christopher Hill's classic *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*, cited frequently in *De fiestas y aguafiestas*. As for the effortlessness with which "established power" is able to confiscate festive activity (218), most serious studies show that it took religious and political authorities nearly a millennium to do so.

As for my alleged overstating of the degree to which the fundamental "logic" of Carnival runs through *Don Quijote* from beginning to end (218), let me first point out that there is *considerably* more evidence of that "logic" than is discussed in my analysis. Part of my purpose was to demonstrate just how correct Bakhtin's intuitions regarding *Don Quijote* actually were. Readers familiar with the Russian critic's work will remember how tempted he seems to be with the notion of carrying out a full-scale application of his theories to Cervantes's masterpiece—a temptation, alas, to which he never succumbed. While a number of more recent critics have explored the carnivalesque dimension of *Don Quijote* (e.g., Redondo and Gorfkle), none

do so from the precise angle I pursue.

Part of what might be perceived as my overzealousness in pursuing the popular-festive connections in *Don Quijote* has to do precisely with the fact that I anticipated skeptical reactions such as Sears's. Moreover, I have a personal aversion toward works of criticism in which the theoretical approach employed is barely sustained by actual textual analysis—a phenomenon which, unfortunately, is becoming increasingly common in literary scholarship.

As for my alleged “assigning massive symbolic value to the slightest gestures or actions” (219), I would respond that to take a fragment out of a much larger analytical context so as to ridicule it is something which can be done with ease with virtually *any* critical text one might choose to discuss. The specific instance in which Sears indulges in this practice has to do with a broad examination of the role of the body in Cervantes so as to contrast it with what we find in Avellaneda. Also, it's unclear to me why what she proposes in her own reading (which is fairly self-evident) is in opposition to my own. As for my comments on the location of Rocinante's “ancas,” I apologize to Sears for insulting her intelligence.

Regarding my failure to discuss the “complex narratorial apparatus” (219) of *Don Quijote*, I should point out that with all the extensive and very competent work already done on the subject (Riley, Haley, El Saffar, Moner, Parr, etc.), and given that such a discussion would not have been pertinent to establishing my central points, I decided not to engage in it.

As for my brutalizing of the Dulcinea problematic (219), my point has to do with tracing the sociopolitical roots, and consequences, of Don Quijote's entire project. No matter what image of her Don Quijote may carry in his mind, other characters in the work (starting with the Toledan merchants in I, 4) are always forcing the issue of the “historical referent” behind the name. Don Quijote himself is forced to admit that her lineage is “recent,” to say the least (see his conversation with Vivaldo in I, 13). And let's not forget that he in fact tries to visit the “distant model” when he travels to El Toboso right at the beginning of Part II (chapters 8–10). I agree that Dulcinea is a complex figure tied to a literary tradition, but we can't overlook the fact that she has as her point of origin an actual *moza labradora* who lives near Alonso Quijano.

As for Sancho's dreams of advancement (219), yes, there is an obvious literary parody going on (as we all have known for years—nay, centuries). My point is that Sancho also happens to be doing what thousands of other *campesinos* are doing at the time—that is, leaving the countryside in search of a better life, thereby creating an enormous problem for the entire Spanish economy. Sancho himself is quite explicit about the reasons for which he is traveling around with Don Quijote—that is, material gain (yes,

pushed to absurd extremes, given the *tonto* side of his *tonto-listo* identity). Regarding the supposed ambivalence of the way in which Sancho regards his dreams, it would have been useful had Sears pointed out specific passages. There are surely many instances in which there is no ambivalence at all (especially after Sancho comes back with a handkerchief full of gold coins at the end of Part I).

As for my alleged simplification of "Cervantes's complex ambiguities to prove a sociopolitical point" (220), it would have been useful for Sears's readers to have the complete context of the phrase she cites in arriving at that judgment. In the very last pages of the epilogue to my study, I ask the question as to why Cervantes, specifically, was drawn so strongly toward the rich symbolism of Carnival culture (assuming, of course, that my extensive analysis of its presence was not a product of my—and Bakhtin's—imagination). The phrase Sears cites has as its point of departure François Delpech's interesting reflections on the precise historical junctures in which folk culture has been used as the medium of political dissidence; also with Stallybrass's and White's well-known discussion of how Carnival imagery and language was used by middle-class and proto-bourgeois groups in their efforts to weaken the hegemony of the aristocracy. While I am, indeed, putting forth an hypothesis, I by no means claim to have answered the question: Why Cervantes? ("En ese sentido, la pregunta—¿por qué Cervantes?—queda por responder todavía"—581–82.)

As for my failure "to acknowledge the fragile nature of the middle class in seventeenth-century" (220), please note that in the exact phrase Sears cites, I refer to the "*incipiente* burguesía o clase media," not to a full-blown version. In fact, it would never occur to me to ascribe full-blown bourgeois—or even middle-class—ideology to Cervantes. I am fully aware of the complexities of class dynamics of the period, including the analysis of them carried out by Maravall (whom I cite extensively in my book). Indeed, middling social sectors in Spain did tend to ape the aristocracy, as they did in many places in Europe, but we surely must recognize that bourgeois ideology evolved *in stages*. Class ideologies, particularly those related to middle sectors, rarely (never, perhaps?) exist in "pure" form. And the fact that Cervantes did probably harbor a "nostalgia for idealized aristocratic values" (220) does not prevent him, or other intellectuals of the period (e.g., Quevedo), from using those values to attack the contemporary version of the aristocracy. In social conflicts in general, it is a time-honored tradition to beat one's foe over the head with his own stick.

Don Quijote does indeed look backward to the time when "blood and deeds were one" (220), but his gaze extends further than what is suggested by Sears. We cannot simply excise the Golden Age speech from the text (I, 11), nor the passage in which Don Quijote says that he has been born into

the world to restore that ideal period—in which, by the way, a class structure, and private property along with it, did not exist (see I, 20). Virtually all ideologies which suggest a leveling of social hierarchies tend to invoke an earlier moment in human history, as I point out on pp. 74–75.

Summing up, while I sincerely appreciate Sears' many positive comments about my work, and while I by no means expect one-hundred-percent praise of my work from reviewers (particularly conscientious ones), I've nevertheless felt myself obliged to address some misconceptions that might arise as a result of her criticisms. And as I've noted in my book, at the very least I hope that its arguments will, indeed, serve to move *cervantistas* to reflect on an important subject—to wit, the Cervantes-Avellaneda relationship—we have largely abandoned since the study of Stephen Gilman, half a century ago.

James Iffland  
 Dept. of Modern Foreign  
 Languages and Literatures  
 Boston University  
 Boston, MA 02139–3914  
 iffland@bu.edu

#### WORKS CITED

- Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*. New York: Penguin, 1975.
- Iffland, James. "Apocalypse Later: Ideology and Quevedo's *La hora de todos*." *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* [Puerto Rico] 7 (1980): 87–132.
- . *De fiestas y aguafiestas: Risa, locura e ideología en Cervantes y Avellaneda*. Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra; Madrid: Iberoamericana; Frankfurt: Vervuert, 1999.
- Sears, Theresa Ann. Review of James Iffland, *De fiestas y aguafiestas: risa, locura e ideología en Cervantes y Avellaneda*. *Cervantes* 21.2 (2001): 215–20.
- Stallybrass, Peter, and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1986.