



REVIEWS

Don Quijote: A New Translation, Backgrounds, Contexts and Criticism. By Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Trans. Burton Raffel. Ed. Diana de Armas Wilson. New York: Norton, 1999. xviii + 862 pp.

Burton Raffel's translation of Cervantes' masterpiece—which has recently replaced Joseph R. Jones's revised Ormsby translation in the Norton Critical Edition series (New York: W. W. Norton, 1981)—is a magnificent achievement. Raffel's translation is very readable and usually very close to the source text of Martín de Riquer's popular edition (Barcelona: Juventud, 1955), on which it is based.¹ Remarkably at times, his prose style captures much of the essence and the flavor of Cervantes' original. This kind of pleasurable readability is particularly useful for contemporary North American college students, to whom this series is primarily directed. However, as they are go-betweens for disparate cultures and times, translations are a compromise. Thus, after outlining this translation's major successes, I will survey what I view as its shortcomings.

Raffel's translation is highly accurate, for the most part, and unlike J. M. Cohen's widely-read version (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1950), his prose style has grace and retains much of the Cervantine cadence and irony. I offer as an example the passage in the Sierra Morena episode (I, 25) in which Don Quijote turns to Rocinante and exclaims:

"He who himself lacks it, gives you your freedom, oh steed as remarkable for your actions as unfortunate in your fate! Go wherever you will, you who carry written on your forehead that neither the hippogryph ridden by Astolfo, nor the celebrated Frontino, who cost the lovely Bradamante so dear, could match your light-footedness." (153)

"Libertad te da el que sin ella queda, ¡oh caballo tan estremado por tus obras cuan desdichado por tu su146erte! Vete por do quisieres,

¹ [Ed. note: In 1972, Riquer replaced the Juventud text with a newer edition, published by Planeta.]

que en la frente llevas escrito que no te igualó en ligereza el Hipogri-
fo de Astolfo, ni el nombrado Frontino, que tan caro le costó a
Bradamante." (241)

By making very subtle changes to the original language, Raffel is able to explain, in simple terms, what nowadays are some rather obscure ideas, but which would have been plain to a seventeenth-century reader. For instance, in I, 8, Raffel writes of the Basque and his mount: "Seeing him come, the Basque would have preferred to get down from his mule, which was a rented animal he could not trust, but had no choice except to draw his own sword" (48). Although Raffel has altered the conjunctions, relative pronouns, and prepositions to get the point across, this is a very clear rendition of the meaning of Cervantes' "[e]l vizcaíno, que así le vio venir, aunque quisiera apearde de la mula, que, por ser de las malas de alquiler, no había que fiar en ella, no pudo hacer otra cosa sino sacar su espada" (88), in which the reason the Basque wants to dismount is explained in the untrustworthiness of the animal. In contrast, Ormsby's lines here are somewhat confusing: "The Biscayan would have liked to dismount from his mule, when he saw Don Quixote advancing. But it was one of those sorry creatures let out for hire, and he had no choice but to draw his sword" (64). Indeed, it seems as though the Basque did not dismount precisely because the mule was rented, which is not what the passage means.

Raffel also excels at translating the word-play humor in a creative fashion. Among the most memorable examples are his parody of Cervantes' Basque-speak (I, 8), Sancho's malapropisms in passages like the following from II, 7, "My Lord, I've *evinced* my wife to let me go with your grace" (393) and "so all your grace has to do is fix up your will with that little codicil, so it can't be repoked" (396), as well as Pedro's flurry of mistakes, in I, 12, including "he could predict when it would be a good year or an arren one" (63).

But, of course, translation is a Gordian knot. The translator must make compromises to preserve faithfully the original values and appeal simultaneously to a contemporary audience. In fact, the chief weaknesses of this translation seem to derive from the positive ones I mention above. I have six main criticisms. First, the improved readability of Raffel's version requires the omission of archaisms that, in Ormsby's, make the text sound as if it were written centuries ago and not in the latter twentieth century. The lack of archaic terms—such as "thou utterest" (40) as spoken by Ormsby's main character—has the unfortunate effect of not creating in Raffel's English version as great a disjunction between the speeches of Don Quijote and those of the other characters, as exists in the Spanish original. That is, the errant knight occasionally sounds too contemporary for one who is imitating the heroes of days of yore. For instance, on Camacho's wedding in II, 22, Raffel writes the following: "'You really can't call it a trick, nor should you,' said

Don Quijote, 'for how can there be deceit when the ending is virtuous?'" (473). In comparison, Ormsby's version sounds more antiquated and yet its meaning is still clear: "'Deceit,' said Don Quixote, 'is not and ought not to be the term used when the end envisaged is a virtuous one'" (543).

Raffel generally uses characters' names that respect the original text and are much preferable to Cohen's anglicized names, such as the dreadful use of "Andrew" for "Andrés" in I, 4 (48). However, my second criticism is of Raffel's reworking of Cide Hamete Benengeli's name to "Sidi Hamid Benengeli." While, more politically correct in its accurate transcription of Maghrebi Arabic (as the editor points out, p. xv), the new name loses a touch of Cervantine irony as well as a glimpse of the telling cultural insensitivity of the Spanish version.

Third, there are unfortunate repercussions to one simple word choice made throughout the translation. More specifically, Raffel's use of the word "dollar" as a translation of the monetary unit "*real*" not only seems at cross-purposes with creating a Spanish feel—it sounds, rather, downright North American—but it may lead students to believe, contrary to historical fact, that the dollar bill was actually used in early modern Spain. In his "Translator's Note" (xvii-xviii), Raffel defends this use and provides a clever etymological history in defense of "dollar" (the word entered Spanish from German *before* it entered English). Nonetheless, this linguistic event does not support his modernization of Don Quijote's words in I, 2 that "eso se me da que me den ocho reales en sencillos que en una pieza de a ocho" (47), which Raffel changes, along a slippery slope, to "I don't care if you give me ten one-dollar bills or one ten-dollar bill" (21). The problem here lies not only in the numerical change from eight to ten, but, more significantly, in the fact that paper money—as predicated by the term "dollar bill"—was not in widespread use anywhere in Europe until the eighteenth century.

Fourth, in the meta-fictional passages, Raffel generally reduces the narratological ambiguity, making it easier for the reader to continue reading on, but nonetheless altering its meaning. For instance, at the end of I, 8, "el segundo autor desta obra" becomes "I, your second author" (49). In II, 44, the translator "corrects" the narrator's words, from the somewhat incomprehensible "Dicen que en el propio original desta historia se lee que llegando Cide Hamete a escribir este capítulo, no le tradujo su intérprete como él le había escrito" to these unequivocal phrases: "It is said that, in the true original of this chapter, one can read how, when Sidi Hamid came to write this chapter (which his translator only partially rendered into Spanish)" (586).

Fifth, the opening sentence of Part I, which begins with the famously memorable phrases "En un lugar de la Mancha, de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme" (35) does not look or sound right as "In a village in La Mancha (I don't want to bother you with its name)" (13).

And last, something with which many *cervantistas* will be displeased is the exclusion of the preliminary materials, including the dedication and the

elogios, which Ormsby provides and which are found in the Juventud source. Raffel does, however, reproduce the appropriate division of Part I into four parts, and he translates faithfully the sonnets and epitaphs at the end of Part I.

These, however, are minor criticisms in the context of this masterful achievement, and I plan on adopting this text when next I teach the *Quijote* in English. I think most English-speaking college students will prefer Raffel's to other available translations, including Ormsby's and Cohen's. The truth is that few of these students will care about the missing *tasa* or *sonetos*. And because Raffel's prose reads so well, students will be able to get through it with greater ease, and more readily come to class prepared to discuss the deeper issues. However, some of those who know the *Quijote* in its original language, I suspect, may still desire to teach from Jones' revised Ormsby and may lament its "retirement" in Norton Critical Editions, for it sounds and feels more like a seventeenth-century Spanish text.

With respect to the critical apparatus and accompanying materials, Diana de Armas Wilson provides an informative introduction and concise footnotes, and has made a good, updated selection of background sources and contemporary criticism. The introduction contains clear biographical information (and there is an accompanying time-line of Cervantes' life as an appendix). In addition, it presents important information on the romances of chivalry, which all students should know before reading the novel.

The footnotes that Wilson provides throughout are used sparingly and are to the point. For instance, on the line in II, 71, where Don Quijote says, "Zamora was not won in an hour," she explains the expression and the history behind it: "Refers to the long siege of Zamora by King Sancho II of Castile, during the war of succession caused by the division of the kingdom of Fernando I (1035-1065). A Spanish equivalent for 'Rome wasn't built in a day'" (732, footnote 2).

In terms of background materials, I am particularly pleased with her short but crucial selections from Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, Rodríguez de Montalvo's *Amadís*, and Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*, as well as the notes that explain and contextualize these selections. Also, of particular import, she has reunited, in one place, translations of Cervantes' prologues from the *Galatea*, the *Novelas ejemplares*, and the *Persiles*, as well as the pertinent autobiographical lines from Chapter Four of the *Viaje del Parnaso*. This wealth of resources will be convenient for any teacher who wants to provide students with a quick and valuable introduction to Cervantes and Don Quixote's imitations of genres and characters, perhaps inspiring some students to read beyond the *Quijote*.

The five general interpretations and reflections on *Don Quijote* are all insightful, well-edited, and complementary. These include Carlos Fuentes on *Don Quijote's* modernity, Harold Bloom on the Romantic reading and the notion of play, Javier Herrero on the characteristics of Dulcinea and Don Quijote's love for her, Anthony Cascardi on Don Quijote's self-fashioned

identity, and Michel Foucault on the lack of resemblance between words and things as indicative of the work's modernity.

The nine contemporary pieces of criticism (abridged or adapted articles or chapters that have been published elsewhere) on specific episodes by *cervantistas* Elias Rivers, Ruth El Saffar, Robert ter Horst, Edward Dudley, Nicolás Wey-Gómez, María Antonia Garcés, Henry W. Sullivan, Carroll B. Johnson, and Anne J. Cruz, provide a good sampling of some of the major directions that *Quijote* studies have followed in the last quarter-century. All are very worthy of their place here, and unlike the priest and the barber, I would not send any to the pyre. There is also a valuable article by John J. Allen and Patricia Finch that gives an historical perspective on interpretations of the novel and the influences of *Don Quijote* on later authors.

The last secondary text included in the edition, quite artistically positioned, is a fiction inspired by the fiction: Borges's "Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quijote*."

With the overall excellence of the edition and the difficulty of the enterprise in mind, I have just two criticisms. First, the introduction seems to place too much emphasis on the importance of the Americas in the novel, an emphasis then reinforced by Raffel's Americanisms and a couple of Wilson's footnotes that point out things American to the exclusion of things European (e.g. footnote 4, page 39, where the reader is informed, in I, 6, that "Ercilla's *Araucana* (1569-1589) stands out among these Spanish poems as the first colonial war epic in America"). While the approach is fresh and based on sound research, such as Irving Leonard's famous tome, some of the ideas in this section are speculative and perhaps better suited to an audience of discerning specialists, rather than to readers of a general introduction. For instance, the fact that conquistadors read books of chivalry, as Leonard showed many years ago, does not in itself prove a connection between Don Quijote and Bernal Díaz, other than the simple fact that they shared common reading habits. Furthermore, the handful of articles and books from the last fifty years on which these ideas are based are not yet representative of a major trend in *Quijote* studies, despite some contemporary interest in the matter. More useful information might have centered on specific historical information about Cervantes' Spain, the Inquisition, the Counter-Reformation, the lives of women and men, nobles and peasants, etc.

Second, the fact that Wilson provides footnotes sparingly is a double-edged sword. While it is a real plus for promoting students' attention spans in our own silicon age of URLs, JPGs and MP3s, it may also be, at times, a drawback. For instance, in the absence of a footnote telling the reader otherwise, he or she might infer that Don Quijote speaks more intelligently on chivalric heroes than he actually does, in say I, 10, where he alludes to two verses from a *romance* on the Cid but states incorrectly that they pertain to the Marquis of Mantua. Some brief footnotes explaining the identity of mythological characters throughout might also have proved useful (as in, for instance,

II, 58, where Vulcan, Mars, Venus, Actaeon, Diana and others are mentioned).

Notwithstanding these minor criticisms, the achievements of Burton Raffel and Diana de Armas Wilson far outweigh any defects. This edition will serve its intended audience of English-speaking college students very well.

Steven Wagschal
Franklin & Marshall College

Cruz, Anne J. *Discourses of Poverty: Social Reform and the Picaresque Novel in Early Modern Spain*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999. xvii + 297 pp.

In this thought-provoking, comprehensive, well-researched and well-written book, Anne J. Cruz studies the divergent discourses that emerged in early modern Spain in response to increasing numbers of marginalized poor, equally focusing on fictional (picaresque) and non-fictional texts, on literary and extra-literary sources. The use of Foucauldian social paradigms allows Cruz to move not only beyond formalist parameters but also beyond strict sociological and moralist approaches as she views the picaresque's dialectical engagement with the multiple conditions that generated its appearance. In Cruz's own words, by analyzing the narratives as "cultural discourses rather than solely literary artifacts" she is able "to foreground the pressing questions of poverty, delinquency, vagrancy, and prostitution embedded in the novels" (xiii). Following along parallel lines the development of the genre and the evolution of the country, Cruz concludes that the end of the picaresque coincides with the decline of Hapsburg Imperial rule and that the "last" picaresque novel—*Estebanillo González*—"records both failed history and the failure of history" (xvii).

Each chapter contains three sections that integrate penetrating discussions of specific literary texts (picaresque novels) with assessments of other documents and issues relevant to the book's main topic: poverty and social reform. Chapter 1 discusses *Lazarillo* as a tale that explores the relationship between society and its poor, in this case the growing numbers of vagabonds and beggars who invaded the emerging urban centers in sixteenth-century Spain and led to an increase in criminality as well as the "later conflation of the poor with the delinquent" (5). In the section entitled "Lepers and Liminality" Cruz states that, as the number of lepers began to dwindle at the end of the Middle Ages, their traditional role as "other" was taken by marginal groups—*conversos*, *moriscos*, loose women, *pícaros*, that is to say, the disenfranchised and dispossessed. The unrelenting poverty and persistent hunger that mark *Lazarillo's* narrative and contribute to its structural cohesion

also match inescapable social realities. Cruz further elaborates on and supports her textual analysis in the following section (“Mid-Sixteenth-Century Debates on Poverty: Soto versus Robles”) which examines some of the serious debates taking place at the time on how to view and deal with the plight of the poor; in particular, the conflicting positions held by the Dominican Domingo de Soto and the Benedictine Juan de Robles are carefully reviewed and the questions they raise insightfully linked to *Lazarillo’s* ambiguity, the marked ambivalence displayed by the author in presenting his concerns regarding poverty and its treatment.

Chapter 2 examines economic treatises and their influence on contemporary thinking on the poor. Cruz argues that pauperism had previously been seen as mostly a moral problem to be solved through personalized charity within a religious context but that, in the mid-16th century, a more systematic, better organized approach to poor-relief began to be favored, an approach that opposed incipient bourgeois rationalism to aristocratic values. The following sections (separate but closely related) explore secularization and social containment, Miguel de Giginta’s syncretic reform movement (which attempted to reconcile confinement with a certain degree of freedom for the poor) and Cristóbal Pérez de Herrera’s visionary and totalizing reform projects (which addressed economic and social issues as well as moral and spiritual concerns).

Chapter 3 (“The Picaresque as *Pharmakos*”) is mostly devoted to Alemán’s *Guzmán de Alfarache* and to its eponymous protagonist, the first formally so-named *pícaro* who, in the text, plays the role of *pharmakos*, “at once responsible for and sacrificed to the country’s social and economic degradation” (79). According to Cruz, the writer’s *converso* origins might have fostered his reformist ideals and strengthened his ideological ties with a group of *arbitristas* that included Pérez de Herrera, whose social philosophy Alemán seems to share. Also influencing Alemán were the debates on divine grace and free will so operative in defining Guzmán’s character in Part One, while Part Two addresses the “‘false’ poor threat to the social body” (93) following the lead of Cellorigo’s treatise *Restauración de estado*. The next section in this chapter reviews Alemán’s defense of mercantilism and again emphasizes the *pícaro’s* role “as the expiatory element in the narrative, as the scapegoat that must be sacrificed to safeguard the nation-state” (106). From here Cruz moves on to explore in depth several critics’ views on the reader’s role in picaresque fiction. Cruz’s conclusion—that the need to control the reader might offer the best explanation for the abundance of prologue literature in modern Spain—is both perceptive and convincing.

Chapter 4 (“Textualizing the Other’s Body”) focuses on Quevedo’s *Buscón* and reviews diverse interpretive approaches to that picaresque novel, ranging from the theological (Pablos as sinner) to the aesthetic (the text as “dazzling fireworks”). For Cruz, Quevedo’s fascination with the socially marginalized manifests itself in the depiction of Pablos and his cohorts, but

does not negate the writer's allegiance to the dominant order. Though concern for the poor is not the main inspiration for the narrative, Cruz believes that the "text's unspoken message" (123) conveys the threatening presence of multiple "others" (*conversos*, *moriscos*, vagabonds, etc.) and expresses a generalized fear of all the unwanted elements in the social body. In the following sections, Cruz considers the significance of scatology in the *Buscón* (applying and elaborating on Bakhtinian models) and sees it as an effective way to highlight chaos and social disease. Most interesting is the section on "*Pícaras as Prostitutes*" with its excellent analysis of how the female picaresque differs from its male counterparts and why the *pícaro* is almost always presented as a prostitute. The male-dominated and male-oriented discourse in female picaresque texts clearly shows the extent of authorial control over the protagonist who is relegated to a "primarily sexualized role" (144). In the final section of this chapter, Cruz deals with issues of misogyny, male voice-over and female enclosure as she engages in detailed analysis of *La Celestina*, *La lozana andaluza*, and *La pícaro Justina*, among others, and concludes that in all these texts, woman's voice is suppressed, woman's sexuality denounced as a disruptive element, and woman's very existence seen as a "necessary evil" requiring constant vigilance and control by the (male) establishment.

Chapter 5—last in the book—examines the evolution "From *Pícaro* to Soldier" and the way in which picaresque narratives expand their angle of vision by following the *pícaro*'s exploits as he leaves the Spanish countryside and moves on to larger spaces (what Cruz calls "the Hapsburg theaters of war" [164]). Cruz's valid argument to justify the inclusion of soldiers' tales in the picaresque canon reflects the basic thrust of her book, namely the intersection of literary with non-literary texts and their location within a specific socio-historical context. (She appropriately reminds us that a term often given as the etymological root of *pícaro* has to do with "piker," a soldier carrying a pike/*pica*). As she surveys a variety of soldiers' stories, Cruz points out both what connects them with and separates them from more traditional picaresque narratives: they all respond to issues of poverty and vagrancy, but soldiers' tales lack the picaresque's ironic critical perspective. That's not the case, though, with *Vida del Capitán Alonso de Contreras* (a "transitional narrative" [199]) and even less with *Estebanillo González* (which "retains the ambiguity and irony inherent in the conventional picaresque genre" [201]). Yet—Cruz affirms—the increasing popularity of this genre eventually domesticated its subversive nature and diminished its satirical power so that, as the reality of Spain's decadence became "painfully manifest in the streets" (206), it ceased to appear in writing. As the Thirty Years War ended, the picaresque novel also came to an end in Spain, though it continued to develop and flourish in other parts of Europe and the New World.

Also in Chapter 5, and while discussing Michael Murrin's studies on military advancements and their far-reaching impact during the Renaissance,

Cruz refers to Cervantes' participation in the battle of Lepanto and to his assessment of new military technology. Don Quixote's denunciation of firearms and gunpowder conveys—according to Cruz—"his author's ironic criticism" which extends to "warfare's elitist constellation...and to the egotistical self-serving motives behind men's military aspirations" (166). Although Cruz, following current critical opinion, does not place any of Cervantes' texts within the picaresque canon, her analysis of how literary genres intersect not only with each other but also with non-literary discourses and, particularly, of how historical changes—in this case, in methods of warfare—influence generic development, helps us to understand more fully Cervantes' own experience as a soldier and the way in which it affected his work as a writer and his own distinctive engagement with the picaresque itself.

Anne J. Cruz displays a solid grasp of relevant scholarship as well as of the latest critical theories. Skillfully blending the literary (texts), the non-literary (documents), and the historical (facts), Cruz's book represents a very valuable contribution to the study of picaresque texts and the picaresque tradition.

Pilar V. Rotella
Chapman University

Kevin S. Larsen. *Cervantes and Galdós in Fortunata y Jacinta: Tales of Impertinent Curiosity*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1999. 160 pp.

Dentro de la bien reconocida y estudiada relación entre Galdós y la obra de Cervantes, Larsen nos ofrece en su estudio comparativo de *Fortunata y Jacinta* un detallado análisis de su deuda intertextual con "El curioso impertinente." El punto de partida son las constantes y numerosas referencias en la novela de Galdós a la curiosa impertinencia de Jacinta, sobre todo a partir de su viaje de novios con su pequeño e infiel don Juan, Juanito de Santa Cruz, y en el contexto de la atracción y amoríos entre éste y Fortunata.

Para que tal relación pueda ser establecida como base de estudio es necesario primero efectuar dos inversiones: la primera tiene que ver con el cambio de género del curioso—de Anselmo a Jacinta—y la segunda, más fundamental en mi opinión, con la diferencia que existe en un principio en la motivación, justificación y objeto de tal curiosidad por parte de ambos curiosos; es decir, la distancia que va de la inocente situación de Camila al culpable carácter de Juanito. Mientras que por un lado la presencia temática en la novela de la curiosidad de Jacinta, incluso impertinente, es obviamente cervantina, queda compartida por la mayoría de los otros personajes, i.e,

Fortunata, Maxi, y el mismo Juanito, hasta convertirse en un verdadero vicio social. Al mismo tiempo no resulta justificado construir a partir de tal presencia una lectura en la que se culpabiliza a Jacinta, responsabilizándola incluso de los pecados y defectos de su pícaro esposo y su debilidad de carácter. Cuanto más si se considera la última y verdadera motivación de Jacinta de redimir y redimirse a través de “su” hijo, el de Fortunata y Juanito que hace suyo a través de lo único que su curiosidad, imaginación y deseo le hace posible crear, su novela “pitúsiana.”

A través de cinco capítulos sin título y sin contenido particular aparente, Larsen insiste una y otra vez en la innegable relación entre *FyJ* y “El curioso” ofreciendo citas textuales y señalando paralelos, si bien esta conexión, su tesis, análisis y conclusión bien pudieran haberse expuesto en un ceñido artículo. El resto de las páginas parecen estar dedicadas a realizar paréntesis especulativos, particularmente psicoanalíticos y simbólicos que sólo en raras ocasiones, como sucede en el caso de las conexiones trazadas entre mona-monería (términos aplicados a Jacinta) y curiosidad-sexualidad, despiertan nuestra curiosidad y aprecio como lectores. En la mayoría de los casos se trata de observaciones tangenciales de escaso interés o valor crítico, doblemente cuestionables por la manera en que están ensarzadas en el texto—en lugar de quedar relegadas a las notas. Esta tendencia, junto con la constante interrupción que suponen las incontables traducciones de las citas de la novela y las numerosas referencias a autores y páginas de estudios críticos en el texto principal del estudio, hacen la lectura poco menos que imposible y exigen un grado de paciencia superior a la curiosidad que incitan los argumentos presentados.

Larsen tiene razón al observar el origen cervantino de la presencia y función narrativa de la curiosidad de Jacinta y señala oportunamente los efectos y caminos a que tal inclinación le llevan. Creó exageradas, sin embargo, su condena de la frustada y engañada esposa cuando la denomina “incipient Torquemada” capaz de contagiar a Juanito con su “uncontrollable female desire” para luego hacerla responsable de su error y caída. Por el contrario, y sin excusar de todo su curiosa inclinación, que como decía Sancho, “peor es menearlo,” Jacinta no recoge “the sad consequences of such temerity,” sino que como joven y fiel casada tiene por el contrario derecho a prevenirse del engaño y a protegerse del vicio, en lugar de tentar contra la virtud como sucede en el caso de Anselmo y Camila. Lo cierto es que, como termina por observar el propio Larsen, es la iniciativa narrativo-creativa de Jacinta la que construye la posibilidad de unión entre las dos casadas y con ello logra potenciar a través del hijo su mutua redención, una que excluye mercedamente a Juanito.

En definitiva, no toda curiosidad es vana o impertinente, y en el caso de Jacinta bien pudiera decirse que su deseo de saber y de ser más allá de las limitaciones físicas y engaños sociales que se le imponen, hace posible que quijotesca su “novela pitúsiana” y la “pícaro idea” de Fortunata se

conviertan en verdaderos instrumentos de afirmación femenina dentro y fuera de la ficción. En el "Afterword," a manera de conclusión, Larsen insiste en caracterizar la insaciable curiosidad de los personajes de Galdós en términos cervantinos en cuanto les lleva colectiva e individualmente a ficcionalizar su realidad y condición. Aún así, creo que una gran distancia separa en el fondo las dos historias de casadas de la historia de los dos amigos. La manía de la imitación es base de la ficción cervantina, sobre todo en *Don Quijote*, donde la ficcionalización de la realidad lleva al protagonista al vencimiento de su locura. Pero como sucede con la locura y deseo de don Quijote, lo que comienza en el caso de Jacinta como fallo, como curiosa impertinencia, termina convirtiéndose en instrumento de salvación tanto creativo como narrativo, y esto nos parece, como hubo de parecerle a Galdós, del todo pertinente.

Eduardo Urbina
Texas A&M University

Don Quijote en el Arte. Madrid: Ediciones CD Arte, 1997. (Ediciones CD Arte, Panamá 3, ent. D, 28036 Madrid.

Don Quijote en el Arte es un CD editado en 1997. Como el triste CD de Slabón, ha sido elaborado sin control académico alguno, y con una presentación "multimedia" a veces innecesaria y que dificulta su manejo. Aparece el icono del Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, pero su presencia, pericia o supervisión no se nota en ninguna parte. No es posible exportar nada, ni texto ni gráficos; los gráficos no llenan la pantalla, al menos la mía; la calidad de las imágenes no es alta.

El cederrón consta de cuatro partes: Biografía, Galería de Ilustraciones, Escenas y Don Quijote en el Cine.

En la "Biografía de Cervantes" leemos que "Cervantes conoció las primeras letras en el colegio de los Jesuitas, en Córdoba," y que en Nápoles tuvo un hijo llamado Promontorio. Para el cervantista, ya con estos datos equivocados todo está dicho. Se ve que no se consultó ninguna biografía moderna, como la de Canavaggio. La breve biografía es de más fácil manejo en el folleto que acompaña al CD que en la pantalla. Curiosamente, en la contraportada del folleto aparecen reproducciones de dos documentos cervantinos, uno la "Partida de nacimiento de Miguel de Cervantes y [sic] Saavedra," pero el CD no incluye ninguno.

En la sección "Galería de Ilustraciones" hay, primero, 28 portadas de ediciones, sin índice (consulte el CD directamente, los nombres de

los archivos incorporan los años de la edición). Las ediciones de 1605 están ordenadas incorrectamente, y la calidad de las reproducciones es pobre. La sección "Capítulos" ofrece una selección de ilustraciones de cada capítulo; las visiones de 30 artistas, por ejemplo, del episodio de los molinos de viento. Las mismas ilustraciones están también accesibles por un índice de Ilustradores, y hay notas breves sobre el creador y el contenido artístico de cada una. Por fin, hay una pequeña sección de billetes de banco, sellos de correos y medallas de conmemoraciones cervantinas.

Bajo "Escenas" hay cinco de éstas, sin ninguna documentación, de acceso alfabético por nombre de episodio, y una "Copla de ciego" de tema cervantino, en catalán, cuya presencia es misteriosa.

La sección "Don Quijote en el cine" podría ofrecer mucho, como por ejemplo los fragmentos de la película de Orson Welles. Pero no contiene sino 1) cinco breves extractos del *Quijote* de Rafael Gil, 2) la película en dibujos animados de Cruz Delgado Palomo y 3) una serie de pinturas en tempera "La Mancha: Paisajes y Espacios," creadas para formar fondo a los dibujos animados.

No tengo palabras para resumir esta experiencia. Lamento que no se produzca un CD con un control de calidad y contenido.

Daniel Eisenberg
Excelsior College

Don Quixote. Broadcast April 9, 2000 on the TNT network. TNT presents a Hallmark Entertainment Production. Robert Halmi and John Lithgow, Executive Producers; Dyson Lovell, Producer; Peter Yates, Director; John Mortimer, writer of teleplay; Joyce Gallie (Casting). Based on the novel by Miguel de Cervantes. Runtime 120 minutes. Cast: John Lithgow (DON QUIXOTE), Bob Hoskins (SANCHO PANZA), Vanessa Williams (DULCINEA DEL TOBOSO), Isabella Rossellini (DUCHESS), Lambert Wilson (DUKE), Peter Eyre (PRIEST), Tony Haygarth (BARBER), Amelia Warner (ANTONIA), Linda Bassett (HOUSEKEEPER). Emmy nominations: COSTUMES for a Miniseries, Movie or Special; MUSICAL COMPOSITION for a Miniseries, Movie or Special; MAKEUP for a Miniseries, Movie or Special. Won no awards.

David O. Selznick's three-hour fifty-five minute 1939 production of *Gone with the Wind* is a wonderful screen adaptation of Margaret Mitchell's 1936

novel. People who read the novel can look at the motion picture and see most of what they know about Scarlett O'Hara, Rhett Butler, and Ashley Wilkes come to life. And movie viewers who read to the book will be delighted with how things are fleshed out. The decision the screenwriter Sidney Howard had to make was essentially what to leave out or condense from the book. It is a long book, so not everything could be included in the motion picture.

Don Quijote is a long book, too. It is too long to try to retell in 120 minutes (even though G. W. Pabst's 1935 version starring the Russian bass Feodor Chaliapin lasted only 73 minutes). Taking the cue from Selznick's four-hour epic motion picture, made when typical movies ran 108 minutes, TNT maybe should have allowed four hours for their version as well (the version done for Spanish TV in 1991 used four hours just for Part I).

John Mortimer's teleplay was different from Sidney Howard's screenplay, because, not only was material excised, but other action was falsified, events were relocated, and some new ones were even added, names were made up, and both Aldonza and Dulcinea appeared, just to mention a few items. What I object to the most in the teleplay is that changes are made which serve no artistic purpose and thus contaminate the original. The enchanter who took away Don Quijote's books is Malfatto in the TNT version. Why not Frestón? What purpose does Malfatto serve that Frestón doesn't? Early on, Don Quijote says "I am no longer Alonso Quijada!" Why not Alonso Quijano, just like the book says? Is the art of the teleplay enhanced by this new name? Why does Sancho have five small children, ages 3–10? Why not *two* teenagers, as in the book? What is gained, especially since none of these children says anything? Why are the two maidens/prostitutes outside the first inn old and haggard instead of young (*mozas*), as in the book. In the TNT version, when Sancho tries to make don Quijote believe that the three country girls (*mozas aldeanas*) are Dulcinea and her two friends, why are they sixty-year-old women in the TNT version? Is that somehow artistically better? What artistic purpose does it serve to have don Quijote *washing* his armor in the trough at the first inn instead of just hanging it nearby? Washing his armor? And why does don Quijote fight with seven muleteers instead of just two? How is the art of the story enhanced by having the first galley slave steal a pair of candlesticks (*à la* Jean Valjean) instead of a basket of freshly-washed clothing? Isn't the purpose of the violations to show that relatively minor thefts result in years of galley service? Why is Ginés de Pasamonte 50 years old and ugly when he's supposed to be 30 years old—he is the *only* character assigned an exact age in the book—and handsome? And why is he called Ginesillo de Pasamonte? The old pimp—what artistic purpose does it serve not to give him white hair and a long beard? Regarding Mambrino's helmet, on a perfectly sunny day, the barber travels with the basin on his head, as if it was a normal thing to do. Isn't the point that the rain makes him cover his new hat by putting it on his head, something he'd never do under ordinary circumstances. When the library is being scrutinized, the niece says

"Here's the *Mirror of Knighthood*, uncle's favorite!" Does that increase the art of the work more so than "Here's *Amadís of Gaula*, uncle's favorite!" would, especially since English speakers don't know either work? Why do don Quijote and Sancho go to El Toboso in the middle of the day? Isn't the point that Sancho can't find Dulcinea's palace because it's so dark? Why does Sancho shout "Yes!" when don Quijote defeats the Knight of the Mirrors? Isn't that a little bit too modern an expression? When we meet the Duchess, she is playing croquet with the Duke, who is dressed as an eighteenth-century dandy. The game is certainly old enough (thirteenth century), but what artistic purpose does it serve here? Why does the duke have a string quartet playing Mozartean music at dinner? Why is Sancho's island called Esperanza? What artistic purpose does it serve to make that change?

I can understand why Dulcinea might appear in a dream sequence in a motion picture, but why should Aldonza appear at all, as she does in the TNT version? And living in don Quijote's own village (following the 1957 Russian version)?

Joyce Gallie, in her casting, used what appeared to be a young British boy to play the young Alonso, but the full-grown Don Quixote had an American accent. In fact, John Lithgow was the only American accent in the motion picture. I think it would have been better to homogenize everyone's speech, most easily by having Lithgow speak British English. Then again, it *was* made for an American audience, so maybe the British actors could have spoken American English.

Regarding names, it would not have made any artistic difference to pronounce them Spanish style, in fact, it is likely that this would have enhanced the production. And when I say "Spanish style" I don't mean using exact Spanish sounds (pure vowels, flapped *r*), but just a reasonable facsimile using English sounds. Thus, for their [alónzo], why not [alónso]? For their [təbozo], why not "el Toboso"? For their [ældónzə], why not [aldónθa]? For their *Ámadis*, why not *Amadís*? Virtually no name is pronounced as it should be.

The entire production was made in Spain, and was done with care and artistry. The technical people always do a wonderful job, no matter what the script is like. Background music was good and effective.

Withal, I was quite disappointed by this production, which has now been released on commercial video. (I got a non-commercial copy that says "For Your Emmy Consideration" from the www.eBay.com auction for about \$15.00). It would doubtless be dangerous to have your students see this version as some sort of ancillary to class.

Tom Lathrop
University of Delaware