refused to let empirical fact correct his ideal vision. Creel relates Cervantes' concept to nineteenth- (Fichte) and twentieth-century (Derrida, Ernst Cassirer) philosophers who also claim that subjective conceptions constitute a world existing in the mind, relational elements combined in systems or ideologies that may have no basis in external reality. Don Quijote believes that others have mistakenly imposed their visions upon external reality and he offsets their vision with his own. Both, Cervantes suggested, may be equally fictional. The desirable course then becomes imposing the best and the brightest construction upon reality and through force of will bringing a better world into existence. Creel concludes that all the Renaissance texts he has treated develop a view of the persona as endowed with childlike innocence rather than tainted by original sin and they synthesize this view with the medieval conception of “the world as a vale of tears” (278). The moral ideal becomes to see the world with clear eyes but to remain pure and not to fall into cynicism or malice (279).

Creel’s essays make the reader reevaluate his/her interpretations of these Renaissance classics. Their erudition never overwhelms the reader; instead the conversational tone of the essays, in which ancient and modern voices are heard in an eternal present, engages the reader to whom Creel presents his interpretations not as final and definitive but as working theses. This collection will prove valuable to teachers of the Spanish Literature survey course as well as to undergraduate and graduate courses in Spanish literature of the Golden Age.

Judging from the present volume, every century seems to have its English or at least its English-speaking Cervantes: Samuel Butler in the seventeenth, Henry Fielding and Tobias Smollett in the eighteenth, Mark Twain in the nineteenth, and Roy Campbell in the twentieth. And these are just the writers explicitly so called. Darío Fernández-Morera and Michael Hanke have assembled a collection of newly-commissioned essays that address, in addition to the above, Ben Jonson, Laurence Sterne, Charlotte Lennox, Tabitha Tenney, Charles Dickens, G. K. Chesterton, and Walker Percy.

Yumiko Yamada, in “Ben Jonson: A Neoclassical Response to Cervantes,” addresses one of Cervantes’ later contemporaries. The essay reiterates the argument of Yamada’s own book-length treatment of the subject, referencing it periodically as...
necessary support for the abbreviated discussion at hand. Yamada argues that Jonson learned from Cervantes a distrust of “Bookes of Chivalrie” and their influence and saw Sir Philip Sidney as an especially pernicious exponent of the chivalric romance. Yamada may make too insistent a case for Cervantes’ influence on Jonson’s neoclassical views, especially as regards the “unities.” Many of these ideas were very much in the wind, and there were other likely influences nearer at hand, not least Sidney himself. The *Apologie for Poesie* provides still closer verbal analogues than those Yamada finds in Cervantes. Still, Jonson’s unquestionable familiarity with Cervantes offers a prominent illustration of the rapid spread of the Spanish author’s fame. By the second half of the same century Samuel Butler’s *Hudibras* was to become the English equivalent to *Don Quixote* itself, as both Voltaire and Samuel Johnson would point out a century later.

Werner von Koppenfels’s essay, “Samuel Butler’s *Hudibras*: A Quixotic Perspective of Civil War,” the one essay in the volume that scans the whole range of English reception, briefly surveys changing English attitudes to *Don Quixote*. In some respects, von Koppenfels’s inclusiveness supplies something lacking in the overall collection, which would have been strengthened by an introductory overview. Only two essays in the collection give a nod to the fact that they are parts of a larger whole, the essay on Roy Campbell, by the editors themselves, and Christopher Ehland’s essay on Smollett. Von Koppenfels notes that until well into the eighteenth century English readers of *Don Quixote* primarily reacted, as did Butler, to the foolishness of the protagonist; only later, in writers like Fielding and Sterne, did the Don’s virtues come to be appreciated.

In “Henry Fielding and His Spanish Model: ‘Our English Cervantes,’” Raimund Borgmeier credits Fielding with anticipating Samuel Johnson’s appreciation of Quixote’s admirable personal qualities. Although Fielding wrote an opera entitled *Don Quixote* in England and included on the title page of *Joseph Andrews* the affirmation that it was “Written in Imitation of the Manner of Cervantes, Author of Don Quixote,” Borgmeier suggests that by the time he wrote *Tom Jones* he had tempered his enthusiasm, avoiding in the structure of his masterpiece what he had criticized as the disconnections of *Don Quixote* but retaining the ironic narrator, creating a Sancho in Partridge, and echoing many episodes.

Laurence Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*, like *Don Quixote*, met with immediate success upon publication and was just as immediately translated into other European languages. Felicitas Kleber, in “Laurence Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy* and *Don Quixote*,” finds numerous parallels in narrative technique, style, and characterization. (One of Sterne’s favorite adjectives seems to have been *Cervantic.* ) Kleber explores the thematic relationship between such noted Sternean “hobby horses” as Uncle Toby’s obsession with fortification and Quixote’s with knight errantry. While in *Tristram Shandy* the explicit admiration for Cervantes is voiced by the fictional, eponymous narrator, the same admiration, Kleber notes, is to be found in *A Sentimental Journey* as well as in the author’s personal correspondence.

Most space of all in the volume (two chapters, one of which is the longest in the book) is given to Tobias Smollett, who, had he not been a Scot, would have been yet
another contender for the title of “English Cervantes.” Pedro Javier Pardo, in “Tobias Smollett’s Humphrey Clinker and the Cervantine Tradition in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction,” treats Smollett as the last major Cervantine of the eighteenth century and counters many critics in adducing Humphrey Clinker, not Launcelot Greaves, as Smollett’s most Cervantine work. Humphrey Clinker, argues Pardo, represents not only the culmination of Smollett’s own long association with Cervantes’ work, but also sums up the ways in which other earlier eighteenth-century novelists used Cervantes. Smollett manages a thorough synthesis of eighteenth-century narrative modes, merging Fielding’s and Sterne’s contributions to the Cervantine novel in the epistolary format of Samuel Richardson. Pardo takes a step further Harry Levin’s definition of the quixotic pattern as the juxtaposition of the romantic with the realistic, the anti-romantic. He argues that in Humphrey Clinker the anti-romantic itself becomes quixotic. In Smollett’s novel, argues Pardo, we find not so much Quixote set against Sancho as multiple Quixotes set against one another.

Christoph Ehland, in “Tobias Smollett’s Quixotic Adventures,” credits Smollett’s popular translation of Don Quixote (more than thirty editions were printed by 1839) with introducing Cervantes to generations of readers in England and America. That Smollett’s translation was almost certainly cribbed from a translation by Charles Jarvis, and that the plagiarism was recognized early on, seems not to have affected the work’s success. Ehland points out that Spanish influence on the eighteenth-century English novel was not in the realm of metafiction: English audiences were more interested in the protagonist of Don Quixote than in the authorial voice. In such novels as Ferdinand Count Fathom and Sir Launcelot Greaves, the latter directly modeled on Don Quixote, Smollett combined moral argument with picaresque narrative structure, his moral intention always clear. Contrasting the pessimism and cynicism of the picaresque with the humanity and “idealistic delusion” of the quixotic, Ehland observes that the latter was particularly congenial to the idealistic spirit of the Enlightenment, with its view of mankind as perfectible.

In “Female Quixotism: Charlotte Lennox and Tabitha Tenney,” Scott Paul Gordon investigates another side of quixotic narrative, in which the characteristic eighteenth-century use of quixotes to satirize society reverts to the earlier tendency to satirize the quixote himself (or herself). Focusing on Lennox’s Female Quixote and Tenney’s Female Quixotism, Gordon counters the tendency of current criticism to see the female quixote, acting outside prescribed norms, as an admirable subverter of “patriarchal oppression.” Gordon finds a much more conservative voice at work, one that presents the female quixote not as admirable but as deluded, usually, Quixote-like, through the reading of too many romances. The proper cure comes by way of the protagonist’s learning to be a wife rather than a heroine. Gordon touches upon a number of other late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century examples of female quixotism, including Maria Edgeworth’s Angelina, in which Lennox’s Female Quixote is prescribed to the protagonist as curative reading, suggesting that such narratives were viewed in their own time as something less than empowering.
Influenced both directly by Cervantes’ novel itself and indirectly by a century and more of intervening English fiction, Dickens took ‘Don Quixote’ as the general model for The Pickwick Papers, with numerous parallels, both close and inverted, between Pickwick and Don Quixote and Sam Weller and Sancho. As Paul Goetsch points out, however, in “Charles Dickens’s The Pickwick Papers and Don Quixote,” the most significant difference lies in the way the authors situate their protagonists in their worlds. Cervantes takes his protagonist, nostalgic for a fictional past, and sets him and his illusions in a solidly realistic contemporary world. Dickens, on the other hand, keeps contemporary reality largely at bay, his nineteenth-century protagonist moving in a world little changed from that of the previous century, with that world itself softened periodically by the lens of nostalgia.

Mark Twain enjoyed a contemporary reputation as the American Cervantes, and, as Henry B. Wonham points out in “Mark Twain: The American Cervantes,” that reputation survives to this day. He saw himself as a Cervantes-like disenchanter, a comic expositor of shams. In the character of Tom Sawyer the American Cervantes created the preeminent American quixote, in Huck Finn the American Sancho. Wonham focuses primarily, however, on A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court, which offers an inverse image of Don Quixote. Don Quixote’s ancient and mythical ideals are incompatible with the practical realities of modern Spain, whereas Hank Morgan, a practical (and somewhat Sancho-like) nineteenth-century engineer, finds himself just as out of place in a world that is itself mythic and imagined. Wonham finds Twain’s satire, at last, uncertain in its focus, as Morgan’s introduction of modern reforms into Arthur’s Camelot accomplishes no lasting change. Twain’s ambivalence toward the present seems to have been much in the spirit of Cervantes’ own ambivalence toward the past, more, perhaps, than Twain himself recognized.

Elmar Schenkel, in “G. K. Chesterton: The Return of Don Quixote,” examines one of a number of quixotic novels by a writer who was himself much the Quixote, openly at odds with his own time. Quixotism becomes in Chesterton a medium for critiquing the present, for looking at modern times, largely unfavorably, through medieval eyes. When Michael Herne, Chesterton’s librarian protagonist, calls for reenchantment rather than disenchantment, for “somebody who does believe in tilting at giants,” we see that the reception and use of Cervantes has come a long way. This we see also in the life as well as in the writings of the South African-born poet Roy Campbell, discussed by the editors themselves in “Roy Campbell: Quixote Redivivus.” Campbell, who translated Cervantes’ play The Siege of Numantia, saw mankind as divided into “the Quixotes and the Sanchos” with himself as one of the Quixotes. An opponent of racial prejudice in South Africa in the 1920s, a supporter of Franco in the Spanish Civil War (Fernández-Morera and Hanke point out that the Communists of the Spanish Republic represented for Campbell what the forces of Islam represented for Cervantes), Campbell often found himself defiantly at odds with his social and intellectual environment, ready, like Quixote, to fight “the righteous fight.”

The final essay in the volume, “Walker Percy’s Enraged and Bemused Quixotes,”
by Monserrat Ginés, brings us once again to America. Percy called *Don Quixote* the book he would most like to have written, and its influence is particularly evident in *The Last Gentleman*, with its amnesiac protagonist, Will Barrett, longing for a golden age of heroism, seeking a reality more to his taste than that in which he actually lives. Ginés spends much time comparing Barrett with Quentin Compson, and one cannot help but wonder whether William Faulkner might have been appropriately included among the authors addressed in this book.

The volume, as I suggest above, would be enhanced by an introduction providing some degree of overview. The abstracts that introduce each essay serve this purpose somewhat, although in only a fragmentary way, and, given that they constitute the only introductory matter, one might have asked for more stylistic homogeneity among them. A heavier editorial hand would have helped in this regard. The book includes brief bibliographies, one for Cervantes generally and one for each of the individual authors addressed. The logic of selection for the works in the bibliographies is not clear. A number of significant works cited in the essays are excluded from the bibliographies—for no evident reason. Nowhere in the bibliographies, general or individual, is an edition or translation of Cervantes included: a serious omission, to my mind. An edition of the Jarvis translation of *Don Quixote* is listed in a footnote to the chapter on Twain, but this buried reference is as close as one gets, and, like so many others, it doesn’t appear in the bibliography for that chapter. (Given the importance of the Jarvis translation to Smollett, one might have expected it to appear in the bibliography for at least one of the chapters on that author.) An essay by Carlos Fuentes is listed in a footnote with a French title but appears in the bibliography with titles in Spanish and English. There are a few typographical errors, one of which, potentially distracting, turns the famous actor David Garrick into Davis Garrick, and a pagination error occurs in the table of contents. Nevertheless, despite small technical flaws and the occasionally troubling omission, and Faulkner or no Faulkner, Fernández-Morera and Hanke’s collection leaves the reader in no doubt as to the depth and breadth of Cervantes’ influence on writers in the English-speaking world, from Cervantes’ day to our own.
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