

The Cambridge Companion to Cervantes. Ed. Anthony J. Cascardi. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. xvii + 242 pages.

This is a frustrating volume, whose review I kept postponing. It has some good essays, but it is sloppy and unbalanced, not on the level of the *Suma cervantina* or the MLA's *Approaches to Teaching Don Quixote*. One misses the presence of the most distinguished and influential of Anglo-American *cervantistas*, such as Allen, Avalle-Arce, Close, Mancing, Murillo, Parr, or Riley.

Melveena McKendrick provides one of the best chapters, "Writing for the Stage," surveying thoroughly his theater and identifying some of its uniqueness and shortcomings. For Cervantes, content has primacy over form; Cervantes was a storyteller and told stories in his drama (143). Mary Gaylord provides an unbiased and informed survey of "Cervantes's Other Fiction," including a sympathetic reading of *La Galatea*, pointing out the varied topography of the *Novelas ejemplares*, and how *Persiles* shares with *La Galatea* a treatment of multiple versions of love. All of his fiction teaches that "irony comes in many shapes and guises" (125). I believe she overstates *Persiles*'s popularity with its first readers (none of the six publishers of the 1617 editions brought out a second edition), and since she cites El Saffar, it surprises that Ruth is not mentioned as someone who has addressed the question of the *Novelas ejemplares*' ordering (127 n. 23).

Fred De Armas studies "Cervantes and the Italian Renaissance" and in the process deals intelligently and sensitively with Cervantes's views on love and literature; it is the article that best examines Cervantes's thought. Cervantes's longing for Italy is a longing for the Renaissance. Anne Cruz reviews recent psychoanalytical studies of Cervantes in "Psyche and Gender in Cervantes," and also provides briefer comments on Cervantes's female characters. Barry Ife's "The Historical and Social Context" provides a history of early modern Spain, focusing on political history and to a lesser extent on economics. That there was a Moorish "invasion" (15) is rather an old-fashioned view, and it is surprising to see Isabel la Católica's expulsion of Jews presented as a step toward strengthening the power of the Church (16).

My only issue with Adrienne L. Martín's "Humor and Violence in Cervantes" is that she tacitly equates Cervantes and *Don Quijote*; there is humor and violence

in “El licenciado Vidriera” and “Rinconete y Cortadillo,” for example. On *Don Quijote* her essay is persuasive: “Cervantes’s genius lies precisely in the ambiguities and profundity of his exploration of the literary relationship between humor (madness), comedy, and seriousness of purpose and meaning” (166). This is precisely what Avellaneda does not “get,” she accurately notes. “The author teaches us the truth through laughter” (167). She concludes with an exploration of the different relationships between humor and violence in Cervantes’s day and ours.

Some essays are disappointing. Diana de Armas Wilson, in “Cervantes and the New World,” starts on the wrong foot by calling *La Galatea* “unreadable,” full of “classical furniture.” The exaggerated links she finds between Cervantes and the Western hemisphere I have commented on elsewhere, in a review of her *Cervantes, the Novel, and the New World* (<http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/reviews/wilson.pdf>, 9 June 2005). The most inadequate is that of Alexander Welsh, “The Influence of Cervantes”; his only concern, as he himself says (80), is the influence of *Don Quijote*, primarily on British novelists. This ignores, for example, the influence of the “Coloquio de los perros” on Freud, the political use made of *La Numancia* in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the influence of *Persiles* in England and Germany, that of the *Novelas ejemplares* in France, influence on Mark Twain and Góngora (*La Galatea*), and so on. Influence of *Don Quijote* does not even touch on the work’s influence in Spain, its role in burlesquing the *libros de caballerías* and preventing them from being revived under the more tolerant reign of Felipe III. A better alternative is Anthony Cascardi’s “*Don Quijote* and the Invention of the Novel.” He points to an increased openness of form as Cervantes’s key innovation (77), yet might have added that openness, of a slightly different sort, is precisely what the Toledo canon said was found in the *libros de caballerías*. Cervantes indeed saw Lepanto as an answer to chivalric romance (71); he presumably would have said that his own adventuresome life was much more interesting—and true—than any work of fiction.

Another disappointment are the topics that are missing altogether. While the publisher’s blurb claims that the book contains “a comprehensive treatment of Cervantes’s life” (<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/description/cam022/2002017500.html>, 9 June 2005), we are given only a chronology and three pages in Cascardi’s introduction. There is almost nothing on Avellaneda, on the *Viaje del Parnaso*, or other verse (despite the editor’s claim in the introduction, 2). Beyond De Armas there is nothing on Cervantes’s thought; Cervantes’s political, economic, historical, and religious views are unexamined. There is no general bibliography, and no summaries of any of Cervantes’s works. There are suggestions for “Further Reading” after each article; some are English-language only and others are plurilingual. In general they are sensible, though *cervantistas* will no doubt join me in shuddering at sending readers, as Welsh does, to Nabokov’s lectures.

The list of *Quixote* translations (xv) mysteriously omits two of the best known, those of Putnam (Modern Library) and Ormsby revised by Jones and Douglas (now unfortunately out of print, while the original Ormsby is ubiquitous on the Internet). There is no guidance about what translation(s) to use. That *Persiles* and the *Novelas ejemplares* have recently been translated into English is not noted. The Appendix on “Electronic Editions and Scholarly Resources” (226–27) provides some starting points in an ever-shifting electronic universe. One wishes that the Web site of the Cervantes Society of America, with the journal *Cervantes*, had been included (<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csapage.htm>), and that Ormsby’s translation were cited from a more permanent home, such as the Internet Public Library (www.ipl.org) or The Gutenberg Project (www.gutenberg.org), rather than from a high school Web site in Port Aransas, Texas.

Finally, this is, without a doubt, the worst copy-edited book I have ever seen from Cambridge University Press. Misprints are unacceptable: *El galladro español* (231), *El ruffián viudo* (231), Luis (for Luís) de Camões (230), *Lusiadas* (for *Lusiadas*, 107, 236), Angelica (for Angélica, 228), Castro del Rio (230), *Numantia destruída* (237), “Texts A&M” for “Texas A&M” (227). Augustin Redondo is spelled correctly on p. 56 but not on p. 185, where his book title is butchered into *Otra manera de leer “El Quijote.” La casa de los celos* is varyingly translated as *The Abode of Jealousy* (228) and *The House of Jealousy* (230); *Los tratos de Argel* is translated two different ways on the same page: *The Ways of Algiers* (6, 139) and *The Traffic of Algiers* (139); only the latter of these is found in the index.

The index is a hodge-podge. Fielding merits a paragraph on pp. 80–81, but is missing from the index; one will look in vain for Esther Crooks where the index says she is found, on p. 78. Isabel Lozano Renieblas is alphabetized under “Renieblas” (129, 239), but Paul Lewis Smith is under “Lewis” (159, 236); Las Casas is under “Casas, Bartolomé de las” (230). Fernando de Saavedra is under Fernando (233); “Diego de Miranda, Don” is under Diego (232). There is no consistency on whether titles of works are indexed in Spanish or English; both are found.

Spanish is capitalized as if it were English: “La Ejemplaridad de las ‘Novelas Ejemplares’” (10 n. 15), “Los Inquisidores Literarios de Cervantes” (10 no. 16). At other times it seems as if French style is being followed: “El Coloquio de los perros” (7). Printers are cited instead of publishers: Rodríguez Marín’s 1947–49 *Quijote* edition was not published by the Tipografía de la *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, nor was it the fourth edition of his “Clásicos Castellanos” edition (xiv). The *Revista de Archivos Bibliotecas y Museos* did not publish “facsimile versions of the first editions of the complete works” (xi). Schevill and Bonilla’s edition was not published by the Imprenta de Bernardo Rodríguez, nor by Gráficas Reunidas (xv). The title of Murillo’s edition is incorrectly cited as *Don Quixote de*

la Mancha (xv). Shelton did not translate Part II of *Don Quixote* into English (xv), although this has been discovered only recently.

In sum, the volume is an uneven collection of essays, but not much of a companion.

DANIEL EISENBERG

Clifton Park, NY