

Published in *Modern Language Review*, 88
(1993), 1011-12.

The Sanctification of Don Quixote: From Hidalgo to Priest. By Eric J. Ziolkowski. University Park: Penn State Press, 1991. xi + 275 pp. £29.95.

This is an unusual, well-written, and challenging book. Its author is a professor of religion. In contrast to most non-specialist readers, he has read widely from the secondary literature on *Don Quixote*, including that in Spanish (although he does not know my corrections, in *A Study of 'Don Quixote'*, to Anthony Close's history of Cervantine interpretation). His study is thus useful to the *quijotista* and *cervantista*, as well as to the reader with religious concerns. It includes a good index, and I have found only two trivial misprints ('Altisadora', p. 28; 'Hisapam', p. 30, n. 71).

Ziolkowski's topic is the religious significance of the character Don Quixote. Because of 'the decline of religious consciousness in the West..., to live a truly religious life in modernity is to appear (or to be?) quixotic' (p. ix). Religious existence in the modern, secular world is a quixotic, nostalgic quest. Like Don Quixote, one must suffer and struggle against a loss of faith. As evidence for this position, Ziolkowski examines chronologically three novels that adapt the Quixote figure for religious purposes: Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* (eighteenth century), Dostoevsky's *The Idiot* (nineteenth century), and Graham Greene's *Monsignor Quixote* (twentieth century). Each of these is accompanied by a chapter on the contemporary interpretation of *Don Quixote*, with emphasis on the religious aspects and drawing heavily on Close. The works studied are well chosen. Yet while Ziolkowski has read and cites Unamuno's writings on Don Quixote, he makes little reference his fiction, where we find subtly religious and quixotic figures, such as Augusto Pérez (*Niebla*) and San Manuel Bueno. In passing Ziolkowski touches on the definition of religion, the secularization of Western society, the parallel growth of the novel, and many key figures of modern Western culture, among them Kierkegaard, Freud, Kafka, and Beckett.

It is hard to evaluate or even adequately summarize such a wide-ranging, learned, and painstaking book. (The author carefully uses, when discussing Fielding and Greene, the translations of *Don Quixote* the authors are most likely to have used. He also uses the Douglas/Jones revision of Ormsby, and the Spanish original.) Its biggest shortcoming, from my *cervantista* point of view, is the author's relative disinterest in Cervantes. A subsection on Cervantes' religious views (pp. 24-30) never mentions the *Persiles*, much less Cervantes' religious drama *El rufián dichoso*. We are told conclusively that Cervantes studied with the Jesuits (p. 29), but the terrible tension of the passage in the

'Coloquio de los perros' on which that conclusion is based, and the veiled attacks on religious orders elsewhere in the *Novelas ejemplares* (see *A Study of 'Don Quixote'*, p. 13, n. 40), are not noted. The important chivalric component in Don Quixote's religion is given little attention. Don Quixote would presumably not have agreed that his 'quixotism much *by definition* stand at odds with whatever tone characterizes the contemporary world' (p. 249, emphasis added).

However, this is taking the book on my terms, not its own. It is not a study of Cervantes, nor even of Cervantes' book or character, but a study and history of what religiously oriented writers have done with the figure they found in Cervantes' book. As such, it is an admirable contribution. How revealing it is that none of these writers (as reported by Ziolkowski) noticed the strong evidence for Don Quixote's Jewish ancestry. (Sancho repeatedly proclaims himself an 'old Christian', while Don Quixote is silent.) An important dimension of his suffering and alienation, and another parallel with Jesus, was missed.

Daniel Eisenberg

Florida State University, Tallahassee