



REVIEWS

James Iffland. *De fiestas y aguafiestas: risa, locura e ideología en Cervantes y Avellaneda*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 1999. 605 pp.

Hidden within this massive, "exhaustive" (touse the author's own word) consideration of three versions of *Don Quijote* in the light of Bakhtin's theory of the carnivalesque is a cogent, elegant interrogation of the relationship between two works of complex, multifaceted genius (Cervantes' *Don Quijote* of 1605 and 1615) and a nother simpler, unidimensional one (Avellaneda's *Segundo tomo*, 1614). It can be difficult, however, to discern the outline of this delicate and useful analysis through the dense theorizing that surrounds and nearly overwhelms it.

De fiestas y aguafiestas consists of an Introduction, which establishes the rationale for a comparative study of Cervantes and Avellaneda and distinguishes Iffland's approach from those of previous studies, principally those of Gilman and Aylward; three parts, which correspond roughly to the *Quijotes* of 1605, 1614, and 1615; and an epilogue that emphasizes Avellaneda's dedication to generic decorum and the approval that such a stance received during the Neoclassical period that followed Cervantes' own Baroque.

Iffland begins by asserting the importance of reading Avellaneda's *Quijote* for understanding Cervantes' obviously much greater accomplishment. The author correctly reasons that it makes no sense to scorn the lesser work, since almost all other literary attempts suffer in comparison to the Cervantine standard. Furthermore, Avellaneda's version provides a clear idea of how that of Cervantes was read in the seventeenth century: "estudiar a Avellaneda es estudiar la recepción contemporánea del *Quijote*" (17). Finally, *cervantistas* ought to read Avellaneda because the master himself did, and his reading helped to shape the second part of his work: "Avellaneda influye en Cervantes, es así de simple" (17).

Iffland then explains how his interpretation of Avellaneda's ideological dispute with Cervantes differs from Gilman's, pointing out that, among other things, the eminent critic's view of Avellaneda as operating within a tradition of asceticism reemphasized by the Counterreformation discounts the promi-

nence of obscene humor in the *Segundo tomo*, and implies a substantial ecclesiastic, theological presence that the work itself does not portray. Iffland (correctly, in this reviewer's opinion) finds the true difference between Cervantes and Avellaneda in the sociopolitical and aesthetic, as opposed to the theological realm. He argues that the latter's avatars at the level of the fiction are the "caballeros de buen gusto" who make Avellaneda's hero perform for their own collective enjoyment and who, in Iffland's words, "en su papel de baluartes de la sociedad monárquico-señorial se sienten amenazados por cualquier artefacto cultural que pudiera contribuir siquiera un poquito a la gran ebullición social de la época" (26). Thus, Avellaneda functions as an "intelectual al servicio de la nobleza terrateniente y de la monarquía absoluta" (27).

Iffland then enters into a microscopic examination of the three works through the lens of the ories of the carnivalesque in order to demonstrate that Cervantes' 1605 *Don Quijote* was "una obra que emite resonancias desestabilizadoras" (34), which was bound to upset the status quo so valued by Avellaneda. According to Iffland, Cervantes portrays a carnivalesque world of inverted social hierarchies, in which his hero clashes with both secular and ecclesiastic authorities, and in which those of lower rank are permitted, indeed encouraged, to laugh at those supposedly above them. Iffland identifies this laughter with the concept of "Renaissance laughter" described by Bakhtin, and sets in within the carnivalesque world with its roots in "lo festivo popular" (62). This permits the critic to associate Don Quijote with a series of characters who appear in popular (which is to say, folk) festivals throughout European history, principally the carnival king, but also Saturn, the holy fool, the warrior-god, and the prophet. All of this is also related to Don Quijote's reversible role as the *loco/cuerdo*, and to his mobility as a self-appointed *caballero andante*.

Don Quijote's practice of inventing new roles for others in the service of his chivalric project, Iffland argues, has the effect of "carnavalizando toda la estructura social a cada paso" (63), and both Sancho and Dulcinea play an important part in this process. Sancho, like his master, functions as the carnival king and embodies reversibility as the figure of the *tonto/listo*. In addition, those qualities traditionally associated with the stereotypical peasant—gluttony, drunkenness, contact with lower animals such as swine and asses, as well as the earth, and ignorance of social niceties with regard to sex and elimination—are highlighted as those celebrated by the popular festivals termed collectively "carnival." As for Dulcinea, as a peasant girl raised to the status of chivalric lady or princess, she becomes the most extreme example of the "carnavalesque coronation" that Don Quijote performs throughout the first part of his story.

In Part II, Iffland focuses on the divergence between the 1605 *Don Quijote* and Avellaneda's continuation, concentrating especially on the ideological motivations for the "flattening" that the characters undergo. Central to his

argument is the contrast between Cervantes' laughter, which is characterized as "polidireccional" (236), and Avellaneda's, which "parte con preferencia desde instancias aristocráticas o nobles, desde arriba para abajo." Iffland aptly compares this supercilious and ubiquitous laughter to situation comedy "laugh tracks," the purpose of which is to incite the audience to laugh whether the spectacle justifies it or not. He also highlights the difference between Don Quijote's literary dreams of chivalric fame in Cervantes with Avellaneda's hero's social ambitions: "Este don Quijote, aunque loco, propone un plan de acción que no dista mucho de lo que querría hacer cualquier trepador cortesano de la época: ir a la corte—centro del poder—y buscar apoyos. Ya no se trata tanto de viajes a tierras lejanas, peleas contra gigantes y ejércitos inmensos, una vida ascética, llena de sufrimientos... Ha quedado en forma desnuda el proyecto de ascenso social, siguiendo el camino que tantos de sus contemporáneos están siguiendo junto con él" (247). Gone are Don Quijote's moments of clarity and eloquence, his ethical idealism, and ultimately, his pathos and grandeur. Avellaneda reduces him to a crazy *arriviste*, one who richly deserves both his casting as court buffoon by the "caballeros de buen gusto" and his eventual incarceration in the *manicomio* by those same gentlemen. Sancho and Dulcinea suffer the same simplifying treatment at Avellaneda's hands, becoming, in the case of the former, a greasy grotesque constantly stuffing his face with as much food as he can cram in and who cheerfully sells out to accept a permanent position as a court buffoon, and in that of the latter, a slatternly prostitute and procuress named Bárbara of outstanding ugliness and debasement, whom Avellaneda places in the "idealized" woman's role after his Don Quijote renounces Dulcinea and love.

The cultural result of Avellaneda's changes is what Iffland terms "una fiesta confiscada," in which the traditional elements of Carnival are usurped by the ruling class for its own purposes, rather than representing a true expression of popular cultural revolt. Iffland tests this conclusion against Cervantes' 1615 second part, which, the critic maintains, underwent crucial changes after Cervantes read Avellaneda's version, which the former used "no tanto como inspiración, ni mucho menos como plagio, sino para jugar con él, superándolo" (380). In particular, Iffland asserts that the changes Cervantes made went beyond the various rancorous comments about Avellaneda and his work, the appearances of characters from the "false" continuation, and the redirection of Don Quijote's itinerary away from Zaragoza. Instead, Cervantes altered those aspects to which Avellaneda had reacted most strongly, in order to emphasize their differences. One of the areas most affected by this process was precisely the reversibility of Don Quijote and Sancho, and it is true that in the 1615 text, many more characters comment with surprise on the difficulty they have deciding whether master and squire are, respectively, crazy and simple, or sane and clever.

The reason that Cervantes magnified his protagonists' reversible tenden-

cies, according to Iffland, was to maintain the carnivalesque ambiance of the work, in contrast to the political confiscation of popular festival in Avellaneda, and in spite of the more courtly settings of the major episodes of the 1615 work. In fact, Iffland places Cervantes' sociopolitical orientation in the context of an incipient bourgeoisie that opposed the decaying nobility and monarchic absolutism (580). Similarly, Iffland presents aesthetic reasons for insisting on Don Quijote's moments of discretion and dignity, arguing that Cervantes objected to the "trivialización" (559) to which Avellaneda subjects his protagonist. This accounts for the somber ending accorded to Don Quijote's story. Iffland maintains that this is a relatively ad hoc moment, and not one that the text prepares for during the entire second part. Instead, it is a late decision based on Cervantes' reading of Avellaneda; otherwise, "la lógica carnavalesca sobre la que está erigido el texto permitía perfectamente una futura resurrección, seguida por más aventuras" (559), most likely, "aventuras pastoriles." Iffland continues to question whether the "carnavalesque logic" would not make it "conceivable que Cervantes dejara vivir a don Quijote al final de la obra" (562), and even speculates that this logic makes it likely that we are meant to laugh at Don Quijote's death (565).

The extent to which *Fiestas y aguafiestas* insists on the dominance of Cervantes' carnivalesque spirit, even to the point of rewriting the master's work and supporting a contrarian reading of one of the more ambiguous and yet poignant scenes in literature, leads us to the problematic aspect of this study, which can be summed up in the question, Which came first, the theory or the text? Iffland, although he does mention in passing that "el Carnaval y los festivales allegados pueden funcionar como las clásicas válvulas de escape, permitiendo esa catarsis transgresiva que fortalece la jerarquía del poder" (168), never really confronts this fundamental weakness of the theory for literary, as well as social, analysis. That is to say, because Carnival is a moment and not a movement, it is ultimately either futile, since it does not fundamentally change the system, or worse, complicit with and a function of the same order. The established power creates a moving theater bounded by spatial and temporal limits within which the lower order acts out an illusory freedom which it then surrenders without complaint or permanent rebellion. It is this aspect which permits the ruling power to confiscate the festival without much change or effort.

Whether it is because Iffland wants to correct for this weakness, or because he is truly unaware of it, he compounds the problem by over-argumentation, in which every point is carried out to its logical extreme. Everything that Don Quijote and Sancho do is termed "carnivalesque," every fall is a dethroning of the carnival king and every time they pick themselves up, it is a re-crowning. Even in those cases where the text or characters themselves resist such an analysis, it is applied. For example, for Iffland, the *yelmo de Mambrino* represents a crown, and the fact that Don Quijote, who is perfectly capable of such extrapolations, does not do so in this case, is

dismissed with "Esto importa poco, porque se trata de analizar cómo lo que ocurre a continuación sigue de cerca la lógica de los ritos de Carnaval" (82). But does it? To choose another case, the study does not acknowledge that the *galeotes* episode may correspond not to a carnivalesque, archetypal logic, but rather to a historical logic, in which an old, chivalric system of justice comes into conflict with a new, absolutist mechanism.

Iffland overstates his case in other ways as well. One is by the overuse of certain theoretical terms: *carnaval* (obviously, in all of its nominal, adjectival, verbal, and adverbial variants), *desterritorializar*, *reterritorializar*, *festivo*, *cuaresmal*, *destronar*, etc. Another is by assigning massive symbolic value to the slightest gestures or actions. The fact that Don Quijote, upon gaining his freedom from the cage, gives Rocinante a couple of affectionate pats on the rump, is laden with the following interpretive significance: "También es notable que le dé palmadas 'en las ancas' a Rocinante, esto es, *en la parte trasera de su cuerpo*. Son sus propias partes traseras lo que han permitido esta libertad que está gozando, y el tocar las de su caballo, instrumento máximo de su movilidad, parecería manifestar una especie de inconsciente solidaridad con ellas" (132, emphasis added). The tendency to belabor the obvious, as in the unnecessary explanation of where one would find a horse's *ancas*, runs throughout Iffland's analysis. In this case, the following discussion of the fact that Don Quijote is free due to certain bodily necessities is also carried to an extreme. Cervantes, after all, makes it perfectly clear exactly what the moment means for him: it is one of the ordinary, human things that the knights in romance never do, and which he inserts to create a new kind of knight, and of romance, for his time. In addition, it is something that those under enchantment never do, which leads to Sancho's important realization of his own logical and literary competence.

If at some moments, Iffland overextends his analytical theorizing, in others he glosses over important distinctions. He seldom discusses the complex narratorial apparatus, and is apt to blur the distinction between narrative voice and the characters themselves. In the critical case of Dulcinea, Iffland conflates the distant model of Aldonza Lorenzo and the idealized *dama*, sometimes as explicitly as in the phrase "se encomienda a su señora Dulcinea (campesina de un pueblo de moriscos)" (230) in order to place her squarely in a carnivalesque, as opposed to chivalric romance/poetic, context. Dulcinea is perhaps the most elusive and allusive of all literary figures, and she cannot (and I would insist) should not be simplified to coincide with the original model. Similarly, Iffland takes seriously the supposedly revolutionary connotations of Sancho's dreams of advancement, disregarding the complex way in which Cervantes qualifies them. They are, first and foremost, a literary artefact that has comically been lifted from its appropriate context, in which squires are members of the nobility who earn advancement by service and/or valor. Sancho himself regards his dreams ambivalently, never able to believe or disbelieve them completely. Furthermore, when Iffland asserts "ahora es

cuestión de ostentar sus raíces campesinas, como un verdadero *self-made man*, precursor del 'sueño americano'" (534), he forgets that Sancho's "dream" does not involve working hard to improve his lot in life; he is looking for someone else (Don Quijote, la princesa Micomicona, los duques, divine providence) to make him. He declares himself over and over too lazy and cowardly to make himself.

In effect, *Fiestas y aguafiestas* does exactly what Avellaneda does, albeit in the opposite direction: it simplifies Cervantes' complex ambiguities to prove a sociopolitical point: "es evidente que un sector social disidente que empleaba el lenguaje carnavalesco para abrir brechas en la hegemonía aristocrática era justamente la incipiente burguesía o clase media" (581). Such a conclusion fails to acknowledge the fragile nature of the middle class in seventeenth-century Spain, which, as Maravall has demonstrated, was much more often committed to imitating the aristocracy than to rising up against it. It also ignores the very strong thread of nostalgia for idealized aristocratic values that runs through virtually all of Cervantes' works. When Don Quijote evokes the difference between noble blood and noble deeds, he looks backward, towards the time when blood and deeds were one, and the nobility of one's birth was displayed by the virtue of one's comportment, rather than forward, towards a future when all social distinctions are leveled.

In *Fiestas y aguafiestas*, Ifland has produced a work that contains valuable insights into Cervantes and Avellaneda and the worlds that they have built around the characters of Don Quijote and Sancho Panza. In the determination to nail every action and speech firmly to the carnivalesque theoretical framework, however, it loses touch with the very complexity and subtlety of Cervantes' achievement.

Theresa Ann Sears
University of North Carolina—Greensboro

Ronald Paulson. *Don Quixote in England. The Aesthetics of Laughter*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. xx + 242 pp.

Paulson's book is about the influence of *Don Quijote* on the evolution of the aesthetics of laughter and satire in eighteenth-century England. Cervantes' novel was immensely popular in that period, being a key reference-point for its foremost writers; and, because of the rise of empiricism and the decentralizing of political power, they used it in a way that was unmatched in contemporary France and Spain. It put in question—Paulson argues—the conventional equation of comedy with satire and laughter with ridicule, as expounded by Hobbes in his *Leviathan*. For the royalist and Anglican Jonathan Swift, Don Quijote's madness symbolizes the Moderns' quest to change

the world: using the norm of common experience, it exposes the folly of the unfettered enthusiasm of Dissenters and radical nonconformist sects. The Whig Joseph Addison, on the other hand, in the *Spectator* (1711-12), takes Quixotic madness as a model for revaluing the imagination that Swift treats as transgressive, and transforms Swiftian satiric ridicule into pure comedy, based on an aesthetics of pleasurable response or sympathetic laughter, an area which he designated as the Novel, New, or Uncommon. In this Addison follows the Earl of Shaftesbury, who, in his "Letter Concerning Enthusiasm and *Sensus Communis*: An Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour," upholds civilized, good-humored raillery, which he sees as a test of gravity, and while criticizing Enthusiasm in its fanatical religious form, defends it, in poetry, as an instrument of the Sublime. The engraver and cartoonist William Hogarth, a prominent figure in Paulson's story, adopts a position akin to Addison's. His transformation of religious symbols into aesthetic equivalents involves secularizing and humanizing them, assimilating them to a Sancho-panzine ideal of blemished but living beauty, which is experienced as Novelty and grounded in a response of laughter.

Many other writers and themes figure in Paulson's account: Henry Fielding's debunking and transformation of Richardson's *Pamela*, the Quixotism of the hero of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, Sterne's conception of the hobby-horse in *Tristram Shandy*, and the conversion of Marcela (*Don Quijote* I, 14) into the heroine of Charlotte Lennox's *The Female Quixote* (1742). Cervantes' masterpiece is a paradigm in all these cases, which bring four contentious problems into play: the madness of the imagination, the cruelty of laughter and ridicule, the question whether there are objective norms of beauty, and the extension of madness to religious belief.

Paulson's book takes its cue from two seminal texts. The first is Milan Kundera's essay "The Day Panurge No Longer Makes People Laugh," in which the Czech novelist defines humor as bound up with the birth of the novel and as an imaginary terrain where moral judgement is suspended. Paulson also draws on Michael McKeon's chapter on *Don Quijote* in *The Origins of the English Novel* (1987), according to whom Cervantes' work entails that the modern disenchantment of the world involves not the eradication of enchantment but its secular reappropriation.

This is a detailed, substantial study, particularly illuminating on the interconnections among the foremost aestheticians of the period, their diverse responses to *Don Quijote*, and the interplay between aesthetics and ideology, political or religious. I sometimes found the exposition over-detailed, perhaps because of my unfamiliarity with some of the texts. Had Paulson stuck to the brief that he defines on p. xi: "Bracketing the intentions of Cervantes himself or the response of his Spanish readers in the seventeenth century, I examine the text of *Don Quijote* from the perspective of an eighteenth-century English reader," I would have had few quibbles. However, in Chapters One and Two in particular he pursues a line indicated by

the sentence immediately following the one just quoted: "I do not wish to deviate from the Cervantean text: everything to which I draw attention is there." In general, I found Paulson's interpretations of passages in *Don Quijote* and comments on its background shaky and outdated. Readers of this journal will be surprised to read statements like these: "*Don Quixote's* one fictional predecessor in Spain was *La vida de Lazarillo de Tormes*" (p. 7); "Maritornes's jest that leaves Quixote hanging from the gate precariously balanced on the back of Rocinante" (p. 19); "to judge by the comedia of Lope [de Vega] and Cervantes, many of these plays were essentially Plautine comedies" (p. 38); "from the view of Sancho the peasant, 'a figure as low and repulsive as that village girl' [i.e. the wench sighted outside El Toboso], is beautiful" (p. 85). I also find it odd, given that Paulson aims to look at *Don Quijote* from the perspective of the eighteenth-century reader, that he chooses as his base text Samuel Putnam's prim and modernizing translation. Doubtless none of these defects will matter much to the staff and students of English literature and comparative literature departments to whom this book is primarily addressed. However, Hispanists should be warned of them. This does not detract from the book's merits as a source of information about how *Don Quijote* was interpreted by posterity.

Anthony Close
University of Cambridge

Rachel Schmidt. *Critical Images. The Canonization of Don Quixote through Illustrated Editions of the Eighteenth Century*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999. xvii + 248 pp. ISBN: 0-7735-1754-5.

This study is of particular interest to iconographers and readers of early illustrated editions of *Don Quixote*, and perhaps of greater interest to all who deal in textual criticism of Cervantes' work. It advocates a rarely heard but convincing argument: that graphic representation of the novel is frequently subtle and penetrating, to the point that it can be held on equal footing with critical textual representations. Rachel Schmidt demonstrates, also, that the tendencies to idealize, sentimentalize, or romanticize the novel were existent, particularly in graphic forms, well before the work of the German Romantics. Rather than paraphrase I quote the following remarks from her Preface to show the development of her thesis:

"The richly detailed and pointedly satiric tapestry of sixteenth-century Spain... does not serve as the backdrop for modern adaptations, but rather is replaced by a nostalgically bucolic countryside or an empty horizon. This idealized setting stages the romancing of *Don Quixote*... In

short, Don Quixote's mad vision, the result of too much ingenuous consumption of chivalric romances, overshadows Cervantes' satiric puncturing of the genre. *Don Quixote*, the parody of a romance genre, becomes a romance in the modern popular imagination.

"The second setting for the modern Don Quixote and Sancho Panza is the broad sky and empty horizon of Picasso's painting. Against an empty landscape the pair stand out as abstractions desperately seeking significance... These readings of the text as a philosophical or theoretical work are, obviously, far subtler and more compelling than the romancing of *Don Quixote*. ...The dialog that enlivens the novel's play is reduced to dialectic. Yet this general approach... appeared in the eighteenth century and was in fact responsible for the canonization of the novel... The erudite, elevating interpretations of the neoclassical critics, expressed both in visual images and text, informed the de luxe critical editions of the eighteenth century that graced bookshelves of the cultured thinking man. The German Romantics, who furthered these readings into the dialectics mentioned above, only took a further step of assimilating satire to speculative thought.

"Significantly for this study, both the sentimental and the satirical interpretations of *Don Quixote* shaped the graphic and literary components of these... editions and, therefore, were integrally involved in the canonization of the novel. By closely analysing both components of these books, this study proposes, first, to revise the history of the reception of Cervantes' work, which until now has been focused on the German Romantic as a major turning point. When one studies these editions as a whole, considering that both visual images and critical writings represent interpretations of the text, the coexistence, conflict, and development of these readings in the eighteenth century comes to light...

"Secondly, this study highlights the productive independence of the illustration from the literary text as an interpretation that can even recast the narrative content into different generic forms. The iconography used by the artist becomes, most graphically, a rewriting through imagery of the text. The aesthetic, social, and even political interests that gave form to these rewritings, whether visual or literary, emerge from a consideration of the different interpretations juxtaposed in the eighteenth century editions when they are viewed in the light of the editorial conflicts and historical contexts giving rise to the book's production."

"For me," Schmidt adds at the end of her statement, "the deluxe editions, albeit the expensive mark of education and class, did at times serve as a public forum for the disinterested, spirited consideration of ideas and perspectives."

In Chapter 1, "Book Illustration as Critical Interpretation of the Text," Schmidt discusses "Printing and Authority," "Prints as Reproductions and Representations," "Illustrations and Iconography: Reading and Writing

Visual Images," "Traditions and Iconography," "Canonization of *Don Quixote* in the Eighteenth Century," "Canonization of *Don Quixote* within the Deluxe Editions," and "Traditions of Reading and Illustrating *Don Quixote*." Chapter 2, "The Book Errant: Seventeenth-Century Readings and Depictions of *Don Quixote*," discusses "Theatrical Burlesque: Boutatts' Illustrations of *Don Quixote*," "The Carnavalesque Burlesque," "The Carnavalesque Body," "The Transformation of Carnavalesque Laughter into Superior Giggles," "The Mock-heroic Mode: the Boutatts and Coppel Frontispieces," and "The Charm of Folly."

Chapter 3, "Cervantes as Hercules Musagetes: The First Neoclassical Edition," suggests that the London J. R. Tonson 1738 two-volume Spanish "deluxe" edition sponsored by Lord Carteret "deserves to be considered the first monument to the novel's author, Cervantes." It included the first biography, commissioned of Mayáns, the first portrait of the author, by Kent, and an "allegorical frontispiece, designed by John Vanderbank, that represents Cervantes as Hercules Musagetes liberating Mount Parnassus from the monstrous invaders of fantastic literature. The publication of the Cervantine biography and portrait, as well as the sheer size and physical sumptuousness of the book, paper, binding, print type, and illustrations, mark this edition as a physical and intellectual venture intended to launch Cervantes from the realm of popular literature on to the ethereal heights of Parnassus." The topics discussed here are "Cervantes as the Champion of Spain: Mayáns' Dedicatory Letter," "Cervantes as Champion of Neoclassical Values: The Allegorical Frontispiece and Kent's Portrait of Cervantes," "An Apology for a Neoclassical Author: Mayáns' Biography of Cervantes," "The Intellectual Context of the Production of the Carteret Edition," "Cervantes as a Neoclassical Satirist of Pernicious Literature," "Don Quixote as the Mouthpiece of Cervantes," "Gesture as an Elevating Device in Vanderbank's Illustrations," "Oldfield on the Illustration as a Vehicle of Instruction and Interpretation," "The Marginalization of the Fantastic: The Cave of Montesinos Episode," "The Banishment of the Burlesque: The Adventure of the Windmills," "Illustration as Theatre," "The Illustration as an Alternative Interpretation: Vanderbank's Sancho," "Vanderbank's Dignified, Defiant Sancho...and Don Quixote as a Man of Sentiment."

In Chapter 4, "Don Quixote Every Man: Eighteenth-Century English Illustrators," Schmidt uses the statement made by Peter Motteux in his 1700 translation voicing a "universalizing interpretation of Cervantes' satirical objective that dominated the novel's reception outside of Spain in the eighteenth century.... As the producers of the Carteret edition strove so mightily to elevate *Don Quixote* from the realm of every man, the popular sphere of the lower classes, certain English contemporaries sought to elevate it to the realm of Every Man, the public sphere of the newly emerging middle class." Topics here include "The Exclusion of Hogarth from the 1738 Edition," "Fielding's definition of the Comic," "Hogarth's Conflation of the Heroic and

the Comic," "Hogarth's Illustrations," "Smollett and Hayman's [the illustrator] *Don Quixote*," and "Smollett's Biography of Cervantes." Schmidt shows that whereas Mayáns' biography discourses more on the author's writings, Smollett "describes the life of the active man." The Hayman allegorical frontispiece and other of his illustrations describing "Don Quixote's ludicrous solemnity," his "drama of the sentiments," "the reasonable deflation of follies," and the conflict of sentiment and good sense between Don Quixote and Sancho are discussed at length.

Chapter 5 is entitled "*El Quixote ilustrado: Illustration and Enlightenment in the Real Academia Edition*," and deals chiefly with that four-volume monument to Cervantes, the 1780 Ibarra. (The reader may be interested in knowing that, as presented in the reviewer's *Essays on the Periphery of the Quijote* [Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1991], 81–96, this is the edition that Diego de Gardoquiso proudly presented to George Washington, the soon-to-be-elected President, two months after their meeting at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention in 1787, the gift truly of the magnitude of a "gift of state.") The topics presented here are: "Cadalso's Hint of Hidden Meaning," "The Reconstruction of Cervantes' Biography," "The 1771 Ibarra Edition: The Burlesque and the Dynamic Intertwined," "The Academy Burlesqued: Cide Hamete Benengeli's Dedication to *Don Quixote* in the 1771 Ibarra Edition," "A Monument to the Author: The 1780 Real Academia de la Lengua Edition," "Cervantes as Sentimentalist and *Ilustrado* in Ríos' Analysis of *Don Quixote*," "A Heroic Don Quixote? Ríos' Analysis of the Novel," "The Controversy Surrounding the Illustrations," "The Marginalization of the Burlesque: The Vignettes," "Allegory Satirized: the Frontispiece," and "Illustration and Double Meaning in *Don Quixote*."

The conclusion is entitled "Goya and the Romantic Reading of *Don Quixote*," and includes the following sections: "The Transformation of Satire," "The Janus Face of Goya," "The Episode of the Braying Asses," "Cracks in the Edifice of Reading: Alonso Quijano Reading" (the segment is illustrated by Goya's famous, anachronous drawing), and "*Rara penitencia*."

In her Preface Schmidt indicates being disconcerted at times in that the "detailed and pointedly satiric tapestry of sixteenth-century Spain... does not serve as the backdrop for modern adaptations, but rather is replaced by a nostalgically bucolic countryside or an 'empty horizon' leading to *Don Quixote*, the parody of a romance genre [becoming] a romance in the modern popular imagination." This is a nicely-put summation and complaint, but one which is valid only in part. Since Cervantes' changed depiction of and his feelings toward his character after Chapter 57 of Part II, one can account for this seeming failure and misinterpretation. I have explored this change in an article, "The Three Deaths of Don Quixote" (*Cervantes* 9.2 [1989]: 21–41). My contention has been and still is that this change is an understandable and acceptable development. Critics, graphic or textual, and readers have probably held both views (generally known as the "funny" versus the "sad") since

Part II was published—and read to its end. In another of my notes (*Cervantes* 9.1 [1989]: 75–83) I have suggested that the sad face of Don Quixote as it appears on the frontispiece of De Rosset's French translation of Part II (Paris, 1618), could very well have been deliberately prompted by the translator himself, having taken careful note of the unusual, unexpected end to Part II. This change in character and in approach to the character which takes place, naturally—and I think convincingly—leads to the development of Don Quixote as the disillusioned idealist of the Romantics. Cervantes' afterthought, as disturbing as it may be to some, has to be seriously considered. Don Quixote's madness, the basis of the satire, serves, as Sancho says, merely "for coin." The lack of stress on the satiric aspects of the novel noted can be forgiven and the idealistic turn of events better understood and allowed.

Schmidt's choice for a second setting for the modern Don Quixote and Sancho is "the broad sky and empty horizon of Picasso's sketch... where the pair stand out as abstractions desperately seeking significance." The implication here is that Picasso has chosen the background for his sketch with his solitary, isolated personages serving as "abstractions desperately seeking significance." I refer to still another of my notes in *Cervantes* (12.1 [1992]: 105–10) in which I surmise that Picasso very probably used a Spanish craftsman's nut and bolt statuette as the model for his sketch, a model which needed no background. The sketch could indeed lead to an *assumption* that it represents Don Quixote and Sancho drawn against a barren landscape as "abstractions seeking significance," but it is really doubtful Picasso had this in mind as he drew it.

Putting aside loose kinds of categorizations and the sometime determination as to what may be on an artist/illustrator's mind, I find Schmidt's research still very worthy, extensive, and thought-provoking. Her conclusions give deserved added importance to the graphic image as a critical interpretive device, and it perforce throws more welcome light on the "funny" versus the "sad" interpretations of *Don Quixote* which will continue being debated. The copies of the engravings used are numerous, sharp, simply but beautifully presented, and serve very well to substantiate the premise that they can be called *Critical Images*, and that these images led to the canonization of Don Quixote in the eighteenth century. The book makes for a welcome addition to any Cervantes collection.

Anthony G. Lo Ré
University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill

Ingeniosa Invención: *Essays on Golden Age Spanish Literature for Geoffrey L. Stagg in Honor of his Eighty-fifth Birthday*. Ed. Ellen Anderson and Amy Williamsen. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1999. xx + 258 pp. ISBN: 0-936388-83-8.

Geoffrey L. Stagg is duly honored in this latest addition to the handsome "homenajes" series published by Juan de la Cuesta. The collection of essays edited by Ellen M. Anderson and Amy R. Williamsen contains some truly excellent contributions to Golden Age studies across the board. As most readers of this journal probably know, Stagg's research focuses on the Cervantine *œuvre*, and he served as an Associate Editor for *Cervantes* since the journal's inception until the date of publication of this *Festschrift* in celebration of his eighty-fifth birthday. However, the editors' introduction makes quite clear the fact that Stagg is nothing less than a Renaissance man—trained in both arms and letters—and this diversity is reflected through the fine selection of scholars and articles that make up this academic accolade.

In addition to sketching Stagg's academic career in their introduction to this homage, the editors also bring to light the human touch of this humanitarian. His diplomatic manner with his students, his very special relationship with his wife, and the couple's generous dinner parties with colleagues and students all paint an intimate portrait that gives a sense of wholeness to this academic tribute.

The volume itself is divided into four sections. The first section, titled "Comparative Contexts," contains three essays that "contribute to the understanding of Spanish Renaissance and Baroque works in the light of the classical letters and the Elizabethan literature Stagg knows and loves so well" (xvii). John J. Allen's "The Transformation of Satire in *Don Quixote*: 'Dine with Us as an Equal' in Juvenal and Cervantes" clearly captures the spirit of a bona fide homage. Allen explains his decision to revisit a case of satire previously explored in his renowned *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool*: "Geoffrey Stagg's work was a model of rigorous thoroughness for me in those years, as it has been since. It has seemed appropriate, therefore, in this brief note dedicated in gratitude to Stagg, to look again at a specific instance of satire highlighted in Part I of my earlier study, a passage with a clear classical antecedent, for me a likely source, and an interesting case of the transformation of satire along the lines suggested in Sheldon Sacks' study of Fielding" (3). The brief study ends with a sensitive explanation of why we read *Don Quixote*. Dian Fox's "What Happens in *Hamlet* and Spanish Golden Age Theater" presents a persuasive theological reading of *Hamlet* that is interlaced with less convincing comparative notes to Spain's Golden Age theater, which curiously silence contemporary Spanish criticism on the questions she discusses. Finally, Diana de Armas Wilson's "Defending 'Poor Poetry': Sidney, Cervantes, and the Prestige of Epic" analyzes the figure of poetry in Philip Sidney (godson and namesake of Spain's Felipe II) and Cervantes. Through an interesting dia-

logue with poststructuralist theorists like Barthes, Bakhtin, and Lacan, the author concludes "that Cervantes helped to deracinate Poetry out of an early modern culture of militancy and mimesis—the signifying world of Sidney and his continental subtexts—to relocate her, during her formative years, in a culture of invention and fantasy" (35). Cervantes' craft is seen to be more "feminine" than Sidney's, thus anticipating the reflections on literature that mark our postmodernity.

The volume's second section is titled "Golden Age Contexts" and pays homage to Stagg's vast range of intellectual interests and pursuits. The section opens with Edward H. Friedman's perspicacious essay "Enemy Territory: The Frontiers of Gender in María de Zayas's 'El traidor contra su sangre' and 'Mal presagio casar lejos,'" which deftly tackles the ambiguities of gender in Zayas's transfiguration of male-dominant language and literary conventions in order to underscore female sensibilities. Although this is one of the longest studies in the volume (26 pages of text), I must confess that I wanted to keep reading Friedman reading Zayas. Friedman shows how Zayas demystifies the literary topos of love and turns it into "a gender-inflected sign, a sign of difference (48), and he powerfully reads against Paul Julian Smith's "(mis)reading" of "Mal presagio casar lejos," contending that "the narrative movement... hinges on Doña Blanca's resistance" (64), which is underscored by her emblematic burning of the bed. Howard Mancing's valuable contribution for narratologists, "Embedded Narration in *Guzmán de Alfarache*," focuses specifically on micro-narration. Mancing defines the interpolated story and the anecdote as two different forms of embedded narration and he proceeds to analyze their use in Alemán's novel. The final study is Roger Gerald Moore's "Quevedo: The Search for a Place to Stand," whose underlying idea, the effect of editorial decisions on literary interpretation, is much more powerful than its resolution.

The third section, titled "Cervantes' Works," focuses on Cervantes' longer prose fiction. Francisco López Estrada's "'Dissoluble ñudo': Una compleja lección de *La Galatea*" continues a line of research initiated by Federico Sánchez y Escribano and followed up by Stagg in his early article on neo-Platonic love in *La Galatea*. López Estrada weighs the various philological and philosophical possibilities of reading the word "dissoluble," concluding that "[e]l ñudo ha de ser *dis-soluble* (entendiendo por 'indisoluble'), concierto de voluntades hasta la muerte y aspiración a la unidad" (134).

The four articles on *Don Quixote* in this section foster the meditations on Cervantes' narrative craft for which Stagg was best known. Joseph R. Jones's "The Baratañan Archipelago: Cheap Isle, Pourboire Isle, Chicanery Isle, Joker's Isle" adroitly offers modern readers a philological "compass to help them navigate the treacherous waters of the Baratarian archipelago," lest we "misinterpret some of the most amusing and moving passages of the work" (146). Antonio Martí Alanís's "Los siete pecados capitales en *Don Quijote*: La Lujuria" seeks an accord between scholastic thought and the literary craft of

Cervantes, but the argument loses much in its presentation. James A. Parr's "Don Quixote: On the Preëminence of Formal Features" begins with the premise that we must focus on form and the telling of the tale, specifically on the tellers in the tale, if we wish "to understand and appreciate Cervantes as a contributor of consequence to the Western narrative tradition" (168). Like Allen's first essay in this volume, Parr unequivocally pays homage to Stagg: "Since the distinguished scholar honored by this collection is one of the more perceptive commentators on Cide Hamete, it seems appropriate to devote some space here to that curious creature" (176). His "deconstructive" analysis, while admittedly out of character, is remarkable. Lastly, in her essay "Luscinda y Cardenio: Autenticidad psíquica frente a inverosimilitud novelística," Helena Percas de Ponseti sees in the story of Luscinda and Cardenio "una de las más logradas revelaciones psicológicas salidas de la pluma de Cervantes" (184). Her study touches again on the question of the "dissoluble nudo," and her final judgment is quite convincing: "la expresión más alta del arte de Cervantes en esta historia está en la sutileza de la caracterización femenina asequible para el lector atento a las menudencias de la narración que iluminan los más recónditos sentimientos y emociones de Luscinda, prototipo de la hija obediente del siglo XVII, pero también prototipo de la mujer noble y fuerte de todos los tiempos, capaz de redimir al hombre débil mediante la constancia, la lealtad, la comprensión y, por encima de todo, el amor incondicional" (204).

The final two essays in this section, written by former students of Stagg, study aspects of the *Persiles*, thus reflecting "Professor Stagg's longtime interest in the chronology of Cervantes' composition and the effect of his Algerian captivity" (xviii). Stephen Harrison's "The Irony and the Purpose of the Title of Cervantes' *Los trabajos de Persiles, y Sigismunda, Historia Setentrional*" goes beyond Casaldueo's commentary on variations of the title and the term "septentrional" in order to discover that, "despite his plans to reorient the original romance towards his more modern conception of the novel, Cervantes finally sought to dictate that it be viewed within the context of the earlier tradition" (221-22). Finally, Ottmar Hegyi's "Algerian Babel Reflected in *Persiles*" examines the fictional portrayal of linguistic difference as cultural sign in the polyglot milieu of the *Persiles*, concluding that Cervantes' "experiences and his literary models mutually reinforce each other, resulting in that syncretism so frequent in the literature of certain periods, and typical of Cervantes" (238).

The fourth and final section, "Cervantes the Author," highlights "Professor Stagg's lifelong devotion to the figure of Cervantes, the writer, and to the bibliography of his life and works" (xviii). Daniel Eisenberg's "¿Por qué volvió Cervantes de Argel?" reads between the lines to put together the puzzle of Cervantes the man behind the pen. His well-written study is persuasive and argues that Cervantes returned to Spain in order to write. My colleague Tom Lathrop's brief essay, "The Fictional Cervantes," took me by surprise. My

initial reaction was “why is he going to such lengths to explain the difference between the historical Cervantes and the fictional one, since the only likely readers of a collection such as this will be professors and graduate students of literature?” But then we see the list of Cervantes scholars who have not been able to make this primordial distinction, some of whom have contributed to this collection of essays. Lathrop’s amusing note is clear and to the point, and it provides the fundamental tool for reading fiction. Alberto Sánchez’s “Nuevos planteamientos en la bibliografía cervantina” finishes off the collection of studies with “a subject dear to Professor Stagg’s heart” (xviii). Sánchez wades through and evaluates the sea of Cervantine scholarship and raises the question “de si es posible, e incluso recomendable, una aspiración hacia la exhaustividad en la esfera de la bibliografía cervantina, cada vez más copiosa” (264). His conclusions signal the future path for “una bibliografía cervantina general, que pueda ser útil y hasta indispensable para los filólogos e investigadores del futuro” (277-78).

The harmonic convergence that comprises this fine *Festschrift* mirrors the wide range of academic interests carried out by Geoffrey L. Stagg over his long and fruitful career. The contributions to Golden Age studies in general, and Cervantes studies in particular, make us want to go back and reread the works discussed in light of these analyses. And this is precisely the overriding goal of criticism.

Vincent Martin
University of Delaware

K. Sliwa. *Documentos cervantinos. Nueva recopilación; lista e índices*. New York: Peter Lang, 2000. 350 pp.

La benemérita y compleja labor de revisión de los documentos cervantinos que el profesor Krzysztof Sliwa está llevando a cabo desde hace unos años ofrece ahora al lector interesado una nueva recopilación de los mismos, que viene a rectificar y completar trabajos anteriores de Leopoldo Rius y Aurelio Baig Baños, entre otros, y, también, a complementar la colección de *Documentos de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra* que el propio Sliwa publicó en 1999 (reseña en *Cervantes*, 20.2 [2000]: 163–65). Si en aquella ocasión el investigador ofrecía una “recopilación cronológica completa de los documentos referentes a Miguel de Cervantes que han sido conservados,” acompañada de la transcripción de los mismos según la fuente utilizada, ahora proporciona una “nueva recopilación cronológica exhaustiva y evaluación de los documentos conocidos hasta el presente sobre Miguel de Cervantes y sus familiares” (p. 1). De los quinientos cuarenta y ocho enumerados y transcritos en el primer libro de Sliwa mencionado, se ha pasado en éste a mil seiscientos sesenta y

uno. En esta ocasión, los documentos no se transcriben: se ordenan de manera cronológica, se señala el lugar de emisión, se indica el encabezamiento o una sinopsis del contenido, su ubicación exacta y el libro donde se puede encontrar transcrito; v. g.: "1550/?/?_Barajas. *Partida de confirmación de Magdalena de Cortinas [nieta de Gonzalo de Cortinas, éste hermano de la abuela materna de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra]*. Archivo Parroquial de Barajas. Libro 1.º de Bautismos, folio 29. Astrana, tomo 2, página 140" (p. 61b).

Las reflexiones que anteceden al acopio documental (pp. 1–8) inciden en las dificultades de la tarea llevada a cabo, resultados de la investigación y posibles trabajos futuros, como, por ejemplo, rehacer el árbol genealógico de Cervantes o "redactar una biografía documentada digna de tal nombre," afirmación esta última que, a la vista del trabajo de Manuel Fernández Nieto, por cierto no incluido en la bibliografía final, sobre "Biógrafos y vidas de Cervantes" (*Cuadernos para la Investigación de la Literatura Hispánica*, 23 [1998]: 9–24), parece excesivamente rotunda. Asimismo, Sliwa destaca la incorporación al acervo documental cervantino de dos documentos nuevos "no localizados y jamás publicados" (p. 8): la información de que Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra conoce a Gaspar de Gaete y Cervantes..., fechada en Madrid el veinte de febrero de 1608 (v. p. 210a) y el testamento de María de Cervantes, tía paterna del autor de *Don Quijote* (1589), cuyos datos, sin embargo, no se corresponden con los ofrecidos en el cuerpo de la documentación (v. p. 241).

Tras esta introducción, la materia documental se organiza en tres grandes apartados: "Documentos cervantinos: nueva recopilación; lista e índices" (pp. 9–231), "Documentos en los cuales no aparecen Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra ni sus familiares" (pp. 233–38) y "Posibles documentos sobre Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra y sus familiares" (pp. 239–42).

El trabajo de Sliwa se complementa con unos índices muy útiles (de nombres, de lugares y de archivos y bibliotecas), un apéndice en el que se reproducen algunos documentos (pp. 325–41) y la bibliografía, en la que se repite, como en el libro de 1999, erróneamente, el nombre de Juan Antonio Pellicer y Saforcada (y no *Pillares*), pero bien seleccionada.

Dos últimas observaciones: el volumen contiene un considerable número de erratas, algunas de ellas, sin duda, motivadas por el uso mecánico de los ordenadores, tan útiles siempre, pero traidores de vez en cuando (pp. 22, 45, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329), que conviene corregir; en segundo lugar: el loable esfuerzo por identificar a las personas que aparecen en los documentos, sobre todo cuando hay una relación de parentesco con Cervantes, lleva a formulaciones del tipo "María de Cervantes, hija del licenciado Juan de Cervantes, abuelo paterno de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra," que acaso se podía simplificar indicando que la antedicha María es tía paterna de Miguel; y en esta misma línea, creo, se podrían aligerar otras denominaciones: v. pp. 57, 58, 64, 156, etc.

Mis observaciones son fruto de una lectura minuciosa del volumen

motivada por el interés del mismo y en modo alguno pretenden hacer empañar su valía. Sliwa trabaja en un campo difícil e ingrato: muchas han debido ser las horas que ha pasado revisando y releendo fuentes y documentos cervantinos; gracias a ello puede ofrecer una lista puesta al día de todos los conocidos. Mi reconocimiento.

José Montero Reguera
Universidade de Vigo