
An anthology with the title *El “Quijote” desde América*, published just after the year of anniversary symposia, points toward two promising possibilities: 1) a symposium that conceptualized the state of the discipline in the Americas, exploring common interests and divergences among nations that approach Cervantes from a post-colonial locus and perspective and offering a model that aligns disciplinary practices along hemispheric lines rather than the traditional emphasis on a shared linguistic heritage; or 2) a theme-centered symposium that would build upon the interest in New World and transatlantic topics that arose in conjunction with the revisioning of Columbus’ legacy at the 500th anniversary of the discovery/encounter. The volume does touch on those topics, but they are not the focal point; rather, like most anthologies derived from a conference, it provides a large number of high quality essays on a wide diversity of topics, as well as a few more problematic studies that point to the challenges faced by an evolving discipline with three distinct geographical axes.

The introduction to this volume, only a page and a half long, unfortunately is all too cursory, and could have explored the myriad connotations raised by the title. It may be that the editors sought to avoid any possible implication of critique concern-

---

1 For an anniversary volume that does emphasize the Quijote / America thematic, see Romero-Díaz and Vélez-Sainz, eds. *Cervantes and/on/in the New World*. 
ing the connections—and tensions—within Cervantine studies as practiced in the US, Hispánic America, and Spain, or felt that this issue would be addressed implicitly and most effectively by the mere presentation of essays that represent the most prominent current trends. Given the tremendous intellec
tual capacities of the editors, I would have welcomed a more explicit exploration, but must respect the reasons for their reti
cence.

The twenty-four essays are presented in alphabetical order, and thus with no at
ttempt to provide categories that might guide readers’ (or reviewers’) interpretation. In order to make sense of the tome as a whole, and to use it as a prism for reflecting on the state of Quixotic studies, I will divide the texts into six sections: Cervantes and the New World, Gender and Desire, Literature and Hístory, Influence Study and Cervantine Rewriting, Don Quijote in light of Cervantes’ Other Works, and Geographical Considerations. However, I am aware that such a division, like the assigna
tion of a literary text to a particular genre, will foreground particular aspects of each essay at the expense of other and perhaps equally important considerations—and that another reviewer might legitimately question the placements or even choose entirely different “pigeonholes.”

There are two studies that focus upon American considerations and a third that incorporates this element. The first, by James Iffland, continues his long history of ad
dressing the ideological implications of “interpellations” of the Quijote in US contexts. This study analyzes a translation into Spanglish of the first chapter of Don Quijote, by Ilan Stavans, the media-designated spokesman of the moment for Latino issues in the US, despite a background which fits none of the accepted definitions of chicanismo. Here, Iffland portrays the multi-faceted issues of class, ethnicity, and identity that currently engulf both academic and celebrity variants of US Hispánism in the post-civil rights era, and explores the role that Don Quijote plays as the canonical text that links three worlds. His study is particularly important at this moment when contestatory definitions of American and Hispánic language use and identity threaten a repeat of the expulsos that Cervantes scrutinized. Mary Malcolm Gaylord points out and ana
lyzes all references to the Americas in the text, and the ways in which the American experience impacted chivalric literary norms. In addition, she explores Cortés’ letters (and/or López Gómara’s hístory based on those letters) as an overlooked source of Cervantine inspiration. In its analysis of Cervantes’ (re)inscription of the American hero, this valuable study does indeed reconceptualize the nature of Quixotism. However, an additional level of contextualization, which would take into account Diana de Armas Wilson’s extensive writings on the New World topic, would have been welcome—prec.

isely because this area of study, still in its nascent phase, might not be familiar to the conference participants (see below) or to readers of this volume. Margarita Peña’s study of the role of Andalusian folk culture (la valentónica) in early modern texts takes into account both the 1605 volume and Rosa de Oquendo’s satiric colonial poetry. These three studies demonstrate that transatlantic approaches to the early modern period and to metacriticism of our own historical positioning provide fertile ground for future
The topic that received the most attention in this volume is the representation of gender, subjectivity and desire. Steven Hutchinson analyzes Anselmo’s curious behavior through the lenses of Lacan and Girard in order to conclude that voyeurism is at the root of the character’s multiple maladjustments. Frank Loveland explores the role of pastoral literature in the formation of a “deseo contradictorio” shaped by the rural idyll as a space of both purity/escape and fertility/eroticism. Harry Sieber employs Foucault’s model of folie in order to conceptualize Marcela and Griostomo’s madnesses in relation to ideological and cultural forces. In their analyses of female characters, Alicia Parodi points out traces of Mary Magdalene in Zoraida and Torralba as well as in Don Quijote himself. Adrienne Martín employs historical data on early modern laboring women and the role of prostitution in order to contextualize Aldonza and Maritormes’ economic position and erotic subjectivity. This section demonstrates the immense vitality of gender study at the present moment and the value of the wide variety of interdisciplinary approaches that nourish this endeavor.

Three of the essays in this volume foreground historical contexts. Mercedes Alcalá presents recent research on early modern leisure reading, which she uses to assert that the Cervantine novel played a key role in normalizing novelistic fiction “como legítimo instrumento de ocio y entretenimiento” (20). Both James Parr and Daniel Eisenberg attempt to recover the initial reading experiences of the 1605 volume, but they draw very different conclusions. Parr’s essay highlights the dominance of the first volume for a general cultural understanding of the Quijote phenomenon, in particular the novelty of a protagonist who teaches the reading public how NOT to consume the new modes of entertainment fiction by his negative example. Eisenberg provides several bits of evidence to show that there was no “first volume of 1605” and argues for the pre-eminence of the 1615 volume in shaping how modern readers interpret the text as a whole. These essays amply demonstrate the relevance of scholarship on the history of reading, the press, and book publication for Cervantine studies.

In the first three sections, this review has emphasized the significance and promise of research methodologies and ideologies that have arisen in recent times. However, more conventional approaches can also continue to provide insights. For example, while “influence studies” that seek merely to point out textual antecedents that Cervantes incorporated have long been discredited, tremendous value can be found in studies that seek to identify such predecessors in order to explore the ways in which Cervantes “re-inscribed” his sources, and to contextualize those modifications. Charles Presberg’s study of early modern models of character development scrutinizes the influence of Aristotelian and Boetian philosophies of character. He then employs a Foucauldian frame to revisit Madariaga’s model of “quijotización” and “sanchización.” Presberg’s valuable analysis of the connections between traditional and postmodern models of subjectivity, a veritable model for bridging the Cervantine scholarly canon with contemporary developments, could have been made even stronger by consideration of Greenblatt’s model of self-fashioning. There are additional noteworthy studies of La...
Galatea’s revision of moral issues in the pastoral (David Boruchoff); structural connections between Don Quijote and La lozana andaluza (Tatiana Bubnova); Arthurian erotic episodes as reinscribed in the Maritornes episode (Alan Smith); links between the Italian novella, the Guzmán and the “Curioso impertinente” (Francisco Ramírez). And, in his study of the representation of murmuring, prayer and cursing among secondary characters in La Celestina and the Quijote, Gustavo Illades presents a nuanced ideological analysis of the relations between modes of speech and the evolution of class dynamics across the early modern era.

Explorations of the relations among Cervantine texts can also go far beyond rote identification of similarities or differences. As Aurelio González demonstrates the prominent role of theatrical dynamics in Don Quijote, he brings new life to well-known episodes. Similarly, Francisco Márquez Villanueva re-invigorates analysis of the parody of pedantic humanistic academic discourses in the Quijote through his analysis of El viaje del Parnaso.

The final three essays to be discussed are emblematic of the imperfect “grid” that connects current studies of Hispanic literature in three geographic regions; linguistic, technological, and professional considerations all contribute to faulty communications. The bibliographies in this volume indicate that there existed a shared canon of critical masterpieces through the 1960s; however, the field has fragmented since that time. In recent decades important work has been done in the US by Hispanists who publish in English because of tenure and promotion issues; often, those texts are not widely read in the Spanish-speaking world. The declining support for public post-secondary education in the US has resulted in a reduction of library funds, and purchases of foreign publications have been cut back. The corporatization of US universities has resulted in ever-higher expectations for publication; as the quantity of Quijote studies has increased exponentially, keeping up-to-date is ever more challenging for all scholars. Even in this electronic age, the bibliographic indexes for books and journal articles printed in different regions are not fully integrated. The result is a decreased familiarity with works published in one’s own and more especially in different regions; for example, Ludovico Oscher’s El pensamiento social y político del Quijote, a Marxist study of economic considerations in Cervantes published in Mexico, is rarely cited in US studies that employ materialist paradigms. On the other hand, presentations at US conferences by European and Latin American scholars often demonstrate a lack of awareness of canonical US studies of the past two decades. In such circumstances, the result is either repetition of an established framework or a lost opportunity to fully contextualize an argument. As a scholar with a US affiliation, I am qualified to point out only the gaps concerning awareness of critical texts published in my own region. In the case of Alma Mejía’s study of Don Quijote’s “aprendizaje” across the first volume, some of the examples she points to as evidence of intellectual growth have been analyzed with an additional level of philosophical sophistication in Maureen Ihrie’s Skepticism in Cervantes. Cristina Mújica’s interesting study of melancholy among the diverse characters in the first volume could have been enhanced by consultation of Teresa Scott
Soufas’ *Melancholy and the Secular Mind in Spanish Golden Age Literature*, which features an entire chapter on the Cervantine protagonist. And, María José Rodilla’s study of “correspondencias, reiteraciones, y engarces” incorporates some points established in David Quint’s analysis of “interlacement” in *Cervantes’s Novel of Modern Times*. In the last example, the volume’s title of course gives no indication that this type of structural analysis would be a primary component. While each of these essays makes a contribution to our understanding of Cervantes, consideration of the relevant texts mentioned here would have added further richness. To repeat and emphasize my previous caveat, I am aware that a similar lack of awareness concerning publications outside of the US could equally well “blemish” the contributions by the US scholars; a review of this anthology by a qualified Latin American scholar would thus be a welcome complement. Increased communication concerning regional critical canons would benefit all Quijotistas.

Despite—or perhaps because of—these complications, it is clear that the project that Iffland and Illades conceived, to foster stronger ties among North and South American Cervantistas, is a worthy goal and one that should continue to be pursued with great vigor. The wealth of innovative and illuminating essays in this volume testifies to the value of continuing this enterprise.
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