model, this narrator is more than just a voice; he is the true creator of the text, proven by the last lines of *Don Quixote*: "Para mí sola nació don Quijote, y yo para él; él supo obrar y yo escribir; solos los dos somos para en uno" (II, 74). The feminine form "sola" is a reference to the narrator’s *pluma*. Cide Hamete Benengeli provides the original manuscript that the *narrador presentador* appropriates and rewrites, infiltrating the text at every turn.

The ideas presented by Ascunce Arrieta’s collection of essays are thought-provoking and meticulously supported through textual evidence; however, there are two areas in need of attention: a more relevant title and better editing. Titles should accurately reflect the content of a work. In this instance, critics interested in narrative voices might completely overlook the text because, at first glance, the book focuses on tragedy, and those desiring a book-length work on tragedy are sure to be disappointed. Secondly, errors abound, beginning with the title. The title on the cover does not correspond with that on the title page, *La tragedia de don Quijote y el Quijote como tragedia*; a simple reversal, but an error nonetheless. After discovering that the publisher advertises the work with the cover’s title, I assume that is the work’s true title. Limited mostly to the footnotes, the errors become increasingly distracting as the text progresses. Italics appear haphazardly and at times they are completely absent. In one footnote, for example, close to twenty works are enumerated with not a single citation italicized (78). The author fluctuates with the capitalization of Don Quixote’s name. Spanish would dictate a lower-case letter, "don Quixote," but Ascunce Arrieta flip-flops between the two. Unfortunately, the accumulation of errors distract from an otherwise worthy study.
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*El Quijote hoy* is another collection of essays derived from a conference celebrating the fourth centenary, and it illustrates some of the challenges of giving a fresh assessment of Cervantes’ contemporary relevance. There are essays that use Cervantes to make pronouncements on current sociopolitical issues: one is a four-page effort titled “Cervantes contra Huntington,” with no citations from Cervantes, and no bibliography save a footnote reference to *Foreign Policy*; another observes parallels between scenes in *Don Quijote* and Kathy Acker’s *Don Quixote*, whose protagonisť has an abortion “...because I refused normalcy which is the capitulation to social control” (258). Others re-
assert the novel’s famous complexity and intertextuality, some with a postmodern and materialist hue. Added to the mix are three papers dealing with Don Quijote translation and criticism in Slovenian, one on its reception in Hungary, two tracing influence in Teutonic literature (Joseph Roth and Wilhelm Muster), and one pointing out quixotic themes in modern Peninsular poetry. The collection is somewhat uneven and idiosyncratic, with several entries apparently still in their conference-paper format of five to eight pages.

In the opening essay, “Parámetros de lectura y parámetros de recepción en el Quijote,” Antonio Gómez Moriana stresses the importance of a sophisticated understanding of allusion and evocation: “El elemento dotado de este poder evocador que atribuyo a la alusión funciona en el texto por tanto como un elemento anafórico; no en sentido transfrástico, sino en sentido transtextual ya que no remite a elementos catafóricos al interior del texto mismo, sino a un patrimonio cultural común al autor y al lector” (18). Having set his parameters of interpretation, Gómez Moriana argues that the library episode (I, 6) contains allusions to the Inquisition, and that Don Quijote’s confrontation with the Toledan Merchants (I, 4), representing a confrontation between bourgeois and feudal mentalities, is best understood in light of the Communist Manifesto (28-30). Ángel Repáraz suggests a number of “links” between Don Quijote and some German writers (e.g., Hoffmann, Schiller, Mann) as a function of rizoma, which purportedly allows for a more disordered, non-hierarchical notion of reception and influence (105-13). Klaus-Dieter Ertler cites Luhmann’s “systems theory” to similar effect, and urges us to think of ourselves as consumers approaching the “supermarket” of Don Quijote, each taking and making use of what we want. According to Ertler, this helps us grasp the complexity of Cervantes’ literary system—although he recognizes the limits of his inquiry: “Lo que no podemos describir aquí, pero que tendría una gran importancia también para el análisis de la configuración sistemática en su totalidad, sería la plasmación de otros sistemas sociales por la novela, es decir—a parte [sic] del sistema literario—el sistema económico, jurídico, y religioso” (120). Although scholars have long been dealing with such contexts, it probably cannot hurt to stress once again the importance of carefully defining one’s hermeneutic circle.

“La recepción del Quijote en Hungría” (Csaba Csuday, 185-95), “Las traducciones de Don Quijote al esloveno” (Jasmina Markič, 197-209) and “La interpretación del Quijote por la crítica eslovena” (Branka Kalenič Ramšak (211-23) are, like a number of the entries, somewhat short on analysis, but they contain informative references for scholars interested in the reception of Don Quijote in Central Europe. Barbara Pihler focuses on the linguistic play of Cervantes as she illustrates the difficulty and measured successes of translating the novel into Slovenian (“Don Quijote y su lenguaje,” 225-54). In one of the more sustained efforts of the volume, Fernando Varela Iglesias offers a readable and fairly nuanced overview of “hard school” and “romantic” strains in Don Quijote criticism (“Realismo e idealismo en la recepción del Quijote”, 43-77). And an insightful and rhapsodic account of Cervantes’ own quijotismo is given by María Luisa Domínguez (“Metadiscurso y pasión en el Quijote,” 137-55). Aply invoking Borges, Nabokov and
Fuentes, Domínguez discusses how Cervantes’ ludic appropriation of conventions and his suspeñt narrators do much more than cultivate a critical, skeptical reader. They also affirm the pleasure of reading, and the ability of fiction, in all its artifice, to shed light on reality.

Despite such luminous moments, I am not sure how much cervantistas stand to gain from working their way through the seventeen essays of El Quijote hoy. The conference undoubtedly produced stimulating discussions and useful connections. But it has made for a somewhat scattered and ephemeral collection of articles. A good reader would more profitably—and with greater pleasure—cultivate an appreciation for Cervantes’ complexity, modernity and celebration of imaginative literature by spending time with the primary works in question.
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