
Cervantes

VOLUME XXIX, NUMBER I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- "Digo que yo he compuesto un libro intitulado
El ingenioso hidalgo de la Mancha"
FERNANDO BOUZA and FRANCISCO RICO 13
- Don Quijote* and the Art of Laughing at Oneself
MICHAEL SCHAM 31
- Yo sé quién soy': How don Quijote Does Things with Words (Part I, chaps. 1-5)
CHARLES ORIEL 57
- Early Modern Illusions of Perfect Male Friendship:
The Case of Cervantes's "El curioso impertinente"
JUAN PABLO GIL-OSLE 85
- Cervantes's Laboratory: The Thought Experiment of "El curioso impertinente"
ALISON E. KRUEGER 117
- Societal change and language history in Cervantes' *entremeses*:
The status of the Golden Age *vos*
JEREMY KING 167
- Don Quijote*, Felipe II y la tecnología de la escritura
JESÚS BOTELLO 197
- Did Cervantes Stutter?
JOHN BEUSTERIEN 209
- A propósito de un "descuido cervantino":
la alternancia yanguéses/gallegos en el *Quijote*
RAFAEL BARROSO CABRERA and JORGE MORÍN DE PABLOS 221

REVIEWS

Friedman, Edward H. *Cervantes in the Middle: Realism and Reality in the Spanish Novel from Lazarillo de Tormes to Niebla*

ANNE J. CRUZ 231

Anthony Close. *A Companion to Don Quixote*

MICHAEL SCHAM 233

José Manuel Lucía Megías. *Leer el Quijote en imágenes. Hacia una teoría de los modelos iconográficos*

RACHEL SCHMIDT 237

José R. Cartagena Calderón, *Masculinidades en obras: El drama de la hombría en la España imperial*

JOHN BEUSTERIEN 238

Emilio Martínez Mata. *Cervantes comenta el Quijote*

MICHAEL SCHAM 242

Juan Carlos González Faraco. *Il cavaliere errante. La poetica educativa di Don Chisciotte*

LUIS GÓMEZ CANSECO 245

Friedman, Edward H. *Cervantes in the Middle: Realism and Reality in the Spanish Novel from Lazarillo de Tormes to Niebla*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta Hispanic Monographs, 2006. 327 pp. ISBN: 1-58871-091-2

As is often the case with major celebrations, the 400th anniversary of *Don Quixote, Part I* got the better of the celebrants. Many of the assorted enterprises held during 2005 merely served to commercialize the novel and its protagonist, from the fabrication of a “Ruta del Quijote” that takes the knight’s incautious fan to places never mentioned in the book, to the marketing of overpriced sandals etched with Don Quixote’s doleful countenance, which, I confess, I couldn’t resist buying. Yet the occasion was also marked by academic activities of a far more productive sort, among them, various excellent conferences attended by distinguished *cervantistas* and a number of publications that have brought renewed attention to the centrality of Cervantes’ novel within the Western European literary tradition. One such publication is the book under review, which rescues *Don Quixote* from a superficially iconic status by tracing its theoretical interconnections with the realist novel and its antecedents.

Situating *Don Quixote* at the center of a long tradition of realist fiction, Edward Friedman juxtaposes a series of canonical novels both diachronically and synchronically to stress the metafictionality of the texts that precede and follow *Don Quixote* in its comprehension (and apprehension) of idealist literature. Looking backward from the seventeenth century, the picaresque novel is seen to combine realism and self-reflexivity, attributes that create a radically new paradigm for the novel. In his first chapter “The Picaresque, *Don Quijote*, and the Design of the Novel,” Friedman explains just how advantageous the model is for the modern novel, as not only the three infamous pícaros, Lazarillo, Guzmán, and Pablos, but Lozana, Justina, and other recalcitrant pícaras, each in his or her own way and for different social, moral, and narrative purposes, mediate the author’s voice through their own. This chapter exhaustively details the picaresque novel’s textuality, what Friedman calls its “interplay among the genetic, generic, and functional principles” (94). Although the chapter reiterates much of what is already known to us about the picaresque (untrustworthy narrator, ironic discourse, social

determinism, Baroque excess, etc.), it expertly directs our attention to the ways in which Cervantes reworks these characteristics in *Don Quixote*, exhibiting in the process his greater consciousness of the creative process. Friedman underscores particularly well how picaresque fiction instructs Cervantes in the use of metafiction when dealing with the historical coincidence of his and Mateo Alemán's victimization by plagiarism.

Although numerous citations from other critical studies are footnoted in the text, it is at times difficult to ascertain Friedman's explicit reactions, whether positive or negative, to particular critical interpretations or literary theories. However, he obviously (and rightly, it seems to me) opposes both a unifying narrative perspective in the picaresque and the privileging of a different type of realism in Cervantes. What holds true for what he calls the narrative realism of picaresque novels (and of earlier texts such as *La lozana andaluza*), if in a "minor key," holds equally true, if intensified, for *Don Quixote* and for the later novels' redefinition of the genre, thanks to Cervantes' role as mediator. Among the many significant and perceptive contributions of Friedman's study is his view that any interpretation of the modern novel must contend with the author's play with language and with literary conventions, no matter how de-emphasized by realism. Thus, the second chapter "The Metafictional Imperative: Realism and the Case of *El amigo Manso*" elaborates on Galdós's mediating fiction, as the non-existent narrator arbitrates between realism and idealism, with *Don Quixote* as its primary intertext.

This intercessionary role is one that Friedman attributes as well to Unamuno's novels. For Friedman, Unamuno's *nivola* mixes the mimetic with the anti-mimetic; his third chapter "The Birth of the *Nivola* and the Rebirth of the Novel: *Amor y pedagogía*" stresses the novel's experimentation as well as its ties to *Don Quixote* as it moves away from realism. (I would have wished for a clearer differentiation between this term and naturalism, as the former runs the risk of becoming over-determined.) Unamuno's fictions, especially *Niebla*, comment on both art and life, as Friedman points out in his fourth and last chapter, "Quixotic Inscription: *Niebla* and the Theory of the Novel." The chapter thoroughly revisits Cervantes' concerns with the written word and its wordliness and with literature and reality in comparison to Unamuno's own anxieties. Arriving at the conclusion that the latter author offers a "metafictional alternative to conventional realism" (244), the chapter convincingly proffers the argument that Unamuno's modernist self-consciousness indeed harks back to early picaresque fiction and anticipates postmodernism.

Friedman's richly intertextual study of canonical exemplars of the Spanish novel, from its early picaresque beginnings through Unamuno's radical antinarratives by way of *Don Quixote*, enjoins us to reflect on how reading Cervantes may also be undertaken from the perspective of later works. As Juan Goytisolo (and Harold Bloom, in another context) once commented, literary influence is a two-way affair: "El influjo, la relación y coincidencias entre obras distintas en el tiempo no opera de modo unilateral sino recíproco, en la medida en que la obra

posterior inyecta nueva savia en la lectura de las obras que la han precedido, entablando diálogo con ellas, y con un nuevo texto general, común y más vasto: el de la totalidad del museo imaginario" [The influences, relations, and coincidences between works from different periods do not occur unilaterally, but reciprocally, to the degree that the later work injects new blood in the reading of the works that precede it, opening a dialogue with them and with a new, collective, general text, vastly more extensive: that of the totality of the imaginary library].¹ By asserting the metafictionality of the texts discussed, *Cervantes in the Middle* proffers a long-needed crosscurrent of critical dialogue from both ends of the historical spectrum.

ANNE J. CRUZ
ajcruz@miami.edu

Anthony Close. *A Companion to Don Quixote*. Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2008. 287 pp. ISBN: 978-1-855-66170-7.

Anthony Close's new book is an updated version of his *Cervantes: Don Quixote* ("Landmarks of world literature," 1990), bearing the refinements of considerable scholarly activity in the interim. Meant as an introduction to *Don Quijote* for the English-speaking non-specialist, it contains a brief overview of Cervantes' life and times, a discussion of the novel's sources, narrative structure and strategies, the development of its protagonists, analysis of key episodes in parts I and II, an account of *Don Quijote's* reception by critics and novelists, and a guide to further reading along with informative bibliography. Close has long been a prominent and occasionally magisterial voice admonishing critics who would anachronistically imbue Cervantes' novel with meanings—political, epistemological, religious, psychological—that the author could never have intended. Some feathers have likely been ruffled along the way, and Close's "intentionalism" is susceptible, amidst the leaps and bounds of critical inquiry, to the charge of antiquation. When, in the present study, Close partly attributes a lack of overt political dissent in Cervantes to "innate good taste" (13), some readers may wince. There are those of us who may feel let down by someone who defers to the staid canon of Toledo (rather than the zealously imaginative don Quijote) in questions of literary theory, and who insists on the decency of the *caballero del verde gabán*, and on Cervantes' detached approval of the entertainments of the Duke and Duchess. But instead of strident polemics or aloof dismissals, this book offers a good deal of clear, well-informed, subtle and, not least, accommodating discussion of *Don Quijote* and its legacy.

Two fundamental and related aspects of Cervantes' art receive fine treatment

1 Juan Goytisolo, *Disidencias* (Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1997), p. 312.

in this study: the nature of *Don Quijote's* realism and comedy. With regard to realism, Close sorts out the generic messiness of the novel, and accounts for the beguiling vitality of knight and squire. More than an affirmation of Aristotelian verisimilitude and unity of action, the canon of Toledo as authorial surrogate sets forth a deceptively innovative aesthetic of "common nature," a foregrounding of "homely ordinariness" (46). Close discusses how Cervantes' attention to the domestic routine of unremarkable characters and the humble imperatives of the body (eating, clothing, sleeping) inspired the likes of Fielding, Sterne and Smollett, and anticipated the great reorientations of the nineteenth-century novel. But he also cautions against conflating Cervantes' representation with the sociological preoccupations and rigor of Flaubert or Galdós. The inn-scenes, for example, are drawn as much from previous literature and folklore as from journalistic observation, and Cervantes modifies the archetypes and stereotypes to his own ends—most notably the parody of idealizing romance. We thus have a "realism of the second degree" (48). Close likewise comments on the narrator's frequent declarations of "la verdad de la historia," which should be understood as a principle of narrative relevance, not a serious or mocking claim to objective veracity (65). This is related to Cervantes' inclination to compromise verisimilitude in favor of functionalism, "function being understood as any feature of the story determined by artistic necessity or convenience rather than by considerations of truth-to-life" (113).

Close maintains that a sort of functionalism is also at play in the representation of don Quijote and Sancho, whose behavior is sometimes determined more by the artistic possibilities of a particular situation than by a strict notion of consistency of character. Here Close pours some cold water on critics who might get carried away with psychoanalysis, despite the appeal such an approach has for certain episodes. Yet he does acknowledge, and helps us appreciate, how the protagonists, drawn from numerous literary and folkloric types, do in fact develop and gain dimension as the narrative proceeds, in part through accumulation of experiences, in part through their conversations and mutual influence, in part through the exigencies of circumstance. He also recognizes that the interactions of knight and squire represent a "radical shift in the development of narrative fiction from incident to dialogue and from action to character" (90). And while he does not accept the idea that the characters' perspectives pose serious epistemological problems, he does show how Cervantes creates a "graduated approach" to truth, as in the piecing together of Cardenio's story (58). In other words, Close keeps his grip on the reigns of modern critical exuberance while illuminating many ways in which *Don Quijote* forms a foundational part of a trajectory that goes through Dickens, Kafka, and Joyce.

The question of *Don Quijote's* realism is inextricably bound to its comedy, an area to which Close has dedicated considerable thought and ink (most notably, *Cervantes and the Comic Mind of His Age*, 2000). The present book includes some cataloging of types of wit in *Don Quijote*—while the least fluid sequence in the

study, it provides a useful resource and contextualization (126-58). Our critic is best when dealing with entire episodes. Taking us through adventures such as the *galeotes* (I, 22) and the *Cueva de Montesinos*, he deploys an exhaustive knowledge of source materials and a fine ear to modulations of linguistic register and echoes of style, theme and image from previous scenes. By such means he succeeds in demonstrating how *Don Quijote* is, indeed, a “funny book,” and how such a designation does not limit its influence and implication. Close has contributed to our understanding of the “empathetic parody” of Cervantes, “his ambivalently intimate relationship to the target texts” (55). As Close illuminates the fugual quality of *Don Quijote*, the “compositional principle of repetition with variation and transference of motifs” (127), he also shows how such principles are at work in Cervantes’ entire *oeuvre*, in which quest narratives, underworld journeys, ennobling love, country and court are sometimes explored with a festive or mischievous levity, sometimes with sincere pathos. Despite a predominance of the comic mode, *Don Quijote*’s unprecedented mixture of what is normally kept separate makes it difficult sometimes to distinguish between the ridiculous and the dignified.

The following inventory and comments regarding don Quijote’s preparations for his *penitencia* (I, 25) indicate the attention to nuance, reference and register in this study:

an elegant exposition of the Renaissance doctrine of literary imitation; Aristotle’s concept of poetic universality; rehearsal of the precedents of his penance in *Amadís* and *Orlando furioso*; echoes of Albano’s farewell to the natural world in Garcilaso’s Second Eclogue; satire of the indecipherable script of scribes, the affectations of love-poets, the faking of lineages; the amusingly vulgar anecdote of the merry widow and her lover; an edifying maxim about the nature of true love, adduced to justify the choice of low-born Aldonza as mistress; the drafting of two letters, one to Dulcinea couched in the archaic convolutions of chivalric novels, the other authorising the gift of three donkey-foals to Sancho in the wooden jargon of commercial bills of sale. Though the effect is absurd, the range of reference is dazzling in its scope, *and latent seriousness is perceptible in the absurdity*. (56 my italics)

Close’s subtle and spirited reading of the *galeotes* episode provides another illustration of how such varied sources and styles produce rich comedy, a ridiculousness with a residue of gravity (79-89). After surveying the literary, social and religious backgrounds of the figures and references, he exercises restraint in judging whether don Quijote’s freeing of the prisoners is meant to convey a conservative *cría cuervos* example, or a transgressive Christian affirmation of charity and human freedom. While casting light on how such opposing interpretations can be (and have been) made, Close reminds us of the curious detachment of the narrator, offering that, in the silent aftermath of the imprecations and violent clamor of the episode’s disastrous *desenlace*, it is the continued twitching of the traumatized ass’s ears that provides “the nearest thing to a comment on the moral

of the affair" (85). Such observations reveal how Cervantes was more interested in complex ironies, and delightful effects of image and tone, than in heavy-handed didacticism. Throughout, Close places Cervantes' singularity in context. He traces the connections to Aristotelian notions of laughter and Spanish Baroque *ingenio y agudeza*, the serio-comical counterpoint in Lope's *comedia*, the grotesque inversions of the picaresque, while delineating Cervantes' particular disposition and humorous mode. In contrast to the frequently humiliating and divisive humor of the picaresque, Close argues that Cervantes "insists on the therapeutic and restorative power of laughter, and presents a world in which it momentarily dissolves social barriers, creates affable relations between sane and insane, and makes the latter objects of sympathy rather than contempt" (158-59).

In *A Companion to Don Quixote* we find an affable Anthony Close who, during his concise account of the trajectory of critical views of *Don Quixote* from the seventeenth century, through Enlightenment Classicism and the Romantics, to modern and postmodern derivations (227-53), even has encouraging words for Bakhtin and Milan Kundera. While he convincingly insists that Cervantes was "a man of his Age," and that the history of *Don Quixote* criticism is rife with spectacular examples of the novel being made to conform to a disparate array of "prevailing ideologies," elements of Close's own historicist readings frequently come to mind during accounts of some rather modern interpretation: for example, the discussion of Bakhtinian "competition amongst languages," identified in Salman Rushdie by Fuentes (251), recalls Close's teasing out of diverse linguistic registers in Sancho, don Quixote, the *galeotes* and the narrator himself. And while he tempers them, he does not close off the potential social and political implications of Cervantes' ironies. As an audience member at a conference a few years ago, I observed Prof. Close as he was invited to comment on the disquisitions delivered by a panel of specialists gathered upon the stage. Exhibiting a range of facial expressions that endorsed his authority as a scholar of the comic, he stated his critical criteria: "¿es verdad, o no es verdad? Y si es verdad, ¿qué más da?" Then, like a new embodiment of governor Sancho, he proceeded to apply this elementary code to the cases before him. Regarding the first question, I would say of *A Companion to Don Quixote*: yes, it rings true. *Y ¿qué más da?* Well, there is nothing particularly new here, no provocative theory or revelation that could provide grist to a skyrocketing academic career. But for generalists—or specialists—interested in an informed and genuine work of appreciation, it is a study of not inconsiderable import.

MICHAEL SCHAM
msscham@stthomas.edu

José Manuel Lucía Megías. *Leer el Quijote en imágenes. Hacia una teoría de los modelos iconográficos*. Madrid: Calambur, 2006. ISBN 84-96049-99-X

As he himself notes, José Manuel Lucía Megías brings to the vast field of Cervantine iconography the conceptual tools and practices of the philologist. The sheer number of illustrated editions of *Don Quixote* from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries poses a daunting task for the researcher interested in tracing and examining the Cervantine images according to the patterns of philological textual criticism. Whereas preparing a stemmata of a text for which there might be 5 or 6 versions is manageable, sifting through the literally thousands of book illustrations and other visual images related to Cervantes' masterpiece involves a methodological challenge of another degree. In general, the results of his research are both highly informative and illuminating. In theoretical terms, the most innovative feature of his thought is the notion of the iconographic program (*programa* or *jerarquía iconográfica*), according to which certain episodes of the novel are depicted in similar manners across various editions and by various artists. He rightly proposes this concept as a way to categorize and analyze the strikingly similar cast of depicted episodes across editions. Moreover, he also rightly states that these programs were often the choice of the publisher rather than the artist. In short, the model of the iconographic program allows for the analysis of coexisting approaches to the illustration of *Don Quixote*. It is a useful tool for capturing both the similarities and the contrasts between different general interpretive stances toward the novel.

Lucía Megías associates these different iconographic programs with specific national traditions: the French, the Dutch, the English, and the Spanish. Whereas it is helpful to contextualize the first and/or the most dominant representatives of each program in their sociopolitical context (take, for example, Coypel as representative of the French and Vanderbank as representative of the English), it is also the case that visual images in general, and prints in particular, circulated much more freely across national and linguistic boundaries than would a text. Subsequently, Lucía Megías himself expands the notion of the Dutch iconographic program, for example, to include the illustrations of Spanish artists such as Diego de Obregón and José de Camarón. Given the general validity of the categories he has identified in their capacity to characterize specific iconographies, perhaps it would be more useful to label them according to their interpretive stance toward *Don Quixote* rather than their origins in a given nation.

Considerable advances in our knowledge of the material in question have occurred in the last decade. Drawings, prints, and other previously unknown archival material have surfaced in a variety of archives. Lucía Megías brings us up

to date on much of this new information within the text itself. Nonetheless, given the acceleration of research in the field of Cervantine iconography, the presentation of a complete bibliography would have been most useful. References to other studies in the text and its footnotes are often incomplete, and at times even allusive. Although the author avoids direct refutation or argumentation with other scholars in the field, I, for one, would have preferred that he directly address issues on which we disagree. As the field of Cervantine iconography matures, it becomes ever more incumbent on all of us that issues of controversy (such as the carnivalesque elements of certain images or lack thereof) be openly and honestly debated. Although reference to the Calvinistic beliefs of 17th-century Dutch printers is helpful contextual material, it still does not explain nor does it obviate the representation of bawdy corporeal humor in the most graphic of terms.

If there is a limitation to this study (in addition to its lack of bibliographical citation of other scholars), it is the tendency to view the illustrations in relation to each other rather than in relation to the editions in which they appeared. That is to say, by tracing iconographic programs that transcend the edition, the author bypasses the messy but interesting question as to how the illustrations contributed to the reader's experience and interpretation of the text. It also sidesteps the issue of how the visual iconography contributed to the historical reception of the novel and its eventual (and I still maintain surprising) canonization. By the same token, the strength of this study is its capacity to arrange and order the overwhelming mass of visual material produced in relation to and with Cervantes' text. José Manuel Lucía Megías has provided an invaluable tool for classifying and studying the development of 17th- and 18th-century Cervantine iconography through his innovative notion of iconographic programs. There is no doubt that it will be much easier for the next generation of scholars to wade into this compelling and fascinating wave of visual imagery.

RACHEL SCHMIDT
rlschmid@ucalgary.ca

José R. Cartagena Calderón, *Masculinidades en obras: El drama de la hombría en la España imperial*, Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, 2008. 382pp.

Cuando terminaba de escribir esta reseña, mi mujer y yo decidimos alquilar un bote de remos en el Guadalquivir un domingo por la tarde soleada en Sevilla. Siendo una mujer del mar, mi mujer tomó los remos y nos guiaba. Los bares repletos de sevillanos en sus trajes de domingo nos vieron y empezaron a abuchear el espectáculo de la mujer remando y el señorito descansando en el barco. En el

momento de pasarlos, todos pensamos en mi masculinidad y, en vez de tomar los remos, decidí cambiar de un lado del barco al otro. Los sevillanos empezaron a aplaudir pensando que iba a tomar los remos. Pero, no, sólo cambié de lado y los sonidos de desaprobación de los espectadores aumentaron más. Seguimos de paseo por el río y a la vuelta tomé los remos y esta vez, al estar remando, salieron los pañuelos blancos de los sevillanos en gran aplauso como si hubiera sido un gran torero que había hecho un pase bonito.

Esto subrayó para mí la necesidad de estudios como los de José R. Cartagena Calderón en cuestionar el gran espectáculo de la masculinidad. En la academia norteamericana es normal encontrar un programa de estudios dedicado al género sexual. Muchas veces estos programas (como los del Harvard, Princeton, la Universidad de California, la Universidad de Michigan, la Universidad de Texas, Yale) utilizan la palabra “mujer” [woman] de alguna forma en el título de su programa. Sin embargo, el estudio de José R. Cartagena Calderón, *Masculinidades en obras: El drama de la hombría en la España imperial*, forma parte de un movimiento dentro de la academia norteamericana en los últimos 15 años en que los estudios del género sexual van más allá de los programas del estudio de la mujer acuñados durante la década de los 1970. Evaluando el mito de la ahistóricidad del supuesto estable cuerpo masculino, un propósito principal del libro es desvincular el discurso de la hombría con la heterosexualidad para no reproducir un discurso normativo de la heterosexualidad. Tal acercamiento rompe la postura crítica que establece una sencilla dicotomía tradicional, en la que, entre otros binomios, lo occidental se conecta con lo masculino y lo oriental con lo femenino.

Al examinar dos representaciones de la masculinidad, la caballeresco-militar y la urbano-cortesana, el estudio de Cartagena Calderón ilumina una España profundamente obsesionada por la masculinidad. El estudio traza los dos tipos de masculinidad a través de textos escritos en la España del siglo XVII (principalmente las comedias) y culmina con un análisis innovador y agudo sobre *El vergonzoso en palacio* de Tirso de Molina donde Cartagena Calderón une su lectura de las dos representaciones de la masculinidad.

Cartagena Calderón establece el trasfondo del primer tipo de masculinidad en los primeros dos capítulos dedicados a Lope de Vega y a la representación del moro e indiano respectivamente. El estudio comienza enfocándose en la primera pieza conocida de Lope de Vega, *Los hechos de Garcilaso de la Vega y moro Tarfe*, para destacar la masculinidad en su faceta caballeresco-militar, que en este caso está cargada con superioridad bélica y que es hispano-cristiana procedente de la voluntad de Dios. Con este trasfondo Cartagena Calderón muestra que Lope, al masculinizar el cristiano, desmasculiniza al moro. Cartagena Calderón conecta *Los hechos de Garcilaso de la Vega* al conocidísimo romance en el cual la madre del rey Boabdil, al haber perdido Granada, le riñe a su hijo con: “Bien es que como mujer lllore con grande agonía / el que como caballero su estado no defendía.” Cartagena Calderón lleva el argumento más allá que uno en que la masculinidad caballeresco-militar

depende del afemenimiento del moro. Evalúa como este argumento sigue en pie en representaciones donde el moro se representa como caballero en textos como *El Abencerraje* y *la hermosa Jarifa* en la tradición supuestamente maurófila. También, ve que cómo el afemenimiento del moro funciona de manera semejante en la representación del rey godo don Rodrigo, el personaje clave en el mítico momento nacionalista-cristiano de perder la península.

Cartagena Calderón sigue la trayectoria de su hipótesis de la masculinidad como motivo más general que sólo el tropo del moro afeminado al dedicar el segundo capítulo a la representación de América en dos obras de Lope, *El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón* y *Arauco domado*. La primera obra teatral en que figura Colón como personaje dramático, *El Nuevo Mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón*, realiza una representación del deseo masculino para enfatizar el carácter colonial feminizante y erótico cuando se transforman datos de las crónicas de la época al llamar la isla que encuentra en su primer viaje “La Deseada” (“La Deseada” era la segunda isla). Para seguir matizando la cuestión de lo viril en Lope, Cartagena Calderón analiza la figura de la madre castradora en *Arauco domado* que Lope emplea para mostrar la falta de masculinidad de los araucanos.

A diferencia del primer tipo de masculinidad que tiene nostalgia por la hombría en la guerra, el segundo tipo se asocia con la vida pacífica de la corte. Mientras que el Duque en *El vergonzoso en palacio* de Tirso de Molina se hace portavoz de la masculinidad caballeresco-militar, el Conde se hace portavoz de la masculinidad urbano-cortesana. En el último capítulo, aparte de discutir esta obra, Cartagena Calderón analiza el auge de este segundo tipo de masculinidad a través de la sugestiva crítica de la falta de masculinidad en el personaje del lindo. Incluye un comentario de como este personaje cortesano está tildado de sodomita, resume críticas del popular personaje Juan Rana, y da un breve contexto histórico. Aunque no se toca el tema en este estudio, este capítulo inspira una investigación en la conexión entre España y la hipermasculinidad. ¿Podría ser que por la crisis de masculinidad surgió el tipo del Don Juan que tiene que mostrarse a través de conquistas femeninas, una tras otra?

En el tercer capítulo Cartagena Calderón discute la escritura de Cervantes. El capítulo sirve como puente entre los primeros dos capítulos sobre Lope y el último sobre la masculinidad urbano-cortesana. Las conclusiones de Cervantes hacen eco a la tesis principal del libro. Cartagena Calderón escribe que Cervantes “seguirá invitándonos a meditar en torno a la masculinidad, desenmascarando otras grandes ficciones culturales” (234). Cervantes, con su entremés *El retablo de la maravilla*, parodia no sólo la tarea masculinizadora del personaje labrador en el teatro de Lope, sino también el espacio mismo del teatro como un espacio poco masculino. Las conclusiones de los moralistas del teatro como espacio feminizante se conectan con una crítica común de la época que caracterizaba España como un lugar que faltaba masculinidad.

La existencia de esa crisis de masculinidad se vinculaba ya en la historiografía

del siglo XVII al momento de incorporar el producto material imperial en España. Como subraya Calderón Cartagena, se lamentan los tiempos perdidos de una verdadera nación española de cuando el chocolate no afeminaba a sus hombres. La existencia de una noción de una España emasculada no sólo surge por la creciente clase de nobles con su demanda por esos productos (una clase que se veía cada vez más alienada de los poderes jurídicos y militares por la centralización del poder en el estado), sino también por su demanda por el capital cultural como el teatro.

Después de leer este estudio, me pregunto si existe un paralelismo entre la evolución de los tipos de masculinidad populares en el teatro y el auge y el declive de la comedia como producto cultural en España. Es más, para ampliar esta pregunta al nivel europeo, ¿cuál es la conexión histórico-social entre al personaje del lindo (y figurón) y la llegada del personaje del *fop* y el petimetre, especialmente en el teatro francés del mismo siglo XVII y el del inglés del XVIII?

El estudio de Cartagena Calderón es una contribución a los estudios del siglo de oro español que incluye no sólo una base teórica innovadora, sino muchas observaciones particulares que merecen destacarse. Se presentan por ejemplo observaciones contundentes y evocadoras con respecto al homoeroticismo del episodio del soldado paje (II.24) en la discusión del *Quijote* (uno de los textos discutidos no teatrales, pero sin embargo, dramático en opinión de Cartagena Calderón).

Cada vez más se encuentran en la crítica española estudios sobre la cuestión de la masculinidad, como los de Angels Carabí, Juan Carlos Hidalgo, Rafael Montesinos, Jose Olavarria, Carolina Sánchez Palencia, Marta Segarra y Teresa Valdés, nutridos en su mayor parte por la academia norteamericana con estudios iniciados de Rachel Adams, Frank Barrettt, Maruice Berger, Harry Brod, R.W. Connell, Michael Debel, Jeff Hearn, Michael S. Kimmel, Katherien O'Donnell, Andrew Pechuk, Helaine Posner, Michael O'Rourke, David Sarran, Harry Stecopoulos, Bryce Traister, Brian Wallis, Simon Watson, y Stephen Whitehead. De todas formas, afuera de la academia norteamericana, pocos han llevado la cuestión de la masculinidad al campo del siglo de oro español. Así que el estudio de Cartagena Calderón enriquece éstos, comenzados por Sidney Donnell, Mar Martínez Góngora, Daniel Heiple, Matthew Stroud, Peter Thompson, Harry Vélez Quiñones, y Sherry Velasco.

¿Por qué el campo del siglo de oro del hispanismo estadounidense introduce una riqueza de preguntas relacionadas con lo sociológico, es decir, relacionadas a la cuestión del género sexual conectada a la historia del afecto sexual, mientras que el campo del siglo de oro del hispanismo español sigue amarrado en su mayor parte a cuestiones estructuralistas? Es más, ¿por qué ese campo norteamericano señala con sensatez los matices homoeróticos de estos textos, pero, sin embargo, en el nivel socio-político estas cuestiones se enfrentan en la sociedad norteamericana a una actitud retrógrada? Por otro lado, ¿por qué el campo de estudios del hispanismo en España se ha quedado mucho más reaccionario que el estadounidense, pero en el nivel socio-político, la sociedad española ha hecho grandes avances con res-

pecto a la cuestión homosexual que están todavía por verse en los Estados Unidos? Para este lector, otra contribución importante de este libro es que estimula tales preguntas que tocan la configuración geopolítica de nuestro campo de estudios.

JOHN BEUSTERIEN
john.beusterien@ttu.edu

Emilio Martínez Mata. *Cervantes comenta el Quijote*. Madrid: Cátedra, 2008. 156 pp. ISBN: 978-84-376-2435-8.

In this unusual and deceptively simple little book, Emilio Martínez Mata gives an account of authorial intention in *Don Quijote*. An introductory citation of Alejandro Malaspina describes his goal: “Despojar al «Quijote» de unas bellezas imaginarias es dar nuevo realce a las muchas que le son propias.” The imaginary beauties, according to Martínez Mata, include post-Romantic claims regarding perspectivism and don Quijote as an advocate of the creative imagination, as set forth by the likes of Ortega, Castro, Spitzer, and Forcione (a brief and enthusiastic prologue to the study is provided by Anthony Close). The fruits of paring away such embellishments? A refined appreciation of some basic concerns of *Don Quijote* criticism: the novels accommodating representation of literature and experience, the narrative designs which draw the complicit reader into an elaborate game of interpretation, the centrality of dialogue, the development of don Quijote and Sancho. The study is unusual in its lack of any imposing theoretical apparatus. It breezes along in sections ranging from five to fifteen pages, with parenthetical and short footnote references to the pertinent secondary literature. Concentrating on the prologue to Part I and the opening dialogues of Part II as the nuclei of Cervantes’ expressions of purpose, Martínez Mata favors substantial textual citations followed by commentary. He thereby reinforces the importance of the primary context of key utterances (e.g., the stated aim of destroying the *libros de caballerías*, the meaning of “la verdad de la historia”), and he inserts bracketed clarifications of certain archaic usages (one of the most central and slippery being the permutations of *curiosidad*). The interpretative frame is occasionally expanded to include other Cervantine writings, some biographical information, as well as Cervantes’ literary and conceptual horizon, including *La Celestina*, *Lazarillo de Tormes*, Garcilaso, Lope, and El Pinciano.

A major contention is that the fixation of critics on chivalric romance—whether we should take at face value authorial assertions that the principle aim of the book is to do away with the genre, or whether Cervantes in fact sets out to redeem it within a contemporary aesthetic—has been a limiting distraction. In this sense, Martínez Mata’s treatment is broader than Daniel Eisenberg’s heftier

and more exhaustive study (1987), which is based on similar premises regarding authorial intent. Martínez Mata asserts that, especially in Part II, Cervantes is less engaged with knight-errantry novels than with his own literary production (Part I, his own *novelas*), contemporary Spanish theater, *Guzmán de Alfarache*, Avellaneda's spurious continuation. He discusses some of Cervantes' main aesthetic concerns—unpretentious style, verisimilitude, variety—and how they serve a relatively novel, un-Horatian emphasis on pleasure over didacticism (123–27).

Particularly good is the discussion of Cervantes' nuanced sense of a varied readership (75–81), and of how he cultivates a dynamic relationship with a reader who is both independent and complicit. Martínez Mata traces this relationship through the address to the reader in the prologue and the famous narrative interventions regarding the precision and plausibility of the material at hand. He repeatedly refers to a “juego con el lector,” and the ludic elements range from the fairly superficial playfulness of making it clear to the reader that the proclamations regarding sources and precise names are not to be taken seriously, to the more complicated game of enlisting the reader's active role in interpretation (e.g., 118). There is a dialogic principle at work here, and Martínez Mata shows how the relationship between author and reader is in certain ways analogous to the interactions between characters. His comments on concessive expressions, such as *con todo*, provide an illustration of an underlying flexibility and collaboration in the determination of meaning: “si mi examen no es erróneo, hay ciento cincuenta y tres casos con valor concesivo. De ellos, una buena parte corresponde al narrador o a un personaje matizando su razonamiento, pero en nada menos que treinta y nueve ocasiones es utilizado por un interlocutor admitiendo de algún modo el razonamiento del otro, generalmente para iniciar la exposición de sus razones, es decir, presentando los argumentos propios sobre la base de que lo afirmado por el interlocutor, pese a las discrepancias, puede tener algún fundamento” (111).

It is in his attempts to delineate precisely what is and is not at play in Cervantes' novel where Martínez Mata's discussion becomes most interesting, and tenuous. As mentioned above, he rejects the notion that *Don Quijote* contains an authentic perspectivism, any serious questioning of reality or setting forth of epistemological quandaries. Nor does he accept the related claim that Cervantes ambivalently endorses don Quijote's enthusiasm for knight-errantry narratives. A reasonable reading of the *baciyelmo* episode (I, 21) reminds us that, despite Spitzer's attractive formulation, there is no “hybrid reality,” never any real doubt regarding the ontology of the barbers' basin (105–08). Similarly, a review of the “contexto burlesco” in which don Quijote delivers his impassioned narrative of the knight and the boiling lake (I, 50) reveals that Cervantes considers it an artistically flawed and ethically perilous transgression of the sage Canon's neo-Aristotelian precepts. I grant the first point more readily than the second, although they are, as mentioned, not unrelated. But before I complain too loudly that Martínez Mata is out to deprive me of my reading fun, let us examine what he does allow. Rather

than a Faulknerian perspectivism, Martínez Mata discusses the “haz y envés” in *Don Quijote*, which he characterizes as Cervantes’ non-dogmatic appreciation of the good and the bad in people and situations. He speculates that this empathy and complex view, evidenced in his depictions of characters such as Maritornes, Zoraida’s father, and Teresa Panza, is the product of Cervantes’ experiences in captivity in Algiers (99–113). If reality is not hybrid in Cervantes, Martínez Mata suggests that people are, as he speaks of the “doble condición de los personajes” (103). There is more to them than initially meets the eye, and their conduct must be seen in the context of their circumstances (100). He is walking a fine line here, and occasionally resorts to hazy generalizations: “la vida es compleja” (100), “un comportamiento complejo” (103), “la ambigüedad del juego entablado con el lector” (105). I do not necessarily claim that he is inconsistent, and his attempts to avoid anachronistic excess while still allowing for a good deal of range and implication are commendable: “Cervantes no plantea ninguna duda sobre la naturaleza de la realidad, aunque, al mismo tiempo, nos muestra cómo los hombres por interés o, incluso, por diversión están dispuestos a falsearla” (105). Still, I am also not sure whether the distinctions that he is at pains to establish, with his intriguing portrayals of an attenuated perspectivism and relativity in Cervantes, always hold up. On the one hand, Cervantes should not be seen in light of Ortega’s absence of “una verdad absoluta” (106); on the other, Cervantes tends, with some exceptions, to not represent “personajes que representan absolutos” (102). And while Cervantes does not seriously present epistemological problems (e.g., 107), he does offer “diálogos en los que un interlocutor, sin necesidad de modificar por completo su enfoque, acaba admitiendo una parte de verdad en el razonamiento del otro” (110). Martínez Mata himself seems to admit some truth in the reasoning of the views he critiques—in this case, Castro and Spitzer. I suspect he might agree that, despite the liberty taken with the implications of *baciyelmo*, Spitzer’s analysis of the relationship between characters’ life experience, language and perception of the world is valid and insightful.

As for Martínez Mata’s disallowance of don Quijote as a persuasive spokesman for imaginative literature, I remain partially convinced. Yes, don Quijote’s rhapsodic boiling lake narrative lacks the verisimilitude that could legitimize the marvelous (Martínez Mata holds up the Capitán cautivo story from Part I as a positive example), he hopelessly confuses historical, legendary and fictional characters, is unable to retain a critical distance to his material, and is naively swayed by the authority of the printed word. But the vivid and varied detail of don Quijote’s narrative, and the beauty of the wish-fulfillment dream, bespeak more than regressive dementia. While of course we should not forget the irony and “burlesque context” of the knights’ utterances, much of the pastoral imagery he deploys recalls Garcilaso more than the “razón de la sin razón” of Feliciano de Silva (I, 1), and his claims regarding the effects of chivalric fantasy (“verá cómo le destierran la melancolía que tuviere”; “después que soy caballero andante soy valiente [...] sufridor

de trabajos, de prisiones”) contain clear echoes of authorial sentiments and values. Again, much of what don Quijote says is contradicted by his behavior and the sordid reality of his “adventures,” but Cervantes’ insistent combining of the ridiculous and the dignified, the absurd and authoritative throughout *Don Quijote* (take for example, don Quijote’s reference to biblical and archeological evidence of giants in the beginning of Part II), make authorial positions seem ambiguous indeed. This is partly due to the way Cervantes cultivates in the reader a critical sensibility and also an affection for don Quijote and Sancho. The squire himself becomes a primary “banisher of melancholy” in Part II, in no small part due to his adoption of the imaginative literary values of his master. As for the notion that such a reaction to don Quijote is necessarily mired in the concerns of Romanticism, it should be noted that a predisposition toward seeing fools as ambiguous, and a susceptibility to the pleasures of fantasy and implausible adventure can also result from reading Erasmus and Burton, Ariosto, Martorell, and Spenser. As Martínez Mata himself observes with regard to Cervantes’ self-portrait in the prologue to *Don Quijote* (I): “Al retratarse de esta forma, Cervantes se muestra sin duda influido por la positiva consideración renacentista de la melancolía como don divino, propia del hombre del genio” (37). The “Romantic approach” has certainly produced anachronistic distortions, to which *Cervantes comenta el Quijote* proposes a clear-sighted counterweight. Thankfully, Martínez Mata does not throw out the baby with the bathwater. This illuminating, amiable study can be read with pleasure and profit for beginners and specialists alike.

MICHAEL SCHAM
msscham@stthomas.edu

Juan Carlos González Faraco. *Il cavaliere errante. La poetica educativa di Don Chisciotte*. Edizione a cura di Anita Gramigna. Milano: FrancoAngeli, 2008. 124 pp. ISBN: 978-88-464-9256-2.

Durante casi dos siglos, el *Quijote* ha sido una de las columnas ideológicas sobre la que se han sostenido, al menos en los países de habla hispana, buena parte de los ideales concebidos en torno a la educación. La lengua, la moral, el pensamiento, todo –al parecer– venía embutido en un libro que se entregaba a niños y a jóvenes fragmentado en píldoras y, a veces, incluso de un solo trago. Lo cierto es que, si algunos lo leían, otros hacían cuanto estaba en sus manos para esquivarlo.

Por suerte o por desgracia, en nuestros días ni siquiera creo que exista la posibilidad de sortear esa lectura, pues el *Quijote* ha pasado a ser un libro más en los estantes de una librería invisible, una referencia lejana y fantasmal para los adolescentes. Por eso resulta profundamente interesante y sugestiva la propuesta de Juan

Carlos González Faraco, que, de un lado, traza una revisión de las relaciones que la pedagogía ha ido estableciendo con el libro de Cervantes y, de otro, se plantea otro modo de recuperar esa lectura como parte de un nuevo proyecto educativo. Desde las inercias de la investigación cervantina, no pocas veces olvidamos que, más allá de las disquisiciones eruditas, la vida real de un libro está en sus lectores y que, cuando no los haya, el cervantismo no tendrá sentido: se convertirá poco menos que en la disección de un cadáver inexistente.

En *Il cavaliere errante. La poetica educativa di Don Chisciotte* se suma el esfuerzo intelectual de explicar la historia del *Quijote* como instrumento pedagógico y la voluntad de construir un discurso gozoso en torno a la lectura. Así lo indica el propio autor: “Il mio proposito è di fare un’analisi comparata di questi testi all’interno di un percorso narrativo che ci conduce a porci delle domande sul capolavoro di Cervantes e le sue letture pedagogiche all’inizio del secolo XXI. Ma anche ad immaginare altre possibili letture educative per il nostro tempo della cosiddetta tarda modernità che, a mio giudizio, dovranno essere preferibilmente *antipedagogiche*” (p. 43).

Esta perspectiva renovada y fresca en torno al libro se inicia con unas páginas sobre los modos de lectura en la escuela, bajo el epígrafe de “*De Lectione: un lettore appassionato.*” La idea última a la que González Faraco quiere llevarnos es la de que no cabe distinción –al menos, no debe haberla– entre la lectura educativa y la libre, pues, en cuestiones de amor, de poco o nada vale la imposición. De ahí que acuda a la sabia pregunta que George Steiner ponía sobre la mesa en *Extraterritorial*: “Per quanti lettori italiani, inglesi o tedeschi, opere come la *Divina Commedia*, *Il paradiso perduto* o la seconda parte del *Faust* costituiscono un’esperienza personale e non un’esperienza di comune riferimento?”. Desde luego, para pocos. Por eso hay que tratar de poner al lector joven –el más frágil, pero el más imprescindible– en la tensión de experimentar una pasión radical frente al libro mismo, dejando de lado las construcciones teóricas y eruditas: “Il buon maestro di lettura deve liberare il libro dall’orpello ‘teologico’ che lo assedia, lo imbavaglia e lo ‘spiega’, deve lasciarlo nella sua primitiva testualità, nell’intemperie nella quale fu composto, per favorire il rincontro del lettore con l’atto poetico primordiale, perché la sua avventura come lettore si alimenti non di quel tempo, che già non è, ma dell’alito, dell’emozione e del coraggio che accompagnarono lo scrittore” (p. 27).

Es en esta sección donde comienza a establecerse una interesantísima conexión que se irá plasmando a lo largo de todo el libro. Me refiero a los lazos que González Faraco tiende entre Cervantes y el escritor cubano Reinaldo Arenas y su concepción de la literatura, que hace de cada uno de nosotros seres potencialmente literarios: “Siamo quello che Omero narrò, siamo le buffe battaglie di Don Chisciotte, i sogni e gli incubi di Shakespeare” (p. 30). Esos vínculos se materializan, sobre todo, en la novela *El mundo alucinante* (1965), donde Arenas narra las peripecias quijotescas de fray Servando Teresa de Mier y sus persecuciones por parte de la Inquisición.

La segunda sección del libro atiende a sus envolturas: a los fervores que ha despertado, a las máscaras que lo envuelven, quiero decir, a todo aquello en que jamás pudo ni quiso pensar Miguel de Cervantes; porque estoy convencido de que por su mente jamás pasó la posibilidad de que su libro fuera un símbolo de nada. Aun así, la historia del *Quijote* es la historia de una sacralización; hasta el punto de que el mismísimo don Marcelino –Menéndez Pelayo, en persona– tuvo razones sobradas para quejarse de los que habían convertido un libro de ficción en todo un evangelio. Sin comerlo ni beberlo, por obra de mágicos encantadores, Cervantes se vio repentinamente trocado en arma arrojadiza de conservadores contra liberales, de regeneracionistas contra conservadores y de todos contra todos. Estamos ante la España del centenario de 1905, que tan certeramente describe González Faraco, en la que dominan dos *Quijote* pedagógicos: uno que entendió el libro como un emblema de las esencias nacionales y otro que lo convirtió en arsenal de toda sabiduría y en vademécum para los problemas de la humanidad.

Hubo incluso quien desde la reverencia, como Ramiro de Maeztu, advertía que la lectura de ese complejo y ambiguo texto no era una lectura recomendable para “los jóvenes de la nueva España.” Y tenía razón, porque no es el de Cervantes, como el autor de este *Il cavaliere errante* subraya, un libro reducible a los parámetros de la pedagogía: “E dunque, nonostante la complessità della sua trama e dei suoi personaggi, che consentono tante letture, si parla del *Don Chisciotte* in modo tanto uniforme, lo si risolve con discorsi che non recano traccia di alcun dubbio? Come è possibile interpretare una narrazione che si regge su tanti mutamenti, cambiamenti di luogo e giochi di specchio, come un elementare catalogo di archetipi umani o indiscutibili imperativi morali?” (p. 58).

En la tercera parte del ensayo, González Faraco hace un recorrido por la historia de una recepción singular del *Quijote*, la del libro como instrumento pedagógico. Es el *Quijote* de las “dos Españas,” la del modelo para una educación católica, la que convirtió a Cervantes y a su libro, sucesiva o simultáneamente, en pauta moral, en revolucionario, en divisa de lo hispánico o en pedagogo experto para niños y jóvenes. Nos encontramos con la crónica de obras singulares, como el *Cervantes educador* de Ezequiel Solana (1905); el libro al que Acisclo Muñiz tuvo el valor de llamar *Catecismo de Cervantes*, en su primera edición (1905), para luego convertirlo en *Cervantes en la escuela* en 1925; los *Comentarios sobre las frases de El Quijote que tienen relación con la educación y la instrucción públicas* de Antonio Cremades y Berna (1906); los *Estudios Didácticos. Cervantes, Rector de Colegio. Pedagogía del Quijote* de Julio Ballesteros Curiel (1919); el “Cervantes y los niños,” de Manuel Siurot, de 1916, que siete años más tarde retomó el asunto en *La emoción de España*; o del número especial que la *Revista Nacional de Educación*, en 1947 y en pleno franquismo, dedicó al *Quijote*.

Toda esa ensalada de alardes, ideada al margen de lo que escribió Cervantes, se condensa aquí en tres recetas. La primera es la del *Quijote* moral, que comenzó a cuajarse a finales del siglo XVIII, con obras como *La moral de don Quijote* (1789)

y *La moral del más famoso escudero Sancho Panza* (1792) del bachiller Pedro Gatell. El trayecto de un siglo largo nos lleva hasta el ya citado Ezequiel Solana, que pudo afirmar sin empacho que “la dottrina cristiana, la grammatica, la letteratura, il diritto, la geografia e la storia, l’economia domestica, la musica, tutte le materie scolastiche possono essere trattate attraverso il semplice commento dei brani di questo libro immortale” (p. 92). La segunda hizo del *Quijote* el símbolo egregio de todo lo español, transformándolo en una basa sobre la que construir una idea de España y de lo hispánico. Por arte de magia política, un simple libro devino en un «símbolo che illumini la Spagna, una nazione scelta dalla Provvidenza per compiere un destino immortale. Quasi tutti i topici del nazional-cattolicesimo più agguerrito sono presenti nella sua retorica patriottica, farcita di argomenti storici» (p. 94). La tercera y última opción –y acaso la más sensata– fue la que utilizó la narración cervantina como recurso didáctico en la escuela, esto es, como instrumento para enseñar lengua y literatura, aunque, eso sí, dejando a un lado el libro como objeto de lectura.

La conclusión es clara: la pedagogía ha reducido el libro a instrumento, obviando lo mejor que ofrecía a sus lectores. “Un’opera d’arte ridotta ad oggetto pedagogico” –puede leerse en la página 101– “condanna l’immaginazione in nome di un principio morale trascendentale, prima di avere fatto svaporare e sparire del tutto l’incanto della lettura.” Con una enorme inteligencia, el autor pone el dedo en la llaga de esta epidemia didáctica, desvelando cómo los pedagogos han venido hurtando algo consustancial al libro: nada menos que la risa. Y es que la risa, la burla, la ironía, el matiz o el placer, cosas tan esencialmente cervantinas, son difícilmente plasmables en un aula; por eso las lecturas pedagógicas aspiran a poner vallas al campo y pretenden negar la libertad del lector.

En respuesta a ese intento, el último capítulo del libro tiene como título el de “Invitati ad una festa,” en referencia al banquete que Cervantes nos ofrece como catadores potenciales de su libro. Aunque, eso sí, como quería monsieur Barthes, se trataba de una invitación a degustar sosegadamente, palabra tras palabra y con el ocio atento de las lecturas antiguas. Es ésta la idea última de este ensayo: la opción por una lectura antipedagógica, en la que no ha de reinar la instrucción, sino el gozo, que recupere las palabras mismas y, en ellas, “il senso profondamente narrativo e misterioso dell’esperienza, non sempre facile, del vivere” (p. 106). Según esto, la mejor posibilidad que el *Quijote* puede aportar a la pedagogía es la de convertir a los jóvenes en lectores conscientes de sí mismos y de la importancia que el arte para la sociedad, como catalizador de lo que somos. Juan Carlos González Faraco resume su invitación con un cita de Reinaldo Arenas, que merece la pena releer: “Non ci rassegniamo a vivere senza bellezza, perché essa è il senso trascendente della nostra vita, la trasfigurazione di tanti momenti magici e fugaci in qualcosa di eterno... Chiediamo agli dei la grazia di poter partecipare al mistero della bellezza, ingrandendolo” (p. 114). No es poco. *Il cavaliere errante* no es sólo un inteligente repaso a través de la recepción pedagógica del libro que escribió Cervantes, sino un

lúcido aviso que viene a recordarnos que la verdadera educación sólo puede ejercerse desde la libertad y que el mejor *Quijote* siempre será el que un lector tenga, libre y gozosamente, entre sus manos.

LUIS GÓMEZ CANSECO
canseco@uhu.es