

conclusión: 'El desengaño se dirige en último término al Seductor por excelencia, esto es, al *logos* (Ley del Padre) que informa unos valores e ideologías que en la época se hallan en total decadencia y en los que el individuo barroco ha perdido toda su fe' (147). El problema fundamental de esta línea de pensamiento es que si tales valores e ideologías estaban ya en la época en total decadencia, ¿cómo se explicaría que Teresa de Ávila, Cervantes y Zayas necesiten de tantas argucias para deconstruirlos?

Para aglutinar los tres ensayos, la autora intenta demostrar que en los tres casos se refleja un conflicto entre, por una parte, las relaciones de producción de un sistema feudal en el que las relaciones entre las personas están basadas principalmente en el parentesco y otro mercantilista donde las relaciones se basan fundamentalmente en el libre intercambio. El problema con esta idea de origen marxista para los casos en cuestión (*Libro de la vida*, *Novelas ejemplares* y *Novelas de Zayas*) es que ni el sistema feudal se dio realmente en la península Ibérica, y menos en Castilla (donde nacieron y escribieron todos los autores tratados), ni el sistema capitalista rigió propiamente en España hasta bien pasado el siglo XVII.

El otro marco teórico que usa la autora para intentar dar unidad a los tres ensayos de que consta el libro es la división epistémica tomada de *Las palabras y las cosas* de Michel Foucault (Madrid: Siglo XXI Editores, 1968). El mayor problema que presenta este marco teórico es que según Foucault, el corte fundamental que separa la episteme antigua de la episteme clásica, se da precisamente a comienzos del siglo XVII (uno de los textos principales que utiliza Foucault para señalar el corte epistémico es precisamente el *Quijote*). Ahora bien, el primero de los textos analizados, *El libro de la vida* (escrito antes de 1567) estaría claramente situado antes del corte, mientras los otros dos se publican bien entrado el siglo XVII (1613 el primero y 1649 el segundo). Solamente este hecho echaría por tierra el intento de la autora de presentarnos los tres textos como paradigmas de la 'mentalidad barroca' que ejemplifica el cambio de episteme foucaultiano.

CARLOS MIGUEL ANDRÉS GIL

*California State University, Stanislaus.*

JUAN RAMÓN MUÑOZ SÁNCHEZ, *De amor y literatura: hacia Cervantes*. Vigo: Editorial Academia del Hispanismo. 2012. 548 pp.

This is a curious work. It is not presented as a stand-alone study, but rather as the prelude to a second book, which promises a comprehensive survey of rewriting in Cervantes' entire literary corpus, organized around the theme of love. The present volume is instead an historical survey of that theme in Western literature from Homer to Petrarch, a literary historiography intended to lay the groundwork for the forthcoming analysis. It is explicitly a 500-page prologue to Juan Ramón Muñoz Sánchez's next book.

The Introduction relates principally to the deferred second instalment of this 'libro en dos partes' (15). Its purpose is to outline the aim of the overall project: 'Aclarémoslo: este trabajo de investigación pretende ser una aproximación a un concepto de palpitante actualidad en la moderna teoría de la literatura, la "reescritura", aplicado a la obra del máximo escritor de las letras hispanas, Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra' (15). 'Reescritura' is here assimilated to 'intratextualidad', the ways in which Cervantes' texts relate to each other, which overlaps with their 'intertextualidad', the dialogue that those same texts maintain with the wider literary tradition (16). Muñoz Sánchez rejects the broad definitions of intertextuality put forth by Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes in favour of Gérard Genette's more circumscribed interpretation, before presenting his own work as filling a gap in the critical literature, which, he claims, lacks a systematic study of intratextuality in Cervantes' *oeuvre*. This is an intriguing and timely avenue of critical enquiry, but the reader is forewarned that the close scrutiny of Cervantine texts will be rough sledding: 'las enumeraciones, con todo el tedio que

comportan, serán harto frecuentes, pero estrictamente necesarias; tiempo habrá después de sintetizar y de ahondar con más reposo los resultados obtenidos en el inventario de temas y problemas' (29–30). Elsewhere we are advised that, in the second volume, examples of Cervantes' rewriting will be enumerated 'hasta la saciedad' (25). Such unusually forthright statements are somewhat akin to being told to eat one's vegetables: unpalatable but nutritious. They seem to herald a view of literary analysis as compilation of a data set.

However applicable that judgment may turn out to be in the case of the follow-up study, I am afraid that it accurately describes the current volume. I appreciate the monumental effort involved in researching it, and I admire Muñoz Sánchez's impressive command of literary history, but despite the abundant erudition on display, much of what is presented here is, in my view, excessive. There is significant scope for synthesis and compression throughout, particularly in view of the fact that Muñoz Sánchez makes no claim to expertise in much of the material that he covers (30). This is the kind of information that one would expect to subtend a comprehensive study of the sort that Muñoz Sánchez announces for his following book, without necessarily wishing to see it explicated in such detail. This sense of 'saciedad' is exacerbated by stylistic concerns. Muñoz Sánchez's commentary on Aquilles Tatiús' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, to take an unexceptional example, is a single paragraph that extends to five full pages (344–50), although in fairness one of those is taken up in its virtual entirety by a footnote. Many of the footnotes, of which there are in excess of 1,100, contain extensive supplemental quotations from primary and secondary sources, which proliferate to the point of distraction. There are abundant errata throughout.

Cervantes is not absent from these proceedings, although he is not as 'omnipresent' as Muñoz Sánchez claims (18). Less than a unifying thread, discussions of Cervantes' works frequently seem like critical afterthoughts. Occasionally they come off as merely perfunctory, e.g. in his tragedy *Andromache*, Euripides made jealousy a central motif, just as Cervantes would do in his own work, particularly *El celoso extremeño* (92). More problematic, from my perspective, are the applications of erotic *topoi* to *Don Quixote*. Muñoz Sánchez consistently takes seriously Quixote's pronouncements on love and Dulcinea, the very nerve centre of his chivalric madness, as straightforward reformulations of the literary tradition, with no mention of the way that Cervantes insistently undercuts them to comic effect. Don Quixote's 'Platonic' (i.e. non-existent) love for Aldonza Lorenzo/Dulcinea is thus dignified as 'puro y verdadero' (401). As a result, rather than a supremely creative engagement with its literary antecedents, Cervantes' masterpiece sometimes appears reduced to the status of commonplace book.

I do not anticipate that such will be the case in Muñoz Sánchez's subsequent volume, which, I infer, will engage its readers with abundant material to ponder, discuss and debate. A comprehensive study of rewriting and love in Cervantes is indeed to be eagerly anticipated.

BRIAN BREWER

*Trinity College, Dublin.*

FREDERICK A. DE ARMAS, *Don Quixote among the Saracens. A Clash of Civilizations and Literary Genres*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 2011. xvi + 237 pp.

Who today writes about Cervantes with the panache of Frederick de Armas? Undaunted by four centuries' worth of spilled ink, in unearthing a stubbornly hidden thematic centrality of the confrontation between Christianity and Islam he outdoes even Luce López Baralt. And the 'secret' he finally reveals, that Don Quixote feels 'at home among the Saracens', points to the tale of his adventures as a challenge to early modern Spanish Christians to learn tolerance toward the rival faith.