

Letters

THE SEMI-ANNUAL NEWSLETTER OF THE ROBERT PENN WARREN CENTER FOR THE HUMANITIES

VOL. 14, NO. 1 • FALL 2005 • VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

Pre-Modern Others: Race and Sexuality

The 2005/2006 Fellows Program at the Warren Center, "Pre-Modern

Others: Race and Sexuality," brings together a diverse group of scholars to examine issues of race and sexuality from the classical period through 1700. While there has been broad interdisciplinary scholarship in modern constructions of race and sexuality, the problems and possibilities of imposing more recent theories on earlier periods are only beginning to be addressed.

Participants will explore a variety of questions in the seminar, including: How can we talk about racial and sexual identities in pre-1700 cultures? To what extent are Eurocentric models challenged by non-Western evidence and theory? What are the particular interdisciplinary advantages of considering pre-modern race and sexualities together?

The program's co-directors are Leah Marcus, Edwin Mims Professor of English, and Holly Tucker, associate professor of French. In a recent interview with *Letters*, Professors Marcus and Tucker discussed the fellows program, its relation to their current research, and some of the

larger issues their ongoing discussions will engage. *LETTERS*: This year's program

new approaches to cultural issues in the early modern/Renaissance period, and we wanted to give

MARCUS: Our purpose was to bring together a dynamic group of scholars across several disciplines to discuss topics of particular interest in current scholarship. It really is a new area for inquiry in our early fields, and neither Holly nor I have a defined perspective on it. The whole point of our year's work is to be exploratory.

TUCKER: There's also a certain timeliness to this. We, of course, want to bring together scholars with overlapping interests on the Vanderbilt campus. Our visiting Fellow, Jean Feerick, does research that intersects brilliantly with everything the rest of us are doing. The program is also timely in the sense that our study of race and sexuality is so pertinent to what I see as a chronic "othering" happening in American society right now. We're really interested in looking at how earlier periods and cultures can inform contemporary discussions of race, sexuality, and subjectivity more generally, and also where our modern understandings of "difference" break down when viewed historically. We will be trying to locate where the questions are and where the theoretical quicksand might be as we start to read modern views of race and sexuality in tandem with the pre-modern.

MARCUS: Yes—there are some scholars, such as Walter Benn



Leah Marcus and Holly Tucker

comes from a faculty group that has met for several years at the Warren Center. Could you say more about this group and the kinds of intersections you see developing between this smaller venue for your discussions?

MARCUS: The seminar used to be called the Early Modern Interest Group but we changed the name to the Group for Early Modern Cultural Studies. The new name has a specific link with innovative methodologies because it connects us to the national conference GEMCS (Group for Early Modern Cultural Studies) that meets every year. The conference focuses on

our group a similar perspective. But this year's Warren Center cohort will be broader than just scholars in the field of Renaissance and early modern studies. Our fellows program will include three medievalists; in our larger seminar, we had only one medievalist who met regularly with the group. In addition, we will have participants who have never been members of Vanderbilt GEMCS.

LETTERS: How did you determine this year's theme, "Pre-Modern Others: Race and Sexuality"? Where do you see discussions going, or what do you have planned for this year?

Inside

| | |
|--|-----|
| Pre-Modern Others: Race and Sexuality (Cont.) | 2-4 |
| Don Quixote Celebrates Its Four-Hundredth Birthday | 5-7 |
| 2006/2007 Fellowships | 7 |
| RPW 2005/2006 Fellows | 8 |

Race was a term that was used to refer to one's family background, as one might still say "He comes from a race of heroes."

Michaels, who are presently suggesting that race studies should be abolished as an academic topic. They hold that by continuing to talk and think about race, we are reifying and essentializing racism in a way that is not productive. They argue that if we don't focus on race in the academic community, this will help to eliminate race as a category of difference in the culture at large. It is an interesting and problematic position, as well as a very controversial one. It goes without saying, however, that our culture's ways of defining sexuality are similarly in flux. The fact that our own definitions are so labile at present may allow us to recognize some aspects of the medieval and early modern periods that we couldn't see when we thought we knew what race and sexuality were.

One of the reasons this is a new area of pre-modern studies is because of a prominent recent view, held particularly by nineteenth-and-twentieth-century literary scholars and historians, that race didn't really exist as a category until the eighteenth or nineteenth century. The reason scholars believed this was because they were imagining race pretty exclusively in terms of color difference. Color difference certainly exists as a category for defining racial difference in our culture, but it may not be the most important category. Now it seems that perhaps the color line is becoming eclipsed by other kinds of cultural differences, such as, for example, religious differences—particularly the challenge to traditional Western values posed at present by radical Islam. In our seminar, we want to investigate whether the same kinds of cultural constructions that our own culture has tended to define in terms of color can be seen to operate in earlier cultures through other mechanisms.

For example, a couple of years ago I wrote an article on Shakespeare's *Othello* in which I talked about the two different early texts of the play, the quarto version published in 1622 and the folio

version published in 1623. I was fascinated by the fact that almost all of the racist comments in the play—or what look to us now like racist comments—were in the folio version of the play and not in the quarto. What does this mean? Does it mean that dramatists and players in Shakespeare's time and a little after understood race so clearly in terms our culture would understand that they



Leah Marcus

could add or subtract racist materials to the play, depending on their audience and other factors that were changing during the period? Or did they so completely lack our contemporary understanding of race and racism that the differences between the two versions had a completely different meaning for them? The whole problem seemed to me uncanny. I still don't have an explanation, but I think it's extremely interesting that a given culture could generate two texts that are so different. If we only had the first quarto version of *Othello*, I doubt whether *Othello* would be considered, as it has been so frequently in our own time, as the Ur-text for modern fears of miscegenation. It may be that the unbridgeable gap in *Othello* is not race but religion. What happens at the end of the play is that Oth-

ello is first isolated from the rest of the community, and then, as he kills himself, turned into a religious other, the Turk. In his final speech he talks about how he killed a Turkish "dog" and then he kills himself. The whole question of religion is as interesting as color in *Othello*. We are very interested in exploring the ways that religion may have served some of the same functions in earlier cultures that skin color has served in our own time.

We especially want to think about these questions in more local terms. I think in our own culture it's also the case that race and sexuality must be understood locally. Part of the purpose of bringing scholars together from a variety of backgrounds is not to come up with one unifying discourse, but to create ways of defining specific patterns from one period as over against other specific periods and practices. The terms race and sexuality did not exist in the periods we're studying. Race was a term that was used to refer to one's family background, as one might still say "He comes from a race of heroes." I don't know that much about the historical construction of sexuality, but I'm quite sure the idea of sexuality wasn't used in the way that we use it until fairly recently.

LETTERS: When were they changed, the terms?

MARCUS: The term racism is from the late nineteenth or twentieth century.

TUCKER: You don't see it in early modern texts at all. Racism as something negative, as a discriminatory action or judgment, does not enter Western vocabularies until quite late. Race, on the other hand, can be found in the earliest texts, but, as Leah mentioned, it is used mostly to refer to notions of family, lineage, or nobility. Even Diderot and

D'Alembert's massive *Encyclopédie* mentions race as a biological difference in passing, almost as a second thought—and just in reference to different types of horses, not humans. Now, even if the lexicon to describe racism did not seem to exist, I don't think we could say that racism itself did not exist. However, the races that might be subject to racism may not be what we would anticipate them to be.

Looking at race through this type of historical lens seems crucial to me. It brings a helpful dimension to recent scholarly moves to call deeply into question racial and sexual identity as something that is inherently stable and part of a "natural" order. In the wake of theorists such as Foucault, Sedgwick, Butler, and others, it is clear that many of the same questions we're asking in contemporary gender and sexuality studies have to be addressed in medieval and early modern scholarship as well. As we begin to nuance our understandings of culturally constructed identities, we have to take stock of the past. Does what we look like or who we sleep with (and how) necessarily dictate who or what we are? Not necessarily for early moderns. However, while recent approaches to gender and sexuality allow us to ask new questions of our early texts, it would be premature to assume that the answer to these questions will look the same in every historical and cultural context.

MARCUS: And then, of course, there's the interesting problem of sexuality as performance. In every culture, behaviors that for us fall under the rubric of sexuality were performed publicly for various purposes. An obvious example might be the androgynous presentation of early modern monarchs: Why did Queen Elizabeth I of England or François I of France deliberately present themselves to their publics as uniting male and female attributes? What were the relationships between such public performances—as well as the histories, literature,

art, and music that have preserved them for us to study—and more private forms of sexual practice? For that matter, to what extent are the cultural artifacts themselves performances? We certainly can't take the naïve view that cultural monuments are reliable mirrors of the culture out of which they emerged.

TUCKER: Right. We are very interested in exploring the myriad ways in which race and sexuality may have been put to use. We know in the modern period—and in tragic and violent ways in these last few years—that race and sexuality can be deployed for political, economical, religious purposes. In some instances, there is striking overlap. In others, the pieces don't always fit the way we would expect them to.

MARCUS: For example, what we think of as nationalism also didn't quite exist in the pre-modern period. It is hard to associate racial identity with national identity in this period. That makes it interesting and troubling to try to figure out how processes of collective self-definition worked in those times. Similarly, in pre-modern times and places, the family didn't have the same structure that it typically has now. In our culture, traditional sexual definitions have grown out of a model of family structure and expected sexual roles. But what might sexuality look like in times for which the so called modern family had not yet been invented? The fact that sexuality hadn't yet been conceptualized as a separable human category means that it's hard for us to conceptualize in contemporary terms.

LETTERS: So modern conceptions of race and sexuality cannot be applied to the pre-modern period?

MARCUS: That's correct. When reading medieval texts, people unfamiliar with that period might believe that the concept of race did not exist at the time. But they did have the same kind of racial dynamic; it was just organized differently.

TUCKER: It is interesting, too,

Now we simply assume that race and sexuality are parallel ideas in some of their political and cultural functioning.

that the notion of the nation-state, as Leah mentioned, is in a moment of great flux. For example, in seventeenth-century France, there is a continual underlying tension and unease as Louis XIV works to solidify notions of divine monarchy and the autonomy of the nation-state. Sexuality is deployed here in some fascinating ways, from clandestine writings about the king's sexual impotence to the idea that syphilis is not a French disease.

MARCUS: Except the English called syphilis the French disease!

TUCKER: The English called it the French disease; the French called it the Italian disease or the English disease. So, sexuality and sexually transmitted diseases become not just about the body. They are also about nationalisms that are in the process of developing. As you define the diseases you can't have but your neighbor can, you're creating maps—you're reifying the idea of contained nations.

MARCUS: That is a process also by which modern ideas of race and sexuality began to intersect, because the idea of disease perhaps came to be associated with racial otherness. One of the questions we ask in this project is: How and in what ways is it profitable to think about race and sexuality together? I think one reason that modern scholars have tended to think of them together is because of the legacy of the late twentieth century. In the 1970s and 1980s, when women's liberation and desegregation were for the first time in our lives becoming highly visible national political agendas, anti-feminist and anti-racist agendas were perceived as operating together. Now we simply assume that race and sexuality are parallel ideas in some of their political and cultural functioning, but the periods we will be exploring are

hundreds of years before the 1980s. It will be interesting to see in what ways ideas about race and sexuality do work together for the pre-modern era, if at all. We assume that they do.

LETTERS: What was the reasoning behind cutting off the modern period at 1700?

TUCKER: Leah and I have talked together on several occasions about our decision to use 1700 as the cutoff date for the group. It is admittedly arbitrary, as is any attempt to impose temporal boundaries on the human experience. Epistemologically, nothing really lines up that neatly. There is actually something very appealing to me about not marking in concrete terms where the pre-modern begins and ends. It resists to a certain degree the



Holly Tucker

in-between, serving as a placeholder between the classical and the Renaissance. In the Renaissance, supposedly people suddenly started acting modern and behaving like individuals instead of members of a larger corporate entity, as in the medieval period. Well, that traditional construction of difference between the periods is going out the window. I'm really looking forward to dismantling a lot of the stereotypical understandings of identity and period identity that have gone along with the idea of the Renaissance.

LETTERS: How did each of you come to this point in your research? What led you to it?

TUCKER: I work in the history of medicine, and I am especially interested in how medicine and literature intersect. Literature and medicine are telling very similar stories, though they are using different genres both to respond to one another and also to establish their own definitions of the world. Reproduction and the studies of reproduction in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries start to get at the really difficult questions related to race and sexuality—and establish in many ways the presuppositions on which the notion of racial hierarchies was established. With the scientific revolution, old questions are posed, but now there are different data. For example, why is it that some people are born white-skinned and other people are born brown-skinned? How does that happen? How is it that children do or don't resemble their parents? A new model of reproduction, preformation, takes center stage beginning around 1670. Animaculum, the idea that little baby humans existed fully formed in the head of each sperm, is the better-known version of preformation. However, it was actually ovism, the idea that all of humanity was preformed in Eve's ovaries, which dominated embryological theory for over a hundred years. The ovary was passed from woman to woman, generation to generation, and

modern, taxonomic impulse.

MARCUS: One of the big debates we'll have at the very beginning of the seminar meetings is about what is at stake in talking about the "pre-modern." What the term "pre-modern" does, among other things, is to take away the aura of privilege that the Renaissance has traditionally had as opposed to the medieval period. For scholars of the early modern, the medieval period has been defined as the period that's

To a degree, our traditional sense of the narrowness of these cultures was part of the business of constructing nationalism.

each child actually existed in miniature in Eve's ovaries. It is just a matter of a sort of unhusking, like Russian dolls.

MARCUS: Until the very beginning of time?

TUCKER: Until the very beginning of time. For as odd and even funny as it seems to us, preformation made perfect sense in a late seventeenth-century context. The human egg had just been discovered, and existing theories had a hard time keeping up. But preformation brings up some key dilemmas: If all humans were preformed in Eve's ovaries, then how do we explain that some humans were pre-formed with white skin and other humans were pre-formed with brown skin? Then we get into genealogies. There are all types of ways to explain this. Perhaps the whites were unhusked first, right? Then toward the inside are the darker-skinned people. In one fell swoop, we have just codified racial hierarchies in a scientific context. How do we explain birth defects, or what the early moderns would call "monstrosity?" Why would God pre-form these imperfect humans, making some missing limbs and arms? But then, again, if whites are closer to perfection in racial hierarchies, could theories on birth anomalies also be used to understand racial differences? So here also, in preformationism, we might find early examples of pathologized bodies and a local snapshot of the complex intersections between race, sexuality, and religion.

MARCUS: I got into this area of study because I was interested in examining the history of editorial practice in relation to Shakespearean texts. I was especially interested in how certain versions of Shakespeare's plays have been demonized, or at least ignored. I have already talked about *Othello*: the quarto version of the play, which is less "racist" to our modern perceptions, has been forgotten in favor of the more "racist" folio version of the play. The idea that there might be more than one version of Shakespeare's plays has long troubled scholars; hence,

they have tended to seize upon a single text as the play Shakespeare must have intended and to suppress the other ones that are different. If you call something a bad quarto, then you can just ignore it. Sometimes the texts that have traditionally been marginalized as part of the Shakespearean record are the very texts that manage issues of race or sexuality differently than the received versions. Even in plays for which there is only one text, there are often cruxes that our culture would traditionally have considered racially or sexually anomalous situations and they are simply edited out.

An interesting example is the blue-eyed hag from *The Tempest*. Caliban's mother is said to be blue-eyed. All the editors say that that doesn't mean she has blue eyes—because she's from Algeria and she's a witch—but instead that the phrase means she was bluish-black around her eyes as a result of pregnancy. Editors have found various clever ways of getting around the fact that in Shakespeare's time there may not have been a stable dichotomy dictating that if you're from Algiers you had to have dark eyes. Many North Africans have blue eyes! Interestingly, I recently had the pleasure of reading an advance copy of Alice Randall's new novel, which centers on *The Tempest*. As an African American woman studying *The Tempest*, Randall also thought that Shakespeare's "blue-eyed hag" had blue eyes. She constructs a classroom situation in the novel that relates to her own experience of being put down as a student for thinking beyond the color line. I see that artificial limitation of a text's potential range of meaning happening over and over again.

In another example, Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* plays were enormously popular in sixteenth-century England. *Tamburlaine* was supposed to be a Mongol leader from Uzbekistan. At one point Marlowe's text says that his skin is snowy white. *Tamburlaine* also has red hair, according to Marlowe. Editors over time

have changed snowy to sinewy and they've given up the idea of white entirely, so the challenging idea of a Muslim Uzbeki leader who looks uncannily like a stereotypical Englishman is lost in modern editions. It is extremely interesting to look back at the texts we thought we knew and realize the extent to which their presentations about race and sexuality have been filtered through nineteenth-and-twentieth-century presuppositions.

For an example about sexuality, in *Othello*, at one point in his growing distrust of Desdemona, Othello says "My name, that was as fresh / As Diana's visage, is now begrimed and black / As mine own face." As we might expect, given what I said earlier, this quotation is from the folio version of the play. Before the onset of his jealousy, Othello had been imagining himself in terms of Diana, who is the goddess of chastity and the hunt. Editors just couldn't conceptualize that this male warrior would think of himself in that feminized way, so most editions change "my face" to "her face" therefore changing his statement to mean Desdemona's face. This example also speaks to the intersection of race and sexuality. What does Othello's sense of his own blackness have to do with his conviction of Desdemona's infidelity?

One of the things we're interested in doing as part of this Warren Center seminar is getting away from a Eurocentric Middle Ages and a Eurocentric early modern era. We need to realize that in pre-modern culture there was often more globalization going on than we had been willing to recognize. To a degree, our traditional sense of the narrowness of these cultures was part of the business of constructing nationalism. French or British culture was supposed to rule the world.

TUCKER: With this in mind, I am especially hoping that we can reconsider some of the universalizing ways in which we have traditionally understood the pre-modern era.

MARCUS: Especially to the extent that those universalizing ele-

ments actually turn out to be western European elements.

TUCKER: Absolutely. A few years ago, I had a chance to spend a week in Paris in a small faculty seminar on "Rethinking Scientific Knowledge" in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Sanjay Subrahmanyam, one of the top scholars of early-modern Indo-Persian history, gave a talk on mapping the coastlines of Asia. I remember him showing illustrations of early maps of India, maps in existence before all of the Jesuit travels, before all of the European empire building. They were so very different than anything I had ever seen. I've done some work with early European maps, which are a fascinating experience in and of themselves, but these maps were so incomprehensible to me. There was a whole system of colored dots used to represent both space and time. It was exciting and unsettling. We just have this tendency to think that maps look the way they do because, well, they're supposed to look like that.

MARCUS: Because that's the way it is. That's the way the world is.

TUCKER: And so much of how we, particularly as Westerners, view things has been conditioned by our pre-modern, European heritage. But how can we be sure we know what we're seeing? After all, the Mercator Projection—which is used to plot a round earth on flat longitudinal and latitudinal lines—is a late sixteenth-century invention. And one that remains controversial at that. Is it a faithful representation of the relative size of one continent, or country over another? Or was Mercator's math also inflected with political and economic subtexts? To be sure, race and sexuality have also been "mapped"—and with results that we all feel, every day, in a plurality of ways. We envision this year's seminar as a remapping that will enrich all the participants' work, and that will take us to a deeper understanding of our own cultural assumptions and what our pre-modern precursors can teach us.

Don Quixote Celebrates Its Four-Hundredth Birthday

Edward H. Friedman

Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra published *Don Quixote* in two parts, in 1605 and 1615. He was in his late fifties and had never had a clear literary triumph. Both books were bestsellers. *Don Quixote* became a classic, and Don Quixote became an icon. We do not know all the details of Cervantes's early life. His father was a surgeon, itinerant and by no means well-to-do. It is believed that the son's education included study with scholars heavily influenced by the works of Erasmus. Cervantes lived for a time in Seville, where he became fascinated with the theater, but when he published eight plays and eight dramatic interludes in 1615, the end of the title bore the words "never presented on stage." As a soldier in Italy, Cervantes took part in the great naval battle of Lepanto (1571), in which he conducted himself heroically and received severe injuries. In 1575, he set off for Spain with recommendations of the highest order, only to find his ship kidnapped by Muslim enemies. He spent five years in captivity in Algiers. His glorious return to his fatherland denied, Cervantes was to spend the greatest part of his life enduring hardships of various sorts, with little professional or personal success, and with only minor recognition as a writer. *Don Quixote* changed that, but even this victory was diminished by the publication, in 1614, of a continuation of the novel by the pseudonymous Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda, whose identity still eludes us.

Cervantes wrote *Don Quixote* at a moment in which the novel—or what we call the modern novel—was being developed, and his work played a significant role in that development. Cervantes offers a template for the future novel, be it an example of realism, naturalism, modernism, or postmodernism, in Europe, the Americas, and elsewhere. At the beginning of the seventeenth century in Spain, the major narrative forms that had endured from the previous century were idealistic in tone and theme.

They included sentimental, pastoral, and chivalric romance, the most popular examples of which bore the titles, respectively, *The Prison of Love*, *Diana*, and *Amadis of Gaul*. There was a realistic current in *Celestina* and *The Robust Andalusian Woman* (both lengthy narratives in dialogue form), the Italian novella (adapted by Spanish writers), and the picaresque mode. The picaresque narrates the lives of antiheroes and antiheroines, often in the first person, offering a view of society from below and a new take on Renaissance humanism, the spiritual confession, and the exemplary biography or autobiography. In his fiction, Cervantes certainly pays attention to this incipient realism, but he establishes paradigms and parameters of his own. His other narrative works include twelve *Exemplary Novels*, published in 1613, and an "epic in prose," *The Trials of Persiles and Sigismunda*, published posthumously in 1617.

The procedure leading to publication of Part 1 of *Don Quixote* was rather complicated. This was the age of the Inquisition, and there was strict censorship of books. Cervantes needed the permission of the Council of Castile and the services of an editor, Francisco de Robles, who became a financial partner, and a printer, Juan de la Cuesta. (Cervantes claimed that others—not he—became rich from the sales of *Don Quixote*.) Printers usually did not use the original, but a version prepared by an amanuensis. The printers worked, it seems in this case, in a hurry, and within a particular format that forced them to make some changes, such as a redistribution of chapters or sections. One can deduce that some, but definitely not all, of the errors, omissions, and misleading chapter headings were due to the methods used in printing rather than to the mental lapses (or a calculated plan) of the author. The *princeps* edition stands apart, even from Cervantes's other publications, for its large quantity of errata. Nonetheless, the book was an immediate success, and within a

short span of time there were reprintings (the first two in Lisbon) and new editions. The fact that emendations were made did not completely change the picture with regard to errors, for many were to remain, yet this defect of Part 1 eventually served the self-referentiality of Part 2. It may be noted that the second part itself was hardly error-free. Both volumes of *Don Quixote* display the same frontispiece, Juan de la Cuesta's crest with the Latin dictum "Post tenebras spero lucem" [After the darkness, I hope for light]. According to the eminent Spanish scholar Francisco Rico, the easily readable font is *atanasia*, an offspring of Garamond. The 1605 *Quixote* has 52 chapters (divided into

ing a recent and much-reviewed version by Edith Grossman, with an introduction by Harold Bloom, and an announced new translation by Thomas Lathrop, a professor at the University of Delaware and the editor of a student edition of the novel. Editions old and new, in Spanish, English, and other languages, run the gamut from the exquisite and ornate to the paperback for under ten dollars. Most academic libraries will have a facsimile edition and a range of editions.

There is something rebellious, even subversive, about *Don Quixote*, starting with the prologue to Part 1. The speaker is a fictionalized version of the author, who receives a visit from a nameless friend, to whom he explains his predicament:

he has written a book, but he feels unprepared to write a formal prologue that would include quotations from the sages in order to prove his erudition. The friend advises him that all he has to do is fill in blank spaces; he can make up whatever he wants, as long as he gets the job done. Although Cervantes directs the prologue to an "idle reader," one can see from the beginning that Cervantes is striving for an interactive text, highly dependent on the response of the reader. He is also creating distance, by making himself a character and by



Edward Friedman

ceding authority to yet another alter ego, the friend, who does by far more talking than "Cervantes." Chapter 1 likewise offers surprises. The narrator emphasizes that what we are reading is a "true history," but his command of the data could make the reader somewhat skeptical. Chronology, for example, is conspicuously off. The narrator has consulted archives, but recent books—including Cervantes's pastoral novel *Galatea*, of 1585—are mentioned. One may think of Don Quixote as a self-fashioned

continued on page 6

Don Quixote continued

knight errant who has adventure after adventure, and, while that is true, the essence of the novel is found more in its commentary about books, as art and as consumer products, than in the imitation of chivalric romance. Stated simply, *Don Quixote* is primarily a book about books, and thus about reading, writing, and critique. Its protagonist and its story are capable of moving us, but at the same time the novel involves us in the process of its composition.

The *hidalgo*, or lesser nobleman who becomes Don Quixote, takes to the road as a knight errant in order to insert himself into the world of chivalry. This unique variety of madness results from his reading. The narrator tells us that the gentleman's brain has dried up after many sleepless nights in his library. Don Quixote takes fiction to be the truth, and the books of chivalry become his models. He wishes to serve humanity by righting wrongs, by defending the defenseless, and by re-creating the values of the Golden Age. He prepares himself for the journey and invents a lady to serve, Dulcinea del Toboso, an idealization of the peasant girl Aldonza Lorenzo. Even before he undertakes his first challenge, he imagines the chronicle that will recount his exploits and hopes that the historian to whom the task falls will represent him accurately. He comes to an inn that he mistakes as—or transforms into—a castle, and the innkeeper initiates a pattern that will recur throughout the novel: he pretends to enter into Don Quixote's fantasy, thereby accepting the role as owner of the castle and dubbing him a knight. On the chivalric stage that he has invented, Don Quixote functions as actor, scriptwriter, director, and producer, and he counts on those with whom he comes into contact to accept his reality as theirs.

After a drubbing early in Part 1, Don Quixote is lying on the ground badly wounded and, placing himself in a chivalric context, rants about his ill fortune, when a neighbor hears him and delivers him to his home. His niece, housekeeper, the village priest, and the barber, concerned for his welfare, undertake a scrutiny of the library, where

they burn those books deemed offensive and tell Don Quixote that this has been the work of evil enchanters. Bibliophiles and critics tend to enjoy these book reviews, which are flavored by the spirit of the Council of Trent and the Counter Reformation. Escape fiction, notably the romances of chivalry, were clearly not part of the program of edification. The burning of the souls that are found wanting is obviously an allusion to the Inquisition, its censorship of books and its fires of punishment. Cervantes seems to have gotten away with this allegory by virtue of the comic and absurdist atmosphere, and perhaps by virtue of the protagonist's madness. One of the many brilliant touches in the novel is the introduction of the topic of enchantment, for now Don Quixote can use what could be called the enchantment defense whenever he is faced with a realistic explanation of his delusions.

Scholars have surmised that, as Cervantes proceeded in his writing, he realized that he could expand the original design in order to produce an extensive narrative rather than a novella. Don Quixote's return to his village allows him the opportunity to choose a squire to serve him, with the promise that, in time, the liege will become the governor of an island. Not only an attendant but a dialogue partner, Sancho, rather than the narrator, can interpret reality, and he can supply humor, physical and verbal, as well as an alternate perspective. Sancho is illiterate, so that symbolically he stands for orality, juxtaposed with the obsessive dependence of his master on written culture. Cervantes accentuates the impact of the printing press on the accessibility of knowledge without forgetting the persistence of oral—and, by extension, popular—tradition. Don Quixote and Sancho Panza serve dualism not only through contrast, but also through mutual development and influence. Salvador de Madariaga coins superb terms when he refers to the relationship as the Quixotization of Sancho and the Sanchification of Don Quixote. Both characters grow in the course of the narrative, and, in some ways, Sancho becomes the protagonist, or co-protagonist, of Part 2. The first

adventure that involves both the knight errant and his squire is the universally known encounter with the windmills, which Don Quixote takes for giants. The episode is brief, but it allows the astonished Sancho to notify his master of the real identity of the giants and allows the injured knight to blame his ills on the enchanter. More consequentially, it could be argued, it becomes—along with visions of the long and lean knight with his short and portly squire—the chief focus of artists who wish to capture the essence of Don Quixote's quest, the proverbial tilting at windmills.

Something highly unusual happens at the end of chapter 8 of Part 1. The narrator announces, in the middle of the description of a battle between Don Quixote and a Biscayan, that he has no more information. In the marketplace in Toledo, he happens upon a manuscript in Arabic that turns out to be the history of Don Quixote by the Muslim chronicler Cide Hamete Benengeli, and that narrative begins where chapter 8 left off. What we are reading is the translation of that manuscript by a Morisco (a Muslim convert), with editorial commentary by the narrator. Readers need to recall that during this period the holy war between the Christians and the Muslims continued. The Christians portrayed their enemies as liars (as did the Muslims), and Cervantes is further shaking the foundation of the "true history," without acknowledging doing so. He is foregrounding the space between the event itself and its expression, by offering a series of distancing devices while insisting on the truthfulness of the account. At this juncture and numerous others, Cervantes replicates the experience, and the ups and downs, of writing and readying a manuscript for publication.

The chapters that follow more often than not have literary bases. The pastoral, the picaresque, poetry, drama, the Italian novella, nonfiction, and aesthetic critique make their way into the plot. When Don Quixote, single-minded in his pursuit of justice, frees a group of galley slaves, he and Sancho flee from the beaten path to the mountains, where they meet new

characters and link up with familiar ones at an inn. One of the key features of this lengthy sequence is the shift from adventures to narration proper, to what I would designate as adventures in storytelling. Characters narrate their lives and trials, usually with interruptions, and there are two extended interpolations: the reading aloud of a novella entitled "The Tale of Foolish Curiosity" and the autobiographical narrative (in a double sense, given Cervantes's imprisonment) of a Christian captive recently escaped from Algiers. On his way home at the end of the first part, Don Quixote meets a canon from the city of Toledo, a man who despises the romances of chivalry and who, together with the village priest, condemns the current state of the Spanish theater, specifically the "new style of writing plays" of Lope de Vega.

Part 2 of *Don Quixote* has a different air about it. The distinction relates, to a large degree, to the prologue, far less playful than its predecessor and with a speaker who seems to be Cervantes, without the quotation marks. Cervantes responds to the spurious sequel of Avellaneda and to the *ad hominem* attacks on his age, character, and integrity by the mysterious author, who decries the attack on the theater. He resents being called a maligner of Lope de Vega, whom he damns here with faint praise. At the end of the prologue, Cervantes reveals that, at the conclusion of the authentic second part, he will kill off and bury Don Quixote, in order to thwart further continuations. Allusions to the Avellaneda tome do not reappear in the text until chapter 59, when two guests at an inn show Don Quixote a copy. The sequel comes into several episodes (including a vision of hell, in which devils are playing a tennis-like game with the Avellaneda *Quixote* in place of balls), but a culminating moment is when Don Álvaro Tarfe, a character from the counterfeit book, meets the real Don Quixote and certifies his legitimacy to a notary.

One can imagine how Cervantes would have reacted to the publication of the "other" continuation; that he was deeply offended is unequivocal. The embarrassment notwithstanding, Avellaneda's intrusion is like a

gift from heaven for the novel. The very falseness of the volume underscores Cervantes's play with history and fiction and with perspective, perception, and expression. Cervantes perforce must align himself with Cide Hamete Benengeli, the Arab historian, who is now manifestly the author of the "true" history. Avellaneda highlights and amplifies, then, Cervantes's calculated design of instability, wherein things change at every stage of the narrative continuum. Every new factor forces the reader to reconfigure events and messages, and not even Cervantes himself can outdo his adversary in this regard. Avellaneda likewise affects forever what Frank Kermode has termed the sense of an ending in the novel, since Part 2 is a chronicle of a death foretold complemented by the Christian death of Alonso Quijano, who renounces the books of chivalry and his own misdirected energies.

The most important book in Part 2 is not the Avellaneda continuation, however, but Cervantes's Part 1. If chivalric romance inspires Part 1, Part 1 inspires Part 2. Don Quixote finds out from the university graduate Sansón Carrasco that a chronicle of his two sallies has been published, and he is concerned about its accuracy when he learns that the historian is an Arab. He wants to know how the book has been received, and Carrasco informs him that it is quite popular, but that critics have disapproved of the intercalated novella, not for its quality, but for its inappropriateness with respect to the question of unity. The discussion covers other

flaws, mistakes, and omissions, as well. The dialectics of process and product in Part 1 now more emphatically includes criticism and theory, and Cervantes seems to be testing himself (and Cide Hamete) as to whether he can conform to the critics' suggestions as he composes Part 2. Since it has generally been assumed that the false sequel did not appear until Cervantes had written most of Part 2, and that he did not heavily edit the completed portion after the appearance of the intrusive text, all of this is pre-Avellaneda, yet it becomes richer and more complex post-Avellaneda.

There is good news and bad news for Don Quixote. The good news is that the chronicle of his exploits has made him famous. The bad news is that people who have read the book know his *modus operandi* before they meet him, and some of them wish to usurp his authority, his theatrical role. This makes him more passive than in Part 1 (until he hears about the competition, at least), and Cervantes resolves this potential problem by giving Sancho Panza increased control. When Don Quixote wishes to visit Dulcinea, Sancho begins to worry, since he has lied to his master about delivering a letter to her. Sancho resolves the dilemma by stopping a country lass on the road and identifying her as Dulcinea. In a role reversal, it is Don Quixote who can only see the baser element, and he vows to do whatever necessary to "disenchant" Dulcinea. Much of the action of Part 2 places Don Quixote emblematically as spectator in the staged perfor-

mances of others. The highest point, or lowest, of this inversion takes place at the palace of the duke and duchess, wealthy aristocrats with time on their hands, as well as avid readers of Part 1. They pretend to honor the knight errant, but they treat Don Quixote and Sancho as buffoons. They fabricate obstacles on the theme of chivalry, and they construct an island for Sancho to govern, along with a plot to undo him.

Part 2 opens with a dialogue on the reception of Part 1 and builds its trajectory around reader response. Like Don Quixote in Part 1, Carrasco and the ducal pair take the motif of reading from the abstract to the concrete, and it is their histrionic sensibility that pushes the action forward. Carrasco disguises himself as an opposing knight so that he can compel his defeated opponent not to exercise the art of chivalry for a year, but Don Quixote defeats him on the first try. Later, he is successful, and Don Quixote and Sancho return home, where the disillusionment and the rejection of the romances occur. The adventures of the second part include, among many others, Don Quixote's descent into the Cave of Montesinos, where in a vision he sees chivalric figures and the "enchanted" Dulcinea; a puppet show that he interrupts in order to do battle with the enemy; a few days with a Spanish version of Robin Hood; and a visit to Barcelona. The death, or deaths, of Don Quixote may provide only the illusion of closure, for Don Quixote has intrigued and baffled readers for four centuries.

We feel for Don Quixote, and we analyze him with ironic detachment. There are critical schools of thought and thousands of studies on Cervantes's masterpiece, but, wonderfully, none can be complete or definitive, because the text keeps exposing new angles of vision and keeps catching us off guard. It makes us look backward and forward, refurbishing the literary and cultural past and shocking us with its precociousness. It is born of nostalgia and prescience, subject to history and to infinite reprocessing. It is as mutable as life and as timeless as true art should be.

• Among the best sources of information on the printing and publication of *Don Quixote* are Francisco Rico, "Historia del texto," in *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, an edition prepared under the direction of Rico (Barcelona: Crítica, 1998), I, cxcii-cxcxii; and Robert M. Flores, in the introduction (in English) to his *Cervantes: "Don Quixote de la Mancha": An Old-Spelling Control Edition Based on the First Editions of Parts I and II* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1988), I, xv-xlii. Three outstanding online resources—for texts, biographical and bibliographical data, illustrations and images, criticism, etc.—are those of the Cervantes Society of America, the Cervantes Project, and H-Cervantes.

Edward H. Friedman is Professor of Spanish at Vanderbilt University. His research focuses on early modern Spanish literature, with special emphasis on Cervantes, picaresque narrative, and the Comedia.

2006/2007 Warren Center Fellowships: "Between Word and Image"

The 2006/2007 Fellows Program at the Warren Center, "Between Word and Image," will be co-directed by Carolyn Dever (English) and Gregg Horowitz (philosophy). The year-long seminar will bring together scholars from a variety of disciplines to explore the space between word and image, where fields of critical

inquiry are being reconfigured.

Participants will explore questions such as: How are shifting social and cultural relations between word and image transforming critical practices in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences? What are the key differences among the diverse strands of contemporary inquiry into the

relation of word and image? What guiding questions bind these diverse strands of inquiry into shared scholarly projects? What is at stake in maintaining current disciplinary distinctions even as scholars of the relation of word and image profit from the flexibility afforded by interdisciplinary practices?

The Warren center will sponsor a Visiting Fellow with expertise in the area of study, in addition to selected Vanderbilt faculty members. Information regarding the internal and external application process can be obtained from the Warren Center or its Web site. www.vanderbilt.edu/rpw_center

Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities

VU Station B #351534
2301 Vanderbilt Place
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee 37235-1534

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
Paid
Nashville, TN
Permit No. 1460

KATHERINE B. CRAWFORD is an assistant professor of history who studies early modern European history. She has written on gender and politics in early modern France with respect to regencies for child kings. Her research is focused on questions involving the sexual culture of western Europe as it intersects with others of non-European origin during the Renaissance. Crawford is the author of *Perilous Performances: Gender and Regency in Early Modern France* (Harvard University Press, 2004) and the forthcoming "European Sexualities, 1400–1800 New Approaches to European History" (Cambridge University Press, 2006). Currently, she is at work on a project entitled "The Sexual Culture of the French Renaissance."

DYAN H. ELLIOTT is Distinguished Professor of History and the author of *Proving Woman: Female Mysticism and Inquisitional Practice in Late Medieval Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004); *Spiritual Marriage: Sexual Abstinence in Medieval Wedlock* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); and *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990). Her research is centered in the areas of gender, spirituality, and sexuality, specifically the ways in which the three variables interact with one another. Her current project examines the blurring of boundaries between sanctity and heresy in the later Middle Ages.

LYNN E. ENTERLINE, professor of English, is a comparatist trained in the English, Italian, Latin, and Greek literary traditions. The author of *The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare* (Cambridge University Press, 2000) and *The*

Tears of Narcissus: Melancholia and Masculinity in Early Modern Writing (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), her research addresses sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English dramatic and non-dramatic literature as understood in relation to continental influences and classical antecedents. Her current book project, "Imitating Schoolboys: An Essay in Shakespeare's Emotions," focuses on the discursive and material practices of the Elizabethan grammar school.

JEAN E. FEERICK, assistant professor of English at Brown University, was awarded the William S. Vaughn Visiting Fellowship for the 2005/2006 Warren Center Fellows Program. While at Vanderbilt, Feerick will continue work on her current project, "Out of England: Relocating Race in the Renaissance." Dealing with issues of race and nationhood, Feerick will study the ways in which the literature of the early modern period in England is representative of a changing viewpoint on physical identity. Because of colonization and a move on the part of the English to foreign soils, climates, and cultures, new ideas on blood and race evolved. Most recently she has authored the article "'A Nation Now Degenerate': Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, Nova Britannia, and the Role of Diet and Climate in Reproducing Races" (Early American Studies, 2003) as well as "Spenser, Race, and Ireland," (English Literary Renaissance, 2002).

CARLOS A. JÁUREGUI is an assistant professor of Spanish and anthropology and the director of graduate studies for the department of Spanish and Portuguese. His research concerns the intersections of gender, politics, theology, and

colonial intellectual history, and currently he is examining the life and work of the seventeenth-century Mexican nun Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. Juárezgui is the author of two books: *Querrela de los indios en las "Cortes de la Muerte" (1557) de Michael de Carvajal* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2002) and the forthcoming "Canibalia: canibalismo, calibanismo, antropofagia cultural y consume en América Latina" (Editions Rodopi B.V., Amsterdam/New York), which won the Premio Casa de las Américas Award for best socio-historical and literary essay of 2005.

LEAH S. MARCUS, Edward Mims Professor of English, is the Spence and Rebecca Webb Wilson Fellow and co-director of the 2005/2006 Fellows Program. The author of six books, she most recently co-edited two volumes of the writings of Elizabeth I: *Elizabeth I: Autograph Compositions and Foreign Language Originals*, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2003) and *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, (University of Chicago Press, 2000) which won the Prize from the Association of American Publishers. Marcus's research focuses on questions of race, gender, and colonialism, specifically how they are played out in our standard editions. Currently, she is at work on a new edition for Arden Publishing of John Webster's *Duchess of Malfi*.

LYNN T. RAMEY, assistant professor of French, is the author of *Christian, Saracen and Genre in Medieval French Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2001) and co-editor of the forthcoming "The 'Mort Artu' of Yale 229: A Diplomatic Annotated Edition" (Turnhout: Brepols). Her current book is a work-in-progress, tenta-

tively entitled "Race and the European Middle Ages." In it she studies the development of racial consciousness in medieval European literature and the importance of the Middle Ages to modern notions of race.

HOLLY A. TUCKER, associate professor of French, is the Jacque Voegeli Fellow and co-director of the 2005/2006 Fellows Program. Her research focuses on the intersections of early modern medicine, folklore, and literature. She is currently working on questions of ambivalent masculinities in seventeenth-century medical and cultural texts. She is the author of *Pregnant Fictions: Childbirth and the Fairy Tale in Early-Modern France* (Wayne State University Press, 2003); *SLA and the Literature Classroom: Fostering Dialogues* (edited with Virginia M. Scott, Heinle & Heinle, 2001); and the forthcoming edited volume "The French Fairy Tale" (Special Issue of *Marvels and Tales*).

DAVID J. WASSERSTEIN is professor of history and Jewish studies and serves as director of the Jewish Studies Program. He is particularly interested in the political and social history of the Muslims in Spain and the history of the Jews in the medieval Arab-Islamic world. Wasserstein is the author of *The Rise and Fall of the Party-Kings: Politics and Society in Islamic Spain, 1002–1086* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); *The Caliphate in the West: An Islamic Political Institution in the Iberian Peninsula* (Oxford University Press Clarendon Press, 1993); the forthcoming (with Abraham Wasserstein) "The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today" (Cambridge University Press); and numerous articles and chapters.

THE ROBERT PENN WARREN CENTER FOR THE HUMANITIES

Warren Center Staff

Helmut Walser Smith, *Director*
Mona C. Frederick,
Executive Director
Galyn Glick Martin,
Activities Coordinator
Lacey Galbraith, *Office Assistant*
and Letters editor.

Letters is the semiannual newsletter of the Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities at Vanderbilt University, VU Station B #351534, Nashville, Tennessee 37235-1534. (615) 343-6060, Fax (615) 343-2248. **For a listing of Warren Center programs and activities, please contact the above address or visit our Web site at www.vanderbilt.edu/rpw_center.**

Statement of Purpose

Established under the sponsorship of the College of Arts and Science in 1987 and renamed the Robert Penn Warren Center for the Humanities in 1989 in honor of Robert Penn Warren, Vanderbilt alumnus class of 1925, the Center promotes interdisciplinary research and study in the humanities, social sciences, and when appropriate, natural sciences. Members of the Vanderbilt community represent-

ing a wide variety of specializations take part in the Warren Center's programs, which are designed to intensify and increase interdisciplinary discussion of academic, social, and cultural issues.

Vanderbilt University is committed to principles of equal opportunity and affirmative action.

Published by University Design and Publishing, Creative Services.

Photos by Daniel Dubois