the unexplored musical imagery of his paintings. She uses musical iconography to enrich earlier readings of masterpieces such as Velázquez’s enigmatic *Fable of Arachne* and suggests that the stringed instrument in the painting’s background is a *lira grande*, whose soothing resonance was believed to serve as a “musical antidote to the spider’s bite” (183).

As a whole, the essays offer insight into both Velázquez’s paintings and the cultural framework in which they were created. Comprehensive in scope, the volume considers paintings by Velázquez from each period of his long career and in every pictorial genre in which he worked. In addition to the themes addressed in this collection, promising areas for exploration might have included his documented engagement with contemporary optical theories, the critical context of his stylistic development, or a close analysis of his role in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century discourse. The essays in *The Cambridge Companion to Velázquez* nevertheless provide a touchstone for examining the directions in which scholarship on the artist is advancing and, equally important, pose new perspectives for relating the painter and his works to the art and culture of early modern Spain.


This thoughtfully-chosen collection of essays is a welcome guide to the labyrinthine world of Cervantes scholarship. Cervantes is one of those few great writers whose work itself is so complex that the maze of critical studies it has generated is almost impossible to navigate without assistance, especially to those non-specialists who have not spent a lifetime acquiring this type of expertise. But this volume will prove valuable even to specialists, for few cervantistas would claim to dominate every “minor” work of this author, let alone every theoretical approach to every text in the corpus.
This book contains a good balance of traditional and newer approaches. As would be appropriate for any guide to a field, all but one of the contributors are well-established scholars with senior ranking in the profession. Several of them, however, are writing within “new” or only recently-developed critical traditions in the arena of Cervantes studies. Several of the essayists note the inherently conservative nature of most Cervantes scholarship up until quite recently. This trend is perhaps due to the fact that most cervantistas have usually been white, Eurocentric males. The representation in this volume of feminist, psychoanalytical, and New World perspectives, especially toward the end of the book, demonstrates that this field of criticism is finally “catching up” with the rest of the scholarly world. In fact, it seems that within the last twenty years there has been a veritable explosion of criticism on Cervantes written from more “cutting edge” theoretical standpoints ranging from materialism to queer theory. There have also been laudable interdisciplinary studies stemming from artistic and religious approaches to Cervantes’ texts. It is only appropriate that this explosion of new critical interpretations
be accompanied by a new volume such as this one. In that sense its publication is very timely indeed.

The book begins with notes on the contributors, a chronology of Cervantes' life, a note on editions and translations, a list of Cervantes' works, and a brief introduction. It ends, as any up-to-date volume of this type should, with an appendix of electronic editions and scholarly resources. As editor, Cescardi states the purpose of the volume in the broadest possible terms:

The present volume is a “companion” to Cervantes. Without slighting Don Quixote in the least, it aims to provide an accompaniment to the broad range of Cervantes' work—in prose fiction, in drama, and in verse. The essays assembled here, all written with this purpose in mind, strive to situate his work historically, to place it within the wider context of early modern (Renaissance) literature, and to give an account of its importance for the subsequent development of the major literary genres. (2)

We see here that these essays are new, having been commissioned specifically for this volume. As such, they are by and large useful surveys of the scholarship in each subfield they are meant to cover. They do not attempt to break new critical ground but rather to survey the existing work in a given area and assess the importance of a range of contributions.

The collection starts out strong and ends with a flourish. The first essay, by B. W. Ife, is titled simply “The Historical and Social Context.” It delivers what it promises, examining in detail particularly the history of the monarchy and the emergence of Spain as a world power. It explores issues of class and race (i.e., “purity of blood”) as they were affected by legislation and political upheavals of this time period. It chronicles the “discovery” of the New World, the defeat of the Invincible Armada, and the fluctuations of the Spanish economy. It is an incisive and accurate snapshot of the world in which Cervantes lived.
The next essay, “Cervantes and the Italian Renaissance,” is my personal favorite (it also provides all three of the book’s illustrations). I would see its purpose as twofold: to demonstrate Cervantes’ obsession with Italy and to show his conscious imitation of the classics in the manner of the Renaissance humanists. Frederick De Armas executes these two ambitious projects with elegance and ease, and the results are more than convincing. It would take an “insider” in the world of Cervantes studies to realize that the connections he is proposing are far from obvious; if anything, they verge on heterodoxy to the staunch supporters of the older view of Cervantes as a “lay genius” who did not consciously partake of the classical heritage. De Armas is not the first to have concluded that Cervantes was a great deal more learned than he seemed or even wanted to reveal at first glance. Alban Forcione, following Américo Castro, had long argued for a genealogy of Christian humanism to be traced through Cervantes’ Persiles as well as his novelas ejemplares. The prominence of De Armas’ work in this volume signals to the world of Cervantes scholars that
the famous *ingenio logo* formulation has been, effectively, defeated.

No volume purporting to be a companion to Cervantes would be complete without an essay on the development of the novel. Cascardi himself answers the call of duty with a handy essay reiterating the insistence that Cervantes basically invented the novel as we know it; he executes this summation utilizing the familiar critical framework derived from Bakhtin. Alexander Welsh’s essay on “The Influence of Cervantes” is a broadly comparative study of the many novels since Cervantes that have drawn on him for inspiration. Similarly obligatory are Mary Gaylord’s entry on “Cervantes’ Other Fiction,” describing primarily *La Galatea*, the *Persiles*, and the *novelas ejemplares*, and Melveena McKendrick’s magisterial treatment of Cervantes’ “Writings for the Stage.” The former does a stylish job of demonstrating often-unnoticed coherence within Cervantes’ *obras completas*, revealing in the less-studied works some recognizable precursors and echoes of characters, techniques, and themes (such as perspectivism) that we also find in the *Quijote*. McKendrick’s study is probably the most useful
essay in the volume, in the sense that not even a specialist can possibly keep track of every *entremés* or dramatic interlude ever penned by Cervantes. It provides the kind of succinct summaries that make this reference work one to which scholars will return again and again.

The last three essays are somewhat more “trendy” but still based on rock-solid scholarship. These approaches have come only recently to be accepted into the canon of Cervantes studies. Adrienne Martín’s study of “Humor and Violence in Cervantes,” Anne Cruz’s survey of work done on “Psyche and Gender,” and Diana De Armas Wilson’s suggestive treatment of “Cervantes and the New World” round out a diverse collection of essays representing some of the most important critical developments. Martín’s essay begins rather basically with definitions of humor, while Cruz’s survey is in large part a defense of the legitimacy of psychoanalytical approaches to literature. That these gestures would be considered necessary demonstrates just how conservative this scholarly field still is. But Cruz in particular does a good job of historicizing the theoretical movements in their own right and acknowledging the
emphasis of these approaches on the critics' concerns of the moment rather than the literature itself. Her essay is a fair and balanced assessment of even some of the more “far out” or less well-received (but highly publicized) critical treatments of Cervantes in recent years.

The worst criticism to which this volume remains vulnerable is that its citation format is confusing. Most of the essays include endnotes and then a list of suggestions for further reading. But repeatedly within the volume one encounters interlinear citations (not tied to endnotes) to books not listed in the “Further Reading” sections. For some of these citations, this reader could not find anywhere a full reference to the original work. This aspect of the format must have been overlooked in the editing process. One other complaint would be that individual authors sometimes refer to titles of Cervantes’ works by different translations, even within the space of a single page (e.g., *El retablo de las maravillas* becomes variously *The Miracle Show* or *The Wonder Show*, 155). For a reader unable to translate the original Spanish, this inconsistent practice would prove confusing. A few unfortunate misspellings
and typos also mar the final product: “an nonexistent lover” (187), “Don Quixote itself contain many” (208), and the most offensive to this reader, “Texts A&M University” (!) (227). But these errors are minimal and do not detract much from this valuable tool. All in all, a fine accomplishment, and one that equals the sum of its elegant parts.


In 1654, Vincenzio Viviani, one of Galileo Galilei’s last students in Tuscany, wrote a biography of his teacher. In this work, Viviani seemingly exaggerated Galileo’s exploits as an experimenter. For example, Viviani claimed that in Galileo’s youth he dropped heavy objects from the leaning tower of Pisa to prove his anti-Aristotelian theory regarding heavy falling bodies. Similarly, Viviani described how Galileo observed a swinging chandelier inside Pisa’s Cathedral, an observation that, according to Viviani, led Galileo to think of the motion of the pendulum. Despite the likelihood that these events never ac-