

abstract and theorized architecture of Renaissance Italy, England's architecture was "hétéroclite, empirique, charnelle, équivoque" (485) (disparate, empirical, carnal/fleshy, equivocal), combining order and disorder—a tension to which, as Cunin shows well in this study, Shakespeare also gave form, like De l'Orme, as both mason and architect.

✠✠✠

El Quijote Hoy: La riqueza de su recepción. Ed. Klaus-Dieter Ertler and Alejandro Rodríguez Díaz. Madrid: Iberoamericana, and Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 2007. 290 pp. n.p. ISBN 978-84-8489-300-4.

REVIEWED BY: Linde M. Brocato, University of Illinois,
Urbana-Champaign.

Of the reading and discussing of the *Quixote*, there is no end—even in the *Quixote* itself. In part, the essays in *El Quijote hoy* both demonstrate and discuss this very point, in greater detail and at greater length. Indeed, we are all seduced by the *Quixote*, becoming rather like the protagonist(s) of the novel, living in the eternal tension between life/ reality/ history and literature/ discourse/ language, in an *espejismo* both reflected in and created by the novel. Yet, if anything, Cervantes both embodies and questions the tendency both of remaining a credulous reader, as well as of radically separating the (two) dimensions.

The essays in this volume participate fully in this very tension, most taking one side or the other in the *porfía*, yet with some very salutary exits from that economy. "Reception" in this anthology means different things in different essays. Indeed, rather than a roll call of the essays and their topics, the introduction might have illuminated the range of meanings and possibilities of "reception," since the essays run the gamut from criticism and editing, to translation and appropriation.

Some essays, a majority of them focusing on the first volume (1605) which is often taken synecdochically as the entire novel, are themselves "receptions" and regulators of reception: critical readings of the novel's structure, autoreflexivity, metafictionality, and complexity. Some trace Cervantes' reception of literary tradition in the *Quixote*; much mention is made of discourse in general, although attention remains focused almost entirely on literary discourse(s). Others trace the reception of the novel itself, in literary and intellectual traditions or in particular works across genres and cultures (poetry and novel; in Spanish, English, and German), using more and less traditional terms and critical frameworks. The most useful and refreshing of the essays also reflect on the academic and critical traditions surrounding current work on and teaching of the *Quixote* (Varela). Essays focusing on translations and adaptations of Cervantes' novel in the German and East European literary traditions are particularly pathbreaking.

The texts are for the most part from an interdisciplinary symposium at the University of Graz (Austria) in 2005, celebrating the fourth centenary of the publication of the *Quixote* (and, again, the publication of the first part is taken synecdochically for the entire work). The writers range from scholars at various European universities, to creative writers of other stripes. One essay is cited as originally published in *Foreign Policy* 8, leading one to suspect it was a translation, when—as I found, only after diligent and assiduous searching—it was actually published in *FP en español* (no issue or volume number, and available to subscribers at <http://www.fp-es.org/cervantes-contra-huntington>); the question that remains is which venue shaped the text. This points to an issue with many essays in the anthology; often, citation is insufficient for finding the materials cited, and, indeed, some sources go completely uncited, even while quoted extensively. While it is altogether reasonable to have an almost entirely European and Eastern European focus in the work these essays represent,

a gesture in the direction of a more global intellectual and academic culture would perhaps be in order (slavish reduction of the intellectual and scholarly world to an Anglo-American orbit is not remedied by refusing to make use of or acknowledge work from those discourse communities).

In a way, what is at play here are the very gifts and problems of being "classic" and studying the classics—seduction and tautology. Critics and students of classic works are drawn in with the rest of us (if they were not powerfully and broadly seductive, they would not be considered or "become" classics), and, if consideration of such works remains within the bounds of the canon/ical, it often tends to define the thing by itself. Thus, when one defines the "modern novel" as having begun somehow with the *Quixote*, it is because the *Quixote* has in fact been canonized as the beginning of the literary modern. In fact, as Varela's essays in this anthology note, the very techniques taken as evidence of the "modernity" initiated by the *Quixote* can be found in various other more and less canonical works of Spanish literature of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance, if not gathered and concentrated as they are in the work of their attentive reader Cervantes (and, often, the writers here might have benefited from more grounding in the Iberian fifteenth century). And, speaking of reception, the most significant of these previous (and unsung modern) works had already laid fertile ground for the translation of the *Quixote* into English and its integration into the literary tradition in that language.

On the level of literary theory, taking up the *Quixote* to prove the power and usefulness of Bakhtin's central theoretical contributions—carnival, dialogism—is carrying tautological coals to Newcastle, since those very theories are in fact based on his reading of Cervantes (an omnipresent foundation for much of Bakhtin's theoretical work, visible to the attentive reader familiar with the Spanish tradition). Further, if the *Quixote* reveals features of our modern epistemology, it is perhaps because the *Quixote* is one of the foundational texts for that very epistemology. And so on. Nonetheless, the volume contains substantive contributions to criticism and metacriticism of the *Quixote*, which are useful and rewarding.

✠✠✠

Duplex Amor Dei: Contextuele karakteristiek van de theologie van Jacobus Arminius (1559–1609). Willem Arie den Boer. Apeldoorn: Instituut voor Reformatieonderzoek, 2008. 342 pp. n.p. ISBN 978-90-75847-21-5.

REVIEWED BY: Richard A. Beinert, Concordia Lutheran Seminary,
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

In this first volume published by the Apeldoorn "Institute for Reformation Research," Willem den Boer offers his readers a fresh interpretation of Jacob Arminius's theology. Often invoked within historical and theological studies, Arminius's name has come to be associated with the legacy of Remonstrantist thought with its emphasis on the notion of the justice of God. While this association is by no means unreasonable, given his position as the landmark theologian from which later Remonstrant clergy took their cue, it has led to a confusion by which the distinctive elements of Arminius's theology have come to be forgotten under the veil of the ensuing tradition that had been sparked by his doctrinal reforms. Boer sets out to correct this oversight through a careful systematic analysis of his thought as reflected in Arminius's own works.

The study is divided into two chief parts. The first begins with a biographical overview of Arminius's career as a theologian and reformer. Within the structure of this work, this introduction is more than just a simple introduction to Arminius's life. Boer here sets out the contours of his larger methodology, framing both his study as well as the structures of