

REVIEW ARTICLE

---

## Authors and Readers in the 1605 *Quixote*<sup>1</sup>

SHANNON M. POLCHOW

---

In recent years, there have been several shorter studies devoted to the readers in and the reading of *Don Quixote*. Edward H. Friedman's and Salvador J. Fajardo's commentaries on the reading experience come to mind, and James A. Parr has a piece on readers and narratees in the homage volume for Augustin Redondo. María Stoopen is the first to bring forth a book-length study centering around reader response, however. Her *Los autores, el texto, los lectores en el Quijote de 1605* might be expected, therefore, to be a pioneering study of its kind.

As the title of her book suggests, María Stoopen undertakes here a dense and detailed study of the interplay among authors, narrators, readers, and the text of the 1605 edition of *Don Quixote*, paying particular attention to the prefatory pages (dedication and prologue) and to the first nine chapters. Basing her study largely on reception theory, Stoopen attempts to decipher the complicated narratological structure of Cervantes' masterpiece. In her

---

<sup>1</sup> María Stoopen. *Los autores, el texto, los lectores en el Quijote de 1605*. Mexico City: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México—Universidad de Guanajuato y Gobierno del Estado de Guanajuato, 2002. ISBN: 968-36-9785-2. 393 pp.

view, *Don Quixote* is more than a single text by a single author, destined to a single reader. Within the preliminary pages of Cervantes' work there is a plethora of authors and readers, all of which the Mexican *cervantista* attempts to delineate within the pages of her own text.

The first chapter, "Las dedicatorias de Miguel de Cervantes a sus mecenas. Autor y lectores históricos," covers a variety of topics. It commences with an insightful look into the world of book publishing during Cervantes' time, looking particularly at laws established by Felipe II which remained in effect well into the reign of Felipe III. Stoopen notes the required but missing *aprobación*, the reason for whose absence is unclear.

From these prefatory pages she delves into the dedication, looking not only at the dedication to *Don Quixote* but also at all of the dedications that accompany Cervantes' texts. Consistent with her stated purpose, she examines the historical readers of Cervantes, specifically those to whom the works are dedicated. Ascanio Colonna received the honor of the dedication to *La Galatea*, but when it came to *Don Quixote* of 1605, that honor was bestowed on the Duke of Béjar, Alonso Diego López de Zúñiga y Sotomayor, due to Colonna's abandonment of Aragón in 1604. There is speculation that Cervantes was not friends with either patron, but that he was introduced to each through a common acquaintance. However, the duke does not last long as Cervantes' benefactor. Every subsequent book was dedicated to the Count of Lemos, Pedro Fernández de Castro, except the *Viaje del Parnaso* whose dedication was previously promised to the son of Pedro de Tapia, Rodrigo. This change in patrons is most likely attributable to the growing prestige of the Count of Lemos. After he is named viceroy of Naples, several writers dedicate works to him. Stoopen notes that: "El, por su parte, recibe gustoso la preferencia de los escritores por su patrocinio, ya que, además de ser poeta y aficionado a las artes, está deseoso de fortalecer su prestigio público" (59).

In this opening chapter, the reader is introduced to a pattern that will predominate throughout Stoopen's text: a preponderance of summarization of well-established scholars with compar-

atively little new insight by the author. While Stoopen's observations about the *aprobación* and dedications are informative and vital for a student embarking on her career in Cervantine studies, they add no new information for those who have been in the field for some time. In this particular instance, Stoopen relies heavily on work carried out by the Cervantine biographers Jean Canavaggio and Melveena McKendrick. Work by Luis Astrana Marín, that noteworthy compiler of Cervantine documents, is also cited frequently. While the work of these scholars is laudable without exception, one might expect that an investigation into Cervantes' relationships with his patrons, particularly the one between him and the Count of Lemos, would entail a more in-depth look into the subject than might be available in a biography that necessarily has to explore many other areas. An investigation of critical studies dedicated solely to the Count of Lemos and his relationship with Cervantes and other writers is lacking in her presentation of facts. While she cites articles by Arnulfo Herrera and Félix Fernández Murga, more detailed, book-length analyses on the topic have not been consulted. For example, José María Asensio provides a brief but introspective historical account of Cervantes' principal protector. Asensio intertwines factual information with dramatized meetings between various writers and the count. Both M. Hermida Balado and Alfonso Pardo Manuel de Villena provide lengthier looks into the life of the Count of Lemos. Not only do they delve into blood lines and biographical information, they also provide a peek into literary life at the time when Pedro Fernández de Castro assumed the position of count, and also into the impact he had in literary circles.

After spending a good portion of the first chapter summarizing the work of other *cervantistas*, Stoopen begins to offer her own opinion about the narratological structure of Cervantes' works, focusing momentarily on the dedications. Instead of applying Occam's razor, as was recently suggested by Howard Mancing ("Cervantes as Narrator"), or taking her cue from Parr or Paz Gago, she embarks on a new hierarchy. After spending so much time discussing Cervantes' relationship, or lack of relation-

ship as the case may be, with his patrons, one would assume that Stoopen might assign the historical author, Cervantes, a speaking role within these dedications. One would assume incorrectly. Stoopen contends that the dedications cannot be assigned to Cervantes, the historical author. She chooses to call the author of the dedications the liminal author. The liminal author might be said to stand in the threshold between the empirical or historical author, Cervantes, and the implicit author of the text. This is just the beginning of the barrage of technical terms that Stoopen will deploy when discussing the narratological hierarchy of *Don Quixote*.

From the dedication, Stoopen logically moves to the prologue in Chapter 2, "El prólogo de 1605: autores, texto, lectores." Here, and throughout the rest of the text, she continues to look at the triad mentioned in the chapter title. Authors, readers, and the text are not separate entities. Their existences are interdependent, and crossovers do occur. This chapter has two functions: to categorize the various authors within the prologue and to show the parodic nature of Cervantes' prologue. The initial author of the prologue is the manifest author because he is the one who claims to be the stepfather of *Don Quixote*. Stoopen feels that this arrangement anticipates the text of Cide Hamete Benengeli text. The manifest author cannot say that he is the father when other versions exist on the horizon. His role changes throughout the prologue. When the friend appears on scene, "el autor inicial, que hasta este momento ha dirigido sin intermediación su discurso al lector, adopta el papel de narrador" (118). This initial author is moved to the role of implicit author, or the author that we infer from the text. The friend who relates how to write a prologue is merely a fictitious author, a creation of the implicit author in order to keep the tale moving.

Stoopen contends that this whole arrangement is yet another anticipation of the Cide Hamete text that will emerge from the *tinieblas* in Chapter 9. She explains that "así, el amigo es, en un sentido, anticipo del papel que desempeñará Cide Hamete Benengeli, a quien el primer autor de la historia cederá la responsabilidad de la autoría del libro" (118). It establishes a pattern. In the

prologue and in the actual text, the reader carefully reads the work presented by one author, but is surprised by the intrusion of another voice/presence into the text. Authors are not the only presences categorized within the chapter. Stoopen also briefly touches upon the categorization of readers of *Don Quixote*, a topic that she develops more fully in a later chapter. At this juncture, she contends that the “desocupado lector” is the implicit reader of the text. He is the reader to whom the narrative is addressed. Stoopen also asserts that there is another reader contained within the prologue: the erudite reader who will understand the parodic nature of the friend’s advice to the manifest author. It is debatable, of course, whether these entities should be called readers or narratees.

While these ideas are valid, many of them have already been presented, not by Stoopen but by Salvador Fajardo. He discusses the idea that the prologue is an introduction of the text that follows. The prologue is: “un texto en el que experimenta las mismas peripecias de lectura que ha de experimentar en los 52 capítulos que siguen. Además vale la pena notar que la filiación del prólogo es semejante a la de la historia de don Quijote en sí: el ‘autor’ se declara a la vez ‘padre’ y ‘padrastro’ del libro y su protagonista, y es padre y padrastro del prólogo, ya que, según dice, adopta sin modificarlas las palabras del amigo que forman su centro” (434). He also makes the connection between the author of the prologue being a *padrastro* and the appearance of Cide Hamete Benengeli’s text in Chapter 9. Fajardo acknowledges that the “desocupado lector” is the implicit reader of the prologue. While he notes the ironic nature of the comments of the friend who enters into the prologue, he also gives a new spin to the ironic nature of the text, which takes root in the prologue and develops throughout the fifty-two chapters. The irony resides in the manipulation of historical verisimilitude. He feels that “el aparato pseudo-empírico del *Quijote*—autores, manuscritos, traducciones, tradición oral, transmisión del texto—pretende darnos ‘lo que podría ocurrir’ como si hubiera ocurrido. La meta de este juego es echar abajo la ‘máquina’ histórica de los libros de caballerías que quiere asentar lo fantástico en lo ‘histórico,’ pero tam-

bién, y sobre todo, ocasionar un cuestionamiento del supuesto substrato empírico de toda narración, inclusive la histórica" (436). An acquaintance with Fajardo's ideas would have buttressed Stoopen's arguments while also demonstrating that she had delved into prior commentary on the subject.

In this chapter Stoopen also explores another often-discussed topic: that Cervantes' prologue parodies Lope's prologue to *El peregrino en su patria*. She feels that the author of the prologue acts as a critical reader of Lope's text and incorporates it into his own. In Stoopen's opinion, "Es claro que lo que el autor implícito del prólogo al *Quijote* pretende por medio de los autores que en él dialogan, es más satirizar un estilo usado en un determinado género que transformar lúdicamente el texto mismo, o sea, parodiarlo, en sentido estricto" (137). E. C. Riley has the best perspective when it comes to this discussion: "Whether or not Cervantes is making fun of Lope de Vega, as the commentators would have it, is immaterial: it was a common literary practice" (77). Enough said. She concludes the chapter with a discussion of the prologue's dependency on the books of chivalry. She feels that the prologue clearly contains the characteristic elements of the chivalric tradition: the fictitious historian who will base his tale on that contained within previously written manuscripts, witnesses of the events, and a hero who embodies both courtly and religious ideals in ironic opposition. The only element missing from the prologue, which will appear in Chapter 9, is a translation of the original manuscript.

Chapter 3, "El hidalgo de la Mancha, lector ficticio," moves us away from the prefatory pages and into the preliminary chapters of the text. Here Stoopen notes the nature of readers at the time. Solitary reading and private libraries are coming into favor. Don Quixote is exemplary in this regard. His genre of choice is chivalric romance. He is not the only consumer of this genre; the *cura* and the *barbero* are also devotées. However, Don Quixote lets his consumption evolve into *locura* when he allows the fictional world of chivalric narrative to permeate the real world. Literate and illiterate people alike are attracted to the books of chivalry. As is evident, Stoopen's ability to summarize shines yet again.

While this is an accurate statement of events that occur within *Don Quixote*, they are elementary observations providing no new enlightenment for the veteran scholar.

This continues into the remaining pages of the chapter, when Stoopen challenges Américo Castro and his investigations into the genealogy of the protagonist, specifically whether or not he has a *mancha* in his blood line. She displays her ability to summarize once again and gives Castro's position on the subject. After exploring his views, Stoopen concludes that the narrator elects to remain ambiguous on the topic. He neither supports the idea that Don Quixote has a *mancha* nor does he deny it. She does not discuss whether the narrator is being ironic, or is perhaps being treated ironically himself by the author, or whether he shows himself to be trustworthy. Again, she does not consult more pertinent studies on the subject. In an article studying Cervantes' *mancha* and its possible manifestation in *Don Quixote*, Michael McGaha asserts the following: "Since the 1960s a number of books and articles on this subject have been published. Although some of these have attracted considerable attention among the general reading public, I don't believe any of them has had a significant impact on Cervantes scholarship. This is probably partly due to the fact that none was written by an academic with specialized training in Cervantes studies." While McGaha does not offer his own arguments on the topic, he does provide thoughts from other scholars. Perspectives by Dominique Aubier, Leandro Rodríguez, Ruth Reichelberg, and Daniel Eisenberg are presented. Granted, while discussion on the topic is sparse, some of these opinions could have been consulted by Stoopen, but were not. Naturally, one could question the pertinence of the whole issue. Is it demonstrably helpful in understanding and appreciating the texts themselves?

Chapter 4, "El sistema autoral y narrativo en el *Quijote* de 1605," is, in my estimation, the most problematical of the text. Even though Stoopen's intent is valid, various comments made are slightly off the mark. She attempts to summarize what other critics have said on the narratological structure of *Don Quixote*, basing most of the content of the chapter on work done by Mik-

hail Bakhtin, José María Paz Gago, and Charles Presberg. She commences with Bakhtin's idea of the polyphonic novel. Stoopen agrees with his assertion that *Don Quixote* is the first polyphonic text and she goes further by stating that its predecessors, the books of chivalry, remain in the world of monologic discourse. This is an erroneous assertion since various chivalric narratives, such as the *Libro del caballero Zifar*, *Amadís de Gaula*, and *Tirant lo blanc*, all exhibit heteroglossia. She proceeds to contradict herself in a later chapter when she cites the work of Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua and states that: "La 'simbiosis entre ambas funciones...el autor responsable del relato y la figura del narrador encargado de transmitirlo a los lectores-oyentes' es uno de los recursos presentes ya en el *Amadís* y explotado por Cervantes con plena conciencia" (225). Is this not an assertion that heteroglossia exists in the chivalric romances? This would then negate her claim that *Don Quixote* is the first polyphonic text. One would not expect an error of this magnitude after reading the previous chapter, in which Stoopen spends much time on the nature of the books of chivalry.

In a brief two pages, Stoopen gives a skeletal paraphrase of James A. Parr's narrative hierarchy of voices and presences. This pales in comparison to the in-depth look at Paz Gago's views on the narrative structure. She claims that Paz Gago is unique in that he separates his hierarchy into narrators and pseudo-authors. While Paz Gago definitely makes a more detailed distinction in this respect, one cannot discount the work done after 1988 by Parr, with which Stoopen is apparently unfamiliar. Even though Parr's 1988 scheme focuses more on narrative voices and presences, he does briefly touch on authors, particularly the inferred author and the author/researcher of Chapters 1–8, and he has subsequently dealt with the role of Cide Hamete. He first published his scheme of narrative voices in 1986 and began to apply Gérard Genette in 1988 in his book *Don Quixote: An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse*. This is prior to Paz Gago's article "El Quijote: Narratología," which appeared in 1989. Well before either of them, however, the Italian scholar Letizia Bianchi had applied Genette to a study of the interpolated stories of Part I. José Ma-

nuel Martín Morán made a sustained application of Genette to both Parts in 1990, five years prior to Paz Gago's *Semiótica del Quijote: teoría y práctica de la ficción narrativa*.

Other figures in the study of narrative voices have their own voices relegated to the chorus. Stoopen gives important commentaries by George Haley, Ruth El Saffar, and Colbert I. Nepaulsingh only a sentence, and their work is merely filtered through Paz Gago. She states: "Paz Gago hace un repaso de las diferentes posturas críticas sobre los diversos componentes del sistema autorial y narrativo" (192), and then gives a summary of his investigation. Thomas A. Lathrop is left out of this particular section, while others such as John J. Allen, Howard Mancing, José Manuel Martín Morán, Jesús G. Maestro, and Alan Burch do not receive even passing mention. A significant omission is Haley's 1984 piece on the first author as a discarded voice. First-hand knowledge of that study might have led her to alter some of her ideas. Considerably more reference might have been made to John G. Weiger's *In the Margins of Cervantes* and also to Michel Moner's *Cervantès conteur* (which is not listed), since both cover some of the same ground. While I have no problem with Stoopen relying heavily on Paz Gago, since his is the most complete narratological analysis to date, I do feel that due credit should be given the pioneers and precursors in this area.

Stoopen starts to expound on her own ideas concerning the narratological structure of the preliminary chapters of *Don Quixote* in Chapter 5, "Las mediaciones de la estructura y la lectura." She feels that the changing of voices in the prologue is an anticipation of what will occur in the first nine chapters of the text. The voice that appears in the beginning chapters is that of the implicit author of the prologue. He, like Don Quixote, is a reader of texts. He has read other versions of the story and has consulted the Annals of La Mancha. Based on his reading, and his awareness of oral tradition, he has created a definitive version. While compiling the text, he also narrates. He interrupts "para definir, describir, calificar o emitir juicios sobre lo que piensa o hace el protagonista o bien sobre la manera como lo perciben y reaccionan ante él los demás personajes" (229). This forthcoming posture allows

him to create a special relationship of complicity with the reader. However, this author-narrator changes roles at the end of Chapter 8.

At this point, the author-narrator cannot continue on with the story. He has found no other materials on which to draw. The narration of the story is handed over to a *segundo autor*. This second author has been hiding in the shadows, reading along with us all the while. He cannot bear the thought of leaving the battle between Don Quixote and the *vizcaíno* without resolution. In Chapter 9, his role changes from reader to author-narrator. At this point, the author of the prologue and I, 1–8 returns to the role of compiler or editor. Stoopen waits until the next chapter to explain that: “componedor es el autor explícito del prólogo, autor inicial de los primeros ocho capítulos” (283). This second author, who has just come out of the shadows, writes and narrates how he finds the missing text. However, his role will change once again when we are introduced to the text by Cide Hamete Benengeli. He becomes another compiler at this point who filters Cide Hamete’s text for us.

Chapter 6, “La autoría y la instancia narradora del texto definitivo,” explores the author-reader-text triad, showing how this manifests itself within the *segundo autor*. He is a reader who has followed along with the text just as we have. He cannot bear the thought of Don Quixote’s tale terminating in mid-fight. His role changes to that of author and he continues with the rest of the story with the discovery of Cide Hamete Benengeli’s manuscript. With more reliance on the work of Paz Gago, Stoopen also revisits her narratological hierarchy by recapitulating her previously presented material.

Chapter 7, “La diseminación del *Quijote* I en el *Quijote* II,” highlights similarities between the two parts of *Don Quixote*. The prologues are parallel in that both display intertextuality. While Lope de Vega’s prologue to *El peregrino en su patria* informs the 1605 prologue, Avellaneda’s spurious text provides tinder for the prologue of 1615. While the 1615 prologue is quite personal in nature and could be attributed to the pen of Cervantes, Stoopen continues to refer to the prologuist as the liminal author who

stands in the threshold between the empirical author, Cervantes, and the implicit author. The prologue in this instance is extended into the dedication to the Count of Lemos, where the liminal author becomes a character in his own story. From the opening of the first chapter, with its “Cuenta Cide Hamete Benengeli” construction, Stoopen feels that the narratological games played in the 1605 edition are continued in the second part. Since the construction is similar to the story filtered through the second author in Part I, she contends that the pattern is extended into the 1615 edition, with the second author continuing his retelling of Cide Hamete’s text.

There are two persistent mistakes that should be mentioned. It is surprising to see that every reference to Sigismunda is misspelled as Segismunda; also, Pinciano sometimes appears as Pini-ciano. Except for these oversights and the fact that the technical terms used become a bit burdensome (e.g., liminal, implicit, explicit, manifest, empirical, pseudo-, and inferred authors), this is an informative work, if only for its synopses of earlier critics’ ideas. Although the effort is uneven, because it relies too much on summarizing some critics, while neglecting to consult others, María Stoopen should nevertheless be congratulated for attempting to offer a fresh perspective on the encoding, transmission, and reception of Cervantes’ polyphonic text.

Department of Hispanic Studies  
University of California, Riverside  
Riverside, California 92521-0222  
spolchow@yahoo.com

#### WORKS CITED

- Allen, John J. *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool? A Study in Narrative Technique*. Gainesville, FL: U of Florida P, 1969.  
———. *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool? Part II*. Gainesville, FL: U Presses of Florida, 1979.

- . "The Narrators, the Reader and Don Quijote." *MLN* 91 (1976): 201–12.
- Asensio, José María. *El conde de Lemos, protector de Cervantes*. Madrid, 1880.
- Astrana Marín, Luis. *Vida ejemplar y heroica de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, con mil documentos hasta ahora inéditos y numerosas ilustraciones y grabados de época*. 7 vols. Madrid: Reus, 1948–58.
- Aubier, Dominique. *Don Quichotte, prophète d'Israël: essai*. Paris: R. Laffont, 1966.
- . *Don Quijote, profeta y cabalista*. Barcelona: Obelisco, 1981.
- Bianchi, Letizia. "Verdadera historia e novelas nella prima parte del Quijote." *Studi Ispanici*. Pisa: Giardini, 1980. 121–68.
- Burch, Alan Jay. "Don Quijote and Narrative Theory: A Critical and Metacritical Reading." Diss. Indiana U, 1995.
- . "Don Quijote and Narratology: The Segundo autor as Extradiegetic Narrator." *Brave New Words: Studies in Spanish Golden Age Literature*. Ed. Edward H. Friedman and Catherine Larson. New Orleans: UP of the South, 1996.
- Cacho Blecua, Juan Manuel. Introducción. *Amadís de Gaula*. By Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo. Vol. 1. Madrid: Cátedra, 2001. 17–216.
- Canavaggio, Jean. *Cervantes*. Trans. J. R. Jones. New York: Norton, 1990.
- Eisenberg, Daniel. *La interpretación cervantina del Quijote*. Trad. Isabel Verdaguer. Madrid: Compañía Literaria, 1995. 30 July 2005 <<http://users.ipfw.edu/jehle/deisenbe/interpet/ICQindic.htm>>.
- El Saffar, Ruth. *Distance and Control in Don Quixote: A Study of Narrative Technique*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina Department of Romance Languages, 1975.
- Fajardo, Salvador J. "La aventura de una lectura." *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*. By Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Ed. Salvador J. Fajardo and James A. Parr. Asheville, NC: Pegasus, 1998. 431–38.
- . "Closure in *Don Quixote* I: A Reader's Canon." *Cervantes* 14.1 (1994): 41–60. 15 August 2004 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/bcsas94.htm>>.

- . "Unveiling Dorotea or the Reader as Voyeur." *Cervantes* 4 (1984): 89–108. 15 August 2004 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/bcsaf84.htm>>.
- Fernández Murga, Félix. "El Conde de Lemos, Virrey-Mecenas de Nápoles." *Actas del II Congreso Internacional de la Asociación de Cervantistas*. Ed. Giuseppe Grilli. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1995. 5–27.
- Friedman, Edward H. "Reading Inscribed: *Don Quixote* and the Parameters of Fiction." *On Cervantes: Essays for L. A. Murillo*. Ed. James A. Parr. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1991. 63–84.
- . "Reading Redressed; or, The Media Circuits of *Don Quijote*." *Confluencia* 9.2 (1994): 38–51.
- Haley, George. "The Narrator in *Don Quixote*: A Discarded Voice." *Estudios en honor a Ricardo Gullón*. Ed. Darío Villanueva and Luis T. González-del-Valle. Lincoln, NE: Society of Spanish and Spanish-American Studies, 1984.
- . "The Narrator in *Don Quixote*: Maese Pedro's Puppet Show." *MLN* 80 (1965): 145–65.
- Hermida Balado, M. *Vida del VII Conde de Lemos (interpretación de un mecenazgo)*. Madrid: Nos, 1948.
- Herrera, Arnulfo. "La reivindicación de un mecenas." *Patrocinio, colección y circulación de las artes. Memoria del XX Congreso Internacional del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas*. Mexico City: UNAM, 1997. 1–17.
- Lathrop, Thomas A. "Who is the Narrator in *Don Quijote*?" *Hispanic Studies in Honor of Joseph H. Silverman*. Ed. Joseph Ricapito. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1988. 297–304.
- Maestro, Jesús G. "El sistema narrativo del *Quijote*: la construcción del personaje Cide Hamete Benengeli." *Cervantes* 15.1 (1995): 111–41. 15 August 2004 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/bcsas95.htm>>.
- Mancing, Howard. "Cervantes as Narrator of *Don Quijote*." *Cervantes* 23.1 (2003): 117–40. 15 August 2004 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/bcsas03.htm>>.
- . *The Chivalric World of Don Quijote: Style, Structure, and Narrative Technique*. Columbia, MO: U of Missouri P, 1982.

- . "Cide Hamete Benengeli vs. Miguel de Cervantes: The Metafictional Dialectic of *Don Quijote*." *Cervantes* 1 (1981): 63–81. 15 August 2004 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/bcsaf81.htm>>.
- Martín Morán, José Manuel. *El Quijote en ciernes: los descuidos de Cervantes y las fases de elaboración textual*. Alessandria: dell'Orso, 1990.
- McGaha, Michael. "Is There a Hidden Jewish Meaning in *Don Quixote*?" *Cervantes* 24.1 (2004): 173–88. 15 August 2004 <<http://www.h-net.org/~cervantes/csa/bcsas04.htm>>.
- McKendrick, Merveena. *Cervantes*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1980.
- Moner, Michel. *Cervantès conteur: écrits et paroles*. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 1989.
- Nepaulsingh, Colbert I. "La aventura de los narradores del *Quijote*." *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas*. Ed. Alan M. Gordon and Evelyn Rugg. Toronto: U of Toronto, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, 1980.
- Pardo Manuel de Villena, Alfonso. *Un mecenas español del siglo XVII, El conde de Lemos. Noticia de su vida y de sus relaciones con Cervantes, Lope de Vega, los Argensola y demás literatos de su época*. Madrid, 1911.
- Parr, James A. *Don Quixote: An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1988.
- . "La recepción del sentido: lectores y narratarios en el *Quijote*." *Homenaje a Augustin Redondo*. 2 vols. Ed. Pierre Civil. Madrid: Castalia, en prensa.
- . "Las voces del *Quijote* y la subversión de la autoridad." *Actas del VIII Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*. 2 vols. Ed. José Amor y Vázquez *et al.* Madrid: Istmo, 1986. 2: 401–08. 2 August 2005 <[http://cvc.cervantes.es/obref/aih/pdf/08/aih\\_08\\_2\\_048.pdf](http://cvc.cervantes.es/obref/aih/pdf/08/aih_08_2_048.pdf)>.
- Paz Gago, José María. "El *Quijote*: Narratología." *Anthropos* 100 (1989): 43–48.
- . *Semiótica del Quijote: teoría y práctica de la ficción narrativa*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995.
- Reichelberg, Ruth. *Don Quichotte ou le roman d'un juif masqué*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1999.

- 
- Riley, E. C. *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel*. 1962. Rev. ed. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1992.
- Rodríguez, Leandro. *Don Miguel, judío de Cervantes*. Santander: Editorial Cervantina, 1978.
- Weiger, John G. *In the Margins of Cervantes*. Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 1988.