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Greetings and farewell

In January of 2008, I had brunch with Fred de Armas, the CSA President, in Chicago, to discuss my being Editor of this Bulletin. The Society was in a bad situation because there had been no issues of the Bulletin published for the previous two years. There were articles lined up, but they needed to be organized, typeset, printed, bound, and mailed off.

I took on the job and got those truant issues in the mail in six weeks. I mean, I make books in a hurry. That’s what I do. I also improved the typography, and put some pretty striking full-color covers on the Bulletin. I also did some things in the wings to make things run smoother and at less expense.

The Bulletin is running well, it is up-to-date, and looks good. And now, because I have some urgent projects clamoring for attention, and because I am not forty years old anymore—and especially since I am running out of Jack Davis illustrations for the cover—it is time to pass the torch on. The Society selected Bruce Burningham to replace me, and the Spring 2011 number, and those hopefully for a dozen more years, will be his.

I would like to introduce Bruce to you all now. Bruce, these are the members of the Society; Members of the Society, this is Bruce.

The Outgoing Editor Toots his Horn
I am really pleased to announce that my translation of Don Quixote is going to replace Walter Starkie’s in the Signet Classics series on April 5 of 2011. Signet Classics is the perfect place for this book, in my opinion, and I am really delighted. On the other hand, Walter Starkie was my professor at UCLA, and it gives me an odd sensation to realize that my book is pushing his off the shelf, as well as Ed Friedman’s good introduction. I
remember in 1964 when Starkie’s translation came out, there was a big stack of them in the UCLA bookstore. I did considerable soul-searching about the expense of purchasing it, but I finally shelled out the dollar and a quarter that it cost. After all, Starkie was my prof.

My same translation has already been published in England by OneWorld Classics. Well, not really the same, since it had to be homogenized for the British audience.

**How “October 5, 2006” convinced me to produce a brand new, elegant edition, of *Don Quijote***

Matthew Moore, then an M.A. student at the University of Delaware, told me a couple of years ago that there was an intrusive date in the middle of a sentence in my edition of the *Quijote*. Sure enough, on p. 247, line 4, it says: “…eran las provincias ni puertos de mar, y October 5, 2006 que así había...” You can look it up in the “Fourth Centenary Edition.” Previous editions obviously are free from this dopey error. I was horrified and incredibly embarrassed. This was clearly the result of pushing the wrong button inadvertently while making a correction nearby on, ah, October 5, 2006.

I thought I must do a new printing immediately to eliminate the stupid error, but on reflection I thought I should take my time and re-do everything to make a really Wonderful New Edition. I would use great new typography (as in this *Bulletin*), and take advantage of the photographs and illustrations from the original version of the translation published in my Cervantes&Co. series. I think the photographs will help comprehension (the bulls of Guisando, the windmills of Consuegra, the bay of Lepanto, the Roman Pantheon) and the fifty-five illustrations by Jack Davis will be a delight. The revision is about half finished.

**How I Invented Mini-notes.**

In the last number, I included a half page article about a nanolithograph of don Quixote and Sancho based on information provided by Félix Rico, through his father Francisco. Well, I didn’t know anything about nano stuff, so all I could do was to write a couple of paragraphs. *Voilà!* A mini-note! This time, Helena Percas de Ponseti had a small but fascinat-
ing point she wanted to make, as you’ll see in a moment, a full two pages long, quite a bit longer than my nano-article. And I also include a two-page article by Jim Montgomery about Part II of the Quijote, chapter 58, which supports the notion that Cervantes didn’t necessarily find out about Avellaneda until he was writing Chapter 59. Jim is a fellow translator of Don Quixote (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009).

**News about the Cervantes&Co. «Cervantes» editions.**
The Cervantes collection continues to grow. My Don Quijote started it all, and you just read about its new edition; soon all twelve Novelas Ejemplares will be in print (four already are); La numancia has been published and two more plays, El trato de Argel and La entretrenida, are waiting patiently by; All the Entremeses, plus “Los habladores,” has been published; and finally Persiles is all but finished. This is enormously satisfying to me.

**Avellaneda? 2014?**
The second book in the Juan de la Cuesta series (1980) was a translation of Avellaneda. To celebrate the dubious fourth centenary of the publication of Avellaneda’s book, we’ll come out with a Really Nice, newly typeset version, in a larger format to show off the wonderful illustrations.

**News about some of the articles.**
The first article is by Carroll Johnson. It was among his “Morisco” papers, which formed most of his posthumous book, Cervantes and the Moriscos—Translating a Culture, which we recently published in the Juan de la Cuesta series. His keynote article in this number had a theme different from his book’s and more appropriate for this publication. I am very happy to see it here.

In the last article Jack Weiner takes us into the life of a Cuban book collector who owned a copy of the first 1605 Don Quijote. Something you don’t think about—on whose shelves did these books sit?

In my final number I am happy to see pieces by the incoming Editor, Bruce Burningham, and by my Assistant to the Editor, Matt Wyszynski, whose last name I never misspell because I have to look it up every time.
Finally, I thank the Associate Editors for their unbiased appraisals of articles to insure that the Bulletin only publishes the good stuff. I look forward to Bruce’s tenure in this position. He will doubtless do better than I did.

T.L.
Una vez más sobre Vicente de la Rosa–Roca y Gante y Luna

Helena Percas de Ponseti

Ayer abrí el último Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America (Spring 2010) y me encontré con el excelente artículo de Abraham Madroñal, “De Nuevo sobre ‘Gante y Luna’ (1, 51) ¿Otra errata en el primer Quijote?” Lo que me impresionó aparte de señalar errores de copistas y restituciones de prominentes cervantistas además de las acertadas restituciones del presente autor, su ingenioso tejer y destejer la valentía “de dos desconocidos como Gante y Luna, junto al famoso García de Paredes” (p.37) que exalta Lope de Vega, el enemigo y contrincante literario de Cervantes, uno de los principales motivos de su artículo, cuyos constantes conflictos he tratado numerosas veces.

Lo que quiero volver a recordar aquí, es que Vicente no se llama de la Roca o Rosa ni de la Rosa o Roca, sino las dos primeras veces es de la Rosa y la tercera vez de la Roca, y que no se trata de un olvido ni desliz de Cervantes. En la edición Clásicos Jackson de 1948 publicada en Buenos Aires bajo la dirección de un comité selectivo integrado por Alfonso Reyes, Francisco Romero, Federico de Onís, Ricardo Baez, Germán Aciniegas, se anota que en la primera edición dos de las tres veces se lee Rosa y una Roca (p. 532, n.4) pero mantienen Roca. En la edición del Instituto Cervantes de 2004 dirigida por Francisco Rico se le llama Roca las tres veces sin anotación.¹

En la edición facsímil de la Real Academia (1605),² comprobaro que las dos primeras veces se le llama Rosa (305 verso y 306). La tercera vez

¹ Centro para la edición de Clásicos Españoles, Navarra-Barcelona, 2004, Primera parte, n.18, 632,634
² Obras completas de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, Madrid, Tomo II, 1917
Leandra le llama Roca (306 verso) cuando cuenta sin apremio cómo Vicente la había engañado. Ambos apellidos le cuadran a maravilla: es Rosa, la diosa del amor carnal, la diosa (Venus), mientras enamoraba a Leandra pero más duro que la Roca cuando la roba y abandona en una cueva. Es Leandra quien lo llama Roca. No se trata de ningún error de Cervantes.

En cuanto a Gante y Luna, mi inolvidable amiga, María Soledad Carrasco Urgoiti—medievalista brillante, que ya no está entre nosotros, Marisol la llamábamos desde que nos conocimos de estudiantes—me dijo de viva voz que ni Gante (Carlos de Gante), ni Luna (Marco Antonio Lunel) llegaron a batirse en duelo. He aquí el comentario tácito de Cervantes sobre el invertido Rosa/Roca que contaba sus muchas hazañas, heroísmo y valentía.
Did Cervantes Learn of Avellaneda’s *Quijote* Earlier Than Chapter 59 of Part Two?

James H. Montgomery

During the many years that I spent translating *Don Quixote*, I reread the entire text more than 200 times, usually in English. Somewhere along the line, it dawned on me that Cervantes seemed to have learned of Avellaneda’s *Quijote* at least as early as the 58th chapter of Part Two. I started searching the literature to see how many other people had noticed this. To my astonishment, I found that I was apparently alone. However, each rereading reinforced my belief that Cervantes was aware of Avellaneda’s *Quijote* earlier than Chapter 59. My reason for thinking this is that in Chapter 58 Cervantes gratuitously mentions several times the existing history of *Don Quixote*—the one by Cervantes—while pointing out that the history emphasizes that *Don Quixote is the most enamored knight in the world*, and *Sancho is extremely witty.*

Ch. 58:

“Oh, my dearest friend,” said the second shepherdess to the first, “what great good fortune has befallen us! Do you see this gentleman that we have in our midst? Well, I want you to know that he is the most valiant, the most enamored, and the most courteous knight in the entire world, unless he is not telling the truth, or we have been misled by a published history of his exploits that I have read. I dare say that this good man with him is a certain Sancho Panza, his squire, whose witty remarks cannot be equaled by anyone else’s.”
“Oh,” said the other girl, “let us ask him to stay, my dear, for our parents and brothers and sisters will be immensely pleased by it. I too have heard all these things about the knight’s valor and the squire’s wit that you mention. In addition, they say the knight is the most steadfast and faithful lover known, and his ladylove is a certain Dulcinea of Toboso, who has been proclaimed the greatest beauty in all of Spain.”

In this chapter methinks Cervantes doth protest too much.

Then in Ch. 59, we find:

“Nevertheless,” said Don Juan, “we would do well to read it, for no book is so bad it doesn’t contain something good. The thing I find most disagreeable, though, is that it depicts Don Quixote as no longer enamored of Dulcinea of Toboso.”

When Don Quixote heard this, he was filled with rage and despair, and raising his voice, cried out:

“Whoever says that Don Quixote of La Mancha has forgotten or is capable of forgetting Dulcinea of Toboso shall be made to understand by me in a fair fight that he has strayed very far from the truth, for the peerless Dulcinea of Toboso can never be forgotten, nor can such forgetfulness ever find lodging in Don Quixote’s breast. His motto is faithfulness and his mission is to preserve it through moderation and without violence of any kind.”

“From what I have heard,” said Don Jerónimo, “you are undoubtedly Sancho Panza, squire to his lord Don Quixote.”
“I am,” replied Sancho, “and am proud of it.”

“Well, you may take my word for it,” said the gentleman, “that this new author has not treated you with the honesty that you deserve. He portrays you as a glutton, a simpleton, and a person devoid of humor—quite different from the Sancho described in the first part of your master’s history.”

To sum up, in Chapter 58 Cervantes seems to be refreshing the memories of his readers—just in case they have forgotten—that the real Don Quixote has always been in love with Dulcinea and that Sancho’s principal characteristic is his wit. By reminding us of these qualities, he shows how absurdly false Avellaneda’s portrayal is when he says in Chapter 59 that Don Quixote is no longer in love with Dulcinea, and paints the character of Sancho as being devoid of humor. I realize this is all supposition at its finest, but I send it forth to have people reconsider an assumption that has been engraved in stone, and to show what too many hours spent translating Don Quixote can do to one’s psyche.
Don Quijote Turned 400.
Did Anybody Notice?

† Carroll B. Johnson

Well, the short answer to my rhetorical question, did anybody notice the quadricentennial of the publication of Don Quijote, Part I, in 1605, is something like “Oh boy, did they ever!” I have filled a total of twenty-five, count ’em, twenty-five 3½ inch floppy disks with announcements and descriptions of quixotic celebrations all around the world that began in 2004 and are sputtering to an end in this room tonight.

Many of these celebrations were pro-forma affairs in which small towns all over Spain paid homage to what everybody knew was a national treasure but nobody was quite sure why.

As early as 2003, the mayor of El Toboso complained to the press that Dulcinea’s hometown was being left out of the planning process.

In 2004, two enterprising young men formed a company specialized in the repair of windmills and made a great deal with the regional government of Castilla-La Mancha, in anticipation of the fourth centennial.

One of the most productive local events was one that didn’t happen. A tiny town in Aragón called Alcalá de Ebro decided not to participate in the national celebration, and the newspaper report of that decision revived a very useful hypothesis concerning the origin of Sancho’s insula, the island Don Quijote promises him at the beginning of their association, and which he finally receives in Part II.

There were marathon readings of the text literally all over the world, from Spain to East Asia.

1 The following were remarks for the Harvard-Radcliffe Club of Southern California from May 16, 2006.
There were art exhibits and musical performances. There was a glut of academic conferences and symposia. Every major university in this country and Latin America and Europe, as well as some in Japan and China and South Korea, got into the act. While I was at a conference at the Sorbonne at the beginning of July (2005), I heard about a guy who had already participated in forty-three of these affairs.

There were special commemorative editions of the Quijote, including one published by the Real Academia Española in collaboration with the academies of every Spanish-speaking country, and made available at a very attractive price everywhere Spanish is spoken, so that every Spanish speaker in the world could experience this book. I picked up a copy at Barnes and Noble in Pasadena. There was an excellent new translation into English by Edith Grossman, which is the version I recommend, if you’re looking for one to read.

Here at UCLA we declared April 2005 “month of La Mancha,” and threw ourselves into a round of celebratory and self-congratulatory activities. We had an academic conference, with scholars from all around the United States and France and Spain. By a serendipitous coincidence, I was selected to give the UCLA Faculty Research Lecture for 2005, and naturally I chose Don Quijote as my topic. We had a one-day Quijote extravaganza organized by University Extension, where I had the good fortune to meet Araceli Espinosa, who is responsible for bringing us together tonight. We had an impressive exhibition of books in the Young Research Library. Our graduate students organized a marathon reading in the rotunda of Powell Library. They also put together a mini film festival provocatively titled “A Complete Night of Incomplete Films: Don Quijote and the Curse of the Silver Screen.” And finally, my colleague Enrique Rodríguez Cepeda mounted a display of his amazing collection of Quijote memorabilia, which included everything from decorative tiles to matchbook covers featuring scenes from the book.

So yes, the quadricentennial of the publication did not go unnoticed. The question is: why was it worth celebrating? What is it about this book that continues to engage people after four hundred years? I think the answer, or answers, depend on who is being engaged.
No one can fail to be moved by the fact that Don Quijote is the second best seller of all time, with receipts exceeded only by the Bible.

While we’re in commercial mode I should point out that the Business School of Stanford University produced a DVD called “Passion and Discipline: Don Quixote’s Lessons for Leadership.” I quote from the jacket blurb: “This program creatively examines how Quixote’s kind of self-knowledge might serve modern leadership. Narrated by Professor March [Professor Emeritus James G. March], the program parallels episodes from Quixote’s adventures with illustrative examples in the modern world, from former President Richard Nixon and Martin Luther King Jr. to Bill Gates and Hewlett-Packard. Engaging interviews with contemporary leaders drawn from business, government and education are interwoven with archival footage of historic leaders who demonstrate imagination, perseverance in the face of adversity, and joy in work.”

Academic critics who are also professional Hispánistas are constantly discovering new meanings and new relevancies through historical and contextual research into the specifics of life in Cervantes’ Spain. Some of this work can turn up astonishing food for thought. It seems the society that Don Quijote and Cervantes belonged to faced many of the same social questions we are called upon to deal with here in Southern California at the beginning of the twenty-first century, especially those resulting from the fact of an ethnically, religiously and linguistically diverse population. These questions boil down to one: Do we celebrate our diversity, or do we insist on purity, with its corollary of exclusion? Spain chose the latter course, with the disastrous results we all know, beginning with the expulsion of the Jews in 1492. With particular relevance for our own situation, in 1609 the Spanish government decreed the expulsion of the Moriscos, that is, the descendants of Muslims forcibly converted to Christianity about a century before. This large group, which constituted the majority in places like Granada, had always resisted assimilation; they refused to learn Spanish, they continued to practice Islam in secret, they continued to wear their distinctive traditional costume, to sing and dance and get married and to bury their dead, as they always had. Although they had been on the land for almost eight hundred years, and the ruling Christian majority had in fact taken their country away
from them, they were widely resented, especially by the great mass of uneducated people, but their cheap labor was essential to the economy, which of course was controlled by aristocrats. Sound familiar? Cervantes dramatizes the effect of the expulsion on the lives of individual Spaniards when in chapter 54 of Part II Sancho happens to run into his old friend and neighbor, Ricote the Morisco, who had been expelled along with all the rest but who had sneaked back into the country under pain of death to recover some property and to try to reunite his family.

Academic literary critics and intellectuals of all stripes, not just Hispanists, have observed how the *Quijote* engages the theories of literature extant in Cervantes’ time, and also anticipates all the theories and strategies of literary criticism that have come along since. Every generation of intellectuals has seen its own preoccupations and its own most cherished discoveries anticipated in Cervantes’ text. The rationalists of the eighteenth century discovered that Cervantes had anticipated them by writing the epic of good sense and social integration. The romantics of the next century discovered the opposite, that Cervantes had anticipated their own preoccupation with the tragic situation of the eccentric genius in a hostile society. The theoreticians of literary realism discovered that he had unlocked the secret of capturing the essence of physical reality in words. In the twentieth century, we saw that Cervantes had anticipated the existentialism of Dilthey, Heidegger, Ortega, and Sartre. And it has become clear to us most recently that Cervantes had discovered, or intuited, that reality is never a given, just out there, existing independently of us, but is always constructed by humans through socio-linguistic practice. All the concerns of the trendiest contemporary theorizing about literature—story and discourse, referentiality and signification, authorial voices and presences, structuralism, post-structuralism and deconstruction can be effortlessly observed in Cervantes’ pages. What is interesting is not so much the fact that the *Quijote* can be and has been profitably read and studied from each new critical perspective. That is a hallmark of any literary masterpiece: to be ahead of its time, to lend itself to new and different critical approaches, to speak to each new generation. What is truly remarkable is not that the current preoccupations are present in the text, but that Cervantes makes them themes of the work. He brings them for-
ward consciously, as objects of inquiry, to be discussed by the characters and acted out in their lives.

Freud once observed that the great writers and artists are great because they are able to intuit profound truths about human nature and human life, and to present their intuitions in a way that engages the reader’s own humanity and tells him or her something significant about him- or herself. In this, Freud continues, the artists and writers are way ahead of the scientists, who come to discover by rational and experimental processes what the artists already knew. Scientific discoveries form a progression in which the most recent depends on what went before. This kind of progression doesn’t exist in art. The intuitions of a Cervantes, or a Shakespeare, or a Rabelais are as valid for us, and as productive in our lives, as those of the most perceptive chroniclers of the high-tech, high-anxiety world we live in.

And what about writers, who are not necessarily philosophers or professional literary critics, but actual practitioners? Lionel Trilling once observed that the whole history of the novel could justifiably be thought of as “a variation on the theme of Don Quijote.” And indeed, ever since the eighteenth century writers have been creating characters who conceive some project that will give meaning to their lives, and set out to make the project, and themselves, come true. From Fielding’s Tom Jones (1749), to Goethe’s Wilhelm Meister (1821-29), to Stendhal’s Le rouge et le noir (1830), to Moby Dick (1851), Madame Bovary (1857), to Huckleberry Finn (1885), to Philip Roth, John Irving, and Kurt Vonnegut, to Elias Canetti and Milan Kundera, novelists have been exploring and experimenting with the possibilities inherent in what has been called the “Cervantine principle.” Many writers have confessed their debt to Cervantes. Perhaps the most eloquent such confession is Flaubert’s only apparent hyperbolic claim that he discovered his own origins in the Quijote, that book, he says, that he “knew by heart before he learned to read.” Finally, in a survey which I believe was conducted by PEN in the late 1990s, one hundred of the most prominent novelists writing in the world today were asked to lift the works that had had the most influence on their own. The title that came up most often was Don Quijote.
At this point I’d like to get myself into this talk, from my perspective as an academic literary critic. In 1983, I published a book that considered Don Quijote’s madness through the insights provided by psychoanalysis. I advanced the hypothesis that the etiology of the character’s psychosis lay in his conflicted relations with women, a housekeeper past forty and a niece under twenty years of age. The precipitating factor, according to my hypothesis, was the emergence of his niece as a desirable young woman at precisely that time in his own life when he was experiencing the typical mid-life replay of the psychosexual upheavals of adolescence. I proposed that unconscious incestuous impulses aroused by the niece propel her uncle first into manic reading of sex and violence escapist fiction that is, the famous novels of chivalry, and when that first line of defense proves inadequate to the task of getting her off his mind, he retreats into psychosis, the most desperate, last-ditch defense we humans are capable of mounting against intolerable environmental stress. Psychosis, or madness, effects a psychic separation of the individual from his environment. The crazy project of a new identity as knight-errant has the added advantage of getting Don Quijote physically out of the house and away from his niece as well. It seemed clear, to me at any rate, that Dulcinea del Toboso is a transmutation of the inaccessible niece into a fictional princess inaccessible by definition.

I then studied Don Quijote’s relations with the real women he meets in the course of his adventures. What I found was a man with powerful erotic impulses who was terrified of physical intimacy with women. I call this his “conflicted intimacy.” The case of Maritornes, the chambermaid in Part I chapter 16, is a case in point. Don Quijote has been pretty badly beaten up. He and Sancho stop for the night at an inn. The innkeeper’s daughter, not incidentally a young woman the same age as Don Quijote’s niece, exerts a powerful attraction on him. He, of course, doesn’t understand that this is an inn; he thinks he’s in a castle, and as he’s lying awake in the room he shares with Sancho and a mule driver, he is hard at work on an erotic fantasy in which the beautiful daughter of the lord of the castle has fallen for him and as soon as the place is quiet enough, plans to slip into his room and his bed. As soon as he reaches this point in his fantasy, he begins to fear for his chastity, and to protect himself, he invokes
his unswerving fidelity to Dulcinea. Well, at precisely this moment, who should slip into the room in fact but Maritornes the chambermaid, who has a date with the mule driver two beds down. Don Quijote thinks she’s the daughter, pulls her close and thanks her profusely for offering herself, but declines because he cannot betray Dulcinea. Meanwhile, the mule driver has overheard our hero’s little speech, thinks Maritornes is standing him up, and comes after her. She gets into bed with Sancho to hide from him, and we’re in full-blown bedroom farce mode.

This episode has its counterpart in Part II, in the palace of the duke and duchess who make such cruel sport of Don Quijote and Sancho. This time there is a closer fit between the women in the palace and the women in Don Quijote’s household. The duke and duchess, incidentally, are superb readers of Part I. I say superb because they picked up on Don Quijote’s conflicted sexuality just as I did. They re-stage the Maritornes episode, by arranging for a young lady-in-waiting named Altisidora, again the same age as Don Quijote’s niece, to pretend to have fallen in love with him and come on to him, so they can enjoy watching his excitement turn into uneasiness and then into panic. Altisidora throws herself into the part, and Don Quijote is taken in. After a nocturnal encounter in which Don Quijote is pretty badly scratched up by some cats, he is alone in his room at night, thinking about Altisidora and mentally calling on Dulcinea for help. He hears the door being opened, and assumes that Altisidora has come to offer herself. He is surprised to find that, instead of a girl his own niece’s age, the intruder is a certain Doña Rodríguez, a middle-aged dueña in the duchess’ service. She has already been introduced, in an altercation with Sancho, as a middle-aged woman who is very concerned for her fading beauty and dwindling sex appeal. In Don Quijote’s terms, she is the same age as his housekeeper back home, and her rank and status make her his social equal as well. She is, in short, a perfect match for him. She is not in his room to seduce him, however, but to enlist his assistance in the recuperation of her daughter’s lost honor. All Don Quijote knows, however, is that he is alone in a room in the middle of the night with a real woman who is actually appropriate for him, with whom he might actually become intimate if he only dared. Both characters are keenly aware of the erotically charged situation in
which the find themselves. Don Quijote wraps himself up in his blanket and stands up in his bed, and each of them demands a pledge of chastity from the other. This to me is the most pathetic episode, in the etymological sense, in the entire novel. Although the text plays it for laughs, this is Don Quijote’s best shot, in fact his only shot, at a normal relationship with a real woman, and it doesn’t happen.

Alas, my book was not well received, at least not at first. For openers, it almost succeeded in forestalling any further advancement up the ladder of academic success here at UCLA. It was taken seriously in some quarters, however, mostly by women academics, and it made possible the study of Don Quijote as a fictional being whose character is defined at least in part by his sexuality. And you’ll be happy to hear that I even got promoted at UCLA. But while I was chafing at my colleagues’ shall we say lukewarm reception of my ideas and attempting to vindicate myself, I began to search for examples of other readers, serious readers who had read the book as I had. I began to search for what I call “Don Quijote re-writes,” works that recreate the interpersonal and psychosexual dynamic of Don Quijote’s household and work through the themes I thought I had discovered: the character’s middle-aged sexuality, the unacceptable incestuous impulses, the presence in the household of a woman of the character’s own age, and the evolution of the middle-aged male character’s relationship with the forbidden younger woman or the appropriate older one.

I turned up some fascinating instances, and I’d like to share some of them with you in the time we have left.

The first “Don Quijote re-write” is the work of Cervantes himself, manifested in the duke and duchess in the second part of his own novel. As I remarked a moment ago, these characters are superb readers of Part I, and they stage a number of adventures designed to expose Don Quijote to ridicule by making public aspects of his character, such as his conflicted sexuality, they have observed in their attentive reading of the first part. Maritornes is restaged as Altisidora, for example. Since they are Cervantes’ creatures, this suggests to me that Cervantes himself was aware of the psychosexual dimension of the character he had created.

The next such rewrite is by an anonymous author who signed himself “Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda” and who published a continuation of
Don Quijote in 1614, a year before Cervantes brought out his own second part.

Avellaneda is keenly aware of Don Quijote as a sexual being. His revision of the character consists largely in depriving him of the paradoxical combination of powerful libido and terror of women, with its rich possibilities of character and narrative development, and replacing it with a kind of oblivious naïveté.

The first change Avellaneda makes in Don Quijote’s household is to get rid of the niece. In chapter 1, she is struck with a sudden twenty-four-hour fever, during the brief course of which she dies, “leaving the good hidalgo alone and disconsolate,” as the text reports (59). The hero’s reaction to her death suggests that Avellaneda understood that Don Quijote was emotionally attached to his niece, and the narrative tactic of killing her off suggests that he intuited the darker potential of that attachment as well.

Don Quijote’s housekeeper recedes into the background. His friend the priest brings him in a woman the text calls a “very devout and Christian old lady, to take care of him at home, prepare his meals and make his bed and do whatever else was required for his care, and finally to inform the priest or the barber of everything he did and said inside or outside his house, that might give any sign that he was returning to his foolish pursuit of knight-errantry” (59).

So the dynamic of the home situation is fundamentally altered. The threat of incest is removed by the niece’s opportune death, and the potential for a normal relationship with the housekeeper is also undone by the presence of the domestic spy the priest introduces into Don Quijote’s ménage.

The niece is out, and within a few pages Dulcinea is also kicked out. As Don Quijote prepares to leave home, he decides to “forget the ungrateful princess Dulcinea del Toboso and find himself another lady who would reward his services more appropriately” (86).

Later on, he decides to abandon love altogether, and takes the new name of “el Caballero Desamorado” the Not-in-Love Knight (94).

In Avellaneda’s vulgar rewrite of the Maritornes episode, which highlights and revolves around Don Quijote’s conflicted sexuality, a chamber-
maid at an inn offers herself to Don Quijote for two *reales*, but our hero remains oblivious to her charms and to her offer. The expression the text uses is “Don Quijote didn’t understand the music” (104).

Later on Don Quijote is joined by a former prostitute, now well along in years and *way past* her prime, named Bárbara de Villatobos. She is a grotesque deformation of the ideal of Dulcinea fleshed out with a similarly deformed version of Aldonza Lorenzo. Don Quijote thinks she is a princess out of a novel of chivalry. Her main function, beyond providing this grotesque counterpoint, is to offer herself sexually to Don Quijote (and once to Sancho) so that they can remain oblivious to her suggestion. And indeed neither Don Quijote nor Sancho “understands the music” when she comes on to them (306, 344).

Avellaneda was the first writer besides Cervantes himself who read *Don Quijote* more or less the way I do, as a tragedy of conflicted sexuality. But instead of sympathizing with the hero, Avellaneda felt threatened, I suppose by his potential for the disruption of order, and he did everything he could to neutralize and trivialize Don Quijote’s sexuality, and ultimately to transform the tragedy into farce.

I want now to jump to Benito Pérez Galdós’ *Tristana*, from 1892. From the opening paragraphs Galdós invokes the *Quijote*, in a series of allusions and reminiscences that no Spaniard could fail to recognize, as he introduces and describes the middle-aged male protagonist. He is known as Don Lope Garrido, but his real name is in doubt, exactly as Don Quijote’s is. He looks like a sixteenth-century *hidalgo*. He lives, as Don Quijote does, in genteel poverty with two women: a housekeeper of about his own age, and a mysterious younger woman whose status and relationship to him are unclear. This is Tristana, the title character. She is not Don Lope’s daughter, she is not exactly a servant, but what becomes clear as the novel progresses is that she is Don Lope’s mistress. And in fact Don Lope is a veritable Don Juan who has made a career out of seducing women. In this he is the exact polar opposite of Don Quijote. Galdós understood that an erotic volcano was bottled up underneath Don Quijote’s timid exterior. He understood that Don Quijote was attracted to his own niece in particular, and he inverted the two aspects of our hero’s character. He seemed to have asked something like: Suppose
Don Quijote had been able to do what he really always wanted to, to engage in an incestuous relationship with his niece, what would happen to the two of them? How would their story play out? And whose story would it be? In Galdós’ hands, it turns out to be Tristana’s story. She is the one who attempts to get out of the erotically charged atmosphere of the house and (if you’ll pardon me) out from under Don Lope. She is the one who sallies forth as Don Quijote does, and like him, she is ultimately brought back home and rendered incapable of any further sallies.

A few years later, Miguel de Unamuno wrote a wonderful little story called El sencillo don Rafael, cazador y tresillista. Like Don Quijote, Don Rafael is a middle-aged bachelor who lives with a housekeeper who clearly wants him to marry her. A foundling who appears on his doorstep gets a wetnurse into the story. She is a young woman who had just given birth to a stillborn illegitimate child. The household begins to look more like Don Quijote’s, but with a ready-made family. Don Rafael is attracted to the young wetnurse as Don Quijote is to his niece, but Unamuno makes her simultaneously a substitute daughter and, through repeated reference to her swollen breasts, a substitute mother as well as an erotic object. They get married and live happily ever after. Unamuno’s feel-good version of the Quijote eliminates all the impediments to Don Quijote’s successful union with his niece, and transforms conflicted sexuality into parenthood and social respectability.

Both Galdós and Unamuno retain the domestic triangle as the basic situation. Both are clearly thinking of Don Quijote and imagining what might have happened if his character had been either drastically or just a little bit different.

I’d like to now move out of the Spanish orbit and conclude with some authors perhaps better known to this group. The first of these is Elias Canetti, who as a Sephardic Jew is actually a kind of honorary Spaniard. I read Die Blendung because its title in English is Auto de fe, and I’ve always been a sucker for the Inquisition. Imagine my surprise when I find a story about a celibate middle-aged bachelor who lives with a whole lot of books and a housekeeper just about his own age. The psychosexual conflict plays itself out between the character and the housekeeper, who exercises a Svengali-like hold over him. My colleague Efraín Kristal has
written on Auto de fe as a “Sephardic rewriting of Don Quixote.” He elucidates the general indebtedness of Canetti to Cervantes, but does not treat the relationship between the character and the housekeeper, which I modestly believe strengthens my hypothesis.

Arthur Miller’s 1955 play, A View from the Bridge, comes almost too close for comfort to the Don Quijote pattern. We get the threat of the uncle-niece incest right up front. A longshoresman named Eddie Carbone is devoted to his wife, and to his niece, who lives with them. When some of the wife’s impoverished Sicilian relatives enter the US illegally, Carbone puts them up and tries to help them find work. One of them falls in love with the teen-aged niece. When this happens, Carbone (“flammable substance,” get it?) has to try to confront, or better, try to avoid confronting his unacceptable incestuous impulses.

And how could we leave Texas out? The final novel in Larry McMurtry’s trilogy about Duane Moore, that begins with The Last Picture Show, is called Duane’s Depressed (1999). Here we meet Duane in middle age. He might be described as an inverted Don Quijote. Instead of a celibate bachelor we have a paterfamilias, with a sexy wife, and adult children and grandchildren all over the place. At the beginning of the book, and for reasons unknown, Duane suddenly can’t take it anymore. He leaves home, as Don Quijote does, and goes off to live by himself. He devotes himself to futile do-good projects such as cleaning up trash beside roads. He is diagnosed with depression, a twentieth-century term for something very like what ailed Don Quijote. When his wife is opportunistically killed in an automobile accident (cf. Charlotte Haze) Duane throws himself into the pursuit of an inaccessible, much younger woman, his lesbian psychotherapist.

I hope to have amassed enough examples to suggest that many writers, from different ages, different linguistic and cultural traditions, have absorbed, consciously or not, and repeated the basic plot and underlying psychosexual dynamic that Cervantes offers in Don Quijote. But I’ve saved the best for last, or at least I hope I’ve saved the best for last.

You come to a Harvard event; you deserve a little Harvard. Vladimir Nabokov taught Don Quijote at Harvard in the early fifties, and while he was there he was also working on the most notorious Don Quijote
rewrite of all. Before he landed at Harvard, Nabokov taught at Wellesley and at Cornell. Michael Karpovich invited him to Harvard for the spring semester of 1952, to teach a course called “Hum 2,” high spots of western literature. Among the required texts was Don Quijote. Nabokov announced that he refused to teach the Quijote, that it was a terrible book, technically crude and psychologically sadistic. Harry Levin, who was in charge of Hum 2, famously replied “Harvard thinks otherwise,” and Nabokov was compelled to include the Quijote in his syllabus. His lectures on Cervantes’ book were subsequently published separately in a volume that has earned him the undying enmity, not to say contempt, of most professional Cervantes scholars.

What has principally raised my colleagues’ collective hackles is Nabokov’s assertion that Cervantes is cruel to his hero. For example: “The author seems to plan it thus: ‘Come with me, ungentle reader, who enjoys seeing a live dog inflated and kicked around like a soccer football, who likes, of a Sunday morning, on his way to or from church, to poke his stick or direct his spittle at a poor rogue in the stocks’; come,... I hope you will be amused at what I have to offer.” Don Quijote, on the other hand, “is chaste, enamored, with a veiled dream, persecuted by enchanters; and above all he is a gallant gentleman, a man of infinite courage, a hero in the truest sense of the word. [...] he is, among knights, the bravest, the most lovelorn of any in this world” (16). For now, I’d just like to call attention to the references to Don Quijote’s love life: He is “chaste,” “enamored,” and “lovelorn.” That is, Nabokov seems oblivious to the powerful erotic impulses I have been belaboring here.

Now, at the same time Nabokov was lecturing on the Quijote, he was also writing Lolita, which I just called the most notorious Don Quijote rewrite of all. It would be really neat if we could conclude that Lolita is simply the result of Nabokov’s Harvard experience with Don Quijote, but as Nixon used to say, that would be the easy thing to do, and furthermore it would be untrue. There is no question that the Quijote engaged Nabokov while he was at Harvard, and that a substantial part of Lolita has to have been conceived specifically and consciously as a Don Quijote
rewrite. For example: In Part II, the Bachelor Sansón Carrasco sets out on a therapeutic mission to bring Don Quijote back home where he can be cared for. To do this, Sansón dresses up in full knight-errant regalia, complete with armor, weapons, horse and squire, and, calling himself the Knight of the Mirrors (a mirror-image of Don Quijote), seeks Don Quijote out with the idea of challenging him to single combat, from which of course Sansón will emerge victorious, and the defeated Don Quijote will be sent home. Sounds good, but it doesn’t work out that way. Don Quijote defeats Sansón on a fluke (Sansón can’t get his horse started), whereupon Sansón vows to continue his search for Don Quijote until he finds him and really whips him, with all therapeutic intention now replaced by pure revenge. He finally catches up with Don Quijote on the beach in Barcelona, defeats him and sends him home, to his death. Nabokov studies this episode in the context of Avellaneda’s 1614 continuation. He considers that Cervantes missed a bet: instead of Sansón Carrasco, it should have been Avellaneda’s Don Quijote who comes after the real Don Quijote and engages him in a fight to the finish.

Nabokov says: “How splendid it would have been if instead of that hasty and vague encounter with the disguised Carrasco... the real Don Quijote had fought his crucial battle with the false Don Quijote! In that imagined battle, who would have been the victor—the fantastic, loveable madman of genius, or the fraud, the symbol of robust mediocrity? My money is on Avellaneda’s man, because the beauty of it is that, in life, mediocrity is more fortunate than genius” (81). As we recall, in *Lolita* Humbert and Lo are pursued by Clare Quilty, who is a kind of alternative Humbert, just as Don Quijote and Sancho are pursued by Sansón, who has a similar reaction to Don Quijote. Humbert and Quilty meet for a final showdown, as Don Quijote and Sansón do. Nabokov had to have been thinking of the Quijote here; there are too many sly allusions for it to be otherwise. Quilty is referred to as “Cue,” written as in “pool cue,” but pronounced “Q,” for Quixote, of course. One of the aliases Cue assumes is “Donald Quicks, from Sierra Morena.” In view of what Nabokov says about the final encounter between Don Quijote and Sansón, it seems clear that the final showdown between Humbert and
Quilty is a conscious attempt to rewrite the *Quijote*, to do correctly what Cervantes had botched.

Nabokov does not allude directly to the uncle-niece erotic dynamic, but he does have some things to say about the niece’s counterfigure, Altisidora. He never fails to call her “little Altisidora.” He introduces her as “a young girl, a child, who... poses as a lovelorn maiden passionately attached to La Mancha’s greatest knight” (70). And he evokes “fifty-year-old Quixote,... melancholy, miserable, excited by little Altisidora’s musical moans” (70). I think Nabokov “understood the music” here.

I am going to propose that Nabokov read the *Quijote* more or less as I do, that is, that he was not oblivious to the unsettling attraction of the uncle to the niece, and that the Harvard experience was crucial to the completion of *Lolita*, but his interest in the thematics of middle-aged men’s erotic attraction to forbidden teen-aged girls goes way back. I want to make a quick detour and look at the evolution of *Lolita* in Nabokov’s life and works.

In fact, Nabokov was obsessed with the pre-history of *Lolita*, but it had to be his version. He writes: “The first little throb of *Lolita* went through me late in 1939 or early in 1940, in Paris” (*Annotated Lolita* 311). He says the “initial shiver of inspiration” for *Lolita* was a novella called *The Enchanter* (*Volshebnik*), written in Russian. “The man was a Central European, the anonymous nymphet was French, and the loci were Paris and Provence. I had him marry the little girl’s sick mother who soon died, and after a thwarted attempt to take advantage of the orphan in a hotel room, Arthur (for that was his name) threw himself under the wheels of a truck. [...] but I was not pleased with the thing and destroyed it sometime after moving to America in 1940” (312). The last sentence is obviously untrue, as Nabokov’s son Dmitri published the translation in 1986. I am fascinated by Nabokov’s phrases: “first little throb” and “initial shiver of inspiration.”

Nabokov’s history of the Ur-*Lolita* then jumps to his Cornell University period, which he does not identify as such. “Around 1949, in Ithaca, upstate New York, the throbbing, which had never quite ceased,

---

began to plague me again. Combination joined inspiration with fresh zest and involved me in a new treatment of the theme, this time in English, the language of my first governess in St. Petersburg, circa 1903, a Miss Rachel Home. The nymphet, now with a dash of Irish blood, was really much the same lass, and the basic-marrying-her-mother idea also subsisted; but otherwise the thing was new and had grown in secret the claws and wings of a novel” (312). Nabokov continues: “The book developed slowly, with many interruptions and asides. [...] Once or twice I was on the point of burning the unfinished draft and had carried my Juanita Dark as far as the shadow of the leaning incinerator on the innocent lawn, when I was stopped by the thought that the ghost of the destroyed book would haunt my files for the rest of my life” (312).

According to Nabokov, the final impetus for Lolita was provided by the summer butterfly hunts, which took him and his wife to the American west and acquainted Nabokov with the locales that Humbert and Lolita visit. “Every summer my wife and I go butterfly hunting.... It was at such of our headquarters as Telluride, Colorado; Afton, Wyoming; and Ashland, Oregon, that Lolita was energetically resumed in the evenings or on cloudy days. I finished copying the thing out in longhand in the spring of 1954, and at once began casting around for a publisher” (312).

But Nabokov silences some crucial episodes.

In the mid-1920s in Berlin he was engaged to a girl named Svetlana Zivert he met when she was only thirteen. They were to have been married as soon as she turned seventeen, but the engagement was broken off. One version is that Vladimir had made a suggestion to her about “a strange kind of kiss.” Svetlana mentioned it to her aunt, who immediately branded him a pervert and cancelled the engagement (Field 90).

In 1928, Nabokov wrote a poem called “Lilith,” in which a man is killed, has intercourse with a ravishing child who is very much like a memory from his own childhood, and then discovers he is in hell when the child disappears just as he is about to reach climax with her (Field 140).

He never mentions that his mother’s nickname was “Lolya” (Field 140).
He never mentions that when he lived in Berlin, from 1922 to 1937, one of his neighbors was a journalist named Heinz von Eschwege, who wrote under the name Heinz von Lichtberg. This von Lichtberg is chiefly remembered for a vivid account of Hitler’s torch-lit procession to the Reichstag in 1933, but he also wrote a story, published in 1916, called “Lolita.” It is a first-person narration told by a man who has an affair with the daughter of the proprietor of the inn where he stays in Alicante (Spain), and who works there as a chambermaid. Her name is Lolita Ancosta. Von Lichtberg’s Lolita seems to telescope the two young women Don Quijote meets at the inn in Part I chapter 16, the innkeeper’s beautiful but chaste daughter and the squat and ugly but sexually active chambermaid Maritornes. I would therefore propose von Lichtberg’s story as another Don Quijote rewrite. In 2000, the German scholar Michael Maar brought this little known work to light and suggested that Nabokov had read it. He stops short of accusing him of plagiarism however. Dieter Zimmer, writing in Der Zeit (18/2004), falls all over himself proclaiming Nabokov’s independence from von Lichtberg. For one thing, who wants to be indebted to a Nazi? And Von Lichtberg’s Lolita is not a little girl of eleven, but a “sexually aware young woman between fifteen and eighteen.” And so on.

Nabokov also forgot his own work, Laughter in the Dark (1932), until an interviewer reminded him of it. This book anticipates the loss of Lolita to Quilty. The protagonist sacrifices everything, including his eyesight, for a girl he then loses to a hack artist named Alex Rex. Nabokov did allow that “some affinities between Rex and Quilty exist” (apparently in an interview with Appel. Intro AL, xxxvi).

And Nabokov neglects to mention The Gift, which he also wrote in his Berlin period, between 1935 and 1937. A character fantasizes about the novel he could write: “Ah, if only I had a tick or two, what a novel I’d whip off! From real life. Imagine this kind of thing: an old dog—but still in his prime, fiery, thirsting for happiness—gets to know a widow, and she has a daughter, still quite a little girl—you know what I mean—when nothing is formed yet but already she has a way of walking that drives you out of your mind. A slip of a girl, very pale, with blue under the eyes—and of course she doesn’t even look at the old goat. What to do? Well, not
long thinking, he ups and marries the widow. Okay. They settle down the three of them. Here you can go on indefinitely the temptation, the eternal torment, the itch, the mad hopes. And the upshot a miscalculation. Time flies, he gets older, she blossoms out and not a sausage. Just walks by and scorches you with a look of contempt. Eh? D’you feel here a kind of Doñostovskian tragedy? That story, you see, happened to a great friend of mine, once upon a time in fairyland when Old King Cole was a merry old soul...” (176-77. Quoted by Alfred Appel in Intro to AL, xxxv-xxxvi).

Nabokov’s own version of literary history is selective, to say the least. He begins in Paris in 1939 or 1940, where he wrote The Enchanter, which he claims he threw away when he moved to America a few months later, but which he must have in fact retained. Then, in Ithaca, NY, he begins a second version around 1949. He works sporadically on this one until it emerges in 1954 as Lolita, after some butterfly expeditions out west. He omits the entire Berlin period, his courtship of young Svetlana Zivert, and the poem “Lilith.” He silences Laughter in the Dark (1932) and The Gift (1935-1937). He also eliminates references to his teaching at Cornell (which is why he was in Ithaca NY in 1949), at Wellesley and at Harvard. That is, he silences those experiences in his own life that enabled the creation of Humbert Humbert and of Pnin, the European émigré who finds himself teaching literature at an unnamed college in the northeastern United States. And needless to say, he eliminates all references to his abrasive engagement with Don Quixote at Harvard in spring 1952. My provisional conclusion is that Nabokov was obsessed from about age 30 with the theme of the middle-aged man sexually attracted to the pre- or just-pubescent girl. He wrote two versions before he emigrated to America in 1940. His academic experience at Cornell, Wellesley, and Harvard gave him the material for Humbert Humbert and Pnin. My modest concluding hypothesis is that it was his conflicted experience with Don Quijote at Harvard in 1952 that provided the final impetus for Lolita.
David Lynch and the Dulcineated World  

Bruce R. Burningham

One of the more recent trends in Cervantes scholarship has been the exploration of the relationship between Cervantes’s works, particularly *Don Quixote*, and those of contemporary culture. These explorations often follow a number of interrelated paths. The most common of these approaches are those that apply contemporary literary and cultural theory to Cervantes’s works.¹ Another common approach explores the structural impact of Cervantine narrativity (and meta-narrativity) on later works.² Still others trace the conceptual intertextualities that exist between Cervantes and various later writers.³ Finally, a more expansive approach explores those instances where contemporary culture—whether deliberately or not, whether self-consciously or not—redisovers, reexamines, and/or reworks ideas and issues explored by Cervantes and his own contemporaries more than 400 years ago.⁴ David Lynch’s 2001 film *Mulholland Drive* is a cinematic narrative that lends itself extremely well to this last type of Cervantine analysis (and not just because this film—like *Don Quixote*, which is routinely said to be a literary work about literature—has been called a film about cinema [Lopate 47; Restuccia 71; and Shostak 6]).

Born in Missoula, Montana, David Lynch is a member of a relatively small group of cutting-edge *auteur* filmmakers that includes Pedro Almodóvar, Wes Anderson, Tim Burton, the Coen Brothers, David

---

¹ See John Beusterien; Anne J. Cruz and Carroll B. Johnson; and Álvaro Ramirez.
² See Robert Stam; Barbara Simerka and Christopher B. Weimer; and Ulla Musarra-Schroeder.
³ See Theo D’haen; Will McMorran; Maria Stoopen; and Kristine Vanden Berghe.
⁴ See Bruce R. Burningham, *Tilting Cervantes*; and William Childers (particularly Childers’s chapters on “Remembering the Future: Cervantes and the New Moroccan Immigration to Spain” and “Chicanoizing Don Quixote.”
Fincher, Terry Gilliam, and Quentin Tarantino (among others). His first film, *Eraserhead* (1977), launched his meteoric career and has become something of a cult classic. His 1986 film *Blue Velvet* established what is the now widely recognized “Lynchian” theme of exposing the unsettling subterranean unease that exists just below the banal surface of contemporary suburban US culture, a theme he further explored in his 1990-1991 television series *Twin Peaks*. And while the commercial success of his Academy Award winning film *The Elephant Man* (1980) might suggest otherwise, Lynch is best known for making difficult and highly surrealistic films like *Mulholland Drive*.

For readers unfamiliar with *Mulholland Drive*, a brief description of Lynch’s highly complex cinematic narrative is in order. One possible interpretation (among several proffered by critics) posits this film as the story of Diane Selwyn (Naomi Watts) who arrives in Hollywood with the hopes of becoming a movie star, but who ultimately becomes disillusioned by her lack of success and thus commits suicide. Lynch structures this narrative in two parts. The first (and by far the longest) part—which most critics read as a dream sequence—narrates Diane’s Hollywood fantasy in the person of “Betty Elms.” The film opens with a kind of abstract and surrealistic montage of jitterbug dancing in which images of a bright and smiling Betty are juxtaposed against a series of shifting images of the real (and occasionally silhouetted) dancers. Later, we see Betty arrive at Los Angeles International Airport—winner precisely of a jitterbug contest held in her hometown of Deep River, Ontario, Canada—in the company of an unrealistically cheerful and “grandparently” older couple who affectionately welcome Betty to Los Angeles and then wish her the best of luck as she sets out on her grand adventure. Betty then takes a taxi to an elegant Hollywood courtyard apartment (which her aunt, who is also an actress, has supposedly let her use while she is out of town). Upon arrival at this apartment, Betty is instantly befriended by the quirky manager of the building (Ann Miller), who provides as warm a welcome to Hollywood as anyone could hope to receive. Shortly thereafter, Betty is surprised to discover that a troubled amnesiac who calls herself “Rita” is unexpectedly showering in her aunt’s apartment. Rita (Laura Elena Harring) has stumbled into the apartment, bleeding from a severe head wound, after
surviving a head-on collision in the back of a limousine not far away on Mulholland Drive. Betty and Rita embark on a quest to discover Rita’s true identity, crossing paths along the way with a dishwater blond waitress named “Diane Selwyn” and a platinum blonde actress named “Camilla Rhodes.” Betty and Rita eventually fall in love with each other, and part one culminates with a love scene between the two women. Throughout the course of part one, however, this main “suspense” plot is counterbalanced by a subplot within which Betty achieves an implausibly immediate success in Hollywood. Within the space of just a few days of her arrival in LA she “wows” the most important casting agent in town; leaves a roomful of studio executives, producers, directors, and actors speechless after a tour de force audition; and looks very much like she might be the next Hollywood “it girl” by the end of the week.

The second (and much shorter) part of the film—which most critics read as a representation of reality (however abstract)—suggests that “Betty” is really Diane (still played by Naomi Watts); that “Rita” is really Camilla (still played by Laura Elena Harring); and that Diane’s life has spiraled so far out of control that she goes mad and shoots herself; this, after she has hired a hit man to kill Camilla because she thinks (or at least feels) that Camilla has jilted her. In an early scene within part two, a drugged-out, haggard Diane hires this hit man, who then tells her that once the fatal deed has been accomplished, he will leave a blue house key in her apartment as evidence of the job’s completion. Thus, part two culminates with Diane’s discovery of this guilty blue key on her coffee table; upon which she starts to hallucinate a Lilliputian version of the “grandparently” couple who initially welcomed Betty to LA at the very beginning of the film. These miniature figures (who suddenly transform into their life-size selves after having crawled underneath the door to enter the room) chase Diane around the apartment, laughing hysterically;

5 For readers unacquainted with the social geographies of Los Angeles, Mulholland Drive is the famous road that winds East to West along the crest of the Santa Monica Mountains. It serves as the line of demarcation separating the prestigious neighborhoods of the northern Los Angeles Basin from the traditionally working class neighborhoods of the San Fernando Valley (although in recent years even these traditionally working class neighborhoods have become more and more gentrified). As such, Mulholland Drive connects Malibu, the Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, Bel Air, Beverly Hills, and the Hollywood Hills to each other.
whereupon Diane runs screaming into her bedroom, pulls a pistol from the nightstand, and shoots herself in the mouth.⁶

What connects the two parts of this bifurcated narrative to each other is a highly surrealistic scene (typical of Lynch’s aesthetic) in which the Betty and Rita characters of part one watch a nightclub performance at a venue called Club Silencio. After this nightclub scene, the two return to the courtyard apartment, and using a mysterious blue key, Rita unlocks an enigmatic blue box that Betty had suddenly discovered in her purse while at the club; upon which the entire first part of the film seems to collapse into the box itself. Part one abruptly ends with a point-of-view shot of the camera entering into the darkness of the box; part two begins immediately thereafter with an exterior shot of the box itself dropping onto the floor of the apartment; after which it then disappears entirely, as the narrative essentially “resets” itself for the second part of the film.

Although there is certainly a great deal of critical overlap among scholars who have analyzed Mulholland Drive, these scholars tend to divide themselves into three groups. Given Mulholland Drive’s intricate and deliberately obscure narrative structure, the first group tends to focus primarily on questions of diegesis in order to tease out of the film some kind of comprehensible interpretation (or at least provide an argument for why such a totalizing comprehensibility is either unwelcome or impossible).⁷ Indeed, while Debra Shostak calls part one of Mulholland Drive a “Nancy Drew fantasy” (12), and while David Roche notes that films like Lynch’s Lost Highway and Mulholland Drive “are mysteries, not because of their genre, but as films, and are held together by the spectator-detective’s desire to make sense of them” (43; original emphasis), a number of diegetic critics argue that the film’s indecipherability is exactly

⁶ This brief and incomplete synopsis of Mulholland Drive does not include any mention of various interrelated and interspersed subplots that may or may not have a direct bearing on the main plotline. One such subplot involves a director (Justin Theroux) whose Hollywood lifestyle is ominously and inexplicably turned upside down when he refuses to hire “Camilla Rhodes” for the lead in the film he is currently directing. This subplot is only resolved when the director agrees to meet with a “Cowboy” (Lafayette Montgomery) in a corral at a ranch in Beechwood Canyon high above Los Angeles, where this Cowboy instructs the director on exactly what to say the next time he is offered the opportunity to cast Camilla Rhodes.

⁷ See Maximilian Le Cain; Kirsten Ostherr and Arash Abizadeh; David Roche; Anna Katharina Schaffner; and Robert Sinnerbrink.
the point: “We are [...] not meant to decode the film. If the viewer looks closely or a second time, the film will not whisper its revelations. This is not a puzzle in which all the varied pieces will eventually fall into place” (Coffeen). The second group, interested in the prominence of dreams and dream sequences in *Mulholland Drive*, tends to focus on questions related to psychoanalysis (whether Freudian, Jungian, Lacanian, or Žižekian). For these critics, *Mulholland Drive* alternatively functions as either “a master class in Freudian dream theory” (Lentzner and Ross 120) or “is structured around the incessant dissatisfaction of desire” (McGowan 195). The third group, which is closely related to the second in terms of its preference for Lacanian theory, focuses on female sexuality and lesbian desire, with some attention being given to the construction of a male gaze within the film itself. For this group, Betty and Rita’s attraction, desire, and eventual coupling provide the nucleus around which the entire film revolves. As Heather Love argues, “*Mulholland Drive* takes up several of the most powerful and persistent images of the lesbian” (121) in order to offer up what Kelly McDowell calls “a space for female subjectivity within the terms of the oedipus complex” (1038).

Cervantes scholars, however, will likely see a somewhat different set of issues at play in *Mulholland Drive*. At the heart of Lynch’s juxtaposition of fantasy and reality is the baroque and subsequently postmodern preoccupation with being and seeming; a preoccupation famously explored, of course, in *Don Quixote*. Now, in comparing *Mulholland Drive* to *Don Quixote*, we might be tempted to read the Diane/Betty character as a kind of Alonso Quijano/Don Quixote figure in which Diane imagines herself to be Betty after perhaps watching too many versions of *A Star is Born*. Such a reading, however, breaks down when we consider that—as far as we can tell from Lynch’s film—Diane does not “perform” the Betty persona (as does Alonso Quijano with regard to “Don Quixote”). Instead, Diane moves to Hollywood, as so many thousands of people have done before her, in the hopes of *becoming* Betty. But this does not mean that she walks around Los Angeles as Betty. In this regard, “Betty” represents for Diane’s psyche her *ideal* identity. In other words,

---

8 See N. Katherine Hayles and Nicholas Gessler; Jay R. Lentzner and Donald R. Ross; Philip Lopate; Todd McGowan; Richard K. Sherwin; Amy Taubin; and Calvin Thomas.
“Betty” is actually better read as a “Dulcinea” of Diane’s own making rather than as a Don Quixote: Betty is Diane’s impossible dream.

In saying this, however, I do not mean to suggest that Diane creates Betty out of whole cloth. Instead, like Dulcinea herself, Betty is the product of a particular discourse already available to Diane thanks in large measure to more than a century of Hollywood mythmaking, both on screen and off. Betty is really the product—and, indeed, a function—of the various manifestations of *Sunset Boulevard* (from which Lynch ultimately borrows his own title) that have been endlessly remade since the invention of the movie industry. (And this is not to mention the discourse of the Hollywood gossip press that permeates so much of contemporary culture, from the E! Network to *TMZ*.) Indeed, Betty is such a powerful and absolute Dulcinea that she needs no Don Quixote to call her into existence; she is a Dulcinea completely unto herself. (Of course, Don Quixote is not entirely absent from the film; he is the inscribed “male gaze” analyzed by critics like Anna Katharina Schaffner [270-71]). Within Lynch’s film, Betty is the embodiment of what Arthur Efron might call Hollywood’s own “Dulcineated World” (1).

I borrow this term, of course, from Efron’s book *Don Quixote and the Dulcineated World* in which he succinctly defines “Dulcineism” (the noun form of his coined adjective) as “the belief that human life is satisfactorily conducted only if it is lived out in close accord with prescribed ideals of the received culture” (11; original emphasis). It is Efron’s notion of an “acculturated” Dulcineism that interests me most, particularly in so far as this overlaps with Antonio Gramsci’s concept of “hegemony” (271), because it is this definition of Dulcineism as the social operation of a culturally received—and politically caustic—idealism that allows Efron (writing at the height of the Vietnam War) to suggest that *Don Quixote* is more than just a protest against the ideologies of Counter-Reformation Spain. The novel’s protest, he says, “is indeed tremendous, both in spread and in depth. It can only be called radical. The context of what it is against, moreover, is much wider in scope than what can be conveyed by designating a single nation at a single period in history. In important ways, it is against our own epoch” (v). In short, it is this expansive notion of Dulcineism that helps illuminate much of Lynch’s *Mulholland Drive*. 
Indeed, my own use of Efron’s term to describe a postmodern culture in which the ideals of medieval chivalry—while still alive and well, as Leo Braudy clearly demonstrates—have largely given way to the ideals of Hollywood’s “dream factory” depends less on the operation of this Dulcineism in blockbuster movies like *Superman*, *Spiderman*, and *Batman* (our contemporary analogues to *Amadís de Gaula* and *El libro del caballero Zifar*) and more on its presence in reality television shows like *The Girls Next Door* and *Keeping Up with the Kardashians* (the current cultural *loci* of our feminine “ideal”). It is this postmodern Dulcineism that inspires thousands of young women and young men every day to pay obscene sums of money to a small army of plastic surgeons and then to descend upon Southern California in the hopes of becoming Angelina Jolie or Tom Cruise. Far more often than not, however, their story turns out not to be *A Star is Born*, but rather *The Black Dahlia* or *Star 80* or *Mulholland Drive*.

Yet, if we are going to read Lynch’s Betty as Diane’s own self-conceived Dulcinea, we must admit that in Lynch’s postmodern version of this Cervantine trope his Dulcinea is a highly fragmented object of desire. Throughout the first part of *Mulholland Drive*, Betty crosses paths with a number of uncannily similar blondes. These blondes include the waitress Diane Selwyn, the actress Camilla Rhodes, and even Rita herself once she cuts her brown hair and dons a platinum blonde wig in order to avoid recognition by the LAPD detectives who are searching for her as part of their investigation of the limousine accident. In this regard, the surrealistic logic of Lynch’s film suggests that these various blondes are but different facets of Diane Selwyn’s Dulcineated psyche. Indeed, when the film’s narrative resets itself for the second part, one of the major elements of this resetting is the “musical chairs-like” quality of the shift in blond personas: Betty becomes Diane, Rita becomes Camilla, and Camilla becomes just another unidentified blonde Hollywood wannabe.9 In short, Betty consists of the shards of desire itself; she is the yearning that we see in so many of Lynch’s close ups. As Todd McGowan rightly

---

9 Compare this shift in identities to the ongoing slippage of identity that occurs over the course of *Don Quixote* (i.e., Quijada, Quesada, Quejana, and Quijano; Juana Gutiérrez, Juana Panza, and Teresa Panza; etc).
notes in his Lacanian reading of *Mulholland Drive*: “Diane feels desire’s perpetual lack: she longs for Camilla Rhodes but cannot have her; she wants a career as an actress but struggles with bit parts; and she sees the opulent lifestyle of Hollywood’s elites but lives in relative squalor” (203).

Ironically, however, and despite what I have just said about Diane not being a Don Quixote figure, there is a kind of “Quixote” aspect to the radical fungibility of identity in Lynch’s film. When Rita’s accident at the beginning of part one leaves her with severe amnesia, one of her most crucial lines is “I don’t know who I am.” Compare—or contrast—this to Don Quixote’s own “Y o sé quién soy” (1.5:106). Ultimately, like Cervantes’s novel itself, Lynch’s film centers on questions of identity. Thus, throughout the first part of the film, Rita’s existential dilemma is patched over by her adoption of the name Rita (a name she has purloined from an old Rita Hayworth movie poster that hangs on the wall of the Hollywood apartment). But, of course, Rita Hayworth is a kind of Hollywood Don Quixote in her own right. She is the invented—and, more importantly, performed—persona of one Margarita Carmen Cansino who, like Betty, was “discovered” after her arrival in Hollywood, and who went on to live a charmed movie star life. Likewise, “Marilyn Monroe,” “John Wayne,” and “Cary Grant” are all Don Quixote personas performed by Norma Jean Baker, Marion Robert Morrison, and Archibald Leach, respectively, once they too have been absorbed into Hollywood’s impossible dream factory. Thus, when Rita becomes Camilla in the resetting that occurs at the beginning of part two, we are left to wonder if “Camilla” is—finally—her “true” identity, or whether this too is just another temporary placeholder, just another free-floating Cervantine signifier.

But this brings us back to *Mulholland Drive’s* famous blue box, which Shoštak calls “a portal into a realm of suppressed knowledge” (3). As I noted earlier, Betty and Rita discover this box at the very end of their visit to the Club Silencio. But while this blue box is—by itself—extremely important, it is only the final component of a larger, more complex segment of the film. Consider how this crucial Club Silencio/blue box segment plays itself out from start to finish. This segment begins immediately after Betty and Rita have made love. Its initial scene opens with an important shot of the faces of the two women lying in bed asleep. Rita’s
face is shown in profile in the foreground, while Betty’s face is shown in the background facing the camera. The shot is set up so that the facial features of the two women line up to create a kind of cubist representation of a single face seen from two perspectives simultaneously, thus suggesting that if Betty and Rita are not somehow the same person, then they at least inhabit what N. Katherine Hayles and Nicholas Gessler call “the slipstream of mixed realities” (483). Suddenly, Rita starts to whisper the Spanish word “silencio” in her sleep. Following this, she then utters the Spanish phrases, “no hay banda” and “no hay orquesta.” As she repeats these words and phrases over and over again, she slowly awakens to the almost disembodied sound of her own voice. When Betty also wakes up and asks what’s wrong, Rita apprehensively begs Betty to go “somewhere” with her “right now.”

Although it is two o’clock in the morning, the two women take a taxi from the Hollywood Hills to Downtown LA where they enter the Club Silencio nightclub. The interior space of the Club Silencio, which is bathed in a kind of otherworldly blue light that shimmers as if reflected off a pool of water, turns out to be a surprisingly elegant turn-of-the-century grand theater. Once inside, Betty and Rita find seats, while an emcee announces (explicitly and in multiple languages: Spanish, French, and English) that there is no band, that it is all an illusion, that it is all recorded, that it is all a tape. This announcer then introduces a trumpet player who walks on stage and appears to be playing the music we hear, but who then removes the trumpet from his mouth in order to demonstrate that this music does not emanate from his instrument. Following on the heels of this display, the emcee then points out (literally) various melodies that seem to emerge from nowhere. Following this, he himself disappears in a cloud of fog and blue light, thus demonstrating that he too is nothing more than an illusion.

At this point, the nightclub performance seems to shift gears—like the film itself—as a new announcer enters and introduces “Rebekah del Río, La Llorona de Los Angeles.” While Mulholland Drive does not explicitly invoke Cervantes (as do other contemporary postmodern narratives), Lynch’s inclusion of La Llorona appropriately foregrounds Hispanic
microphone, proceeds to sing an a cappella rendition (in Spanish) of Roy Orbison's song “Crying.” During the next three minutes of footage, while Rebekah del Río delivers one of the film's most powerful performances, Lynch offers the viewer a series of extreme close ups of the singer’s face (on which a single teardrop has been painted) juxtaposed against a number of shots of Betty and Rita weeping uncontrollably. Toward the end of this show-stopping performance, however, Rebekah del Río suddenly collapses as if dead. Nevertheless, her voice and song still carry on even as her limp body is dragged from the stage. It is at this point, with the final strains of Rebekah del Río’s performance still echoing in the theater, that Betty and Rita suddenly discover the blue box in Betty’s purse.

Lynch immediately cuts to a shot of the two women reentering the apartment, whereupon they move quickly into the bedroom to explore this strange blue box. Suddenly, Betty moves out of frame as the camera pans away from Betty in order to follow Rita, and with this simple panning shot, Betty disappears from the film entirely, not to be seen again until the final minute of footage. Finding herself unexpectedly alone, Rita calls Betty’s name a couple of times and then asks worriedly, “¿Dónde estás?” She then discovers a triangular blue key inside her own purse. She inserts this key into the blue box and opens it; at which point, as I have already said, the camera seems to be sucked into the box’s dark interior. Lynch’s very next shot is of the box itself dropping onto the floor of the apartment with a thud; at which point the owner of the apartment (who we were initially introduced to at the start of the film as Betty’s absent aunt) walks into the room to investigate the source of the mysterious thud she seems to have heard from the other room. But, by then, even the blue box has disappeared (along with any other props connected to the Betty/Rita storyline). This woman then shrugs her shoulders and walks back into the other room, after which she is never seen again either.

Most critics read this Club Silencio/blue box segment as the place in the film where fantasy and reality collide; as the point at which, in the words of Hayles and Gessler, the “idealized double of Diane can

culture, as Domino Renee Perez points out, within a film set in Los Angeles and starring a Latina actor (Laura Elena Harring) who was actually born in Sinaloa, Mexico (161).

11 Rebekah del Río is the real name of this singer.
no longer be sustained" (496). For most critics, this segment functions as the key to unlocking the Freudian and Lacanian psychology at play within the text. For these critics, the importance of the “no hay banda” leitmotif that Lynch takes such great pains to emphasize is its function as a commentary on the “artificiality” of the Betty narrative; an artificiality that then assumes that the Diane narrative that follows represents a real-world scenario, one that ends with Diane’s suicide, with her ultimate “silencio.” While I do not necessarily dispute such interpretations (how can one dispute any reading of a film so ambiguous, so surreal, and so complex?), I do think a parallel reading can be teased out of this transition from part one to part two, a reading that centers on Rebekah del Río’s stellar performance.

What exactly is the function of this performance? Steven Dillon calls the entire Club Silencio segment “an idealized performance of cinephilia” (93), while Robert Miklitsch argues that it is Rebekah del Río’s song itself that brings the blue box into existence, that the performance actually causes the box to “materialize” (243). Most critics read her torch song as a commentary on Betty and Rita’s (or alternatively, Diane and Camilla’s) lesbian desire. Again, I do not necessarily dispute such interpretations, but I do think that there is something else going on here, something that relates specifically to the time Lynch dedicates to this song and to the extreme close-ups he offers us of the singer’s face and mouth. The point of this performance, I would argue, is to lull the viewer into a false sense of interpretive security. As we become enthralled with the performance—as we hear the words of this song apparently coming out of the mouth of this particular singer (and therein lies the importance of the extreme close-ups)—we forget what Lynch has just told us: that there is no band. Thus, when Rebekah de Río suddenly collapses and is carried offstage—even while her song and her voice persist—we are forced remember one more time that it is all an illusion; that the “owls are not what they seem” (to quote a similar leitmotif from Lynch’s television series Twin Peaks).

This scene represents, I think, a kind of ars poetica of the entire film, similar to the kind of ars poetica Cervantes provides in part one, chapter 47 of Don Quixote in which the Canon describes the ideal chivalric novel in terms that can be read to describe Cervantes’s novel itself (1.47: 567).
But in Lynch’s case this *ars poetica* is specifically designed to “dis-illusion” us. Thus, the blue box need not be read (solely) as a symbol of Diane’s shattered psyche; nor the blue key that unlocks this box (solely) as a symbol of Diane’s sense of guilt for having hired a hit man to murder Camilla. The blue box can also be read as a symbol of *Mulholland Drive* itself. And the key to unlocking this box is precisely the leitmotif Lynch has created in this 15-minute Club Silencio segment (which is also why the color blue, I think, is so prominent in this scene): the entire film is *all* an illusion.

In many ways, the Club Silencio/blue box segment functions as a postmodern analogue to Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz’s baroque contemplation on the “artifice” of her own portrait in her well-known sonnet “Este que ves, engaño colorido,” a sonnet whose final line—“es cadáver, es polvo, es sombra, es nada” (134)—anticipates Lynch’s repeated use of the word “silencio,” even while it deliberately echoes the final line of Luis de Góngora’s own poetic contemplation on death. But the “cadavers” at the heart of these texts are not Sor Juana’s and Diane Selwyn’s dead bodies;12 rather, the cadavers—in both instances—are the texts themselves: the painted canvas and the nightclub performance (and beyond them, Sor Juana’s sonnet and Lynch’s film). More importantly, these texts are “cadavers” not because something that was at one time alive is now dead; they are cadavers because they were never “live” to begin with. They are always already “tape recordings;” they are always already Memorex (to quote from a now-outdated television ad for audio cassette tapes). Again, as Schaffner argues, “Ultimately [...], Lynch seems to state, nothing in film is real; no level can ever definitively assume authoritative status, for all is artifice and representation” (282).

Thus, if we take Lynch at his word when he insists that there is *no band* what emerges is a radically different perspective on the film. What this leitmotif tells us (in no uncertain terms) is that there is simply no connection—or at least causality—between the music we hear and the musicians we see. Any assumed causality between the performers and the performance is merely an illusion. It is a misreading. For, just as it is a mistake to assume that a change of emcee and performer on the

---

12 I say this despite Love’s assertion that “[Diane’s] rotting corpse is at the center of the film, the ‘content,’ if there is any, of the blue box” (129).
Club Silencio stage means that Rebekah del Río’s performance is no longer just an illusion, so too is it a mistake to assume that the resetting of *Mulholland Drive* that occurs at the end of the Club Silencio/blue box segment means that part two of the film is somehow less “oneiric.” Part two is just as much an “engaño colorido” as part one (more so, in many ways).

Most critics, I think, have generally overlooked this point for one significant reason. By assigning semantic value to Naomi Watts’s function as an actor, critics insist on connecting the Betty of part one to the Diane of part two simply because Watts plays both characters. But if there is no band—the cinematic analogue of which is, “if there is no cast”—such an *apparent* “doubling” is as much an illusion as the false “doubling” between sound and image in Rebekah del Río’s nightclub performance. The fact that Watts plays both Betty and Diane may be just as accidental as the fact that Dulcinea is “played” (unknowingly and/or unwillingly) by Aldonza Lorenzo in part one of Cervantes’s novel and by the unnamed peasant girl on the road to El Toboso in part two. Indeed, as Don Quixote himself eventually admits in a very well-known passage of the novel, there is no material reality behind Dulcinea to begin with:

> Así que, Sancho, por lo que yo quiero a Dulcinea del Toboso, tanto vale como la más alta princesa de la tierra. Sí, que no todos los poetas que alaban damas, debajo de un nombre que ellos a su albedrío les ponen, es verdad que las tienen. ¿Piensas tú que las Amariles, las Filis, las Silvias, las Dianas, las Galateas, las Alidas y otras tales de que los libros, los romances, las tiendas de los barberos, los teatros de las comedias, están llenos, fueron verdaderamente damas de carne y hueso, y de aquellos que las celebran y celebraron? No, por cierto, sino que las más se las fingen, por dar subjeto a sus versos, y porque los tengan por enamorados y por hombres que tienen valor para serlo. Y así, bástame a mí pensar y creer que la buena de Aldonza Lorenzo es hermosa y honesta[...]. Y para concluir con todo, yo imagino que todo lo que digo es así, sin que sobre ni falte nada, y píntola en mi imaginación como la deseo[.] (1.25: 313-14)
Álvaro Ramírez correctly reads this passage of *Don Quixote* as an example of a Baudrillardian simulacrum in which Dulcinea functions as an “unbound sign, a sign without a referent in the ‘real world’” (85). But this is why *Mulholland Drive* can be read as Lynch’s own articulation of Efron’s “Dulcineated World.” Neither Betty nor Diane actually exists. Both are nothing more (or less) than pure idealizations, each functioning as the antithesis of the other.

Of course, viewers of *Mulholland Drive* may find this very “literal” reading of Lynch’s film (i.e., that it is *all* an illusion from start to finish) to be somewhat untenable simply because Betty’s fairytale seems far too contrived, while Diane’s tragedy seems far too genuine; in which case, let me offer a slightly more ambiguous (and therefore more Cervantine) reading of the film. In her Freudian contextualization of *Mulholland Drive*, Amy Taubin argues that “there is no conclusive evidence that the dreamer [i.e., Diane] ever awakes” (54). I would argue—as I have essentially just done—that there is no conclusive evidence that the dreamer ever *exists*; at least not as an individual, at least not within the diegesis of the film itself. But just because Lynch has told us that there is no band, does not mean that there is no music; which is to say, even as Rebekah del Río’s limp body is being dragged from the stage, we still hear her torch song. The implications of this logic, I think, are clear: there is no dreamer; there is *only* the dream. Thus, I would ultimately argue that there is no causality between Betty and Diane (one is not the product of the other); there is only contiguity. Betty and Diane are two sides of the same “True Hollywood Story.” Betty exists as Diane’s wildest dreams; Diane exists as Betty’s worst nightmare. And if we must insist on assigning “agency” to these dreams (even an unconscious agency) then we would have to say that Betty and Diane dream each other in the kind of postmodern narrative circularity characteristic of Jorge Luis Borges, Julio Cortázar, or M. C. Escher. Thus, I would argue that these two narratives essentially
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13 *True Hollywood Story* is the name of a biographical documentary series that has been running on the E! Entertainment cable network since 1996.

14 Indeed, Coffeen offers an unwittingly Borgesian reading of *Mulholland Drive* when he argues that the film itself is the “agent” of these dreams: “This is film telling its own tale, in its own language.” Likewise, he further argues that “cinema” itself is the film’s intended audience: “Cinema is watching.”
mirror each other, with the Club Silencio/blue box segment operating as
the reflective space that exists in between.

But this brings me to my final point. If Betty can be said to be
Diane’s idealized Dulcinea, then Diane herself—the strung-out failed
actress, part-time prostitute, part-time waitress, and guilt-ridden mur-
derer—would have to be seen as this Dulcinea “enchanted.” Again, I do
not mean to suggest by this that she is some version of Aldonza Lorenzo
or of Sancho’s anonymous peasant girl, because to do so would be to
suggest that there is a “dreamer” (that there is an external, accessible re-
ality) existing somewhere within Lynch’s cinematic text. Instead, what
I mean by this is that Diane is the Enchanted Dulcinea of the Cave of
Montesinos. And there are any number of reasons to read the second
part of Mulholland Drive (rather than the first part) as occurring inside
the blue box. These reasons include the fact that the point-of-view shot
Lynch offers us of his camera entering into the box can also be read not
as the subsumption and enclosure of the Betty narrative (as I previously
suggested), but rather as the viewer’s entrance into the Diane narrative
(comparable to Alice’s entrance into Wonderland through the looking
glass); as well as the fact that Diane’s suicide (which concludes this sec-
ond narrative) incorporates the same fog and blue light that Lynch ini-
tially used as the backdrop for the first emcee’s “it-is-all-an-illusion” dis-
appearance in the Club Silencio.

Several elements connect the Cave of Montesinos and the Club
Silencio. First, both spaces are “set off” from those of the rest of the
text. Second, as various critics have pointed out, both episodes are pivotal
within the flow of their larger narratives. Following his drowsy descent
into the Cave of Montesinos, Don Quixote’s singular mission becomes
(regardless of any other activities he might engage in along the way) the
disenchantment of Dulcinea; following their own somnambulant visit
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15 A great many scholars have commented on the Cave of Montesinos. I will not take the
time to gloss their work here because such scholarship is very well known. Having said that, there
are several critics—particularly psychoanalytic critics like Carroll Johnson and Diana de Armas
Wilson—whose work illuminates this present discussion.

16 Gethin Hughes even uses the word “pivotal” in discussing the Cave of Montesinos (112),
while both Jennifer Barker and Heather Love characterize Lynch’s blue box as a “hinge” (Barker
241; Love 122).
to the Club Silencio, Betty and Rita metamorphose and/or disappear entirely. Third, both episodes are highly ambiguous. Cide Hamete goes out of his way at the start of the next chapter to declare this episode of *Don Quixote* to be “apochryphal,” and then even goes so far as to note that Don Quixote himself disavowed this episode on his deathbed; likewise, Lynch’s cinematic frame (through both the camera’s point of view and its final edited montage) ultimately refuses to supply the viewer with any perspective from which to definitively interpret these scenes. Fourth, both episodes involve uncontrollable weeping and the symbolic inclusion of water imagery. In *Don Quixote*, Montesinos notes that, after having taken compassion on Ruidera and her daughters and nieces when he heard them weeping, Merlin seems to have transformed them into the Lakes of Ruidera. This is followed by the arrival of Belerma and her weeping retinue. In *Mulholland Drive*, the blue light that infuses the interior of the Club Silencio shimmers as if it were reflected off a pool of water. This is followed by Rebekah del Río’s tearful rendition of “Crying,” which also causes both Betty and Rita to sob mournfully. Fifth, both episodes involve the doubling of their female characters. Belerma and Dulcinea both appear inside the Cave of Montesinos in their degraded states of enchantment. (Indeed, Don Quixote’s description of Belerma’s face uncannily mirrors Lynch’s shot of a haggard Diane with extremely dark circles under her eyes.)¹⁷ For their part, Betty and Rita—the latter of whom, as I mentioned, has donned a blonde wig—look something like twins as they watch the Club Silencio performance. And, finally, what is at stake in both episodes—at least according to psychoanalytic critics—is desire, impotence, repression, and psychosexual frustration.

Still, what interests me most about the Cave of Montesinos (at least in terms of how it sheds interpretive light on *Mulholland Drive*) is the way in which the characters inside the cave seem to exist simultaneously on two separate planes of reality (or, better yet, “irreality” [doCarmo 657]). In describing for Don Quixote how he (and everyone else) came to be inside the cave, Montesinos offers no explanation for how he went from cutting out Durandarte’s heart in Roncesvalles (where he presumably left

---

¹⁷ See Johnson regarding Belerma’s “sallow complexion” and her relationship to the Enchanted Dulcinea [160-65]).
Durandarte’s corpse on the battlefield before setting off on his journey to deliver this heart to Belerma) to finding himself standing there alongside both Belerma and Durandarte’s talking corpse inside the cave (a space he readily acknowledges as such). Thus, unless his presence in the cave is the product of some kind of amnesia-ridden, Orphic descent into the underworld—much like Rita’s own arrival in Betty’s apartment with no memory of how she got there—Montesinos must continue to exist somewhere outside the cave as well, still functioning within another, alternative narrative. For, when Don Quixote suddenly sees Dulcinea and her two ladies-in-waiting frolicking in the field and then asks Montesinos if he knows them, Montesinos replies that these women simply appeared there a few days earlier like so many other women from the past and present centuries (“que pocos días había que en aquellos prados habían parecido” (2.23: 220). What this suggests, of course, is that everyone trapped inside the cave is simply a spectral projection of some enchanted person still living in the “real world.” Still, given that the country wench who Sancho first presents as Dulcinea on the road to El Toboso denies even knowing what Don Quixote is talking about when he bows down before her, whereas the enchanted Dulcinea of the Cave of Montesinos not only identifies herself as Dulcinea, but actually sends one of her ladies-in-waiting to make a request of Don Quixote in her name, we might ask ourselves which of these two Dulcineas has “amnesia,” or better yet, which

---

18 I am taken by the way in which the verb ‘parecer’ (rather than ‘aparecer’) subtly implies not just that the women physically appeared in the meadow, but also that their “appearance” might somehow be little more than a “seeming.” In this regard, John Beusterien astutely argues that “the simulation of reality in the Cave of Montesinos is not imitation but a semblance of a nonexistent reality” (430). Likewise, Mercedes Juliá notes that the whole episode demonstrates the very relativity of reality (276); while María Gracia Núñez characterizes the image within the cave as that of a totalizing cosmic consciousness. For his part, Bruce Tracy argues that “the implication is supposedly that reality itself—or the vision of it—is apocryphal, and that Don Quixote, while in a mental state which transcends reality, continues to contain the reality within the transcendency” (6).

19 Of course, these kinds of questions simply evaporate if one assumes (as do so many critics) that the events Don Quixote recounts are nothing more than the product of his unconscious imagination as he sleeps inside the cave. If we examine these events from his perspective at the moment when he actually recounts them as having “truly” happened, however, these questions become germane to an understanding of the relationship that exists between the alternative realities created by Don Quixote’s own diegesis.
of these two Dulcinesas is “real.” I would argue that, on a profound level, the Enchanted Dulcinea of the Cave of Montesinos is the “most real” of all the Dulcineas we encounter over the course of the novel. She is the only Dulcinea who is not simply a pure object (however virtual); she is the only Dulcinea who acknowledges herself as such; and in the end, she is precisely the Dulcinea whom Sansón Carrasco ultimately pronounces “desencantada” (2.74: 588).

But this brings us back to Mulholland Drive. In trying to separate dream from reality, most critics categorically declare Diane to be the real thing, with Betty existing as some kind of pathetically naïve fantasy. But since Lynch provides no definitive vantage point from which to choose one storyline over the other, we are left with characters who essentially function as mirror images of each other while living inside spectrally alternative realities. In this regard, Diane is simply “Betty Encantada” (or, if you prefer, “Ugly Betty”). She is a tragically compromised Dulcinea whose only hope for disenchantment (absent a movie director knight-errant who might come to her rescue) is suicide. For, just as Rebekah del Río’s song continues even after her apparently dead body has been removed from the stage, so too does the Betty storyline continue even after it is no longer the focus of Lynch’s film (and it is no mere coincidence that Betty disappears by simply stepping out of frame; which is to say, she is not gone, she is just off camera). In other words, Betty’s idyllic storyline does not “conclude” (in an Aristotelian sense) just because the viewer passes from one reality into another via the blue box. Betty’s idyllic storyline merely becomes (in a Baudrillardian sense) a permanently “virtual” hyperreality, one that continues to coexist alongside that of Diane. Indeed, during a particularly important scene of part one, Betty and Rita actually discover Diane’s rotting corpse inside the same seedy bedroom where we later see her kill herself in part two. And it is worth remembering that part two of the film actually commences with Diane’s rotting corpse being “awakened” by the Cowboy, thus making her storyline an infinitely circular text. In this regard, then, Diane’s suicide is no more conclusive than Betty’s disappearance, since her storyline always

20 And here I disagree with Barker who argues that “to be off screen is to cease to exist” (247).
begins and ends with her dead body lying on the bed. But if this is true, where does this ultimately leave her?

In an essay entitled “Suicide and the Ethics of Refusal,” I argue that Marcela’s abrupt departure from part one of *Don Quixote* amounts to a kind of “discursive suicide” through which she simply refuses to participate any further in the novel within which she unhappily finds herself (51). In this same essay, I also note that Florinda in Lope de Vega’s *El último godo* justifies her own suicide by claiming that one of the reasons she has decided to kill herself is because she cannot bear the thought of forever being remembered (in literary texts just like Lope’s *comedia*) as the cause of the loss of Visigothic Spain to the Moors (50). In both cases, these characters prefer a kind of deathly exit to an unhappy life embedded within their respective texts. My reading of Diane’s suicide in *Mulholland Drive* is of a similar vein, although, I readily acknowledge that Lynch’s narrative structure makes it virtually impossible for Diane to ever escape the film. Like Durandarte, Montesinos, and Belerma in *Don Quixote*, Diane is permanently stranded between life and death inside Lynch’s blue box.

That said, I certainly do not mean to suggest that she does not kill herself. Disenchanting Dulcinea requires sacrifice; which is precisely why Diane cannot survive. Recall that in *Don Quixote* this sacrifice was initially supposed to consist of the 3300 lashes that Sancho was assigned to self-inflict on his own bare buttocks, a painful sacrifice he ultimately fails to render. Recall, too, that what ultimately releases Dulcinea from her enchanted state is Don Quixote’s own death. On a strictly technical level, of course, what I mean by this is that, without Alonso Quijano’s imminent demise, Sansón Carrasco would never have announced her “disenchantment.” But on a symbolic level, it is Don Quixote’s death that actually releases Dulcinea from her torment, just as it is Don Quixote’s defeat of the wineskin in part one that saves Princess Micomicona from Pandafilando de la Fosca Viña (and beyond her, Dorotea from Don Fernando). Ultimately, then, Lynch’s Diane is haunted not by her supposed murder of Camilla (which may or may not actually have happened), but by Betty’s alternative narrative. For, what actually drives Diane to shoot herself in the mouth is not really the blue key she finds on the cof-
fee table, but the specter of the elderly couple who first welcomed Betty to Hollywood at the start of the film, and who literally chase Diane onto her deathbed. And in “disenchanting” herself (by attempting to end the nightmarish storyline in which she, like Florinda, also unhappily finds herself), Diane actually liberates Betty, whose own idealistic storyline is no longer tethered to Diane’s in the infinite interplay of reflections that exist inside the box that constitutes Lynch’s film. This is also why Lynch’s penultimate shot of the film consists of an ebullient image of Betty and Rita (in her blonde wig) superimposed on a shot of the Hollywood skyline, and why the final shot of Mulholland Drive is of the blue-haired woman in the Club Silencio softly repeating the word “silencio.” For, just as the final line of Sor Juana’s sonnet brings the poem itself to a close, while leaving timelessly intact the portrait it contemplates; so too does Lynch’s final line bring his film to a close, while leaving Betty cheerfully on her way to certain stardom inside her own Dulcineated “True Hollywood Story.”

In this last regard, however, Lynch’s postmodern film is perhaps a far less convincing indictment of contemporary culture than it may initially appear.21 If Efron is right when he argues that Don Quixote is a wholesale critique of Western culture’s Dulcineated idealism, Mulholland Drive’s final shots make Lynch’s film decidedly less so. In the end, what Mulholland Drive really calls into question is only the “failed” side of the American dream. In other words, while Lynch’s film can certainly be read as a cautionary tale about the risks involved in trying to chase down an elusive dream that always seems to be just out of reach, Mulholland Drive ultimately leaves this dream utterly intact. Thus, one could argue that Mulholland Drive is no more or less Dulcineated than any other Hollywood film. To be a truly radical critique of Western idealism, Mulholland Drive would have to have called into question Betty’s “success story” itself, rather than merely calling into question Diane’s failure to live up to the acculturated notions of “success” around which Betty’s storyline revolves.22 And this, in itself, would require a film that “disillu-

21 This is essentially Stephen doCarmo’s thesis.
22 In this regard, Fernando Colomo’s 1984 film La línea del cielo—in which the lead character, whose dream is to become a staff photographer for Life magazine, simply allows the long-
sions” Betty instead of Diane. It would require a film that truly “disen-
chants” Dulcinea in ways that Cervantes does not. It would require a film
that lets us see that simply being Aldonza Lorenzo is more than sufficient.
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awaited phone call offering him the job to go unanswered as he heads out the door of his New
York apartment in order to move back to Spain—is a much more radical critique of the American
dream than Mulholland Drive.


“Todo es morir, y acabóse la obra”
Las muertes de don Quijote

Francisco Layna Ranz

Adieu, adieu! Hamlet, remember me.
(Hamlet, acto1, escena V)

NADIE PUEDE RELATAR SU propia muerte. Pero sí es posible leer esta imposibilidad. Nada se niega al supremo poder de la escritura. Don Quijote atestigua esta supremacía cuando no puede persuadirse de que la historia de su vida exista. Duda de su propio libro porque le hablan de sus altas caballerías impresas cuando sigue fresca en la cuchilla de su espada la sangre de sus enemigos.1 Sobrado de razón, atribuye el caballero esa escritura a algún letrado encantador. Porque si no echamos mano del prodigio, del portento, no hay manera humana de explicar libro tan imposible, y tan unido a una escritura siempre afectada por la muerte. Tanto Don Quijote de 1605 como de 1615 llegan a su final en la representación mortuoria del caballero, bien en forma de epitafios, bien a través del relato de una “buena muerte”, escribano y testamento incluidos.2 La insistencia siempre es significativa, merecedora por tanto de intensidad crítica. Las páginas que subsiguen pretenden circunscribirse no a la súbita cordura de un agonizante Alonso Quijano, que a tantos ha disgustado por repentina e inopinada, sino a aspectos textuales y de relación escritura–muerte en los momentos últimos de los dos Quijotes.3

---

1 Don Quijote de La Mancha 1989, II, 3; 646. A partir de ahora todas las referencias irán en el texto.
2 Véase Rachel Schmidt.
3 Crítica en Hanno Ehrlicher, “Fin sin final...”; Martin v. Koppenfels; Salvador Fajardo, “Clousre in Don Quixote...”; Julio Rodríguez Luis; Dian Fox; Luce López-Baralt; Albert Sicloff; Luis Peñalver Alhambra; Percas de Ponseti y Daniel Eisenberg.
“Los que en la estampa a no morir murieron”

Impresiona leer los preliminares de *Persiles y Sigismunda*. En el prólogo Cervantes esboza una despedida cuando ya apremia la cercana muerte: “¡Adiós, gracias; adiós, donaires; adiós, regocijados amigos! Que yo me voy muriendo.” Y en la dedicatoria a Fernández de Castro la brevedad afecta tanto a la frase como al tiempo que le queda de vida: “Ayer me dieron la extremaunción y hoy escribo ésta.” Lapidario, nunca mejor dicho. Cervantes es muy dado a contemplar la muerte como una constante de todo aquello que vive. “Yo nací para vivir muriendo” (II, 59; 1107) afirma tajante don Quijote cuando observa la complacencia en la comida de su escudero. No hace mucho Julio Baena recurría a la imagen de Scherezade, personaje por excelencia que vive mientras narra, en un gerundio integralmente vivo, “viviendo mientras narrando.”4 Un radical antagonista de la acción, un absoluto quietista como Miguel de Molinos creía, tal vez como remembranza de la bíblica idea de que los libros se multiplican sin término (*Eclesiastés* XII, 12), que “ni todo está dicho, ni todo está escrito; y así, habrá necesidad siempre de escribir hasta el fin del mundo.”5 La escritura como transcurso es vida; como escrito es muerte. Aquí reside el sentido de las palabras de Cervantes en el prólogo de 1605. En ellas apela al lector para dejarle saber que lo más laborioso de su libro es ese prólogo en proceso, y a través de una magnífica perífrasis de gerundio le sitúa en un preciso instante, siempre actual y siempre presente, una perífrasis con que se recuerda al lector que está leyendo. La lectura como un continuo, una fractura en el tiempo, en una inmediatez paralizada en el presente eterno de la lectura.

Pero al mismo tiempo el libro es la memoria de la muerte, túmulo vivo, en palabras de Lope de Vega.6 El jesuita Juan Eusebio Nieremberg así lo especifica en su intento de establecer las diferencias entre lo temporal y lo eterno: “los emperadores del Oriente [...] llevaban en la mano izquierda un libro con las hojas de oro, [...] y estaba todo lleno de tierra y polvo, en significación de la mortalidad humana, para acordarse con esto de aquella antigua sentencia: *Polvo eres, y en polvo te convertirás.* No

---
4 Julio Baena.
5 Miguel de Molinos 143.
6 Florentino Zamora Lucas 138.
fue sin mucha conveniencia estar en forma de libro este recuerdo de la muerte, para dar a entender de cuánta enseñanza y doctrina sea su memoria, y que ella sola es escuela de grandes desengaños.”

7 Esto nos lleva a la viejísima relación entre escritura y muerte y al diálogo platónico en el que Sócrates habla a Fedro de Zeuz, dios del cálculo, la geometría y las letras. Zamus, rey de Egipto, recibe en señal de pleitesía el hallazgo que hará más sabios y memoriosos a los hombres: la escritura. Pero de inmediato queda defraudada su esperanza porque las letras –le dice el rey– producirán olvido en quienes las aprendan y, por consiguiente, el descuido de la memoria. No es, pues, un fármaco de la memoria lo que presenta con entusiasmo, sino un mero recordatorio. 8 Quizá en Derrida y en su análisis de Fedro esté el origen de una divulgada preocupación por la naturaleza letal de la escritura, aunque muchos años antes un Unamuno deportado a Hendaya hablaba de la misma deletérea condición:

El que pone por escrito sus pensamientos, sus ensueños, sus sentimientos, los va consumiendo, los va matando. En cuanto un pensamiento nuestro queda fijado por la escritura, expresado, cristalizado, queda ya muerto y no es más nuestro que será un día bajo tierra nuestro esqueleto. La historia, lo único vivo, es el presente eterno, el momento huidero que se queda pasando, que pasa quedándose, y la literatura no es más que muerte. 9

Todo esto es muy conocido. Y que las letras siempre responden una y la misma cosa, o sea, aquello que está escrito. La escritura no puede presentar otra ambigüedad que la que le provoque su lector. El texto escrito no ofrece más variantes esenciales que aquellas que introduzca quien lo lee. 10 Montaigne decía: “no he hecho mi libro más de lo que mi libro me ha hecho a mí.” 11 El aspecto mortífero de la escritura aparece más diáfano en comparación con la palabra pronunciada, con la vívida inmediatez

7 Juan Eusebio Nieremberg 9a y b.
8 Jacques Derrida.
9 Miguel de Unamuno 37.
10 Emilio Lledó 121.
11 Michel de Montaigne II, 18; 416.
de la oralidad. Muy significativas son las palabras de Mateo Alemán: “la diferencia que hacen los vivos a los difuntos, los hombres a las estatuas, esa misma es la que llevan a los escritos las palabras.” Entre aquellos que añoraban la eficacia de la palabra hablada, evidente en el caso de los sermones, confrontaban oralidad y escritura en términos de “voz viva” y “lengua muerta.” La opinión de Mateo Alemán tiene estricta correspondencia con la de Alejo de Venegas al decantarse éste por la palabra pronunciada en su propio lugar, “la cual en tanto escede a la escrita, cuanto el hombre biuo al cuerpo sin anima.”

El libro es un sucedáneo: uno lee sobre algo porque no lo puede tener o contemplar en sí mismo. La escatología cristiana estuvo muy pendiente de esta naturaleza distante y provisional del libro, porque todo en la vida cristiana queda aplazado. El libro tiene que sustraerse a ese aspecto mortífero que le caracteriza. Las sagradas escrituras lo dicen: Litera occidit, spiritus autem vivificat, “la letra sola mata, mas el espíritu vivifica” (II Corintios 3, 6). En la estela de lo dicho por Mateo Alemán y Alejo de Venegas, Grisóstomo el despechado es menos testamentario: “Con muerta lengua y palabras vivas”, dice en su canción desesperada (I, 14; 148). He aquí la paradoja: el texto escrito está apartado de lo vivo humano, mientras que su estricta estabilidad visual, como dice Walter Ong, asegura su resurrección por parte de un número virtualmente infinito de lectores vivos. Esto significa el fracaso de Sócrates en su intento por convencer a Fedro: como creía el dios Zeuz, la escritura se convierte en la alacena de la memoria. Desde San Jerónimo los libros se erigen en memoria eterna de los hombres. Otro contemporáneo de Cervantes, Malón de Chaide, hablaba de “viva memoria de que fueron en otro tiempo y supieron y escribieron.” Y un predicador, al que bien pudo Cervantes escuchar en su púlpito, fray Pedro de Vega, insistía en la misma relación: “escritura es

---

12 Mateo Alemán, Ortografía... 120. Véase Margit Frenk 152-80.
14 Hans Blumenberg 41.
15 Clemencín ve aquí la presencia de un romance de la novena parte del Romancero general de Flores: “Si quieres amar de burlas / y ser de veras querida, / vayan tus palabras muertas / donde van mis obras vivas,” El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha (1967), 1159.
16 Walter Ong 84.
17 Malón de Chaide 128.
vida de la memoria, que ya fuera muerta. Registro donde buelve a hallar lo que una vez perdió, deprende de nuevo lo que se aúa olvidado, y da vida a lo que ya estaba muerto y sepultado en las tinieblas del tiempo.”\textsuperscript{18}

Don Quijote leería lo mismo en el prólogo del \textit{Caballero Zifar} o en el de \textit{Tirante el Blanco}.\textsuperscript{19} Lugar común, pues, asiduo de los libros de caballerías. De todas las citas traídas aquí a colación, tal vez la más pertinente procede de un soneto incorporado a uno de esos innumerables manuales de caligrafía que proliferaron en el siglo XVII. Su autor es Calderón de la Barca: “Pues en doctos caracteres pudieron / Hazer de lo pretérito presente, / Hablar lo mudo, y percibir lo ausente, / Los que en la estampa a no morir murieron.”\textsuperscript{20}

Son muchos los ejemplos y, al parecer, se trata de preocupación secundar. Américo Castro cita el testimonio de Al-Mas´udi, escritor nacido en Bagdad en la primera mitad del siglo X, quien pondera el libro como el amigo mejor y el más seguro: “allega lo que está lejos a lo que está cerca de ti, el pasado al presente; combina las formas más diversas, las especies más distintas. Es un muerto que te habla en nombre de los muertos, y que te trae el lenguaje de los vivos.”\textsuperscript{21} Similar fue la voz divina que Teresa de Jesús escuchó para atemperar la pena por el veto a los libros en romance: “Yo te daré libro vivo.”\textsuperscript{22} Sepulcros y libros abiertos forman alianza para representar la vanidad del conocimiento, el destino terrenal de cualquier orgullo. Es ésta relación tenebrosa entre calavera y libro característica de la pintura barroca, naturaleza muerta, emblemas del tiempo transcurrido, en definitiva.\textsuperscript{23} Desde las crónicas troyanas de Dictis Cretense y de Dares Frigio,\textsuperscript{24} de lejos viene el motivo del libro encontrado en una sepultura, tan habitual por demás en los libros de caballerías. Es conocida la presentación que hace Garcí Rodríguez de Montalvo de las \textit{Sergas de Esplandián} encontradas en una tumba de piedra. Pero no lo es tanto que en la \textit{Crónica del rey don Rodrigo} de Pedro del Corral se da noticia de un

\textsuperscript{18} Citado por Fernando Bouza 88.
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Libro del Caballero Zifar} 70. Joanot Martorell 7.
\textsuperscript{20} Calderón Joseph de Casanova.
\textsuperscript{21} Américo Castro 377.
\textsuperscript{22} Santa Teresa 26, 6; 347.
\textsuperscript{23} Fernando R. de la Flor.
\textsuperscript{24} Francisco Márquez Villanueva, \textit{Fuentes...} 2.47.
pergamino que Carestes, vasallo del rey don Alfonso el Católico, encontró en la sepultura de don Rodrigo:

Yo Carestes […] fallé una sepultura en un campo en la cual estavan escritas estas palabras que agora oíredes en letras góticas. Esta sepultura estaba delante de una iglesia pequeña fuera de la villa de Viseo. […] E por lo que yo fallé escrito en esta sepultura só de intención quel Rey don Rodrigo yaze allí. E por la vida que él fizo segund me avedes oído en su penitencia, que así mismo estaba en dicha sepultura escrito en un libro de pergamino, creo sin dubda que sería verdad.25

Es sencillo rastrear en Don Quijote la presencia de algún libro en las cercanías de un sepulcro. En ese ultramundo de condenados que llevan siglos esperando la llegada mesiánica de don Quijote hay un catafalco en el centro del palacio cristalino. Y ace allí el cadáver hablador de Durandarte. Con voz desmayada, ante la más que segura probabilidad de que el caballero manchego a nadie libere, al paladín Durandarte solo le queda permanecer en el ataúd y expresar su resignación con aquel “paciencia y barajar.” El primo que le condujo a la cueva, siempre atento a cualquier dato útil para su historia de los orígenes, aprovechará estas palabras para su libro Suplemento a Virgilio Polidoro. Altisidora, por el contrario, abandona el sepulcro ante la negativa de Sancho de aceptar nueva mortificación de su carne. Después recreará en la cámara de don Quijote el infierno donde los demonios jugaban con el libro apócrifo de Avellaneda. Pero donde con mayor claridad se ve la estrecha conexión entre escritura y muerte es, sin duda alguna, en el episodio del desesperado Grisóstomo. En aquellas páginas libros y fosas se abren al mismo tiempo. Alrededor del cadáver del impostado pastor, en las mismas andas en que es transportado, aparecen “libros y muchos papeles, abiertos y cerrados” (I, 13; 143). Pretende eterno y decidido olvido. Sin embargo, el caballero Vivaldo libra de las llamas su canción desesperada, incumpliendo la voluntad última del fallecido: tierra para su cuerpo y fuego para sus textos. Y la canción se va leyendo al tiempo que se va cavando la sepultura (I, 13; 146). Y aún tenemos otro

25 Pedro del Corral 12.
muy esclarecedor ejemplo en el representado por el florentino Anselmo, el curioso impertinente que redacta una declaración inculpándose de su mortífera curiosidad, y antes de finalizar su palinodia escrita, el aliento le falta y deja la vida sin acabar la razón de su testimonio. Fue hallado “tendido boca abajo, la mitad del cuerpo en la cama y la otra mitad sobre el bufete, sobre el cual estaba con el papel escrito y abierto, y él tenía aún la pluma en la mano.” (I, 35; 422)

Anuncio y negación del futuro
De un modo muy convincente Ehrlicher ha mantenido que Don Quijote de 1605 hace de la ausencia de fin, de su naturaleza inconclusa, un principio poétolóxico. La conclusión del primer volumen no es definitiva, pues se deja abierta la posibilidad de continuación, pero tampoco es provisional, pues se anuncia la muerte del héroe y se incluyen los epitafios escritos en su memoria. En efecto, el narrador último nos informa de que ha buscado los hechos de la tercera salida de don Quijote, de que en las memorias de La Mancha queda su participación en unas justas en Zaragoza, donde ya se sabe que le sucedieron cosas dignas de su valor y entendimiento. También reconoce que la “buena suerte” le deparó un “antiguo médico” que tenía en su poder una caja de plomo que guardaba la noticia de las hazañas y de la sepultura del caballero. Y ese último narrador deja caer, casi condescendiente, que tal vez se anime a buscar y sacar nuevas aventuras. Sucedía poco antes, en el mismo capítulo, una escena de hechura muy similar, cuando Sancho llora y clama un panegírico sobre un don Quijote al que considera muerto por el espadazo del disciplinante. Se nos dice que ‘revive’ el caballero por sus voces y gemidos, y Sancho, aliviado por la resurrección, encarece el regreso a la aldea para, una vez allí, pergeñar nueva salida de más provecho y fama. Este es, pues, el panorama: muerte, pero aviso de continuación; anuncio de futuro, pero negación del mismo. Esta aparente paradoja domina la atmósfera que define el final de Don Quijote 1605. Y diríase que se extiende a toda la obra de Cervantes y aún a su propia vida, pues sus últimas palabras, firmadas en el prólogo y dedicatoria de Persiles y Sigismunda, anuncian la inminencia de la muerte
pero al mismo tiempo se prometen nuevos libros. De manera parecida don Quijote promete a Sancho nuevos títulos al tiempo que declara post tenebras spero lucem (II, 68; 1179), lema de su editor Juan de la Cuesta incluido en el frontispicio del libro en 1605.

La sugerente propuesta de Ehrlicher parte de que Don Quijote pone un acento especial en la dificultad de dar inicio y dar fin a la escritura. No encontramos a Cide Hamete antes del capítulo noveno, y aún antes de resolverse este problema el cura dice de su amigo Miguel de Cervantes que “propone algo, y no concluye nada.” Como se sabe, es un comentario a propósito de que Alonso Quijano tiene en su biblioteca un ejemplar de La Galatea. La continuación de este su primer libro, del que siempre se mostró orgulloso, fue una constante e incumplida promesa, símbolo en él de lo interminable. En Cervantes “terminar” adquiere una importancia que va más allá de cualquier anécdota relativa a la narración. Hay quien explica esta imposibilidad de fin mediante la filiación de Don Quijote a los libros de caballería, diseñados ex profeso para generar una escritura indefinidamente prolongada. La inacabable descendencia de la genealogía textual del caballero andante es algo que el cura y el mismo don Quijote ponen de manifiesto (I, 1; 38 y II, 74; 1221). Obra que queda pendiente de nueva entrega y en constante fragmentación, en Don Quijote pocas cosas tienen término definitivo. Casi todas las historias se muestran interrumpidas, y difícil es encontrar personaje que pueda iniciar, desarrollar y concluir su relato o declaración. En esta dirección cabe el sentido del prólogo de 1605, donde Cervantes se muestra a sí mismo remiso e incapaz de poner punto y final, y reconoce abiertamente que muchas veces tomó la pluma para escribir el requisito último del prólogo y muchas la dejó, imposibilitado de rematar su Don Quijote. El refrán de Sancho “hasta la muerte, todo es vida” (II, 59; 1108) se podría parafrasear y ampliar: ‘nada es libro mientras haya vida.’ Ya antes Sancho había concordado imprenta y cuna en su reivindicación textual ante la duquesa (II, 30; 876). En buena lógica cabría concordar ataúd y última palabra impresa. En 1615 el tiempo
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apremiaba para Cervantes, viejo y en pleno sprint por hacer del libro un aliado extremo de la muerte. Y sabía que ese punto y final coincide con el hálito supremo. Don Quijote lo había dicho muy claramente: “todo es morir, y acabóse la obra.” (II, 24; 228)

Una propuesta para Ginés de Pasamonte

Esta imposibilidad de término es definitoria de Cervantes, rasgo de su talante creador, y si bien este aspecto de la obra inconclusa es característica del romance y de los libros de caballerías, en Don Quijote se da un paso más y se emprende una muy fértil senda en la figura de Ginés de Pasamonte y su impedimento de dar fin a un libro coincidente de pleno con el desarrollo de una vida (“¿cómo puede estar acabado si aún no está acabada mi vida?”). La lucha por alcanzar el final de la obra antes de que concluya la propia vida fue brecha intelectual abierta por Guzmán de Alfarache, y de enorme trascendencia en la historia de la ficción. Francisco Rico recoge al respecto el testimonio de Basilio Sanctoro y su obra Prado espiritual, biografía del obispo de Valladolid e inquisidor general. En la dedicatoria se dice que su destinatario merecería en un hipotético paraíso de santos “dignísimo lugar, a poderse escribir la vida de un santo antes de acabarla.” Rico ve en estas palabras una exacta concomitancia con lo que le dice Ginés a don Quijote y concluye que no “hay noticia de ninguna otra que se le acerque tanto como la que nos ha sorprendido en la dedicatoria del Prado espiritual.”

Hay, no obstante, otras opciones. Michel Moner cree que las palabras de Ginés de Pasamonte subrayan la inadecuación entre vida y literatura y señala al caso que ya Juan Luis Vives aludía a esto mismo cuando distinguía “entre la crónica de los hechos del príncipe (o del capitán) y la relación de su vida, teniendo por difícil que ésta se escribiera mientras el sujeto estuviese en vida.” Llevar a cabo el relato de una vida antes de que ésta termine fue problema puesto de manifiesto por los historiadores y biógrafos, aunque tal vez fuera más apropiado hablar de tanatógrafos. Y

30 Francisco Márquez Villanueva, Trabajos...; Antonio Rey Hazas; Hanno Ehrlicher, Alemán....
31 Francisco Rico 469.
32 Michel Moner 92a. Cita a Vićtor Frankl 89.
aventura Moner una dirección muy apropiada para el acercamiento a ese desajuste entre escritura y vida: la dedicatoria que Francisco López de Gómara incluye en su *Crónica* de los Barbarrojas. Éste es el texto referido por Moner:

Dos maneras hay, muy ilustre señor, de escribir historias; la una es cuando se escribe la vida, la otra cuando se cuentan los hechos de un emperador o valiente capitán. De la primera usaron Suetonio Tranquillo, Plutarco, San Jerónimo y otros muchos. De aquella otra es el común uso que todos tienen de escribir, de la cual para satisfacer al oyente bastará relatar solamente las hazañas, guerras, victorias y desastres del capitán: en la primera se ha de decir todos los vicios de la persona de quien se escribe; verdadera y descubiertamente ha de hablar el que escribe vida; no se puede bien escribir la vida del que aún no es muerto; las guerras y grandes hechos muy bien, aunque esté vivo. Las cosas de los demás excelentísimos capitanes que ahora hay, hablando sin perjuicio de nadie, he emprendido de escribir, no sé si mi ingenio llegará a su valor, ni si mi pluma alcanzará donde sus lanzas; pondré a lo menos todas mis fuerzas en contar sus guerras. Ninguno me reprenda al presente si dijere o echaré de menos alguna cosa en esta mi escritura, pues no escribo vida, sino historia, aunque piense, si los alcanzare de días, de escribir asimismo sus vidas.”

Basilio Sanctoro, Luis Vives o López de Gómara, todos válidos para dilucidar el asunto en cuestión. Pero dada la evidencia del estrecho vínculo que une *Guzmán de Alfarache* y *Don Quijote*, ¿por qué no explicar las palabras de Ginés con el final de la obra de Mateo Alemán?: “Aquí di punto y fin a estas desgracias. Rematé la cuenta con mi mala vida. La que después gasté, todo el relante della verás en la tercera y última parte, si el cielo me la diere antes de la eterna que todos esperamos.”

La futura escritura, es decir, lo que queda de vida, depende de la muerte. El texto, pues, es deudor de los días de vida. Cervantes, como hemos visto, es el ejemplo. Alcanzar el final de la obra antes de que termine
la propia vida deja abiertas las puertas de la ficción, impide el cierre de cualquier escritura. Hay quien recurre al mito de Sísifo, símbolo metonímico de la condición humana, para explicar Guzmán de Alfarache: cualquier meta que se proponga el ser humano es inalcanzable, lo que significa que el fin se relega a un perpetuo aplazamiento. En esas postreras palabras del pícaro Guzmán podría perfectamente originarse una nueva disección crítica de las de Ginés de Pasamonte.

**Anterioridad de la escritura**

Recordemos: el llamado “segundo autor” sale a buscar la continuación del texto interrumpido al final del capítulo octavo. Y el último narrador de 1605 aparece para concluir el texto y aventurar que tal vez se anime a buscar nuevas aventuras. Y en Don Quijote de 1615 Sansón Carrasco anuncia la promesa de Cide Hamete Benengeli de una continuación que va buscando con extraordinarias diligencias y que, en el caso de hallazgo, la dará a la estampa guiado más por interés económico que por cualquier otra razón. Dicho de otra manera: el libro ya está escrito, la escritura es siempre previa, anterior a todo. De hecho, don Quijote sale al mundo no para localizar salvedades o excepciones, sino para confirmar que el mundo exterior al libro es un calco perfecto del libro leído por él. Esto significa que desde un principio él sabrá lo que va a suceder en el mundo exterior al que se arroja, pues ya ha sucedido previamente en las páginas leídas. Hasta que los demás no le ofrezcan la opción del encantador, don Quijote en estos iniciales capítulos de la primera parte se limitará a eliminar cualquier atisbo de anomalía o diferencia respecto al modelo libresco. A partir del capítulo séptimo, el encantador será socorrido recurso para que don Quijote se explique lo inexplicable para él: que en el mundo exista algo que no esté previamente en el libro. La continuación no es, por tanto, labor de escritura, sino de localización, de búsqueda, de arqueología. Y la promesa de nueva entrega es su fin constitutivo. Prometer segundas partes es en Cervantes dinámica habitual, en La Galatea, en Ocho...

---

34 Benito Brancaforte en Mateo Alemán, Guzmán... 7-10.
35 Trabajo aún sin emprender: las razones por las que unas veces el texto es labor de búsqueda, como las referidas, y otras labor de escritura, así por ejemplo en II, 44 y 45.
comedias y ocho entremeses, en Rinconete y Cortadillo, en las dos partes de Don Quijote, en Persiles y Sigismunda...

Esta relación con la anterioridad enlaza con la propuesta de Roy Harris de considerar lo escrito “un objeto, y no un acontecimiento.”³⁶ Y como tal objeto depende de la materialidad de la escritura y de las diferentes formas de inscripción del lenguaje, proceso que implica diferentes intervenciones, copistas, editores, impresores, cajistas, corretores...y diferentes materiales.³⁷ La materialidad presupone el soporte, y no hay ejemplo mejor de la consistencia del mismo que aquel de Leriano bebiéndose antes de morir las cartas de su enamorada Laureola. Nada hay más tangible que aquello que se ingiere: “Hizo traer una copa de agua, y hechas las cartas pedaços echólas en ella, y acabado esto, mandó que le sentasen en la cama, y sentado, bevióselas en el agua y así quedó contenta su voluntad.”³⁸

Cide Hamete promete continuación pero dice que no la ha hallado ni sabe quién la tiene. El libro, objeto concluido, ya está escrito y es labor de búsqueda en un yacimiento de libros, archivo, biblioteca o lo que se tercie. Luis Vives hablaba de aquellos libros que “yacieron en las viejas bibliotecas, ocultos por la herrumbre y el polvo.”³⁹ Don Quijote queda sepultado no en tierra, sino en un texto, entre anaqueles y legajos, en un yacimiento de letras, como había anunciado en el prólogo: “En fin, señor y amigo mío –proseguí-, yo determino que el señor don Quijote quede sepultado en sus archivos de la Mancha.” Al final se confirma que en las memorias de La Mancha, en la escritura como sinónimo de memoria que reposa en la silenciosa y yacente quietud de un archivo, aquellos archivos manchegos en que al autor tanto le costó inquirir y buscar, queda para la posteridad relación de don Quijote. Su fin y acabamiento solo es posible gracias a esa caja de plomo que escondía pergaminos escritos en letras góticas y que daban cuenta de la sepultura y de los epitafios de los académicos de Argamasilla. Desde el momento en que con esta caja se alude a los desenterramientos de supuestas reliquias y escrituras sagradas
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en el Sacromonte, suprema impostura morisca, estos escritos, como dice Ehrlicher, atestiguan lo poco fiable y manipulable que es el medio de la escritura, documentos que, además, necesitan la labor filológica de uno de los académicos “por estar carcomida la letra.” Se nos dice que este filólogo, casi en funciones de forense, a costa de muchas vigilias y muchos trabajos consigue descifrar algunos versos, y esta fijación y establecimiento del texto es el acta de defunción, la credencial de su muerte. De todo lo cual se deduce que la escritura plúmbea con que se cierra la primera parte de Don Quijote es, a buen seguro, tan falsa como la de los libros del Sacromonte. Habría que insistir mucho más de lo que se ha hecho hasta ahora en esta circunstancia de la escritura falsificada de los hechos del caballero andante.

Un médico morisco

La última voz narrativa de la primera parte nos dice que el autor “ni de su fin y acabamiento pudo alcanzar cosa alguna, ni la alcanzara ni supiera si la buena suerte no le deparara un antiguo médico que tenía en su poder una caja de plomo...” (I, 50; 591). Un médico nunca deja de serlo, a no ser que haya sido apartado de su profesión. Habida cuenta de la frecuencia y abundancia de médicos moriscos,40 y de una política española destinada a alejarlos de la práctica de la medicina,41 es más que probable que detrás de ese “antiguo médico” se oculte igualmente otro morisco dispuesto a místificar.42 Su presentación en el libro es muy similar a la del aljamiado traductor del manuscrito arábigo de Cide Hamete: “la suerte me deparó uno” (I, 9;108), dice ese buscador de cartapacios y papeles viejos por la Alcaná de Toledo al encontrar al joven traductor. Ahora a ese último narrador ‘la buena suerte le depara un antiguo médico’ que le facilita aquella caja de plomo con los pergaminos de la escritura sepulcral. Todo encaja en esa atmósfera atañedera a los libros apócrifos del Sacromonte.

40  Luis García Ballester.
41  Luis S. Granjel 82.
42  Apuntado por Case 21 y Márquez Villanueva, Fuentes... 317.
El yacimiento del texto
Por otro lado, coincido con la idea de que este fin es el ramal definitivo de un debate presente a lo largo de toda esta primera parte: la legitimidad de la ficción y la epistemología de la verdad. Desde las páginas iniciales (“basta que en la narración del no se salga un punto de la verdad” I, 1; 37) hasta el careo entre el canónigo de Toledo y un don Quijote que no distingue en su turno de respuesta entre historia y ficción (I, 49), este trasfondo histórico de la falsificación morisca de santas y verdaderas escrituras alude al difícil discernimiento entre la verdad y la falaz credibilidad de la ficción. Esta es preocupación constante en Cervantes. Sirva de mero ejemplo la comedia del Gallardo español y las palabras de Guzmán para dar fin a la comedia: “cuyo principal intento / ha sido mezclar verdades / con fabulosos intentos /.” No es raro en la obra cervantina que la ficción remita, paradójicamente, a la verdad. El lector atento sabe que con suma frecuencia a la verdad se accede a través de la fábula, como si fueran inestables las señales o rasgos que distinguen el sueño de la vigilia, la ficción de los hechos. No sobra aquí comentar que incluso un descreído científico como Francisco Sánchez afirmaba que “toda ciencia es ficción.”

Los epitáfios se dedican a don Quijote, Dulcinea y Sancho. En los debidos a los académicos Monicongo y Cachidiablo se declara que tanto don Quijote como Sancho “yacen.” En la segunda parte de 1615 el epitafio será labor de Sansón Carrasco y de igual modo en él se alude a que allí “yace el hidalgo fuerte.” Del verbo latino iaceo, en el diccionario de Alfonso de Palencia se recoge que “el que murió yaze,” sin más. Pero desde tiempos bien lejanos, “yacer” es el verbo más adecuado para indicar lo que queda en escrito, depósito sempiterno de la memoria y garantía de veracidad. Así en el Auto de los Reyes Magos se lee: “dezirm’án la uertad, si iace in escripto” (verso 125). O en el Libro de Alexandre: “en scripto yaz’esto, sepades, nos vos miento” (copla 11d); “en scripto yaz’esto, es cosa verdadera” (copla 2161d); “non yaze en escripto, es malo de creer” (copla
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Similar en el *Libro de Apolonio*: “Bien deuié Antinágora en escripto iacer” (copla 551a). Y ya como definitiva asimilación vemos en Sem Tob que el verbo “yacer” es el que más y mejor remite a la escritura y a su perpetua permanencia:

Negar lo que se dize,
A veces ha logar;
Mas su escribto yaze,
Non se puede negar
(...)
e la razón que puesta
non yaze en escrito
tal es commo saeta
que non llega al fito.

Como inscripción que se pone en la laude, describe Covarrubias la palabra “epitafio.” “Arte de escultor y grabadura de lapidario”, es la definición bíblica. Escribir es lo que Dios ordena a Moisés, que grabe sobre dos piedras de ónix, que las engaște y guarnicione de oro para escribir–escribir los nombres de los hijos de Israel (Éxodo XXVIII, 9-12). “Vive en este volumen el que yace / en aquel mármol, Rey siempre glorioso” escribía Góngora para el principio de la *Historia del señor rey don Felipe II*, de Luis de Cabrera.47 Tambié don Quijote yace, pero bajo las losas de los sonetos–epitafio, a la espera, se dice, de “forsí altro canterà con miglior plečtio.” Y “yace” de nuevo cuando la pluma personificada toma la palabra al final de la segunda parte para exigir al escritor fingido y tordesillesco que deje reposar a don Quijote en su sepultura, que renuncie a exhumarlo y a sacarlo de la fosa-libro donde “yace” tendido de largo a largo, en horizontal, como las líneas tendidas de la escritura. Porque lo que queda sepulto es el texto, la escritura convertida ya en escrito, culminada y finada.

---
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**Impresa / empresa**

Para algunos el paso del plectro (fin de 1605) a la pluma (fin 1615) es sinónimo del paso de la voz a la escritura. Pero al margen de la evidente ambivalencia oralidad / escritura en *Don Quijote*, al margen de esto, el “prudentísimo” Cide Hamete cuelga su pluma en una espetera con la esperanza de que allí quede por largos siglos, y solicita a ésta, no sabe si bien o mal cortada, péñola suya que advierta a los historiadores futuros de que no osen descolgarla del alambre, y espetá a modo de conjuro:

¡Tate, tate, folloncicos!
De ninguno sea tocada,
porque *está impressa*, buen rey,
para mí estaba guardada.

Se verá que he escrito y enfatizado *impressa*. Así figura en la edición príncipe de 1615, aunque con no poca frecuencia los editores corrijen el texto y proponen a cambio la lectura de *empresa*. Suele atribuirse a Schevill y Bonilla la enmienda; no obstante en la edición conmemorativa del III Centenario de la muerte de Cervantes ya aparece la corrección *empresa*. Pero bastantes son los que mantienen la *impresa* inicial (Juan Alcina, Celina Sabor de Cortázar e Isaías Lerner, Vicente Gaos, Martín de Riquer). Desde la edición de John Bowle (1781) sabemos que los versos reproducen, con una ligera variante, los de un romance incorporado a las *Guerras civiles de Granada* (1ª parte) de Ginés Pérez de Hita. Es significativo que se deban a Alonso de Aguilar, encargado por el rey de poner el pendón en la Alpujarra, los versos “aquella empresa, señor / para mí estaba guardada.” En apoyo de *empresa* está la gran cantidad de veces que don Quijote repite o parafrasea la locución ‘esta empresa para mí está guardada’ (I, 20; II, 22; II, 27; II, 41).

---
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En los años 1987 y 1989 Helena Percas de Ponseti insiste otra vez en la propuesta “está impresa.” Seis años después Eisenberg se opuso a esta lectura y se mantuvo firme en leer “esta empresa”, lo que dio lugar a que de nuevo Helena Percas se reafirmara en una última respuesta.\(^{52}\) Si antes citábamos las razones para apoyar empresa (romance del cerco de Granada y uso de Cervantes en otros lugares), quepa ahora apoyar a Percas de Ponseti y a todos los que optaron por impresa.

Percas recoge impresa como anomalía de empresa. El Tesoro de Covarrubias parece confirmarlo en el mismo campo semántico: “emprenta por otro nombre prensa.” A su vez, en el Diccionario de Autoridades se especifica que emprenta “es lo mismo que imprenta.” Es usual esta alternancia vocalica, verificada y confirmada en multitud de textos. Por ejemplo en la Ingeniosa comparación entre lo antiguo y lo presente de Cristóbal de Villalón (1539): “tanta perfección y polideza en las emprentas de la Italia, Basilea y Francia...”\(^{53}\) O en las Historias peregrinas y ejemplares de Gonzalo de Céspedes y Meneses (1623): “Doce historias prometí en mi Gerardo, y otras diera hoy a la emprenta si...”\(^{54}\) Lo mismo sucede en las Ordenanzas para la emprenta de San Pedro mártir de Toledo...” (1672). En éstas un tal licenciado Tomás de Salazar, por mandado del rey, estipula cómo se ha de obrar para la “buena cuenta y razón, guarda y custodia de las bulas de la Santa Cruzada, y otras bulas que se imprimen y se han impreso en la dicha emprenta.”\(^{55}\) Percas subrayaba en sus notas algo que se aviene bien con lo visto hasta aquí: la tendencia cervantina a jugar, habitualísima en él, y a concentrar en una sola palabra dos conceptos distintos. Es decir, el juego aquí consistiría en proponer al lector la anfibología “esta empresa está impresa.” Es una opción plausible, desde luego. Todavía en la segunda mitad del siglo XVIII existe la confusión como podemos ver en las Letters concerning the Spanish Nation, de Edward Clarke, quien atribuye a Cervantes las “Impressas políticas” de Saavedra Fajardo.\(^{56}\) Esto mismo se corrobora en otro texto cervantino, la Numancia, donde un

\(^{52}\) Esta es la secuencia: Helena Percas de Ponseti, “Tate...”, “A Revision...”, Daniel Eisenberg y Helena Percas de Ponseti, “Nota a la nota...”.
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sacerdote dice: “Si acaso yo no soy adivino, / nunca con bien saldremos de \textit{esta impresa}. / ¡Ay desdichado pueblo numantino!”\footnote{Miguel de Cervantes, \textit{El cerco de Numancia}, II, 792-794; 67.}

Curiosamente, los que por error pasan por ser los que originaron el cambio de \textit{impresa} a \textit{empresa}, Schevill y Bonilla, conservan en su edición de la \textit{Numancia} la forma “\textit{ynpresa}.”\footnote{Miguel de Cervantes, \textit{Comedia del cerco de Numancia}, II, 21-23;135.} Recientemente Luce López Baralt ha preferido volver a hablar de “\textit{impresa}” o escritura “guardada” para apoyar su novedosa propuesta: que con \textit{esta} pluma de Cide Hamete Benengeli se alude al cálamo supremo del \textit{Corán}. Para un árabe, apunta, la escritura siempre está asociada al establecimiento de un destino irremisible, por lo cual el texto debe quedar sellado para siempre, que nadie contravenga el destino clausurado por la muerte, lo que sucede, a su parecer, en las líneas últimas de \textit{Don Quijote}.\footnote{Luce López Baralt.} Lectura que incidiría en la idea de \textit{impresso} como sinónimo de finalizado, concluido y muerto.

**OBRAR Y ESCRIBIR**

La memoria es hija de la pluma y del papel, afirmaba el emblemiṣta Lorenzo Ortiz.\footnote{Lorenzo Ortiz en Antonio Bernat Vištarini y John T, Cull 661.} Muchas veces Cervantes había tomado la pluma para escribir un prólogo que se le resistía, y muchas terminaba con el papel delante y la pluma en la oreja.\footnote{María A. Roca Mussons II, 1222-23.} Al final el narrador que relata las palabras de Cide Hamete a su pluma le cede el turno para que profiera aquella célebre declaración:

Para mí sola nació don Quijote, y yo para él; él supo obrar y yo escribir; solos los dos somos para en uno, a despecho y pesar del escritor fingido y tordesíllesco que se atrevió, o se ha de atrever, a escribir con pluma de avestruz grosera y mal delinada las hazañas de mi valeroso caballero, porque no es carga de sus hombros ni asunto de su resfriado ingenio; a quien advertirás, si acaso llegas a conocerle, que deje reposar en la sepultura los cansados y ya podridos huesos de don Quijote, y no le quiera llegar, contra todos los fueros de la muerte, a
Castilla la Vieja, haciéndole salir de la fuesa donde real y verdaderamente yace tendido de largo a largo, imposibilitado de hacer tercera jornada y salida nueva.

Al margen de posibles alusiones a la pluma de La pícara Justina, o de su uso en Viaje del Parnaso, o de su ascendencia literaria, o de la paráfrasis de las palabras dirigidas a su espada por un moribundo Roland, o de la despedida en la Arcadia de Sanazzaro de la zampoña que queda colgada en un árbol, despedida que imitará Lope de Vega en su Arcadia y en Los pastores de Belén, al margen de todo esto la invocación al utensilio de la escritura tiene lógica cabida en este fin material del libro. La pluma desea seguir allí, colgada de la espetera, largos siglos sin que nadie atente contra todos los fueros de la muerte, declaración en primera persona dicha oralmente, no escrita, como perspicazmente se ha observado. No se trata de impedir la resurrección del personaje, sino de negar la vuelta de la hoja, el plus ultra del texto, la siguiente línea al punto y final. Lo escrito solo es cuando deja de ser, cuando cesa, cuando es participio pasado. Se dice que es argucia de Cervantes para evitar cualquier iniciativa del espurio continuador. Pero no es eso, o no es solamente eso, pues ya figura en el diseño cervantino antes de la aparición de Avellaneda este definitivo y funerario cierre de puertas. En 1605 también todo concluía con la muerte de la escritura. La escritura sepulta. Lauda, lápida, catafalco para las letras andantes. Y Don Quijote queda bajo el poder de una pluma que se enseñorea ufana como poseedora de lo escrito. El emblemista Francisco de Zárraga dirá: “todo el mundo está debajo de una pluma como el mundo todo en manos de una lengua.”

A modo de coda, quisiera añadir aquí una reflexión acerca del hecho de que ‘don Quijote supo obrar y la pluma escribir’. Fray Antonio de Guevara en su Relax de príncipes describe cómo el emperador Marco Aurelio entrega la llave de su biblioteca al anciano Pompeyano. Le advier-

---

63 Lope de Vega, La Arcadia 451.
64 Martin v. Koppenfels 78.
65 Francisco de Zárraga en Antonio Bernat Viñarini y John T. Cull, emblema 1205, 591.
te que en esa biblioteca hallará muchas cosas de su mano bien escritas y bien ordenadas, y continúa:

y también confieso que hallarás muy pocas dellas por mi esecutadas. Y en este caso me parece que, pues tú no las supiste escrivir, que las se-pas obrar, y desta manera tú alcanzarás premio de los dioses por aver-las obrado, y yo alcanzaré fama entre los hombres por averlas escrito.\[66\]

He aquí una semejanza que da que pensar.

**Supremum vale**

Antes decía que en Cervantes la idea de término, de fin, adquiere una importancia que va más allá de cualquier anécdota relativa a la narración. Con muchísima frecuencia Cervantes “remata la historia”, como decía Mateo Alemán, con la palabra “fin”, “finis”, o en boca de alguno de los personajes o a modo de didascalia: en Numancia, en La Galatea, en Don Quijote 1615, en el Rufián Dichoso, en La gran sultana, en Laberinto de amor, en La entretenida, en El gallardo español, en La casa de los celos, en Los baños de Argel, en El juez de los divorcios, en Persiles y Sigismunda... La última palabra de Don Quijote 1615 es la misma con que se termina el prólogo de Don Quijote 1605: el latínismo “vale.” En aquel ya lejano y arduo prólogo, Cervantes se despide escuetamente de su lector: “Y con esto, Dios te dé salud, y a mí no olvide. Vale.” Diez años después una voz muy cercana a la de este primer prólogo cierra y selía el libro para siempre, y aclara que su deseo fue poner en aborrecimiento de los hombres los libros de caballerías, y agradece que a causa de su don Quijote “van ya tropezando, y han de caer del todo, sin duda alguna. Vale.” Los editores recientes apenas anotan el término. Solo en algunas ediciones se recoge que la palabra “vale” es un latinismo que significa despedida. En el Universal voc-ocabulario en latín y en romance, de Alfonso de Palencia, año 1490, podemos leer: “vale es del que se parte como salve y ave del que viene. Otrossí a los muertos se dize vale. Es verbo de renunciación, y de hacer por el muerto plegaria.”\[67\] El Diccionario de Autoridades recoge Supremum vale,

---

66  Fray Antonio de Guevara 474.

67  Alfonso de Palencia.
el trance de la muerte. Son éstas las palabras de Orfeo cuando pierde por segunda vez a Euridice.\textsuperscript{68} Prueba de la frecuencia de su uso son los numerosos ejemplos: Moreto, Calderón, Juan Pérez de Montalbán, Suárez de Figueroa...\textsuperscript{69} Y es expresión que Cervantes empleó en varias ocasiones. En \textit{La Galatea}: “hizo una sepultura en el mismo lugar donde el cuerpo estaba, y, dándole el último \textit{vale}, le pusieron en ella.”\textsuperscript{70} En el \textit{Gallardo español}: “morir sirviendo a Dios, y en la muerte, / cuando el hado les fuere inexorable, / dar el último \textit{vale} a sus maridos.”\textsuperscript{71} En \textit{Persiles y Sigismunda}: “traería una gran cruz que en su estancia tenía y la pondría encima de aquella sepultura. Diéronle todos el último \textit{vale}.”\textsuperscript{72} En \textit{Don Quijote} la Trifaldi dice: “Muerta, pues, la reina, y no desmayada, la enterramos; y apenas la cubrimos con la tierra el dimos le último \textit{vale}...” (II, 39; 947).

\textit{Don Quijote} se cierra con la despedida a un muerto. Y el más allá del \textit{vale} queda como dominio exclusivo de un lector que va leyendo.
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Carolyn Lukens-Olson has written that *Los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda* is Cervantes’ attempt to reinvent the chivalric hero, replacing his traditional arms with persuasion (51). Rhetoric is so important to the work that Lukens-Olson pithily concludes that Cervantes very well could have begun the *Persiles* with the tag “Verba virumque cano” (70). Alberto Blecua provides a similar analysis based on his reading of the *Persiles* and of Cervantes’ other works: “Es muy probable que Cervantes creyera que el orador era un *vir bonus dicendi peritus* según la conocida definición” (134). Like the *Persiles*, *Don Quijote* is a work novel full of speeches, and Cervantes’ “intimate knowledge of rhetorical precepts, the ease with which he uses the classical figures of thought and language, are apparent in every line” (Mackey 51) of many of the speeches in the novel. The characters’ words often cause conflict with other characters, lead to an amusing scene for the reader, or both. One only has to think of the results of Don Quixote’s speech when he arrives at Don Diego de Miranda’s home: both Don Diego and his son are confused because Don Quixote mixes lofty rhetoric with his outlandish behavior. Don Lorenzo opines: “él [Don Quijote] es un entrevorado loco, lleno de lúcidos intervalos” (776) and both father and son “se admiraron… de las entremetidas razones de Don Quijote, ya discretas y ya disparatadas” (781).

It is not surprising to find rhetoric in *Don Quijote*. The *ars bene dicendi* was the heart of the educational system for thousands of years, and was the fundamental subject for students during the Renaissance and Baroque. Boys started their formal education by reading Cicero, the rhetor *par ex-*
cellence, and by listening to the teacher explain the rhetorical structure and the rhetorical figures in a passage. As they progressed, students also began to write compositions according to the rules of rhetoric. Even students without a university education were very familiar with rhetorical patterns of thought and speech. Brian Vickers, an expert in Renaissance rhetoric, observes that even young students “were thoroughly drilled in every stage of the art” (Vickers 258). Those students that did graduate from the university, no matter what their specialty, were men intimately familiar with rhetoric and its many uses because “[c]ivil society formed itself and acted, usually for the better, through rhetoric” (Grendler 233), at least according to the theory of Renaissance humanist educators.

Traditionally, however, women were excluded from this comprehensive rhetorical education. Joan Gibson summarizes the trend saying,

Both sexes pursued a general study of literature encompassing a continuum of grammar, rhetoric and poetics, but the systematic conflation of the persuasive aspects of logic and rhetoric served to separate the more specialized parts of rhetoric from grammar and was usually available only to male students. (11)

In fact, those girls and young women that were offered an education learned in the vernacular and their curriculum consisted of the more “feminine” arts of singing and sewing (Grendler 99). A consequence of the absence of formal rhetoric in women’s education was that their voice in official circles was silenced: “...speech, authority and persuasion were systematically denied even to educated women by the obsessive demands of a constraining decorum” (Gibson 18). For the few women did somehow move on to more advanced humanistic studies, which would naturally include advanced studies in rhetoric, their education was viewed as “an end in itself, like fine needlepoint or the ability to perform ably on the lute or virginals” (Grafton 56), and not as something that would eventually be put to use by society.

Notwithstanding this sociological generalization, every reader of Don Quijote knows that Cervantes does give a voice to many of his female characters, and that they use it effectively to lay out their cause to their
respective audiences and to Cervantes’ audience as well. In fact, several of these women are quite forceful in the defense of their actions or in asking for assistance from other characters. They become successful advocates for their own cases. In particular, the rhetorical interventions of Marcela, Dorotea and Ana Félix are worthy of analysis, though Marcela’s for different reasons than Dorotea’s and Ana Felix’s. Ironically, because Marcela employs a more traditional rhetorical mode than the other two women do, she fails, while Dorotea and Ana Félix abandon the Ciceronian model of rhetoric and deliver orations that win over their audiences to their cause.

Marcela’s case is the first and perhaps most obvious use of rhetoric by a woman in Don Quijote. She has been accused of homicide by the men of her neighborhood: because she did not return Grisóstomo’s love for her, he died of desperation. Marcela does not accept this charge and appears at Grisóstomo’s funeral to defend herself. Mary Mackey has analyzed Marcela’s speech according to the classical norms of rhetoric and finds that it is almost technically perfect, that her style is appropriate and that her oration “does expose the logical development of her thoughts” (60). Hart and Rendall, in a subsequent article, also analyze Marcela’s discourse, and though they find it does have some rhetorical flaws, they also hold it in high regard as a solidly constructed piece of rhetoric in the classical tradition. In spite of the critics’ concurrence as to the excellent structure of Marcela’s discourse, Mackey’s conclusions differ significantly from Hart and Rendall’s.

Mackey uses formal rhetorical patterns—Marcela’s speech at Grisóstomo’s funeral and Don Quixote’s speech before the goatherds—to make judgments about how Cervantes attempts to differentiate his characters through their speech acts, while at the same time he criticizes the Baroque excesses of elocutio. By comparing Marcela’s speech with Don Quixote’s on the Golden Age, Mackey observes that Marcela is a paragon of true Christian rhetoric because of her careful control of elocution and the precise development of her arguments. On the other hand, according to Mackey Don Quixote’s highly ornamented speech given before a group of uneducated shepherds is a substandard oration. Mackey concludes that “…the surest indication of [Don Quixote’s] madness is his in-
decorousness” (63), and so, conversely, Marcela’s excellent sense of what is decorous indicates her sanity.

Hart and Rendall counter Mackey’s argument by pointing out what should be obvious: Marcela’s speech does not convince anyone present. Grisóstomo’s friend Ambrosio has some vituperative verses against Marcela placed on Grisóstomo’s headstone, and in spite of Marcela’s spirited defense of her liberty, Don Quixote feels he needs to protect her from the men who might want to follow her off into the wilderness. According to Hart and Rendall, Marcela fails because she gives an inappropriate speech at an inappropriate moment (292). Further, both Marcela and Don Quixote “confuse what is possible in literature with what is possible in life” (298).

Like Hart and Rendall, I am not convinced that Marcela has succeeded in her rhetorical endeavor, even though she has clearly demonstrated her technical expertise in the *ars bene dicendi*. Obviously, she has been well instructed in the art of public speaking and knows how to manage rhetorical arguments expertly. Her failure has little to do with what she says or how she says it. She fails because she is, of course, a woman, and a Renaissance woman was not to speak eloquently. Eloquence is not a virtue for her; rather, it distinguishes her and marks her as an aberration.¹ Marcela’s rhetoric, in effect, is another indication of her perverse behavior. She chooses not to conform: she has left town for the wilds, she denies Grisóstomo—or any man—her love, she will not marry and have a family, and she will not remain silent. Each of these components of Marcela’s behavior put into relief her status as an outcast.

Though many modern readers finds something noble and likable about Marcela’s “spunk,”² each of her attitudes would have lead her con-

---

¹ There is a limited range of opinion on this topic during the late Renaissance, with some commentators arguing that women have equal capacity for eloquence, but because of their domestic duties it is incumbent upon them not to exercise that faculty. Others view the virtues of man and woman as distinct and often opposite, so while a man ought to be eloquent, a women should be silent. Influential humanists such as Erasmus, Agrippa and Vives held the latter view (Maclean 55-56).

² In addition to Mackey’s favorable treatment of Marcela, other critics have viewed her favorable as well. Jehensen, as one example consistent with much of the modern criticism of the episode, views the shepherdess’ non-traditional behavior as the focus of the episode (30) and that her behavior is laudable (31). Likewise, García opines “Cervantes le otorga a la mujer una con-
temporaries to draw one conclusion: Marcela is unchaste, goatherd-narrator Pedro’s comment to the contrary notwithstanding. An unmistakable sign of this, from a man’s perspective, is precisely her skillful, if ultimately ineffective, use of rhetoric. Though a man was to strive, according to the theorist of the time, to be a *vir bonus dicendi peritus*, there was no such thing as a *mulier bona dicendi perita* in the Renaissance. On the contrary, silence was a virtue for a women. A woman who did attempt speaking in public staked her reputation and honor. In one of her studies on women and rhetoric in Renaissance culture, Patricia Bizzell observes that “the woman speaking in public was almost obsessively condemned in Renaissance culture, and that condemnation usually took the form of branding her as unchaste” (“Opportunities” 52). In her study on Erasmus’ *In Praise of Folly* Bizzell uses an apt metaphor to explain the relationship to women and rhetoric during the Renaissance:

> The adult woman who entered the arena of rhetorical combat unprotected by great political authority risked being treated like the only female player in a touch football game: and what chaste woman would take such a risk? (“Praise” 11)

Given this pervasive attitude, what would any man educated in the Renaissance have thought of the shepherdess? The modern reader, because Marcela is a woman who uses classical rhetoric aptly, may view her as subverting the Baroque legal system for her own benefit (García 59). But in the end, her rhetoric is not persuasive. But not only is her rhetoric

---

3 Pedro says of Marcela, “No se piense...que venga en menoscabo de su honestidad y recato: antes es tanta y tal la vigilancia que mira por su honra, que de cuantos la sirven y solicitan ninguno se ha alabado ni con verdad se podrá alabar que le haya dado alguna pequeña esperanza de alcanzar su deseo” (133). Ambrosio also attests to Marcela’s purity: “Y con esto queda en su punto la verdad que la fama pregona de la bondad de Marcela, la cual, fuera de ser cruel, y un poco arrogante, y un mucho desdeñosa, la misma envidia ni debe ni puede ponerle falta alguna” (152). Both of these observations are given before Marcela’s speech of self-defense.

4 Ian Maclean points out that silence is one of the virtues of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and therefore was thought to be the ideal for all women (25).
ineffective,\(^5\) it has had the opposite effect than she intended: she cannot publicly defend herself against the accusations without risking even greater censure by men. Cervantes’ skillfully deploys formal rhetoric to further characterize Marcela, but not, as Mackey concludes, to provide a worthy model of emulation, nor as Hart and Rendall argue, solely to demonstrate that both Don Quixote and she confuse a literary mode with reality. Marcela’s rhetoric, along with her other “eccentric” behaviors, further classify her as a woman apart—for the modern reader in a positive way, but for Cervantes’ contemporaries, this is an aberration worthy of censure.\(^6\)

Marcela’s rhetoric provides a striking contrast to Dorotea’s use of the verbal arts. When the priest, the barber and Cardenio come upon her in the wilds, Dorotea is dressed as a man and is lamenting her fortune. Soon, however, the men discover what they have already known: this beauty is a woman, not a man. Her beauty and the paradox of her costume provoke the curiosity of the men, and they approach her to learn more. Taken unawares, Dorotea must mold her words to fit the situation, and she uses pathos weighted rhetoric. Her discourse might be classified as judicial just as Marcela’s is because Dorotea is attempting to prove “cuan sin culpa” (322) she is in the present case, though at this point neither the men nor the reader knows why she has ended up in the middle of the mountains alone and dressed as a man; they are entirely ignorant of the case being presented before them.

Dorotea begins her speech in a traditional way, with an attempt at captatio benevolentiae. In classical rhetoric, the introductory part of any speech aims at making the listeners “receptive, well-disposed, and atten-

\(^5\) Hart and Rendall concede that Marcela’s use of logical argumentation is “marked by an almost scholastic rigor and thoroughness and we may fairly grant that she makes effective use of the appeal to reason or logos” (291-92), but that her attempt to engages her listeners on the emotional plane are rather limited (292), and at a funeral of the shepherds’ friend, perhaps emotion would have been employed more logically.

\(^6\) Mackey makes the distinction between Don Quixote’s and Marcela’s ostensible and actual audiences (62-63) who they speak to within the narration and the contemporary reader of the narration. In Marcela’s case, both of these audiences are the same: educated men of the upper classes. While Marcela’s ostensible audience may have been overcome by her beauty so as to overlook the faux pax of her speaking like a man in public, her actual audience would not have missed the underlying significance of her rhetorical style.
tive” (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 13) to the arguments that will follow, and one way of doing that is to capture the listeners’ good will. In order to thank them for their offer of help, Dorotea will tell them the whole unvarnished truth, though she would rather not. On the face of it then—even though in the traditional schema this discourse would be classified as judicial—Dorotea does not necessarily view the priest, the barber and Cardenio as judges. She narrates her story as an expression of gratitude for the offer of help. By her own admission, she does not explicitly seek to influence them because they are powerless in her cause: “no habéis de hallar remedio para remediar [mis desdichas], ni consuelo para entretenérlas” (320).

If this is indeed the case, then Dorotea’s speech is taken out of the realm of “traditional” rhetoric and placed into a different context, a rhetoric that modern theorists have termed “invitational rhetoric” (Foss 5). This system of rhetoric is one proposed by feminists as an alternative to classical rhetoric, which in one way or another seeks to use some kind of force to control the actions of another and is therefore inherently “a form of social and intellectual violence” (Ryan 70) often employed by the patriarchy, broadly understood. Invitational rhetoric, on the other hand, does not seek to exercise power over another, but rather “constitutes an invitation to the audience to enter the rhetor’s world and see it as the rhetor does” (Foss 5). That some power may, in fact, be exercised as a result of this invitation, invitational rhetoricians do not deny, but that change is not the primary purpose of the discourse (Foss 6). Sharing and understanding are.

Narrative is in many ways a fundamental aspect of invitational rhetoric: “a story is not told as a means of supporting or achieving some other end but as an end itself—simply offering the perspective the story represents” (Foss 7). In Dorotea’s case, it is fair to ask the questions, “Why is Dorotea so frank with these three men? What is her purpose? What, if

---

7 “Patriarchy, in the context of invitational rhetoric, is the *social system* in which we tend to function, not the radical separation of gendered activities. Men and women alike may not agree with the system, they may not live by the system’s constraints, and many women and men, in fact, challenge the ‘rules’ put forth by the system, but, they still function within such a system” (Bone 442).
anything, does she really want?” The men, through the priest have offered to share her pain: “hallaréis quien os ayude a sentir vuestras desgracias” (320), but more than anything else Dorotea wants them to understand how she came to be alone in the mountains dressed as a man because of the injustice of Don Fernando.

By offering this story, Dorotea is in some small way shifting the cultural paradigm through which the men see her. She does not focus on her “mistake,” if it can be termed such, but rather the circumstances and events that precede and follow from it. At one point during her narrative, she lets the men into her mind, describing for them her thought processes:

Y o, a esta sazón, hice un breve discurso conmigo, y me dije a mí misma, ‘Sí, que no seré yo la primera que por vía de matrimonio haya subido de humilde a grande estado... Pues si no hago ni mundo ni uso nuevo, bien es acudir a esta honra. (226)

She is utterly honest with the men (a point corroborated by the multiple voices that tell different parts of this story), and they, in turn, are moved and honest with her, offering her whatever help they can. With her narrative, Dorotea employs resourcement.

Re-sourcement is “a response made by a rhetor according to a framework, assumptions, or principal other than those suggested in precipitating the message” (Foss 9). This response is generally made in a way that is not threatening to the individuals involved, but involves shifting perspectives. Dorotea does not accept the fate left to her by her putative husband. She could very well have argued following a traditional rhetorical scheme that what she did was not wrong, but right, and that the true fault was Don Fernando’s. After all, the Council of Trent vehemently denounced this type of secret marriage precisely because of the possible abuses women could suffer at the hands of a man, but the Church Fathers nevertheless recognized the validity of vows made in secret, as matrimony is a sacrament administered by the spouses and only witnessed by a
cleric. Instead of this possible direct confrontation with her parents and the society in which she lives, she changes tactics and sets off in search of Fernando. Her actions have opened up new rhetorical possibilities for her, and that is the purpose of re-sourcement (Foss 9). Likewise, by presenting her predicament in a way that is not threatening to her audience, Dorotea opens yet another rhetorical possibility: the chance to speak with Don Fernando.

Though the principal aim of invitational rhetoric is not change, it does not preclude that a discourse can have an effect on its listeners. The primary goal of a speech in this mode, however, is to explain and to help another understand (Foss 6; Ryan 70; Bone 436). If that understanding leads to change, in effect, if the rhetor has convinced her audience, so be it. Here, the Thomistic doctrine of double effect is useful: Dorotea does not believe these men can help her; she only wants to share her story. That is her purpose even though other consequences may follow. But her story does effect a change, in fact a series of events that will lead to her eventual reunion with her husband in Chapter 36.

Dorotea is as formidable a woman as Marcela. Both have made a decision and both have actively undertaken courses of action contrary to the expectations of society. Despite these similarities, Dorotea’s use of rhetoric is much more effective than Marcela’s. Marcela attempts to persuade the men she speaks to by means of traditional argumentation. She relies too much on ethos (a lost cause, in her case from a man’s point of view) and logos, and she fails. Dorotea’s exclusive use of narration as a means of establishing pathos leads to not just a rhetorical “victory,” but also to a more important end: her reintegration into society through marriage with her Don Fernando. In its entirety her story moves from order, to chaos and then back to order again (García 79). Because her rhetoric is

---

8 The Council Fathers said that “Although it is not to be doubted that clandestine marriages made with the free consent of the contracting parties are valid and true marriages...” such marriages were prohibited because of the possible abuses inherent in them (*Trent* 183)

9 Succinctly defined “The doctrine (or principle) of double effect is often invoked to explain the permissibility of an action that causes a serious harm, such as the death of a human being, as a side effect of promoting some good end” (McIntyre). Within this rhetorical context, the serious harm is the persuasive power exercised by the rhetor since according to many theorists of invitational rhetoric, persuasion is a sort of violence (Foss 3), but the greater good of sharing her story outweighs the possible negative effect.
viewed as “feminine” by the men and used in function of reestablishing societal order, it is an acceptable form for the women to use. It does not place Dorotea in the position of Marcela, who has attempted to co-opt traditional rhetoric, thereby making a “monster” of herself.

Dorotea is not the only woman to employ a pattern of invitational rhetoric in *Don Quijote*. In Part II Ana Félix’s social situation differs from Dorotea’s, but in many ways the context of their rhetorical interventions are similar. Ana Félix, like Dorotea, is first seen as a man by the men who will be her audience. Like Dorotea, her beauty is astounding and is immediately noticed by all the men. Unlike Dorotea, however, Ana Félix’s speech is both urgent and important because she is been found guilty of homicide and is about to be hung from a yardarm. Even as she starts her discourse, the rope is around her neck.

Her speech is very similar to Dorotea’s in structure: she begins by talking about herself and her family, stressing that they are good Catholics, even though suspicion has been cast on them due to their *morisco* ancestry. She says, “Tuve una madre cristiana y un padre discreto y cristiano ni más ni menos... Ni en la lengua, ni en [las costumbres] jamás, a mi parecer, di señales de ser morisca” (816). The second part of her discourse is the narration proper: she recounts how she and Don Gaspar Gregorio met and fell in love, and how he followed her in her exile. She has returned to Spain in order to get the ransom for Gregorio, whom she left in Algiers disguised as a woman.

Though Ana Félix is about to die, she does not explicitly plead her case. Her rhetoric is not the expected judicial discourse typically employed by a defendant in a criminal cause. Instead, Ana Félix resorts to some of the concepts of invitational persuasion; she invites her listeners to commiserate with her. Like her father Ricote, Ana Félix will not allow the general socio-historical situation in Philip III’s Spain to overshadow her own particular case. By presenting her individual case and the par-
ticular circumstances surrounding it, Ana Félix employs re-sourcement. She invites her listeners to see her life not as simply part of an anonymous group, but rather as an individual.

Instead of attempting to prove her innocence and purity in this case of honor by means of logical proof and argumentation as Marcela does, Ana Félix tells a story in the same way that Dorotea does. That is, the narratio in the morisca’s discourse is inflated to become the rhetorical vehicle by which she will achieve her ends: an audience who has listened and understood her history. Ana Félix like Dorotea makes great use of pathos—both women are intent on using a story that will provoke an emotional response from their audience.

These women’s use of invitational rhetoric is not absolute, however, because they lack one of the fundamentals for true communication according to this theory: “To engage in invitational rhetoric is to exchange ideas from positions of mutual respect and equality” (Bone 437). It is obvious, for instance, that even though Marcela attempts to speak to Grisóstomo’s friends as equals and employing a rhetorical method acceptable to them, she is rejected. Dorotea and certainly Ana Félix are in no position of equality. In a society with a rigid code of honor and a strict hierarchy, both of these women are vulnerable—Ana Félix doubly so because of her standing as a woman and as morisca. Dorotea’s and Ana’s rhetoric is more of a “proto-invitational” rhetoric. It shares some aspects of the invitational rhetoric that would be described by modern rhetorical theorists. Neither Dorotea nor Ana Félix speaks from a position of equality with her audience. But both do rely on story, they do not explicitly construct a judicial speech like Marcela does, and they both use a technique that is either re-sourcement or very similar to it. In traditional terms, Dorotea’s and Ana Félix’s rhetoric is strongly built on Aristotelian concepts of ethos and pathos, and only minimally on logos.

But as if to compensate for the lack of equality between men and women, Cervantes adds a balancing factor, at least in the eyes of men: Marcela’s, Dorotea’s and Ana Félix’s beauty is almost overwhelming to the men that surround them. Pedro, one of the shepherds who tells the tale of Marcela, says “…nadie la miraba que no bendecía a Dios, que tan hermosa la había criado y los más quedaban enamorados y perdidos por ella”
(86). The narrator describes the Cardenio’s reaction at seeing Dorotea: “no es persona humana, sino divina,” (318) and the priest and barber concur. When Ana Félix appears on board the Spanish warship in Barcelona dressed as a man, the narrator describes her as “uno de los más bellos y gallardos mozos que pudiera pintar la imaginación humana” (1151), and her beauty “aéts as an immediate catalyst, Don Antonio Moreno and the Viceroy showering presents on her and offering her unlimited hospitality” (Hitchcock 184). The beauty of all these women serves as a non-verbal captatio benevolentiae since it makes the women’s listeners attentive, receptive and even sympathetic to their speech even before they begin to speak.

Another of Cervantes’ creations who relies heavily on invitational rhetoric and not traditional argumentation is Ruy Pérez de Viedma, the capitán cautivo who tells his story in Chapters 39-41 to everyone gathered in the inn. The Captive’s tale is in many ways similar to the women’s stories. Like Dorotea and Ana Félix, he is often a victim of his fate: “Rui Pérez, hombre de verdadero temple heroico, no hace en su novela casi nada, pues siempre le arrastran los azares adversos y también las voluntades más poderosas de otros seres tal vez menos nobles” (Márquez Villanueva 98). His arrival at the inn reminds of Joseph and Mary searching for shelter the night of the Nativity (DiRenzo 10; Casalduero 176; Gerli 45), and underscores both his status as an outsider and his vulnerability. Of course, he is a man and so is not in the same social position as the Marcela, Dorotea and Ana Félix. Nevertheless, his rhetoric is not in this case determined by his gender but by his status as “outsider.” He has lived for year away from Spain, and a good many of those years were spent in captivity. When he returns to Spain, he expects, and rightly so, to be treated with suspicion after having spent so many years as a captive, possibly having become a renegado, one who has renounced the Faith in favor of Islam. Orthodoxy is by nature suspicious of outsiders and necessarily wants to exclude them. The fear of corrupting society with a renegade was particularly acute, since he, the renegade, was “la imagen invertida del converso y expresa la otra cara del español, la parte maldita, ya que en él señorea la tentación de darse al enemigo, de traicionar a los suyos invirtiendo el signo de las más apreciadas certidumbres” (Illades 14).
Though the narration Cervantes places in Ruy Perez’s mouth is a fiction, it obviously contains historically accurate elements. It is probable that like the renegade of the tale, Ruy Pérez himself would have had to appear before the ecclesiastical authorities. The Captive, then, must prove himself worthy of reintegration by appearing before the Inquisition and offering testimony of his faithfulness to the Church and to Spain. As a primary step, he first shares his experiences with his audience, in anticipation of the “inquisitorial autobiography”\(^\text{12}\) that he may have to produce for the Tribunal of the Inquisition.

As in any autobiography, logical proofs and formal rhetoric are not the best tactic employed to narrate a life. The Captive, like Dorotea and Ana Félix, uses narration to invite his listeners to understand his situation. The folkloric elements (Chevalier) as well as the literary antecedents and other aspects of this intercalated novel have been studied (Márquez Villanueva 92-146), along with the biographical elements (Mayer). Ruy Pérez, following the same narrative pattern that the women employ, begins his narration with his family background, and then explains why he chose his career. He recounts his military exploits and tells two sonnets that lament and memorialize the battle of La Gola. This is a fortunate inclusion, since the cousin of one of Don Fernando’s friends was the author of those poems, a coincidence which perhaps draws all the listeners further into the Captive’s tale.

By the end of his narration, the reader recognizes that Don Fernando and the others listening to the Captive’s tale are themselves captivated by the narration, and in fact, would like to hear the tale again because of its literary qualities. Don Fernando tells the Captain:

\[\text{Por cierto, señor capitán, el modo que habéis contado este extraño suceso ha sido tal, que iguala a la novedad y estranzeza del mismo caso: todo es peregrino y raro y lleno de accidentes que maravillan y suspenden a quien los oye; y es de tal manera el gusto que hemos recibido en escuchalle, que aunque nos hallara el día de mañana entre-}\]

\(^{12}\) “Inquisitorial autobiography” is a term Kagan uses to describe one of the manners by which those accused by the Holy Office employed to defend themselves against accusations brought against them (4).
tenidos en el mismo cuento, holgáramos que de nuevo se comenzara. (493)

But the sweetness of the narration does not just provide a pleasant experience to his listeners since the other effect is an offer of assistance:

...don Fernando, Cardenio y todos los demás se le ofrecieron con todo lo a ellos posible para servirle, con palabras y razones tan amorosas y tan verdaderas, que el capitán se tuvo por bien satisfecho de sus voluntades. Especialmente le ofreció don Fernando que si quería volverse con él, que él haría que el marqués su hermano fuese padrino del bautismo de Zoraida, y que él, por su parte, le acomodaría de manera que pudiese entrar en su tierra con el autoridad y cómodo que a su persona debía. (493)

By avoiding the formal patterns of classical rhetoric and instead relying more on narration and producing the *admiratio* demanded by the poetic theory of the time (Riley 88-94), the Captive has won over his audience to his cause, not through traditional persuasion, but by inviting them to listen and to share his history.

Ruy Pérez, in short, is an example of a man, an outsider, who can uses the same invitational rhetoric that Dorotea and Ana Félix do to relate to those with power. But in the duchess, Cervantes draws the portrait of a woman who has little need for any rhetoric, classical or invitational. In fact, she shows herself to be ignorant of even some familiarity with the art. After dinner with Don Quixote that the duke and duchess host and the comical beard washing episode invented by their servants, the duchess pleads with Don Quixote to describe his fair lady Dulcinea. This, Don Quixote avers, he is unable to do, for such a task could only done well by “la retórica ciceroniana y demoština” (895). When the duchess pleads that she has never heard the word “demoština,” Don Quixote explains that it has to do with Demosthenes, similarly, “ciceroniana” refers to Cicero, and these two men were the greatest rhetors of the ancient world. The duchess’ ignorance of the art may be due to two reasons: first, it may reflect both her lack of formal education in rhetoric and her reading hab-
its—like many nobles of the period who had retired from the court to the country, she is perfectly versed in the *novelas de caballerías*. A second and more important reason why this woman is ignorant of rhetoric is that she has power and is not afraid to wield it. After all, the duchess, along with her husband, invent the fabulous world in which Don Quixote truly believes at last that he is a knight errant; she even has the power to remake reality for Sancho:

...la autoridad de la duquesa es suficiente para que Sancho cuestione lo que él creía por experiencia propia: como miembro de una clase inferior, tiene que creer, o decir creer, o actuar como creyera, lo que afirma esa autoridad superior. (Rivers 40)

When the duchess is faced with a situation in which rhetoric—especially invitational rhetoric—might be useful, she resorts not to words, but to violence, and does so without any fear of repercussions. When Doña Rodríguez tells Don Quixote the secret of the “fuentes” on the Duchess’ legs, the duenna is immediately castigated by her mistress:

Luego la pobre dueña sintió que la asían de la garganta con dos manos...y que otra persona con mucha presteza, sin hablar palabra, le alzaba las faldas, y con una al parecer de chinela le comenzó a dar tantos azotes, que era una compasión. (1022).

The duchess has no use for rhetoric since in this world, she hold absolute power, deferring only to the duke, though at times he seems be nothing more than her “front man”.

In contrast to the duchess, those most in need of effective rhetoric are those with limited power or no power at all. They must somehow make themselves known as individuals. Marcela is as independent a woman

---

13 Paz Gago makes this observation about the reading habits of the duchess: “En este sentido, la duquesa y su esposo con fiel reflejo de los hábitos de la nobleza áurea que emplea su tiempo de ociosidad...en tres actividades esenciales, todas ellas ejercitadas en sus residencias campestres, como esta casa de placer de los duques: las trazas—en este caso efímeras—, la lectura y la caza” (176)
in the seventeenth century as she would be in the twenty-first century, and attempts to explain herself and justify her actions by co-opting the domain of men’s traditional rhetoric. Though she speaks eloquently according to the rules of the art, she utterly fails in her attempt to persuade her ostensible audience because the speech she gives does not conform to their expectations of how a woman should speak. Dorotea and Ana Félix’s rhetoric, on the other hand, is accepted by the men for two reasons: first, they do not follow the traditional rhetorical, male-dominated mode of communication. Their rhetoric conforms more closely to the notion of “invitational rhetoric” proposed by Foss and Griffin. Second, their rhetoric aims at a restoration of the status quo. Dorotea hopes to regain what she has unlawfully and immorally lost, her husband. Ana Félix also expresses a desire for reintegration: she wants to return home and she wants to marry her true love, a Catholic gentleman who has, in turn, sacrificed everything for love. Perhaps to these two reasons—their rhetorical mode and their desire for the status quo—we should add a third: beauty, though of course in Marcela’s case, her beauty is not great enough to offset her debilities—manly rhetoric and manly independence.

Women must at least play the part of victim to be heard by men, and being beautiful certainly does not hurt their cause. Cervantes acknowledges the limits of society—and perhaps his own limits—at the same time showing its promise. The limit for women is represented by the few choices available to them: indeed, both in theory and in praxis, according to Ian Maclean, “Marriage is an immovable obstacle to any improvement in the theoretical or real status of women in law, theology, in moral or political philosophy” (85). This limitation is typified by Marcela’s, Dorotea’s, and Ana Félix’s discourses and their relative success. Through these characters, Cervantes portrays both the rhetorical capacity of women and the receptivity of men to various forms of feminine rhetoric.
Works Cited

Grendler, Paul F. Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning 1300-1600. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989.


El receptor en el punto de mira: exordios encontrados en la primera parte de 

*Don Quijote de la Mancha*

*Rafael Climent-Espino*

Quisiera yo, si fuera posible, lector amantísimo, excusarme de escribir éste prólogo, porque no me fue tan bien con el que puse en mi *Don Quijote* que quedase con ganas de secundar con éste. 

*Miguel de Cervantes.*

Intentar aportar algo nuevo sobre los prólogos cervantinos no es tarea fácil, pues es un aspecto que la crítica ha tratado con bastante recurrencia hasta hoy día y que sigue y, probablemente, seguirá despertando su interés. Así, nos acercamos con humildad a un tema que sabemos tan estudiado.

El historiador francés Roger Chartier se ha referido a la obra maestra de Cervantes como “el libro de los libros” (4), definición muy acertada a nuestro parecer y con una doble significación, ya que por una parte hace alusión a *Don Quijote de la Mancha* (*DQ* en adelante) como una de las cimas de la literatura universal y, por otra, a que es un libro compuesto y formado por otros libros, refiriéndose sin duda a las novelas intercaladas. Cervantes era consciente de las críticas que podía sufrir por el hecho de intercalar historias o relatos breves en su obra. Si en la primera parte de *DQ* hay una serie de novelas intercaladas, aspeécto éste sobre el que la crítica es bastante unánime, pensamos que estarían también “prologadas” de una u otra forma con la intención de influir en el público y, para ello, Cervantes utiliza una herramienta de la oratoria clásica: el exordio. La tesis que se plantea en estas páginas es que cada novela intercalada está introducida por un exordio puesto en boca de distintos personajes, tras
los cuales está la voz de Cervantes que se dirige a su público lector, preparándolo para recibir positivamente lo que va a narrar. En este sentido estamos en consonancia con Bakhtin cuando afirma que “El autor de una novela polifónica no debe negarse a sí mismo ni a su propia conciencia, sino que necesita ampliar, profundizar y reconstruirla de una manera extraordinaria (ciertamente, en una determinada dirección) para poder abarcar las conciencias ajenas equitativas” (101). En DQ la importancia del lector es incuestionable, Cervantes quiere influir en él de forma muy sutil, deleitarlo y así crecer en fama.

Además de sacar a la luz estos exordios escondidos dentro de la obra, sugiero que Cervantes utiliza los diálogos que en ellos aparecen de forma casi subliminal para manipular la opinión del lector de DQ. Si esto es así, como pretendo demostrar en estas páginas, Cervantes está usando unos sistemas y recursos narrativos muy complejos que estarían por debajo del umbral de conciencia: dirige el discurso a un personaje concreto pero tiene en mente al lector como receptor último de su obra. En este sentido Riley señala en su Teoría de la novela en Cervantes que “el narrador oral más primitivo conoce la importancia que tiene sorprender a sus oyentes” (149), parece que Cervantes tuvo muy en cuenta este aspecto al escribir DQ; mediante el uso de distintos exordios, el escritor alcaláno, predispone al lector, a través de una adulación breve y sutil, a una positiva recepción de lo que va a leer o a escuchar, intentando influir en la recepción positiva de su obra, aumentar su fama y mejorar así su estatus.

Porqueras Mayo en su libro El prólogo como género literario se detiene considerablemente en el Siglo de Oro para afirmar que:

Los prólogos son más importantes en España que en otros países, porque nuestra literatura está atravesada (...) por una constante veta popular. De aquí se deduce que el autor proyecte su obra hacia la masa, se identifique plenamente con ella, y se fusione con su público en un íntimo diálogo. El vehículo expresivo adecuado será precisamente el prólogo. Y el prólogo, con verdadero valor literario, aparece, como elemento encargado de valorar lo humano: el lector (15).
Pensemos en el contundente “Desocupado lector” (I 95) de la primera parte o en el no menos llamativo “¡Válame Dios, y con cuanta gana debes de estar esperando ahora, lector ilustre o quier plebeyo, este prólogo” (II 25). Lope de Vega en su *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias*, cuyo eco encontramos en el capítulo XLVIII de la primera parte, ya afirmaba en su famosa sentencia que “como las paga el vulgo es justo hablarle en necio para darle gusto”. Cervantes y Lope eran conscientes de la importancia de la fama para mejorar su estado económico y social: la fama fue objetivo prioritario de muchos escritores aureoseculares.

En cuanto al receptor de la obra en el Siglo de Oro, Riley habla de “dos clases de público: la de los discretos y la del vulgo (...) entre los lectores cultos y con discernimiento y los lectores incultos y necios” (1966 178). Cervantes, consciente de la importancia del receptor, escribe dos elaborados prólogos para atraerse el favor del público. Los preliminares de *DQ* tienen la clara función de halagar a quien lee, darle importancia y mejorar la visión de la obra: “Tú, lector, pues eres prudente, juzga lo que te pareciere, que yo no debo ni puedo más” (II 232). Esta afirmación es sólo parcialmente sincera, ya que Cervantes nos describe siempre la reacción del público oyente intentando predeterminar cuál debe ser la del lector que, a menudo, tiene la última palabra. Riley sostiene que “El vulgo constituía la víctima propiciatoria adecuada, cuya estupidez y malicia podían ser atacadas por cualquier autor cuando éste se daba cuenta de que no era, o no podía ser, apreciado” (*Teoría* 175). Cervantes, que por tantas calamidades había pasado, no estaba dispuesto a que la voluntad de “los necios” lo relegara a un segundo plano en el ambiente literario de la época y actúa en consecuencia para evitarlo.

Según el DRAE, el prólogo “en un libro es el texto que precede al cuerpo de la obra y que generalmente sirve para hacer su presentación o la de su autor, o para explicar algo relacionado con ella”. Recuérdese que el étimo de prólogo viene del griego pro-: ‘antes’, y légo: ‘yo digo, hablo’. Por otra parte, señala este mismo diccionario que exordio es el “principio, introducción, preámbulo de una obra literaria, especialmente primera parte del discurso oratorio, la cual tiene por objeto excitar la atención y preparar el ánimo de los oyentes”. Hemos de notar, pues, que mientras el prólogo va dirigido al lector, el exordio se centra en el oyente, el canal
de trasmisión del mensaje en uno es la palabra escrita y en el otro la hablada. La importancia que adquiere la oralidad en DQ se debe a que el porcentaje de analfabetos de la época era elevado, también los necios formaban parte del público receptor. Porqueras, por su parte, confirma que “El exordio oratorio es una parte integrante del discurso. Su presencia es imprescindible. Nace con el discurso y no como el prólogo que nace, o puede nacer, independientemente de la pieza. Su conexión con el resto del discurso es evidente y participa de abundantes características del estilo de éste” (32). El exordio era/es la primera de las cuatro partes en que la retórica dividía el discurso: exordium, narratio, argumentatio y peroratio.

La influencia de Cicerón, autoridad de la oratoria, es clara en Cervantes, y su repercusión en el Quijote es importante, como señala Riley (1966 24), que dedica parte de un capítulo de su libro al tema de la admiración (Teoría 148-56) en DQ. Cervantes se refiere a Cicerón en varias ocasiones en su obra maestra (I 101), don Quijote (DQ en adelante) cita a Demóstenes y Cicerón como los dos mayores retóricos del mundo (II 302). El arte de hablar con elocuencia es siempre celebrado por los personajes, que quedan admirados cuando una persona pronuncia con propiedad un discurso.

Cervantes alaba el buen hablar y los buenos oradores, de hecho se podría considerar como un subtema de la obra, pues son recurrentes las ocasiones en la que unos personajes corrigan a otros cuando pronuncian palabras como no se debe y, por último, es significativo el progreso de la oratoria de Sancho Panza: “Y mira, Sancho, cómo hablas, y ten cuenta de no encajar algún refrán de los tuyos en tu embajada” (II 281) o “Muy filósofo estás Sancho – respondió don Quijote- muy a lo discreto hablas; no sé quién te lo enseña” (II 580). Tanto el “Discurso de la Edad de Oro” como el de “Las armas y las letras” son de una oratoria impecable y sirven para resaltar el “buen entendimiento y buen discurso en todas las cosas que trataba” (I 521) DQ. Que Cervantes titule el capítulo XXXVIII como “Que trata del curioso discurso que hizo don Quijote de las armas y las letras” (I 518) es significativo, pues hace referencia directa al tono eminentemente oral. Es curioso que, aunque el público cambia, el nivel de erudición de los dos discursos es el mismo: en el de “La Edad de Oro” son cabreros, en el de “Las armas y las letras” hay gente letrada. No
obstante, la reacción es la misma, todos se quedan asombrados del buen entendimiento de DQ. Lo ha ta aquí dicho subraya la importancia de lo oral y lo discursivo en DQ.

La fuerte relevancia de oralidad y escritura en la obra es evidente y, por ello, creo que no distinguir entre prólogo y exordio empobrece en cierta medida la recepción y la visión del texto. Sancho Panza reconoce que es iletrado: “que como no sé leer ni escribir” (I 190); si Sancho es analfabeto, su aprendizaje y las influencias que recibe no se producen a través de la lectura sino de lo que oye, hay aquí una dicotomía, como tantas otras en la obra, entre escritura y oralidad, aquélla se podría identificar con DQ, ésta con Sancho Panza. Derivada de esta dicotomía la importancia de lo escrito y de la materialidad del texto es, a nuestro parecer, de enorme significación en la novela, pero no menos importante es el campo semántico de lo auditivo en los exordios, que nos pondría en relación directa con la oralidad.

Mientras las aventuras de DQ y Sancho aparecen sin previo aviso, las novelas intercaladas están introducidas por exordios que informan al oyente de lo que va a acontecer a continuación. Pensemos en el hecho de que hay un acto comunicativo a través de dos canales paralelos distintos, por una parte lo oral, que se establece en la ficción entre personajes, por otra la lectura entre el lector y DQ, así pues a través del canal de la escritura se está reproduciendo el de la oralidad. El autor madrileño no utiliza el estilo libre indirecto sino que cede la palabra a los personajes, que dialogan utilizando el estilo directo: el escritor pasa así a un segundo plano en la narración. Nos acercamos aquí al concepto de polifonía de Bakhtin, pues ciertamente encontramos “una pluralidad de voces y conciencias independientes e inconfundibles, la polifonía de voces autónomas” (16).

Veamos un ejemplo para apoyar nuestra tesis. Tras el “Discurso de la Edad de Oro”, que los cabreros escucharon “sin respondelle palabra, embobados y suspensos” (I 196), se intercala una breve historia en DQ, la de los amores del pastor Antonio, que es introducida mediante un exordio de la siguiente manera:

Queremos darle solaz contento con hacer que cante un compañero nuestro que no tardará mucho en estar aquí; el cual es un zagal muy
entendido y muy enamorado, y que sobre todo sabe leer y escribir y es músico de un rabel que no hay más que desear. (...) Antonio, bien podrás hacernos placer de cantar un poco, porque vea este señor huésped que tenemos quién (...) y así te ruego por tu vida que cantes el romance de tus amores (...) que en el pueblo ha parecido muy bien (I 196-97).

Cervantes, conocedor de la psicología del “antiguo legislador que llaman vulgo” (I 96) que va a leer u oír su obra, prepara al receptor para recibir positivamente su texto. Este “darle solaz contento” o el “en el pueblo ha parecido muy bien”, así como los aumentativos “muy”, “sobre todo”, “no hay más que”, “bien podrás”, “ruego por tu vida”, etc., nos da idea de que el oyente u oidor va a asistir a un acto de tan enorme singularidad como no puede haber otro. Cervantes predispone al lector a una visión de lo que va a leer u oír que no puede ser más positiva, DQ es un oyente más entre los que allí se encuentran. Lo que planteo es que en este exordio, tras la voz del cabrero que se dirige a los allí presentes y a DQ, está la pluma de Cervantes que se dirige al lector subrepticiamente. Hemos apuntado que el exordio tiene la intención de “excitar la atención y preparar el ánimo de los oyentes” y Cervantes, gran conocedor de la oratoria y la retórica clásica, sabía muy bien cómo influir en ese público que lo lee o que lo oye. DQ ruega a Antonio que cante algo más; si partimos de la identificación de oyentes (cabreros y DQ) y lectores (nosotros) podemos interpretar este ruego de DQ como que al público le ha gustado lo que ha escuchado y al lector lo que ha leído. ¿No es curioso que DQ, después de *escuchar* la historia de los amores de Antonio, sea curado de su *oreja* por un cabrero que elabora el remedio en su *boca*? Las referencias al campo semántico de lo auditivo son evidentes.

El escritor complutense, que ya había mostrado la importancia que para él tenía el lector en el prólogo, pasa a la acción de una forma muchísimo más sutil, casi subliminal, pues este mensaje dirigido a diferentes personajes en la obra acaba permeando en un receptor último y único: el lector real o el personaje oidor. En los exordios Cervantes esquiva el nivel de consciencia utilizado en los prólogos donde se dirigía directamente al
lector y elabora su ficción para influir en el receptor. En cuanto a la lectura en esta época, García de Enterría ha afirmado que:

La enorme cantidad de pliegos sueltos que corrieron por las prensas y luego por las calles de España sólo nos permite pensar en, primero, una capacidad lectora más difundida de lo que se había pensado, por más que esa capacidad fuera elemental y por más, también, que afirmemos nuevamente la extensión del fenómeno bien conocido de la lectura oral. Y, segundo, que los lectores de esos pliegos sueltos no eran sólo los que leían con dificultad o se resignaban a escuchar su lectura y, tal vez, a aprenderse de memoria los textos (350).

Así pues, parece que este embobamiento en el que caen tantos personajes del Quijote al oír un cuento o una lectura provenía de la realidad de la época. Ese estado de asombro es el que intenta inculcar Cervantes al lector de DQ a través de los exordios. Otra muestra “cortada del mismo artífice y del mismo paño” (II 28) sería el exordio que da inicio a la historia intercalada de Grisóstomo y Marcela:

—¿Sabéis lo que pasa en el lugar, compañeros?
—¿Cómo lo podemos saber? – Respondió uno dellos.
—Pues sabed—prosiguió el mozo—que murió esta mañana aquel famoso estudiante llamado Grisóstomo, y que se murmura que ha muerto de amores de aquella endiablada moza Marcela (…)

Y don Quijote rogó a Pedro le dijese qué muerto era aquél y qué pastora aquélla;

a lo cual Pedro respondió que... (I 201).

Estos diálogos no carecen de cierta teatralidad, se podría ver aquí otra nueva identificación entre lector y espectador. De nuevo hay un acto introductorio hablado entre los personajes de la historia que se va a desarrollar con posterioridad. DQ “rogó” al mozo que contara la historia, o sea, le pidió con súplicas y encarecidamente que narrase lo que ocu-
rría. Cervantes crea suspense y da importancia a lo que se va a contar, afectando al lector con ello. Además, cuando la historia acaba, DQ toma de nuevo la palabra para decir que: “agradézcoos el gusto que me habéis dado con la narración de tan sabroso cuento” (I 207) que sería la reacción esperada por Cervantes del público lector que está leyendo su DQ, nunca hay reacciones negativas a estas historias. Esas partes finales de lo que se cuenta muy bien podrían relacionarse con otra herramienta de la retórica clásica, me refiero a la peroratio o peroración que como señala el DRAE es la “última parte del discurso, en que se hace la enumeración de las pruebas y se trata de mover con más eficacia que antes el ánimo del auditorio”.

Otra novela intercalada donde los rasgos señalados son más evidentes es la historia de Cardenio y Luscinda, el exordio de esta historia está al principio del capítulo XXIV cuando DQ dice: “yo os suplico (...) que me digáis quién sois y la causa que os ha traído a vivir y morir entre estas soledades como bruto animal” (I 332). Cardenio responde con lo que podemos considerar un breve exordio:

Si gustáis, señores, que os diga en breves razones la inmensidad de mis desventuras, habéisme de prometer que con ninguna pregunta, ni otra cosa, no me interrumpiréis el hilo de mi triste historia; porque en el punto que lo hagáis, en ése se quedará lo que fuere contando. (...) Esta prevención que hago es porque querría pasar brevemente por el cuento de mis desgracias; que al traerlas a la memoria no me sirve de otra cosa que añadir otras de nuevo, y mientras menos me preguntáredes, más presto acabaré yo de decírselas, puesto que no dejaré por contar cosa alguna que sea de importancia para no satisfacer del todo a vuestro deseo (I 332-33).

Este discurso tiene como público a DQ, Sancho y el cabrero pero, de nuevo, está sutilmente dirigido al lector de DQ. Llama la atención que Cardenio pida que no hagan preguntas, o sea, la premisa para contar la historia es que no haya diálogo, situando prácticamente al oyente al mismo nivel que al lector. Una pregunta, de difícil respuesta, que subyace a todo lo que aquí estamos planteando es quién manipula el discurso en Don Quijote de la Macha. La historia de Cardenio es especialmente curiosa en cuanto a los exordios, pues es interrumpida por la pelea ante el desacuerdo de opiniones entre el Roto y DQ sobre la honestidad de la reina Madásima. Tres capítulos después, en el XXVII, son el cura y el barbero
los que se encuentran con Cardenio en Sierra Morena y éste continúa su historia, que había quedado en suspenso. Cardenio introduce su historia con un nuevo exordio:

no sé más que dolerme en vano y maldecir sin provecho mi ventura, y dar por disculpa de mis locuras el decir de la causa dellas a cuantos oírlas quieren; porque viendo los cuerdos cuál es la causa, no se maravillan de los efectos, (...) os ruego que escuchéis el cuanto, que no le tiene, de mis desventuras, porque quizá, después de entendido, ahorraréis del trabajo que tomaréis en consolar un mal que todo consuelo es incapaz (I 375-76).

Otra vez el campo semántico de lo auditivo está presente con los verbos “oír” y “escuchar”. Las palabras de Cardenio al cura y al barbero son palabras que Cervantes, tras la voz de Cardenio, dirige al lector de la obra predisponiéndolo a leer la historia con interés y agrado, ésta va a ser contada para el oyente pero, en última instancia, es un mensaje del escritor al receptor.

Durante toda la obra Cervantes ofrece un complejo juego narrativo debido a la alternancia de materiales textuales y narradores, estos últimos se presentan, a veces, difuminados. Esa nebulosidad narrativa permitirá a Cervantes jugar con un amplio margen de libertad para influir en el narratario y en el lector implicado, “idea de un lector posible” (Reis 135), estos lectores-oyentes adquieren tantas formas como los narradores dentro de DQ. Iser afirma que “Authors play game with readers, and the text is the play ground. The text itself is the outcome of an existing world, but though the act is intentional, it aims at something that is not yet accessible to consciousness” (327). De nuevo, recordemos que la tesis planteada es que Cervantes crea un discurso mediante estos exordios con la intención de manipular la recepción de su texto.

Se señaló que el exordio es la parte introductoria del discurso del orador, del discurso hablado; en DQ hay un prólogo que podríamos calificar de metaprólogo -la importancia de la metaficción es indudable en la obra—que tiene carácter dialogado, pero también varios exordios que se corresponderían con las introducciones a las novelas intercaladas
y a algunos otros pequeños discursos dentro de la novela. La forma en la que Cervantes utiliza el exordio encaja perfectamente con la definición encontrada en Porqueras: “dizese exordium principio o comienço y el exordio faze el orador en la causa porque los oydores sean ganosos de saber y quieran bien al que dize” (57). Los personajes en DQ siempre están dispuestos a escuchar una historia, Cervantes utiliza esta herramienta de la oratoria como instrumento adecuado para “prologar” sus novelas intercaladas que tan distinta valoración habían tenido entre la crítica.

Otro caso no menos interesante es el de “El curioso impertinente”, en esta ocasión en formato de libro. En un principio esta historia está hecha para ser leída y así se hace, pero en voz alta, es el caso de lectura oral que ha señalado García de Enterría (350); la famosa maleta de la venta de Juan Palomeque también contiene, pues, un discurso oral al ser leídos los papeles que contiene. Veamos este nuevo exordio:

—Cierto que no me parece mal el título desta novela, y que me viene voluntad de leella toda.

A lo que respondió el ventero:

—Pues bien puede leella su reverencia, porque le hago saber que algunos huéspedes que aquí la han leído les ha contentado mucho, y me la han pedido con muchas veras (…) 

(…) había tomado Cardenio la novela, y pareciéndole lo mismo que al cura, le rogó que la leyese de modo que todos la oyesen. (…) 

—Harto reposo será para mí – dijo Dorotea – entretener el tiempo oyendo algún cuento (…) 

—Pues desa manera – dijo el cura-, quiero leerla, por curiosidad siquiera (…)
Acudió maese Nicolás a rogarle lo mismo, y Sancho también; lo cuál visto por el cura, y entendiendo que a todos daría gusto y él le recibiría, dijo:

—Pues así es, esténse todos atentos; que la novela comienza de esta manera (I 446).

Cervantes acrecienta el suspense subrayando el interés que tienen los personajes por lo que ven y oyen. En suma, se puede identificar en estos exordios a Cervantes con el narrador u orador y al lector-oidor con el narratario, cualquiera que sea, dentro de los exordios: “leer” y “oír” son acciones paralelas en el libro. El cura y Cardenio quieren leer, Dorotea, Sancho, maese Nicolás y los demás que allí estaban quieren escuchar la historia. El ventero ya nos ha informado de cuánto gustó la novela a los que la leyeron: Cervantes hace un trabajo previo para que la recepción de la obra sea positiva, creando una predisposición a que guste la novela. Recordemos el juicio del cura tras la lectura: “Bien—dijo el cura—me parece esta novela” (I 496) o el comentario de la duquesa en la segunda parte: “hemos de dar crédito a la historia que del señor don Quijote de pocos días a esta parte ha salido a la luz del mundo, con general aplauso de las gentes” (II 303), estos comentarios podrían funcionar como una suerte de peroratio tras el discurso. Este “bien me parece” y “el general aplauso de las gentes” es una forma de Cervantes de elogiar su propia obra y preparar a su público para que reciba positivamente las novelas que interpela en DQ. Cervantes juega también a ser crítico literario de su propia obra. El texto de “El curioso impertinente” es un objeto de intercambio entre escritor y lector, pero si los personajes son iletrados y la lectura no es posible, se introduce la lectura oral de la que habla García de Enterría, para que el texto llegue a todos. Anotemos que en este tipo de lectura, lector y orador convergen.

Como último ejemplo me gustaría señalar el exordio de la historia del cautivo y Zoraida. Esta novela, aunque con algunas interrupciones, se introduce después del famoso “Discurso de las armas y las letras” tras el que el narrador nos dice: “Todo este largo preámbulo dijo don Quijote en tanto que los demás cenaban” (I 521); ¿preámbulo de qué? Efectivamente,
la temática del discurso de DQ sobre las armas y las letras tiene mucho que ver con la historia del cautivo: ¿consideraba Cervantes este discurso como exordio de esta novela? En todo caso, al aparecer nuevos personajes, se precisa saber su historia, todos están en la venta de Juan Palomeque y es don Fernando quien pide al cautivo que dé cuenta de su vida:

don Fernando rogó al cautivo les contase el discurso de su vida, porque no podría ser sino que fuese peregrino y gustoso, según las muestras que había dado comenzado a dar, viniendo en compañía de Zoraida. A lo cual respondió el cautivo que de muy buena gana haría lo que se le mandaba y que sólo temía que el cuento no había de ser tal, que les diese el gusto que él deseaba; pero que, con todo eso, por no faltar en obedecelle, le contaría. El cura y todos los demás se lo agradecieron, y de nuevo se lo rogaron. (…) —Y así estén vuestras mercedes atentos, y oirán un discurso verdadero a quien podría ser que no llegasen los mentirosos que con curioso y pensado artificio suelen componerse (I 522).

Este exordio, como ya se ha señalado “causa que los oydores sean gnosos de saber y quieran bien al que dize”; todos los personajes, además del lector, creo, están esperantes ante la historia del cautivo que es también la historia de la bella Zoraida. De nuevo aparecen los ruegos para que cuente su historia, y hay una actitud positiva para escucharla, esto se transmite al lector de DQ que, probablemente, sienta la misma curiosidad que los personajes. La novela del cautivo ocupa gran parte de los capítulos XXXVIII-XLII y acaba de la siguiente manera: “No tengo más, señores, que deciros de mi historia, la cual, si es agradable y peregrina, júzguenlo vuestras buenos entendimientos; que de mí sé decir que quisiera habérosla contado más brevemente, puesto que el temor de enfadarme de cuatro circunstancias me ha quitado de la lengua” (I 564). El público aparece como juez de lo que ha oído, recordemos que el autor del prólogo ya pedía “lector carísimo, que perdones o disimules las faltas que en este mi hijo vieres, y ni eres su pariente ni su amigo, y tienes tu alma en el cuerpo y tu libre albedrío como el más pintado, y estás en tu casa, donde eres señor della (…) y así puedes decir de la historia todo aquello que
te pareciere” (I 95-96). Por tanto el lector, el vulgo, el público y su aplauso estaban, creemos, en el pensamiento de Cervantes al escribir los prólogos, los exordios y las peroraciones señalados en estas páginas.

Para concluir quiero señalar que no se han mencionado, ni mucho menos, todos los exordios que hay en Don Quijote de la Mancha, pero es suficiente lo haústa aquí dicho para apoyar la tesis de inicio. Hay que indicar que, a pesar de los exordios, la técnica de las historias intercaladas no dio muy buen resultado a Cervantes, pues recibió tempranas críticas por su inclusión en DQ. Cervantes reconoce en el capítulo XLIV de la segunda parte que: “Y, así, en esta segunda parte no quiso ingerir novelas sueltas ni pegadizas, sino algunos episodios que lo pareciesen” (II 387). El afán innovador de Cervantes en la novela lo llevó a arriesgar haústa sus últimas consecuencias en la técnica narrativa a sabiendas de las posibles críticas, lo cual demuestra que el escritor complutense fue valiente no sólo en las armas sino también en las letras.
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The Function of Skepticism in
Part I of Don Quijote

Daniel Lorca

The aim of this essay is to clarify one of the functions of skepticism in Part I of Don Quijote. More specifically, even though there are many studies about the presence of skepticism in the writings of Cervantes, there is one aspect of that philosophy that has not received all the attention it deserves: the way in which it gives thematic continuity and structure to the novel. As we shall see, Cervantes took deliberate advantage of skeptical philosophy to create a contrast between the story of Don Quijote and the character “Don Quijote.” On the one hand, Don Quijote’s dogmatism drives him from one adventure to the next, which gives continuity to the narration, and on the other, the story of Don Quijote is presented as being un-dogmatic. This structural contrast works best in a culture where skeptical doctrine is well-known and influential, which is the case of Europe when the book was written.

1 See for example, Maureen Ihrie (1982), Alban K. Forcione (1982), Juan Bautišta Avalle-Arce (1975), Américo Cañero (1925) and José Antonio Maravall (1991).

2 For the re-discovery of Sextus Empiricus’s works during the Renaissance see C. Schmitt (1983) and R. Popkin (1964). The strong influence of skepticism during the Golden Age can be appreciated by considering Maureen Ihrie’s work. Before she applies skepticism to Cervantes, she explains in the first chapter its enormous popularity. She begins with a brief but accurate account of the extent and sense in which Sextus Empiricus, Juan Luis Vives, Francisco Sánchez and Pedro de Valencia are skeptics, and then Ihrie concludes as follows:

These three scholars, Vives, Sánchez and Valencia are, as Menendez y Pelayo noted, the key representatives of the critical orientation of sixteenth-century peninsular thought. But Skepticism does appear, less directly, sometimes less intelligently, in numerous other philosophical expositions. Fox Morcillo (1526?–1560), Gomez Pereira (1500–1558), and Francisco Valles (1524–1592) typify Skeptical manifestations on this level. (24)
Skepticism rejects authority as a valid mechanism to obtain truth. Argumentation and direct observation ought to be used instead. The reason why authority is rejected in favor of argumentation and observation is because the former represents the most anti-skeptical attitude one can take: dogmatism (believing that something is true only because an authority says that it is true). If we keep this in mind, then the structural...

After that conclusion Ihrie moves on to explain the “extremely popular” views of Juan Huarte de San Juan, also a skeptic (25), and mentions briefly Erasmism, “the key intellectual-philosophical current in sixteenth-century Spain” (25). This current shares with the skeptic the “strong aversion to useless speculation” (26). Finally, to give stronger support to her claim that skepticism played an important influential role in the literature of the time, Ihrie explains how it influenced the writings of Quevedo (26). In short, according to Ihrie, Cervantes’s skeptical tendencies are typical during his time.

In the current age the connection between skeptic methodology and gaining empirical knowledge is almost unavoidable. For instance, that connection is present in Popperian falsificationism, which is one of the most influential explanations for scientific discovery: According to falsificationism an acceptable conclusion in science is a conclusion that an experiment has failed to prove that it is false, and consequently the hypothesis can be accepted as true for the time being because it can no longer be reasonably doubted (Karl Popper, 1991, 106-111). Steven Hawking in _The Illustrated a Brief History of Time_ uses falsificationism to justify his scientific endeavors: After mentioning Karl Popper, he writes: “Each time new experiments are observed to agree with predictions the theory survives, and our confidence in it increases” (1996, 17). However, it is necessary to point out that historically, skepticism was conceived as a method to produce a happy life (that is, it was a moral theory). The skeptic’s position can be better appreciated if we read one of the most famous skeptics of all time, Sextus Empiricus:

The person who says that wealth, perhaps, is good and poverty bad, if he does not have wealth is disturbed in two ways, both because he does not have the good, and because he busies himself over the acquisition of it; but when he acquires it, he is punished in three ways, because he is elated beyond measure, because he busies himself with a view to the wealth’s remaining with him, and because he agonizes and is afraid of its loss. But the person who ranks wealth neither among the things by nature good nor among the things by nature bad, but utter’s the expression ‘not more,’ is neither disturbed in the absence of this nor elated at its presence, but in either case remains undisturbed. So that as regards the things thought by opinion to be good and bad, and the choices and avoidances of these things, he remains perfectly happy. (1997, 25)

To obtain the happy life the skeptic argues against all the other major positions of his time. For example, Sextus Empiricus begins by specifying the targets of his arguments:

All those philosophers who seem to proceed by methodical exposition of basic principles – and most conspicuously of all, those of the Old Academy and the Peripatetics, and also the Stoics— are accustomed to make a division, saying that, of existing things, some are good, some bad, and some in between, which they call indifferent. (3)
contrast between the skeptical story and Don Quijote’s dogmatic character can be appreciated more easily.

**Skepticism and the Story of Don Quijote**

The prologue contains an explanation of the problem facing the author: he is unsure what the “antiguo legislador que llaman vulgo” (13) will say about him and his book because of several reasons: the book has no erudition; it does not quote from Aristotle nor Plato; it does not appeal to Aquinas nor the holy scripture; it does not have a list of authors that ends with Xenophon, or Zolio or Zerxius (13); and it does not have at the beginning poetry written by important people such as “duques, marqueses, obispos, damas o poetas celeberrimos” (14). In short, the author is worried about the reception of the book by the “vulgo” because it lacks authority. Then we are told the solution. A friend who is unknown (and therefore lacks authority) proposes the following: invent the sonnets and claim that they were written by important people (for example, “Preste Juan” (15)); use the quotes that you already know and are easy to remember and place them strategically throughout the book, making sure that they have authority (“Horacio”, “Escritura Divina”, “Catón” (15-16)); with respect to the annotations, include them using the same strategy, citing even more authorities such as “Ovidio . . . Homero . . . Virgilio . . . Julio César . . . Plutarco . . . León Hebreo” (17); with respect to the list of authors, take it from another book and put it at the end of the book so that it gives “de improviso autoridad al libro” (18).

In addition to the solution, the friend explains why the book needs no authority: “este vuestra libro no tiene necesidad de ninguna cosa de aquellas que vos decís que le falta, porque todo él es una invecciata contra los libros de caballerías, de quien nunca se acordó Aristóteles, ni dijo nada San Basilio, ni alcanzó Cicerón” (18).

Later on, to avoid long subjects, he will merely use the expression “dogmatism” to refer to all of them at once: “... and other things, connected with the dogmatists’ pedantry, tend to be said against such definitions” (8).

All the experts who have studied skepticism before the Enlightenment recognize the basic connection between that philosophy and the production of a happy life, such as for example, Peter Lom (2001), Marcelo de Araujo (2003) and John C. Laursen (1992).
Finally, the reason stating why the work was written contains an explicit reference against authority: “esta vuestra escritura no mira a más que a deshacer la autoridad y cabida que en el mundo y en el vulgo tienen los libros de caballerías...” (18).4

The constant undermining of and preoccupation with authority continues in Chapter Nine. In that chapter we learn that we do not know when the story of Don Quijote was written because it could be old or not. It could be ancient because most of it was missing, and this unfortunate event is explained using time, who is “devorador y consumidor de todas las cosas” (100), but it could also be modern because a partial manuscript was found next to texts that were written recently, such as for example “Desengaño de cellos y Ninfas y Pastores de Henares” (101). We do not know its provenance either, because the one selling it is a boy in the street. We do not speak the original language of the found manuscript because it is in Arabic (101-2).5 Furthermore, the person claiming authorship is an Arabic historian named Cide Hamete Benengeli: “Historia de Don Quijote de la Mancha, escrita por Cide Hamete Benengeli, historiador

4 Carmen Escudero’s view indicates indirectly that Cervantes’s technique of not following the friend’s recommendations but merely reporting them, produces a skeptical attitude on the reader: “En lugar de ofrecer un resultado, un prólogo perfecto (en el sentido de ya concluido), Cervantes ofrece el proceso mismo de la confección de ese prólogo, e intenta hacer al lector confiante de sus dudas, con lo que el destinatario quedará definitivamente implicado en la obra al sentirse incluso colaborador de ella” (184). Fajardo’s view also points to skepticism: “The first author does not say that he undertook to follow his friend’s advice but that his friend’s words left an imprint in him... Thus, he adopts his friend’s statement as worthy of imitation because it has been voided of authoritative context” (11). One of the basis of skepticism is to embrace doubt (Escudero) and reject authority (Fajardo) as a method of discovery, and therefore their conclusions are consistent with skepticism. For example, Francisco Sánchez was a well known skeptic during the period, and he writes in the prologue to Que nada se sabe: “Tú, lector desconocido, quiénquiera que seas, con tal que tuvieres la misma condición y temperamento que yo; tú, que dudaste muchas veces, en lo secreto de tu alma, sobre la naturaleza de las cosas, ven ahora a dudar conmigo: ejercitemos juntos nuestros ingenios y facultades; séanos a los dos libre el juicio, pero no irracional” (1923, xvii). He also writes: “Tampoco me pidas autoridades ni falsos acatamientos a la opinión ajena” (xx).

5 Caroll Johnson has shown that “of the eighteen Castilian romances of chivalry published between 1508 and 1589, thirteen purport to have been written originally in Greek, and one each in Latin, English, an unspecified foreign language, and Arabic” (2007, 180). Therefore, the story of don Quijote is consistent with this aspect of the tradition; however, Caroll Johnson’s finding does not change the notion that the readers of the story of Don Quijote do not understand Arabic. We do not read the “original” (Arabic), but a “translation” (Castillian).
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arábigo” (102), and the authority of this historian is undermined because the text specifies that all Arabs are liars: “su autor [es] arábigo, siendo muy propio de los de aquella nación ser mentirosos” (103). Finally, we do not know who translated it from Arabic to Castilian because the translator is another unknown Arab (another liar, according to the text): “La suerte me deparó [un Morisco aljamiado]” (102) and “roguéle me volviese aquellos cartapacios . . . en lengua castellana;” therefore, when the text says that “la traducción, comenzaba de esta manera” (104), we have been led to believe that we are reading a text written by an Arab historian, and we are told that Arabs are liars. This unreliable text is then translated by a Morisco, and we don’t know if it is truly a faithful translation. We are also led to believe that we do not know its provenance, because the one selling it is a boy in the street. Finally, we don’t know if the text is ancient or modern, but later we learn it must be modern given the dates in the text. In short, we are led to believe that the text has no authority whatsoever.

The rejection of authority is therefore present in four key elements of the text: (1) it is associated with the explicit justification of the text (i.e., to undermine the authority of the Romances of Chivalry); (2) it is used to construct the greater part of the prologue by way of mocking the authorities; (3) the text says of itself that it does not need any authority; (4) and finally, given the information in Chapter Nine, the text does not have authority. To sum up, Cervantes took such great care in making sure that the story of Don Quijote does not depend on authority, that even his attack against the authority of the Romances of Chivalry comes from a text that does not have authority (or so we are led to believe).

This attitude is consistent with skeptical doctrine. We need to recall that Sextus Empiricus argued against the authorities of his time calling them “dogmatics,” and that his works were rediscovered and influential during the Renaissance. For Sextus Empiricus, truth is obtained by way of argument and direct observation, and not because the one who said

---

6 The authority of Cide Hamete is undermined by two additional factors which may not be as immediately obvious as the one mentioned in the main body of the text: no one knows what else he has written, and as mentioned by Martín the Riquer in his edition of Don Quijote (2002), the name is invented, common and ironic: “Nombre inventado, pero en auténtico árabe e irónico: cide, señor, Hamete, el nombre árabe Hamid, y Benengeli, aberenjenado. Hamete era un nombre muy corriente entre moriscos” (102, n.11).
it has authority. For example, his influence can be found in the work of Francisco Sánchez, a skeptic of the period who also rejects authority in favor of argumentation and observation:

Tampoco me pides autoridades ni falsos acatamientos a la opinión ajena, porque ello más bien sería indicio de ánimo servil e indocto que de un espíritu libre y amante de la verdad. Yo sólo seguiré con la razón a sola la naturaleza [that is, observation]. La autoridad manda creer; la razón demuestra las cosas; aquélla es apta para la fe; ésta para la ciencia. (1923, xx)

This basic skeptical attitude is maintained in *Part I*: the truth about Don Quijote, and by association the truth about the Romances of Chivalry, will depend on the story of Don Quijote, and not on the authority of anyone.

Many critics have pointed out that the text is highly unstable in terms of its truth-value. For example, Howard Mancing’s analysis demonstrates the complexities that arise:

When he first discovers the manuscript he laments that the author is Arabic “siendo muy propio de los de aquella nación ser mentirosos” (I, 9, 102). Then, after noting that historians should be “puntuales, verdaderos y no nada apasionados” –essentially the qualities praised in Cide Hamete— he eschews responsibility for any error in the story: “y si algo bueno en ella faltare, para mí tengo que fue por culpa del galgo de su autor (p. 103).” (1981, 66)

It should be noted that this strong destabilization is consistent with the skeptical tradition: according to skepticism what ought to be done is to suspend judgment, And that is precisely what the destabilizing ele-

---


8 Maureen Ihrie explains: “the skeptic feels the only reasonable solution to the dilemma [about the truth or falsehood of claims] is to suspend judgment on all matters and live undog-
ments in the story accomplish: given that it is difficult if not impossible to ascertain the truth or the falsehood of the story based on authority, the reader is forced to reject authority as a valid principle of argumentation. This entails in turn that the only thing left is the story itself. Regardless of whether the story has authority or not, we have no alternative but to read about Don Quijote. This is important from the perspective of skepticism because if we simply read the story, then we will observe Don Quijote as the story unfolds. In other words, no appeal to authority is needed because the only thing the reader has to do is to read the story.

It should be noted that in this analysis the relationship between Part I and authority has been discussed from a very limited perspective: the perspective of skepticism as a method to establish truth. If, however, we expand the use of authority to include other uses, then the relationship becomes more complex.

Literary critics tend to view the question of authority from the perspective of mimesis and literary models. For example, Frederick de Armas associates the giant Goliath, who is mentioned in the prologue, with several traditions, or models:

Although Eduardo Urbina (1987) and Agustín Redondo (1998) rightly search for models of Cervantine imitation in the chivalric romances, the prologue of Don Quixote makes it clear that there are other traditions of giants, the biblical and the classical. (2006, 43)  

Carolyn A. Nadeau explores the women mentioned in the prologue in order to illuminate the kind of imitation used most frequently by

---

9 Frederick de Armas also writes the following: “An innkeeper is compared to Cacus in the second chapter of Part I, while the size of Goliath is discussed in the first chapter of Part II using the bible as authority.” (2006, 43). The giant Cacus is not being used as a means towards establishing the truth of the story, but as a comparison. On the other hand, even though the existence of Goliath is supported with an appeal to authority, that use is in Part II, and therefore it falls outside of the parameters of this study. I suspect strongly that the relationship between authority and skepticism changes in Part II, but that change cannot be covered here.
As a final example, Michael McGaha argues that the imitation of models found in Don Quijote can be interpreted as an attempt to surpass Virgil: “Cervantes’ primary intention in Don Quixote . . . was to imitate and improve upon Virgil’s Aeneid” (1980, 34).

This general emphasis on authority as it relates to imitation is well justified because it is consistent with one of the ways in which authority was viewed during the Renaissance and the Golden Age. For example, Ángel García Galiano writes:

La admiración por los clásicos es a la vez una necesidad de elevar la Antigua poética romance a las más altas cotas de genialidad estética. La imitación, por lo tanto, se convierte, aparte de una doctrina preceptiva y estética, en una técnica sistematizada y rigurosa. (1992, 449)

García Galiano also points out that the attitude towards the classics is not only imitative because it is often joined with an attempt to obtain innovation, or invention. The goal is not merely to copy what the classics did, but to improve their works. García Galiano quotes Vilanova as follows to explain this important aspect:

La doctrina de la imitación renacentista no se limita en modo alguno a un remedio ideal de los modelos clásicos, sino que consiste en una reelaboración consciente de temas e ideas de la antigüedad grecolatina, cuando no en una sistemática apropiación de las fórmulas estilísticas y de los recursos retóricos de los poetas clásicos y modernos, muchas veces convertidos en tópicos por la tradición renacentista. (449)

Furthermore, this attitude towards authority can be traced back to earlier times. Jacqueline T. Miller begins by quoting a remark made by Bernard of Chartres, “the twelfth-century humanist and educator” (1986, 10)

For example, after comparing the ways in which Guevara, Ovid and Virgil make use of authority when it comes to imitation, Carolyn A. Nadeau concludes that “although Cervantes’s imitation differs greatly from Guevara’s imitations of sources, Cervantes does share similarities with Ovid and Virgil, because at times he, like Ovid, subtly incorporates his models into narrative and, like Virgil, at times dismisses them” (2002, 133).
9): “we are as dwarfs perched upon the shoulders of giants” (9), and then she explains:

This is neither a wholesale advocacy of reverence for the ancient author nor a wholesale dismissal of the contemporary author. It attempts to acknowledge the value of the ancients and the reliance of the moderns upon them, and simultaneously to recognize the value of the moderns and the contributions their greater vision may make. The remark grants the importance of studying the ancients, but not at the cost of ignoring the achievements possible by the moderns. (11)

Therefore, when we consider what the critics have said as exemplified by Frederick de Armas, Carolyn A. Nadeau and Michael McGaha, and when we add to their views the general attitude towards imitation as explained by García Galiano and Jackeline T. Miller, it becomes clear that Cervantes did not reject authority in Part I when it comes to imitation/improvement.11

However, the theory of imitation is not the only concern with authority during the Golden Age and the Renaissance: equally important is the role of authority in arguments that purport to establish truth.12 For example, the rejection of authority is at the heart of the newly discovered and very influential skeptical texts of Sextus Empiricus. It is also a constant theme in all the writers of the Renaissance and the Golden Age that exhibit skeptical tendencies, such as for example Montaigne, Erasmus, Vives and Francisco Sánchez.13 The rejection of authority in favor of di-

---

11 As further support, Part I offers explicitly a theory of the value of literature that depends at least in part on imitating authority. The discussion between the priest and the canónigo points to the notion that art is worthy when it is imitative to some extent and in some way: “son más dignos de reprehensión los que hasta aquí han compuesto semejantes libros sin tener advertencia a ningún buen discurso, ni al arte y reglas por donde pudieran guiar y hacerse famosos, como lo son en verso y prosa los dos príncipes de la poesía griega y latina” (48, 505).

12 For the sake of accuracy it should be noted that the explanation in the main body does not entail that the critics ignore the relation between truth and authority. My claim is weaker: the general emphasis and main concern tends to be the relation between imitation/improvement and authority.

13 For more information about the skeptical tendencies of the mentioned authors, see for example Maureen Ihrie (1982, 11-18).
rect observation is one of the forces driving the establishment of the empirical sciences. The preoccupation with the role of authority in matters of truth comes to the forefront in the conference of Valladolid, when the orthodoxy (i.e., truth) of Erasmus’s writings was scrutinized:

Los frailes pasaban en revisita los principales puntos de dogma y disciplina: la Trinidad, la divinidad de Cristo, la divinidad del Espíritu Santo, la inquisición de la herejía, los sacramentos . . ., la autoridad de la Escritura, la teología dogmática, la autoridad de los Santos Padres, el culto de la Virgen, la autoridad de los Papas y concilios, las ceremonias, los ayunos y abstinentencias, el celibato, la escolástica, las indulgencias, el culto de los santos . . ., el derecho de propiedad de los bienes temporales, el libre albedrío, las penas del infierno, y bajo cada uno de esos capítulos [los frailes] representaban textos sospechosos entresacados de la obra de Erasmo. (1939, 289)

Out of the twenty themes discussed, six are directly related to authority. This shows that imitation is not the only way in which authority was important during Cervantes’s time: equally important is the role we ascribe to authority in matters of belief, truth, and persuasion. Therefore, in the same way that the text makes clear that Cervantes accepted author-

14 In matters of religious doctrine a further distinction can be made between “textual authority” and “theological auctoritas.” However, in the context of this investigation that distinction is unnecessary. The goal is to show that there was a concern with authority in matters of argumentation and truth, and the quoted passage exemplifies that concern without further distinctions.

15 The importance of authority during the period can be appreciated in the works of Peter Ramus (1515-1572). He was a teacher of Rhetoric in the University of Paris, the most important center of scholasticism, and consequently, the place where authority was revered the most. He dedicated his life to attack relentlessly scholastic methodology: “[Ramus’s] books had the effrontery not only to condemn the argumentative methods in use in the University of Paris since at least the twelfth century but also to argue for replacing them with Ramus’s way” (Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, editors, 1990, 557). Today he is considered one of the most important figures in the history of modern Rhetoric.

Ramus chose three main targets: Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. He chose them because all three authors had enormous influence in the teaching of Rhetoric throughout Europe (they had authority). In Argument in Rhetoric against Quintilian he begins with this statement after a polite introduction: “I have a single argument, a single subject matter, that the arts of dialectic and rhetoric have been confused by Aristotel, Cicero and Quintilian. I have previously argued
ity when it comes to imitation (and improvement), the same text also makes clear that the truth of the story of don Quijote is presented as not depending on any authority. I find that one of the greatest achievements of the book is precisely this complex relation: on the one hand authority is rejected as a valid principle of argumentation, but on the other it is not rejected when it comes to literary models.

A question becomes unavoidable: Part I is literature, not philosophy, and therefore, why would a book that is non-philosophical be so concerned with authority in matters of argumentation?

The first explanation that comes to mind is by itself insufficient: a topos of the times is that a book should teach while producing delight (deleitar enseñando); therefore, if a book should teach, then it seems that a preoccupation with authority is in order because the teaching method may depend on authority, or it may not. Furthermore, this topos is found against Aristotle and Cicero (563). Then he argues relentlessly against Quintilian. He first explains Quintilian’s position by quoting him:

I teach [Quintilian] says, ‘that the orator cannot be perfect unless he is a good man. Consequently I demand from him not only outstanding skill in speaking but all the virtuous qualities of character.’ This is the type of orator that Quintilian constructs for us. Afterwards in the twelfth book where he defines him in similar terms as a good man skilled in speaking well, he identifies those virtuous qualities of character as justice, courage, self-control, prudence, likewise knowledge of the whole of philosophy and of law, a thorough acquaintance with history, and many other attributes worthy of praise. (565)

It is clear from the quoted passage that according to Quintilian the orator has authority because he must be perfect. This is confirmed when we consider the way in which Ramus quotes Quintilian: “An evil man cannot have leisure to devote to rhetoric” he says. Or again, ‘The greatest part of rhetoric concerns goodness and justice” (568), and “Virtue’s authority prevails in persuasion” (568).

Ramus’s attack against Quintilian explains indirectly why authority had such an enormous appeal. If, to begin with, only those that are perfect speak well according to Quintilian, then they have total authority because they are perfect in every way. It should be noted that despite of Ramus’s best efforts, the connection between perfection and authority was still strong up to the Enlightenment. It should be noted as well that Ramus’s arguments exhibit a strong skeptical component. His skepticism comes to the forefront when he asks a rhetorical question about Cicero: “There is yet another point in respect to the authority of Cicero: Do we wish the authority of any man in a debate concerning an art to be superior to the truth of the case” (574)? Obviously, for Ramus the answer is no: an authority is right when he or she believes the truth, but the authority cannot be right simply because he or she is the authority.
when the Canónigo explains to the Priest why he has never been able to finish reading any Romance of Chivalry:

Este género de escritura y composición cae debajo de aquél de las fábulas que llaman milesias, que son cuentos disparatados, que atienden solamente a deleitar, y no a enseñar: al contrario de lo que hacen las fábulas apélogas, que deleitan y enseñan juntamente. (47, 501-2)

However, the notion that a book should teach and produce delight is not sufficient to answer the question at hand because many other books of the period make the same claim, and most of them do not contain a strong rejection of authority in matters of argumentation.

A better answer is to say that the book is not only literature, but also a serious attempt to establish truth; in other words, the book is also philosophical in the sense that it has taken upon itself a task that is normally associated with philosophy: the illumination of truth and the banishment of falsehood. The story of Don Quijote is similar to philosophy in the sense that it presents the reader with a series of reasons to establish the truth that the Romances of Chivalry have no authority.

If the book is read taking into account its similarities with philosophy (without for that reason negating its literary character), then the question of authority as it relates to argumentation becomes unavoidable: after all, the aim of the book under this philosophical perspective is to convince the reader that Chivalric Romances have no authority, and therefore a stance towards authority as a valid form of argumentation becomes necessary. The text reveals the author’s choice: it is rejected in matters of persuasion and truth, or, using other words, the text depends on skeptical methodology (argumentation and direct observation).

The complex relation with authority found in the text can therefore be explained if we maintain that the book is, at the same time, a serious attempt to do the best kind of literature according to the standards of the time (imitation and invention), an also a serious attempt to obtain a result that is normally reserved for philosophy (it is true that the Romances of Chivalry have no authority). Furthermore, in order to avoid oversimplifying the issue, it should be acknowledged that the two attitudes to-
wards authority contained in the text influence each other, making a web of relations that adds more complexity. However, those complexities must be put aside because in this investigation the skeptical aspects of the book take precedence. This emphasis should not be taken to imply the absurdity that the literary aspects of the text are less important.

To sum up, even though my analysis depends on a very limited perspective, the following conclusion applies within the parameters of the investigation: The strategy used by Cervantes to construct the story of *Don Quijote* is consistent with the skeptical tradition in three important ways: first, there is a deliberate effort to present the story as being as non-dogmatic as possible; second, the destabilization thus created is consistent with skeptical doctrine because it forces the reader to suspend judgment about the authority of the story; third, given that the reader cannot make positive judgments of that kind, he or she has no choice but to observe *Don Quijote*.

Some critics, such as for example E. T. Aylward (1999) and Ruth El Saffar (1974), have explained the main differences between the genres of the Romance and the Novel. Aylward concludes that the novel “is the preferred fictional form of skeptics and doubters” (1999, 17). My analysis shows that Cervantes took the skeptical tendencies of the novel a step further: the story of *Don Quijote* is constructed in part by taking deliberate advantage of some important skeptical themes in matters of argumentation.

**Skepticism and the Standard Objection against the Romances of Chivalry**

If we emphasize the argumentative aspects of the text (without for that reason negating that the book is literature), then the function of skepticism in the story of *Don Quijote* can be better appreciated if we take into account the standard objection against the Romances of Chivalry. The most common objection during the Renaissance and the Golden Age is not only that they contain all kinds of falsehoods, but also that those falsehoods are harmful to one’s character. More precisely, the objection does not state that those books are false and harmful, but that they are harmful because they are false. One does not have to go far to see this
strong connection between falsehood and harm. For example, in his introduction to *Don Quijote*, Martín de Riquer offers a long list of “autores graves” that argue against the Romances of Chivalry because their falsehoods produce harm (2002, xxxvi – xxxviii). The list begins in the year 1522 with Juan de Molina, and ends with Fray Luis de la Cerda in 1599. Fray Agustín Salucio holds in the year 1559 the following view:

\[\ldots\] ningún español que haya tenido ingenio lo ha tenido en tan poco que lo haya empleado en semejantes frasquieras; y así, los que se han aplicado a esas composiciones de cosas fabulosas, en prosa o verso, han sido parleros y vanos idiotas sin ninguna noticia ni lección de buenos autores ni de buenas letras; todo es mentir de ventaja, sin orden ni tiento, ni lenguaje, y sin estilo, sin saber guardar el decoro ni aun al bajo el argumento que tratan. (1959, 144-5)

Therefore, according to Fray Agustín Salucio, writing those romances is a form of lying (“todo es mentir de ventaja”), and at the same time that activity is the cause of a long list of vices: (1) “vano idiota”; (2) “parlero”; (3) lack of decorum; (4) bad language and bad style; (5) unable to benefit from education, and finally (6) it devalues “ingenio”.

The same connection between falsehood and harm is found almost by the end of the story of *Don Quijote*. The *Canónigo* is trying to explain to the knight his error. He first explains the harm caused by books that contain falsehoods, and then he finishes his lesson explaining to *Don Quijote* why he should read true books:

¡Ea, señor don Quijote, duélate de sí mismo, y redúzgase al gremio de la discreción, y sepa usar de la mucha que el cielo fue servido de darle, empleando el felízísimo talento de su ingenio en otra lectura que redunde en aprovechamiento de su conciencia y en aumento de su hon-

---

16 For more information on the standard objection against the Romances of Chivalry see the essay written by Edward Glasser (1966). He takes into account the works of many Renaissance authors to explain some variants of the same objection. He specifies that reading Romances of Chivalry causes great harm (“resultaría un grave daño moral” (394)), but if the books are true (the holy scripts), then they are beneficial to the soul (“serían recompensados con lucros espirituales” (394)).
ra! Y si todavía, llevado de su natural inclinación, quisiere leer libros de hazañas y de caballerías, lea en la Sacra Escritura el de los Jueces [y otros libros verdaderos]; que allí hallará verdades grandiosas y hechos tan verdaderos como valientes, cuya lección de sus valerosos hechos puede entretener, enseñar, deleitar y admirar a los más altos ingenios que los leyeren. Ésta sí será lectura digna del buen entendimiento de vuestra merced, señor don Quijote mío, de la cual saldrá erudito en la historia, enamorado de la virtud, enseñado en la bondad, mejorado en las costumbres, valiente sin temeridad, osado sin cobardía, y todo esto, para honra de Dios, provecho suyo y fama de la Mancha, do, según he sabido, trae vuestra merced su principio y origen. (49, 516)

The Canónigo’s explanation is consistent with the most important tenet of the skeptical tradition: it is impossible to obtain a happy life when the soul is under the influence of false beliefs. To put it simply, Don Quijote and the readers of the Romances of Chivalry are being harmed because the books they read are false. The connection between Part I and skepticism is deliberate because the harm of those books is presented as being in direct proportion to the level of dogmatism of the person reading them: as we shall see below by way of example, the more dogmatic one is, the more harmful they become. The explicit goal of Part I is therefore consistent with the skeptical tradition of avoiding the harm caused by falsehoods, and therefore, if we take that purpose seriously, then the connection with skepticism is double. Not only did Cervantes write a story that relies on skeptical structural elements, but also the aim of that story is consistent with skeptical doctrine.

Skepticism, the Ventero and Don Quijote
The arguments advanced by the Ventero and Don Quijote can be used as a summary and further illustration of the skeptical elements in the story of Don Quijote. The Ventero appeals to authority as follows:

Bueno es que quiera darme vuestra merced a entender que todo aquello que éstos buenos libros dicen sea disparates y mentiras, estando impresos con licencia de los señores del Consejo Real como si ellos
fueran gente que habían de dejar imprimir tanta mentira junta y tantas batallas y tantos encantamientos que quitan el juicio! (343)

Later in the book, Don Quijote makes the same appeal, and this time the appeal is not limited to the Consejo Real: it includes the kings (in plural):

Los libros que están impresos con licencia de los reyes y con aprobación de aquellos a quien se remitieron, y que con gusto general son leídos y celebrados de los grandes y de los chicos, de los pobres y de los ricos, de los letrados e ignorantes, de los plebeyos y caballeros, finalmente, de todo género de personas de cualquier estado y condición que sean, ¿habían de ser mentira, y más llevando tanta apariencia de verdad . . .? (521)

To change the minds of people such as the Ventero or Don Quijote will not be easy: as a matter of fact, within the story neither is convinced that the Romances of Chivalry are false or harmful. What happens instead is that those who tried to convince them give up hope. Therefore, the views of the Ventero and Don Quijote are not there because they are supposed to change their minds, but because they show that an appeal to authority can be used to defend the view that the Romances of Chivalry are true, and therefore not harmful, during the Golden Age. This shows that accomplishing the explicit goal of Part I as it is stated in the prologue is not an idle exercise.

According to the prologue, the targeted audience is the people in the real world that enjoy reading Romances of Chivalry. It is therefore sig-

17 The arguments advanced by Don Quijote and the Ventero may also be interpreted ironically. If that is the case, then the irony leads to the conclusion that the Romances of Chivalry cannot distinguish the true from the false; therefore, either way, the result is the same: the authority of the Chivalric Romances is still undermined.
18 More specifically, the popularity of the Romances of Chivalry was waning when Cervantes wrote Part I, and yet, it remains true that it was difficult to change the minds of those who still thought that the genre had authority.
19 The meaning of “audience” in this investigation assumes the theory proposed by Ruth Mitchell and Mary Taylor in their essay “The Integrating Perspective: An Audience-Response Model for Writing.” (1979, 247–71). Paraphrasing their view, authors and speakers can direct their words to a real audience, an audience that exists in the world out there.
nificant that Don Quijote’s appeal to authority is found almost by the end of the book. At that point in the lecture the reader has an advantage: he or she has read the story of Don Quijote almost in its entirety. Furthermore, the information that the reader has obtained about Don Quijote is non-dogmatic, precisely because the story of Don Quijote is presented as not depending on any authority. At the same time, given the destabilizing elements of the text, the reader was forced to suspend judgment, which means that his or her judgment about Don Quijote will be grounded on what he or she has observed about the knight while reading his story. When the reader finally encounters Don Quijote’s argument he has enough information to conclude that his argument, and by implication the Ventero’s argument, is a form of dogmatism. Chivalric Romances have no authority even if they are approved by the kings and the Consejo Real. They cannot have authority because the reader has observed that their falsehoods are the direct cause of the protagonist’s ridiculous behavior. By implication, the Ventero’s argument cannot be convincing either because Don Quijote, who is being harmed by those books, uses the same argument. Furthermore, the harm that those books cause to the gentleman from La Mancha and to the Ventero is directly proportional to their level of dogmatism: it causes more harm to Don Quijote because he lives in that world, and less harm to the Ventero because at least he acknowledges that one can no longer be an errant knight: “bien veo que ahora no se usa lo que se usaba en aquel tiempo” (32, 344).

To sum up, the positions advanced by both characters are shown to be unconvincing especially because they are non-skeptical arguments, and their lack of persuasion is linked to their level of dogmatism. Cervantes’s reliance on skepticism is therefore not only deliberate, but also quite effective. By definition and methodology, the worse enemy of dogmatism is skepticism.

**Don Quijote’s Dogmatism with Respect to the Romances of Chivalry**

We have seen how the story of Don Quijote is constructed in part by taking advantage of skeptical themes. We have seen as well that the explicit purpose as it is stated in the prologue of Part I is consistent with skeptical
The exact opposite occurs in relation to Don Quijote: he embodies the most extreme form of dogmatism. The purpose of this section is to show that Don Quijote’s violations of skeptical doctrine constitute an important structural device that gives thematic continuity to don Quijote’s adventures throughout *Part I*.

To begin with, we need to keep in mind that Don Quijote’s illness is described by Francisco Sánchez. As pointed out by Maureen Ihrie (1982), he was a skeptic that maintained that too much lecture and not enough interaction with the world will cause damage to the mind:

> By dint of reading and rereading, and explaining clearly and consistently what we read, our most precious years pass us by: we lie buried in mountains of paper, attentive only to men and their deeds, our backs toward living Nature. Thus, many times, by virtue of wanting to fit all knowledge inside us, we turn ourselves into fools. (31)

At the same time, Maureen Ihrie also quotes Cervantes’s description of Don Quijote’s mental condition:

> . . . . In short, our gentleman became so immersed in his reading that he spent whole nights, from sundown to sunup and his days from dawn to dusk in poring over his books, until, finally, from so little sleeping and so much reading, his brain dried up and he went completely out of his mind. (Ihrie, 30, and *Don Quijote*, I, 1)

Therefore, Don Quijote’s madness is caused by his manner of reading, a manner that violates the recommendations of the skeptic.

Furthermore, the nature of his illness is explained quite precisely in *Part I*, as follows: “y asentóséle de tal modo en la imaginación que era verdad toda aquella máquina de aquellas sonadas soñadas invenciones que leía, que para él no había otra historia más cierta en el mundo” (1, 35). In other words, Don Quijote’s condition is a form of extreme dogmatism. This dogmatic attitude is the contrary of what the skeptical tradition recommends. For example, even though Francis Bacon’s *Novum Organum*...
first appeared in 1620, it can be used to illustrate Don Quijote’s violation of skeptical doctrine:

And with regard to authority, it shows a feeble mind to grant so much to authors and yet deny time his rights, who is the author of authors, nay rather of all authority. For rightly is truth called the daughter of time, not of authority. It is no wonder therefore if those enchantments of antiquity and authority and consent have so bound up men’s powers that they have been made impotent (like persons bewitched) to accompany with the nature of things. (1969, 120-1)

According to the tradition we are taking into account, the feebleness of Don Quijote’s mind results from his dogmatism. He is “bewitched” because for him, the Romances of Chivalry have total authority. The kind of bewitchment he suffers is explained accurately and concisely by Scott Paul Gordon, who takes advantage of the ideas of Francis Bacon:

Don Quixote embodies an unpurged mind. If Bacon likens a proper intellect, one capable of discovering the “nature of things,” to a fair sheet of paper with no writing on it, “then Quixote’s mind is disabled from finding the “nature of things” because it already has “writing on it.” Don Quixote’s mind has been inscribed by the romances he has consumed, and his perceptual problems . . . confirm Bacon’s theory that the fictions inside our heads control not only our response to what we see but also what we see itself. (2006, 20)

The best way to appreciate the extent of his bewitchment and also the harm that it causes him is by illustrating it with an example. Don Quijote tries to improve his morrión simple as follows:

de cartones hizo a modo de media celada, que, encajada con el morrión, hacían apariencia de celada entera. Es verdad que para probar si era fuerte y podía estar al riesgo de una cuchillada, sacó su espada y le

20 For further support, see Maureen Ihrie (1982, 30-53). She offers an illuminating and detailed explanation of Don Quijote’s dogmatism in Part I.
At first it may appear that Don Quijote is un-dogmatic because even though his choice of material is questionable (card-board), he is willing to test his work. However, he decides not to test the celada a second time. He has proof in front of him that one cannot make a celada entera out of a morrión simple with card-board, because he himself has destroyed it with the first strike of his sword, and yet, undaunted by this evidence, he reconstructs it adding some iron. Without testing it further, he concludes that it is a “celada finísima de encaje.” This shows that his dogmatism is extreme not only because he believes something that is obviously false, but also because he ignores the evidence in front of him: a morrón with card-board and iron bars is not a celada “finísima.”

Part I continues by letting us know the consequences of Don Quijote’s false belief. His first battle is in the venta where he is armed a knight, and because he wins, the celada/morrón survives intact. However, he loses ignominiously his next battle against a “mozo de mulas” (4, 62), and even though he is not beaten on the head (his attacker concentrates on “las costillas” (62)), later on we are informed that the object in question was of such poor construction that it did not survive this indirect attack: “la visera, que ya estaba hecha pedazos” (5, 65). Furthermore, when he returns beaten to his village he once again repairs “su rota celada lo major que pudo” (7, 86), which reinforces his dogmatism because he now has direct proof that his card board construction, even with the iron reinforcements, is not up to the task.

---

21 For a contrary view about the celada see José Ángel Ascunce Arrieta. This critic holds that Don Quijote’s attempt to make a celada out of a morrón simple shows that he is not as crazy as might be supposed (2005, 21-22). I agree with him in a limited sense: Don Quijote is quite intelligent, and in that sense he is not crazy because his actions serve a deliberate purpose. However, he is also a dogmatic; therefore, if we judge his illness with respect to his intelligence, then he is not (as) crazy, but if we judge his mental condition with respect to his dogmatism, then he is crazy (according to the skeptical tradition).
His adventures continue with a concentration of attacks against his face: the battle with the Vizcaíno costs him the celada once again, and also “la mitad de la oreja” (9, 104). When he is with Maritornes, the arriero “descargó tan terrible puñada sobre las estrechas quijadas del enamorado caballero, que le bañó toda la boca en sangre” (16, 161). The sheep herders destroy “tres o cuatro dientes de la boca” (18, 179). Finally, Sancho vomits on his face (18, 180). The fact that some of those injuries are inflicted when his head is unprotected reinforces his dogmatism because those injuries show that his protection is the same as not wearing any protection.

All of this harm to his head wins him his new name, “el Caballero de la Triste Figura” (19, 189), which is given to him by Sancho when the squire notices that Don Quijote’s face looks terrible: “le he estado mirando un rato ... y verdaderamente tiene vuestra merced la más mala figura, de poco acá, que jamás he visto, y debelo de haber causado, o ya el cansancio deste combate, o ya la falta de las muelas y dientes” (189). Once again Don Quijote ignores the evidence, and instead he uses his dogmatism to explain the provenance of his new name: “no es eso –respondió don Quijote–; sino que el sabio a cuyo cargo debe de estar el escribir la historia de mis hazañas, le habrá parecido que será bien que yo tome algún nombre apelativo, como lo tomaban todos los caballeros pasados” (189). Don Quijote’s dogmatism is astounding: losing teeth is very painful and disfiguring, and yet he does not pay attention to the evidence provided by that pain and disfigurement.

Don Quijote’s dogmatism as it applies to his protection continues with the elmo de Mambrino. The continuation of the same dogmatic theme is made clear when we keep in mind that Don Quijote mentions the magical object right after he discovers that his celada has been destroyed by the Vizcaíno (see 10, 109). Given the constant beatings he has received on the head, it is not surprising that he would want the protection of a elmo. The problem is not that he seeks to be protected, but the manner in which he tries to obtain that protection. 22

22 Martin de Riquer (2003) also explains the sequence of events that lead from the celada to the elmo. However, his explanation is not as detailed as the one provided here. Also, Riquer’s aim is to discuss the weapons used by Don Quijote, and therefore he does not make a strong connection between Don Quijote’s weapons and his dogmatism.
Don Quijote sees “un hombre a caballo, que traía en la cabeza una cosa que relumbraba como si fuera de oro” (21, 206). This is clearly not sufficient to conclude that what he sees is the *yelmo*, but Don Quijote has made up his mind even though Sancho insists that he is wrong. Don Quijote says so twice: “trae en la cabeza puesto el yelmo de Mambrino” (206), and “pues ese es el yelmo de Mambrino” (206). The falsehood of his belief becomes evident in his next great battle: The *bacía* he wears not only fails to protect him, but it is actually used to beat him: “le quitó la bacía de la cabeza, y dióle con ella tres o cuatro golpes en las espaldas y otros tantos en la tierra, con que la hizo pedazos” (22, 228).

Don Quijote’s dogmatism with respect to the *yelmo* is reinforced when, instead of accepting the truth that the *yelmo* is not a *yelmo*, he explains the evidence away using an argument that shows, according to him, that the *yelmo* is a *yelmo* that appears to be a *bacía*:

—¿Sabes qué imagino, Sancho? Que esta famosa pieza de este encantado yelmo por algún extraño accidente, debió de venir a manos de quien no supo conocer ni estimar su valor, y, sin saber lo que hacía, viéndola de oro purísimo, debió de fundir la otra mitad para aprovecharse del precio, y de la otra mitad hizo esta que parece bacía de barbero, como tú dices. Pero sea lo que fuere; que para mí que la conozco no hace al caso su transmutación; que yo la aderezaré en el primer lugar donde haya herrero, y de suerte, que no le haga ventaja, ni aun le llegue, la que hizo y forjó el dios de las herrerías para el dios de las batallas; y en este entretanto la traeré como pudiere, que más vale algo que no nada; cuanto más, que bien será bastante para defenderme de alguna pedrada. (21, 208)

Don Quijote’s argument begs the question: aside from the fact that the *bacía* is not made of pure gold, the only way his argument can be used to establish that the object in question is a *yelmo* is by assuming that it is, and only then it follows that it is a *yelmo* that appears to be a *bacía*. As a matter of fact, the argument begs the question so obviously that it brings attention to Don Quijote’s dogmatism. It is a terrible argument. Furthermore, the connection between the harm to his head, which began
with his failed attempt to make a celada, and his attempt to obtain better protection with the yelmo is reinforced: he wishes to have the yelmo because “será bastante para defenderme de alguna pedrada.” The fact that latter on the yelmo not only fails him, but it is actually used to beat him shows one more time the falsehood of his dogmatic beliefs: one cannot use a bacía to protect oneself from stones thrown to the face.

Several critics have pointed out that the yelmo is one of the most important devices used by Cervantes to give structure to the novel. However, when we consider the issue from the perspective of his dogmatism, we discover that this device does not start with the yelmo per se: it begins with Quijote’s attempt to make a celada “finísima” out of a morrion simple (which is dogmatically obtained), and it then continues with the yelmo (which is obtained just as dogmatically). The thematic connection is there because in both cases, the protection for his head is inadequate, and it is precisely the inadequacy of the celada what prompts him to seek the yelmo.

In fact, the thematic thread begins even before the ill-fated construction of the celada: Two of his possible surnames are “Quijada” or “Quesada.” The name “Quijada” brings attention to the feature on his head that will be unprotected the most throughout his adventures: his chin. The name “Quesada” brings attention to the state of his dogmatic feeble mind, a mind which is made of cheese. The opinions of Frederick de Armas and Agustín Redondo add strength to this interpretation. The latter critic takes into account that “quesada” is similar to cheese, and then he maintains that cheese is a sign of Don Quijote’s madness (1998, 215-6). The former critic makes a strong connection between the name “Quijada” and the chin of the emperor Charles V. In both cases the chin is viewed as “a sign of determination” (2006, 119). Later on de Armas will also add that “although [the knight] is constantly defeated, his determination [his chin] leads him from one battle to the next” (120). Therefore, the chin brings attention to the knight’s inability to change his mind, even though he is constantly defeated. In other words, his unprotected chin brings attention to his dogmatism.

\[23\] See, for example, Michael McGaha (1981), Manuel Durán (1995) and Peter N. Dunn (1996).
The dogmatic thread that unites the sequence discussed here (Quijada/Quesada; morrón simple; celada “finísima”; bacía/yelmo) culminates in the famous discussion in Chapter 45 about the nature of the object in question: is it a yelmo, a bacía, or as Sancho maintains, both? This episode has produced an enormous amount of criticism. A common theme is to say that the episode is a discussion of the changing nature of reality. For example, José-Ángel Ascunce Arrieta first maintains that the theme of “life is dream” “refleja la conciencia de desorientación y perplejidad que ofrece el hombre barroco” (1994, 100), and then he finishes the paragraph with a discussion of the baciyelmo:

Todas las realidades se manifiestan como claroscuros, o, según la terminología del propio Cervantes, como “baciyelmos”, donde una rodera puede ser a un mismo tiempo bacía o yelmo según circunstancias o intereses de quienes las valoran o las hagan operativas. La propia expresión de “vida como sueño” representa un claroscuro con los tonos semánticos más encontrados que imaginarse pueda. (100)

Américo Castro maintains that the baciyelmo represents the notion that reality changes, depending on the perspective of the observer:

El Quijote se funda en el supuesto de que el objeto de los propósitos y actividades del hombre poseen una realidad cambiante y sin seguro asidero: parece esto, pero puede ser quien sabe qué. Ya lo vimos antes con la ocasión del yelmo-bacía-baciyelmo. El observador y lo observado no coinciden, por lo común, en un vértice válido para otros observadores. (1966, 301)

Furthermore, some critics, as pointed out by Edward Dudley, see this changing reality as “símbolo del poder transformador” of the hero-knight (1972, 360), while others, such as Michael McGaha, take a more negative view and maintain that the episode is a sign of Don Quijote’s madness (1981, 746). At the same time George Güntert, without denying that other readings are valid, takes another direction and concludes that the
entire episode is there most of all to show that “la capacidad persuasiva del héroe logra su fin solo a medias” (51):

Lo cierto es que las disputas en torno al bacín-yelmo reflejan la perplejidad de los restantes personajes ante la veridicción del héroe; y analógicamente reacciona el lector al discurso heroicocómico que le propone la obra. En el simulacro del “medio yelmo” se manifiesta, pues, la tensión inherente al proceso de veridicción que suscita, en los destinatarios, reacciones dispares. (1993, 51)

It is difficult to take sides in a debate of such proportions; however, if we look at the episode from the perspective of Don Quijote’s dogmatism, then the discussion about the object that he wears on his head can be interpreted as the culmination of the dogmatic thread that began with his name.

The episode starts in Chapter 44 when the unfortunate barber appears. The barber maintains that it is a bacía, Don Quijote that it is a yelmo, and Sancho that it is both, a baciyelmo. Let us put Sancho’s opinion aside for the moment.

The discussion takes place because the other barber (the one from the Don Quijote’s village) wants to ridicule of Don Quijote’s false belief-system: “Nuestro barbero, que a todo estaba presente, como tenía bien conocido el humor de don Quijote, quiso esforzar su desatino y llevar adelante la burla, para que todos riesen” (45, 478-9). In other words, the episode is there ostensibly to mock Don Quijote’s dogmatism.

Then the participants take sides: those who know about Don Quijote’s condition agree with the second barber because they too want to have a good time at the knight’s expense. This group includes the priest, as well as “Cardenio, don Fernando y sus camaradas” (479). It is crucial to realize that the members of this group are important, powerful people

24 The possibilities offered by the critics are staggering. Just to offer three more examples, Peter N. Dunn sees the episode as an indication that “reality is constituted . . . through the action of discourse as power.” (1996, 126). Cesáreo Banderas sees it as an attempt to “encubrir la violencia” in the text (1975, 170). Manuel Durán sees the episode from the point of view of “perspectivism” (1995, 29) in order to conclude that the entire novel can be seen as Don Quijote’s “attempt to transform reality into a sign” (30).
according to the standard of the time, and that consequently they have *authority* because of who they are in the social scale. More specifically, the priest has the authority of the church, and Don Fernando and Cardenio have authority because of their noble upbringing and blood. The only powerful character excluded explicitly from this group is the “oidor,” and that is because he is preoccupied with the “negocio de don Luis” (479). According to this group, the only reason why the object in question is a *yelmo* is because they agree ostensibly with Don Quijote:

>[The barber from the knight’s village says] . . . este, aunque es yelmo, no es yelmo entero.

—No por cierto—dijo Don Quijote—porque le falta la mitad que es la barbera.

—Así es—dijo el cura, que ya había entendido la intención de su amigo el barbero.

Y lo mismo confirmó Cardenio, don Fernando y sus camaradas. (479)

Therefore, the object is deemed to be a *yelmo* because Don Quijote says so. This is a clear appeal to the knight’s authority in matters of argumentation. Just as importantly, those who agree (ostensibly) with the knight *have authority* because of who they are in the social scale (Don Fernando, Cardenio and the priest).

The episode continues with two objections against that group’s mode of argumentation. The one who advances the objections is the unfortunate barber: he holds that if the *bacía* is a *yelmo* because those with authority (“gente honrada” (45, 479)) says so, then this should cause admiration in a University, and furthermore, if what they say is true, then it is also true that his *albarda* is a *jaez*:

—¡Válame Dios! –dijo a esta sazón el barbero burlado—. ¿Que es posible que tanta gente honrada diga que ésta no es bacía, sino yelmo? Cosa parece ésta que puede poner en admiración a toda una
Universidad, por discreta que sea. Basta: si es que esta bacin es yelmo, tambiên debe ser esta albarda jaez de caballo.... (45, 479).

To sum up, so far in the discussion we have an ostensible appeal to authority made by characters that have authority (the priest, Don Fernando, Cardenio, etc.), and then two objections against that kind of appeal advanced by someone who has no authority.

The episode continues when Don Quijote’s respond to the second objection advanced by the barber: “A mi albarda me parece... pero ya he dicho que en eso no me entremeto” (479). The full effect of Don Quijote’s answer can only be appreciated if we go back to the beginning of the episode, which is when Don Quijote explained why he has no opinion about the albarda (even though it appears to him to be one):

En lo de la albarda no me entremeto; que lo que en ello sabré decir es que mi escudero Sancho me pidió licencia para quitar los jaeces del caballo deste vencido cobarde; y con ellos adornar el suyo; yo se la di, y él los tomó, y de haberse convertido de jaez en albarda, no sabré dar otra razón si no es la ordinaria: que como esas transformaciones se ven en los sucesos de la caballería. (44, 477)

Therefore, Don Quijote’s response to the unfortunate barber is justified with an appeal to the “sucesos de la caballería”, which brings attention to his dogmatism. Furthermore, his dogmatism is extreme because Don Quijote thinks that it is normal to make that kind of an appeal: it is, as he says, a “razón... ordinaria”. At the same time, just about all the information he believes to be true happens to be false: the animal in question is not a horse but a donkey, the object that Sancho took from the vanquished barber is not a jaez but an albarda (see 21, 209-10), and finally, to top it all, Don Quijote believes that the object changed “de jaez en albarda” because of some kind of wizardry, which again, it is false. In short, Don Quijote’s answer to the unfortunate barber is dogmatically justified and completely false.

Authority as a means to establish truth is then discredited further when Don Fernando not only agrees (ostensibly) a second time with
Don Quijote to ridicule him: “el señor don Quijote ha dicho muy bien hoy” (45, 480), but also when he tries to provide another proof that relies, once again, on authority: he takes a secret ballot to ascertain (by means of authority) whether or not Don Quijote is right. This appeal to authority is discredited further because Don Fernando only asks the opinion of those who have authority (see 480), and therefore, it is not even a fair test.

The pernicious effects of using authority to establish truth is then brought to bear when the unfortunate barber capitulates:

No la tenga yo en el cielo —dijo el sobrebarbero— si todos vuestras mercedes no se engañan, y que así parezca mi ánima ante Dios como ella me parece a mi albarda, y no jaez; pero allá van leyes ..., etcétera [the complete saying, as explained by Riquer is “allá van leyes, do quieren reyes.”] (45, 481, n. 10).

This is a capitulation because for the barber what counts to establish truth is no longer what he sees with his own eyes, but the authority of the powerful (the kings, according to the complete saying). This capitulation is then shown to be absurd when the text makes explicit that the words of the barber are as humorous as the words of Don Quijote: “no menos causaban risa las necedades que decía el barbero que los disparates de don Quijote” (45, 481).

To sum up, so far in the episode we have a relentless attack against authority in matters of argumentation: Don Quijote’s belief system is mocked because it is dogmatic and false; the unfortunate barber has advanced two powerful objections against authority, neither of which has been answered adequately (as a matter of fact, the first one is dropped); those who want to ridicule Don Quijote’s dogmatism do so by being ostensibly as dogmatic as Don Quijote, and what they sustain is therefore equally false. To top it all, the pernicious effects of authority in matters of truth are brought to bear when the barber changes his mind, despite of his own powerful objections and despite of the evidence.

Then the conversation changes drastically: the one who speaks is one of the servants of Don Luis:
Si ya no es que ésto sea burla pensada, no me puedo persuadir que hombres de tan buen entendimiento como son, o parecen, todos los que aquí están, se atrevan a decir y afirmar que ésta no es bacía, ni aquella albarda; mas como veo que lo afirman y lo dicen, me doy a entender que no carece de misterio el porfiar una cosa tan contraria de lo que nos muestra la misma verdad y la misma experiencia; porque ¡voto a tal!—y arrojéle redondo—que no me den a mi a entender cuantos hoy viven en el mundo al revés de que ésta no sea bacía de barbero y ésta albarda de asno. (45, 481)

The one speaking has no authority because he is a servant. Furthermore, his argument does not rely on an appeal to the authority of anyone, but on “la misma verdad y la misma experiencia.” It should be noted that this represents a typical skeptical attitude: truth is to be established by way of argumentation and observation, not authority.

Then, just before the fight starts because Don Quijote loses his temper, one of the cuadrilleros (someone without authority when several nobles and a priest are present) reinforces the skeptical position by once again stating that truth is to be established using direct observation: “Tan albarda es como mi padre; y el que otra cosa ha dicho o dijere debe de estar hecho uva [borracho]” (45, 481). In the episode, therefore, there is a strong opposition between two modes of argumentation: dogmatism versus skepticism.

Therefore, if we read the episode from the perspective of Don Quijote’s dogmatism exclusively, then we reach the conclusion that the discussion about the object in question is there to illustrate that truth should be established by means of observation and argumentation, and not by means of authority. In other words, the episode is there to illustrate that Don Quijote’s dogmatism is absurd. This conclusion receives additional support when we keep in mind that the group that sided with Don Quijote did not really side with him; On the contrary, they wanted to ridicule him all along, and therefore they knew that with respect to the Romances of Chivalry, an appeal to authority can only produce false results. Furthermore, before they leave the priest pays the unfortunate
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barber for the *bacía* (46, 486), and this indicates that the priest always knew that the object was not a *yelmo*. Finally, all the damage done by Don Quijote in the *venta* was paid by “Don Fernando” (46, 487), which again, indicates that his appeal to authority was not a real attempt to establish truth, but a means to ridicule Don Quijote’s feeble mind.

But what about Sancho? He maintains that the object in question is a *baciyelmo*. It should be kept in mind that Sancho accepts that the object is a *yelmo* because his master says so, and therefore that part of his belief depends on the authority provided by Don Quijote. At the same time, Sancho think that the object is a *bacía* because he cannot deny what he sees with his own eyes, and therefore he is also adopting a skeptical attitude that relies on direct observation. The result of using both epistemic strategies at the same time makes him unable to decide one way or the other, and therefore he concludes that the object is a *baciyelmo*; therefore, Sancho’s belief may be interpreted in two mutually supportive ways: first, it is an indication that one cannot be a skeptic and a dogmatic at the same time to establish truth because nothing is resolved; second, Sancho states his position at the beginning of the episode, and therefore the *baciyelmo* may be interpreted as an introduction of the theme that will be discussed in the episode: is the object a *bacía* or a *yelmo*? The answer to this question depends on the epistemic stance taken by the participants: if the person speaking is a dogmatic, just like Don Quijote, then he or she will accept the ridiculous and false belief that it is a *yelmo*, and if the person speaking is a skeptic, then he or she will believe the obvious truth that it is a *bacía*.

The perspective I have used to analyze the episode of the *baciyelmo* is very limited: it focuses on Don Quijote’s dogmatism. I acknowledge that the episode may be interpreted in different and even mutually exclusive ways, depending on the point of departure. For example, if we look at the episode from the perspective of baroque disillusionment, then it may be concluded that in the episode reality itself changes (this is Acunce-Arrieta’s conclusion, as quoted above); if we approach the text from a phenomenological perspective, then it may be concluded that the formation of reality depends on observation (this is Castro’s conclusion); and if we focus instead on the participants, then the episode may be viewed
as proof that Don Quijote’s power of persuasion is not complete (this is Güntert’s conclusion). There are many perspectives that can be taken, and each one reveals an important aspect of the episode. Here I have focused on Don Quijote’s dogmatism for two reasons: using his dogmatism as the point of departure is well supported by the text (after all, the explicit reason why the episode is there is that some of the participants wanted to ridicule the knight’s false belief system), and more importantly, if we focus on Don Quijote’s dogmatism, then the discussion about the bacía/yelmo/baciyelmo can be seen as the culmination of the dogmatic theme that began with his two possible names and that gave thematic continuity to his adventures. It is the culmination of that thread not only because the episode ridicules Don Quijote’s dogmatic belief that the object in question is a yelmo, but also because an alternative is being offered explicitly: Don Quijote’s epistemic illness would be cured if he relied on direct observation and argumentation (skepticism). For example, instead of believing, as he stated previously, that the yelmo is a yelmo that appears to be a bacía, or instead of not having an opinion about the albarda even though it appears to him to be one, he should believe, quite simply, that the bacía is a bacía because it appears to be one, and the albarda is an albarda for the same reason. If he could establish truth based on arguments that rely on observation, then the Romances of Chivalry would have no authority for him, and therefore they would cease to cause him harm. In other words, if he were able to establish truth by taking as his guide the way in which the bacía and the albarda appear to him, then his head would not be made of cheese (Quesada) and therefore his chin would not be unprotected (Quijada).

Don Quijote’s anti-skeptical attitude towards his own person comes at a heavy price. Instead of believing his painful experiences, his dogmatism gets in the way and does not permit him to discover the truth. We could therefore say that when it comes to his own protection, don Quijote is harmed by his own dogmatic stance. It should be noted as well that his dogmatism is of epic proportions: given the evidence that Don Quijote has, which is provided mainly by constant beatings to the head, it is hard to believe that he does not conclude that his head is injured because it lacks adequate protection. Instead of blaming the obvious, the
extent of Don Quijote’s dogmatism is revealed when he explains his injuries by blaming a jealous wizard on repeated occasions.

Don Quijote’s dogmatism is the exact opposite of the un-dogmatic stance used to construct his story. This contrast serves an important purpose: it makes Don Quijote’s dogmatism and the harm it causes to himself much easier to identify, and at the same time, it makes the story of don Quijote appear even more un-dogmatic. This combination shows Cervantes’s mastery of skepticism: he took advantage of that philosophy not only to write a skeptical story, but within that story, he also created the most famous anti-skeptic in literature.


Sánchez, Francisco. *Que nada se sabe.* n. p.: Gil-Blas, 1923.


The plot of the jealous husband’s using his best friend to test the virtue of his chaste wife in Behn’s *The Amorous Prince; Or, The Curious Husband* (1671) was adapted from the inset story included in Cervantes’s *Don Quijote de la Mancha* and entitled “El curioso impertinente.” According to Dolors Altaba-Artal (1999: 48), “[w]hen the texts of Cervantes and Behn are closely compared to each other the indebtedness is evident, for the atmosphere, the setting, and the main body of the plot, as well as some of the thoughts and manner of reasoning of the characters.” However, there is a noteworthy difference between these two texts: Cervantes’s “El curioso impertinente” is a tragic story whereas Behn wrote a comedy from the original text. Therefore, I aim to analyze how she turned a tragic tale into a comedy; that is, I would like to disclose the comic devices which Behn used in order to alter the genre of the original tale. Furthermore, Behn’s is not the only adapta-
tion of Cervantes’s work: among others, the Spanish Guillén de Castro also turned the same tragic story into a comedy entitled *El curioso impertinente*. This allows us to compare the comedies written by Behn and Castro in order to explore the gender differences and implications: on the one hand, I would like to check whether Behn and Castro used the same devices in order to turn a tragic text into a comedy and, on the other hand, I would also like to examine whether the number, relevance, and role of female and male characters in comedies differ significantly depending on the playwright’s gender. This analysis will be carried out by taking into account the difficulties Behn underwent in the reception of her plays within a patriarchal society where women were not expected to write for the stage or have their literary works published.

2. “The Curious Impertinent”: a Tragic Tale

Eric Bentley (1984: 140) contends that both comedy and tragedy try to cope with “despair, mental suffering, guilt and anxiety,” but do so in a different way. In the case of Cervantes’s tragic tale and Behn’s and Castro’s comedies, they all deal with the same topic: a jealous husband tests the virtue of his chaste wife by using his best friend. In each of these three works, the jealous husband suffers from the “despair, mental suffering, guilt and anxiety” which Bentley refers to and which comes from the husband’s distrust of his virtuous wife. The main difference between the tragic story and the two comedies is obviously the ending: in Cervantes’s tragic tale, every character dies at the end, whereas in Behn’s and Castro’s comedies, the most relevant characters achieve the aims they had been fighting for from the beginning. Nevertheless, there are also differences

3 Apart from Guillén de Castro’s and Behn’s adaptations of Cervantes’s “El curioso impertinente,” I would like to mention the following in order to show the far-reaching reception of this tale: John Fletcher’s *The Coxcomb* (1611), Nathaniel Field’s *Pardon for the Ladies* (1611), Thomas Southerne’s *The Disappointment* (1684), John Crowne’s *The Married Beau, or The Curious Impertinent* (1694) or Nicholas Rowe’s *The Fair Penitent* (1703) (cf. Jorge Figueroa Dorrego 1997: 69; Jehenson 1998: 31; Snider 2006: 317). In the same way as the abovementioned English playwrights, Spanish playwrights also adapted it: Josef Joaquín Isurre’s *Anselmo o El curioso impertinente* (1791), Adelardo López de Ayala and Antonio Hurtado’s *El curioso impertinente* (1853), José de Echegaray e Izaguirre’s *Los dos curiosos impertinentes* (1924), Tomás Luceño’s *Es de vidrio la mujer... o El curioso impertinente* (1927), or Jaime Armiñán and José María Forqué’s *El curioso impertinente* (1967) (cf. Juan María Díez-Taboada 1995: 456-57)
between Behn’s and Castro’s comedies: every character in *The Amorous Prince* (1673) not only survives but also achieves happiness while, on the other hand, Castro kills the jealous husband in order to clear the way for a happy ending. However, the differences between these two comedies will be dealt with later in further detail. In this section, I intend to analyze the most relevant features in Cervantes’s tragic tale.

Aristotle (1984: 230) defined tragedy as “the imitation of an action that is serious and also, as having magnitude, complete in itself; [...] with incidents arousing pity and fear, wherewith to accomplish its catharsis of such emotions.” Though thought for tragic drama, this definition fits Cervantes’s tale: as every character dies at the end, it is serious and it arouses pity, which “is occasioned by undeserved misfortune” (Aristotle 1984: 238); that is, Camila and Lotario’s undeserved misfortune, and it also kindles fear, which derives from the possibility that the audience could experience a similar situation. In Cervantes’s tragic tale, Camila and Lotario fall in love because of Anselmo’s eagerness to test his wife’s virtue and, therefore, Anselmo is regarded as responsible for their love affair. As the starting point of Camila and Lotario’s betrayal, the audience feels that Anselmo deserves death. On the contrary, the audience may think that Camila and Lotario do not deserve their misfortunes: on the one hand, at the beginning, they endeavor to deceive Anselmo in order not to betray him and, on the other hand, their deaths take place because of a false assumption: Camila runs away because she thinks that Anselmo is aware of her betrayal, although he is not. As regards the audience’s reaction in tragedy, Philip Sidney (2002: 98) contends that this genre, “with stirring the affects of admiration and commiseration, teacheth the uncertainty of this world.” So, in view of these uncertainties, the audience must feel insecure. Certainly, regarding Cervantes’s tragedy, the audience might fear that an unwise resolution could bring about its own tragic death.

Moreover, the tragic dimension is likely to be intensified by “the intermediate kind of personage, a man not preeminently virtuous and just, whose misfortune, however, is brought upon him not by vice and depravity but by some error of judgement” (Aristotle 1984: 238). Certainly, these features fit Anselmo when he fails to rate Camila’s virtue highly.
His “error of judgement” leads to a change in his fortune, a change from happiness to misery: at the beginning, we are acquainted with the happiest man in the world, but later he finds out that his wife and his friend had fallen in love, which brings about his misery. Following Aristotle, Dante Alighieri (1984: 31) defined tragedy as “tranquil and conducive to wonder at the beginning, but foul and conducive to horror at the end, or catastrophe.”

After Anselmo’s wedding, Lotario goes on visiting Anselmo and Camila’s lodgings but, as time goes by, Lotario decides to avoid his stays there because he is worried about his friend’s honor. In fact, “[a] man’s reputation, regardless of his social class, depended upon the opinion of others” (Elizabeth A. Foyster 1999: 58) and, therefore, if Anselmo’s neighbors begin to talk about Lotario’s prolonged stays at his married friend’s house, it may affect Anselmo’s reputation seriously because he might be alleged to have failed to control his wife if she was supposed to commit adultery as was common in the early modern period (cf. Robert B. Shoemaker 1998: 101):

el casado a quien el cielo había concedido mujer hermosa, tanto cuidado había de tener qué amigos llevaba a su casa como en mirar con qué amigas su mujer conversaba, porque lo que no se hace ni cierta en las plazas, ni en los templos, ni en las fiestas públicas, ni estaciones (cosas que no todas veces las han de negar los maridos a sus mujeres), se concierta y facilita en casa de la amiga o la parienta de quien más satisfacción se tiene (Cervantes 1995: 396).

Lotario’s words reflect the misogynistic view of women as too prone to gossip and prurience, and for that reason husbands should control their wives’ meetings with both male and female friends. Without any doubt, the effect of these ideas about women was as great on Anselmo as on Lotario. In fact, as Diana de Armas Wilson (1987:26) states, “Camila is regarded barbarically –by both her husband and her lover– as curren-


Cervantes describes a woman who perfectly fits the patriarchal concept of femininity, that is, as Gerda Lerner (1986: 209) points out, “passionate and unable to control her appetites, weak, providing only low matter for the process of procreation, devoid of soul and designed to be ruled” (my emphasis). However, in spite of Lotario’s reluctance to act in the same way as when his friend was single, their relationship seems to overcome the hardships derived from Anselmo’s new marital status. Yet Anselmo is too jealous and asks his friend to help him to try Camila’s virtue. The anxiety Anselmo shows is symptomatic of early-modern masculinity. As Mark Breitenberg (1996: 3) remarks,

> anxiety and masculinity: the terms must be wed if only for the obvious reason that any social system whose premise is the unequal distribution of power and authority always and only sustains itself in constant defense of the privileges of some of its members and by the constraint of others.

In early modern society, men’s honor depended to a large extent on their wives’ virtue. Due to women’s supposed inferior condition, they have to be ruled by men, but if these men fail to keep women under their control, they will also be considered unable to be in charge of other important issues, such as economy or politics. So, if Camila is not able to preserve her virtue, Anselmo’s honor will be affronted and, furthermore, he will be derided as a cuckold, one of the worst offences for men at the time (cf. Foyster 1999: 67). Thus, fears of becoming a cuckold make Anselmo willing to test Camila’s virtue although he promises Lotario that he will be satisfied “sólo con que comiences, aunque tibia y fingidamente,

5 When Anselmo asks Lotario to prove Camila’s virtue, Lotario warned his friend against his design: “la mujer es animal imperfecto, y que no se le han de poner embarrados donde tropiece y caiga, sino quitárselos y despejalle el camino de cualquier inconveniente” (Cervantes 1995: 403).

6 As R. W. Connell (1995: 68) contends, “[w]omen were certainly regarded as different from men, but different in So, Anselmo witnesses Lotario addressing love poems to Clori/Camila but he does not realize, which reveals that he is unable to control what is happening around him and, therefore, the immediate implication is that Anselmo does not fit the patriarchal ideal of masculinity, which states that men must be able to control and rule their households.
a solicitar a Camila [...] y con solo este principio quedaré contento, y tú habrás cumplido con lo que debes a nuestra amistad” (Cervantes 1995: 406). Trying to avoid being replaced by another person in the enterprise, precisely because he also thinks that Camila will yield to temptation, Lotario promises Anselmo to test Camila’s virtue. However, due to Camila’s “estremos de bondad y de hermosura [...] bastantes a enamorar una estatua de mármol” (Cervantes 1995: 411), Lotario falls in love with her, which is clearly the beginning of the tragic ending insofar as Camila never realizes that her husband is putting her virtue to the test and, therefore, she is not able to plot a way to avoid Lotario’s wooing, as Behn’s female characters do. From his tale, it is possible to infer that, for Cervantes, women are unable to control their own lives and what happens around them. Contrary to her design, Camila falls in love with Lotario; despite this, however, Lotario assures Anselmo of Camila’s virtue: “[T]ienes una mujer que dignamente puede ser ejemplo y corona de todas las mujeres buenas” (Cervantes 1995: 414). At this point, Anselmo decides to finish the enterprise by asking Lotario to write some poems to Clori, a fictional woman who would be Lotario’s lover for Camila.

Thus, Camilia and Lotario manage to deceive Anselmo until one night, when he discovers a man in Leonela’s lodgings. Leonela pleads with Anselmo: “No me mates, señor, que yo te diré cosas de más importancia de las que puedes imaginar [pero] déjame hasta mañana, que entonces sabrás de mí lo que te ha de admirar” (Cervantes 1995: 434). Afraid of Leonela’s statement, Camila gets some valuable jewelry and money and runs away. In the morning, Anselmo finds neither Leonela, who had also left his lodgings in order not to tell him about her lover, nor Camila and, when he finds out that Lotario has also run away, Anselmo dies of a broken heart. Lotario dies in a battle in Naples and, after knowing about Lotario’s death, melancholy and sadness bring about Camila’s death. Thus, the initial quietness turns into horror, the horror of death: everyone dies at the end, the typical ending of tragedy in contrast to that of comedy. Although Anselmo’s curiosity is the point of departure, every character’s attitude and circumstances contribute to bring about this tragic ending: on the one hand, Anselmo’s distrust of Camila, Lotario’s attempt to deceive his best friend, Camila’s passivity or Leonela’s selfishness; on
the other hand, the chance meeting between Lotario and Leonela’s lover, Camila’s interpretation of her husband’s words after meeting Leonela and her lover or Lotario’s death, among others.

Taking into account Cervantes’s plot, I find some patterns of behavior which are recurrent in both comic and tragic characters. In the same way as comic characters, Camila and Lotario manage to deceive Anselmo twice: Anselmo thinks that Lotario’s poems are directed to a fictitious Clori and he also seems to be persuaded that Camila is really upset when Lotario tells her that he loves her. Moreover, misunderstandings are also present in this tragic narrative: on the one hand, Lotario’s thinks that Leonela’s lover is one of Camila’s and, on the other, Camila interprets her husband’s words about his talk with Leonela in the wrong way. It is clear that the comedy and the tragedy of this tale share some elements but, they differ in the final consequence of those similar actions. I would like to analyze now Castro’s and Behn’s comic plots in order to find out whether deception and misunderstandings are also part of their works and, if they are, why they become the origin of comic situations.

3. The Curious Impertinent: a Comedy
Concerning comedy, Alighieri (1984: 31) holds that it “introduces a situation of adversity, but ends its matter in prosperity.” As happens in Cervantes’s tragic tale, Castro introduces a situation of adversity, although at the beginning: in the first act, the audience is already acquainted with Camila and Lotario’s love and prospective marriage. However, when Anselmo meets Camila, he falls in love with her and, as Lotario values friendship more than love, he transfers his beloved Camila to his best friend: “Si tú gustas, de mi mano / quiero casarte con ella” (Castro 1991: 109). It is the first instance of the appropriation of the female body on the part of the male characters in this comedy. Neither Lotario nor Anselmo thinks about taking into account Camila’s opinion regarding the exchange. Lotario decides to give Camila in marriage to Anselmo and the latter agrees although he has not met Camila yet. In addition to that, Camila not only declines to confront the decisions Lotario and Anselmo take but also accepts Lotario’s will, which consists of pleasing Anselmo:
Vi que amor de solo un día
al de mil se adelantaba,
en uno que me dejaba
y en otro que me quería.
Y con causas de olvidar
y efecto de agradecer,
pude al uno no querer
y pude al otro adorar

Thus, she is depicted as a puppet in the hands of these two men. Camila does not impose her own will although she was really in love with Lotario and she even wanted to marry him before Anselmo’s appearance. Moreover, she accepts her father’s will and she endeavors to fall in love with Anselmo. This sudden exchange of prospective husband could be considered the beginning of the situation of adversity Dante refers to because it is the origin of Anselmo’s, Camila’s, and Lotario’s unhappiness, which is brought about by Anselmo’s anxiety. Like Cervantes’s Anselmo, Castro’s is also affected by the effects derived by the unequal distribution of power in a patriarchal society but, moreover, his suffering is increased by circumstances: at the beginning, Camila and Lotario were in love and, therefore, the possibility of becoming a cuckold is likelier than in Cervantes’s tale. However, it seems that Anselmo does not take into account the fact that his wife and Lotario had been in love because, when he starts to suspect about Camila’s faithfulness, Anselmo asks Lotario to test her virtue. Anselmo proves to be very naïve when he expects not to be betrayed by Lotario in this affair:

Y si se rindiese a ti,
que nunca el cielo tal quiera,
a solo su pensamiento
podría llegar mi ofensa
Anselmo’s statement suggests that he does not trust in his wife’s honor but, on the contrary, he relies on her former fiancé in order to test her virtuousness. This is precisely the first mistake Anselmo makes and, therefore, it is also the beginning of his end as a respectable husband. Certainly, Anselmo’s attitude seems to be really incongruous: he makes his wife’s virtue be tested by her former fiancé. This incongruity which Anselmo does not perceive makes him a comic character. It is also possible to say that the audience may feel superior to him because he fails to foresee the possible consequences of this testing: it is very likely that he will become a cuckold. This superiority on the part of the audience makes him an object of derision for the audience (John Morreall 1983: 4). Moreover, Castro’s Anselmo is not as virtuous as Cervantes’s: when he leaves home so that Lotario could woo Camila, he tells Culebro about his lewd intentions:

[T]ú has de saber, 
que en casa de Lotario estoy, 
adonde de cierta dama 
he de gozar la hermosura, 
porque tenga más segura 
en mi secreto su fama

This attitude makes him ungrateful and, therefore, it overshadows Camila’s betrayal because of her relationship with Lotario. In Cervantes’s tragic tale, Camila is punished because he had cheated her husband and, therefore, the audience might think that she somehow deserves punishment. However, in Castro’s comedy, Camila cheats on her husband but she does it because he himself has hurled her at her former fiancé and, while Lotario tries to woo Camila, Anselmo is also cuckolding her wife. It is possible to perceive a sexual double standard: on the one hand, Anselmo wants his wife to remain virtuous but, on the other hand, he
himself cuckolds his wife. From that, we can infer that Anselmo is not really in love with Camila but he only wants to preserve her as his property.7

Moreover, Camila’s naivety about her husband’s design makes her likeable to the audience. Anselmo had told his wife that the Duke had ordered him to go to Pisa but, while talking to the Duke, he tells her that it is not true. However, Camila is so naïve that, at the beginning, she does not believe the Duke:

A su trato desleal
Da colores de ésta suerte,
pues él debió de endiablo
porque quiso a solas verme,
y luego por no ofenderme,
se obliga a disimulable
(Castro 1991: 140).

Her words are really comical because of the incongruity between what the audience expects and what really happens. As readers, we expect Camila to believe the Duke and, as a consequence, to get annoyed about her husband’s lies. On the contrary, Camila trusts in her husband and, although he has really deceived her, she thinks that it is the Duke who is lying in order to woo her. Thus, we laugh at Camila’s naivety but also grieve that this woman, thinking that her husband is unable to deceive her, is at the same time being betrayed by him. Later, Leonela, whom Culebro had told about Anselmo’s whereabouts, tells Camila the truth: “de cierta dama que adora, / está bebiendo el aliento, / tu esposo” (Castro 1991: 148) and, at the same time, she also encourages her to revenge: “Muérete por él, señora, / y está su sombra adorando, / mientras él te está ofendiendo” (Castro 1991: 148). Taking into account Leonela’s advice, Camila, who does believe her, decides to take revenge on Anselmo by allowing Lotario to govern her:

7 Cf. Shoemaker (1998: 101), who contends that “[once married, men and women […] had a lot of advice, from the church, the law, conduct manuals, and their own family and neighbors, advice which emphasized the husband’s authority over his wife (my emphasis).]"
We must take into account that Camila is a female character in a comedy written by a male playwright. Therefore, it is not astonishing that she fits the patriarchal ideal of femininity: she thinks that she has to be governed by someone, although the challenge lies in that she decides who is going to govern her, Lotario, the man she loves.

Leonela, Camila’s maid, brings about the comical ending of the play, although unwittingly. In fact, she intends to do Camila harm but does not succeed and this reversal increases the humor created by Camila and Lotario’s sudden happiness. The difficulties appear when Lotario sees Leonela’s lover leaving Anselmo’s house because he thinks that this man is one of Camila’s lovers. In his jealousy, Lotario decides to tell Anselmo the truth, that is, his truth:

Y a tu esposa
se ha rendido a mis porfías;
vila andar algunos días
entre amante y recelosa,
y siempre te lo he callado,
por pensar si era ilusión,
haña ver su corazón
en tu ofensa declarado

After taking revenge on Camila, Lotario is asked by Leonela: “lo que anoche viiste / no lo sepa mi señora” (Castro 1991: 174). Thus, he realizes that the man he had seen the night before was not one of Camila’s lovers but Leonela’s and, therefore, he regrets telling Anselmo: “Yo estuve sin seso, ¡ay cielos!” (Castro 1991: 175). Lotario’s reaction to this situation proves that he is governed by his feelings, whereas Camila shows her ra-
tionality when she is informed about Lotario’s betrayal. Both of them have decided to deceive Anselmo but, when Lotario talks to Anselmo, he only makes reference to Camila’s attitude, avoiding telling him about his responsibility.

Proving her resolution, Camila manages to reverse the plight by making Anselmo witness her rejecting Lotario. However, Camila gets angry about Leonela’s licentiousness and dares to hit her because of her embarrassing deeds. In a fur, Leonela tells Anselmo: “Que fue fingido / quanto viste en tu aposento” (Castro 1991: 183). This revelation hastens the ending of the comedy: Anselmo gets so angry that he tries to kill Lotario. However, he falls off and, before dying, he comprehends that the only solution to this situation is his death:

Fue siempre mi grande amigo
y el darme agora la muerte
fue la mayor amistad
que en su vida pudo hacerme

Finally, taking into account Anselmo’s will and immediately after his death, the Duke encourages Lotario to marry Camila: “Dale a Camila la mano” (Castro 1991: 187). Surprisingly, Lotario agrees: “Pues ya remedio no tiene, / yo la doy” (Castro 1991: 187). Apart from the happy resolution, the immediacy between Anselmo’s death and Lotario’s proposal of marriage brings about the comic effect, just because of the incongruity between what is usually expected after someone’s death, and in particular after a husband’s death, and what really happens: this death comes as a great relief to Camila, the widow, and Lotario, who do not hesitate to get engaged.

Deceptions and misunderstandings are also at the heart of this play but, in order to turn Cervantes’s tragic tale into a comedy, Castro makes use of the jealous husband. He presents him as a contemptible character and this contempt towards him allows the audience and the readers to
laugh at him. At the beginning, he is willing to marry Camila although she was his best friend’s lover; then, he makes his best friend test Camila’s virtuousness while he is behaving as a philanderer; and, finally, he intends to punish Lotario. At the same time, Camila and Lotario move us to pity because Anselmo had been making them suffer substantially throughout the whole comedy. Thus, it is so easy to accept his death and, at the same time, welcome Camila and Lotario’s marriage.

4. The Curious Impertinent: a Feminist Comedy
Behn was extremely influenced by Spanish novelists such as Cervantes, Quevedo or Castillo Solórzano, among others (cf. Altaba-Artal 1999: 46-47, Figueroa Dorrego 1999: 38), and her adaptation of “El curioso impertinente” is just an example of this literary debt. However, she was not the only one who reworked the tale. As I have already pointed out, other English playwrights based their works on Cervantes’s “El curioso impertinente” but Guillén de Castro was the only one who turned this tragic tale into a comedy in the seventeenth century, just about sixty years before Behn did it (cf. Christiane Faliu-Lacourt and María Luisa Lobato 1991: 9). In this section, we intend to analyze the distinguishing resources tapped upon by this female playwright in order to make her comic version of Cervantes’s tragic tale by paying special attention to gender issues. Behn also introduces a situation of adversity at the beginning: Antonio wants his friend Alberto to prove his wife’s virtue. However, in her comedy, from the outset, Behn inserts some devices which will turn this incipient situation of adversity into prosperity. One of the most important is the knowledge the female characters are provided with. Clarina is acquainted with Antonio’s design on proving her virtue: “’Tis strange, since he set him that task so long ago, / He would not begin before” (Behn 1996: 97). In fact, the audience learns about Antonio’s design through the female characters. Apart from Clarina, her sister-in-law Ismena is also

8 Cf. Henri Bergson (1975: 3), who points out that “[l]’indifférence est son milieu naturel. Le rire n’a pas de plus grand ennemi que l’émotion.”
acquainted with it and her maid Isabella is continuously providing them with information:

—I warrant you, Madam, my Intelligence is good;
And to assure you of what I have said,
I dare undertake you shall hear the same over again;
For just now Alberto is come to visit my Lord,
Who I am sure will entertain him with no other stories,
But those of his jealousie,
And to persuade him to Court you
(Behn 1996: 97).

According to Regina Barreca (1988: 9), “[women’s] writing is characterized by the breaking of cultural and ideological frames.” Patriarchy had prevented women from voicing their ideas and their knowledge. However, when women began to write in the early modern period, they tended to create intelligent heroines, such as Clarina, Ismena or Isabella. In Behn’s The Amorous Prince (1673), this intelligence brings about an active answer on the part of these female characters: they make use of disguises in order to avoid Clarina’s wooing on the part of Alberto.

Behn never hesitates to make use of disguises. In fact, disguises are one of the most common strategies used by women in order to provide female characters with the agency and independence that they had been denied, that is, in order to break away from the established order. Frances M. Kavenik (1991: 181) focuses on the aims that female characters have when they dress up as men: “the breeches part is used to break down the basic courtship motif,” which usually consists of an active man wooing a passive woman. When Ismena impersonates Clarina, they avoid this pattern insofar as these women are, at least, as active as the men in the play: they not only avoid Alberto’s wooing of Clarina but also make him fall in

9 Cf. J. Douglas Canfield (1997: 149), who regards female servants as “subversive women tricksters who operate from the margins, […] but who nevertheless obtain space of their own on those margins in which to maintain a combination of agency and (subversive) integrity.”
10 Cf. also Edna L. Steeves (1991: 220), who states that the “disguise is used as a major plot device” by another Restoration playwright, Mary Pix.
love with Ismena; that is, they manage to impose their own will although male characters do not realize this until the end. So, throughout the play, it is possible to notice Alberto’s and Antonio’s needless anxiety. In the same way as Cervantes’s Lotario, Alberto does not want to betray his friend. In fact, he is afraid of Camila’s falling in love with him although, unlike Cervantes’s character, she does not fall in love with him thanks to the female characters’ precautionary measures and, therefore, Alberto’s worries appear to be unnecessary and, consequently, ridiculous. When Antonio finds out that his friend had deceived him, he gets really angry: “Did I not see how unconcern’d you were, / And hardly paying her a due respect; / And when she even invited thee to speak, / Most rudely thou wer’t silent” (Behn 1996: 103). After this first meeting, in the same way as Lotario, Alberto had already fallen in love with the supposed Clarina: “Inform me Love who shares the better part, / Friendship, or thee, in my divided heart” (Behn 1996: 102). However, as Antonio had got so angry, Alberto is willing to put into practice his friend’s plan, which consists of wooing the supposed Clarina by talking to her about his love: “My timorous heart that way my tongue would spare, / And tells you of the flames you’ve kindled there” (Behn 1996: 106) but, this time, unlike Camila, who falls for Lotario, Ismena decides to tell him the truth:

Enough my Lord, have you nought else to say?  
The Plot’s betray’d, and can no further go;  
The Stratagem’s discover’d to the Foe;  
I find Antonio has more love than wit,  
And I’ll endeavour too to merit it  
(Behn 1996: 107).

When he hears this, Alberto gets so surprised that he is not able to lie: “What you have said, I do confess is true” (Behn 1996: 107). So, since the beginning of the comedy, the women have been in control of the situation thanks to Isabella, the maid, who had informed them about Antonio’s plot, and thanks to their women’s wit, which had helped them to avoid exposing Clarina to Alberto’s courtship and, also, preventing their falling in love with each other. Consequently, Ismena becomes so confident
that she is able to tell part of the truth and to acquaint Alberto with her knowledge although she does not reveal her true identity. Alberto’s reaction is comical because it illustrates Ismena’s superiority: he confesses that his attitude had been plotted by Antonio, but he also proves to be frightened because he thinks that he has fallen in love with his best friend’s wife.

Barreca (1988: 5) points out that “women writers have traditionally used comedy to subvert existing conventional structures.” The patriarchal concept of femininity is one of these existing conventional structures Barreca refers to. In opposition to the ideal of femininity which patriarchy promotes, female friendship is one of the most relevant points in Behn’s comedy. According to traditional misogyny, women are unable to create alliances amongst themselves because they are bossy, greedy, revengeful, self-interested or selfish (cf. Barreca 1996: 1, Finney 1994: 2). As we have already said, Cañero’s depiction of Leonela illustrates women’s inability to create alliances with other women. One of the most noteworthy instances of this takes place when Leonela makes Camila responsible for her own wrongdoings: “¿Tan buen exemplo me has dado, / que tanta culpa me das?” (Cañero 1991: 182). On the contrary, by depicting female characters’ success as a result of their alliance, Behn’s comedy proves that the assumption that women are unable to ally themselves is false. Apart from sympathetic, Behn’s female characters are also very witty. In spite of adversity, they are able to reach their aims: Clarina avoids Alberto’s wooing, Ismena makes Alberto fall in love with her and Isabella manages to marry Lorenzo. Obviously, this is not easy to achieve unless they make use of their wit and resourcefulness. For instance, Ismena dresses up in order to deceive Alberto and Antonio. Behn’s characters want to control their own lives and disguises allow them to do so.

Isabella proves that, through psychological impersonation, it is also possible to obtain similar results: she makes Lorenzo think that he will meet Clarina in her own chamber so that Antonio finds him there and, on account of Isabella’s virtue, he forces him to marry her. First, she promises Lorenzo a meeting with Clarina, whom he loves, to “order him at [her] pleasure” (Behn 1996: 110) and, then, she makes Wallet tell Antonio about Lorenzo’s presence in his lodgings. Finally, when Antonio
enters Isabella’s chamber, having been encouraged by her, Lorenzo feigns to be the “lawful husband to Isabella” (Behn 1996: 137) in order to avoid Antonio’s wrath. Lorenzo is neither Isabella’s husband nor her lover: Lorenzo is in love with Clarina but, as Isabella loves Lorenzo, she thinks that the only way to manage to marry him is by making Antonio believe that they are engaged, although they are not. Thus, as she “impersonates” Lorenzo’s supposed wife-to-be, at the end Antonio claims marriage for them and they finally marry despite Lorenzo’s attempt to avoid marriage (5.3).

Through these procedures, Behn’s characters prove that patriarchy is not as firm and stable a system as it was thought to be, insofar as, by making use of disguises, even psychological, women (Clarina, Ismena, Isabella) are able to break down the designs which have been created by supposed superior beings (Antonio, Alberto; Lorenzo). Hence, these female characters manage to impose their own will, although the male characters are not conscious of it until the end, which shows their lack of control. On the one hand, Alberto had not been informed about Ismena’s transvestism and, therefore, she feels in control of this situation. Alberto loves the woman he is courting, but he does not know that this woman is Ismena until she tells him. Regarding this, Snider (2006: 326) holds that Alberto’s love for Ismena is due to a sense of transgression; that is, Alberto falls in love with her because he thinks that Ismena is his friend’s wife, although at the end he finds out that she is not. Thus, this revelation makes not only the audience but also the characters laugh, because they experience something which does not fit into our internalized patterns of experience (Morreall 1983: 16). On the other hand, the sense of transgression also applies to Isabella’s affair. Lorenzo enters Isabella’s chamber because he thinks that, there, he will meet Clarina, the married woman he loves. On the contrary, due to Isabella’s design, he meets Antonio, her husband, and, as this encounter makes him so frightened, he takes into account Isabella’s advice, which consists of pretending to be his husband-to-be. This false statement leads inexorably to his marriage to Isabella.

Isabella’s struggle for Lorenzo is about to ruin Clarina and Ismena’s plan. One day,
Alberto arrives at Clarina’s lodgings and finds Lorenzo there. He becomes so jealous that he encourages Antonio to witness the supposed Clarina’s attitude towards him. In order to check his wife’s faithfulness, Antonio hides in her lodgings but, having been informed about Antonio’s presence, the supposed Clarina feigns to be faithful to her husband: “I’le still retain / My love for him; and what I had for you, / Which was but Friendship, I’le abandon” (Behn 1996: 127). Moreover, she also pretends to think that Alberto’s love for her may be her own fault: “But stay, / Thou say’st my Beauty forc’d thee to this wickedness” (Behn 1996: 128). Thus, she makes them believe that she is willing to commit suicide. Having witnessed everything, Antonio feels embarrassed about having suspected Clarina’s virtue. By the time he goes out, Clarina’s impersonator, lying half dead, looks pertly up and, at this point, Alberto realizes that everything had been feigned.

Later, Ismena says in an aside. “You’ll be more surpriz’d, when you know / That you are cheated too as well as Antonio” (Behn 1996: 129). As I have pointed out before, Ismena feels and proves her superiority because, with the help of Clarina and Isabella, she had made Alberto fall for her. Furthermore, after the performance, Antonio thinks that his wife had been tempted to cuckold him and had not succumbed to it, which would mean that Antonio’s plan had succeeded. The happy ending is only due to the active role of these three female characters: Clarina, Isabella, and Ismena, who manage to deceive the male characters in order to achieve their aims. This comic resolution of the plot is possible because the woman dramatist creates female characters who are active, independent, intelligent, and sympathetic towards other women. This is common in plays written by Behn and also by her female successors on the stage at the turn of the century: Ariadne, Pix, or Centlivre, among others.

5. Conclusions
I have dealt with the way in which masculine anxiety reflects the absurdity of the dominant ideology in a patriarchal society. In fact, the three works I have analyzed here start from the curious husband’s doubts about his wife’s virtue, which make him so anxious because of the responsibil-
ity the society imposes on husbands as regards their spouses’ sexuality. On the one hand, in Castro’s, and even in Cervantes’s, work the anxiety the husbands show appears to be justified by their wives’ unfaithfulness but, on the other hand, Behn introduces extremely different female characters who are ahead of the male characters’ design and, therefore, they manage to avoid the tragic events that both Camilas undergo throughout the other two works. Behn’s female characters are active, intelligent, talkative or witty, whereas Castro’s and Cervantes’s seem to be prurient, silent and submissive. Thus, it is possible to infer that, regarding women, Behn provides a different perspective. In Cervantes’s and Castro’s plays, the ingenuous Camilas are easily governed by male commands, although they do not foresee or wish the possible effects incurred by them. Instead, in Behn’s comedy, women are sensible beings who prove that they are not as inferior as patriarchal precepts indicate: they are able to control their lives and the situations brought about by the male characters who, under the influence of the patriarchal ideology, underestimate their intelligence. Finally, it is possible to state that, in order to reach the comic effect, Behn and Castro make use of different interpretations of feminine and masculine gender identities.
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The purpose of this study is to analyze the personality and motivations of this Cuban philanthropist, diplomat, bibliophile, art collector, and businessman. I want to determine what attracted Mr. Cintas so irresistibly to his beloved books—and especially the 1605 Quijote—and art. This study will also show that quixotic idealism and benevolence fueled his desire to collect books and art primarily for the well being of the Cuban people. A collector’s paintings and books allow the scholar to peer into that collector’s heart and soul.

I hope to explain why, and sometimes how, Mr. Cintas acquired the specific books, manuscripts, paintings, and other art objects that constituted his world-renowned collections. The reader can readily find some of the answer to this question in the intriguing words of this study’s epigraph.

A while ago when I was studying Cervantes’s *Don Quijote*, Jill Gage, a Newberry Library reference librarian suggested that I might like to see the Newberry’s first edition of that novel (1605-1615).

When I opened the cover of the first volume, I saw the bookplates of the three previous owners of this Newberry copy of *Don Quijote*: Henry Labouchère, Oscar Benjamín Cintas of Havana, Cuba, and Louis H. Silver. The fact that a Cuban had owned such a rare bibliographic treasure greatly piqued my curiosity. And that is the genesis of this study.

**The Early Years:**

**Family History, Sagua la Grande, and Great Britain**

Because Mr. Cintas’s artistic and intellectual development are so closely associated with his family and with his native city of Sagua la Grande, a family biography and city description are very much in order.

---

2 The Cintas/Silver/Newberry edition (Case Y 722 c 3441) is one of about a dozen known copies worldwide. Mr. Cintas purchased this edition from the rare book dealer John Francis Fleming who was a representative of the A. S. W. Rosenbach firm. In 1942 Mr. Cintas paid $5,000 for it. In 1961 Mr. Fleming purchased it back from the Cintas estate for $44,000 (*New York Times* May 18, p.6). In 1963 The Newberry Library purchased this very edition from the Silver estate (Towne, passim). The Rosenbach firm had originally purchased this book from Maggs Brothers (Knowles 50).

Mr. Cintas also bought the second edition of Barcelona of 1608 as well as the 1617 one from Barcelona both of which are also part of the Newberry Library collection. He also had several other early editions of *Don Quijote* (O’Reilly items 79-82).
In 1887 Oscar Benjamín Cintas y Rodríguez was unto the manor born in the Cuban provincial town of Sagua la Grande although his family’s economic situation had already begun to diminish.

His family had him baptized in the town’s Parish Church. It was in this large and beautiful church that a priest had baptized each Cintas family child for decades. On such occasions Mr. Cintas’s maternal grandfather, José Rodríguez López († 1886) used to take from his own home art gallery a painting of the Virgin by Murillo. He used to place it on the altar as a witness to the ceremony with the hope that the Virgin would protect these children. According to Portela this painting by Murillo is different from the one that graced Mr. Cintas’s Havana mansion (Telephone conversation, March 8, 2008).

According to Ramos, in this church there also hung a canvas by the Belgian painter Jos. Correns called, “The Savior’s Baptism” (Ramos [1962] 30-31). Ramos confirms that the donor was a Dutchman called Juan Van der Kieft who had married into a prominent Sagua family (Ramos ibid., 33 note 2).

3 On page 90 of Lloyd there is an 1851 painting of Sagua la Grande which would date back to Mr. Rodríguez López’s adolescence. The city is right on the Sagua River and prone to considerable flooding.

4 Much of the biographical material for Mr. Cintas’s early years I owe to the kindness of Mr. Raoul García Iglesias who shared with me an unpublished essay on Mr. Cintas. Of incalculable help have been the material, time, and enthusiasm that Juan Portela has offered me. He was Mr. Cintas’s great nephew, to whom Mr. Cintas spoke on a regular basis during visits to Mr. Cintas’s mansion. Mr. Portela (1942) is the authority on Mr. Cintas.

In Catholic countries it is common to name a child after the saint on whose day the child was born. However I have not been able to determine what Mr. Cintas’s birthday is because I have not been able to find any Saint called Oscar. Also it was common to give the name, “Benjamin,” to the youngest male sibling. I have every reason to believe that this was also Mr. Cintas’s case.

5 “Invitation to Funeral of D. José R. Rodríguez ” (Portela Archive).
Thus we could say without fear of contradiction that within a week or so of his birth, Mr. Cintas received his first introduction to great art thanks to his grandfather and to Mr. Van der Kieft. For Mr. Cintas this tradition helped to create and to maintain an environment well-disposed to art, one that would nurture him throughout his life (Portela telephone conversation, September 30, 2000). Even though his grandfather had died the year before Mr. Cintas was born, his artistic tradition remained a part of Mr. Cintas’s tradition for his entire life. In fact, according to Portela, Mr. Cintas was always particularly proud of his Rodríguez López ascendancy. He was especially rhapsodic about the time when money was less of a problem, and his grandfather’s family enjoyed prosperity. Probably the single greatest economic loss for this family was its two sugar mills (Portela e-mail October 02, 2007). But like the Phœnix, eventually Mr. Cintas turned his own family tragedy and his own economic ashes into wealth and unsurpassed personal greatness.

When Mr. Cintas’s maternal grandfather died, the family passed its mantle of culture to his wife, doña Margarita Rodríguez López. She in turn passed it to her nephew Francisco P. Machado (1852-?). Don Francisco had received part of his education in the United States and was a person with progressive ideals. He was very active in local politics and finance and was a staunch defender of Cuban sugar interests in the United States Congress.

According to Lloyd, the Machado residence is a “splendid example of a high-class Cuban country house, and contains many valuable art and literary treasures.” (Lloyd 447) This house was also the center for Sagua la Grande literarati (Lobo 310). I would venture to say that Mr. Cintas also inherited his uncle Francisco’s taste for books and paintings which most likely included the family Murillo painting.

In contrast with the Rodríguez López family branch, there seems to be almost nothing publically known about the Cintas branch of the fam-

---

6 Before and during Mr. Rodríguez López’s visits to Spain, Bartolomé Murillo (1617-1682) was Spain’s most popular and best known painter. His paintings hung on the walls of galleries throughout Western Europe particularly in Holland, in The United States, and in Great Britain (Stratton 91). One could also easily understand Mr. Rodríguez López’s attraction for Murillo and his desire to own a painting by this artist.

7 There is an impressive photo of this house in the Spanish version of Lloyd, 452 (Portela Archive).
ily. In fact Mr. Cintas hardly if ever speaks about the paternal side of his family.

The Cintas family had been well established in Spain before it arrived in Cuba. Nevertheless we have precious little information if any on the origins of the Cintas-Rodríguez family. We also have almost no information on the infancy, childhood, and adolescence of Mr. Cintas (Alberto Barral e-mail September 21, 2007).

Mr. Cintas was one of at least three children born to Lorenzo Cintas and Amelia Rodríguez. Don Oscar’s male sibling was Lorenzo (c.1885) who I believe was a fencing instructor (Ramos [1958] 115). Mr. Cintas’s sister María seems to have been the youngest sibling, and she outlived him. According to a distant relative, Professor Pierre Cintas, Lorenzo perished during World War I (E-mail, April 12, 2007.) This is also the opinion of Johnson (E-mail, March 11, 2008). However, according to Portela the brother Lorenzo died in World War II (e-mail April 12, 2008).

Portela also told me that Mr. Cintas had a niece married to an Englishman who died during World War II on a flight from Lisbon to London (e-mail March 12, 2008). By extraordinary coincidence, tragically she and her husband perished on the same flight on which Leslie Howard died (Portela e-mail, March 13, 2008).

From what I have been able to determine, the Cintas family was very loving. It instilled in its children a need to do good not only for themselves but for others as well. Like those who inspired him, in his own way Mr. Cintas was very active in public life.

Don Oscar’s enlightened parents provided him with an excellent and cosmopolitan education, both at school and at home. He attended the Sagua la Grande Jesuit School, where his education included compassion, social awareness, and responsibility. Such a caring and nourishing background was a driving force in Mr. Cintas’s future philanthropy.

Mr. Cintas’s maternal grandfather was also a major benefactor of the city (Barral e-mail, September 21, 2007). According to Portela, don José

---

8 Don Oscar’s father was an alderman in 1879. (Alcover [1905] 298). Don Oscar’s maternal grandfather had a brother named Santiago who was also mayor of Sagua. (Ibid., 336-340).

9 In Sagua la Grande Mr. Cintas and his family lived on Calle García 107. (Memoria Oficial Octava 450 note).
and his brother Santiago owned and ran a sugar brokerage. They also dealt in lumber (Portela, telephone conversation, September 30, 2007). Mr. Rodríguez was also a wealthy bank and land owner. Both of them were in business at least by 1859 (Alcover [1905] 180).

As one could expect the Rodríguez López family exercised considerable power in Sagua la Grande (Pérez 131). However, according to Portela, it lost a great deal of money during the economic panic of 1879 and most likely committed suicide the year before Mr. Cintas was born. The Cintas branch of the family also had some minor sugar holdings in Sagua la Grande.

Among Mr. Rodríguez López’s most notable examples of urban philanthropy was to donate to Sagua la Grande the old building where the Casino Español once stood (Machado 92). Indeed we can safely say that Mr. Cintas’s maternal grandfather was an inspirational model of civic pride and duty for the young grandson. Later in life Mr. Cintas would emulate such an egalitarian and wonderful grandfather in many ways.

Probably among the very first paintings that Mr. Cintas ever saw and recollected as a child, and which doubtless inspired him was by the Spaniard Federico de Madrazo y Kuntz (1815-1894). It was an impressive, full length portrait of his paternal grandfather signed on February 23, 1872 by the painter (Museo Nacional 93-620 and Álvarez, “Cuba...” 57). Judging by the date, location, and formal dress of Mr. Rodríguez López in this portrait one could conclude that he occupied some diplomatic post in Madrid. And in effect, he was a Cuban representative to the Spanish Parliament (Las Cortes). Apparently also he was a lieutenant colonel, at least at the time of this portrait (Alcover [1905] 240).

Mr. and Mrs. Rodríguez López often traveled to Spain because their son José Ramón studied law in Madrid (Portela e-mail September 25, 2007). Don José’s wife was Margarita Machado an aunt of the Sagua la Grande historian Francisco de P. Machado to whom we have already referred and to whom we will refer again in this study (Portela e-mail September 24, 2007).

---

10 Alcover gives 1884 as the year of the economic collapse of the Rodríguez-López business empire ([1905], 344).
I originally had thought that don José was one of the Cuban delegates to Las Cortes sent there to deal with the question of slavery in Cuba (Corwin 186, 238-254). Although he most likely dealt with this problem, he was not an official member of this delegation (Valverde 39).

In spite of his wealth and prestige Mr. Rodríguez López was not a social climber. Just the opposite was true. For example, according to Portela, the Spanish Queen Isabella II had indeed offered him a title of nobility, but he declined this honor. He stood for a democratic Cuba, and a title of nobility in his opinion was incompatible with a democratic society. Doubtless his reputation and memory influenced his grandson Oscar.

It is important to note that not everyone from Sagua la Grande shared Mr. Rodríguez López’s egalitarian sentiments. An interesting observation on this matter is that the Sagua la Grande representative to this Madrid commission to study the matter of slavery in Las Cortes was indeed a member of the Cuban nobility the Conde de Vallesano (Valverde 39).

The Spanish founded the modern Sagua la Grande around 1818, very late in Cuban colonial history. The city is fifteen miles from the north coast of Villa Clara. Its port is Isabela de Sagua, and it is on the Sagua la Grande River. Among the products which that region produced were sugar, cattle, rice, and beans. In fact, during the nineteenth-century Sagua la Grande was the largest sugar cane exporter in the world (Testa 11). Most of its sugar production went to the United States.

During Sagua la Grande’s earliest years the general appearance of the city was dismal and chaotic mainly because it lacked urban planning. For example, there was so much fetid water in the streets that the city looked and smelled like a swamp. At that time its population was 2,400 inhabitants and had some 400 homes (Machado 97). In contrast, in 1913 it had an estimated population of 16,000 inhabitants (Lloyd 445).

But in 1850 the city began to change with the arrival of the new Spanish representative, lieutenant colonel Joaquín Fernández Casariego.
He began to govern the city in an admirable manner. His efforts radically changed these deplorable conditions. For example, he had a surveyor lay out a blueprint for a very attractive city which included paved streets. One of these was Colón Street on which the Casino Español stood (Machado 101). There is no doubt but that the colonel’s enlightened changes created an environment which would make don Oscar very proud to be a sagüero, as a native of Sagua is called.

The new governor helped to develop a sewage system. He also improved the municipal docks so that Sagua la Grande could increase its export and import capacity. He beautified the local cemetery and created numerous benefic societies. The city could also boast of a university (Machado 84).

He improved land transportation and established the Cuban Central Railways Limited. This made the city less isolated. All of this and much more the Colonel managed to do within only five years. (Machado 97-102). In essence Mr. Cintas’s place of birth had become an enlightened city with a developing population and commercial center.

However, not all was pleasant in Sagua la Grande. I do not know where Mr. Cintas was on June 16, 1906. There is a very good chance that he was attending school elsewhere. But on that fateful day the skies above Sagua la Grande opened and poured rain of biblical proportions on that city. The Sagua River overflowed its banks and did horrific damage. The flood waters were such that they reached roof tops (Machado 439-448). But even if Mr. Cintas was not present physically, there is no doubt but that his family and friends would have described to him what had happened on that day in his beloved city.

Although Mr. Cintas came from a privileged background, this privilege could hardly protect him from the harsh reality of events in Cuba. As a very young boy he witnessed the depravation, hunger, and disease that military conflict and political turmoil created. In Cuba’s struggle for independence, people died from beri-beri, lack of adequate medical treatment, poor hygiene, and gunshot and stab wounds. For many years these deplorable conditions were rampant and killed thousands. I do no know how the Cintas family fared, but no doubt those general conditions had a traumatic effect on Mr. Cintas and his family.
During this conflict, the United States offered assistance both to Cubans as well as to United States citizens caught up in this maelstrom of chaos. Not many angels abounded during these struggles. Both the Spanish authorities and the insurgents burned property and killed people (Despatches Roll 6 June 2, 1897 to September 1, 1900). Those years were extremely harsh for Cuba, and I do believe that the bloody struggle for independence from Spain deeply influenced Mr. Cintas’s weltanschauung.\(^*\)

With Cuba now free and independent from Spain, her conflicts with the United States were now to begin and in earnest. At that time little did eleven year old Oscar Benjamín Cintas know how much his life and the life of the United States were going to intertwine.

During Cuba’s struggle for independence from Spain, many in the United States and many in Cuba clamored for the annexation of that island (Thomas 289). The United States had long reached the Pacific Ocean but was always interested in exploration, expansion, and development. The Americans coveted Cuba for its natural wealth, soil, and space where North American settlers could begin life anew.

It is quite clear that many Cubans including the young Mr. Cintas realized that there was much to be gained from a Cuban-American relationship, although I doubt that Mr. Cintas was an annexationist. He loved both his native land as well as his adopted United States of America. And indeed Mr. Cintas was, “a great friend and admirer of America” (Parke-Bernet Catalogue, 1963, no page given). In spite of this I do not believe that he favored relinquishing any Cuban sovereignty to the United States. Don Oscar was a great Cuban patriot. This is quite evident when one examines his role in Cuban-American diplomatic relations and his love of the Cuban people.

Because of Sagua la Grande’s traditional relationship with sugar, it was a place where great dependency on slaves had existed long before 1886, the year in which Spain finally abolished slavery in Cuba. However, it should not come as a surprise to know that there was lingering anti-black sentiment in that city as well as in other parts of the island (Testa

\(^*\) In Sagua la Grande as a result of this war there were hundreds of orphans for whom the city cared in various orphanages (Gutiérrez Quirós 10 and on the page, “A la memoria de mi padre”).
Perhaps some of this resentment surfaced because many blacks there practiced African religions (Tešta 31).

In spite of its early association with slavery, in the early twentieth century Sagua la Grande appears to have been a progressive and pleasant place. There were even integrated public schools (*Memoria Oficial Ochava* 305, 321). Sagua la Grande had good schools, both co-educational and non-coeducational (Rodríguez Altunaga 236, 249). Sagua la Grande also had newspapers and printing presses (Ibid., 263). As early as 1856 it had a theater, concerts, and opera (Ibid 279-280 and Gracia *passim*). It obviously had an active cultural life. According to Alcover ([1905] 224, 226) there were also a Masonic Lodge and a Public Library.

Something of great curiosity and interest about Sagua la Grande was the fact that in it there also was a considerable artistic Chinese population. In spite of the menial jobs which many of them performed, these community members had created a traditional Chinese theater (Rodríguez Altunaga 279 and Pérez de la Riva 250, note 173). According to Barnet the Chinese theater in Sagua la Grande was very elegant and constructed from wood (95). At the time of Mr. Cintas’s birth Sagua la Grande was the home of at least 8,000 Chinese (Pérez de la Riva 198). In addition to performing heavy manual labor they were engaged in many businesses, such as restaurants, tailor shops, and candy stores (Barnet 96).

All in all Sagua la Grande was an interesting, prosperous, sophisticated, and rather cosmopolitan city in which to come of age (Lloyd 443). This ethnic diversity and inclusiveness certainly provided a greater view of the world than the uninitiated might have believed to be possible for such a city in the provinces of Cuba. One might add that this environment was also the home of many distinguished Cuban physicians (Ramos, 1947 *passim*) musicians, journalists, and writers (Alcover [1901] *passim*). Among the latter was the eminent essayist Jorge Mañach.

Later in life Mr. Cintas acquired a very extensive collection of Chinese vases, mainly via the Duveen Brothers from John Pierpont Morgan Jr. (O’Reilly #282). Perhaps an initial attraction for things Chinese might have come from his exposure to the Chinese community in Sagua la Grande. It is unlikely, but not impossible, that they would have had examples of rare vases. However, the Chinese vases that were in Sagua la
Grande might well have made a lasting impression on the artistic tastes of Oscar Cintas. On the other hand Portela talks about the beautiful porcelain, mainly green, which was part of the Rodríguez López household in Sagua la Grande (Telephone conversation, March 9, 2008).

In addition to railroad facilities, in Sagua la Grande there was the abovementioned attractive Casino Español (Lloyd 449 Tešta 50). Judging by photographs from Mr. Cintas’s early years in Sagua la Grande, this casino was an elegant place indeed (Memoria Oficial Oclava 211,225). One could imagine that within its confines a rather young Mr. Cintas with other well-to-do local neighbors and friends would congregate on a regular basis.

Another Sagua la Grande cultural institution was the Liceo Club founded on October 10, 1899. The cream of Sagua la Grande society belonged to this club, including one Lorenzo Cintas, who was most likely don Oscar’s uncle, and definitely a member of the Cintas family (Lloyd 451). It was a very impressive structure as can be seen by Lloyd’s photograph (451). Its general appointments were as beautiful as they were luxurious.

Like most cities Sagua la Grande also did have its vices. For example, there were opium dens (Pérez de la Riva 250, note 172). There was also a red light district, a venue for a traditional rite of passage for young men (Cueto 49). Such institutions must have made a great impression on Mr. Cintas and may have inspired in him a desire for social justice.

Mr. Cintas’s earliest trip to Great Britain enlightened him even more and opened his eyes and ears to the English language, culture, and art. This in part explains his fluency in English and his taste for English paintings, silver, furniture, and literature, some of which later in life he would acquire. According to Portela (Telephone conversation September 30, 2007) Mr. Cintas spoke English like an Englishman. It was impeccable. I have read some of his correspondence, and I can verify that his written English was also perfect (Barral 77-78).

---

13 For a greater description of the Liceo Club and its history see (Lloyd 449).
Sagua la Grande was a very important railroad center which at that time was mainly in the hands of a British consortium. But there were also Americans involved in these and other activities. As it turned out the British controlled the railroad from Sagua la Grande west, while the Americans controlled the railroads in eastern Cuba (Lloyd 333-335).

The English-speaking colony of Sagua was quite large and well off economically. However, there were very few British in other parts of the island (Lloyd 366). Without a doubt Mr. Cintas came to know members of this Sagua la Grande community which would pay him great dividends later in life. It goes without saying that those English speakers had a most beneficial impact on Mr. Cintas’s life.

In Great Britain by the eighteenth century there was already a tradition which one called “The Grand Tour.” In particular, for members of the British elite class this was a precious, privileged, and invaluable educational opportunity to visit another part of Europe and to discover new horizons. This tour was in a way the capstone of their early studies and helped to prepare these young people for their lifelong professional activities and social lives.

Very often as a result of the “Grand Tour,” these travelers took back to Great Britain works of art and literature. These mementos became the basis for many new British private collections or added to already existing ones. I would imagine that the houses and collections which Mr. Cintas saw in Great Britain stimulated the growth of his own book collection and the galleries in his own Havana mansion which he eventually filled with so many great works of art and literature (*Treasure Houses...* passim).

In essence, in the nineteenth century this, “Grand Tour,” also existed for the privileged few in Latin American (Ely 69). When Mr. Cintas was still very young, his father passed away. Perhaps on the advice of her Sagua la Grande British friends, his mother doña Amalia decided to send her young son to Great Britain. She wisely realized how important such an exposure to English culture would be for young master Oscar.

---

14 According to Alcover [1905] in Sagua la Grande there were many other consulates: France, Sweden, Norway, Mexico, Uruguay, and Argentina (30). Later in life Mr. Cintas was to visit at least some of these countries.
I suspect that Mr. Cintas began his trip to Great Britain soon after studying with the Jesuits in his home town, which would be around 1904. Even though grandfather don José and his brother Santiago had lost much if not all of their wealth, Mr. Cintas’s mother must have received financial support from the local English-speaking community, and was able to send him to Great Britain for more education. Alcover suggests that it possibly was the British consul in Sagua who sponsored young Oscar (Alcover [1905] 424). Abroad, the children of the Cuban wealthy usually had such a sponsor (Ely 194, note 285). In Great Britain young Oscar’s guardian was a certain Sir William Todd, a man who had been a friend of his maternal grandfather.

We know that at whatever age he began his studies in Great Britain, he remained there until he was twenty-one years of age, i.e. 1908 (State Department Document 701.3711/471). This date is very close to November 9, 1909, when he most likely returned to Cuba via New York. As was the case for his British friends, this “Grand Tour” of which the young Mr. Cintas partook certainly prepared him for the life that he soon would embrace.

There is little doubt that from his very early years the British had an enormous influence on him. Mr. Cintas began his Grand Tour in England, but later in his life it ended at the Savoy and Ritz-Carlton in New York and in his mansion in Havana (Barral passim). His favorite New York restaurant, where he dined almost on a daily basis, was the Colony (Portela, Telephone conversation, March 9, 2008).

ASCENDANCY IN BUSINESS AND IN CULTURE: ADULT LIFE IN CUBA AND IN THE UNITED STATES

When Mr. Cintas returned to Cuba from Great Britain he soon obtained an entry level position in the British railroad Empresa de Ferrocarriles. He quickly rose through company ranks and was in charge of buying and selling railroad cars and equipment. When the company sent Mr. Cintas to its Havana office it was an obvious promotion. By then Mr. Cintas was an experienced salesman in a profession which would soon make him a wealthy man.
Mr. Cintas was a good businessman and defended Latin-American business interests to the very best of his ability (“Charlie’s Oscar” *Time*, July 24, 1939). His insistence on developing his Company’s Latin American branches brought him into direct conflict with his former friend and boss William Hartman Woodin (1869-1934). This conflict caused Mr. Cintas to resign from the American Car and Foundry (“Charlie’s Oscar,” *passim*).

Mr. Cintas made considerable efforts to develop his Latin American market. One of these measures was to invite Mr. Manuel Alonso de Arelyzaga (1895-1984) into his enterprises. Mr. Alonso was the former captain of the Spanish Davis Cup team and the fourth ranking tennis player in the United States (*New York Times*, February 17, 1928 p.34). He resided in the United States in the 1920s.

The relationship between Mr. Cintas and Mr. Woodin had not always been so rocky. For example, in January and February 1928 the Sixth Pan American Conference took place in Havana. Among those in attendance were officials from the Chase National Bank, Electric Bond and Share, John Pierpont Morgan (1867-1943),15 and Mr. Woodin.

Mr. Woodin was also an outstanding book collector and numismatist. It would seem likely that these shared interests and enthusiasm helped create their original friendship (Google). Among other posts which Mr. Woodin occupied was the presidency of the American Car and Foundry Company16 and Consolidated Railway (Thomas 586).17

The American businessmen who attended this Pan-American Conference preferred a Cuban businessman to be president of Cuba. This was not a meeting for the faint of heart. I do not know whether or

---

15 Mr. Morgan had financial dealings with Cuban banks as early as 1921. (Morgan Archives ARC 1216 (072). He had made numerous trips to Cuba and other Caribbean locations where they received him well. During difficult financial times, perhaps 1935-1938, Mr. Morgan sold many of his art works. Mr. Cintas probably purchased the Morgan porcelain collection during such a period. (Morgan Papers (143):109.1.

16 Founded in 1899 (Kaminski, 1)

17 Mr. Wooding was also either president or board member of J. B. Brill Company (Kaminski 33), Montreal Locomotive Works, and the Railway Steel Spring Company. He was also Director of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York.

J. G. Brill and Company, “at its zenith... was the largest manufacturer of streetcars and interurbans in the United States” (Wikipedia).
not Mr. Woodin and his colleagues had their eye on Mr. Cintas for the presidency of Cuba. Not long after this Conference, Mr. Woodin made Mr. Cintas a protégé, and he became vice-president of Mr. Woodin’s companies. In 1933 while Mr. Cintas was Cuban ambassador to the United States, President Roosevelt appointed the infirm Mr. Woodin Secretary of the Treasury (Thomas 558).

Mr. Cintas often traveled to Europe and to the United States for business and for pleasure. His excellent bearing and manners were always his calling card. Along the way he developed his excellent taste in art and in books. During these trips to Europe and later to the United States he began to invest in art and in books and to expand his cultural horizons.

At the same time Portela made it quite clear to me that Mr. Cintas loved to use very salty language and tell salacious and ribald stories and jokes. Mr. Portela also describes his great uncle as quite a ladies man, but most likely this was the case when he became a widower.

Perhaps one of Mr. Cintas’s most important trips abroad was his visit to Paris in 1925. On the return voyage to Cuba early in December of that very same year he met his future wife Graziella Tarafa (1903-1941). She was a native of Matanzas and had been in Paris to purchase the trousseau for her up and coming marriage in Cuba. According to Portela, Mr. Cintas and Miss Tarafa fell hopelessly and uncontrollably in love at first sight. So passionate was their love that they married immediately in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. Perhaps part of their mutual attraction had to do with the fact that her family also owned a significant porcelain collection as well as other art objects.

The hard part of this event was yet to come. Both Mr. Cintas and doña Graziella had to break the bad news to her fiancé who was patiently awaiting her arrival when the ship docked in Havana (Telephone conversation with Portela, September 30, 2007). One can only imagine how that fiancé must have reacted when he saw his planned marriage go up in smoke. Perhaps here there is an unintended but ironic echo of Paris and Helen. For the lovers returned home on the S. S. Homerica (December 9, 1925) (Ancestry).

Mr. Cintas’s father-in-law was Colonel José Miguel Tarafa (1863-1932) (New York Times July 25, 1932, p.15), a hero of Cuba’s War of
Independence from Spain. In the city of Matanzas, Colonel Tarafa had considerable sugar and railroad interests (Jiménez 76). He was a member of the Cuban Sugar Producers Committee. Indeed, Colonel Tarafa was an important person in Cuban economic life and society (Ayala 232). One could safely say that this marriage held many social and economic advantages for Mr. Cintas. The Tarafa family was indeed one of the most wealthy and socially prominent families in Cuba.

The Tarafa family most likely was among the Spanish planters who began their businesses in Cuba early in the nineteenth century (Moreno Fraginals 142-143). Colonel Tarafa was born poor but became wealthy because of his acumen and contacts with American corporations (Jiménez 76, Zanetti 264).

Along with his excellent manners and erudition Mr. Cintas had by all reports an attractive physical appearance (Thomas, 614, n. 34). According to *Time* magazine, Mr. Cintas was extremely well tailored, dapper, “handsome, and strapping,” and smoked cigarettes (July 24, 1939 Google). This unfortunate habit may have contributed to the cancer which eventually killed him (Norman, 5).

From what I have seen, Mr. Cintas was a kind, considerate, and generous person. On one occasion he even gave his Havana gardener and housekeeper a Mary Cassatt painting most likely as a token of gratitude and as a means of instilling in him a love of art.

On the other hand his friend Lastra describes Mr. Cintas as, “a severe man, his firm preference for solitude and soliloquy earned for him a reputation of egoist” (18). Perhaps Lastra describes Mr. Cintas following his beloved wife’s premature death.

Nevertheless, I do believe that Mr. Cintas preferred the quiet of his mansion to the hustle and bustle of Havana social and business life particularly among Cuba’s social elite. Most likely he sought refuge in his home amidst all of these great works of art and literature. In a way these items became his religious relics and his home his cathedral. According to Portela, his grand uncle was born Roman Catholic but was not an observant one (E-mail, October 1, 2007).

Mr. Cintas had a great sense of humor particularly about his own mortality. For example, in December of 1934 while in Lima he became very ill.
but then recovered. A little later from the Plaza Hotel in Buenos Aires he wrote his friend, the American diplomat and Assistant Secretary of State, Francis M. White (1892-1961), “For a time it looked as if I were going to leave my perfectly good bones in Peru!” (Milton S. Eisenhower Library Special collections Ms. 194 Box 1).

I do not know when Mr. Cintas first came to the United States. But I know that he made at least eighty boat trips here mainly to New York (Ancestry, passim). He seems to have preferred New York as a base of operations during much of his life, and spent a good part of each year in the United States.

Mr. Cintas was Cuban Ambassador to the United States between 1932 and 1934. In this capacity he did all that he could to ensure that Cuba receive fair treatment in its dealings with the United States. And it seems that he made considerable progress in this area. Mr. Cintas was a tenacious bargainer and very tough opponent in business, diplomacy, and in the acquisition of art and books (Duveen-Cintas passim). His, “blazing black eyes,” could intimidate (Time, July 24, 1939; Google).

As ambassador his principal concern was how to deal with Washington on the matter of sugar cane production and of sugar cane tariffs. Related to these problems was Mr. Cintas’s wish for the United States to remove the Cuban dictator General Gerardo Machado (1871-1939) from the Cuban presidency (Foreign Relations of the United States V (1933):339). During Mr. Cintas’s ambassadorship to the United States, the United States abrogated the Platt Amendment of 1901 which, “had made Cuba an American protectorate” (Pierre Cintas comments on line).

As Cuban ambassador Mr. Cintas attended the World Economic Conference (Foreign Relations of the United States Ibid., 291) and was a member of the Commission of Neutrals to resolve the Chaco dispute.

---

18 Part of the Ritz Carlton Hotel chain.
19 New York was some fifty-six hours from Havana on a daily basis and eight and one half days from Havana to London (Lloyd 373).
20 As it turned out Mr. Cintas was not the Cuban Government’s first choice. But the Cuban Government’s preferred candidates for this post—Márquez Sterling and García Kohly—did not have the sufficient personal wealth to occupy this position (State Department Document 701.3711/464). So Mr. Cintas went to Washington.
between Bolivia and Paraguay (Ibid. 126-129). It is obvious that many important people sought Mr. Cintas’s advice and expertise.

A propos of tough bargaining, Mr. Cintas must have used his business bargaining skills for the common good as well as for his own. He even knew how to bargain with the Soviet Union. For example, in 1930 he purchased for the hallway approach to his grand dining room in Havana, two lapis lazuli columns which previously had graced the Czars’ palace at Tsarskoe Selo (Lobo, 310). The Soviets had sold many books and works of art for hard currency, and in 1930 this pair of columns was among them.

According to Mr. Cintas, the importance of good relations with the United State was paramount to the well being of Cuba itself (Lastra, 18). This becomes quite obvious in a letter from December, 1934 to the aforementioned American diplomat Francis M. White. Mr. Cintas had had contact with him at the State Department between 1932 and 1934 and most likely before when Mr. White served in Cuba and many other Latin American countries. Writing to Mr. White from Lima, Mr. Cintas laments, “The reports I receive from Cuba are far from satisfactory. What a disgraceful mess your incompetent successor in the State Department has made of my country!” (The Milton S. Eisenhower Library Special Collections Ms. 194 Box 1).

I have every reason to believe that from his earliest childhood Mr. Cintas had always opposed slavery in any and every way. Hence his adoration of Lincoln and of Lincoln scholars. Mr. Cintas loved freedom, and from what I have been able to surmise, he was egalitarian in spite of his privileges. His choice of documents, books, and iconography, particularly American, manifests his great love of freedom and of equality (O’Reilly, passim). The following two examples are fundamental to this manner of judging Mr. Cintas’s feelings on the matter of slavery and of national unity.

On April 27, 1949 at the Parke Bernet Galleries, Mr. Cintas purchased the Colonel Alexander Bliss copy of Lincoln’s “Gettysburg Address.” At that time it was the only copy of this speech in private hands. It is also the only copy that bears Lincoln’s signature. Its price of $54,000 was the highest price ever paid for a document at a public auction21 As the reader

21 Mr. Cintas also owned an 1863 printed copy of the same address (Parke Bernet Catalog #2040 (1961):4:314A).
can see Mr. Cintas went to great extremes to obtain the objects and to achieve the objectives which he truly desired.

The bidding was fast and furious. With the advice of his agent Harry E. Russell, Mr. Cintas outbid John Francis Fleming. On that day Mr. Cintas was indeed a, “Happy Bibliophile” (*Life Magazine*, May 16, 1949, 145-48). And in true Cintas style he promptly donated his purchase to the United States Government. That document now hangs in the Lincoln Room of the White House.

In 1952, for $12,000 Mr. Cintas purchased the famous Thomas Hicks portrait of Abraham Lincoln (*New York Times*, April 20, 1952, p.74). It was the first portrait of Abraham Lincoln painted from real life. Hicks finished it on June 13th, 1860 (Chicago Historical Museum, “Cintas Will”). It depicts the future president while he was still in Illinois.

Again, in true Cintas fashion he donated the Hicks painting, but this time the donation went to the Chicago Historical Society.²² Apparently he did so because of his great admiration for the Society’s secretary, the noted Lincoln scholar and historian, Paul McLlreland Angle (1900-1975) (Robert Kent, The Chicago Historical Society e-mail May 10, 2007). And indeed Mr. Angle was most worthy of Mr. Cintas’s respect and admiration for works such as his essay, “Four Lincoln Firsts” (*passim*)²³

The Johns Hopkins’ Milton S. Eisenhower Library houses a copy of *Letters of John Hay and Extracts from Diary* (1908) which had belonged to Mr. Cintas. Mr. John Milton Hay’s (1838-1905) book was not a surprising choice for Mr. Cintas. Mr. Hay had been a friend and secretary of President Lincoln for whom Mr. Hay had great affection. He was a major biographer of Lincoln and an abolitionist (*Letters* iv, vii). In 1898 President William McKinley appointed him Secretary of State (1898-1905) (*Letters*, xvi).

I have often thought about why Mr. Cintas admired President Lincoln so much. I can think of at least two reasons. After all the horror of the wars for Cuba’s independence, Mr. Cintas wanted Cuba to be a peaceful, just, and unified nation. This was President Lincoln’s greatest

---

²² Now called the Chicago Historical Museum.

²³ Of great interest also is Professor Angle’s *On a Variety of Subjects*. Chicago: Chicago Historical Society, 1974.
accomplishment and blessing for this country. Most likely Mr. Lincoln’s, “House Divided Speech,” of June 16, 1858 made a lasting impression on Mr. Cintas’s psyche (Angle, 4).

As we have already mentioned, Mr. Cintas knew a great deal about slavery from his days in Sagua la Grande, and I am convinced that even then he opposed it vigorously. The fact that his family was involved in the sugar cane industry and the fact that Sagua la Grande had one of the highest concentrations of slaves in Cuba must have made a deep and lasting impression on Mr. Cintas from his earliest childhood (Knight, 41).

From a political point of view Mr. Cintas wanted a Cuba that reflected the words of Carlos Manuel de Céspedes (1819-1874), a fighter for Cuban independence from Spain. “We only want to be free and equal as the Creator intended all mankind to be... we believe that all men were created equal” (Thomas, 244). These words echo the United States Declaration of Independence and Lincoln’s “Gettysburg Address.” These thoughts also permeate Don Quijote. One might then conclude that Mr. Cintas agreed with the words of the Founding Fathers of this nation, of President Lincoln, and of Cervantes. Such a conclusion perhaps explains why Mr. Cintas would offer so much of his fortune to obtain two of these eternal and universal works. In fact so enthusiastic was Mr. Cintas about President Lincoln that he said, “In Cuba we need recollections of Lincoln. He raises our spirit” (my translation) (Álvarez Carteles, 30 (1949): 40).

The Cleveland Public Library contains a book from the Cintas Library entitled Pastoral del ilmo. Sr Obispo de Cuba, para todo el estado ecclesiástico secular, y regular de su diócesis. (Habana: Imprenta del Cómputo Ecclesiástico, 1700) by Joseph de Hechavarría Y elguezúa. This book is rare. Only two or three libraries in the world list it.24 In his book, bishop Hechavarría explains to all the priests of his Havana diocese that blacks are their brothers and consequently worthy of compassion and respect. The bishop wanted to bring blacks into the Church and wanted them to feel welcome by considering them equal to whites (3, 8). He was also worried because so many blacks adhered to their African religions (16).

---

24 Either Mr. Cintas or the Cleveland Public Library purchased the Hechavarría work from H. P. Kraus according to an undated Kraus letter.
Mr. Cintas did not have to look abroad for heroes. He had many of them in his native land. Among these was the great liberator of Cuba from Spain General Máximo Gómez y Báez (1836-1905). This general was a perfect model for Mr. Cintas à la Abraham Lincoln.

This general advocated peace and reconciliation between Cubans and Spaniards, and among Cubans of all backgrounds and races. He was most anxious for all Cubans to share in the country’s bounty in a truly fraternal manner. This is what the General wanted to do, and he saw a model for his thoughts in the United States because, “Ésa es la grandeza del pueblo yankee” (Gómez, 25). Like Lincoln before him, General Gómez wanted peace and wellbeing throughout his land. Both the General as well as Mr. Cintas understood the idea that a house divided against itself could not stand.

As it turned out, in 1899, when Mr. Cintas was only twelve years old General Gómez visited Sagua la Grande. The population greeted the hero with affection and enthusiasm. In his honor there were festivities and a great banquet in the Uriarte Theater. It is most likely that Mr. Cintas, if he was not away at school, and his family were in attendance (Gómez 27).

Mr. Cintas willed these Lincoln symbols of freedom and equality to the United States as a token of his goodwill to this country. But these were not the only such occasions. From January to March 1936 he loaned his Goya portrait of the “Marqués de Caballero” to the Metropolitan Museum of Art as part of a special exhibition of the works of this painter. It was a major exhibition and showed that Mr. Cintas was among the art collectors elite in this country (Ivins #11). Also in 1940 he lent Rembrandt’s “Portrait of a Rabbi,” to an art exhibit at the New York World’s Fair (Parke Bernet [1963] 40). Mr. Cintas’s friend Lastra contends that his art collection rivaled those of Morgan, Mellon, and Frick (18). Regardless of whether or not Mr. Lastra is correct, one can safely say that the Cintas collection was indeed a most impressive one.

Before his death many of Mr. Cintas’s paintings were in the United States (Lastra, 18). But in Cuba he also had many books and manuscripts

---

25 General Gómez, however, was a native of the Dominican Republic (Thomas 255, note 7).
(Álvarez, “Cuba poseerá” 57, 61). Mr. Cintas was a client of the Chase National Bank and later of the Chase Manhattan Bank. As it turned out, not long before his death Mr. Cintas had entrusted a significant portion of his rich book and art collections to the Chase National Bank: Ethan Alyea, his legal counsel27, David Rockefeller, and a long list of other art and legal specialists. Mr. Rockefeller met Mr. Cintas early in the 1950s (Johnson, e-mail Tuesday March 11, 2008). Mr. Cintas did this in order to establish a trust for his possessions most likely after his earlier efforts to create a library and museum in his Havana residence failed.

In the fifties as a result of their meetings members of the Chase National Bank trust division persuaded Mr. Cintas both for idealistic purposes—as well as for tax benefits—to create a foundation in this country for Cuban-American writers, artists, and musicians, and invited Alfred Barr the former director of the Museum of Modern Art to help in this process. Mr. Rockefeller was not involved initially in these events although he was aware of this process. Nevertheless, at one point he did encourage Mr. Cintas to establish what would soon become the Cintas Foundation (Johnson e-mail March 11, 2008). This cultural entity originally was called the Cuban Art Foundation. But later in 1963 in honor of Mr. Cintas the Board of Directors posthumously changed the name to the Cintas Foundation (Wikipedia).

At one point Mr. Rockefeller became the executor of Mr. Cintas’s will and was responsible for disposing at auction of his paintings, books, and other works of art (Portela e-mail March 10, 2008). With these auction sales Mr. Cintas financed his foundation (Portela, e-mail March 12, 2008). In addition Mr. Cintas also willed a great part of his real estate, stocks, and bonds to help finance this enterprise (Portela archive).

Mr. and Mrs. David Rockefeller did visit Mr. Cintas in his Havana residence. There on one occasion, shortly before his death, Mr. Cintas gave the Rockefellers, “six pieces from a Vienna Dessert Service” (Johnson, e-mail, March 11, 2008). This gift was more important and symbolic than one might realize. For, as we have already stated, according to Portela, in 1959 revolutionaries entered the Cintas mansion and

27 Mr. Alyea was a partner in the law firm of Dewey, Ballantine, Bushby, Palmer & Wood and was a loyal member of the Cintas Foundation (Alyea file, American Philosophical Society).
destroyed the mighty porcelain collection that Mr. and Mrs. Cintas had collected. (Portela telephone conversation, March 9, 2008). So at least the set that Mr. Cintas gave the Rockefellers still exists and intact. And so was the money that Mr. Cintas managed to invest in order to create his foundation.

In 1959 Mr. Cintas’s loyal valet, Pancho Sotomayor, delivered many of his boss’s treasures to several Cuban cultural institutions. It would seem to me that he did this either because he was fulfilling Mr. Cintas’s wishes or that he simply wanted to prevent happening to them what had happened to Mr. Cintas’s porcelain collection. I might add that in his holograph will of October 7, 1953 Mr. Cintas named executor of his estate Dr. Luis Vidana y Valdés. Mr. Cintas instructed Mr. Vidana to treat well his servant Pancho Sotomayor because he was like Mr. Cintas’s own family (Portela archive).²⁸

In his will Mr. Cintas left money for the poor of Sagua la Grande. In such a way Mr. Cintas never forgot his roots and people who were less fortunate than he was (Portela archive).

From the moment that I examined the Cintas Newberry copy of Don Quijote there was something about Mr. Cintas that impressed me and has made him a person for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration. In his Havana mansion Mr. Cintas had assembled a collection of old books and manuscripts. Equally as important he had a very large collection of Old Master paintings thought at that time to have been worth some $2,000,000, a very large collection of porcelain, and of other objets d’art.²⁹ Mr. Cintas originally had intended to create a public art museum for the Cuban people in his Havana residence which was located on Calle

²⁸ Mr. Cintas’s paintings have hung on the walls of museums such as the Montclair Art Museum, the Brooklyn Museum, the Cummer Art Gallery in Jacksonville, and the University of Miami Lowe Gallery (D’Otrange Mastai, 135).

²⁹ Among his valuable possessions was English silver (Christie, Manson & Woods, pp. 36,140). “A set of twelve George II plain circular dinner plates with shell and, gadrooned borders, engraved with a coat-of-arms in a foliate cartouche 10 in. diam. by Paul de Lamerie, 1745 (2330zs. 18 dwts.).” (Ibid., 140).

One can find copies of almost all of the Cintas auction catalogues on Scipio. However, two from O’Reilly Plaza Art Galleries: “French 18th & 19th Century Porcelains, Georgian & Other Silver,” and “Fine Diamond and Gold Jewelry,” both, in 1961 do not list Mr. Cintas’s art objects under his name (Watson Library).
15, Number 551, corner of D Street in the Vedado neighborhood (*Libro de Oro*, 209 and Eduardo Luis Rodríguez (passim). But its construction required the acquisition of additional land which belonged to his neighbors. However, they balked. Consequently the hoped for Cintas Havana art museum never came to fruition. Had this not been the case, the museum would probably have been one of the best Latin American art collections of Old Masters. And surely it would have been one of the most important art collections in Cuba (Álvarez, passim).

According to Portela, in conjunction with the museum Mr. Cintas had also hoped to establish a foundation in Cuba with his own collection of art which would have afforded him tax advantages. He then went to President Batista who told him that his collection could have tax advantages if the collection were housed in the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes but not in Mr. Cintas’s mansion. Mr. Cintas refused, and that was the end of that. This perhaps is the source of the long time hostility between President Batista and Mr. Cintas (Telephone conversation with Portela, March 9, 2008).

Also according to Portela, Mr. Cintas had a huge library. It was, in fact, so large that Mr. Cintas had to construct a separate building on his property in which to house it. After Mr. Cintas’s death I understand that the majority of his books which remained in Cuba ended up in the Biblioteca Nacional in Havana, where I believe that they remain to this day.

Mr. Cintas occupies a very special place among his generation and peers. He was a Maecenas in a part of the world where such philanthropy is not as widespread or as universally well known as it is in other countries. Mr. Cintas said that it was his responsibility to preserve his paintings, books, art objects, and manuscripts for the Cuban people. He did not squander his money on yachts, gambling, and mistresses as other wealthy people did. (Álvarez, “Pagué” 43). Art, books, and other things of beauty were his passion. So was the Cuban people.

Quite a number of his countrymen had similar intentions. Therefore Mr. Cintas was not alone in his plans for a national art gallery. With him, for example, was José Gómez Mena who was another very important Cuban art collector. Both he and Mr. Cintas dreamed of creating this
museum in Cuba (Del Buño, *passim*). In the words of Mr. Gómez Mena’s grandson J. Pepe Fanjul, “They were friendly competitors for many works of art and both were involved in the creation of a major painting museum.” (Letter of July 10, 2007).

In 1955 after a sustained effort and numerous transformations and negotiations the Cuban government and these art collectors finally formed what was then called the Patronato de Bellas Artes y Museos Nacionales (Rippe 16). The purpose of this council was to improve the quality of the art museums in Cuba.

The Council asked a number of its members to contact museums abroad. They were to seek information on how to elevate the level of public art collections in Cuba. Within Cuba there was a constant flood of private donations to these public institutions. Among those in this group were Mr. Cintas and Julio Lobo (Rippe 8). Other contributors were the Archdiocese of Havana, José Gómez Mena, la Casa de Beneficencia, María Ruiz de Olivares, the marchioness de Pinar, Joaquín Gumá, Count of Lagunillas, and Tomás Felipe Camacho (Rippe 9).  

As it turned out Mr. Cintas was very wise to have kept many of his Old Masters in the United States. From that residence in Havana, the Castro government confiscated art works and most likely has sold some of them at auction and privately, mainly in Europe (González, *passim*). Outside of Cuba most of Mr. Cintas’s relatively few remaining Old Master paintings are on permanent exhibit at the Lowe Art Museum at the University of Miami Coral Gables (Cintas Foundation Brochure). These works remain, however, the property of the Cintas Foundation.

Mr. Cintas’s collections were born of his financial acumen, his unerring eye, and connoisseurship (Christie’s, “Important Old Master Paintings” (1997, p. 238). For example, the July 3, 1963 Cintas art auction produced the massive sum of $1,280,500 (*Sotheby’s Highly Important Paintings*, p. 27).

---

30 Among other contributors there were Juan Mingorance Gutiérrez, María Dolores Machín, the widow of H. Upmann, Count of San Fernando de Peñaver, Evelio Govantes, Ignacio Ponce de León, Antonio García Hernández Valdivia de Santo Tomás, Osuna-Varela Zequeira, and Manuel Mimó Abalo (Rippe 12).

31 According to many, Mr. Cintas’s former mansion is now the Chinese embassy.
Mr. Cintas’s wealth derived mainly from sugar and railroads. When the Cuban National Art Gallery which he envisioned in his Havana residence did not come to fruition he converted his wealth, art, and books into funding for his foundation. In this way ingeniously and even quixotically, Cintas Foundation awards perpetuate the artistic creative process which Mr. Cintas so much adored.

According to Portela, his granduncle was a complex person. For example Mr. Cintas and other family members did not always get along well. In fact they were very frequently involved in disputes. He was for the most part antisocial, suspicious, and irascible. He was not at ease in general company, but preferred to be with his works of art and books. Mr. Cintas knew the philanthropic efforts of many American patrons of the arts such as Mellon, Frick, Morgan, Carnegie, Marshall Field, and Huntington among others. (Álvarez, “Cuba poseerá” 57). And they obviously influenced him.

Mr. Cintas collected books and art from the Renaissance to the early Twentieth Century. These included painters like Tiépolo, Sánchez Coello, Titian, El Greco, Velázquez, Gainsborough, Goya, Sorolla, and Zuloaga. They cover the gamut from profoundly religious canvases to those of a lay nature (Álvarez, “Cuba... passim, Lowe, and Montclair).

As far as I know there is no separate Cintas archive *per se* although his papers are held together as a unit in various storage areas. Many were stolen, and I have heard that many were sold in the Havana flea market. If this is the case then we have a great artistic tragedy.

The full nature and size of Mr. Cintas’s library are difficult to determine. To this day we have no clear idea of just how many of his books and manuscripts have remained in Cuba and which ones they are. Nevertheless I would guess that there are many still there most likely hundreds if not more.

Mr. Cintas’s library outside of Cuba is also difficult to establish with great clarity, but I shall try to do so. The largest book auction catalogue of solely Mr. Cintas’s books that I know is by O’Reilly’s Plaza Art Galleries, Inc. of New York (May 26th, 1961). O’Reilly’s lists 480 books by author and title. It also indicates hundreds and hundreds of books sadly sold in bulk without specifying title or author (O’Reilly:479-487). The only
The manuscript in this catalogue is a “Spanish Patent of Nobility” (hidalguía) (1568) (item 370). Because this company and its records no longer exist, I guess that we will never know all the items from that sale. As with his paintings, Mr. Cintas had a wide spectrum of book interests. The largest known areas of his collections pertain to history mainly American, British, and Latin American. His collection of biographies deals with presidents, kings, and statesmen. His range of books on world literature is also extensive.

The American Book Auction Catalogue of 1961-11-10 contains 329 items from various sellers including Mr. Cintas. But unfortunately the catalogue does not specify the owners of individual books. So there is no way to determine which books were Mr. Cintas’s and which were not.

Of special interest for us is the Parke-Bernet Galleries auction “2040” of rare books including Mr. Cintas’s on May 16 and 17, 1961. This catalogue contains eleven of Mr. Cintas’s books among which are the first edition of Don Quijote (1605 and 1615). There is also the first volume of the 1608 edition of Don Quijote (18 #76). In 1963 the Newberry Library purchased the first edition of Don Quijote from the Louis Silver collection (Towner 6-7).

The only extensive Cintas correspondence that I have been able to locate is between him and the House of Duveen. It is said that during the first half of the twentieth century the most important art dealer in the world was Joseph Lord Duveen (1869-1939). Anyone who was anybody in art collecting normally purchased some art via this company which

---

32 It is a shame that I cannot identify this hidalguía. Perhaps this document had something to do with Mr. Cintas’s own family and blood line. O’Reilly lists four rare editions of Don Quijote (#79-82).

33 William O’Reilly, son of the former owner of the now defunct Plaza Art Gallery, recently confirmed my findings. (Telephone conversation, March 2, 2008). I thank Mr. O’Reilly very much for his help.

34 I have traced two titles from the Cintas library which the O’Reilly Galleries auctioned in May, 1961. We also know that Mr. Cintas contributed Cuban imprints to the University of Florida. But that is not all. The George Peabody Library of the Johns Hopkins University has a former Cintas copy of a 1931 edition of James Fenimore Cooper’s The American Democrat. In the University of Chicago catalog I have seen a reference to a copy of Juan Pérez de Montalbán’s (1602-1658) Sucesos y prodigios de amor (Brussels, 1626).
was also called Duveen Brothers. So it should not come as a surprise that Mr. Cintas also dealt with this institution.

The written record between Mr. Cintas and the House of Duveen contains about one hundred documents mostly bills of sale which cover the years between 1927 and 1953. The original Duveen Archives are at the Getty Library. There are also microfilm copies at the Watson Library of the Metropolitan Art Museum, The Courtauld Art Institute of London, and at the Institut National d’histoire de l’art in Paris. To the best of my knowledge these documents are also the largest collection of Cintas generated documents available for public scrutiny outside of Cuba.

The Duveen-Cintas correspondence offers a penetrating view of Mr. Cintas’s personality, character, and weltanschauung. An overall examination of its contents is in order. The first letter dated December 2nd, 1927 is from Lord Duveen himself and addressed to Mr. Cintas care of The Railway Equipment Company of Cuba. By this time Mr. Cintas had already arrived on the arts and financial scene in Cuba. A year after this letter the Sixth Pan American Conference took place in Havana (January-February 1928). By this conference Mr. Cintas had surely arrived.

This Duveen-Cintas letter is the first that I have ever seen addressed to Mr. Cintas by anyone. In it Mr. Duveen congratulated him on the acquisition of Cosimo di Rosselli’s (1439-1597), “The Crucifixion.” Mr. Cintas had purchased it from the John Levy Galleries. This letter praises Mr. Cintas’s superb taste in art, and it shows that Mr. Duveen had his eye on him as a potential and above all a wealthy client. Mr. Duveen was absolutely correct in this assessment of Mr. Cintas. The letter is also an example of Mr. Cintas’s learning process about art and about the world of art collecting.

Mr. Cintas continued to buy art from the House of Duveen. For on January 31th, 1940 it sent Mr. Cintas information on United States customs regulations for art. The United States Customs Act of 1930 stated

---

35 I am very grateful to Casie Keșterton for photocopying these items for me.
36 This letter gives the name of an additional art dealer from whom Mr. Cintas purchased works of art. In spite of my sincerest efforts I have not been able to find any correspondence between Messieurs Levy and Cintas. But it surely must exist somewhere. (John Levy Galleries passim)
most emphatically that works of art were for the most part exempt from import duty.

The fact that Mr. Cintas had such a document in his possession suggests that he was considering transporting at least some of his works of art and books to the United States. It is very possible that he was worried that his very own Cuban government might try to confiscate his paintings and other works of art. We know that he had very little confidence in President Batista.

World War II found Mr. Cintas frequently in New York as a guest at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. On January 5th, 1942 Mr. Cintas received a brochure from the House of Duveen. It was about the Thomas Gainsborough portrait of William Pitt which Mr. Cintas had recently purchased.

On January 6th, 1942 The House of Duveen sent Mr. Cintas the 177th copy of its *Duveen Pictures in Public Collections of America* (1941). The House of Duveen only requests that Mr. Cintas retain this publication for his library. Not one of these Duveen-Cintas letters alludes to the events of World War II. Mr. Cintas’s life was totally isolated and insulated from the carnage of that conflagration. Geography and wealth kept his life so.

The date of the next letter to Mr. Cintas is July 26, 1945 addressed to him while he was still a guest at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. It contains a photograph and brochure of the Rembrandt portrait of, “Hendrickje Stoffels.” Naturally Duveen Brothers was hoping that Mr. Cintas would purchase it. On September 7, 1949 B. S. Boggs of Duveen Brothers sent Mr. Cintas a brochure for the sale of Van Dyck’s, “The Countess of Carlisle.”

One of the most important and revealing parts of this correspondence is a series of letters between Duveen Brothers and Mr. Leto M. Prindle, Professor of Classical Languages and Literatures at the University of Vermont (December 5, 1945). In this correspondence Professor Prindel explains to Duveen Brothers that he would like a photograph of Frans Hals’s “The Merry Lute Player,” which was in Mr. Cintas’s collection. He needed that photograph for his course on European painting, and he

37 Mr. Cintas also stayed at the Ausable Club a resort in St. Hubert’s P. O. in Essex County, New York (Duveen-Cintas July 8th 1952)
had heard that the painting was in the Cintas Collection in Havana. He asked Duveen Brothers to obtain this necessary photograph.

One December 7, 1945 Duveen Brothers forwarded Professor Prindle’s letter to Mr. Cintas who had been traveling and had recently returned to Havana (March 27th, 1946). Mr. Cintas explained that the letter had just caught up to him and that he was only too happy to satisfy Professor Prindle’s request.

Professor Prindle had expected a negative response from Mr. Cintas in that Mr. Cintas would not want to share his paintings with anyone else. To this Mr. Cintas responds, “I am delighted that he likes this painting but I fail to understand his fear that I might not want it shown. I did not execute it; I am merely its temporary custodian—great works of art have no owners in the ordinary sense they belong to everybody” (March 27, 1946). These words are so descriptive of Mr. Cintas’s feelings on the role of art and books for the general public. At the same time these words reflect Mr. Cintas’s generosity.

As we have already stated, one of Mr. Cintas’s business qualities was that he was a very hard bargainer who invariably low-balled. Rarely if ever did he pay the prices which the House of Duveen, or for that matter any other dealer asked. Mr. Cintas simply walked away and left the dealers dangling. He badgered and cajoled the Duveen staff on a regular basis. Take for example the case of John H. Allen, who according to Mr. Cintas wanted too much money for a Rembrandt. As Mr. Cintas wrote, “Sometime ago I made you a cash offer which you turned down and today I do not feel in the same good mood as I did then” (November 19, 1946).

In the late forties and early fifties Mr. Cintas bought from Duveen Brothers many pieces of porcelain and quite a number of paintings (May 12, 1948 and January 3, 1949). It is little wonder that Duveen Brothers did not want to alienate this client.

Tragically, on December 27, 1941 doña Graziella died of cancer at the Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center (Pierre Cintas). He would succumb to the very same illness some sixteen years later. She and Mr. Cintas had no children, and he never remarried. After her death, “Oscar preserved her bedroom untouched for the rest of his life as a shrine to this great love” (Lobo, 310).
In spite of such spousal fidelity, according to Portela, Mr. Cintas was interested in marrying again. Two of these ladies, however, were not from Cuban high society, and they were not interested in him. During much of his life—I do not know when it began—Mr. Cintas manifested a great dislike for Cuban high society. Most likely this explains his choice of some women when he became a widower.

Mr. Cintas had built a beautiful mausoleum in Havana’s Colón Cemetery in which to bury his wife, doña Graziella and for himself as well (Portela, e-mail October 26, 2007). Like Paris’s Cemetery of Père Lachaise and Buenos Aires’s La Chacarita this Cuban cemetery also is famous for the many important people who are buried there and for the beautiful funerary art work which graces its grounds (Lloyd, 139).

Probably the first canvas which Mr. Cintas ever saw was that baptismal Murillo painting of the Immaculate Conception. And so it was in death. For his tomb has a, “beautiful relief of a Madonna and child” (Lobo, 310). For a man who was not a practicing Catholic it is perhaps ironically fitting that an image of the Virgin should have graced both his baptismal font as well as his tomb.

Mr. Cintas died in Cuba on May 11, 1957 (Chicago Historical Museum Cintas will). He had been director of the Cuban Railroad Company’s sugar mills in Punta Alegre, Jatibonico, and Jobabo. He was also president of Railroad Equipment of Brazil and of Argentina” (New York Times, May 12, 1957). He was director of the American Car and Foundry and the American Locomotive Sales Corporation. He had subsidiary companies of other manufacturing organizations as well.

At the time of his death Mr. Cintas’s estate officially was worth around ten million dollars, only one million of which was in Cuba (Chicago Historical Museum, Ibid.). Lastra has suggested that it was fifteen million dollars (18). His wealth also included 212,500 shares of the common stock of the Punta Alegre Corporation, but with the Castro government

---

38 David Rockefeller also served on the board of this company (Wikipedia). There is a photograph of this company’s tracks in Lloyd 263. Also in Manual… 121-127.

39 There is a photograph of each of these sugar mills in Lloyd 260 and 263. Lloyd published this work in order, “to attract to Cuba that capital and labour to which it offers such unlimited scopes” (preface).
their value evaporated. However, I suspect that Mr. Cintas’s total personal wealth was much greater than the official amount.

I do believe that it is time for the Cuban authorities to recognize the enormous contribution that Mr. Cintas has made to Cuban society and to recognize his personal greatness. Some of Mr. Cintas’s paintings are hanging in the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes in Havana. Perhaps this is the first hope of a thaw to study, recognize, and to acknowledge Mr. Cintas’s considerable contribution to Cuban culture in Cuba and abroad (Linares, 61).

After its long journey, the Cintas collection of the earliest editions of Don Quijote now rests securely in the Newberry Library. Don Oscar acquired them because he loved Don Quijote’s message of freedom and humanity. These volumes are at the Newberry because he sold them to fund what eventually became the Cintas Foundation. Mr. Cintas had a very large library, but his copy of the first edition of Don Quijote was its crown jewel. As the reader has seen, with a Midas touch, Mr. Cintas transformed his library and art collection into gold for his foundation.

amalia1@rcn.com

THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY
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The Borders Classics’ version of *Don Quixote* is based on Charles Jarvis’ 1742 English translation of the novel, and it is one of five English translations of Miguel de Cervantes’ masterpiece to be published since the year 2000. Unlike the previous four English translations, Borders Classics’ *Don Quixote* is not a scholarly edition, and, linguistically, it varies very little from Jarvis’ translation.

Jarvis’ English translation of *Don Quijote* was the most popular version of the novel for nearly two hundred years. There were more than thirty editions by 1839, and it continued to be reprinted well into the twentieth century. In 1998 Oxford World’s Classics published a modernized English translation of *Don Quijote* based on Jarvis’ translation, which its editor E.C. Riley describes as “sensitive, careful, and full of life. It is closer in spirit and style to the original than are most recent versions.” Notwithstanding the merits of Jarvis’ translation, readers may discover the unnamed editor’s or editors’ failure to modernize

---


Jarvis’ eighteenth-century translation to be a linguistic challenge. Upon seeing the windmills, for example, Don Quijote expresses his delight to Sancho that a great adventure awaits them: “Fortune disposes our affairs better than we ourselves could have desired: look yonder, friend Sancho Panza, where thou mayest discover somewhat more than thirty monstrous giants [...]” (28). Subsequently, the knight points out the windmills to Sancho: “Those thou seest yonder [...] with their long arms; for some are wont to have them almost of the length of two leagues” (28). Sancho’s reaction upon hearing Don Quijote’s desire not to accept any reward for slaying the giant Pandafilando is another consequence of the unnamed editor’s decision not to modernize Jarvis’ eighteenth-century translation: “‘Alack!’ cried Sancho, ‘your worship must needs be downright crazy! Tell me, pray, do you mean to take this journey for nothing? And will you let slip such a match as this, when the dowry is a kingdom, which, they say, is above twenty thousand leagues round?’” (129). Lastly, the enchanted head’s response to Sancho’s query about his future may also present a problem for today’s reader: “‘If thou returnest home,’ said the oracle, ‘there shall thou be a governor, and see again thy wife and children; and shouldst thou quit service, thou wilt cease to be a squire’ ” (424). The archaic English of Jarvis’ translation allows the reader to appreciate the linguistic nuances of the original, but perhaps Borders Classics could modernize Jarvis’ translation in a future edition so that a twenty-first century reader would be able to identify more closely with the text.

Borders Classics’ decision to excise parts of a novel as complex as *Don Quijote*, is, at best, a difficult proposition. One of the most grievous exclusions is the narrative voice of Cide Hamete Benengeli. Consequently, the reader is not able to experience the “narrative wonderland of unrivaled genius.” The absence of other material, including the prologues, the poems of the princeps edition, the dedications and the approbations by Valdivielso and Márquez Torres, makes it difficult for the reader, especially the one who reads the knight’s adventures for the first time, to appreciate fully the intent and spirit of the novel. Furthermore, the exclusion of a table of contents and chapter titles not only affects the physical coherence of the translation, neglecting to provide the reader with contextual guidance, but it also divests the unnamed editor of the opportunity to educate the reader about the missing chapter 43 in the original Spanish version.

Jarvis’ translation contains over two hundred footnotes in Part I alone, yet Borders Classics does not include a single footnote in its translation. In compar-

---

6 Jarvis’ 1742 translation does not contain the dedications to Parts One or Two. In addition, Jarvis did not include the prefatory verses to Part One in his translation.
ison, Tom Lathrop’s 2007 translation contains more than 1,000 footnotes, and James Montgomery’s 2009 translation has more than 300 footnotes. Without footnotes, the reader, regardless of his or her academic pedigree, may wonder at one point or another about the more than eight hundred literary, legendary and biblical characters, the historical figures, the books, and the geographic locations that Cervantes cites. Furthermore, the inclusion of footnotes that explain, for example, references to distance or to currency (“reals” and “quartil”; 449), might have mitigated the reader’s inability to understand certain anachronistic vocabulary.

Borders Classics decision to publish an English translation of Don Quijote is certainly worthy of appreciation; any effort to ensure the literary legacy of Miguel de Cervantes and of his masterpiece is a valuable endeavor. While I do not recommend that a teacher or a scholar use Borders Classics’ translation of Don Quijote, it does enable the first-time reader of the novel to glean its literary importance and to justify its inclusion in the Borders Classics series of great works of literature.

Michael J. McGrath
Georgia Southern University
mmcgrath@georgiasouthern.edu


Hay libros pensados para el estudio y otros escritos para la lectura, y a la sombra del Quijote se han compuesto sinnúmero de los unos y los otros. El de Francisco Vivar más se inclina al segundo, por más que se presente acompañado de un amplio aparato erudito. Pero es que al lado de la bibliografía crítica brillan con más luz las continuas referencias a poetas, escritores y ensayistas, como Kundera, Gil de Biedma, García Márquez, Octavio Paz y, sobre todo, Elias Canetti, pues no en vano cada capítulo del libro se abre con una cita suya, que ilumina el espíritu y la intención que lo guía.
Los senderos intelectuales de Francisco Vivar lo han llevado a transitar entre Quevedo, Pérez de Montalbán y Cervantes. Al primero dedicó su monografía *Quevedo y su España imaginada* (2002), que recogía los frutos de una tesis leída en la Universidad de California, Los Ángeles; el segundo ha dado lugar a algún notable artículo; mientras que la obra cervantina es el objeto de trabajos como *La Numancia de Cervantes y la memoria de un mito* (2004) o de este *Don Quijote frente a los caballeros de los tiempos modernos*, que publican las Ediciones Universidad Salamanca con un formato que invita gratamente a la lectura.

El libro presente parece tener su embrión en varios artículos precedentes, en especial, «Las bodas de Camacho y la sociedad del espectáculo», que salió en el número 22 de *Cervantes. Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* (2002), y «El Caballero del Verde Gabán y el Caballero de los Leones: la plenitud del encuentro» (2004). A partir de esos primeros tanteos, Francisco Vivar ha construido una lectura de la segunda parte del *Quijote* en la que el protagonista va definiéndose a sí mismo en el reflejo de otros cinco personajes, que corresponden a otros tantos capítulo del libro: don Diego Miranda, Camacho el rico, los duques, Roque Guinart y don Antonio Moreno. De esta nómina sólo falta una figura tan singular como Sansón Carrasco, el caballero de los tiempos modernos con quien más abiertamente se enfrenta don Quijote y para quien Cervantes reservó el privilegio de abrir y cerrar las aventuras de 1615.

En el recuento de Francisco Vivar, el primer caballero moderno que sale al encuentro de don Quijote es el del Verde Gabán. Casi al tiempo que topa con don Diego Miranda, el manchego obtiene una dudosa victoria frente a unos leones enjaulados. Es entonces cuando ambos personajes se miran a los ojos. En apariencia, son iguales en edad y costumbres, pero uno de los dos hidalgos ha dado en dejar de ser él mismo para convertirse en caballero andante, mientras que el otro se mantiene en su casa, ocupado en la educación de su hijo y en la gestión de su hacienda. La de don Diego es una vida acomodada, que se convierte en emblema de la nueva burguesía que se va asentando en el entorno del poder como clase ocupada en la administración del Estado. Frente a la vida sosegada de los Miranda, padre e hijo, don Quijote todavía se siente firme para defender con entereza su elección vital.

El siguiente caballero es curiosamente un villano, al que el dinero ha puesto en un sitio que poco antes le hubiera estado vedado. Cuando el Antiguo Régimen se desmorona, Camacho ha encontrado en la riqueza su razón de ser ante sí mismo y, sobre todo, ante los demás. Entre otros, ante los padres de Quiteria, que inmolan a su hija en el altar del beneficio, pues, al fin y al cabo, la joven es sólo un adorno más en el aparato público de Camacho. El papel de su
hermosura no dió mucho del de esos innumerables cocineros, todos limpios, diligentes y contentos, que Vivar ha querido subrayar lúcidamente como «imagen de los nuevos tiempos y de una clase social que se define por la ostentación» (p. 53). Si el elástico Sancho toma de inmediato el partido del rico, su amo se espanta de tanto exceso y opta por quedarse voluntariamente al margen. Sin embargo, en cuanto la ocasión se ofrece, no duda en salir al quite de los amores verdaderos de Quiteria y Basilio, aun cuando éste disfrute de más ingenios que bienes.

Al hidalgo asentado y al pomposo villano, le siguen unos duques tan ricos y nobles como ociosos. Los tiempos de cambio también han alterado la vida de estos aristócratas hasta degradarlas, convirtiéndolas en representantes de una nobleza que va perdiendo poco a poco sus funciones, que se siente cada vez más lejos del poder y que, tanto en lo político como en lo económico, se ve sobre-pasada por las nuevas clases. Su única ocupación real es el ocio y acaso por eso pretenden convertir a don Quijote en objeto de sus burlas, aun a costa de gastos desmedidos. Tras muchos avatares, el caballero logra escapar tiempo de la trampa y vuelve a su camino con su famoso canto a la libertad, que el autor interpreta como «un acto de resistencia del caballero a lo que amenaza con destruir su significado; representa la reapropiación de su humanidad plena» (pp. 98-99).

Roque Guinart es el cuarto caballero de estos tiempos modernos y, según Vivar, un «alma gemela» de don Quijote (p. 118). El bandolero es un héroe problemático, inventado por otros, que vive en un laberinto del que aspira a salir, para poder seguir una existencia propia y ajena a la fama que lo empuja a ejercer una vida que no es la suya. Es esa complejidad la que hace de él un verdadero héroe moderno, en el mismo sentido que lo es don Quijote. En el otro extremo estaría don Antonio Moreno, amigo de Roque y el más hondo antagonista del caballero. Don Antonio encarna la modernidad por excelencia, está inserto en la realidad de una ciudad, vive en la permanente actividad del pragmatismo y sabe manejarse en los entresijos del mundo nuevo. Frente a él, don Quijote no sabe cómo actuar, queda al margen y apenas se mantiene como personaje al fondo. Si frente a don Diego Miranda o frente a los duques, don Quijote se resiste y sale a recobrar su libertad perdida, en Barcelona se resigna y da un paso atrás. Lo que seguirá es la derrota ante el Caballero de la Blanca Luna y la vuelta a casa, en busca de la persona que había sido. Como resume Vivar, «es el regreso a la unidad del ser, la vuelta para reconciliarse con el que ha sido antes» (p. 135).

A ese retorno se dedica el último capítulo del libro, cuyo sujeto es Alonso Quijano en persona. Entiende Vivar que el proceso de disolución de don Quijote como invención de sí mismo está íntimamente unido a la progresiva
degradación de Dulcinea como ideal. Desde el encuentro con la aldeana en El Toboso hasta la visión en la cueva de Montesinos, la realidad más cruda se va imponiendo, y, al final, el caballero se mostrará incluso incapaz de defender el nombre de su dama ante el de la Blanca Luna. Es el momento del reconocimiento final, pues «en este duelo se le ofrece a Don Quijote un Espejo con la más Blanca Luna para que el hidalgo pueda ver su propia imagen, conocerse y ser él» (p. 146). Don Quijote volverá a ser Alonso Quijano y terminará por aceptar con dignidad la muerte. Entendido de ese modo, el Quijote de 1615 sería un proceso de autoconocimiento del protagonista en el espejo de los personajes con que se va encontrando. Esos cinco caballeros representarían distintas facetas del mundo moderno con el que el andante imaginario se enfrenta: «...cada encuentro pasa a formar una parcela de la propia personalidad de don Quijote. Es decir, los nuevos caballeros son el instrumento para reconocerse a sí mismo y frente a los cuales se autocontempla el caballero andante para al final poder reafirmarse como Alonso Quijano» (p. 163). La solución final será la aceptación de de su identidad original en el mismo momento de la muerte.

De acuerdo con los planteamientos de Francisco Vivar, Cervantes habría compuesto «la segunda parte de su novela como una secuencia de encuentros entre don Quijote y los distintos tipos de caballeros contemporáneos del hidalgo. Estos caballeros, paralelos a don Quijote, nos permiten ver una manera nueva de construir el personaje por parte del autor y una manera nueva de acercarse al personaje por parte del lector» (p. 121). Esta propuesta de lectura acaso parezca demasiado moderna y fruto de un conciencia narrativa, que, a mi juicio, no es tan característica de Cervantes como de otros contemporáneos. Piénsese tan sólo en el autor del Lazarillo o en Mateo Alemán. Estoy convencido de que el Quijote fue más un libro más hallado que pensado; y si hubo plan previo para alguna de sus partes, circunstancias sobrevenidas, como el ataque de Avellaneda, lo cambiaron casi por completo. Aun así, lo atractivo de este Don Quijote frente a los caballeros de los tiempos modernos está precisamente en su modernidad, en la proyección que hace de la novela de Cervantes hacia el presente. Francisco Vivar no se ha limitado a ofrecer su particular lectura del Quijote, sino que ha sabido trasladar las moraldades cervantinas hacia nuestras propias existencias; y todo ello envuelto en una escritura ágil y grata al pensamiento. No es poca la labor, y los lectores del libro sabrán agradecerlo.

Luis Gómez Canseco
Universidad de Huelva
canseco@uhu.es

It is most welcome to recognize the newest study from an established scholar as meticulous in her critical research and erudite insights as Adrienne Martín. The groundwork for her present study on Spanish literary eroticism is invigorated by her considerable examination of the subject in previous works that comprise several articles, the edited collection *Poesía erótica del Siglo de Oro. Crítica y antología* (*Calíope* 2006), and compilations co-edited with J. Ignacio Diez Fernández: *La poesía erótica de Fray Melchor de la Serna* (2003), *Venus venerada: Tradiciones eróticas de la literatura española* (2006), and *Venus venerada II: Literatura erótica y modernidad en España* (2007).

Martín analyzes the representation of eroticized figures found in canonical and less prominent works that encompass the genres of poetry, prose, and drama. She addresses the function of these works as literature and as aesthetic constructs and explores their meanings, both literal and figurative. Her study is informed by Ericson’s sociology of deviance that characterizes behavior as normal or anomalous based on its reception in society. The moral stigmas associated with non-normative sexualities are formalized as codifying precepts in law, society and, consequently, literature.

Martín’s five-chapter study opens with the chapter “Prostitution and Power” in which she discusses the social and literary frames of prostitution in Cervantes’s exemplary novel *La tía fingida* and in the *Quixote*. She describes prostitution as a threat to the existing social order that requires social and financial containment. This prompts municipal and religious authorities to regulate licensed public brothels that, in effect, condone a legal prostitution as a lesser evil through the rationalization of health and morality. Correspondingly, in *La tía fingida* Esperanza creates social disorder in her role of prostitute. Although she is exploited, reified, and dehumanized in a class and gender power system, Martín observes that she is reintegrated into the wider community only through Cervantes’s redemption of her through marriage. This chapter concludes with a discussion of rural prostitution that focuses on the *Quixote’s* sympathetic character Maritornes. Martín notes that, similar to the urban centers, regulatory laws were passed to control inns and taverns limiting the amount of time public women could spend there. Maritornes is the literary representation of unfortunate, socially marginal women who are forced into prostitution as their only
means of survival. Martín adds that Cervantes’s attitude of tolerance toward impoverished women is comprehensible when we recall the suspect behavior of the women in his own family.

In Chapter Two, “Homosexuality and Satire,” Martín explores the socio-cultural conditions that determine the reception of homosexuality and she discusses how the concept of sodomy in early modern Europe differs from a single association with homosexuality, a modern social identity. The repression of sodomy by societal institutions and social anxiety about non-normative sexual practices generate antisodomite satire. She analyzes how social attitudes are conveyed in literary terms in Spanish burlesque and satirical verse, a genre representative of the characterization of homosexuals. Martín examines the sociohistorical and literary constraints of homosexual discourse in Quevedo’s sonnet “Por no comer la carne sodomita,” wherein the reference to a triple heretic - Lutheran, sodomite, and witch—links sexual difference and religious anomaly as a threat to social and political stability. Quevedo’s epitaph “A un bujarrón” and his poem “A un ermitaño mulato” satirize the Italians and the sinful hermit for their crimes against sexual taboos. The poems reflect the popular sentiment that all crimes against nature are reduced to the delito nefando (nefarious sin) of the sodomite. Martín then discusses the polyvalent erotic terminology in Góngora’s burlesque and satirical verse that discloses a sociology of early modern sexuality. This again serves to demonstrate the homophobia of Golden Age society that fears non-normative sex as a force for social destabilization and reaffirms that those prosecuted for sodomy were often members of the marginal class.

The peccatum mutum or silent sin, a reference to female homosexuality, is explored in Chapter Three, “Lesbianism as Dream and Myth.” In Fray Melchor de la Serna’s narrative poem, “El sueño de la viUDA de Aragón,” Martín illustrates that female homosexual desire is dismissed as harmless in a male-centered view of sexuality. The burlesque aspekt of the poem depicts a woman’s gender transmutation as a simulacrum of conventional heterosexual love that disregards lesbian eros. Cristóstom de Villalón’s El Crótalon, a misogynistic cautionary tale about cross-dressing twins and the betrayal of friendship in a love triangle, does not negate the possibility of same-sex desire but, as Martín observes, it is again dismissed because it cannot have a natural conclusion without the mediation of the male. This chapter concludes with a discussion of lesbian desire in Jorge de Montemayor’s canonical pastoral novel Los siete libros de la Diana. Martín’s analysis centers on the homoerotic interlude between Selvagia and Ysmenia, who claims to be a man dressed as a woman but is in fact a woman in love with
a male cousin, Alanio. In discussing why the homoerotic content does not raise objections in its day, Martín explains that this episode creates a myth of female-female desire that is assimilated into the heteronormative view of love without a challenge to male sexual hegemony or literary mores. According to Professor Martín’s reading, the episode is non-transgressive and escapes the repressive control of social and legal systems because there is no threat to heterosexuality and it conforms to the philosophy of love that allows for female desire based on the Neoplatonist’s pursuit of beauty.

In Chapter Four, “Wild Women and Warrior Maidens,” Martín explores the legend and literature of the female fighter in varied genres: the balladry of the doncella guerrera (warrior maiden); the narrative of the historical Catalina de Erauso, the Lieutenant nun and cross dresser who fought in the Americas; and varied poetic and dramatic manifestations of the serrana (wild mountain woman). She describes the doncella guerrera ballads as a recognizable tradition with many variations in which the female protagonist disguises the erotic elements of her female identity but not without attempts to reveal her true sex. Martín reads the doncella guerrera ballad as the progressive courtship stages between the Prince and the maiden in expectation of marriage. Beyond the aesthetic value of the ballads, the doncella guerrera reveals woman’s intersession in the salvaging of family honor and her erotic empowerment. Martín focuses on issues of sexual otherness and eroticism in Catalina de Erauso’s prose work Historia de la monja alférez, which has value as a sociological document. Catalina has been interpreted as a woman who finds the female role limiting and chooses to become hypermasculinized. Professor Martín notes Catalina’s paradox of transgression as a warrior maiden and manly woman, but offers that Catalina does not disrupt the social order because she ultimately receives license from the patriarchal hierarchy to live as an honorary member of the masculine gender. Martín ends the chapter with a review of the violent mountain girl known as the serrana. She begins with Juan Ruiz’s well-known Libro de buen amor, then addresses the legendary serrana from the ballad tradition, and concludes with Luis Vélez de Guevara’s character Gila, the manly murderous woman who is the protagonist of his 1613 play La serrana de la Verea. In her analysis, Martín follows the transformation of the serrana figure from crude promiscuity in her earliest representation to a sensual performance in Vélez de Guevara’s play.

In the last chapter, “Eros and the Art of Cuckoldry,” Martín examines the mechanisms of sexual humor in a variety of genres: the world of cuckolds, female tricksters, and erotic tricks in Golden Age poetry, short novels, and dramatic interludes. Erotic humorous poetry functions as a burlesque rebuttal of
the ideal love of Petrarchan poetry and as a repudiation of the moralists of the age. Martín examines the themes of illicit love and trickery in erotic verse novellas. Fray Melchor de la Serna’s “Novela de las madejas” and his “Novela de la mujer de Gil,” written in a comic tone to amuse rather than edify, portray the conventional erotic deception of the simpleton husband who is deceived by his wife and her lover. The recurrent theme of female adultery precipitated by male jealousy is synthesized in Cervantes’s theatrical interlude El viejo celoso and his exemplary novel El celoso extremeño and is also the subject of María de Zaya’s short story El prevenido, engañado. Martín’s analysis of the charged lexicon reveals a dialogue and imagery replete with double entendres. She frames women within the contemporary revision of Golden Age literary history and identifies them as resourceful leaders in issues of love and free will. In a world upside down these women are not punished for social transgressions as are the women of Golden Age drama.

Martín provides valuable critical resources in an extensive bibliography. Her study does not have a concluding chapter but Martín presents some closing thoughts in Chapter Five. She cites the studies and anthologies on early modern Spanish erotic literature that have been published since 1990. She earnestly recommends future research in this legitimate and incipient field by reminding the reader that early modern erotic texts are abundant and still understudied. These works deserve scholarly attention not only because they are precursors but because they are a unique form of narrative verse that embodies sociocultural context and reception. Golden Age verse reflects the existence of a complex set of tolerant attitudes toward the literary representation of sexuality and eroticism, which the Inquisition did not attempt to censor. Martín’s study is an intelligent, well-documented, eloquent, and significant contribution to the growing field that she terms erotic philology. She introduces new perspectives on the Golden Age to encourage and validate an area of investigation that has been on the margin of philological interest and authenticates early modern erotic literature as an integral part of Spain’s national literature that enriches our literary and historical image of the past. Martín’s exploration of the erotics of sexual transgression goes beyond a literary study to document the sociohistorical circumstances and contexts that sanction the acceptance or rejection of sexualized figures both in society and in literature.

Joan F. Cammarata
Manhattan College
joan.cammarata@manhattan.edu
announces its current and future Cervantes list.
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- Don Quijote
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- Novelas ejemplares III (“La española inglesa,” “El licenciado vidriera,” “La fuerza de la Sangre,” “La ilustre fregona”)
- Persiles y Sigismunda

Contracted:

- El trato de Argel
- La entretenida

We are looking for editors to do other classics as well. Go to www.CervantesandCo.com to see the complete collection.
ALBATROS HISPANÓFILA SIGLO XXI is a series of monographs on Spanish literature—for the present, on Golden Age literature. This series seeks to stimulate and disseminate criticism based on a variety of cultural, socio-historical, and linguistic perspectives without ties to groups, styles, or schools. Such a broadly oriented philology is intended to encourage interdisciplinary approaches to the study of literature and disciplines relevant to literature.
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