



The Composition and Revision of *La Galatea*¹

GEOFFREY L. STAGG



y topic, over a century old, can offer no novelty, except perhaps in its treatment. From as early as 1878 and up to 1954, a series of critics and biographers—such as Díaz de Benjumea,² Cotarelo y Mori,³ Rodríguez Marín,⁴ and Astrana Marín⁵—expressed the belief that some, or much, or even all, of *La Galatea* had been written before its author returned from captivity. Such views were completely ignored by the editors

¹A paper read at the Annual General Meeting of the Cervantes Society of America held in Toronto on December 29, 1993 (One slight addition has been made).

²"En mi concepto, el poema de la *Galatea* fue comenzado por Cervantes en España, tal vez aumentado y limado durante el cautiverio y completado a su vuelta" (111).

³"no parecería aventurado suponer que lo [i.e., este libro] trajo [del cautiverio] ya escrito, al regresar á la corte" (113).

⁴The great *cervantista* modified his view somewhat over the years. In 1903 (*Barahona de Soto* 119, note) he argued that both *La Galatea* and Gálvez de Montalvo's *Pastor de Filida* were written "muy al comenzar el último tercio del siglo XVI, si bien a última hora . . . sus autores les añadieron algunas cosas tales como el *Canto de Caliope*." In 1925 (in his edition of "Rinconete y Cortadillo" 125) he states that the first draft was written "antes del año 1575."

⁵For example, discussing Cervantes's captivity, he remarks (*Vida*, III, 29) that "mucha parte de los versos y prosas de *La Galatea* debió de elaborarse entonces." See also III, 35 and 174.

Schevill and Bonilla, whose unsupported statement that the pastoral was probably written in the 1580s⁶ seemed, for some strange reason, to gain general credence.

So things stood until 1954, when Amezúa published a letter penned by Cervantes on February 17, 1582, in which the writer revealed that he was “criando a Galatea.”⁷ And again, for some strange reason, it seems to have been generally agreed that this demonstrated that *La Galatea* was written wholly in the 1580s.⁸

But that letter tells us only that Cervantes was *working on* his manuscript in 1582—something we might have guessed anyway. It tells us nothing about when he began it, or whether it was a first draft or a revision or an expansion. Answers must still be sought.

A work with the loose structure and tenuous story-line of a pastoral novel lends itself to intermittent composition; poems and tales can be written independently of the main theme, which can be easily modified to accommodate them; substitutions and revisions need cause little trouble, and the final text may contain elements of many different vintages.

Now Cervantes was prone to intermittent composition;⁹ he was also prone to delayed publication, as his plays and short stories demonstrate. We know that he was writing verse before he left for Italy, and while he was in captivity;¹⁰ and I have argued that the first draft of “La española inglesa” dates from the 1560s.¹¹ Was the writing of *La Galatea* also spread over many years? Was its publication also delayed?

Do not expect the author’s Dedication and Prologue to throw any light on the matter. Rather they are designed, I fear, to confuse

⁶“no es inverosímil suponer que la novela fue redactada después que Cervantes volvió a Madrid (en diciembre de 1580) de su cautiverio en Argel” (edition of *La Galatea*, I, viii). Narciso Alonso Cortés (*Casos* 93) is one of those accepting the editors’ statement without question.

⁷“Una carta desconocida e inédita de Cervantes.”

⁸Alborg (*Cervantes* 68, n. 1), for example, states that the letter “debe resolver al fin la debatida cuestión.” Cinti, in her edition of *La Galatea*, contradicts herself: after stating (10) that parts of the novel were written by Cervantes in his twenties, she concludes (23) that, after Amezúa’s article, the dating question seems to be resolved.

⁹Buchanan, “The Works of Cervantes and Their Dates of Composition” (25) concludes that “Cervantes seems to have composed his works intermittently and concurrently rather than within a specified period of time.”

¹⁰See the Schevill and Bonilla edition of his *Poesías sueltas*, 5–36.

¹¹“The Composition and Revision of ‘La española inglesa.’”

the reader. The description of the book as “estas primicias de mi corto ingenio” (I, 1)¹² can only be, at best, a half-truth. On the one hand his claim that he does not wish to delay publication any longer suggests that the manuscript had been completed some time before;¹³ on the other hand, his comment that he could be excused for writing it because he had only recently left youth behind clearly implies that he *had* just finished it.¹⁴

Cervantes’s obfuscations and ambiguities are worse than useless; and the earlier scholars’ speculations—no doubt inspired by the author’s apparently artless confidences—are not to be trusted. Our only recourse is to the text of the novel itself. An examination of it leads to the following conclusion: that Books I to III were written in the late 1560s, and Books IV to VI in the 1580s, when certain revisions were made to both the drafted first half and the earlier-planned second half.

II

First, evidence from historical and autobiographical references in the text.

Books IV to VI contain a number of such references that point to late composition.

In Book IV Cervantes makes complimentary mention of seven characters from *El Pastor de Fílida*, published in 1582.¹⁵ This suggests that at the time of writing Cervantes knew that publication of Gálvez de Montalvo’s novel was imminent or already a fact (a compliment to a work unknown to the public would have little point). Was Cervantes, then, composing Book IV when he wrote his letter?

In Book V the resumed tale of Timbrio and Silerio includes stirring descriptions of two storms at sea, complete with a series of technical nautical terms and manoeuvres which would come naturally only to one who had spent considerable time on the water (II, 106–7, 118–20);¹⁶ allusion is made to a number of the smaller islands dotting

¹²Except where otherwise stated, page-references to *La Galatea* will be to the Avalle-Arce edition.

¹³“no he publicado antes de ahora este libro, ni tampoco quise tenerle para mí solo más tiempo guardado” (I, 8).

¹⁴“habiendo apenas salido de los límites de la juventud” (I, 6).

¹⁵“porque en [estas nuestras riberas] apacientan sus ganados los famosos y conocidos Eranio, Siralvo, Filardo, Silvano, Lisardo y los dos Matuntos, padre e hijo, uno en la lira y otro en la poesía sobre todo extremo estremados” (II, 73).

¹⁶The explanatory use of “como dicen” in the phrase “amollar—como dicen—en popa” (I, 106) betrays knowledge gained from personal experience.

the central Mediterranean—Stromboli, Lipari, Pantelleria, Lampedusa, Zembra (II, 106–7)—to “los recién derribados muros de la Goleta,” walls which had been leveled in 1574 (II, 107), to the ruins of Carthage bordering the sea (II, 107), and to the brilliant picture offered by Genoa to those passing on board ship (II, 107–8).¹⁷ An account of a battle with Corsair galleys led by the redoubtable Arnaute Mamí (II, 113–16) harks back in part to the battle that led to Cervantes’s capture.¹⁸

In all this the author is clearly drawing on memories of his Mediterranean journeys and adventures.

Book VI contains the “Canto de Calíope” (II, 109–225), listing, among others, poets who had made a reputation or published or composed verse in the early 1580s.

If Cervantes had composed the *first* three books after his return from captivity, one would expect to find there also a comparable incidence of historical and autobiographical material. But such is not the case; the difference from the last three books is, in this respect, striking.

For example, Manuel de Montoliu, an expert witness, can find, in Silerio’s tale (Books II–III) no reflection of any Cervantine acquaintance with Catalan geography.¹⁹ His point is well made: the port where the main action takes place is given no name (I, 129); elsewhere only Rosas (I, 139) and Barcelona (I, 130, 134, 139) are mentioned, and the latter city, recipient of high praise in later works of Cervantes, is here simply termed “big” (I, 130); the Viceroy is called “el Virrey de Barcelona” (I, 130); we must wait until the second half of the novel to be told that the Catalans were identifiable as such by their dress and speech²⁰—nothing is said about this in Books I to III. The remarks about Catalan bandits prove little: Cervantes could

¹⁷It is to be noted that the brief description is rendered in the present tense, in contrast to the surrounding past tense of the narrative; this device emphasizes the vividness of Cervantes’s recollection.

¹⁸See Avalle-Arce’s “La captura de Cervantes” (326–7). Though the account is in the Byzantine mode, the scholar admits that “el hilillo rojo del autobiografismo se percibe aún en estas páginas” (326).

¹⁹“Ni en uno ni en otro relato [i.e., of Silerio and Timbrio] encontramos ninguna indicación geográfica concreta sobre Cataluña . . .” (*Cervantes y Barcelona* 3).

²⁰“much a gente armada, cuyo traje y lengua dio a entender ser catalanes, y ser de Cataluña aquella costa” (II, 120).

have learnt about them from afar,²¹ and the activities attributed to them in the tale of the two friends all derive from Heliodorus.²²

So with Italy. In Books II and III, for example, Silerio recounts various happenings in and around Naples, a city that in other works of Cervantes is evoked with nostalgic delight. But here, as Cinti points out, “non risveglia nessuna reazione sentimentale”—“it awakens no emotional response.”²³ Timbrio’s sailing from Gaeta reveals Cervantes’s knowledge, not of that port, but of Gil Polo’s novel, which mentions it as Marcelio’s point of disembarkation.²⁴

All such evidence strongly suggests that Cervantes wrote Books I to III before going abroad.

But one question does arise.

Early in Book III we are told that Pransiles and Timbrio are to fight their duel “en una tierra del estado del duque de Gravina” (I, 169) near Naples. Mention of this rarely-quoted ducal name must give us pause. It need not, however, imply that Cervantes, before writing this passage, had personally seen the Palazzo Gravina in Naples,²⁵ or encountered, outside the city, the ducal estates (which, in any case, lay on the other side of the Apennines);²⁶ but rather that he had read *Question de amor*, a sixteenth-century best-seller (over twenty editions), which lists the Gravina family among the vice-

²¹Martín de Riquer is quite positive about this whole matter: “Si reparamos con atención, en la historia de Timbrio y Silerio nada escribe Cervantes que exija un conocimiento directo de Cataluña, y los leves datos que nos da de la geografía del país y las referencias que hace al bandolerismo y a la piratería turca sin duda alguna los conocía el joven escritor antes de huir de Madrid en 1569” (*Cervantes en Barcelona* 24).

²²Briefly, just as Timbrio is captured by “bandoleros,” whose chief treats him with all respect and takes him to the bandits’ village (I, 134–5), so Theagenes and Chariclea are taken prisoner by a band of brigands led by Thyamis, who shows them every consideration and takes them with him to his retreat (*Historia etiópica*, ed. López Estrada 18–22).

²³*La Galatea*, trans. and ed. Cinti (91, n. 37).

²⁴“me desembarcaron en el puerto de Gayeta, del reino de Nápoles” (*Diana enamorada* 57–8).

²⁵For an architectural description, history, and (blurred!) photographs of this building, see Ceci.

²⁶In the region of Gravina di Puglia, some 40 miles W.S.W. of Bari. The lands in question belonged to the Orsini family from 1420 to 1807. The Duchess of Gravina mentioned in *Question de amor* (Angela Castriota Orsini, who died in 1518) is buried there in the Church of Santa Sofia (*Enciclopedia Italiana*, vol. 17, 766–7).

regal entourage.²⁷ Cervantes was behaving in this instance as he was to later, in *Don Quijote*, when, as Prof. McCready has pointed out, he selected the name “el caballero Fonseca” from a similar list of knights in *Tirante el blanco*.²⁸ He must have made a mental note of such useful compilations.

III

Secondly, evidence from literary sources.

The main sources of *La Galatea* were Sannazaro’s, Montemayor’s, and Gil Polo’s pastoral novels, Garcilaso’s verse, and Heliodorus’s *Theagenes and Chariclea*. All this material was available to Cervantes in the late 1560s in original or translated texts, and its influence is visible both early and late in his pastoral.²⁹

But there is a notable difference between the first and second halves of the novel in their use of other sources.

Overt and covert Italian influence is strong in the second half. Calliope praises Petrarch, Dante, and Ariosto (II, 187–8); mention is made of the Italian poet and humanist Telesio;³⁰ a line of Italian—“che per tal variar natura è bella”—is quoted in the original (II, 110); the debate on love in Book IV draws heavily on Bembo’s *Gli Asolani* and Equicola’s *Di natura d’amore*, translated verbatim, the bibliographical evidence suggests, by Cervantes himself.³¹ The translations are both fluent and accurate, testifying to a command of Italian such as could be acquired only by residence in Italy.

²⁷ “El duque de Gravina” is to be found in *Question de amor* as printed in Menéndez y Pelayo’s *Orígenes de la novela* (II, 94), in the section “Los atavios de los capitanes d’armas, solo de las armas.” On this same page is listed “la duquesa de Grauína” (in the section “La partida del visrey”).

²⁸ “Cervantes and the ‘Caballero Fonseca.’”

²⁹ For Sannazaro see: Scherillo’s ed. of *Arcadia* (ccli–cclx); Torraca (131); Popescu-Telega (125–46); Wellington. For Montemayor: Schevill and Bonilla ed. of *La Galatea* (I, xxii–xxiv); López Estrada, *Estudio crítico* (65–7). For Gil Polo: López Estrada, *Estudio crítico* (71–2); Hors ed. of *La Galatea*, “Prologo.” For Garcilaso: Blecua. For Heliodorus: López Estrada, ed. of *Historia etiópica* (xxviii–xxx); Stegmann (147–50).

³⁰ Castro (198–9, n. 20) prefers to identify this character with the philosopher Bernardino Telesio; Schevill and Bonilla (ed. of *La Galatea*, I, XXXII) see in him a reminiscence of the poet and humanist Antonio Telesio (1482–1534), to whom Garcilaso dedicated a Latin ode. Given Antonio’s connection with both poetry and Garcilaso, and the character’s stout defence of Spanish poetry, the editors’ choice seems far more appropriate.

³¹ López Estrada, *Estudio crítico* (88–92, 92–95); Stagg, “Plagiarism in *La Galatea*.”

In contrast, the philographic substance of Books I to III is provided by Gil Polo (on jealousy)³² and Castiglione, whose *Cortegiano* could have been read by Cervantes from early days in Boscán's version. One notes that *all* the Castiglione parallels listed by López Estrada are taken from Books I to III.³³

The change from dependence on Gil Polo and Castiglione in Books I to III to dependence on Bembo and Equicola in Book IV is sudden and complete, suggesting a prolonged hiatus in composition.

It has, moreover, an unexpected result: the transformation of "el desamorado Lenio." This character first appears in Book I, and soon shows himself to be argumentative, short-tempered, and pugnacious. His discussion with Elicio and Erastro about love (I, 84–6) soon develops into an altercation quickly descending to personalities.

Yet in Book IV he becomes the vehicle for the love-theories of Bembo and Equicola, handling abstractions calmly and competently at the philosophical level (II, 44–54). To save face at this sudden sea-change, Cervantes has Elicio explain that Lenio had in fact spent his best years in praiseworthy studies on the banks of the Tormes (II, 72). Lenio is now equated with Tirsi and Damón. Why this bizarre development?

It is reasonable to assume that Cervantes first introduced Tirsi and Damón to bear the burden of the "razones de filosofía" of which he boasts in the prologue (I, 8). Damón did indeed do his part in Book III with his discourse on jealousy (I, 128–31); doubtless a discourse on love by Tirsi was planned for Book IV (in imitation of Montemayor's Book IV)³⁴—most probably a passage plagiarized from Boscán's translation of *Il Cortegiano*. But in Italy Cervantes found the best-selling works of Bembo and Equicola, with enough material to furnish, not just a discourse, but a debate—a debate between a supporter and an enemy of love. But the only enemy of love available from Books I to III was "el desamorado Lenio," who was therefore awkwardly pressed into service. Cervantes's failure, in revision, to adjust the earlier Lenio to the later is typical.

What of the intercalated stories in Books I to III? Can Italian influence be seen there?

Investigation of the sources of the tragic story of Lisandro in Book I, with its theme of a family feud and its bloody consequences, has suffered in the past from the assumption that its origins could be

³² Compare *Diana enamorada* (83–87) with *La Galatea* (I, 228–31).

³³ *Estudio Crítico* (115).

³⁴ *Los siete libros de la Diana* (195–201).

identified with those of *Romeo and Juliet*.³⁵ It was López Estrada who finally pointed out “la gran diferencia” between Cervantes’s tale and those of Bandello and Luigi da Porto;³⁶ but to Ellen Anderson must go the credit for establishing by her lucid analysis the primacy of Alonso Pérez’s story of Sagastes and Disteo as Cervantes’s main source. No Bandello, no Luigi da Porto.³⁷

The Story of the Two Friends (Books II–V) was likewise earlier believed to be derived from Boccaccio’s story of Tito and Gisippo,³⁸ but Professor Avallé-Arce concluded that this was not necessarily the case.³⁹ Now, more precisely, we can say that Cervantes’s tale is a tight weave of elements derived directly from *Theagenes and Chariclea*, *La vida del Ysopet*, *El caballero Cifar*, Núñez de Reinoso’s *Clareo y Florisea*, Jerónimo de Contreras’s *Selva de aventuras*, Gil Polo’s *Diana enamorada*, Alonso Pérez’s *Diana*, and Timoneda’s *Patrañuelo*, all works available in the late 1560s in Spanish texts. There are indeed points of contact between the Boccaccian text and *La Galatea*, but all of them are also found in Timoneda’s work. Boccaccio as a direct source of Cervantes’s tale can be dismissed.⁴⁰

In summary, nowhere does the prose of Books I–III show indebtedness to Italian forerunners. The case for their early composition grows even stronger.

IV

Thirdly, evidence from the time-sequence.

There is ever greater evidence identifying Lauso with Cervantes, and Damón with Pedro Laínez. Both writers were living in Madrid in the late 1560s, apparently moving in similar circles, both, for example, writing poems on the death of Isabel de Valois.⁴¹ Lauso first

³⁵ E.g., “Se trata de otra versión de un tema que obtuvo un éxito universal en manos de Shakespeare: *Romeo y Julieta*” (López Estrada, *Estudio Crítico* 106).

³⁶ *Estudio crítico* (106). Yet he concludes: “La impresión es que Cervantes había leído la obra de Bandello o Luigi da Porto y que recordaba sólo la línea esencial del argumento” (107, n. 1).

³⁷ “Role-Playing and Role-Change,” I, 87–90.

³⁸ Rotunda (245); Sorieri (249); Alarcos García (197–206); López Estrada (*Estudio* 102–5).

³⁹ “creo que . . . Cervantes no acudió necesariamente al *Decamerón*” (*Nuevos deslindes* 184).

⁴⁰ Detailed evidence in support of my analysis of the sources of the Tale of the Two Friends will be found in an article now in preparation.

⁴¹ Schevill remarks: “Since 1797 the assertion of Juan Antonio Pellicer that Damón in *La Galatea* is Pedro Laínez because Tirsi is Figueroa has met little op-

appears in Book III of the novel, on Day 4, presented simply as one of three “dispuestos pastores,” a suitably modest introduction by an apprentice author of his fictional counterpart, who is then welcomed by his “antiguo y verdadero amigo,” Damón (I, 232).

Early in Book IV, however, we are told that Lauso has travelled through many parts of Spain and all Europe and Asia (seemingly a misprint for Africa), and spent many years in courtly exercises and martial pursuits (II, 29, 34). Such a description would be applicable to Cervantes after he had returned from captivity, and must have been written then. If Book III had been written at the same time as Book IV, surely such impressive credentials would have been presented then, on Lauso’s first appearance? We are left with the persuasion that Book III was written in 1569, and Book IV in the 1580s.

After their first meeting in Book III on Day 4, the two friends next meet in Book V on Day 5. They then discuss the numerous events that had taken place since their last encounter, when D. Astraliano (Don John of Austria) had left “los cisalpinos pastos” to crush those who had rebelled against his brother and the true faith (II, 93–4). The reference is either to April 1569, when Don John had left Aranjuez—to on the Tagus, scene of *La Galatea*, be it noted—to go into the mountains (hence “cisalpinos pastos”) to crush the moriscos; or the reference could be to 1576, when Don John was named governor of Flanders.⁴²

position” (“Laínez, Figueroa and Cervantes” 426). The joint exaltation of Laínez and Figueroa at the end of the “Canto de Calíope” (II, 224–5) is surely adequate proof that Damón in *La Galatea* represents Laínez. The conclusion drawn by Entrambasaguas (*Obras de Pedro Laynez* I, 184) that “Damón en otros autores, incluso *La Galatea* de Cervantes es dudodísimo o imposible, según los casos, que represente a Pedro Laynez” simply demonstrates the dangers of arguing from sporadic occurrences of common pastoral names in Golden Age texts (not infrequently of dubious attribution). Laínez’s editor had himself earlier admitted that “Incluso para sus contemporáneos eran inseparables los nombres de *Damón y Tirsi* o de Laynez y Figueroa” (I, 142–3). The identification of “Larsileo” with Mateo Vázquez (see below, VI) points clearly to Lauso’s being Cervantes. Laínez in documents is several times called “vecino de Madrid” (Pérez Pastor, *Bibliografía madrileña*, III, 391ff.). Entrambasaguas mentions “la amistad íntima que hubo entre Laynez y Cervantes” (I, 109). Laínez’s elegy on the death of Isabel de Valois is printed in the Marín Ocete ed. (144–52) and the Entrambasaguas ed. (II, 181–91), Cervantes’s poems on the same theme in the Schevill and Bonilla ed. of the *Poesías sueltas* (11–18).

⁴² See the note in the Schevill and Bonilla ed., II, 288. The editors consider 1576 the preferable reference, giving “cisalpinos” the restricted Italian geographical sense. Cervantes, who probably borrowed the adjective from Sanzaro (“Cisalпина Gallia” in “Prosa Settima,” Carrera’s ed. 58), no doubt

But since both Cervantes and Laínez were in Madrid in 1569, and Laínez was certainly not with Cervantes in Algiers in 1576, we conclude that the previous meeting of Lauso and Damón in Book III on Day 4 had taken place in 1569.

Now we are not told what the “numerous events” were that had taken place since that meeting; but the mention of them in juxtaposition to the mention of Don John suggests that they were of national or international importance, and as such would have occurred only over an extended period; what is beyond all doubt is that they did not all happen overnight, between Days 4 and 5, with news of all of them reaching Lauso and Damón on the Tagus on that same night.

Obviously Cervantes has confused fictional and historical time—no doubt a constant danger in a *roman à clef*—and transferred to one night of the narrative the protracted period separating two successive real-life meetings of Cervantes and Laínez, which can only be their last meeting in 1569 and their reunion in or after 1580. It follows that the meeting in Book III was linked in Cervantes’s mind with 1569, and the later meeting in Book V with the 1580s. They would have been so linked if those had been their respective dates of composition.

V

Fourthly, evidence of revision in Books I–III.

I have argued for an early date for the composition of Books I–III. Yet when we turn to the verse in these three books, we find a number of indications to the contrary.

In general, this verse resembles compositions of the 1560s, the choice of forms apparently dictated by Montemayor’s.⁴³ This, following our argument, is to be expected. What is *not* expected is the presence, in the earlier pages of Book I, of three poems showing the strong direct influence of recent or contemporary Italian poets. Two can be discussed together: the opening poem—“Mientras que al triste lamentable accento” (I, 15–16)—and the fifth—“Afuera el fuego, el lazo, el hielo y flecha” (I, 57)—both distinguished by *plurimembración* and *correlación*, as found in Luigi Groto’s *Rime*, which in 1577 had brought

equated “alpino” with “alpestre,” favoured by Italian poets read by Cervantes in the broader meaning of “mountainous.”

⁴³ Except for Cervantes’s exclusion of *romances*, the correspondence for the whole of the two pastorals is virtually complete. See López Estrada’s ed. of Montemayor (301–2) and his *Estudio Crítico* (152) for relevant lists.

back to favour in Italy a Quattrocentist fashion for this type of verse.⁴⁴ Cervantes imitated it in *octavas* sent on November 8, 1579, to fellow-captive Antonio Veneziano,⁴⁵ and one suspects that the two poems in *La Galatea* were also written at about that time. The younger Cervantes seems to have liked composing a group of poems in quick succession on the same theme: four, for example, on the death of Isabel de Valois.⁴⁶

The other poem in question is the seventh in Book I, a *sestina*, obligatory in any pastoral novel, in this case one based, as Kenneth Allen has shown by detailed comparison, on a *sestina* in Book I of *Gli Asolani*, where Cervantes also found substance for the debate in Book IV of *La Galatea* and the madrigal in *Don Quijote*.⁴⁷

The presence of these three imitations of Italian poets can be attributed to Cervantes's desire, in the 1580s, to offset the then somewhat old-fashioned air of the opening pages of his novel by adding or substituting poems of presumed greater attraction or novelty, to give his work a façade of greater topicality.

Indeed, we catch Cervantes in the very act of revision. It seems not to have been generally noticed that *La Galatea* opens with a "false start." The novel begins *in medias res* with a song sung by Elicio: we are now launched into Day 1; the narrator, after analysing Elicio's relations with Galatea, continues: "y así, un día . . ." (I, 18), with the unbroken linear narrative then persisting—for seventy pages—to the end of Book I. Day 1, the day when Elicio was singing his song, has been, apparently, wholly forgotten. All this

⁴⁴ See Fucilla, "A Rhetorical Pattern . . ." especially pp. 32–33, and p. 43, and López Estrada, *Estudio crítico* (149–51). Dámaso Alonso (*Seis calas* 96–7) stresses the importance of Veniero as "retransmisor de los procedimientos correlativos" in mid-century Italy, but admits that his followers were "muy oscuros poetas." In contrast, the fashion set by Groto spread through much of Western Europe. Fucilla (*Estudios* 180) notes the resemblance between Cervantes's poem and a sonnet by Veniero ("Non punse, arse, o legò, stral, fiamma, o lacio"), but Ruta ("Cervantes e i danni d'amore") questions Veniero as source, noting two poems by Paterno and one (in Sicilian dialect) by Veneziano that also resemble Galatea's sonnet. She suggests that Cervantes was responding to the general fashion for verse on "i danni d'amore" rather than to a specific poem. This, given the date (1579) of his octaves to Veneziano, may well be. Is it mere coincidence that Veniero's poem and Amalteo's (see below, note 49) should have appeared in the same 1569 anthology (Fucilla, *Estudios* 83)? Galatea's sonnet is studied by Dámaso Alonso in *Seis calas* (105–6) and *Poesía española* (165–6).

⁴⁵ See *Poesías sueltas* (31–6) and Ruta ("Le ottave di Cervantes per Antonio Veneziano e Celia").

⁴⁶ *Poesías sueltas* (6–18).

⁴⁷ Kenneth P. Allen, "Cervantes' *Galatea* and the *Discorso*" (56–64).

points to careless revision. Reconstructing, we can say that, in the original draft, the narrative began (in imitation of Montemayor's opening) with the analysis of the Elicio-Galatea relationship, and that Cervantes, in revision, added the introductory song without adjusting the narrative sequence.

Since he would almost certainly have included a *sestina* in his early draft, we may assume that the Bembo calque was a substitution, not an addition.

Galatea's sonnet ("Afuera el fuego . . ."), sung as she is on her way, alone, to meet Florisea, could have been interpolated with minimum disturbance of the text and the flow of narrative.⁴⁸

Finally to be noted, in the *canto alterno* of Elicio and Erastro in Book I (I, 25–28), is the presence of an octave ("La blanca nieve y colorada rosa") condensed from a sonnet by Amalteo.⁴⁹ Elicio's lines (I, 26) follow immediately upon an octave that contains, according to the editor, a "repetición conceptuosa propia de la lírica cancioneril, pero que ya había caído en desuso para la época de *La Galatea*" (I, 26, note). Cervantes was, in revision, presumably attempting to restore the balance.

VI

Fifthly, evidence of revision in Books IV–VI.

Did Cervantes, before leaving Spain, plan or write any material for the three later books? And, if so, did he, on his return, revise any of his plan, or any material already written? Some answers to these questions are possible.

In Book IV Damón recites a long poem that, according to him, Lauso wrote in praise of pastoral life before he came to share it; this poem, he says, the author had *sent* to Larsileo, experienced in courtly affairs, and it had been praised by the recipient, and approved by all who had seen it "en aquel tiempo" (II, 26–40). The reference is obvi-

⁴⁸ In *Don Quijote* (I, 15), after the interpolation of four chapters, Cervantes restores the situation to the *status quo ante*, even repeating some phraseology ("en buena paz y compañía"). A similar mannerism affects the interpolation of Galatea's sonnet: the reader is told that she sang it "en tanto que *llegaba adonde su amiga Florisea creyó que estaría* (I, 57), and later that "el acabar el canto Galatea y *llegar adonde Florisea estaba fue todo a un tiempo*" (I, 58) (The italics are mine).

⁴⁹ Francisco de la Torre, probably a friend of Cervantes (see Antonio Blanco Suárez 321–7) also wrote a sonnet closely based on Amalteo's (*Poesías* 70), but Cervantes's lines show coincidences with Amalteo's not present in Francisco de la Torre's poem.

ously to the “Epístola a Mateo Vázquez,” of which the lines in *La Galatea* are a kind of pastoral reworking, copying some of the epistle’s phraseology.⁵⁰ They were probably written not long after the “Epístola,” that is, around 1577. They certainly could not have been part of any plan made in the 1560s.

I have already dealt with the presumed change in plans, in Book IV, for the discussion of the nature of love.

Timbrio’s tale in Book V (II, 105–22) is deceptive. First appearances suggest that it is a late invention, introduced by Cervantes after his return, to add drama and excitement to his novel. Timbrio’s journey from Gaeta back to Gaeta, and his and the ladies’ journey from Gaeta to the Catalan coast advance the central plot of the story hardly at all, and have all the air of an interpolation. But Timbrio’s account is based on the same sources as Silerio’s, written in the 1560s. This suggests that both were planned at the same time, one as Heliodoran counterpart of the other, and that Cervantes in the 1580s followed a plan of narrative made years before, adding picturesque detail from his own experience. That he re-wrote a story first written in the 1560s is unlikely: I know of no such extensive re-writing by him elsewhere (the revisions of the two *novelas* in the Porras Ms. are, I have argued in another place, by Porras himself).⁵¹

The elegy for Meliso in Book VI (II, 177–83) commemorates Hurtado de Mendoza fittingly, with appropriate allusions to his career. As a traditional pastoral component, one would expect it to have formed part of the original plan. But how could it have, if the poet honoured did not die until 1575? And if it had been written after 1575, why does it display early habits of Cervantes as versifier—such as his use of the phrase “el ancho suelo hispano” (II, 179) and of the rhyme-word “malla” (II, 178)?⁵² Two lines of the elegy answer such questions:

¡Oh muerte, que con presta violencia
tal vida en poca tierra reduxiste! (II, 178)

Hurtado de Mendoza did not die “con presta violencia”—but the revered Garcilaso did. This careless slip in revision shows that Cervantes had written the elegy earlier to do homage to Garcilaso, and had modified it in the 1580s to mourn the more recently deceased poet.

⁵⁰ See the Schevill and Bonilla ed., II, 285–6.

⁵¹ “The Refracted Image: Porras and Cervantes.”

⁵² Cf. *Poesías sueltas*, pp. 5, 15 (“del ancho suelo hispano”) and p. 8 (“nuestro hispano suelo”); also p. 5 (“fina malla”) and p. 16 (“malla” rhyming, as in the elegy, with “batalla”).

VII

The evidence of revisions in Books IV *and* V *and* VI suggests that Cervantes, in the 1580s, was following a plan made for those three books before he left for Italy. Perhaps a sense of loyalty to his earlier self, or his unease with revision, restrained him from making more than relatively minor modifications. We are thus denied the opportunity of gauging the full measure of his artistic and critical development during his years abroad. But hints there are: his experiments with a new (for him) literary manner; his wish to give greater depth to the analysis of the workings of the human heart; his vague dissatisfaction with accepted models of prose narrative—all early, halting steps, perhaps, but already set on the path that would, in the fullness of time, lead to an unimagined New World of prose fiction.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

WORKS CITED

- Alarcos García, Emilio. "Cervantes y Boccaccio." *Homenaje a Cervantes*. II. *Estudios Cervantinos*. Ed. Francisco Sánchez-Castañer. Valencia: Mediterráneo, 1950.
- Alborg, Juan Luis. *Cervantes*. Madrid: Gredos, 1966.
- Allen, Kenneth P. "Cervantes' *Galatea* and the *Discorso intorno al comporre dei romanzi* of Giraldo Cinthio." *Revista Hispánica Moderna* 39 (1976-77): 52-68.
- Alonso, Dámaso. *Poesía española. Ensayo de métodos y límites estilísticos*. Madrid: Gredos, 1950.
- Alonso, Dámaso, and Carlos Bousoño. *Seis calas en la expresión literaria española*. Madrid: Gredos, 1951.
- Alonso Cortés, Narciso. *Casos cervantinos que tocan a Valladolid*. Madrid: Junta para Ampliación de Estudios, 1916.
- Amezúa y Mayo, Agustín G. de. "Una carta desconocida e inédita de Cervantes." *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 34 (1954): 217-23.
- Anderson, Ellen M. "Role-Playing and Role-Change as Means of Self-Discovery in Selected Works of Cervantes." Diss. U of Toronto, 1986.
- Anon. *Question de amor de dos enamorados. Orígenes de la novela*. Ed. M. Menéndez y Pelayo. NBAE 7. Madrid: Bailly/Baillièere. II (1907): 41-98.
- Astrana Marín, Luis. *Vida ejemplar y heroica de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra*. Vol. 3. Madrid: Reus, 1951.
- Avalle-Arce, Juan Bautista. "La captura de Cervantes." *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 48 (1968): 237-80.
- . *Nuevos deslindes cervantinos*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1975.
- Benjumea, Nicolás Díaz de. *La verdad sobre el Quijote*. Madrid: Gaspar, 1878.

- Blanco Sánchez, Antonio. *Entre Fray Luis y Quevedo: en busca de Francisco de la Torre*. Madrid: Atlas, 1982.
- Blecuá, José Manuel. "Garcilaso y Cervantes." *Homenaje a Cervantes*. Madrid: Insula, 1947: 141–50.
- Buchanan, Milton A. "The Works of Cervantes and their Dates of Composition." *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 32 (1938): 23–39.
- Castro, Américo. *El pensamiento de Cervantes*. Ed. Julio Rodríguez-Puértolas. Barcelona: Noguer, 1972.
- Ceci, Giuseppe. "Il Palazzo Gravina." *Napoli Nobilissima* 6 (1897): 1–4, 24–31.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *La Galatea*. Ed. Juan Bautista Avall-arce. 2 vols. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1961.
- . *La Galatea*. Ed. Rudolph Schevill and Adolfo Bonilla. 2 vols. Madrid, 1914.
- . *La Galatea*. Trans. and ed. Bruna Cinti. *Tutte le opere*. Ed. Franco Meregalli. Milano: Mursia, 1971. I, 5–293.
- . *La Galatea*. Ed. Enriqueta Hors. Madrid: CIAP, 1931.
- . *Comedias y entremeses. Poesías sueltas*. Ed. Rudolph Schevill and Adolfo Bonilla. Vol. 6. Madrid, 1922: 3–107.
- . *Rinconete y Cortadillo*. Ed. Francisco Rodríguez Marín. Madrid, 1920.
- Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio. *Efemérides cervantinas*. Madrid, 1905.
- Fucilla, Joseph G. "A Rhetorical Pattern in Renaissance and Baroque Poetry." *Studies in the Renaissance* 3 (1956): 23–48.
- . *Estudios sobre el petrarquismo en España*. Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1960.
- Gálvez de Montalvo, Luis. *El pastor de Fílida. Orígenes de la novela*. Ed. M. Menéndez y Pelayo. NBAE 7. Madrid: Bailly/Baillièrre. II (1907): 399–484.
- Gil Polo, Gaspar. *Diana enamorada*. Ed. Rafael Ferreres. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1958.
- Heliodorus. *Historia etiópica de los amores de Teágenes y Cariclea*. Traducida en romance por Fernando de Mena. Ed. Francisco López Estrada. Madrid: Aldus, 1954.
- La Torre, Francisco de. *Poesías*. Ed. Alonso Zamora Vicente. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1956.
- Lainez (Layne), Pedro. *Poesías de Pedro Lainez*. Ed. Antonio Marín Ocete. Granada: U de Granada, 1950.
- . *Obras de Pedro Laynez*. Ed. Joaquín de Entrambasaguas. 2 vols. Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1951.
- López Estrada, Francisco. *Estudio crítico de La Galatea*. La Laguna de Tenerife: U de La Laguna, 1948.

- McCready, Warren T. "Cervantes and the 'Caballero Fonseca'." *Modern Languages Notes* 73 (1958): 33–35.
- Montemayor, Jorge de. *Los siete libros de la Diana*. Ed. Francisco López Estrada. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1946.
- Montoliu, Manuel de. *Cervantes y Barcelona*. Barcelona, 1947.
- Pérez Pastor, Cristóbal. *Bibliografía madrileña*. 3 vols. Madrid: Biblioteca Nacional, 1891–1907.
- Popescu-Telega, Alexandru. *Cervantes și Italia. Studiu de literaturi comparate*. Craiova: Ramuri [1931?].
- Riquer, Martín de. *Cervantes en Barcelona*. Barcelona: Sirmio, 1989.
- Rodríguez Marín, Francisco. *Barahona de Soto*. Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1903.
- Rotunda, Dominic P. "A Boccaccian Theme in the *Galatea* of Cervantes." *Romanic Review* 20 (1929): 245.
- Ruta, Caterina. "Le ottave di Cervantes per Antonio Veneziano e Celia." *Bolletino del Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani* 14 (1979): 1–17.
- . "Cervantes e i danni d'amore." *Quaderni di lingue e letterature straniere* 5–6 (1980–81): 199–214.
- Sannazaro, Jacobo. *Arcadia*. Ed. Michele Scherillo. Torino: Loescher, 1888.
- . *Arcadia*. Ed. Enrico Carrara. Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1948.
- Schevill, Rudolph. "Laínez, Figueroa and Cervantes." *Homenaje ofrecido a Menéndez Pidal*. Madrid: Hernando, 1925: I, 425–41.
- Sorieri, Louis. *Boccaccio's Story of Tito and Gisippo in European Literature*. New York: Institute of French Studies, 1937.
- Stagg, Geoffrey. "Revision in *Don Quixote*, Part I." *Hispanic Studies in Honour of I. González Llubera*. Oxford: Dolphin, 1959.
- . "Plagiarism in *La Galatea*." *Filologia Romanza* 6 (1959): 255–76.
- . "The Refracted Image: Porras and Cervantes." *Cervantes* 4 (1984): 139–53.
- . "The Composition and Revision of 'La española inglesa'." *Studies in Honor of Bruce W. Wardropper*. Ed. Dian Fox, Harry Sieber, Robert Ter Horst. Newark, Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta, 1989.
- Stegmann, Tilbert Diego. *Cervantes' Muster-Roman "Persiles."* *Epentheorie und Romanpraxis um 1600*. Hamburg: Lüdke, 1971.
- Torraca, Francesco. "Gl'imitatori stranieri di Iacopo Sannazaro." *Scritti vari*. Milano: Dante Alighieri, 1928. 111–210.
- Various. *Enciclopedia Italiana di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*. Treves: Treccani, 1933.
- Wellington, M. Z. "La *Arcadia* de Sannazaro y *La Galatea* de Cervantes." *Hispanófila* 3 (1959): 7–18.

