

De los osos seas comido: Sancho Panza as Intruder in the Discourse of the Hunt

MICHAEL HAMMER

IN CHAPTER 34 OF PART II, Don Quijote and Sancho Panza go hunting with the Duke and Duchess. In a typical big-game hunt of the period—known in Spanish as *montería*—trackers and dogs force a wild boar through the woods toward the hunting party, which takes up positions to wait for the animal to charge out. When the boar finally appears it is so large and frightening that Sancho takes refuge in the branch of a tree, which snaps under his weight. For this he is ridiculed, and soon finds himself debating the Duke on the merits of hunting. Later,¹ as evening falls and the hunting party is still in the forest, the hunters are treated to what appears to be a supernatural vision. Various enchanters from novels of chivalry arrive, bringing with them the enchanted Dulcinea herself. It is here that the great sage Merlin instructs Don Quijote and Sancho on how Dulcinea is to be disenchanting, much to the dismay of Sancho and “both of his broad buttocks, robust and large” (Grossman 692). Cervantes’s skill as a comic writer is well on display. He presents the reader with images of exquisite contrasts: tall, angular Don Quijote on his broken down Rocinante, of course, contrasts vividly with short, rotund, cowardly Sancho Panza, trotting on his donkey, and together the two present a striking contrast to the elegant Duke and Duchess.

Underpinning these comic contrasts are layers of irony and social

¹ At the end of Chapter 34 and into Chapter 35.

commentary, for all is not what it seems. After all, underneath her elegant skirts the Duchess oozes pus from open sores. For his part, the Duke himself is so deeply in debt to one of his own vassals that he is prevented from exercising justice in his territory. This is the context that frames the extraordinary conversation where Sancho, through his critique of the hunt, exposes the inadequacy of aristocrats like the Duke and Duchess. As Margaret Greer observes in her masterful exploration of the role of hunting imagery throughout *Don Quijote*, while ostensibly arguing about the merits of hunting, Sancho and the Duke are actually debating competing social visions. Greer writes that Sancho's humanistic objection to the hunt echoes Montaigne and ultimately Erasmus, giving Cervantes the chance to offer "a subtle critique of the ethos of the aristocracy" (216). This critique reveals that "an idle, self-absorbed and sometimes cruel aristocracy . . . no longer serves any defensive function that would justify its privileged status and that there is more true nobility and justice in Sancho's kindness and common-sense government" (Greer 218). Aristocratic privilege, like the elegant Duchess, is at best an empty façade.

Carroll Johnson, meanwhile, argues that Cervantes presents a series of social types throughout Part II, each of which represents a degenerate form of an earlier ideal. In Johnson's view, the Duke belongs in this "gallery of decadents," because he embodies a degraded version of aristocratic and knightly values, which are brought to the fore in the hunt episode. Johnson argues that in contrast to the Duke (and the rest of the "gallery of decadents"), Don Quijote emerges as the clear moral superior, indeed, the moral center of the entire novel (196).

I wish to look again at this episode, considering the hunt as social discourse and more specifically as a literary motif that transmits the codes of that discourse to the written page. The episode combines two elements—the *hunt* as precursor to a *vision*—that together form a well-established motif, which Cervantes makes full use of, to brilliant comic effect. The comic potential of the hunt as motif would not be possible without the hunt as discourse. As Greer notes, this discourse, which signifies a variety of exclusive aristocratic values, frames Sancho's social criticism. But I will argue that it is only by means of the hunt motif that Sancho is able to participate in an activity meant to exclude him and

converse with the Duke in the first place. The hunt motif in Part II occurs on two different narrative levels. First, The Duke and Duchess use the motif to create a piece of theater designed to humiliate Don Quijote and, especially, Sancho. But their use of the motif is subverted by Cervantes, who draws on the same literary resource to give Sancho a voice; it is only by means of the hunt motif that a discourse meant to exclude someone like Sancho ends up allowing him to speak. Sancho's important confrontation with the Duke occurs because the Duke himself is bound by the rules of his own fiction. The end result is exposure of the Duke and his ilk as frauds. This exposure is not revealed through any activity of Don Quijote, however. Therefore, in contrast to Johnson, I will argue that the real moral center of this episode is not Don Quijote, but Sancho Panza. Don Quijote in this context is at best morally neutral.

Before discussing the use of the hunt motif in Part II, it will be helpful to examine the hunt as power discourse. *Montería*, the type of hunting described by Cervantes in this episode, was understood to be the exclusive domain of nobility. In *montería*, as opposed to falconry, huntsmen, both mounted and on foot, chased down and killed game using hounds. Marcelle Thiébaux points out that the typical prey hunted in medieval literature is "the stag, together with the 'noble' boar" (19), although a third popular quarry seen in Spanish ballads and hunting manuals is the bear.² Such a hunt could be logistically complex, involving strategic placement of men and hounds.³ Sometimes the hunt could last well into the night, leaving men to camp in the field. Medieval theory held that suffering privation, facing danger, handling weapons, and strategic thinking were all essential training for knights. More than recreation, the hunt trained one for war. The *Libro de la montería*, a 14th-century hunting manual compiled by Alfonso XI of Castile, points out that "el cauallero deue sienpre vsar toda cosa que tanga a armas et a caualleria. Et quando non lo podiere vsar en guerra, deue lo sienpre vsar en las cosas que son semeiantes a ella" (3). The text goes on to explain that *montería*

2 See also Cummins 120-31.

3 Cummins (33-46) gives a detailed description of a stag hunt from the morning assembly of the hunters to the ritual butchery of the beast. A boar hunt would have been similar to a stag hunt (Cummins 98).

is similar to war because hunters must suffer cold and heat, stay out all night, get up early, sleep poorly, and go hungry and thirsty. They must even experience fear from time to time (Alfonso XI 3).

Though a medieval commonplace, this theory actually harks back to Xenophon in the 4th century B.C., who writes of a number of good hunting virtues:

First, when they march under arms on difficult roads, they will not become exhausted; for they will tolerate the hardship from having learnt to carry weapons for catching wild beasts. Secondly, they will be able to sleep rough and to be good guards of whatever they are instructed to watch over. . . . And in their approach to the enemy they will be able simultaneously to attack and to obey orders because this is how they themselves catch their quarry. (81)

The Duke will repeat much the same justification for the hunt in his conversation with Sancho (see below).

Yet the hunt served another valuable purpose: that of spectacle. It provided the powerful a chance to put themselves on display. Walter Burkert points out that in early societies where hunting was not necessary for survival it instead served as "a ritual status symbol. The pharaoh was celebrated as a hunter, as were his counterparts in Babylon and Ninevah . . . Of course, it was no longer a question of catching one's dinner, but purely a demonstration of the ruler's power to kill" (42-43). The principle remains the same in medieval Castile: the hunt has always belonged to power discourse, and the powerful have always made certain the weak do not partake of its benefits. Thus, the hunt not only puts the powerful on display, but also draws lines between the powerful and those without power. This exclusivity is part of the hunt's mystique, as the Duke later points out to Sancho.

Over time, the display was joined by a great deal of ritual governing every aspect of the hunt from beginning to end and the division of spoils. As Steven Mullaney notes, paraphrasing Michel Foucault: "Ritual and spectacle are not spontaneous; they are staged events, orchestrated manifestations of power, studied representatives of authority and

community. In early modern society power was inseparable from such public manifestations” (23). Although not scripted, the hunt is spectacle, a sort of theater in which society’s powerful and powerless, the high and the low, mingle in the performance of their respective roles. Ritual governs who leads the hunt, how it is carried out, how the animal is butchered, and who receives which portion of the animal. In his studies of the role of spectacle in power discourse, Teófilo F. Ruiz has stated that “this mixing of two levels of culture allowed for play, but it also served as a powerful means for instructing those below as to their social status, place and duties” (309). The hunt, like other forms of spectacle, allows play, but does so in a way that reinforces existing power structures.

The hunt, therefore, is an exclusive activity that enables nobles to practice the art of war, while displaying their power to those who have been excluded. It is important to note that this theory of the hunt has not been projected backwards onto the past by post-modern theorists, but was known and repeated by medieval and Renaissance practitioners themselves. Medieval didactic literature explicitly defines hunting as a noble activity. The *Libro de la montería* posits *montería* as the most chivalric form of hunting:

Et de todas las caças del mundo non a otra mas acostada a la caualleria que esta [montería], njn en que mas ande el omne en abito de cauallero andando a ninguna caça de las otras el mundo mas que en esta, por que anda de cauallo et trae arma en la mano. (3)

It is a noble sport, practiced by nobles, with noble rules; by its very nature it helps define the state of nobility itself.

Because the hunt is a marker of nobility, one of the primary functions of the hunt motif in literature is to identify its participants as noble. Naturally, this highly charged motif also brings to literature the entire history of exclusion and display discussed above.

The noble hunt was a staple of medieval literature, as Marcelle Thiébaux explains: “European literature between the eighth and the fifteenth centuries is full of casual allusions to hunts: Heroes hunt on the way to getting somewhere, they hunt as a means of showing their rank and

proWess, of seeking out their enemies in disguise, or of agreeably passing the time. A random episode easily culminates in a human encounter (17).” Because the hunt is a motif with a lengthy history rooted in noble culture, these “casual allusions” are loaded with connotations that do not have to be explicit to be appreciated. As the noble activity *par excellence*, the hunt and its participants signify nobility and the values associated with nobility.

But throughout its long history, the hunt motif has been used to signify much more. The hunt can stand as a metaphor for love (it requires little imagination to show how the chase, with its evocations of pursuit and penetration, can signify the pursuit of love),⁴ or it can signify religious searching.⁵ Edith Random Rogers traces a number of uses of the hunt motif in *The Perilous Hunt: Symbols in Hispanic and European Balladry*. She notes that in some ballads the hunt provides the setting for a future disaster. In others the hunt reveals omens that presage a disaster. She recounts a ballad of Rodrigo de Lara, for example, where the hero’s loss of his falcons foreshadows the “doom of the hunter” (21).

Cummins explains that the hunt was appealing to medieval writers because it allows the hero to be separated from his regular surroundings and “takes him into unfamiliar territory. In medieval fiction this new territory is not merely topographical, but emotional and sometimes moral” (74). Thus, the hunt sets the stage for an encounter to come. In the short version of the “Romance del Conde Arnaldos,” the hunt precedes an encounter wherein the hunter meets a sailor who sings a song that can calm the sea and make the fish leap from the water. When the Count seeks to learn the song, the sailor responds: “Yo no digo esta

4 For the literary connection between the hunt and love, see Thiébaux, especially chapters 3 and 4. See also Allen for a study of the love connotations of the chase in Renaissance literature, Gerli for a description of the erotic connotations of hunting imagery (particularly falcons), and Friedman for hunting images as symbolic of love in iconography.

5 See Thiébaux 59-66 for a discussion of the conversion of St. Eustace, where the hunted animal—a magnificent stag—turns out to be a divine messenger. Eustace is converted, along with his family, and is eventually martyred. See also Cummins 71-74 for more examples of the hunt as religious symbol.

canción / sino a quien conmigo va" (Bergua 19). While the hunt itself may not be magical, it serves as a catalyst for the magical experience. The hunt portends enlightenment.

The hunt very often leads to the supernatural, be it magical animals, fairies or enchanted maidens. Strikingly, for our purposes, Rogers describes variants of a group of ballads called "La infantina encantada," in which a solitary hunter comes across a maiden who must be disenchanting. Sometimes she has been changed into an animal, sometimes not. In every case, however, the hunter leaves to seek his mother's advice and loses his opportunity (Rogers 32-36). A similar scenario plays out in *Don Quijote*: the knight's hunt leads him to an encounter with the "enchanted" Dulcinea. The differences are also important to note, however: rather than hunt alone, Don Quijote forms a part of a hunting party, one whose purpose is to hold him and his squire up to ridicule.

The hunt in literature not only typically marks a character as noble, it can also comment on the quality of that character's nobility. An un-ironic use of the hunt attaches a positive value to the character's nobility. The "casual allusions" to the hunt mentioned by Thiébaux can establish that a character is a noble and worthy of our esteem, even in works where a hunt does not actually occur. In the first stanza of the *Cantar de Mio Cid*, the hero surveys his home for the last time before going into exile. He sees "puertas abiertas e uços sin cañados, / alcándaras vazías sin pieles e sin mantos / e sin falcones e sin adtores mudados" (11). His wistfulness as he contemplates the empty perches of his hawks and falcons is enough to establish the Cid's goodness and worth from the very beginning of the poem. More importantly, the birds of prey act as metonymic extensions of the Cid himself. The absent falcons signify the impending absence of the Cid from his homeland, the absence of a good and worthy nobleman.

Bad hunters, those who have let the hunt get the better of them or who are marked by greed or other unsportsmanlike conduct, tend to be flawed characters. According to Carol Wilkinson Whitney, bad hunters are motivated by selfish desires and often end as tyrants (Whitney 134). In this case, the hunt motif is used ironically and becomes a marker of their greed and selfishness, rather than their nobility. The death of the

Asturian king Favila, killed by a bear after a reign of only two years, is a prime example of the consequences of intemperate hunting. One ballad recounts, “Dos años lo tiene no más, / porque era muy liviano; / amaba mucho la caza, / mas que conviene a su estado; / corriendo la montería / un gran oso habie hallado; / matarle quieren los suyos; / Favila les ha mandado / que ninguno mate al oso, / que él sólo quiere matarlo. / Luego arremetió con él, / a los brazos han llegado; / mas por la su desventura / el oso lo habie matado” (Bergua 77). The ballad suggests that Favila brings about his own death through his selfishness. To flaunt his power (recall the social identifying role of the hunt mentioned earlier), the monarch bullies his way to the forefront of the hunt in an effort to steal the glory from his men. Favila pays the ultimate price for his egotism, an epitome of bad hunting.

Another sort of bad hunter is one who refuses to hunt according to his station. Carroll Johnson singles out as another member of his “gallery of decadents” from *Don Quijote II*: Don Diego de Miranda (the Caballero del Verde Gabán), who keeps a ferret for hunting rabbits instead of hunting with falcons and hounds. Johnson argues that Don Diego’s style of hunting represents a perversion of noble values. “Only two kinds of hunting were of any use to the aristocrat, and they are precisely those Don Diego refuses to practice,” Johnson writes (206).⁶

From the preceding it should be apparent that the hunt motif accomplishes three general literary tasks: it signals that a particular situation is significant and advises the reader that some sort of encounter (perhaps supernatural) is about to occur; it identifies certain characters as noble and comments on the nature of their nobility; finally, it draws upon an entire discourse of power and exclusion that can allow for interplay between high and low.

With this in mind, let us turn to Cervantes’s use of the hunt motif in Part II, 34, taking each of the conclusions above in order. As is so often the case, Cervantes’s use of this motif is drenched in irony. To begin with, the hunt in *Don Quijote* does indeed signal an encounter to come, but it

6 Contrast Johnson’s view with that of Greer, who sees in Don Diego a new and more humane form of knight (204-05).

is an encounter that functions on two narrative levels. First, it is a fiction⁷ devised by the Duke and Duchess, who are as avid readers of romance as Don Quijote himself. They take a common motif and use it as the structure on which to develop their elaborate subversion of chivalric romance. As in “La infantina encantada” the hunt leads to the hero’s encounter with an enchanted maiden. Following the hunt the members of the party are visited by a succession of enchanters, including Merlin, who reveals the manner in which Dulcinea is to be disenchanting. This is followed by a visit from Dulcinea herself. Rather than pay tribute to chivalric romance, the ducal fiction makes a mockery of everything those romances purport to value: from the sham Merlin to the tart-tongued “Dulcinea” (in reality a cross-dressing page boy), the “vision” to which the hunt points is dubious in the extreme. The Duke and Duchess clearly relish their roles as creators of this fiction, one designed to toy with Don Quijote, yes, but more particularly to humiliate Sancho. They bludgeon Sancho with the promise of an *insula* to make him acquiesce to Merlin’s bizarre and juvenile demand that he whip himself 3,300 times on his bare backside in order to disenchant Dulcinea (II, 35: 674). Ironically, as “authors” of the hunt and its theatrical aftermath, the Duke and Duchess are unaware that they are themselves characters in a larger fiction. Where the Duke and Duchess manipulate a well-known motif to shame Sancho, Cervantes does it to allow him to speak, and in the process subvert their degraded form of aristocratic discourse.

Next, the hunt signals the nobility of its participants, with the obvious exception of Sancho. The fact that he participates in a noble hunt presents the reader with an unusual opportunity to see high and low mingling on a more or less equal footing. Low-born people such as Sancho had long participated in noble hunts as beaters and dog handlers, but Sancho participates as one of the *monteros*, albeit mounted on an ass instead of a horse. Significantly, Sancho is offered a horse but chooses to ride his donkey. A horse is a more appropriate animal for a noble hunt than a donkey. That Sancho refuses this offer is a foreshadowing of the subversion to come. Prior to the hunt Sancho is provided with a hunting

7 Greer refers to it as theater (215-16).

costume made of expensive green cloth (green being a suitable color for hunting).⁸ The cost of the fabric confirms that this is clothing meant to separate the noble hunter from the lower class. Don Quijote receives the same offer, but opts instead to wear his armor. Thus, the participation of both Don Quijote and Sancho in the noble hunt, ostensibly as honored guests of the Duke and Duchess, can be read as an ironic statement about the other members of the hunting party. Each in his own way rejects some of the ritual trappings of the noble hunt, participants in but not fully of the discursive realm they have entered.

But it still must be recognized that Don Quijote is more at home in this environment than Sancho is.⁹ Even before his chivalric incarnation as Don Quijote, Alonso Quijano had been a hunter. We learn this in the very first paragraph: "Frisaba la edad de nuestro hidalgo con los cincuenta años; era de complexión recia, seco de carnes, enjuto de rostro, gran madrugador y amigo de la caza" (36). From the very beginning we learn that the *hidalgo* who is not yet Don Quijote has a lust for life that gets him out of bed early, and that he loves to hunt. Though poor, he lives the life of a true country gentleman and is well-acquainted with gentlemanly pastimes. As an *hidalgo*, Don Quijote is not of the high nobility, but as a gentleman he (along with the Duke and Duchess) is well-versed in the ways of the hunt and as a knight he is expected to know how to hunt. Of course, none of this is meant to imply that Don Quijote is not also the butt of the joke. He is, and will continue to be. But in his own mind, at least for the moment, he aligns himself more with the Duke and Duchess than with Sancho. We see this at the beginning of their stay in the ducal household, when Don Quijote truly feels like a knight errant for the first time. He is conscious of his surroundings and equally conscious of Sancho's deficiencies. He shows himself to be not only exasperated by Sancho, but embarrassed by him, making apologies for Sancho's vulgarities at every step of the way.¹⁰

8 See Cummins 178-79 for more on the clothing of huntsmen.

9 Greer 210-11 also makes this point.

10 See, for example, Don Quijote's chastisement of Sancho following the embarrassments of Chapter 31: "¿No adviertes, angustiado de ti, y malaventurado de mí, que si veen que tú eres un grosero villano, o un mentecato gracioso pensarán que yo soy algún

The one person who does not belong is Sancho Panza. From his physical appearance, to his steed, to his attitude about the hunt, Sancho is clearly an intruder in a special world. It is because of this that Sancho is chided by the Duke for being a bad hunter. Meanwhile, Don Quijote seems merely a bewildered bystander, watching while his world is adeptly hijacked by the Duke and mediated by Sancho. The contrast between Sancho and the other hunters marks him not only as the comic relief, but also as the moral center of the episode. His inclusion subverts the very values the hunt motif is meant to convey and casts into dubious light the nobility of his fellow hunters. He is derided as a bad hunter, but the implied question for the reader (one we will return to below) is, who is really the bad hunter? Or, put another way, if the hunt signals nobility, who is the true noble? In contrast to the despicable Duke and Duchess, the answer is clear: Sancho.

Finally, the hunt motif evokes the hunt discourse and the interplay between high and low which that discourse entails. The hunt in Part II is a planned, almost choreographed affair. The hunters arrive at a pre-selected spot, the various members of the hunting party are assigned positions and the hunt begins with loud sounding of horns and barking of dogs. Hierarchy is strictly observed. The Duke, Duchess, Don Quijote and Sancho, and other members of their party dismount and wait, while the huntsmen and dogs drive their quarry toward them.¹¹ Sancho, of course, hangs back, frightened, and eventually takes refuge up a tree when the large boar charges out. The ceremony accompanying the killing and butchery of the beast can be seen as the dead boar is placed on a mule and covered in sprigs of rosemary and myrtle branches “como en señal de victoriosos despojos,” (II, 34: 668) evoking the ritualized nature of the hunt and its aftermath. Every element, from the clothing to the placement of men to the triumphal carrying of the boar is governed by ritual. Noble and common come together, true, but they do so in an ordered way, with

echacuervos, o algún caballero de mohatra?” (II, 31: 646).

11 *Montería* could take various forms, depending on the quarry to be hunted and the region. According to Cummins, in Spain and Portugal, “the boar was driven towards lines of hunters waiting at *armadas* with bows, crossbows or spears, and additional dogs” (102).

every participant occupying his given place and performing according to the rules.

Sancho's inauspicious entrance into the power discourse leads to a frank discussion between him and the Duke about the hunt and its place in courtly society. The Duke has to preserve the fiction that his guests are worthy of his respect. Therefore, their conversation gives Sancho more latitude than he otherwise would have had. To Sancho the hunt is not only a waste of time, it is cruel, a critique that Greer identifies as kin to Montaigne and following "in the footsteps of Erasmus's satire of the violence of aristocratic society and its dedication to the hunt" (209). Sancho simply cannot understand why any man would want to confront a dangerous animal that has not done any harm, and possibly get killed himself in the process.¹² The Duke's response sounds like a paraphrase of the passage from the *Libro de la montería* quoted above:

[E]l ejercicio de la caza de monte es el más conveniente y necesario para los reyes y príncipes que otro alguno. La caza es una imagen de la guerra: hay en ella estratagemas, astucias, insidias para vencer a su salvo al enemigo; padécense en ella fríos grandísimos y calores intolerables, menoscábase el ocio y el sueño, corroboráanse las fuerzas agilitáanse los miembros del que la usa, y, en resolución, es ejercicio que se puede hacer sin perjuicio de nadie y con gusto de muchos; y lo mejor que él tiene es que no es para todos, como lo es el de los otros géneros de caza, excepto el de la volatería, que también es sólo para reyes y grandes señores. Así que, ¡oh Sancho!, mudad de opinión, y cuando seáis gobernador, ocupaos en la caza y veréis como os vale un pan por ciento. (II, 34: 668)

The speech is both ordinary and extraordinary in its implications. Ordinary, because its justification for the hunt is what had long been a commonplace. Extraordinary because—to his face—the Duke tells

12 Sancho is not alone in thinking so, as the boar was an extremely dangerous quarry, especially to hunters on foot. Gaston Phoebus, author the *Libre de chasse*, wrote of the folly of dismounting during a boar hunt: "It is perilous indeed to put oneself at risk of death or maiming to gain so little honour or profit, for I have seen good knights, squires and servants die by doing so" (qtd. in Cummins 101).

Sancho that the best part about the hunt is that people like Sancho cannot participate. It is an exclusionary activity meant to highlight the differences between the rulers and the ruled in society. While spoken in such a way that Sancho seems included among the powerful—at least for the moment—the real meaning of the Duke’s words do not seem lost on Sancho, who replies frankly, but still as an intruder:

Eso no . . . el buen gobernador, la pierna quebrada, y en casa. ¡Buena sería que viniesen los negociantes a buscarle fatigados, y él estuviese en el monte holgándose! ¡Así enhoramala andaría el gobierno! Mía fe, señor, la caza y los pasatiempos más han de ser para los holgazanes que para los gobernadores. En lo que yo pienso entretenerme es en jugar al triunfo envidado las pascuas, y a los bolos los domingos y fiestas; que esas cazas ni cazos no dicen con mi condición, ni hacen con mi conciencia. (II, 34: 668-69)

Sancho’s point of view resonates in certain circles even today: a good governor should be available to his constituents and not spend too much time at leisure. If nothing else, Sancho is giving voice to values quite at odds with those of the Duke—or Don Quijote. After all, Sancho seems to be accusing noble hunters of a sort of idleness, which ironically is the antithesis of the virtue of the hunt as expressed in the hunting manuals.

Clearly the Duke regards Sancho as a bad hunter, with all the negative connotations that might imply. But we return to the ironic question that lies at the heart of this conversation: which of these two is really the bad hunter? While the surface text holds up Sancho’s inept hunting for ridicule, his words, juxtaposed against the Duke’s, reveal that Sancho is more astute than he seems to the condescending Duke. Earlier Sancho has quoted two lines from a *pliego suelto*: “De los osos seas comido / como Favila el nombrado” (II, 34: 668).¹³ He speaks these words in response to a comment by the Duchess, but the Duke is also present, and I think we are justified in considering this a part of the

¹³ As Fajardo and Parr indicate (668 n. 11), this reference comes from *Maldiciones de Salaya*, a *pliego suelto* containing couplets in which a master curses his servants, along with romances of Fernán González and the Cid.

overall conversation with the Duke. To this, Don Quijote interjects that Favila had been a Gothic king who was eaten by a bear. But what is left unsaid both by Don Quijote (who misses the point) and by Sancho Panza (who surely does not) is why Favila was eaten by the bear: Recall that he reaped the rewards for being a greedy, selfish and intemperate hunter. The subjunctive *seas* indicates that the out-of-context verses that Sancho utters would translate “May you be eaten by bears like Favila el nombrado.” Sancho is not merely recalling what happened to Favila, as Don Quijote seems to think. He is suggesting that Favila’s fate might, and perhaps should, be shared by the Duke. Here Sancho speaks for the non-hunters, the have-nots of society, and all but declares that the Duke, like Favila, is a bad hunter. The connotation, of course, is that selfishness and tyranny during the hunt reflects a ruler’s character in other areas as well. Rather than practice the hunt worthily, as Sancho has slyly pointed out, the Duke is using the sport to exercise his own brand of tyranny upon his guests, first in the chase, then later in the vision and its aftermath. Consciously or unconsciously Sancho has uttered a political statement. It is not just the noble pastime he is criticizing, but the practitioners themselves, useless creatures whose empty lives revolve around devotion to forms that have long since expired.

In his conversation with Sancho the Duke reveals a side of himself that seems just as dependent on an idealized view of the past as Don Quijote is. The knightly virtues that the Duke associates with the hunt were already old when they appeared in the *Libro de la montería*, more than two centuries before the time the Duke is speaking. By now those values have long since been out of date. Although the Duke would like to think his use of the hunt places him in a position of power, times have changed: the Duke himself owes money to one of his own vassals. As Johnson observes: “The official and visible social order has been subverted. There exists an invisible order, a deviant version of the visible one, which renders its proper operation impossible. A non-aristocrat is richer than the duke” (203). Power in society is beginning to be expressed by other means, and this can perhaps be symbolized by Sancho himself, who sees his new green hunting clothes as a commodity to sell, rather than a noble symbol (II, 34: 667). The hunt motif allows non-hunter Sancho to speak

common sense, while the Duke is revealed as a selfish anachronism.

As in the earlier uses of the hunt motif discussed by Rogers, Don Quijote's hunt is the precursor to a vision. The vision of the enchanted Dulcinea, of course, provides the impetus for much that is to follow, including the development of Don Quijote's and Sancho's relationship, and for that reason alone this episode must be considered a pivotal passage in the novel. But the value of this episode does not lie solely in its function as a plot device, for underlying the encounter with the Duke and Duchess is a current of tension that receives its fullest expression through the mechanism of the hunt. The hunt motif allows two widely divergent segments of society to converge, and the tension created by this convergence allows for pointed social commentary. This occurs at two levels, both of which make use of the hunt motif to subvert traditional chivalric discourse. The Duke and Duchess see in Don Quijote a fool who clings to outdated values extracted from dubious sources and have designed a chivalric experience meant to expose his folly. But Cervantes subverts the ducal discourse by inserting an intruder who is allowed to speak his mind by virtue of the very motif that the Duke and Duchess are attempting to manipulate. The ensuing conversation reveals that they are as mad as Don Quijote, for they, too, are living in the past, oblivious to the world around them.¹⁴ Meanwhile, as a representative of his class, Sancho Panza acquits himself rather well. It is Sancho who enters into the ancient power discourse of the aristocratic hunt and finds it absurd, while the Duke reveals himself to be living a self-indulgent, anachronistic lie.

SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY
mhammer@sfsu.edu

¹⁴ Johnson's comment regarding Don Diego Miranda seems to apply to the Duke as well: "He occupies a certain historical time in which the values and indeed the mission and *raison d'être* of his class had ceased to exist, but nothing had come along to replace them. Instead of the future, there is only a degraded version of the past" (208).

Works Cited

- Alfonso XI. *Libro de la montería*. Ed. Dennis Seniff. Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1983.
- Allen, Michael J. B. "The Chase: The Development of a Renaissance Theme." *Comparative Literature* 20.4 (1968): 301-312.
- Bergua, José, ed. *Romancero español: colección de romances selectos desde el siglo XIV hasta nuestros días*. Madrid: Ediciones Ibéricas, 1956.
- Burkert, Walter. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Trans. Peter Bing. Berkeley: U of California P, 1972.
- Cantar de Mio Cid*. Ed. Alberto Montaner. Barcelona: Crítica, 2000.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Eds. Salvador Fajardo and James A. Parr. Asheville, NC: Pegasus, 1998.
- Cummins, John. *The Hound and the Hawk: The Art of the Medieval Hunting*. 1988. London: Phoenix, 2001.
- Friedman, Mira. "The Falcon and the Hunt: Symbolic Love Imagery in Medieval and Renaissance Art." *Poetics of Love in the Middle Ages: Texts and Contexts*. Eds. Moshe Lazar and Norris J. Lacy. Fairfax, Virginia: George Mason UP, 1989. 157-183.
- Gerli, E. Michael. "Calisto's Hawk and the Images of a Medieval Tradition." *Romania* 104 (1983): 83-101.
- Greer, Margaret R. "Diana, Venus and Borrowed Dogs: On Hunting in *Don Quijote*." *Cervantes y su mundo III*. Eds. A. Robert Lauer and Kurt Reichenberger. Kessel: Reichenberger, 2005. 201-21.
- Grossman, Edith, trans. *Don Quijote*. By Miguel de Cervantes. 2003. New York: Ecco-Harper Collins, 2005.
- Johnson, Carroll B. "A Gallery of Decadents: Society in *Don Quijote*, Part II." *Indiana Journal of Hispanic Literatures* 5 (1994): 195-211.
- Mullaney, Steven. *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.
- Rogers, Edith Random. *The Perilous Hunt: Symbols in Hispanic and European Balladry*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1980.
- Ruiz, Teófilo F. "Elite and Popular Culture in Late Fifteenth-Century Castilian Festivals: The Case of Jaen." *City and Spectacle Medieval Europe*. Eds. Barbara A. Hanawalt and Kathryn L. Reyerson. Medieval Studies in Minnesota 6. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994. 296-318.
- Thiébaux, Marcelle. *The Stag of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1974.
- Xenophon. "On Hunting." *Xenophon and Arrian on Hunting*. Trans. A. A. Phillips and M. M. Willcock. Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips, 1999. 33-89.
- Whitney, Carol Wilkinson. "The Hunted Hunter of the Alliterative Morte Arthure." *Mediaevalia* 14 (1988): 179-199.