



Don Quijote and the Romances of Chivalry: The Need for a Reexamination

Daniel Eisenberg

Hispanic Review, Volume 41, Issue 3 (Summer, 1973), 511-523.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0018-2176%28197322%2941%3A3%3C511%3ADQATRO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-D>

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

Hispanic Review is published by The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/hr.html>.

Hispanic Review

©1973 The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2003 JSTOR

DON QUIJOTE AND THE ROMANCES OF CHIVALRY: THE NEED FOR A REEXAMINATION

SINCE Don Quijote was, above all things, a man who had read a great deal, it hardly seems possible to reach a satisfactory understanding of his personality without rereading some of his favorite books. Moreover, no satire can be adequately appreciated without a systematic study of the object it ridicules. Yet in recent years scholars have neglected the study of the *Quijote* in the light of the romances of chivalry that inspired Cervantes and his hero. Specialists in the romances of chivalry, such as Pascual de Gayangos and Sir Henry Thomas, have not considered themselves knowledgeable enough about Cervantes to attempt it. Cervantine scholars, on the other hand, have usually lacked access to the texts of the romances.¹

For our knowledge of the subject we must go back to the only study which claimed to be comprehensive, that of Diego Clemencín. Clemencín, who, for the moment, remains the person best acquainted with the romances of chivalry since the seventeenth century, began in 1833 the publication of his monumental edition of the *Quijote*, a project that was completed by friends after his death. In the notes which accompany his text is a vast amount of information about the

¹ Those romances that have been reprinted in modern times have received some study; *El "Amadis" y el "Quijote"* is the title of a monograph, though far from a definitive one, by P. Félix Olmedo (Madrid: Nacional, 1947). On the *Sergas* we have the article of María Rosa Lida cited below (n. 24), and S. Gili Gaya's "*Las Sergas de Esplandián* como crítica de la caballería bretona," *BBMP*, 23 (1947), 103-11. The facsimile reprint of *Claribalte* made possible the studies of Guido Mancini, "Sul *Don Claribalte* di Fernández de Oviedo," *Annali dell'Università di Padova: Facoltà di Lingue in Verona*, Serie II, 1 (1966), 3-21, and of Daymond Turner, "Oviedo's *Claribalte*: The First American Novel," *RN*, 6 (1964), 65-68, although neither of these knew the study of Antonello Gerbi, "El *Claribalte* de Oviedo," *Fénix*, 6 (1949), 378-90, who worked with a photocopy of a photocopy of the original. Accompanying the edition of *Palmerín de Olivia* of Giuseppe di Stefano (Pisa: Istituto di Letteratura Spagnola e Hispano-americana dell'Università di Pisa, 1966), are two important volumes of studies: Guido Mancini's *Introduzione al "Palmerín de Olivia,"* and *Saggi e ricerche*, a volume of articles on various aspects of the work, though in neither of these is the question of the work's influence on Cervantes discussed directly. Edwin Place's "*Cervantes and the Amadis*," *Hispanic Studies in Honor of Nicholson B. Adams* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966), pp. 131-40, has little substance.

romances of chivalry. As he believed one of the main functions of literary criticism to be the study of a work's sources, he attempted to read as many as possible of the books Cervantes knew, including all those romances of chivalry he could obtain. Access to various private libraries made his project possible.²

Francisco Rodríguez Marín has done much to deny Clemencín the position in Cervantine and chivalric criticism to which he is entitled. In his edition of *Don Quijote*, the most important one of this century, he criticizes in some detail, and sometimes with evident relish, Clemencín's shortcomings, often those in the field of language.³ This is not a serious fault; it is, after all, an essential part of criticism to note the mistakes of one's predecessors. More disturbing, however, is that Rodríguez Marín not only does not add significantly to our knowledge of the romances of chivalry (which, as Director of the Biblioteca Nacional, he was well equipped to do), he takes, as it were, a step backward by not including in his notes many of Clemencín's valuable comments. For example, when Don Quijote, upon taking his chivalric name *Caballero de la Triste Figura*, explains that he does so to be like the famous knights of old, who had similar names, "cuál se llamaba el de la Ardiente Espada, cuál, el del Unicornio, aquél, el de las Doncellas, aqueste, el del Ave Fénix, el otro, el Caballero del Grifo, estotro, el de la Muerte" (I, 19), Clemencín identifies the knights these names refer to.⁴ This kind of help will not, however, be found in Rodríguez Marín's notes, where there is only a

² Martín de Riquer draws heavily on Clemencín's notes in his discussion of the sources of the *Quijote* in his *Aproximación al "Quijote,"* 2nd ed. (Barcelona: Teide, 1967). Less known than Clemencín's edition of the *Quijote* (reprinted, with numerous errata, by Ediciones Castilla [2nd ed. ?], 1966), but none the less valuable, is his monograph *Biblioteca de libros de caballerías*. It consists of bibliographical notes on the romance of chivalry, which were meant to serve as the basis for a supplementary volume to his edition of the *Quijote*. Made early in the nineteenth century, they remained in manuscript until published by the Cervantist and bibliophile D. Juan Sedó (*Biblioteca de libros de caballerías. Año 1806*. Publicaciones cervantinas, 3 [Barcelona, 1942]).

³ See Américo Castro's review of Rodríguez Marín's edition, in *RFE*, 4 (1917), 393-401.

⁴ Amadis de Grecia, Belianis de Grecia, a knight in the *Caballero de la Cruz*, and Florarlán de Tracia are, respectively, the first four. The *Caballero de la Muerte* was also Amadis de Grecia. His identification of the *Caballero del Grifo*, taken from Bowle, is unsatisfactory; it has since been established that it refers to a knight in *Philesbián de Candaria* (see the present author's "Búsqueda y hallazgo de *Philesbián de Candaria*," *Miscelánea Barcinonensia*, 11 [1972], 147-57).

comment on a change he introduced in the text. Twice in *Don Quijote* we find mention of Lirgandeo: in I, 43, where Don Quijote invokes him, along with Alquife, and in II, 34, where he is one of the figures in the procession at the ducal palace. Clemencín, but not Rodríguez Marín, identifies him as a *sabio* who appears in the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros*. These are not isolated examples, but reflect a clear tendency on the part of Rodríguez Marín to give only the unavoidable minimum of treatment to chivalric material in his notes.⁵

To be able to evaluate Clemencín's treatment of the romances of chivalry from a quantitative standpoint we need to establish how many romances of chivalry Cervantes was familiar with. At the same time we can discuss the extent of Cervantes' acquaintance if we pause to consider how many romances of chivalry there were, a question that cannot be decided with certainty. Thomas' chronological list at the beginning of Chapter v of *Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry* (Cambridge, 1920) includes 39, excluding Portuguese works and sequels of the same title. To this number we should add two works which Cervantes believed to be Spanish, although we know now they are not, *Palmerín de Inglaterra* and *Tirante el Blanco*,⁶ and two works which Thomas was unaware of, *Lidamante de Armenia*, of Dámaso de Frías (1590),⁷ and *Rosión de Castilla*, of Joaquín Romero de Cepeda (Lisboa: Marcos Borges, 1586).⁸

Of these, many are mentioned by name in the *Quijote*. A considerable number are discussed in the *escrutinio de la librería*: the

⁵ This difference in focus between Clemencín and Rodríguez Marín goes much deeper than an attempt on the part of the latter to enlarge himself at the former's expense (although that was a factor as well), but rather reflects the dichotomy in literary criticism between those who believe that the study of sources is a legitimate form of criticism, and those who do not. Rodríguez Marín tried to find sources for Cervantes' literary works in contemporary history; his discoveries, like the similar ones of Luis Astrana, remain controversial.

⁶ For Cervantes, of course, Martorell's work was Castilian; the translation of 1511 nowhere indicates the work's original language, nor that it was a translation. Likewise, it does not mention the work's authors; in the discussion of the *Tirante* in *Don Quijote* I, 6, the author can only be referred to as "el que le compuso." Clemencín knew the *Tirant* only in the Italian translation.

⁷ This work is cited by Clemencín (see n. 2). On the author see Narciso Alonso Cortés, *Miscelánea vallisoletana*, 2nd ed. (Valladolid: Miñón, 1955), I, 225-30.

⁸ See A. Rodríguez-Moñino, *Curiosidades bibliográficas* (Madrid: Langa y Compañía, 1946), pp. 7-16.

founder of the genre in Spain, the *Amadís de Gaula*, as well as its offspring, the *Sergas de Esplandián* and *Amadís de Grecia*; *Olivante de Laura*, *Lepolemo* (*El Caballero de la Cruz*), *Florismarte* (for *Felixmarte*) *de Hircania*, the *Espejo de caballeros*, half Italian and half Spanish,⁹ *Palmerín de Olivia* and his descendents *Platir* and *Palmerín de Inglaterra*, and *Belianís de Grecia*. Elsewhere in the *Quijote* we find reference to the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros* (*El Caballero del Febo* [I, 1]), *Cirongilio de Tracia* (I, 32), *Lisuarte de Grecia* (II, 1), and the works of Feliciano de Silva (I, 1), by which we are to understand the popular "dezeno" and "onzeno del Amadís," *Florisel de Niquea* and *Rogel de Grecia*,¹⁰ not the earlier, less popular works which are today accepted as his.¹¹

It does not necessarily follow, of course, that because the name of a book or a character is cited, that that book has been read. In many cases, however, together with the names of the chivalric romances there is additional information which shows that Cervantes had at least a superficial, and in some cases a substantial, acquaintance with the book in question. For example, it is certain that Cervantes knew more of the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros* than the name of its protagonist, since in the introductory sonnet from the *Caballero del Febo* he refers to several incidents in the work. The innkeeper in I, 32 tells several details about his books; Cervantes knew enough of *Belianís de Grecia* to know how fiery its protagonist was, and how miraculous the cures he received. Cervantes' knowledge of *Tirante el Blanco* was so thorough that he remembered the insignificant character Fonseca.¹²

The other alternative—if one assumes that Cervantes' acquaint-

⁹ This work is discussed for the first time by Maxime Chevalier, in *L'Arioste en Espagne* (Bordeaux: Institut d'Études Ibériques et Ibéro-américaines de l'Université de Bordeaux, 1966), pp. 172-75.

¹⁰ This book is also mentioned in I, 24.

¹¹ Henry Thomas has pointed out that Silva's name appears on some late editions of Book IX of the *Amadís* series, and has offered evidence that the author of Book IX was also the author of Book VII. But even if Cervantes knew this, the convoluted conversations ("intricadas razones"), which were the feature that Don Quijote so highly admired, appear for the first time in Book X. I hope to discuss this change in Silva's style on another occasion.

¹² It was not, as was suggested by W. T. McCreedy, "Cervantes and the Caballero Fonseca," *MLN*, 73 (1958), 33-35, because he opened the book at random, but intended to illustrate his opinion of the book (on which see my forthcoming article "Pero Pérez the Priest and His Comment on *Tirant lo Blanch*," *MLN*, 83 [1973]).

ance with the romances of chivalry was slight—is to believe that he picked as the subject for a satirical work a type of literature he knew little or nothing about, and that to find the points he was going to make fun of he inquired among all his friends as to what struck them as particularly ridiculous about the romances of chivalry. Humorists do not work this way, at least not great ones; besides which, near the end of the sixteenth century, if one were to learn anything about the romances of chivalry, one had to read them for oneself. In literary circles, few people in Spain paid them the slightest attention.

It is also clear, even from those titles that are explicitly mentioned in the *Quijote*, that Cervantes' interest in the romances of chivalry led him to investigate the subject seriously, and not to be satisfied with perusing those books that were easily obtainable. We see that he was acquainted with the later romances, such as *Olivante de Laura*, as well as the classics of the genre. That he knew *Tirante el Blanco* is, however, quite surprising, for the work was not popular in Castile, was never reprinted, and was soon forgotten.¹³ *Platir*—as the priest remarks, an “antiguo libro”—reposed in similar oblivion.

We may well pause a moment to wonder how and where Cervantes was able to read these books, since he was of modest means, and they were not cheap; Don Quijote had to sell “muchas hanegas de tierra de sembradura” to obtain the money to support his addiction. As Don Quijote must have had trouble obtaining these books in La Mancha, no more a cultural center then than it is now, so Cer-

¹³ Although, as Riquer says, “A Itàlia el Tirant lo Blanc fruí de certa acceptació” (*Tirant lo Blanch*, ed. Riquer [Barcelona: Selecta, 1949], I, *180), he neglects to draw the conclusion implied by this statement, which is, that in Castile it did not. In fact, aside from Cervantes, it is only mentioned by some moralists whose acquaintance with it was slight, if any: Vives, and several who copied him, and Jerónimo de San Pedro, who punned on the name in the introduction to his *Caballería celestial*. It is true that many of the romances of chivalry were never mentioned by anybody—there was little occasion to—but if the *Tirant* had been a well-known work we might have found it discussed by Juan de Valdés in the *Diálogo de la lengua*, written not much later, mentioned by Román Ramírez (see n. 34 to my “Who Read the Romances of Chivalry?,” *KEQ*, 20 [1973], 209–33), or cited in Lope's list in *Las fortunas de Diana* (see Rodríguez Marín, *Don Quijote*, nueva edición crítica, I [Madrid: Atlas, 1947], 192, note), or we might have found the title character a figure in the presentations of famous knights which occur in the later romances, such as in the introductions to *Olivante de Laura* and to Part III of the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros* (see also Irving Leonard, *Books of the Brave* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1949], pp. 15, 106, and 107, and notes 18 and 19 to my “Who Read . . .” article, cited above).

vantes, even had he had the money, would have found it difficult to buy these obscure books of several generations before. All this leads to the suggestion that Cervantes might not have purchased the books himself, but rather read them in some collection, accumulated when the romances of chivalry were in their heyday. This would be even more likely if it is true that Cervantes "discovered" the romances of chivalry not, as many readers did, when young, to despise them in maturity, but when he was already middle-aged, and further removed from the height of the genre's popularity.

Of the romances of chivalry mentioned by name in the *Quijote*, and which must therefore be examined first as possible Cervantine sources, there are no less than four which Clemencín was unable to examine. One of these, *Platir*, is exceedingly rare. The other three are also rare, but no more so than the other romances; they are *Felismarte de Hircania*, *Cirongilio de Tracia*, and Feliciano de Silva's *Florisel de Niquea*, Book x of the *Amadís* series. He does not conceal the fact that he was unable to locate copies of these.¹⁴ He attempted to make up for it by reading many works which are not mentioned by name. He found evidence that Cervantes knew at least one romance of chivalry not referred to by name, and Rodríguez Marín found similar evidence for another. In the discussion which the canon from Toledo has with Don Quijote about the romances of chivalry, he states: "¿Qué ingenio, si no es del todo bárbaro e inculto, podrá contentarse leyendo que una gran torre llena de caballeros va por la mar adelante como nave con próspero viento, y hoy anochece en Lombardía y mañana amanezca en tierras del Preste Juan de las Indias, o en otras que ni las describió Tolomeo, ni las vio Marco Polo?" (I, 47). This is, as Clemencín correctly noted, an explicit reference to the romance *Florambel de Lucea*, first published in 1532 and reprinted in 1548.

Rodríguez Marín's discovery is particularly striking because he made it by accident. While arranging books for a Cervantine exhibition, he happened to open *at random* a copy of Book iv of *Clarín de Landanís*, also a work never mentioned by Cervantes, and found in it no less than a *Caballero de la Triste Figura*, as well as a *Caballero de los Espejos* (one of the names used by Sansón Carrasco). Who

¹⁴ See notes 15 and 25 to I, 32. Particularly helpful in assessing the extent of his knowledge of the romances of chivalry are some of his longer notes, in which he gives examples of a phenomenon from all the books he has read (note 14 to I, 49; note 32 to I, 19; note 27 to II, 17).

knows what he would have found if he had read the book all the way through! As it was, he contented himself with perusing “una buena parte.”¹⁵

Although other romances of chivalry not mentioned in the *Quijote* might not yield such surprises, certainly the time has come to fill the holes in Clemencín’s work, and to make as complete a survey as possible of the entire corpus of Spanish romances, as we now know it.¹⁶ It is, however, equally important to realize that much of the work which Clemencín did do cannot be said to be adequate by modern standards; little criticism of the early nineteenth century is. In many cases he was working under a handicap, in that he had to refer to books he had read and made notes on many years before, and

¹⁵ “El Caballero de la Triste Figura y el de los Espejos: Dos notas para el *Quijote*,” *BRAE*, 2 (1915), 129-36, reprinted in his *Estudios cervantinos* (Madrid: Atlas, 1947), pp. 373-79. Certainly *Phileasbián de Candaria* is another example of a romance Cervantes knew, which is never mentioned by name in the *Quijote* (see my article cited in n. 4).

¹⁶ Rather than specify all those romances which Cervantes had contact with, it is safer to proceed in the opposite direction and eliminate those he did not know, reserving judgment on the others. We may tentatively conclude that he was not familiar with *Florisanda*, Book VI of the Amadís series, not only because it was an early work, but because it is so different in intent and content that it would have been mentioned during one of the discussions of the romances in the *Quijote* (see Maxime Chevalier, “Le roman de chevalerie morigéné. *Le Florisanda*,” *BHi*, 60 [1958], 441-49). Menéndez Pelayo, who saw a source for Sancho Panza in the *Caballero Cifar* (*Orígenes de la novela*, second “edición nacional” [Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1962], I, 311-13), considered it “imposible que Cervantes no conociera [el *Cifar*]” (“Cultura literaria de Miguel de Cervantes y elaboración del *Quijote*,” in *San Isidoro, Cervantes y otros estudios*, Colección Austral, 2nd ed. [Buenos Aires: Espasa-Calpe, 1944], p. 116), but there is no reason to suppose that he did (as is confirmed by Schevill and Bonilla, in their edition of the *Quijote*, I [Madrid, 1928], 416); it too might well have been mentioned, as it was an old book, and therefore of interest to Cervantes. (The *Cifar* as an origin for Sancho is also rejected by W. S. Hendrix, “Sancho Panza and the Comic Types of the Sixteenth Century,” *Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal*, II [Madrid, 1925], 485-94, and by F. Márquez Villanueva, “Sobre la génesis literaria de Sancho Panza,” *ACerv.* 7 [1958], 123-55.) At the other extreme, it is true, as Rodríguez Marín points out, that Cervantes was in Valladolid in 1602, when *Policisne de Boecia* was published in that city, but this does not prove that he knew it before writing Part I of *Don Quijote*; he was short on friends, shorter on money, and probably in no mood to read this mediocre work. There is, in any event, nothing in Part I that reflects the work; Rodríguez Marín’s discovery in it of the source of Micomicona’s story merely reveals his ignorance of things chivalric. To say that it was *Policisne de Boecia* which caused a dismayed Cervantes to expand his *novela ejemplar* into a full-length work is irresponsible speculation (*Don Quijote*, ed. cit. in note 13, IX, 53-56).

which he could not readily consult again. Thus, we find notes like the following: "De la amistad de Alquífe con Urganda, con quien vino a casar en segundas nupcias, se habla largamente, no me acuerdo bien si en la historia de Esplandián o en la de Amadís de Grecia."¹⁷ Clemencín also lacked many critical tools which we take for granted. He was unaware of problems of style, oral and written, so that we still know only through intuition the extent to which Cervantes (and Don Quijote) used chivalric language.¹⁸ He was aware of plot only in the gross sense of the adventures Don Quijote undertook or underwent; minor episodes and exchanges, and the sources for them, he often did not discuss.

We should also note that Clemencín did not particularly like the romances of chivalry, and read them only out of dedication to the *Quijote*. He believed that Cervantes wrote the *Quijote* to banish the romances of chivalry, and comments at length on Cervantes' apparent justification in doing so in the prologue to his commentary. It is not without significance that one of Clemencín's longest notes elaborates on the "desaforados disparates" which the Toledan canon had said the romances of chivalry were full of. It begins: "¿De qué género los quiere el lector? ¿históricos, geográficos, cronológicos? ¿ponderaciones monstruosas, relaciones absurdas, desatinos contrarios a la razón, y al sentido común? De todo hay con abundancia en los libros caballerescos . . ." (note 34 to I, 47). This point of view led him to make a number of unfavorable and much-repeated comments on the romances of chivalry, such as his succinct condemnation of the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros* as "pesado" and "fastidioso" (note 16d to I, 1), or his note on the many wounds which Belianís de Grecia received: "Sólo en los dos primeros libros de los cuatro de que consta, se cuentan ciento y una heridas graves, y probablemente son más las de los dos libros que siguen; pero no me ha alcanzado la paciencia para contarlas, y no ha sido menester poca para hacerlo en los dos primeros" (note 11 to I, 1). It probably affected his commentary in ways much more profound than this.

A number of discoveries about the *Quijote* made in the course of a preliminary sampling of the romances of chivalry provide further

¹⁷ I, 43, note 30. (The work in question is the latter.)

¹⁸ Unfortunately the dissertation of Howard Mancing, "Chivalric Language and Style in *Don Quijote*" (Diss. University of Florida 1970), is of limited value because the author assumed the *Amadís* to be representative linguistically of the Spanish romances of chivalry, which is by no means the case.

evidence of the need for a methodical study. One of the funniest adventures in the book, that in which Maritornes leaves Don Quijote dangling by one arm at the inn, might well have been inspired by a similar episode in *Cirongilio de Tracia*.¹⁹ This romance (as stated above, one which Clemencín was unable to obtain) is no more than named by Gayangos²⁰ and Menéndez Pelayo;²¹ Thomas speaks of it only to subject it to his usual ridicule.²² Although we need not agree with the author of the book's colophon, who claimed that the language of the work could be said to surpass Ciceronian Latin, the book is not devoid of merit, and the author makes, at times, a distinct effort to attain a refined style.

The episode in question is the following: in *Cirongilio*, a certain knight delights in playing tricks on others, and is named the Metabolic Knight, the author (confusing the word with “metamorphic”) tells us, because of the disguises he uses in carrying out his tricks (III, 12). Dressed as a girl, he succeeds in robbing the horses of two knights, by means of a series of deceptions (III, 13). They have no choice but to buy their own horses back from him, and outside his castle offer to do so. The Metabolic Knight refuses to open the castle doors, but from a tower lowers a basket on a rope for a squire to be pulled up, along with the money. Having pulled the squire halfway up, he ties the rope securely and goes off and leaves him (III, 14). The squire manages to escape by using the money to bribe one of the castle servants to lower him. The same servant lets the knights into the castle, and they, with considerable amusement, take their revenge on the Metabolic Knight by suspending him with ropes by his wrists.²³

Another discovery has to do with the Cave of Montesinos, a central episode of Part II of the *Quijote*. It casts additional doubt on Clemencín's reliability since its source is found in a work which he supposedly studied. Among other examples of caves, Clemencín

¹⁹ Rodríguez Marín, in commenting on this passage, could only point to a legal practice.

²⁰ In the “Discurso preliminar” to his *Libros de caballerías*, I (BAE, Vol. 40), p. lvi.

²¹ *Origenes*, I, 437.

²² *Romances*, pp. 140-42.

²³ A parallel to this trick played in *Cirongilio* is that played on Virgil; see Castillejo, *Obras*, I (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1960), 56. María Rosa Lida, in *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*, ed. R. S. Loomis (Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 415, suggests a source for Maritornes' trick in the *Lancelot*.

cites one in the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros* (last note to *Don Quijote* II, 22), but for his main illustration of this adventure he cites an episode in the *Sergas de Esplandián* (note 41 to *Don Quijote* II, 23). María Rosa Lida developed this parallel.²⁴ But the similarities between the Cave of Montesinos adventure in *Don Quijote* and the Cave of Artidón adventure in the *Espejo de príncipes* are so striking that they suggest that the *Espejo de príncipes* is, if not the only, at least the primary source for this important adventure.²⁵

Whereas in the *Sergas de Esplandián* xcix, it is the author Montalvo who, by accident, falls into a nameless well, in both *Don Quijote* II, 22 and the *Espejo de príncipes* II, 4 and 5 it is a protagonist who enters a famous cave in search of adventures. Both Rosicler, who carries out this adventure in the *Espejo de príncipes*, and Don Quijote are concerned about their ladies, which Montalvo is not. Don Quijote "sees" her, a fact of great importance to him; Rosicler learns about her. In both the caves of Artidón and of Montesinos, we meet a dead lover, with his heart in the one case exposed, in the other removed; they both talk when there is need, but sparingly. In both cases the desired lady is enchanted there as well.

Clemencín also did not note in his reading of the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros* that Lirgandeo, one of the two "authors" of the work, comments on the story in a manner surprisingly similar to Cide Hamete in his "marginal notes." When the author, Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra, speaks in the first person, as he does on infrequent occasions, his tone is similar to that of Cervantes when we hear him speaking.²⁶

There are also episodes in *Don Quijote* which stand out as clearly inspired by the romances of chivalry, though not by a particular one. For example, the description in I, 9 of Don Quijote's battle with the *vizcatno* is a delightful parody of the clichés used in describing duels in the romances of chivalry: the fierce appearance, the blow stopped by fortune, the blow which carves off part of the armor. Also, the fact that Don Quijote steals away from home to begin his adventures has no profound psychological significance, such as Madariaga gives

²⁴ "Dos huellas del *Esplandián* en el *Quijote* y en el *Persiles*," *RPh*, 9 (1955), 156-62.

²⁵ Apparently Clemencín happened to skip this part of the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros*. It is the same cave he refers to in the note mentioned above, but later on in the book, when a secondary character visits it.

²⁶ See particularly the opening of III, 38, in my edition (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, in press).

it.²⁷ It was, in fact, customary for knights-errant to start off on their adventures secretly. Generally, their families and friends were interested in seeing them remain at home, believing them, for one reason or another—often their youth—unready to practice the demanding profession of knight-errantry. Thus, the only way they could begin their adventures was secretly.

In the realm of style, Hatzfeld has seen in Cervantes' use of contrary-to-fact conditional sentences “la gran idea de la condicionalidad del ideal.”²⁸ In fact, this sentence structure is a common feature of the romances of chivalry, which Cervantes has picked up, at least in some places deliberately. Three examples, found without much effort, should demonstrate this:

Don Belianis hiziera lo mesmo [fallen off his horse], si no se tuviera con esforçado animo con el braço derecho al cuello del cavallo. (*Belianis de Grecia*, 1587 edition, fol. 40^v)

El gigante, aunque fue desatinado del golpe, como lo vio tan cerca tirole a la cabeça, y el Donzel del Aventura no tuvo tiempo de apartarse, y alço el escudo, sobre el qual dio el gigante tal golpe que se lo cortó hasta que el espada llegó al yelmo, y fue tan cargado que le hizo poner la una rodilla en tierra, y a no estar el gigante desatinado del gran golpe que recibió en la cabeça, sin duda con este solo diera fin a su batalla. (*Felixmarte de Hircania*, fols. 72^v-73^r)

Dio de través por medio de la cintura al Cavallero de Cupido un tan furioso golpe que en dos partes le partiera, si no fueran las armas templadas por el gran saber de Artemidoro. (*Espejo de príncipes y caballeros* II, 31)

Frequently what is not discovered in an investigation is just as enlightening as what is discovered in it. A case in point is the role of magic in the romances of chivalry. Although it is usually present, it is more often benign than evil. Virtually every knight had a *sabio*, among whose abilities was that of working magic, to protect him; rarely do we see evil enchanters at work, and certainly beautiful women are not changed into ugly ones. Thus Don Quijote's paranoia stands out even more clearly: he is not explaining the world

²⁷ *Guía del lector del “Quijote,”* 6th ed. (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 1967), p. 101.

²⁸ Helmut Hatzfeld, *El Quijote como obra de arte del lenguaje*, trans. [M. Cardena], 2nd ed. (Madrid: *Revista de Filología Española* [Anejo 83], 1966), p. 41.

in terms of the romances of chivalry, but in terms of his psychological needs.

Finally, it becomes obvious, if it were not so already, that Don Quijote's favorite book was far and away the *Amadís de Gaula*. This romance, decidedly un-Spanish in nature, no matter what its original language, is sentimental to a degree far surpassing the other Spanish romances of chivalry, in which action is, more than love, the main interest. Don Quijote's devotion to Dulcinea, which is a constant motivating force throughout the book, could have been modeled only on that of Amadís to Oriana.

In conclusion, a thorough study of the chivalric sources of the *Quijote*, preliminary to one of Cervantes' humor,²⁹ is in order. Enough private collections of the romances of chivalry have passed into public libraries that the works are accessible to all: on microfilm, one can assemble all the works which presumably were in Don Quijote's library, until now an unrealizable but common dream of Cervantine bibliophiles. Spanish bibliography has progressed to the point that we now know the location of at least one copy of almost every romance of chivalry.³⁰ Based on a modern interpretation of all aspects of the *Quijote*, and without the nineteenth-century bias against the romances of chivalry, such a study could not help but

²⁹ The necessity of such a study can be seen from the stimulating article of P. E. Russell, "Don Quijote as a Funny Book," *MLR*, 64 (1969), 312-26.

³⁰ See José Simón Díaz, *Bibliografía de la literatura hispánica*, 2nd ed., Vol. III, Part 2 (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1965), 437-524, and the present author's "Más datos bibliográficos sobre libros de caballerías españoles," *Revista de Literatura*, 34 (1968 [1970]), 5-14. (This information is presented in a somewhat updated form as an Appendix to the Bibliography of the present author's Ph.D. thesis, "An Edition of a Sixteenth-Century Romance of Chivalry: Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra's *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros [El Caballero del Febo]*," Diss. Brown University 1971 [1970]. Also included on p. xxix, n. 35 and on p. cii, n. 1 are lists of errors and misprints in the cited section of Simón Díaz's work.) Of the known Spanish romances of chivalry (and there are likely a few we do not know about, as well as several works, known only by title, of which it is not certain whether they are chivalric or not), we know the location of some version of the text for all the works except the following: *Leoneo de Hungría* and *Lucidante de Tracia*, known only through Fernando Colón's catalogue, and *Leonís de Grecia*, known from another sixteenth-century book inventory, all of which may be lost forever, and *Lidamante de Armenia*, which Sir Thomas Phillipps had a manuscript of and Clemencín saw an edition of. Thanks to the assistance of my former colleague Juan Bautista Avall-Arce, the missing *Philesbián de Candaria* has been located (see the article cited in n. 4).

prove immensely rewarding, both in terms of our understanding of the *Quijote* and of the romances which gave it birth. All we need to do is begin.

DANIEL EISENBERG

*The City College
City University of New York*