

Web site: <http://bigfoot.com/~daniel.eisenberg>  
Email: daniel.eisenberg@bigfoot.com

This article was first published in *Josep Maria Solà-Solé: Homage, Homenaje, Homenatge* (Barcelona: Puvill, 1984), II, 171-83. The text that follows is the heavily revised English original that was used in preparing the translation published in my *Estudios cervantinos* (Barcelona: Sirmio, 1991), pp. 119-41. In some places (for example, n. 10) the text suddenly changes language, breaking into Spanish; these are additions or emendations, written directly in Spanish. The edition of Cervantes' works used is that of Schevill and Bonilla, citing volume, page, and line, followed by (for *Don Quijote*) the part and chapter.

## Cervantes, Lope, and Avellaneda<sup>1</sup>

Daniel Eisenberg

In this article we will examine the greatest unsolved mystery surrounding Cervantes, the identity of Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda, author of the false second part of *Don Quijote*.<sup>2</sup>

One of the few undisputed facts about Avellaneda is that he was, in Riquer's words, "un ferviente admirador de Lope de Vega" (I, lxxx). A play of Lope is presented in Avellaneda's *Quijote*, his verses are quoted on several occasions and his poetical ladies mentioned, and in the prologue Lope is defended with strong words. Nicolás Marín has recently suggested, with cogent arguments, that

---

<sup>1</sup>I would like to thank Nicolás Marín for his comments on a draft of this article. Subsequent to this article, and citing it, is Martín de Riquer's *Cervantes, Passamonte y Avellaneda* (Barcelona: Sirmio, 1988).

<sup>2</sup>For the history of this question, see the introduction of Martín de Riquer to his edition of Avellaneda, *Clásicos Castellanos*, 174-76 (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1972), I, lxxix-lxxxviii. Quotations from Avellaneda are taken from this edition.

Lope was the author at least of Avellaneda's prologue.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, it is logical to begin by examining Cervantes' relations with Lope.

These relations have been outlined by Entrambasaguas.<sup>4</sup> Lope and Cervantes were, it seems, on good terms until shortly before the publication of *Don Quijote*. Each had praised the other in print, Cervantes in the "Canto de Calíope", and Lope in *La Arcadia* (1599); Cervantes, apparently by invitation, wrote a prefatory sonnet to Lope's *Dragontea*, published in 1602. Yet no later than the end of 1605, we find that in a famous letter, Lope speaks of Cervantes in harsh terms,<sup>5</sup> and, apparently

---

<sup>3</sup>"La piedra y la mano en el prólogo del *Quijote* apócrifo", in *Homenaje a Guillermo Guastavino* (Madrid: Asociación Nacional de Bibliotecarios, Archiveros y Arqueólogos, 1974), pp. 253-88. The conclusions of this article were also published in his "Lope y el prólogo del *Quijote* apócrifo", *Ínsula*, No. 336 (November, 1974), 3.

<sup>4</sup>"Una guerra literaria del Siglo de Oro. Lope de Vega y los preceptistas aristotélicos", in *Estudios sobre Lope de Vega*, segunda edición corregida y aumentada (Madrid: CSIC, 1967), I, 63-II, 411, at I, 108-41. Lope's relations with Cervantes are also examined by Marín, "Belardo furioso. Una carta de Lope mal leída", *Anales cervantinos*, 12 (1973), 3-37. The earlier article of M.A. Buchanan, "Cervantes and Lope de Vega: Their Literary Relations. A Preliminary Survey", *Philological Quarterly*, 21 (1942), 54-64, is now outdated, that of Tomás S. Tómov, "Cervantes y Lope de Vega (Un caso de enemistad literaria)", in *Actas del Segundo Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas* (Nijmegen: Instituto Español de la Universidad de Nimega, 1967), pp. 617-26, is superficial and inaccurate, and José López Rubio, S.P., in "Génesis y desarrollo del *Quijote*", *Anales Cervantinos*, 7 (1958), 158-235, takes their relations to inadmissible extremes.

<sup>5</sup>Luis Astrana Marín, *Vida ejemplar y heroica de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra* (Madrid: Reus, 1948-58), VI, 140-46, presents strong reasons for assigning this letter the date of late 1605, rather than that which it bears, August 14, 1604; Marín reexamines the question in the article cited in the preceding note, but does not refute Astrana adequately. He does, however, reedit the letter (pp. 4-5), and helpfully points out that it was not directed to a doctor, as previously believed. If it is from late 1605, as Astrana argues, then a logical possibility is that it was directed to Sesa, like the other letters of the same collection; Lope and Sesa's relationship began earlier in 1605.

mistaking a sonnet by Góngora<sup>6</sup> as Cervantine, wrote one attacking Cervantes,<sup>7</sup> which someone, if not Lope him

---

<sup>6</sup>This sonnet (“Hermano Lope, borrame el sone...”) may be found in the edition of Góngora’s *Sonetos* of Biruté Cipliauskaitė (Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1981), pp. 581-82. This sonnet could not possibly, from its tone, have been written by Cervantes; modern scholars, having studied Cervantes’ and Góngora’s works as no one in Golden Age Spain did, can better make an accurate attribution than could Lope.

<sup>7</sup>Entrambasaguas argues, and I concur, that this sonnet is in the style of Lope; it also has exactly the tone of Avellaneda’s prologue. As it is not frequently seen, I will reproduce it here:

Pues nunca de la Biblia digo le-,  
no sé si eres, Cervantes, co- ni cu-,  
sólo digo que es Lope Apolo, y tú  
frisón de su carroza, y puerco en pie.  
Para que no escribieses, orden fue  
del cielo, que mancases en Corfú.  
Hablaste buey; pero dixiste mú.  
¡O mala quixotada que te dé!  
¡Honra a Lope, potrilla, o guay de ti!  
Que es sol, y, si se enoja, lloverá;  
y ese tu *Don Quixote* valadí,  
de cul... en cul... por el mundo va  
vendiendo especias y azafrán romí  
y al fin en muladares parará.

(This is the text as first published, in Juan Antonio Pellicer’s *Ensayo de una biblioteca de traductores españoles* [Madrid, 1778], p. 171, as reproduced in Schevill and Bonilla, *Viaje del Parnaso*, 197. Entrambasaguas, I, 117-19, offers a slightly different text, and Cipliauskaitė, *Sonetos* of Góngora, p. 583, edits from a MS a text with more substantial differences.)

The first line seems to be a reply to Cervantes’ attack (*Don Quijote*, I, 31, 20-23, I, Prologue), on someone’s use of Bible quotations, which made him falsely seem like a “doctor de la iglesia”; I agree with the traditional interpretation that the person so attacked is Lope. The whole first quatrain is suggestive of an attack on Cervantes’ purity of blood. Only Old Christians were proud of not reading the Bible; Jews read it; the references to *culo* and *puerco* have religious overtones in Golden Age Spain. (Sentimos no poder concordar con la explicación de Martín de Riquer de los epítetos “co—“ y “cu—“ aplicados a Cervantes, *Cervantes, Passamonte y Avellaneda* [Barcelona: Sirmio, 1988], p. 134. Vale la pena apuntar otro poema empleando “cu—“ como insulto: es “Diego Moreno tenía”, en el *Cancionero de Pedro de Rojas*, ed. José J. Labrador Herraiz, Ralph A. DiFranco, and María T. Cacho [Cleveland: Cleveland State University, 1988], p. 186.)

The first tercet is answered by Cervantes at *Don Quijote*,

self, sent to Cervantes anonymously, with the added insult of making him pay the *porte*.<sup>8</sup>

What was responsible for this change in Lope's attitude? The suggestion most commonly made is his anger over the attack on his displays of superficial erudition found in the prologue to *Don Quijote*. Yet Cervantes' tone there is light; the mockery is gentle; he speaks unflatteringly of himself. This alone would not be responsible for so abrupt a change in Lope's attitude, and leaves without explanation the change in that of Cervantes. The differences between them are considered a mystery.<sup>9</sup>

Yet there is an obvious explanation, mentioned by both authors: their rivalry over the *comedia*. The topic was a vital one. Lope set a great deal of store by his composition of *comedias*, for which reason, and for the economic benefit, he wrote so many of them, as he tells us in detail in the prologue to *El peregrino en su patria* (1604). It was from his *comedias* that he was known in all levels of Madrid society, and elsewhere; he was in demand by play producers. Yet in Cervantes' view this position was unfairly gotten: "alçósse con la monarquía cómica", he says in the prologue to the *Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses*, and from the discussions of drama there, in the *Parnaso* and *Adjunta*, and in *Don Quijote*, I, 48, we can see that Cervantes felt deeply his own lack of success as a playwright. The acclaim he wanted and felt he deserved was going to someone else, Lope.

Much seems to have happened regarding Lope's *comedias* shortly before 1605. It was shortly before 1605

---

*III, 43, 18-44, 14, II, 1* (the story about the *locos* of Seville, one of whom claims to represent Jupiter and will prevent rain for three years). A "muladar" was "el lugar o sitio donde se echa el estiércol o basura que sale de las casas" (*Autoridades*).

<sup>8</sup>*Adjunta al Parnaso*, 125-26.

<sup>9</sup>"Sigue vigente la aserción del profesor argentino y apasionado cervantista Ricardo Rojas: 'Lo que no se ha podido averiguar es qué origen pudo tener la malquerencia de Lope...'" (Alberto Sánchez, "Estado actual de los estudios biográficos", in *Suma cervantina*, ed. J.B. Avallé-Arce and E.C. Riley [London: Tamesis, 1971], pp. 3-24, at p. 20, n. 31). "El laberinto en la aparente amistad y posterior discordia que hubo entre los dos y cuya salida, buscada tantas veces, no ha sido encontrada" (Marín, "Belardo", p. 20).

that Cervantes wrote the discussion of the deficiencies of *comedias* found near the end of *Don Quijote*, I, which, despite praise for Lope's *Ingratitud vengada*, would inevitably be taken as directed at their most famous writer. The preliminaries of *Don Quijote*, I, are from late 1604, but Lope responds to an attack, evidently Cervantine, in the prologue to *El peregrino en su patria*, some of whose preliminaries are from late 1603 and whose *tasa* is dated February 27, 1604; either he knew *Don Quijote* before publication and the discussion was written by late 1603, or he was responding to another, presumably oral, attack. As part of his answer he lists all of his plays he can remember. Publication of his plays also started at this time, first a volume of six plays in 1603, assembled without Lope's participation (only two of them are his), then the *Primera parte* in 1604.

I have suggested elsewhere that most of the "comedias nunca representadas" which Cervantes published are from before 1605.<sup>10</sup> Cervantes also refers, in the prologue to his collection of drama, to a renewed attempt to interest "actores"<sup>11</sup> in his plays "algunos años ha"; this expression would seem to indicate that more than two or three years had passed. It is a reasonable hypothesis that this unsuccessful attempt was prior to 1605, when he was trying to "sal[ir]... del olvido" (*I*, 31, 9, I, Prologue), yet subsequent to 1603; the conversation with an "actor" described in *I*, 348, 1-31, I, 48 seems to be the report of a recent conversation. Here, at least, is a potential explanation for the change in Cervantes' attitude towards Lope.

What would Cervantes have told a producer to induce him to present his plays? He would have said what he said to Rodrigo Osorio in 1593: that each of his plays, if produced, would be found to be "una de las mejores comedias que se han representado en España",<sup>12</sup> by implication, if not explicitly, better than those of Lope, which Cervantes found—as reported by Lope—"odiosa[s]" (Marín, "Belardo", p. 5). That they

---

<sup>10</sup>A *Study of "Don Quixote"*, p. 53. En la versión primitiva del capítulo, "El Bernardo de Cervantes fue su libro de caballerías", *Anales cervantinos*, 21 (1983 [1984]), 103-17, se halla la discusión en las pp. 106-07.

<sup>11</sup>Producers; actors were "representantes".

<sup>12</sup>Astrana, *Vida*, V, 29-30.

followed “las leyes de la comedia” (*Don Quijote*, II, 350, 26, I, 48), against whose application Lope protests.<sup>13</sup> How could this attempt by Cervantes to get his plays produced, replacing, however briefly, other playwrights, not have gotten back to the ears of Lope?

And what more likely to anger Lope than a public claim by Cervantes that his plays were better?<sup>14</sup> What would infuriate him more than the discussion of the “actores” errors—the reasons they preferred Lope’s plays to those of Cervantes—found in *Don Quijote*, I, 48, in which Cervantes praises Lope’s ability but attacks his works, all but openly accusing him of selling his art for money? What would twist the knife in the wound more than the proposal of an “examinador” with the authority to approve or reject all plays (*Don Quijote*, II, 352, 21-353, 10, I, 48), a position Cervantes might well have envisioned for himself?<sup>15</sup>

There is another area in which Lope might have felt himself attacked by Cervantes: his personal life. The primary theme of Part I of *Don Quijote* is, after literature, the proper relations between the sexes; *honestidad* is repeatedly praised. The middle-aged protagonist is crazy over women; women are at the center of his chivalric existence. The most important woman, about whom he writes verses (I, 375, 30-376, 30, I, 26), is not chaste, and he has changed her name and transformed her into someone idealized, but so far from the original as “lo está el cielo de la tierra”. It is easy to see the potential relevance of this to Lope, whose relations with common women, idealized and renamed by him in verse, were well known.

In *Don Quijote*, the use of a *tercero* is attacked. While we do not have the detailed knowledge of Lope’s

---

<sup>13</sup>*El peregrino en su patria*, ed. Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce, Clásicos Castalia, 55 (Madrid: Castalia, 1973), p. 63.

<sup>14</sup>One reason Cervantes may have felt his plays to be superior, implied though not specifically stated in the canon’s comments, is that, in contrast with those of Lope, they did not use *romances* as sources. Cervantes’ view of *romances* is discussed in “The Romance as Seen by Cervantes”, in this volume.

<sup>15</sup>Such a position was created in 1608, only three years after the publication of *Don Quijote*, Part I; see Hugo Albert Rennert, *The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega* (1909; rpt. New York: Dover, [1963]), p. 217.

life before 1605 that we have during his correspondence with the Duque de Sesa, it is worth noting that Lope served the Duque in that capacity,<sup>16</sup> and it is a strange coincidence that Don Quijote describes *alcahuetería* as an “oficio de discretos”, for which, just as for the *comedia*, there should be an *examinador* (I, 304, 7-27, I, 22).

It is certainly possible that Lope saw references to himself in all this. Was such intended by Cervantes? Perhaps not; Cervantes was interested in helping, educating, and correcting the *vulgo*, whether noble or plebeian, not a *discreto* such as Lope. Yet there are two occasions on which Cervantes definitely alludes to Lope’s scandalous personal life. The first is the well-known comment in the Prologue to Part II of *Don Quijote*, Lope’s “ocupación continua y virtuosa” (III, 28, 19-20, II, Prologue). No reader with the slightest knowledge of Spanish literary life would have taken that as sincere.

The second allusion is found in the sonnet of Gandalín to Sancho Panza: “a solo tú nuestro español Ovidio/ con buzcrona te haze reberencia” (I, 43, 26-27, I, prefatory verses). Who was “nuestro español Ovidio”? Annotators have suggested that it was Cervantes himself, that Cervantes had changed people like Ovid had in his *Metamorphoses*. Yet Ovid’s changes were physical ones, people turned into stars, trees, and the like, while Cervantes’ are only changes of name and behavior. And why would Cervantes describe himself as praising only Sancho, and then with a *buzcorona* (a blow)?

From the Middle Ages right up to the present, and probably in antiquity as well, the name of Ovid was associated all over Europe with love, especially sexual love. In Spain, “writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were well aware of the prestige of Ovid as *doctor amoris*” (p. 135), an “authority in the principles of illicit love” (p. 122).<sup>17</sup> The one fact about Ovid’s life that was common knowledge was that he had been exiled,<sup>18</sup> a

---

<sup>16</sup>Agustín G. de Amezúa, *Lope de Vega en sus cartas*, I (Madrid, 1935), Chapter 3 of the introduction.

<sup>17</sup>Both quotations are from Rudolph Schevill, *Ovid and the Renaissance in Spain*, University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 4, No. 1 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1913; rpt. Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1971).

<sup>18</sup>Cervantes took it for granted that his readers would recognize the “desterrado a Ponto” (*Don Quijote*, III, 207, 13, II, 16; *Parnaso*, 54,

dubious distinction which Lope had shared; Lope's exile must have been common knowledge as well. Who else of the persons who would have read *Don Quijote* before its publication would have been worthy, for good or ill, of being called "nuestro espanol Ovidio"?<sup>19</sup>

An the reaction to Cervantes' work described in those lines (praising only Sancho) sounds surprisingly like what we hear from Sansón about some reader's reaction to Part I (*III, 65, 27-31, II, 3*), and Cervantes was to respond positively to this comment by increasing the role of Sancho in Part II. He does respond to criticism, of course, in several ways; if Sancho was too credulous in believing he could have gotten an island, an attack on the verisimilitude of Cervantes' work (*III, 65, 31-66, 2, II, 3*), in Part II he gets an island. His *palos* are reduced, surely reflecting a comment on Part I (*III, 64, 8-13, II, 3*). If there were errors in Part I, found by a *censurador escrupuloso* without *misericordia* who looks at *átomos* (*III, 70, 11-12, II, 3*),<sup>20</sup> a "puntualísimo escudriñador de los átomos" (*IV, 140, 7-8, II, 50*) will see that there are none in Part II. Yet there is an additional comment he acts on as well: if the "Curioso impertinente" found favor ("no por mala ni por mal razonada", *III, 67, 20, II, 3*), but was out of place, "arrima[da] a las locuras de don Quixote [y]

---

9, IV).

<sup>19</sup>After making this connection, I found that it had already been suggested, in a justly-forgotten *librillo*, José de Armas [y Cárdenas]'s *Cervantes y el duque de Sessa* (Havana, 1909), p. 71. He also identifies the "grave eclesiástico" of the Duques', uncourteous enemy of Don Quijote and his book, as Lope (p. 109), and explains a *galeote*'s knowledge of witchcraft as an allusion to an intimate friendship of Lope with Luis Rosicler or Sicler, a French practitioner of occult arts (p. 76, n. 21). Quite unacceptable are his interpretation of the mention of Juan Latino in Urganda's poem (*I, 40, 15, I, prefatory verses*) as an allusion to Sesa (pp. 64-66), as Latino had previously been protected by the Duque's family, and the final lines of Solisdán's sonnet (*I, 46, 26-27, I, prefatory verses*) as a reference to Lope's failure to obtain the favors of Jusepa Vaca for Sesa (pp. 55-56, 66-70), as Lope's amorous services to Sesa began after publication of Part I of *Don Quijote*.

<sup>20</sup>For Cervantes' opposition to *escrúpulos*, see the prologue to the *Ocho comedias* (*I, 9, 18-20*). Lope did allude to the *rucio* error (in *Amar sin saber a quién*, cited by Rafael Osuna, "Dos olvidos de Cervantes: el rucio de Sancho y el bagaje de Bartolomé", *Hispanófila*, No. 36 [May, 1969], pp. 7-9, at p. 8). No other contemporary author has been reported to have referred to the error.

a las sandezes de Sancho” (IV, 65, 3-4, II, 44), and not in its *lugar*, he will create more of such well-received pieces, but in the proper *lugar*, a separate book.

Who made this comment on the “Curioso impertinente”? We can not know, but it is very possible that it was Lope. Lope was pleased with Cervantes’ *novelas*. “En [las novelas] no le faltó gracia y estilo a Miguel Cervantes”, he said in the dedication to “Las fortunas de Diana”.<sup>21</sup> Cervantes wanted “la opinión de los ingenios de España” (*Don Quijote*, II, 353, 8, I, 48), and what greater *ingenio* was there than Lope?

So it is a reasonable hypothesis that Lope’s reaction to *Don Quijote* was a factor, even if it was not the only one, in Cervantes’ decision to set aside the continuation of *Don Quijote*, begun in 1605,<sup>22</sup> and work on *novelas*. This was a wise decision, for it was the *Novelas ejemplares* which marked Cervantes permanently as a critical success, and made it possible for him to publish the *Parnaso* and, at long last, his *comedias*.

To return to Avellaneda. Lope and Cervantes were rivals; Lope had reason to feel Cervantes a threat to his prestige and his livelihood, and to feel offended by comments made in *Don Quijote*. It is plausible to suggest that Lope was the author not just of the prologue, but of the entire false *Quijote*; Avellaneda was a great admirer of Lope, and what greater admirer was there than Lope himself? Although I hasten to assure my readers that this identification will not stand, let me review the reasons why it is seemingly tenable.

The *Quijote* of Avellaneda is both explicitly and implicitly a reply to Cervantes’ work. Avellaneda is out to show that he is a better writer, that he can beat Cervantes at writing a funny book. He intends to damage Cervantes economically (“quexesse de mi trabajo por la ganancia que le quito de su segunda parte”, I, 8, 8-9). And Avellaneda’s book, everyone agrees, has considerable

---

<sup>21</sup>In *Novelas a Marcia Leonarda*, ed. Francisco Rico (Madrid: Alianza, 1968), p. 28.

<sup>22</sup>It clearly reflects Cervantes’ excitement over the success of Part I, and comments on it which were most likely made immediately after its publication. See “El rucio de Sancho y la fecha de composición de la Segunda Parte de *Don Quijote*”, included in this volume.

merit. It was also the product of someone with some education, who like Lope shows it off, using Latin, for example, frequently. Avellaneda has less interest in literary theory than Cervantes, and more knowledge of *libros de caballerías*; he is more favorable both to the latter and to *romances*. Lope fits all of this.<sup>23</sup> While Cervantes' protagonist was crazy about women, in Avellaneda's work the protagonist is now "El caballero desamorado".

Lope frequently put other names on his writings.<sup>24</sup> More important, the *Quijote* of Avellaneda was published by Lope's publisher, Sebastián Cormellas, with a false imprint,<sup>25</sup> which at that time was highly unusual and may well reflect some pressure placed on Cormellas, pressure which Lope was in a good position to exert.

The extraordinary knowledge that Avellaneda had of Lope's life and works is easily explained if Lope is identified with Avellaneda. Menéndez Pelayo's argument that Lope could not be Avellaneda because this is not mentioned in the correspondence with Sesa<sup>26</sup> does not have much strength; his other pseudonyms are not mentioned there either, the correspondence does not often refer to literature, and Lope might well not have wanted to put such information even in a private letter. Avellane-

---

<sup>23</sup>Lope is the only writer of the first half of the seventeenth century to praise *libros de caballerías*, in the prologue to *El desconfiado* (1620; the passage is quoted in the introduction to my edition of the *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros*, Clásicos castellanos, 193-98 [Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1975], I, L, n. 49). On Lope and *romances*, see "The Romance as Seen by Cervantes", in this volume.

<sup>24</sup>S. Griswold Morley, *The Pseudonyms and Literary Disguises of Lope de Vega*, University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 33, No. 5 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951).

<sup>25</sup>Francisco Vindel, *La verdad sobre el falso "Quijote"* (Barcelona: Antigua Librería Babra, 1937). I have not seen Francisco Giraldo, *Acerca de "La verdad sobre el falso 'Quijote'", de Francisco Vindel. ¿Dónde se imprimió el "Quijote" de Avellaneda?* (Barcelona, 1940, 15 pp.)

<sup>26</sup>In the introduction to his edition of Avellaneda, reprinted in *Estudios y discursos de crítica histórica y literaria I*, edición nacional (Madrid: CSIC, 1941), 365-420, at pp. 386-87.

da shows knowledge of Zaragoza,<sup>27</sup> but it is not impossible to argue that Lope sought out knowledge about this area which, so far as is known, he never visited; he did do so with Lérida.<sup>28</sup> According to Cervantes (*Don Quijote*, IV, 249, 13-14, II, 59), Avellaneda had Aragonese characteristics in his language, yet these are far from definitive evidence; even Aragonese scholars do not agree on what they were.<sup>29</sup> Avellaneda's *Quijote* has a false author's name and a false imprint; its language could also be counterfeited, and Lope, who used dialectal speech in his plays, was sophisticated enough to have done that. Such a use of language, and the references in the prologue to the "ostentación de sinónimos voluntarios" (I, 9, 11-10, 1) and the offense to someone other than Lope (I, 9, 1-3), could be an attempt to direct suspicion onto someone else, specifically to Pasamonte, an Aragonese who is the only person attacked by name in Part I. Pasamonte's *Vida* is an incompetent work, compared with the *Quijote* of Avellaneda, and it is arguable that rather than being Avellaneda, Pasamonte was someone Cervantes and other readers were intended to *suspect* of being Avellaneda; creating such a false scent was not beneath Lope either.

Yet, as already stated, this identification of Avellaneda with Lope will not stand. The linguistic and stylistic differences between Avellaneda's text and prologue, much less other writings of Lope, are evident even on superficial examination. A means of quantifying the linguistic difference has been developed by Manuel Criado de Val;<sup>30</sup> it consists of examining the author's

---

<sup>27</sup>Riquer, *Cervantes, Avellaneda y Passamonte*, pp. 100-04.

<sup>28</sup>A.M. Parramón y Doll, "Lérida en el teatro de Lope. La comedia de *El molino*", *Ilerda*, 14-15 (1956-57), 159, cited by Francisco Márquez Villanueva, "Lope, juez de la justicia catalana", *Actes del segon col·loqui d'estudis catalans a Nord-Amèrica*, ed. Manuel Duran, Alberto Porqueras Mayo, and Josep Roca-Pons (Montserrat: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1982), pp. 425-43, at p. 429, n. 2.

<sup>29</sup>See the comments and references of Riquer in his introduction, pp. li-lxxix, especially pp. lxi-lxiii, and those of Fernando García Salinero in his, *Clásicos Castalia*, 41 (Madrid: Castalia, 1972), pp. 19-20, and his "El lenguaje es aragonés...", *Anales cervantinos*, 16 (1977), 247-48.

<sup>30</sup>*Análisis verbal del estilo. Índices verbales de Cervantes, de Avellaneda y del autor de "La tía fingida"*, Anejo 57 of the *Revista*

conditional verb forms, especially the ratio of *-ra* and *-se* imperfect subjunctives. No one, in an attempt to disguise authorship, would deliberately alter the use of these verb forms.

Here are some figures, partly taken from Criado de Val and partly of my own collection, of the use of conditional verb forms by Lope, Avellaneda, and Ginés Pérez de Hita, the latest candidate proposed for the identification of Avellaneda:<sup>31</sup>

	<i>-se</i> (A)	<i>-ra</i> (B)	$\frac{B}{A}$	<i>-re</i>	<i>-ría</i>
<i>El peregrino en su patria</i> , Book I	58%	26%	40%	3%	14%
<i>Las fortunas de Diana</i>	51%	32%	62%	3%	14%
<i>Guzmán el bravo</i>	45%	32%	71%	12%	12%
<i>Quijote</i> of Avellaneda, Chapters 1-2 <sup>32</sup>	58%	19%	33%	8%	15%
Id., “Los dos felices amantes”	65%	12%	19%	8%	14%
<i>Guerras civiles de Granada</i> , Chapters 1-4	51%	25%	49%	5%	19%

It will be observed that both Lope and Pérez de Hita use far more “r” forms of the imperfect subjunctive, in proportion to the “s” forms, than does Avellaneda. And that settles the matter: neither Lope nor Pérez de Hita was Avellaneda.

There is, however, another candidate for the identity of Avellaneda who has recently been proposed, who was not previously considered because his existence was unknown until the twentieth century. That person is Jerónimo de Pasamonte, author of the *Vida y trabajos de Jerónimo de Pasamonte*, which Raymond Foulché-Delbosc published in 1922.<sup>33</sup>

---

*de Filología Española* (Madrid, 1953).

<sup>31</sup>Eulalia Hernández Sánchez, “Pérez de Hita y Avellaneda: Algunos aspectos léxicos de la maurofilia”, pp. 857-64, and Manuel Muñoz Barberán, “Posibles alusiones a la persona y la obra de Ginés Pérez de Hita en los libros de Cervantes”, pp. 865-77 of *Cervantes. Su obra y su mundo. Actas del I Congreso Internacional sobre Cervantes*, ed. Manuel Criado de Val (Madrid: Edi-6, 1981). Muñoz Barberán also defends the theory of Pérez de Hita’s authorship in *La máscara de Tordesillas* (Barcelona: Marte, 1974).

<sup>32</sup>Nicolás Marín, “Piedra”, p. 259, has obtained the same results from an examination of other chapters.

<sup>33</sup>*Revue Hispanique*, 55 (1922), 311-446. On the basis of this edition José María de Cossío included Pasamonte’s *Vida* in his

Jerónimo de Pasamonte is clearly the person behind the *galeote* Ginés de Pasamonte of Cervantes. Both are authors of a *Vida*. Both have been galley slaves; both speak several languages; both have a defect in their vision; both are devout. To these similarities, examined by Alois Achleitner and Olga Kattan,<sup>34</sup> I can add that Ginés has extra chains (*I*, 396, 19-31, I, 22), as did Jerónimo (Chapter 23); Ginés complains that he is gratuitously “desdichado... porque siempre las desdichas persiguen al buen ingenio” (*I*, 309, 9-11, I, 22), and Jerónimo tells us of an incredible series of misfortunes, all of which are, in his view, gratuitous and in no way the consequence of any of his own actions.

Martín de Riquer has proposed, though cautiously, that Jerónimo de Pasamonte was Avellaneda.<sup>35</sup> This identification is so plausible that I will endorse it as correct; Pasamonte satisfies every criterion ever proposed for the identification of Avellaneda, and passes with flying colors the linguistic test applied to Lope’s candidacy.

Cervantes, for whatever reasons, tells us that Avellaneda was Aragonese, and Jerónimo was Aragonese, and proud of it (Chapters 34 and 59); a significant portion of his *Vida* takes place in Aragón. In the *Quijote* of Avellaneda “Santo Domingo, los dominicos y el Rosario casi son una obsesión”, and in the *Vida* of Pasamonte “Santo Domingo y los dominicos son citados casi en cada página y tal era su devoción al Rosario que afirma que rezaba cinco diarios y, en algunas ocasiones, hasta quince”.<sup>36</sup> And Avellaneda complains, in his prologue,

---

*Autobiografías de soldados (siglo XVII), Biblioteca de autores españoles*, 90 (Madrid: Atlas, 1956), pp. 5-73, with an introduction on pp. vii-x. I have given chapter rather than page references, so that either edition may be consulted.

<sup>34</sup>Alois Achleitner, “Pasamonte”, *Romanische Forschungen*, 62 (1950), 77-79, translated in *Anales cervantinos*, 2 (1952), 365-67; Olga Kattan, “Algunos paralelos entre Gerónimo de Passamonte y Ginesillo en el *Quijote*”, *Cuadernos hispanoamericanos*, No. 244 (April, 1970), 190-206.

<sup>35</sup>“El *Quijote* y los libros”, *Papeles de Son Armadans*, 54 (1969), 5-24.

<sup>36</sup>Riquer, “Libros”, p. 22; más extensamente, *Cervantes, Pasamonte y Avellaneda*, pp. 105-13.

that Cervantes had ostentatiously used “sinónimos voluntarios” in Part I of *Don Quijote* (I, 9, 11-10, 1), in which the name Ginés de Pasamonte is converted to Ginesillo de Parapilla, to Ginés’ irritation (I, 307, 10-31 and 314, 2-10, I, 22), certainly an example of a *sinónimo voluntario*.<sup>37</sup>

Riquer has also pointed out that Pasamonte omits “artículos”, which Cervantes mentioned as a characteristic of Avellaneda’s language.<sup>38</sup> And when we examine the imperfect subjunctive forms in Pasamonte’s *Vida*, we find that he, like Avellaneda, has a low proportion of “r” forms:

	-se(A)	-ra(B)	$\frac{B}{A}$	-re	-ría
<i>Vida de Jerónimo de Pasamonte</i> , 1-20, 58-60	71%	10%	14%	4%	14%

No one of these pieces of evidence alone would be sufficient. But taken together, they form a case which is extremely strong. Pasamonte, portrayed by Cervantes as an aspiring but incompetent author, “buena voya [rower]” as Avellaneda calls him at the very beginning (I, 23, 8), was Avellaneda. Furthermore, it is very likely that Cervantes knew this, since he tells us that he knew Avellaneda was a pseudonym and was not from Tordesillas (*Don Quijote*, III, 27, 6-8, II, Prologue; III, 28, 29-31, II, Prologue; IV, 405, 17, II, 74), and shows in Part II, Chapter 62 that he knew that the book had been printed in Barcelona.

It is appropriate, then, for us to look at Pasamonte, the man and the character, to see what can be found that is relevant to Cervantes. It should be noted, first of all, that Ginés is the most problematical character of *Don Quijote*; it is *his* theft of the donkey which is missing,<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Ángel Rosenblat, in *La lengua del “Quijote”* (Madrid: Gredos, 1971), pp. 116-30, proposes that “sinónimos voluntarios” refers to Cervantes’ use of pairs of similar words, a frequent characteristic of his style. Yet this stylistic device, common to many writers, as Rosenblat himself admits (p. 120), would not explain Avellaneda’s anger.

<sup>38</sup>For a more extensive discussion of the Aragonese features of both Avellaneda and Pasamonte, see Riquer, *Cervantes, Passamonte y Avellaneda*, pp. 141-58 y 161.

<sup>39</sup>For the circumstances of the theft, see Geoffrey Stagg, “Revision in *Don Quixote*, Part I”, in *Hispanic Studies in Honour of I. González Llubera* (Oxford: Dolphin, 1959), pp. 347-66, at pp. 360-

with a glaring inconsistency in the narration as the result. He is also the character who changes the most; his transformation from a strong-willed, ungrateful criminal to the inoffensive puppeteer Maese Pedro, whom Don Quijote and Sancho do not recognize, is abrupt and unsatisfying. Maese Pedro's fame in the "*Mancha de Aragón*" (*III*, 318, 19, II, 25; emphasis added) is irreconcilable with the short time that has passed since Ginés' freedom from chains in Part I. He appears at a critical juncture in Part II, as well, in which large amounts of territory are passed over in silence, and Don Quijote and Sancho have an adventure, the *barco encantado*, which seems out of context; I have suggested this as the point at which the text was set aside and picked up years later.<sup>40</sup>

Cervantes portrays Pasamonte as a "grande bellaco", "ladrón de más de la marca", with "más delitos que todos los otros [galeotes] juntos", "nada bien sufrido" (*I*, 306, 32-302, 2, 307, 21, 314, 6, I, 22), and as an "embustero y grandísimo maleador" (*III*, 73, 13-14, II, 4). Pasamonte, on the other hand, portrays himself as the innocent victim of an awesome number of "traiciones", as well as an honest, devout, clean-living soldier. Which has the most claim to our credence? I believe that Cervantes, so concerned with truth, is clearly the one who deserves it; he has little reason to deceive us, and Pasamonte is the author of the biggest deception in Spanish literature. It is not certain that Cervantes had read Pasamonte's *Vida*; at *III*, 431, 12-14, II, 27 we find that the "infinitas vellaquerías y delitos" of Ginés "fueron tantos y tales, que él mismo compuso un gran volumen contándolos", and Jerónimo's life is not a history of *bellaquerías*, but of *trabajos*. Yet it must be pointed out as well that in the *galeotes* episode, Ginés says of his *Vida* that it "trata verdades, y que son verdades tan lindas y tan donosas, que no puede aver mentiras que se le igualen" (*I*, 308, 15-

---

61.

<sup>40</sup>In the following article in the present volume. This thesis is supported by Nicolás Marín, "Camino y destino aragonés de Don Quijote", *Anales cervantinos*, 17 (1978), 54-66; also "Cervantes frente a Avellaneda: La duquesa y Bárbara", *Cervantes y su mundo*, pp. 831-35, and "Reconocimiento y expiación. Don Juan, Don Jerónimo, Don Álvaro, Don Quijote", in *Estudios sobre literatura y arte dedicados al profesor Emilio Orozco Díaz*, recogidos y publicados por A. Gallego Morell, Andrés Soria y Nicolás Marín (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1979), II, 323-42.

18, I, 22). This is a significant statement to find in the work of an author, Cervantes, who believed that a book should indeed contain “verdades lindas y donosas”, and that such would be superior to *mentiras*. That no comment on this is made in the text, that no one says that it is a shame for such a truthful, and therefore virtuous, author to be sent to the galleys, implies that Pasamonte’s *Vida* is anything but true, that it is full of *mentiras*.

That Pasamonte’s *Vida* can not be accurate, that he does not portray himself truthfully, is a conclusion which easily impresses itself on the reader. In the letters accompanying the *Vida*, for example, we find that it was sent to the ecclesiastical authorities in Naples for inspection, as Jerónimo had been accused of heresy; there is nothing whatsoever in his self-presentation that explains this accusation. Randolph D. Pope, in his study of Spanish autobiographies, suggests that Pasamonte may have been mentally ill.<sup>41</sup> Pope also experienced “dudas...sobre la sinceridad de la vida religiosa de Pasamonte” (p. 132), who portrays himself waiting at the church door for it to be unlocked, and remaining “dos o tres horas...de rodillas oyendo missas y rezando” (Chapter 34), scarcely normal conduct even in the passionately religious Golden Age Spain. And finally, comparing Pasamonte’s *Vida* with other Spanish autobiographies of the period, Pope finds his to be the most literary (p. 139).

Every reader of Pasamonte’s *Vida* notices the surprising parallels between his life and that of Cervantes. Both were soldiers, and both were wounded by an “arcabuzazo” (prologue to the *Novelas ejemplares*; *Vida*, Chapter 17). Both participated in Lepanto, though Pasamonte offers us no description of that celebrated battle. Both were taken captive, and spent years in captivity, though Pasamonte, while offering us much less descriptive detail, claims to have spent many more than Cervantes, eighteen years, more than any captive who did

---

<sup>41</sup>*La autobiografía española hasta Torres Villarroel* (Bern: Herbert Lang, and Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1974), p. 131; Pasamonte’s *Vida* is discussed on pp. 124-40). Benito Sánchez Alonso describes Pasamonte’s “temperamento” as “enfermizo” (“La literatura histórica en el siglo XVI”, in *Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas*, III, reimpresión [Barcelona: Vergara, 1968], p. 333).

not abandon his religion.<sup>42</sup> Both were even kept in a *baño* (*Vida*, Chapter 26). Both organized unsuccessful escapes, and when recaptured offered to take sole responsibility. Both unsuccessfully sought official recompense for their travails.

We have already seen that Pasamonte took material from Cervantes in writing his continuation of *Don Quijote*; he may well have done the same in his autobiography. Cervantes was obviously very public about his military career, as he used it so often in his works; he must have talked about it frequently, in response to the inquiries his injured hand would naturally provoke.

What was it that led Cervantes to include Pasamonte in *Don Quijote*, to remove the episode in which he was to be portrayed as a thief before our eyes, to recast him as a puppeteer? What is the meaning of the epithet *Ginesillo de Parapilla* (*I*, 307, 11-31, *I*, 22)? There are no answers to these questions; we will probably never know what Pasamonte's true life was or what crimes, if any, he committed. There is only the hint in the text that Cervantes had befriended him, as Don Quijote did, and that his help was poorly repaid.<sup>43</sup> "El hazer bien a villanos es echar agua en la mar", says Don Quijote (*I*, 316, 8-9, *I*, 23); Don Quijote's action in setting him free "después le fue mal agradecido y peor pagado" (*III*, 340, 25-26, *II*, 27). The evil of ingratitude is insisted on in *Don*

---

<sup>42</sup>George Camamis, *Estudios sobre el cautiverio en el Siglo de Oro* (Madrid: Gredos, 1977), p. 205. Camamis merely says that Pasamonte's Christian captivity was "uno de los cautiverios más largos", but he does not cite any longer example.

<sup>43</sup>There are two allusions to possible crimes of Pasamonte in *Don Quijote*, for neither of which there is any substantiation. The first is Cervantes' description of Avellaneda as someone who "no ossa parecer a campo abierto y al cielo claro, encubriendo su nombre, fingiendo su patria, como si hubiera hecho alguna traición de lesa magestad" (*III*, 28, 29-32, *II*, Prologue; emphasis added). The second is Don Quijote's statement in the chapter in which we meet Ginés that "suelen hazer algunas mugerzillas simples y algunos embusteros vellacos... algunas misturas y venenos con que buelven locos a los hombres" (*I*, 305, 3-6, *I*, 22); Ginés is immediately and repeatedly called both "embustero" and "bellaco" (*I*, 307, 2; 307, 27; *I*, 309, 12, all from *I*, 22; *I*, 495, *I*, 23, interpolated passage; *III*, 73, 13, *II*, 4; *III*, 341, 12, *II*, 27). Pasamonte portrays himself as poisoned and temporarily maddened by a *mujercilla*; Kattan (pp. 201-02) suggests this as a source of the poisoning in "El licenciado Vidriera".

*Quijote*;<sup>44</sup> I would not go so far as to suppose, with Achleitner, that Pasamonte was one of those Cervantes had helped to escape from captivity. Yet it is at least a possibility that Cervantes had helped Pasamonte, and was then treated shabbily by him, as Don Quijote was.

It is also worth suggesting that Cervantes was told or pressured to alter his treatment of Pasamonte, removing the theft of the donkey and changing him to a harmless, yet in Cervantine terms still a pernicious character.<sup>45</sup> Pasamonte did have the influence necessary to get his book published, and in a highly unusual fashion. The printer who issued it with a false imprint, an act which carried some risk, was Lope's printer, Sebastián Cormellas of Barcelona, as Cervantes seemingly points out by portraying the printing of Avellaneda's work during Don Quijote's visit to the Barcelona print shop. The attribution to Lope of the prologue to the *Quijote* of Avellaneda has been strongly argued. Lope, then, presumably helped Pasamonte. Yet there is another person who helped him as well, of the house whose name is the one known like between Pasamonte, Lope, and Cervantes: Lemos. According to his *Vida*, Pasamonte received considerable assistance from the Conde de Lemos, father of the count who assisted Cervantes;<sup>46</sup> it is often forgotten that Lope, prior to entering the service of the Duque de Sesa, was secretary to Cervantes' future patron.

---

<sup>44</sup>“De gente bien nacida es agradecer los beneficios que reciben, y uno de los pecados que más a Dios ofende es la ingratitud” (*I*, 312, 27-29, I, 22); “siempre los malos son desagradecidos” (*I*, 495, I, 23, interpolated passage); “la ingratitud es hija de la soberbia, y uno de los mayores pecados que se sabe, y la persona que es agradecida a los que bien le han hecho da indicio que también lo será a Dios, que los hombres cometen, aunque algunos dizen que es la soberbia, yo digo que es el desagradecimiento, ateniéndome a lo que suele decirse: que de los desagradecidos está lleno el infierno” (*IV*, 237, 3-7, II, 58); “bien puede ser que un cavallero sea desamorado; pero no puede ser, hablando en todo rigor, que sea desagradecido” (*IV*, 337, 6-8, II, 67).

<sup>45</sup>Maese Pedro first obtains money by deception (his monkey), as the text carefully explains to us, and then ignorantly presents information taken from *romances* as historical. (See “The *Romance* as Seen by Cervantes”, in the present volume.)

<sup>46</sup>It is curious that the imaginary author of Avellaneda's prefatory sonnet, “el menguado entre los rudos”, has the same name as Cervantes' patron: Pe[d]ro Fernández.

Cervantes' association with Lemos is, of course, not known at that time. There are still a number of unexplained, and perhaps inexplicable, mysteries surrounding Pasamonte; the most troubling of these is the difference in literary skill between the *Vida* and the false *Quijote*. We can only suppose that Pasamonte received some literary education, that he was assisted, that he worked at this writing.

In conclusion, I would like to point out two ways in which a reaction of Cervantes to Pasamonte may be noted. The first of these is the use of Zaragoza. Don Quijote's decision to "no pon[er] los pies en Zaragoza" (IV, 253, 10, II, 59), after learning of Avellaneda's book from a certain Jerónimo and his friend Juan, is of course pointed out in the text as a reaction to that book. Yet Cervantes' choice of Zaragoza as a destination, where Don Quijote expected to "ganar fama sobre todos los cavalleros aragoneses" (III, 76, 7-8, II, 4), can also be seen as a reaction to the Aragonese Pasamonte, and the story told by Maese Pedro's boy is of course one of villainy in Zaragoza. And a subsequent reaction of the Aragonese to this treatment of their capital and to Cervantes' extravagant praise of Barcelona<sup>47</sup> is detectable as well. Just as Lope is the only contemporary writer to defend *libros de caballerías* after the publication of *Don Quijote* (see note 23), Zaragoza is the only city in which a *libro de caballerías* was reprinted, and successfully at that, after *Don Quijote*;<sup>48</sup> it is also the only city where we have documented any reaction to the book of Avellaneda.<sup>49</sup>

Finally, it is certainly possible to see the "Historia del cautivo", a narration in which truth is a major theme,<sup>50</sup> as an answer to Pasamonte's *Vida*. Just as the *Vida* contains many parallels to the life of Cervantes, so does

---

<sup>47</sup>*Don Quijote*, IV, 383, 24-28, II, 72; "Las dos doncellas", III, 43, 14-23.

<sup>48</sup>The *Espejo de príncipes*, of which Parts I and II were reprinted in Zaragoza in 1617, and, evidence that this edition was commercially successful, Parts III and IV in 1623.

<sup>49</sup>Riquer's introduction to his edition of Avellaneda, I, lxxxii-lxxxiii.

<sup>50</sup>Juergen Hahn, "El capitán cautivo: The Soldier's Truth and Literary Precept in *Don Quijote*, Part I", *Journal of Hispanic Philology*, 3 (1979 [1980]), 269-303.

that of Cervantes' soldier, so many that John J. Allen takes from it information about Cervantes' military career.<sup>51</sup> Pasamonte presented inaccurately the life of a soldier and the sufferings of captivity; Cervantes offers us the truth.

---

<sup>51</sup>“Autobiografía y ficción: El relato del Capitán cautivo (*Don Quijote*, I, 39-41)”, *Anales cervantinos*, 15 (1976), 149-55, and “Más sobre autobiografía y ficción en el *Quijote*”, *Anales cervantinos*, 16 (1977), 253-54.