

## INTRODUCTION

---

Cada cual tiene el derecho de admirar el *Quijote* a su manera.\*  
MENÉNDEZ PELAYO

Estás en tu casa, donde eres señor della . . .  
*Don Quixote*, I, 30, 8-9

**T**HIS BOOK is a study of *Don Quixote* in relation to its author, Cervantes. I have tried to ascertain his goals in writing the book, what he thought it meant, and how he desired it to be read. Although I did not set out to interpret the book, the concluding evaluation of Cervantes' interpretation has interpretative implications.

My approach has been to establish, to the extent possible, Cervantes' own literary context and outlook; as these cannot be determined from *Don Quixote* alone, I have used external evidence, including that in his other works. My starting point, however, has been *Don Quixote's* stated focus and the preferred reading of its book-loving protagonist, the *libros de caballerías*.<sup>1</sup> My original purpose in reconstructing Cervantes' literary outlook was to better understand the humor of *Don Quixote*, with which the *libros de caballerías* are intimately related.<sup>2</sup>

As this study grew, unexpectedly, from a short article<sup>3</sup> into a monograph, I came to see the extent to which Cervantes' book differs from what he wanted it to be. In retrospect, it is also painfully obvious that the humorous

\* "Interpretaciones del *Quijote*," in *Estudios y discursos de crítica histórica y literaria*, edición nacional (Madrid: CSIC, 1941-42), I, 303-22, at p. 312.

<sup>1</sup> I have previously offered a definition of the genre, and studied it independently of Cervantes, in *Romances of Chivalry in the Spanish Golden Age* (Newark, Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta, 1982), with a related bibliography, *Castilian Romances of Chivalry in the Sixteenth Century. A Bibliography* (London: Grant & Cutler, 1979). On my use of the Spanish generic label for these books see later in this introduction, and on the meaning of *libro*, Chapter 2. Although the erroneous singular "libros de caballería" was used more widely in the eighteenth century than previously realized, I have defended the plural in "Un barbarismo: 'libros de caballería,'" *Thesaurus*, 30 (1975), 340-41, and "More on *libros de caballería* and *libros de caballerías*," *La Corónica*, 5 (1976-77), 116-18.

<sup>2</sup> I am much indebted to P. E. Russell's classic article "*Don Quixote* as a Funny Book," *MLR*, 64 (1969), 312-26, and to the related work of Anthony Close, "*Don Quixote* and the 'Intentionalist Fallacy,'" *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 12 (1972), 19-39, 19-39, reprinted in *On Literary Intention*, ed. David Newton-de Molina (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1976), pp. 174-93; and *The Romantic Approach to "Don Quixote"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978). See also Ruth El Saffar, "Concerning Change, Continuity, and Other Critical Matters: A Reading of John J. Allen's *Don Quixote: Hero or Fool?* Part II (Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1979)," *JHP*, 4 (1980 [1981]), 237-54.

<sup>3</sup> "Teaching *Don Quixote* as a Funny Book," in *Approaches to Teaching "Don Quixote"*, pp. 62-68.

attack on *libros de caballerías* is today among the book's least important elements. We are not seventeenth-century men and women, and *libros de caballerías* are no longer a danger (if they ever were). We approach *Don Quixote* with different views of the world, society, and the nature and function of literature. A seventeenth-century approach to the book is inadequate.

Yet although an author's interpretation of his or her book may be incomplete, even inevitably so,<sup>4</sup> I do maintain that Cervantes' interpretation of *Don Quixote* is ascertainable, and the proper beginning of study. That my topic is of at least potential interest is shown by the frequent references to authorial intent found in Cervantine studies. At best, these statements are incomplete.

Many others, of course, also disagree with one or another of the statements which have been made about Cervantes' goals in *Don Quixote*. Cervantine studies are so chaotic, and the positions held so contradictory, that every scholar disagrees strongly with much of what has been written. However, I have, in general, avoided the history of the questions examined, which would have considerably augmented the size of this book. We have already had, in the recent past, three critical histories of *Don Quixote* interpretation, each of which has itself been highly controversial.<sup>5</sup> There are already adequate tools to help those who wish to study Cervantine scholarship.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Only an author who completely understood him- or herself could provide the definitive interpretation of his or her work; this is the gaping hole, grudgingly conceded and then dismissed, in E. D. Hirsch, Jr.,'s defense of the author (*Validity in Interpretation* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967], pp. 22-23 and 51-57). For discussions of the problem of validity in interpretation, see Hershel Parker, *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons: Literary Authority in American Fiction* (Northwestern University Press, 1984), Paul B. Armstrong, "The Conflict of Interpretations and the Limits of Pluralism," *PMLA*, 98 (1983), 341-52, and P. D. Juhl, *Interpretation: An Essay on the Philosophy of Literary Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980); these will lead the interested reader back to previous theoretical work.

<sup>5</sup> In chronological order, Arthur Efron, "Satire Denied: A Critical History of English and American *Don Quixote* Criticism," Diss. University of Washington, 1964; A. J. Close, the book cited in the second note to this introduction, reviews of which are listed in the second note to the appendix; and R. M. Flores, *Sancho Panza through Three Hundred Seventy-five Years of Continuations, Imitations, and Criticism, 1605-1980* (Newark, Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta, 1982), reviewed by Eduardo Urbina, *JHP*, 7 (1983 [1984]), 224-26, Howard Mancing, *Cervantes*, 4 (1984), 84-86, myself, *BHS*, 61 (1984), 507-08, Mary Cozad, *SAR*, 50 (1985), 112-15, and John J. Allen, *CL*, 37 (1985), 371-72.

<sup>6</sup> The volume *Suma cervantina*, ed. J. B. Avallé-Arce and E. C. Riley (London: Tamesis, 1971) provides general introductions to Cervantes' works and many of

There is one question, however, on which discussion of preceding scholarship is unavoidable, and since it is preliminary to much of what follows it will be addressed now. That central question is the validity of the views of the canon from Toledo, who discusses chivalry, chivalric literature, and contemporary drama in Chapters 47 through 49 of Part I: whether his principles and observations are those of Cervantes. I take his reliability to be complete.

The most recent attack on the validity of the canon is that of Alban Forcione, who sees Don Quixote's answer as a refutation;<sup>7</sup> however, Don Quixote's response is actually an illustration of faulty argumentation, as is discussed in Chapter 3. With more conviction, Bruce Wardropper belittled the canon and his views a generation ago.<sup>8</sup> His article has already been called "totalmente desenfocado" by Alberto Porqueras-Mayo and Federico Sánchez y Escribano;<sup>9</sup> E. C. Riley does not mention it, though he surely knew it, and I mention it only because Wayne Booth criticized Riley for not discussing it.<sup>10</sup> I find the errors in this article to be numerous. Wardropper's argument that the canon is ambiguous on the *libros de caballerías* is an argument for his identification with Cervantes, rather than the reverse. That the canon believes the genre one of much potential is understandable if we accept that Cervantes had written in it, as is proposed below. I do not find that Pero Pérez is a "sycophant" (p. 219), or that his approval of the canon is to be so dismissed. And finally, Wardropper himself says that the canon is "a true Cervantine creation" (p. 218), and ends by declaring that we find "the same dichotomy in Cervantes [over the *comedia*] as we find in the canon" (p. 221).

If one is to make sense of Cervantes' literary beliefs—and there is scarcely a more basic topic—then we *must* accept the reliability of the canon from

the critical problems, with bibliographies. There are two recent bibliographies of *Don Quixote* studies: Dana Drake's *"Don Quijote" (1894-1970): A Selective Annotated Bibliography*, Volume I, University of North Carolina Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures, 138 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Department of Romance Languages, 1974), Volume II, Miami: Universal, 1978, and the *Bibliografía fundamental* which accompanies Luis Murillo's edition of *Don Quixote*, 2nd edition, Clásicos Castalia, 79 (Madrid: Castalia, 1982). The annual *Anales Cervantinos* includes a bibliographic section, with summaries of the items included; it and the new journal of the Cervantes Society of America, *Cervantes*, will do much to introduce the novice to Cervantine studies.

<sup>7</sup> *Cervantes, Aristotle, and the "Persiles"* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), Chapter III.

<sup>8</sup> "Cervantes' Theory of the Drama," *MP*, 52 (1955), 217-21. Wardropper reaffirmed his condemnation of the canon in "Comedias," *Suma cervantina*, pp. 147-69, at pp. 155-56.

<sup>9</sup> *Preceptiva dramática española del renacimiento y el barroco* (Madrid: Gredos, 1965), p. 21, n. 21.

<sup>10</sup> In a review of Riley's *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), *MP*, 62 (1964), 163-65. (Riley did mention the article subsequently, in his "Teoría literaria," *Suma cervantina*, pp. 293-322, at p. 303.)

Toledo. No theory has been proposed which excludes him yet arrives at a consistent Cervantine picture of *libros de caballerías*, the epic, and the drama. If we do accept him, we have a place from which to start, and some pieces of the puzzle fall into place. Such is what I am doing in this book.

To take a character as a spokesperson for the author is nowhere nearly as hazardous when dealing with Renaissance literature, or early literature in general, as it is in modern literature. Authors were then much more definite about having a "message" to communicate to their readers, and in overtly saying what that message was. Although today authors avoid doing so, it was common to base literary characters on real people.<sup>11</sup>

Cervantes is commonly credited with having created authorial distance and independent narrators and characters, though there are precedents for both in historical writing and in the *libros de caballerías*.<sup>12</sup> To be sure,

<sup>11</sup> One obvious example is Castiglione's *Cortesano*; another is pastoral literature. In *La Galatea*, "muchos de los disfrazados pastores della lo eran slo en el bito" (I, L, 2-3); for identification of them, see Francisco López Estrada, *Estudio crítico de "La Galatea" de Miguel de Cervantes* (La Laguna: Universidad de La Laguna, 1948), pp. 157-67, although Geoffrey Stagg, "A Matter of Masks: *La Galatea*," in *Hispanic Studies in Honour of Joseph Manson* (Oxford: Dolphin, 1972), pp. 255-67, is more skeptical. Jorge de Montemayor declared in the "Argumento" of *La Diana* that in it are "muy diversas hystorias, de casos que verdaderamente an sucedido, aunque van disfrazados debaxo de nombres y estilo pastoril" (ed. Francisco López Estrada, *Clásicos Castellanos*, 127, 4th edition [Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1967], p. 7). On the historical characters behind those of *La constante Amárilis*, see J. P. Wickersham Crawford, "Some Notes on *La constante Amárilis* of Christóval Suárez de Figueroa," *MLN*, 21 (1906), 8-11; this is to be preferred to the revision of the material found in *The Life and Works of Christóbal Suárez de Figueroa*, published dissertation, University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1907); Crawford's conclusions are endorsed by Juan Bautista Avallé-Arce, *La novela pastoril española*, 2nd edition (Madrid: Istmo, 1974), p. 215. The use of real characters in the pastoral goes back to Virgil, and before him Theocritus (López Estrada, *Los libros de pastores en la literatura española. La órbita previa* [Madrid: Gredos, 1974], pp. 487-90).

<sup>12</sup> There is no general examination of this topic, although Cristina González has promised a monograph dealing with the evolution in Spanish chivalric writing from history to fiction, and there is scholarship from outside of Spain, the most closely related being Suzanne Fleischman's discussion of the role of the narrator in "On the Representation of History and Fiction in the Middle Ages," *History and Theory*, 3 (1983), 278-310, and Stephen G. Nichols, Jr.'s important book, *Romanesque Signs. Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983). There is an enormous body of medieval and Renaissance prose writing, ignored by historians because too literary and by literary scholars as too historical, to be studied; I mentioned the most important Spanish examples of it in my *Romances of Chivalry*, pp. 39-40, although foreign texts need to be dealt with as well. (The influence of the pseudo-Turpin chronicle on Spanish prose is completely unexamined, for example.) The independent narrator is in his origin the historian, and *libros de caballerías*, like *Don Quixote*, are *historias fingidas*; see my "The Pseudo-Historicity of the Romances of Chivalry," in *Romances of Chivalry*, pp. 119-29.

Cervantes used them more extensively, and *Don Quixote* was later to popularize them. Yet Cervantes' purpose in doing so was not to hide behind masks or advance literature *per se* but to educate readers, to teach them to recognize deceptive narrators.

Let me make the same point even more generally. In modern fiction, the identification of a character with the author is not to be assumed, but must be established, if such identification is to be accepted as valid. This is, however, not the way to read the literature of earlier periods, in which the identification of the author's views with the statements of virtuous characters was taken for granted; it would have been thought of as wasteful, even sinful, to write things the author thought untrue, and statements which are false are included only to point readers to an obvious conclusion endorsed by the author. In studying *Don Quixote*, then, I have taken the position that every character is a mouthpiece for the author, unless there is evidence to the contrary, *which in many cases there is*.

But Cervantes is ironic, I will be answered; surely one cannot take him in such an uncomplicated fashion. True, Cervantes is ironic, but he is not obscure, at least not deliberately so. It is surprisingly easy to distinguish statements Cervantes meant us to accept from those he meant us to reject. When Cide Hamete addresses his pen and attacks Avellaneda, at the very end of the book, he is speaking for Cervantes, as everyone agrees. (This is also a passage in which we are told why the work was written.) When he says "¡Bendito sea el poderoso Alá!" (III, 110, 5) he is not. When Don Quixote says to Sancho "Primeramente, o hijo, has de temer a Dios . . . . Lo segundo, has de poner los ojos en quien eres, procurando conocerte a ti mismo" (IV, 51, 4-8; also III, 262, 32-263, 1), he is speaking for the author. When he says that in response to a royal summons to all Spanish *caballeros andantes*, "tal podría venir entre ellos que solo bastasse a destruir toda la potestad del Turco" (III, 39, 5-7), he is not. When Cervantes says of himself "yo soy aficionado a leer, aunque sean los papeles rotos de las calles," and that he could identify Arabic letters (I, 129, 27-32), we can believe him. Yet his pretense of having sought, purchased, and translated the work we all know to be false. In the important cases it is as simple as that.

The text repeatedly directs our interpretation. We are told, for example, that Don Quixote's observations in Chapter 1 of Part II, of which the recommendation to the king is one, are "grandes disparates" (III, 49, 21-22); the priest, the barber, and the *ama* all censor, in various ways, Don Quixote's statements in that chapter. In the middle of his advice to Sancho, we are told that Don Quixote was speaking as a "persona muy cuerda y mejor intencionada . . . . Como muchas vezes en el progreso desta grande historia queda dicho, solamente disparava en tocándole en la cavallería, y en los demás discursos mostrava tener claro y desenfadado entendimiento" (IV, 55, 5-9). Such obvious clues cannot be ignored.

Additional guidance in interpretation can be had if one keeps in mind the Christian context in which the work was written. Everyone has an immortal

soul; everyone can be saved; all are children of God, and, as such, equal.<sup>13</sup> Thus, characters are not described as evil; rarely are they identified as good. What they say to us about themselves can be slanted, self-serving, even deceitful. The infallible key, referred to repeatedly, is what they *do*. "*Operibus credite, & non verbis*" (III, 325, 29-30; IV, 152, 9-10); this is how God will judge all men, and how we are intended to judge Cervantes' characters.<sup>14</sup> Following this principle, the problem of irony, the perspective we are meant to have on the characters, is much simplified. Diego de Miranda—a *nombre significativo*, like so many others in the book<sup>15</sup>—shares his wealth with the poor; Roque Guinart kills. Pero Pérez, for all the fun he pokes at Alonso Quixano, goes to some trouble to get him home and help him recover his sanity; Sansón Carrasco urges him to "bolver en sí" (IV, 399, 10; adapted), i.e., become crazy again, when he is finally sane.

With these provisos, Cervantes' interpretation can be reconstructed. In rereading what I have written, I find that I have assumed that from the text itself we can tell how it was intended to be read, that this guidance is straightforward and sincere, that the characters and narrators tell us what Cervantes' views were, what books he had read, what topics interested him, even what his language was and by implication what his personality was like. I find, also, that in documenting my arguments I have assumed that Cervantes' goals in all his works are more similar than different,<sup>16</sup> and his characters are as well. In fact, with all the exceptions one cares to name, Cervantes' characters are all variations on a single theme, the Christian, which was not so far from his self-image.

A methodological consideration. This book assumes of the reader a knowledge of the Spanish language, without which assumption it could not

<sup>13</sup> "Las almas todas son iguales, y de una misma massa en sus principios criadas y formadas por su hazedor" (*Persiles*, I, 115, 10-12).

<sup>14</sup> For textual comments on the primacy of *obras*, see note 85 to Chapter 3 and note 76 to Chapter 4. The objection that God (for Cervantes) not only can but does judge intentions is without merit; the famous, censored, phrase, "las obras de caridad que se hazen tibia y floxamente no tienen mérito ni valen nada" (III, 444, 30-445, 2), is said by the duchess in an attempt to pressure Sancho to hurt himself with the 3,300 blows her servant, dressed as Merlin, has ordered. In the virtuous person, intentions and acts are in harmony; God helps see that this is so (IV, 63, 18-19); "es muerta la fe sin obras," says Don Quixote near the end of Part I (II, 374, 16), not without a pointed statement on the importance of *liberalidad* with which the rich can demonstrate *agradecimiento*. That one could enter heaven on the basis of good intentions alone is a ludicrous idea; it is the road to hell which is proverbially paved with them.

<sup>15</sup> "Miranda" in Latin means something that should be observed.

<sup>16</sup> Thus, I take the statement of exemplary intent in the prologue of the *Novelas exemplares* as completely sincere, however imperfectly it is realized in the book.

have been written or even conceptualized. In the first place, close reading requires the use of the original language. Cervantes can be appreciated in translation, but one can no more accurately study him in English than one could study Shakespeare using only Spanish. A translation is at best, in Cervantes' famous phrase, a "tapi[z] . . . por el rebés" (IV, 295, 15), a tapestry seen from the back.<sup>17</sup> One of the few things on which Cervantine scholars agree is that all translations distort him, some seriously.<sup>18</sup> For those who must study *Don Quixote* in English, I suggest the use of two translations simultaneously. First, for the closest English approximation of *Don Quixote*, the earliest translation, that of Thomas Shelton (1612 and 1620), much praised by later translators;<sup>19</sup> more than any other, his translation reflects

<sup>17</sup> On this expression and on Cervantes' view of translations, see Lore Terracini, "Una frangia agli arazzi di Cervantes," in *Linguistica e filologia. Omaggio a Benvenuto Terracini* (Milan: Mondadori, 1968), pp. 279-311, reprinted in *Lingua come problema nella letteratura spagnola del Cinquecento (con una frangia cervantina)* (Turin: Stampatori, 1979), pp. 285-322.

<sup>18</sup> See the article of P. E. Russell cited in note 2, and John J. Allen, "Traduttori traditori: *Don Quixote* in English," *Critica Hispánica*, 1 (1979), 1-13 (incorporating his earlier "Cide Hamete's English Translators," *HR*, 35 [1967], 367-68), and Robert M. Jackson, "A Tradition of Error: English Translations of *Don Quijote*, II, 24," *Homenaje a Stephen Gilman, Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* [Puerto Rico], 9 (1982), 123-27. The shaping of interpretation by translators is studied by Mary Jane Power, "The Voices of Don Quixote: A Study of Style through Translation," Diss. Wisconsin, 1967 (abstract in *DA*, 28 [1967], 1055A-56A).

<sup>19</sup> Sandra Forbes Gerhard, "*Don Quixote*" and the Shelton Translation (Madrid: José Porra Turanzas, 1982), pp. 7-9. Shelton's translation is frequently praised by scholars as well; in addition to those mentioned in the previous note, John Ledger Skinner compares it favorably to other early translations in "Changing Interpretations of *Don Quixote*, from Hudibras to Pickwick," Diss. Cambridge, 1973, pp. 26-41.

Another important yet little-known commendation of Shelton was made by the eighteenth-century English scholar Thomas Percy. He proposed "not a *new Translation*, for the Public is so surfeited with these that it would nauseate the very name[,] but a new & improved Edition of an Old one . . . . The Old one of *Shelton*, as far as I have observed excells them all: it is as faithful to the Sense, as any of them, has more simplicity, because the Translator aims at no refinements upon his Author: and has one excellence, which gives him the preference, his old English Style is exactly adapted to express the solemn manner of the original; and his antiquated words & phrases give additional force to the Author's humour. This Version I will carefully compare with the original Spanish, wherever it departs from the Authors sense will correct & emend it." (From a letter to the book dealer Lockyer Davis, March, 1761; published by David Nichol Smith in the preface to the reconstruction of Percy's *Ancient Songs chiefly on Moorish Subjects translated from the Spanish* [London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1932], p. xiii. The date is established from Davis' answer, March 20, 1761, conserved in Boston Public Library, MS Eng. 154(1), for the knowledge of which

Cervantes' vocabulary, syntax, and humor.<sup>20</sup> And as a check on Shelton, who does make errors and take liberties which will confound the student of the book, the only translation which reflects current Cervantine scholarship, the revision of John Ormsby's translation by Joseph R. Jones and Kenneth Douglas (New York: Norton, 1981).<sup>21</sup> In the Index of References to Cervantes' Works I have provided chapter references, so as to facilitate the consultation of these or other translations.

However, Cervantes is, to a considerable degree, untranslatable.<sup>22</sup> There is no Spanish author who is so linguistically sophisticated; Góngora is difficult, but Cervantes is rich. He can not only be as careful as a philosopher with his concepts, but as precise as any poet in his use of language. As a result, *Don Quixote* is full of untranslatable linguistic humor, uses every style from the most vulgar to the most elevated, and has vocabulary, linguistic structures, and rhythms for which there are no English equivalents.<sup>23</sup>

I am indebted to my colleague Bert Davis; the recipient was first identified and the date approximated as early 1762 by Gisela Beutler, from her research on Percy's Spanish library, *Thomas Percy's spanische Studien, ein Beitrag zum Bild Spaniens in England in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts* [Bonn, 1957], pp. 337-38 and especially pp. 385-86.)

A revision of Shelton, as proposed by Percy, has never been published.

<sup>20</sup> Those able to handle Elizabethan orthography can read Shelton's translation in the edition of James Fitzmaurice-Kelly (1896; rpt. New York: AMS, 1967). There have been several uncritical modernized editions; that most commonly seen today, the Harvard Classics edition, only includes Part I. Users of Shelton's translation should note that it follows the original chapter numbers of Part I, dividing Part I into four separately numbered parts (see Chapter 4, p. 131.)

<sup>21</sup> As stated in the following section, "A Note on the Texts," I have included in the Index of References to Cervantes' Works a key indicating the chapter to which each page number refers.

<sup>22</sup>"The style of Cervantes in his *Don Quixote* possesses an inimitable beauty, which no translation can approach. It exhibits the nobleness, the candour, and the simplicity of the ancient romances of chivalry, together with a liveliness of colouring, a precision of expression, and a harmony in its periods, which have never been equalled by any other Spanish writer." (J.C.L. Simonde de Sismondi, *Historical View of the Literature of the South of Europe*, trans. Thomas Roscoe, 4th ed., [London, 1885-88], II, 226.) "They have the smallest share of it [the pleasure of reading *Don Quixote*] who use the dark glass of a translation, those the highest, who enter into the spirit of the original. They who are versed in Languages cannot but know the possibility of fully comprehending the import and meaning of words, and yet find themselves utterly unqualified to express themselves properly in their own. What Voltaire says of Hudibras, that it is *introduisible*, is applicable to almost every Original composition of Wit, Genius, and Humour." (John Bowle, *A Letter to the Reverend Dr. Percy, concerning a New and Classical Edition of . . . "Don Quixote"* [London, 1777], p. 47.) This position is further elaborated in José María Sbarbi, *Intraducibilidad del "Quijote"* (Madrid, 1876).

<sup>23</sup> "The style of Cervantes merits every encomium. It may be compared to the

Richard Predmore, faced with a similar problem, chose to write his *El mundo del "Quijote"* in Spanish.<sup>24</sup> The use of two languages, however, has a crucial advantage: an expanded critical vocabulary. In discussing late sixteenth-century literary theory and concepts of genre, it is necessary to use the original terminology; especially important, I have come to realize, is that *libros de caballerías* were not thought of as "romances" of chivalry.<sup>25</sup> Precision requires the use of these terms in their Golden Age sense, which in many cases is different from their modern Spanish meanings as well as those of their English translations: *romance* was not the same as romance,<sup>26</sup> *historia* and *poesía* were broader than history and poetry, *novela* narrower than novel. By using Spanish terms in their Golden Age sense, and English terms in their modern one, one has additional tools with which to tackle some vexing problems.

Although writing, then, in English, I have freely used the Spanish language. I believe that doing so is not only necessary, but an esthetic advantage of this book. I am proud to quote Cervantes' beautiful language in its original form.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that this book does not claim to be *the* study of Don Quixote, only *a* study. My approach is authorial, and what special expertise I have in understanding Cervantes is derived from reading books he himself read. My knowledge of those books is most imperfect; no one has ever duplicated Cervantes' reading, and I believe no one ever will. Who can, today, read Virgil, Boiardo, Ariosto, Garcilaso, Ercilla, Juan Rufo, Pedro de Padilla, Cristóbal de Mesa, the *Crónica de Juan Segundo*, *Guzmán de Alfarache*, *La pícara Justina*, the *Diana*, *Diana segunda*, and *Diana enamorada*, *Amadís de Gaula*, *Cirongilio de Tracia*, *Belianís de Grecia*, and so on? No one can; it would mean devoting our *horas ociosas* to it, and we have other books to read, including the vast amount of literature and other writings subsequent to him. I think Cervantes himself would want us to read the best books that we can; only by limiting ourselves to those written before 1616, and making

noblest river, that now rapid runs with proper velocity, now gently glides along, and suffers its crystal current to be tinged with hues, which it receives from the lesser streams that mingle with its waters. To drop the allusion, the language of *Don Quijote*, though the purest and most elegant of the Castilian, has its variations and inequalities, conformable to the persons in whose mouths it is put, and to the subjects treated of." (Bowle, *A Letter to Dr. Percy*, p. 34.)

<sup>24</sup> See his comments in the preface to *The World of Don Quixote* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967).

<sup>25</sup> The term "romances of chivalry" denies the links—style, structure, and focus—which these books have with historical writing, and imposes on them a fictional orientation which was neither the authors' clear intent nor the readers' expectation. On the term "*libro de caballerías*," see Chapter 2.

<sup>26</sup> See my "The *Romance* as Seen by Cervantes," cited at the end of this Introduction.

them our primary recreation, would it be possible to duplicate his reading. This will never happen. For this reason alone we will never be finished studying his works. I have done the best I can.

Many friends have read sections of this study in draft form, and made invaluable suggestions for its improvement. These include Howard Mancing, A. David and Ruth Kossoff, Alan Deyermond, Anthony Close, James Parr, Harvey Sharrer, Thomas Lathrop, Ruth El Saffar, John J. Allen, Gilbert Smith, and Ellen Burns. I would like to give them much credit for the help, while retaining responsibility for the errors that remain. I am especially grateful for the continued stimulus and encouragement of Richard Bjornson.

Some material once a part of this volume has been published separately: "Cervantes and Tasso Reexamined," *KRQ*, 31 (1984), 305-17, in which I argue against Cervantes' use of Italian literary theory, specifically the debate concerning the *romanzo*, and point out the many parallels between the man Tasso and the character Don Quixote; "The *Romance* as Seen by Cervantes," *Anuario de Filología* [Madrid], 1 (1984), 177-92, in which Cervantes' attitude toward the *romance* is said to be similar to his position on *libros de caballerías*; "Cervantes, Lope, and Avellaneda," in *Josep Maria Solà-Solà: Homage, homenaje, homenatge* (Barcelona: Puvill, 1984), II, 171-83, in which I identify additional allusions to Lope in *Don Quixote*, defend Riquer's tentative identification of Avellaneda with Gerónimo de Passamonte, and suggest several of its implications for *Don Quixote*; "Did Cervantes Have a Library?," in *Hispanic Studies in Honor of Alan D. Deyermond: A North American Tribute* (Madison, Wisconsin: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1986), pp. 93-106, in which the myth of Cervantes' poverty is attacked; and "La biblioteca de Cervantes" (a reconstruction), in *Studia hispanica in honorem Martín de Riquer* (Barcelona: Quaderns Crema, in press), in which I have indicated many works which Cervantes may be concluded to have owned, identifying, in many cases, the translations and editions. A translated draft of Chapter 2 was read as a paper before the eighth congress of the Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas (Brown University, 1983), and published in *ACer*, 21 (1983 [1984]), 103-17.

Journal abbreviations are those of the Modern Language Association, and may be found in any issue of its *Bibliography*. In addition, I have used the abbreviations *HCS* for *Hispanic Culture Series: Spanish, Portuguese, and American Books before 1601*, *BPLC* for *Books Printed in the Low Countries before 1601* (both series published by General Microfilm Company), *RHi* for *Revue Hispanique*, and *(N)BAE* for the series "*(Nueva) Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*."