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gives no reasons for his date, but as a terminus ad quem it fits the very little that we know of Ferruz. The early date of this reference is, however, not its most significant feature. More important is the evidence it seems to provide that in the late fourteenth century LBA was so well known that Ferruz could rely on his readers to see the point without any need to mention the book or author by name.18

Westfield College
University of London

A. D. DEYERMOND

Pero Pérez the Priest and His Comment on *Tirant lo Blanch*

The statement concerning *Tirant lo Blanch* found in Chapter 6 of the *Quijote* should, by any reasonable standard, by now be a dead issue. Since Diego Clemencín first labelled this single paragraph as "el pasaje más oscuro del *Quijote*," almost a century and a half have gone by, and 14 articles, excluding this one, have been devoted specifically to it,19 as well

18 I am grateful to Dr. C. B. Gybbon-Monypenny, Professor Ian Michael, Mrs. Gail Phillips, and Dr. Roger M. Walker for their helpful comments on this article.

* This paper was read at the Twenty-fifth Annual Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, April 28, 1972.

as a multitude of treatments of it within larger studies. Yet, astonishing as it may seem, there has been virtually no agreement on the questions raised about the passage: whether it was intended as praise or censure of the \textit{Tirant}, the motives for such praise or censure, whether the words mean what they seem to mean, and whether the text may be trusted. Without


Juan Calderón, Riquer, and Sansone, in particular, have attempted to explain the passage through what can only be called distortion of the meaning of the words in it; Riquer has been refuted by Montoliú and Sansone, but he has twice said that despite criticism he still holds the same opinion (in his edition of the \textit{Quijote} of Avellaneda [Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1972], III, 13, 18, and in his “Cervantes y la caballeresca” chapter in the forthcoming \textit{Sama cervantina} volume [London: Tamesis, 1973]).

Various nineteenth-century editors and critics, among them Menéndez Pelayo, sought to give the sentence coherence removing the negation; Arnold proposed
being able to evaluate individually each of the interpretations proposed, this paper attempts to present additional evidence leading to an interpretation which is in harmony with the text as it stands, and with the normal meaning of the words and expressions in the passage.

I would like to pause briefly to read the paragraph to you. After deciding to dispose of the remaining romances of chivalry without further examination, "por tomar muchos juntos," one fell on the floor, and it turned out to be *Tirante el Blanco*. The passage continues as follows:

---¡Válame Dios!---dijo el Cura, dando una gran voz. ---¡Que aquí esté *Tirante el Blanco*! Dádmele acá, compadre; que hago cuenta que he hallado en él un tesoro de contenido y una mina de pasatiempos. Aquí está don Quiricleón de Montalbán, valeroso caballero, y su hermano Tomás de Montalbán, y el caballero Fonseca, con la batalla que el valiente de Tirante hizo con el alano, y las agudezas de la doncella Placerdemivida, con los amores y embustes de la viuda Reposada, y la señora Emperatriz, enamorada de Hipólito su escudero. Dígoos verdad, señor compadre, que, por su estilo, es éste el mejor libro del mundo: aquí comen los caballeros, y duermen, y mueren en sus camas, y hacen testamento antes de su muerte, con estas cosas de que todos los demás libros deste género carecen. Con todo eso, os digo que merecía el que le compusieran, pues no hizo tantas necedades de industria, que le echaran a galeras por todos los días de su vida. Llevadlo a casa y leedlo, y veréis que es verdad cuanto del os he dicho.

The problem which has received so much comment is the apparent inconsistency between the priest’s enthusiasm for the book, and the condemnation of the author to the galleys.

I think that this passage can be understood properly only by examining the personality of the character whose words we hear: Pero Pérez, the priest who carries out the "escrutinio"—or rather, destruction—of Don Quijote’s library, following the suggestion of the housekeeper that the books be burned. Pérez is one of the most significant among the minor characters of Part I of the *Quijote*. He is usually mentioned in the same breath as his friend and companion the barber, but the priest is by far the more important of the two, and, especially at the beginning, dominates his companion in a manner not unlike that in which Don Quijote dominates Sancho. It is the priest, for example, who initiates the expedition to return Don Quijote to his village, and it is he who discusses literature with the canon from Toledo. It is not until the conclusion of Part I that the barber initiates a conversation or expresses an independent point of view.6

making the central statement a question, a suggestion that was refuted by Centeno. More recently, Sansone has also attempted to reinterpret the passage by changing the punctuation.

6 I would not wish to take the Don Quijote-Sancho priest-barber parallel too
The priest is a particularly intriguing figure since, although there is a
great deal to laugh at in Part I, usually accepted as the more humorous of
the two parts, the priest is one of the few characters who are funny by
intent, rather than involuntarily. He is, from the very beginning, pre-
sented as a humorous character, since he was a graduate of the University
of Sigüenza. Clemencín, in a note which Rodríguez Martín did not see fit
to reproduce, pointed out that because of its intellectual level, even to
name this university was humorous; Cervantes drives the humor home by
slyly observing that the priest was an “hombre docto.” It is, in fact, the
priest who in view of his knowledge of romances of chivalry, suggests the
extremely comical, although logical, disguise as a damsel in distress by
which to trick Don Quijote into returning to his village. It is the priest
who baits Don Quijote by mentioning the galeotes who had been freed,
rumor had it, by “algun hombre sin alma y sin conciencia” (I, 29). It is the
priest who would have Sancho worry about his master becoming an
arzobispo andante; it is the barber who allays his fears (I, 26).

This, then, is the person who takes it upon himself to examine the
contents of Don Quijote’s library, and who delivers in the process of the
examination a series of most remarkable literary judgments, though per-
haps not so remarkable as the fact that they have been repeatedly taken
as completely serious. There are 27 titles commented on specifically, out
of the more than 300 books which Don Quijote had in his library (I, 24);
three others are also mentioned which were not found in it. The priest,
who insists on at least reading the titles of the books before burning them,
selects 16, or more than half, as worthy of salvation (of which more later);

far, but certainly the barber becomes more like the priest as Part I progresses,
although the corresponding change in the priest does not occur. They have
both read romances of chivalry, as we can tell from Chapter I, 1, but the priest
is much more familiar with them, as well as better educated in general. As Don
Quijote is a knight, and single, so the priest also practices a demanding pro-
\fession with a high social standing, and is celibate.

4 We can also mention the people Don Quijote meets on his primera salida,
and, of course, the galeotes, “gente que recibe gusto de hacer y decir
bellaquerfas.”

7 By Riquer and Montoliu, for example; also William E. Purser, Palmerin of
England. Some Remarks on this Romance and on the Controversy Concerning
its Authorship (Dublin, 1904), p. 204: “No one will deny that he the priest
is merely the channel through which Cervantes expresses his own views.”
Stephen Gilman, “Los inquisidores literarios de Cervantes,” Actas del Tercer
Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas (Мexico, 1970), p. 6: “los juicios que
expresan [the priest and the barber] son los de Cervantes.” In this paper, with-
out wishing to accept some of his more general remarks, much less his affirma-
tion that Cervantes wrote the Quijote to criticize the drama of the time, Gilman
has made a real contribution by calling attention to the religious imagery in
the examination and condemnation, which explains the personification of
various of the books.
if Don Quijote’s shouts had not interrupted the process, very little would have been burned.

In only a few cases does the priest give any meaningful justification for his decision to destroy a book, and even then we can see his sense of humor at work. He says of *Felixmarte de Hircania* that its style is hard and dry, which is meaningful enough, yet quite irrelevant to the book’s content, moral or otherwise, and to its potential for contributing to Don Quijote’s madness. On the other hand, *Olivante de Laura* is condemned because of its content, yet it is not clear how the priest would have a romance of chivalry be other than *mentiroso*, or fictional; in any event, the book may be *disparatado*, but why does he call it *arrogante*? His criticism of Feliciano de Silva’s works are understandable, but he illustrates his disapproval with a most unusual image: he would, to be able to destroy these books, burn his father as well, if his father were a knight-errant.

With the remaining books condemned to the flames, except for three pastoral novels and the chivalric romance *Platir*, which are condemned without explanation, he abandons subtlety and makes a humorous remark, in two cases a pun: such as, that the novel of Gil Polo should be preserved as if it were of Apollo.

Of the books which are saved, many receive their reprieve only with a condition attached. The *Diana* of Montemayor must undergo major surgery; the *Tesoro de varias poesías* requires some excisions. Perhaps we are to understand that pages must be ripped out, but I fail to see how *Belianis de Grecia* could conceivably cure itself, no matter how long a time is allowed it. Similarly, humor can be the only reason for ordering all the books about “*estas casas de Francia*” to be placed in a dry well, as if they contained something poisonous that could not be allowed indoors (as *Belianis* can, if no one reads it), nor left on the ground, for fear an animal might eat it.

There is little consistency to be found in the priest’s comments, but we can deduce, parenthetically, the following with regard to his literary tastes: first, he has a sense of the history of literature, and will condemn the *Amadis* for giving the romances of chivalry birth, while pardoning the *Diana* of Montemayor in part because it started the pastoral novel in Spain. Secondly, the priest likes to see good language. He censures the language of Feliciano de Silva and that of *Felixmarte de Hircania*, as well as the translations of Ariosto; on the other hand, he commends the language of *Palmerín de Inglaterra*. Finally, the priest is not much interested in lyric poetry. Not only do Darici’s eclogues displease him, but López Maldo- nado’s could also be a bit shorter; the *Diana* of Montemayor must have its major verse removed, and the *Tesoro de varias poesías* is too long, as well

* Except that we do not know what displeased him about Queen Pintiquinestra.
as in need of some purification. Even the verses of Cervantes himself do not satisfy him.9

Besides Tirant lo Blanc, there are two other books about which the priest is particularly enthusiastic. His comments on one of them, Palmerin de Inglaterra, have been discussed in an excellent book-length study, and we need not speak of them here; however, his comments on the second, Antonio de Lofraso’s Los diez libros de Fortuna de amor, are very much to the point. If one would still believe that the priest’s ambiguous judgments are to be taken as those of Cervantes—that we are to take him seriously when he calls Turpin a true historian and Ariosto a Christian poet—his comments on Lofraso prove decisively that the books the priest is enthusiastic about would not necessarily receive Cervantes’ praise.

I would like to read his comment on Lofraso:

—Por las órdenes que recibí—dijo el Cura—que desde que Apolo fue Apolo, y las musas musas, y los poetas poetas, tan gracioso ni tan disparatado libro como ése no se ha compuesto, y que, por su camino, es el mejor y el más único de cuantos deste género han salido a la luz del mundo; y el que no le ha leído puede hacer cuenta que no ha leído jamás cosa de gusto. Dámeme acá, compadre; que precio más haberle hallado si me dijeran una sotana de raya de Florencia.

We know what Cervantes’ true opinion of Lofraso was, since in the Viaje del Parnaso, the hitheress of satire is applied to him: it is proposed that he, as the most expendable on the literary boat, be thrown to the waves, to enable the boat to pass between Scylla and Caribdis. It should be no surprise, then, that the priest is enthusiastic about Lofraso’s book not because it is well written, but because it is funny and ridiculous, or, in his words, gracioso and disparatado. This is the sense10 in which it is “el más único de cuantos deste género han salido a la luz del mundo.” It is because it is such a bad pastoral novel that the humor-loving priest is going to take it home with him, in order to laugh at it.11

And so we finally arrive at the work which is the focus of our discussion, Tirant lo Blanc, a book which certainly would be no better known than the other romances of chivalry were it not for the passage we are examining. I would like to pause before discussing the priest’s statement to mention briefly the most common interpretation of Cervantes’ attitude

9 “Más versado en desdichas que en versos” can be taken as a comment on Cervantes’ poetry, as well as on his life.

10 Por su camino supports the interpretation that por su estilo in the comment on the Tirant means “in its own way,” and has nothing to do with Martorell’s use of language.

11 Palacios, Rodríguez Martín, and Mendieta all mention Lofraso, although they do not all draw this conclusion from the passage. That the novel of Lofraso was in fact a very inferior work is confirmed by Juan Bautista Avalle Arce, La novela pastoril española (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1959), pp. 148-55.
toward the Tirant, that of Menéndez Pelayo. Menéndez Pelayo's position, briefly paraphrased, is that Cervantes realized that the realistic nature of the Tirant was a valuable contribution, but that he felt obliged to censure the book because of its obscenities and licentious scenes. Realism no longer inspires the reverence in the literary world that it did in the preceding century, and I think that modern Cervantine criticism would resist the picture of a Cervantes enamoured of realism in its varied forms and opposed to the usual literary modes of his time, which were not realistic in the sense which that word normally has today. Without being able to enter here into an indeed complicated and controversial area, I would merely remind you that while Cervantes wrote La Gitanilla, he also wrote El amante liberal; that while he wrote Rinconete y Cortadillo, he also wrote Las dos doncellas; that he considered his Persiles—scarcely a "realistic" work—superior to his Quijote, and that at the end of his life he was working on Part II of the Galatea, and the Semanas del jardín, which from its title alone must have resembled the idealized world of Boccaccio or of Los cigarrales de Toledo.

With regard to the second part of Cervantes' alleged attitude, that he was censoring the Tirant for its immorality, there is a great deal that could be said. First of all, the Tirant is not a particularly dirty book, and its "obscenities" are confined to a small section; it seems to me absurd to call it, in the words of Francisco Maldonado, "una apoteosis del erotismo," or to say, as Rodríguez Marín does, that "La lozana andaluza, con ser lo que sabemos, no le echa el pie delante más que en una escena." Secondly, Cervantes is being quite inconsistent in singling out the Tirant, as various other romances also have licentious elements, which he never mentions. But most important, I think that in the Quijote alone there are too many explicit or implied sexual references for us to accept its author as a Victorian prude, and I mean more than the scabrous episodes associated with the aventura de los batanes (I, 20), and Don Quijote's imprisonment in the cage (I, 48), or the delightful semantic discussion of the term "hideputa" (II, 13). Don Quijote himself calls the office of alcaldue a necessary and important one, and Otis Green feels he speaks

---

11 I hope that Frank Pierce would agree with this statement, for although, in his article cited in n. 2, he says that the sexual element in the Tirant is "pervasive," he admits that it is restricted to the parts dealing with the court of Constantinople. He is more concerned with the type of presentation—natural and accepting—rather than the quantity of sexual scenes. It should be noted that the emphasis on the sexuality of the Tirant began in an attempt to find an explanation for the necedades the priest finds in it, other than the one given below.

12 "Martorell," $22.

14 Don Quijote, ed cit., IX, 186.

18 This is particularly true in the case of Feliciano de Silva's works, which I hope to discuss in the near future.
for Cervantes. There are, in Part I, several women whose virtue is open to question (as is Aldonza Lorenzo’s; see I, 25) or nonexistent (Maritornes, la Tolosa). Sexual lust is what moves the muleteer to seek Maritornes, bringing on the hilarious scene in the inn; in the equine world, it brings on the adventure with the yangüeses, contributes to Maritornes’ trick on Don Quijote, and is a concern of the Caballero del Verde Gabán (II, 16). There are explicit, yet casual references to homosexuality in the Historia del Cautivo and in the tale of Ana Félix, Ricote’s daughter (II, 63). And beyond this, there are other references of such questionable taste that I hesitate to mention them in public.


20 III, 188, II, 2-3 of Rodríguez Martín’s edition, cited above: “le quiso tanto, que fue uno de los más regalados garzanes stivos.” Garzón in an Arabic context meant “un sodomita mantenido por un señor árabe” (Háfez, cited by Corominas).

21 Sancho’s etymology of Ptolomeo (II, 29), a scatological reference in Teresa Panza’s letter to her husband (II, 52), an allusion to menstruation (II, 23), and no doubt others I have missed.

I said “in the Quijote alone,” because I am sure that a systematic survey of the Cervantine corpus would turn up many more sexual allusions. There is a constant sexual undertone to El celoso extremeno (and El viejo celoso), there are references to syphilis in El casamiento engañoso, and various types of sexual allusions in El colloquio de los perros. (My thanks to Ruth El Saffar for a stimulating discussion of this topic.)

In his introduction to Tirante el Blanco, I (Barcelona: Asociación de Bibliófilos de Barcelona, 1947), li-iii, and almost verbatim in his Aproximación al Quijote, pp. 58-69, Riquer maintains that Cervantes criticized the romances of chivalry as a genre as “incitadores de la sensualidad.” He cites three passages in support of this allegation, two of which were spoken by the canon from Toledo, whose identification with Cervantes is in any event not to be taken for granted (see Alan Forcione, Cervantes, Aristotle, and the Persiles [Princeton, 1970]). The first of the quotations (“¿Qué haremos de la facilidad con que una reina o emperatriz heredera se conduce en los brazos de un amante y no conocido caballero?”) was cited by the canon as an example of lack of verisimilitude, not of licentiousness; in the second, the canon compares them to the Milesian fables, then goes to explain that he means by this that they lack a moral lesson, not that they are obscene, as Riquer tries to show from other texts. The final quotation Riquer uses to prove his point is spoken by the Caballero del Verde Gabán, who says that knights-errant were “en daño de las buenas costumbres,” an extremely vague comment that by no means need refer to sensuality.

Although not mentioned in this context by Riquer, others have seen Cervantes as criticizing the Celestina for its licentious elements, in the comment of Donoso, “libro en mi opinión divino / si se quitará más lo humano” (I, W. McPheters, “Cervantes’ Verses on La Celestina,” Romance Notes, 4 [1965], 136-38; Pierre Ullman, “The Burlesque Poems which Frame the Quijote, ACoro, 9 [1961-62], publ. 1965, 223-23). I would venture the opinion that to see these lines as
Having said all this, we can return to the priest’s statement. The key, to my mind, to understanding this passage is that the priest says the Tirant is full of ncedades, idiocies, and by saying “tantas nceadas” he makes it clear that he is referring to the details he has just given. In a chivalric context, the book is ridiculous. We see a knight fight with a dog, and an empress in love with a squire; there is also the merry widow, a figure completely alien to the chivalric world, in the person of Reposada, whose sexual desires lead to her suicide. Knights die of old age—a dishonorable death 19—taking the precaution of making a will before. Finally, even the names knights have are ridiculous: Kiriëleíson de Montalbán, which Cervantes must have understood as a ridiculous attempt to create a Greek-sounding name (like “Polifebo”), such as many other knights in the Spanish romances had, and whose association with the famous Montalbán family was doubly funny, and the knight Fonseca, an insignificant character who could only have caught Cervantes’ eye because of his name. Because of its very familiarity, we find nothing noteworthy in the name Fonseca, but it is an unwritten rule of the Spanish romances of chivalry that the characters in them never have Hispanic names, so much so that it would seem a hilarious blooper for one to appear, above all, as a Greek.20

In short, the book is “un tesoro de contento y una mina de pasatiempos” because of details like these which the priest found in it. If it had been Martorell’s purpose to write a humorous or farcical book—that is, if he had in fact written these idiocies “de industria”—he would not deserve any punishment. It is because he attempted to write a serious romance of chivalry, and failed so badly, that he should be sent to the galleys.

Of course, this is only the opinion of a country priest of a mediocre education, and is not to be taken literally, or perhaps even figuratively, referring to sex reflects our modern prejudices, and that by “lo humano” Cervantes meant the whole spectrum of human passions presented in Rojas’ work.

It is noteworthy that Cervantes never criticized Avellaneda for his greater crudity in these matters.

19 At Don Quijote’s death, the escribano said that “nunca habla leído en ningún libro de caballerías que alquién caballero andante hubiese muerto en su lecho tan sossegadamente y tan cristiano como don Quijote.” It is unclear to me whether this is meant as praise or ridicule of Don Quijote.

20 This does not mean that Fonseca is the most unusual name in the Tirant, nor that there were not chivalric figures, such as Bernardo del Carplo, who had Spanish names. But within the context of the sixteenth-century Castilian romance of chivalry (and Cervantes had no way of knowing that the Tirant was not such a work), the appearance of any Spanish element is striking. Following the lead of the Amedís, the books had neither a Spanish setting nor Spanish characters, and though occasionally a Spanish knight might turn up at a tournament, he would have a fantastic name, undistinguishable from those of the other knights. This is the case even in those books whose titles would lead one to believe otherwise: Cristalión de España, Rosán de Castilla, Florando de Castilla.
as expressing Cervantes' true opinion; no doubt Cervantes would not have really sent Martorell to the galleys, any more than he would have really placed the books dealing with the matière de France in a dry well. What should be clear, is that there is in this passage no praise of Tirant lo Blanch, on the part of Cervantes, or of anyone else.

DANIEL EISENBERG

The City College
City University of New York

Melisendra's Mishap in Maese Pedro's Puppet Show

Among the most interesting and illuminating contributions made in recent years to our understanding of Don Quijote, especially as this involves the establishment of the complex relations between author, reader, and characters, is George Haley's article on "The Narrator in Don Quijote." Professor Haley demonstrates convincingly that "Maese Pedro's puppet show is . . . an analogue to the novel as a whole, not merely because the burlesque legend that Maese Pedro re-creates with puppets is a reductio ad absurdum of the same chivalric material that Cervantes burlesques through his characters, but also because it reproduces on a miniature scale the same basic relationships among storyteller, story and audience that are discernible in the novel's overall scheme." I should like here to focus on another facet of Cervantes' achievement in the representation of this little play within the novel, and to attempt a modest extension of Haley's analysis to include a further point of analogy with the novel as a whole.

Haley's unraveling of the complex relations between Maese Pedro, his narrator the 'trujamán,' and his spectator Don Quijote, establishes the parallel between the puppet show and the novel as a whole:

22 The other, briefer allusions to the Tirant in Don Quijote are no more indicative of a favorable attitude on the part of Cervantes. Aside from the list in Don Quijote's speech at the beginning of I, 20, the description in I, 13, "el nunca como se debe alabado Tirante el Blanco," is ambiguous, and the adjectives acomodado and manual used to describe him in II, 1 are frankly insulting, despite Riquer's attempt in a note to his edition of the Quijote, 6th ed. (Barcelona: Juventud, 1969), II, 548, to explain them away. Acomodado, in the Diccionario de Autoridades, is "el que es muy amigo del descanso, regalo y conveniencias"; manual, citing this very passage as its example, is "el hombre que tiene el genio dócil, y es muy fácil en hacer cuanto le mandan."

2 George Haley, 'The Narrator in Don Quijote: Maese Pedro's Puppet Show,' Modern Language Notes, 80 (1965), 148. Subsequent references appear in parentheses in the text.