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Guide to Don Quixote

_Cervantes’ Don Quixote_. New York: Monarch, 1975, long out of print and hard to find.

Cervantes’ Literary Career

The evolution of Cervantes’ novelistic technique has never been satisfactorily delineated by literary critics and historians. It has often perplexed critics to note that Cervantes’ first work, _La Galatea_ (1585), is an example of the highly artificial and imitative genre of the pastoral novel, and that he refers several times throughout the rest of his life to a “second part,” in which he seems to have been interested even as he was writing _Don Quixote_. The curate finds a copy of _La Galatea_ in the course of his scrutiny of Don Quixote’s library, and concludes that “we must wait for the second part which he [Cervantes] promises,” and in the Prologue to _Don Quixote_ II, and even in the Dedication of his _Persiles_, he is still promising the reader this continuation of _La Galatea_. The problem for criticism is of course the reconciliation of this affection for the stylized and artificial pastoral in the author who created the modern realistic novel. It is in fact Cervantes himself who first points out the artificiality of the genre, in one of his exemplary novels, “The Colloquy of the Dogs,” when Berganza brings up the discrepancy between the lives of real shepherds and those books “dreamed up and well written for the entertainment of idle folks, and not true al all.” Two aspects of the pastoral novel may have attracted Cervantes. First, it constituted an established genre and therefore a logical vehicle for a writer’s apprenticeship, and one which combined prose and verse, thus afford a place for the poetry which Cervantes very much wanted to write successfully. Second, it also afforded the opportunity for a degree of psychological penetration in the characters’ introspective laments.
Cervantes’ Interest in Delusion.
After publishing La Galatea at thirty-eight years of age, Cervantes published nothing further until 1605, when Don Quixote appeared. Yet, extraordinarily, this book, published when he was fifty-eight, was only the beginning of his real literary legacy. In 1613 his Exemplary Novels appeared, establishing Cervantes as the founder of the modern Spanish short story. Although the influence of the Italian novellieri can be seen in some of these stories, the best of the collection, “Rinconete and Cortadillo,” “The Deceitful Marriage,” “The Colloquy of the Dogs,” are entirely original in content, conception, and style. “Rinconete and Cortadillo” and “The Colloquy of the Dogs” each share some characteristics with the picaresque novel, though neither falls entirely within the genre. Another of the stories in this group, “The Man of Glass,” reflects the interest in madness and delusion which is so important in the creation of Don Quixote. There are twelve stories in all, which critics tend to divide roughly in half, one group of realistic stories contrasting with another of romantic, Italianate tales.

In 1615 both Don Quixote II and Eight Comedies and Eight Interludes appeared. The eight plays, never produced, reveal Cervantes’ attempt to come to terms with the new conditions which Lope de Vega’s outstanding talent and prolificness had imposed upon the theater. The plays in this volume are all of the Lopean, three-act construction, as opposed to Cervantes’ earlier predilection for four or five acts. They are quite overshadowed by the interludes published with them. These are brief, farcical pieces in prose or verse which were presented between the acts of full-length Golden Age plays, and Cervantes is the acknowledged master of the genre. His interludes are often presented even today.

An Unresolved Dilemma.
Cervantes’ last prose work, The Hardships of Persiles and Sigismunda, published posthumously in 1617, presents another enigma for the critics. Why, after creating the modern realistic novel, did Cervantes turn again to a stylized and artificial genre, this time the so-
called Byzantine novel of Heliodorus, a Greek author of the fourth century, A.D., whose work was popular in Spanish translation? Some critics, unable to accept this dramatic change or reversal of aesthetic orientation, have talked of the rapid onset of senility, or suggested that Persiles is a work written much earlier, and published in the wake of the fame of Don Quixote, but most have seen Cervantes’ last work as an ambitious, through flawed, effort to write the prose epic which he had mentioned in Don Quixote (I, 47), in the symbolic adventures of his pair of idealized lovers. The most recent criticism has emphasized the unresolved dilemma which the book reflects between the canons of Aristotelian criticism and Cervantes’ instinctive advocacy of unrestricted freedom for the creative writer, and the symbolic interpretation of the movement of the plot.

**Brief History of Criticism of Don Quixote**

The problem of the reader’s attitude toward Don Quixote is perhaps unparalleled in the history of literature, both in duration and in extent. Cervantes’ first public saw in Don Quixote only a book of entertainment, a parody of the novel of chivalry. The second stage seems to have been one of identification with Don Quixote in his folly. Motteux could say, in 1700, that “every man has something of Don Quixote in his Humour, some darling Dulcinea of his thoughts, that sets him very often upon mad adventures.” Dr. Johnson remarked, in 1750, that “very few readers, amidst their mirth or pity can deny that they have admitted visions of the same kind… When we pity him, we reflect on our own disappointments; and when we laugh, our hearts inform us that he is not more ridiculous than ourselves, except that he tells what we have only thought.” At about the same time, other commentary in England indicates that the shift to the idealization of Don Quixote had already begun. In 1739, a friend of Pope’s seemed to him “so very a child in true Simplicity of Heart, that I love him; as he loves Don Quixote, for the most Moral and Reasoning
Madman in the world." In 1754, finally, Sarah Fielding could say: "To travel through a whole work only to laugh at the chief companion allotted us, is an unsupportable burthen. And we should imagine that the reading of that incomparable piece of humor left us by Cervantes, can give but little pleasure to those persons who can extract no other entertainment or emolument from it than laughing at Don Quixote’s reveries, and sympathizing in the malicious joy of his tormentors… That strong and beautiful representation of human nature, exhibited in Don Quixote’s madness in one point, and extraordinary good sense in every other, is indeed very much thrown away on such readers as consider him only as the object of their mirth."

These notes of pity and admiration constitute the seeds of the Romantic interpretation of *Don Quixote* which was to dominate 19th-century criticism. Don Quixote is increasingly seen as the “knight of the faith” who embodies the spiritual force of human aspirations, being “superior in moral fibre to the people who flout him.” This is perhaps still the popular view of the book, through 20th-century criticism has tended increasingly to return to earlier points of view which see the knight, in spite of his nobility, as the butt of Cervantes’ satire.

The range of viewpoints has indeed been broad in this century. Cervantes has been seen as a reactionary (Cesare de Lollis), a non-conformist (Américo Castro), a relativist (Jean Cassou), a revolutionary (Pavel Novitsky, A. Gerchunoff), an Erasmian (Ludwig Pfandl), man of the middle Ages (Mario Casella), Baroque man (Marcel Bataillon), counter-reformationist (Helmut Hatzfeld), and iconoclast (Arthur Efron). This enormous diversity of opinion testifies to the extreme complexity of *Don Quixote*, and to its propensity to suggest much more than it actually says. This situation obviously argues persuasively against attempting a judgment of the novel based upon anything less than a full and careful reading of the complete text.

Another aspect of twentieth-century criticism has been its increasing tendency to examine the structure, narrative technique, and style of the novel as new methods of the analysis of fiction.
have been developed. These kinds of investigation have been aided by the publication of excellent critical editions by Francisco Rodríguez Marín and Rudolph Schevill.

Finally, it can be said as Helmut Hatzfeld has pointed out, that the most recent criticism tends to emphasize the pitfalls of the Romantic identification of Cervantes with his protagonist, and to take seriously the implications of Cervantes' statement that he is the “stepfather” of Don Quixote, and not the father (I, Prologue).

Areas for Research and Criticism

1. Cervantes’ portrayal of contemporary Spanish society.
3. The incorporation of contemporary historical, cultural, and political events into Don Quixote.
4. Autobiographical elements in Don Quixote.
5. Literary theory in Don Quixote and its relation to Cervantes’ practice.
6. Time in Don Quixote.
7. Authorial commentary in Don Quixote.
8. Description in Don Quixote.
9. The interpolated stories in Part I.
10. Man of La Mancha and Don Quixote: comparison and contrast.
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“The Example of Cervantes,” by Harry Levin. Professor Levin identifies the critical achievement of Cervantes in *Don Quixote* as the presentation of “the pattern of art embarrassed by confrontation with nature.” “Parody, explicitly criticizing a mode of literature [the chivalric novels], developed into satire, implicitly criticizing a way of life.”
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Turgenev, Ivan. See under Barbera.

Unamuno, Miguel de. *Life of Don Quijote and Sancho according to Miguel de Cervantes Sáavedra expounded with comment by Miguel de Unamuno*. Trans. Homer P. Earle. New York: Knopf, 1927. A chapter by chapter commentary in which Unamuno develops his concept of Don Quixote as the Knight of the Faith, whose stance toward the world must be emulated by those who would lead Spain to a renewal of its former greatness, coupled with a disdain for Cervantes, whom the author presents as inferior to his creation.
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