

MADNESS AND LAUGHTER: CERVANTES'S COMIC VISION

IN *DON QUIXOTE*

By

Rachel Noël Bauer

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the

Graduate School of Vanderbilt University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Spanish

December, 2007

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Edward H. Friedman

Earl Fitz

Andrés Zamora

William Franke

Copyright @ 2007 by Rachel Noël Bauer
All Rights Reserved

To:

my committee members, Drs. Earl Fitz, Andrés Zamora, and William Franke, whose invigorating support and excited encouragement motivated me to do better.

my advisor and the head of my committee, Dr. Edward H. Friedman, whose dream-like efficiency and continual availability made this whole process a lot less painful.

Thank you for all of your support these past four years.

Dr. Todd Hughes, who always had time to listen and who always offered good advice.

my McTyeirites at the McTyeire International House, who happily put up with two years worth of over-exuberant ravings about Don Quixote. You helped me keep in perspective why I was doing all of this learning.

mis buenos amigos madrileños, cuya paciencia burlesca con una guiri perdida pero decidida me ayudó no sólo a mejorar mi castellano, sino que también me enseñó otra capa de la risa, si se puede decir, española.

my Mom and Dad and siblings, I could not have done this without you. Thank you for your unending support, for reading Don Quixote and my manuscripts, and for urging me to not give up.

Alberto, my ‘well’ of support and laughter, without whom I surely would have thrown in the towel years ago and fled back to my non-academic life in Madrid. I love you.

And lastly, to all of you out there struggling through your degrees who toil honestly in your intellectual pursuits: ¡ánimo y al toro!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. READING <i>DON QUIXOTE</i> IN THE MENIPPEAN TRADITION	10
II. DISTURBING DEVICES: JOURNEY AND HUMOR IN <i>DON QUIXOTE</i>	54
III. HUMOR IN CERVANTES AND AVELLANEDA: UN SENDERO QUE SE BIFURCA	92
IV. MADNESS AND LAUGHTER: INGENIOUS INTERPRETATION.....	163
CONCLUSION.....	202
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	205

INTRODUCTION

*People who never laugh
cannot be taken seriously.*

— Seneca

Wisdom at times is found in folly.

— Horace

*If you wish to avoid seeing a fool you must
first break your looking glass.*

— François Rabelais

When I first began to think about writing my dissertation, I knew that my topic would have to be one that I was very passionate about, in order to keep me motivated through the long and arduous roller coaster ride that I had heard writing a thesis would be. My love of literature and history, but most of all my enthusiasm for comedy and for all things that fill life with laughter, made my decision easy. *Don Quixote* encompasses a wide variety of laughter-provoking artifices. This, in addition to its wealth of historical references as well as its place in literary history, has provided me with the necessary fodder to not only craft my thesis but moreover to keep me excited about the subject matter. Although other critics have focused separately on the Menippean satire, on the role of journey in all of Cervantes's works, on the importance of the Avellaneda sequel, and on madness in literature, I believe the analysis that I provide here, with regard to *Don Quixote* specifically, offers a fresh perspective on a four hundred year old creation.

Chapter 1, “Reading *Don Quixote* in the Menippean Tradition,” looks at the manner in which Menippean satire appears in Cervantes’s novel. In his prologues, Cervantes posits that *Don Quixote* is a parody of books of chivalry, but this seems to be only a piece of the puzzle towards fully understanding his creation. A parody is an imitation of a particular form, generally made in jest. While *Don Quixote* does attempt to follow the books of chivalry in his actions, *Don Quixote* itself is not a parody of form, strictly speaking, since it varies in plot and composition from the traditional chivalric romances. In other words, to some degree it parodies the actions of chivalric romances but it is not written in the same format.¹ The parody in *Don Quixote* provides humor through which an experimentation of various ideas and beliefs often occurs. Although the readers are not provided with a moral or message concerning the ideas explored in the text, they are often times offered the opportunity to reflect on the plausibility of a particular philosophy or social convention. Menippean satire is the genre whose purpose is the testing of a truth or an idea, and humor is one of its defining features.

Corresponding to the analysis of this genre and its representation within *Don Quixote*, I primarily make reference to Northrop Frye and Mikhail Bakhtin, two critics who have studied the Menippean satire independently of each other but who concur on several basic points regarding the genre. I also examine interpretations of Cervantine humor and comic genres by Anthony Close and Laura Gorfkle. In order to comprehend the multiple layers and techniques of comicality employed by Cervantes in this novel, I

¹ Books of chivalry, such as *Amadís de Gaula*, *Lisuarte de Grecia*, or *Le Morte d’Arthur*, tend to be very lengthy, but they do not play with prose and verse in the way that Cervantes does in *Don Quixote*, nor focus as heavily on dialogue between the characters. Their plots are also highly fantastical, where character types such as superhuman knights undergo dangerous quests to restore honor or to rescue beautiful maidens. *Don Quixote*, in contrast, does not set off to avenge anyone but rather seeks fame and glory under the guise of rekindling the chivalric tradition. As a result, in my opinion, *Don Quixote* does not faithfully parody the normal trajectory of chivalric romance because its protagonist is not given a mission but rather makes his own.

look at Menippean satire in texts such as Lucian's *A Trip to the Moon*, Apuleius's *The Golden Ass*, Petronius's *The Satyricon*, and Cristóbal de Villalón's *El crotalón*. I believe Menippean satire such as these influenced both Cervantes's writing and the evolution of the novel itself, as can be seen in Rabelais's *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*, and Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses*, to name just a few examples.

Briefly, Menippean satire is a protean genre. This flexibility of form not only allows it to mix freely with various other genres, but also injects instability into otherwise stable narratives. The principal ingredients of this genre include dialogue, laughter, a variety of voices within the text, as well as movement either through journey or a transitioning of space. It also combines verse and prose. All these elements, in their own way, add to a subversion of narrative control. It is only natural that laughter, one of the most destabilizing tools in literature, serves as the key ingredient. Laughter, just like Menippean satire, creates a subversion of some kind, whether it be of the absolute position of the author or of a socio-historical construct. The readers, in interpreting this subversion, are offered the opportunity to react via laughter. Menippean satire serves as a vehicle through which dissimilar ideas or unusual events can collide. Within predictable elements of time and space, the readers interpret that specific actions will have a particular outcome. When these time-space elements become unpredictable, the actions no longer achieve their customary result. Thus, in *La historia del Abencerraje y de la hermosa Jarifa*, when Abindarraez gives his word to Rodrigo de Narváez that he will return as prisoner after delivering his message to Jarifa, there is no element of surprise when he does follow through, because keeping one's word is what is expected of knights.

In Part I, chapter 3 of *Don Quixote*, Andrés's master, Juan Haldudo, also promises Don Quixote that he will pay Andrés for the work he has done as shepherd. But what Don Quixote fails to recognize is that Juan is not a knight and therefore does not subscribe to the same social laws. It is easy for Juan to lie and then punish Andrés even further after Don Quixote leaves. The realization that the honor code that Don Quixote believes in does not apply here allows for an unexpected twist in interpretation, which thereby is capable of provoking laughter on the part of the readers. Through the characters' conversations and actions, the social construct of honesty and keeping one's word is brought into question, with the outcome of a deceitful master and a duped Don Quixote serving to flesh out the problematic of a chivalric-social philosophy. This examination of a social construct through dialogue, humor, and distance is what lies at the heart of Menippean satire. Through the textual examples I analyze in this chapter, I show where this genre surfaces in *Don Quixote* and how Menippean satire affects an overall understanding of Cervantes's novel.

In the second chapter, "Disturbing Devices: Journey and Humor in *Don Quixote*," I draw a parallel between the narrative devices of travel and comicality, and how their employment destabilizes a text. Especially in *Don Quixote*, the storyline contains multiple concepts of journey. In *The Dialogic Imagination*, Bakhtin discusses the chronotope, or a point in the text where temporal and spatial objects intersect. Every intersection offers a distinctive point within the narrative that influences the storyline. In other words, this junction creates an atmosphere of possibilities that, as the character passes through, can have an effect on the direction of the text. Steven Hutchinson, in *Cervantine Journeys*, employs Bakhtin's concept of the chronotope of the road and

analyzes all of Cervantes's writings. In this chapter, I expand on Hutchinson's work by focusing specifically on *Don Quixote* and the various types of journeys that exist in the novel as well as how they add humor. Some of the journeys that I analyze are those that take place in dialogues, through the act of reading, via evolving signifiers, and with regard to the production of laughter. Anything that is interpreted as humorous, for example, in many ways parallels the mechanisms of journey: through a fluctuation in coordinates, a change occurs and, in the case of comic coordinates, laughter is the outcome. It is a physical phenomenon that takes place as the reader assimilates and comprehends an unlikely coupling of ideas or issues. In order for someone to find something humorous or laughter-provoking, generally speaking, an incongruity or unusual crossing of ideas must take place. Amadís de Gaula, for instance, speaks to Oriana with vocabulary fitting a high-born maiden. When Don Quixote employs the same type of speech pattern to address the two prostitutes waiting outside the inn (I: 2), the women, who are unaccustomed to such treatment, and the readers are provoked into laughing. Since the prostitutes are not high-born, Don Quixote's vocabulary does not fit the recipients and this contrast incites a comic interpretation. The technique of humor, therefore, should be understood as a narrative journey, because it transports the audience away from the previous textual linearity. There is also the physical and mental journeying that occurs during the act of reading. As the readers' eyes travel from page to page, so too they move in and out of the many layers of narration in the novel. The readers journey through the act of reading physically, via the act of moving from one word to the next, and mentally, via the concepts created by the words. These actions coincide with the act of interpretation. Depending on how the readers read a particular scene, laughter is

created if it is interpreted as funny. In the rest of the chapter, in addition to understanding laughter as journey as well as how reading is an act of journey, I look at how a word travels through a text accruing new meanings, how characters evolve through the journey of dialogues, and how a character's particular goal can be a voyage in self-discovery.

Chapter 3, "Humor in Cervantes and Avellaneda: Un sendero que se bifurca," focuses on the humor found in Cervantes's and Avellaneda's versions of *Don Quixote*. Initially, I mention critics' attempt to identify Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda, as well as their effort to determine the level of influence Avellaneda had on Cervantes's text and vice versa. Subsequently, the humor that surfaces in each novel through dialogue, plot, and narrational devices is explored. Avellaneda prefers to incorporate a more unidirectional laughter, where the observers enjoy the antics of the participants in a particular scene. Cervantes, however, generally favors a more carnivalesque laughter. This is where everyone, including the readers, are participants in the laughter, in that they laugh at each other as well as at themselves. Multidirectional laughter in general leads to a rejuvenation within the text by fostering development of characters beyond their traditional roles. Unidirectional laughter, on the other hand, promotes an overall tone that is negative or stagnant because the disparaging nature of this kind of laughter immobilizes character development and reinforces established hierarchies.

When one analyzes each novel's ending, however, the outcomes appear to contradict the direction of the text up until that point: Cervantes's knight errant dies, for example, while Avellaneda's is only temporarily cured of his madness before setting out on new adventures. I look at what these endings may represent with regard to the comicality contained in the text up to that point. Above all, I strive to show the necessity

of reading both authors' novels, for their differing types of humor as well as their portrayal of the two main protagonists, but mostly so that a fuller appreciation of Cervantes's magnum opus may be attained.

Utilizing Erasmus's *Praise of Folly* as a starting point, Chapter 4, or "Madness and Laughter: Ingenious Interpretation," examines madness from the vantage point of humanism. My interest here lies in the ethical and historical dimensions of laughter. As a direct consequence of his madness, Don Quixote transforms windmills and wine bags into giants, and a herd of sheep into an army of knights. He follows his visions and, because his adventures are steeped in a humorous context of parody, satire, and absurdity among other things, they can be laughter-provoking. Although viewed as a madman, Don Quixote is neither alienated nor silenced. His insanity takes an active role and works to rejuvenate everyone, the majority of whom react to his antics with laughter. More than solely derisive, this laughter is also at times due to the witness's ability to relate to Don Quixote. Those who are not able to laugh at themselves, such as Sansón Carrasco or the Duke and Duchess, are those who are deemed insalubrious by the reader, in contrast to the insane protagonist.

Don Quixote is not the only character to exhibit traits of madness, however. Just about every character in the novel partakes in some kind of silliness, obsession, foolishness, or what could otherwise be considered an unstable action. I believe that this is due to an underlying current of humor that stems from the belief that madness is a fundamental human attribute. As in Erasmus's *The Praise of Folly*, Cervantes embraces these aspects of the human experience. It is true that characters such as the Barber and the Curate sought to control Don Quixote's madness under the pretext of saving him, but at

the same time they also spur him on as well as act foolishly when they attempt to control him. With the Duke and Duchess, Don Quixote's madness was a form of entertainment for them. Rather than truly attempting to rout it out or eliminate it from their lives, they encouraged his madness and gave it their full attention, going to almost absurd lengths to harness it.

It is this embracing of all aspects of humanity, including both reason and madness, or the elevated and the vulgar, or the noble and the base, that is so adequately captured by Cervantes in the exploits of Don Quixote, Sancho Panza, and various other characters. At many different times throughout the novel, the narrators, translator, and characters alike react with amazement when Don Quixote, labeled as insane, comes forth with sound judgments or wise proclamations. The same thing occurs when Sancho Panza, considered inexperienced and dimwitted, renders intelligent verdicts as governor of the Island of Barataria. The observers' reactions of incredulity perhaps belie a society's inability to view the possibility of someone embodying supposedly opposite qualities; rather, from this black-or-white perspective, it is understood that an individual can be either crazy or sane, either simple or intelligent, either silly or serious, but not both. Nonetheless, in *Don Quixote*, there are many times when those characters that hold more respectable roles in the novel, such as the Curate, Barber, and Duke and Duchess, act in foolish or ridiculous ways. Continuing with this idea of the merging of opposites, I explore society's need to separate characteristics like sanity and madness and how Humanists such as Erasmus seek to erase the borders between these divisions and instead accommodate all aspects of being human. Cervantes, too, subtly appears to be

questioning these dichotomies as he imbues his characters with supposedly conflictive qualities and emphasizes the surprise in the spectators' reactions.

The analyses in these chapters focus on the organic element of humor that is so apparent in Cervantes's masterpiece. It is multifaceted and the text itself serves as an anatomy of various examples of comicality. Rooted in the humanist tradition, which recognizes the complexity of human nature and cherishes all of its representatives, *Don Quixote* is a wonderful adventure in questioning life, society, and its ideas. At the same time, it is a carnivalesque journey in laughter and a praise of folly.

CHAPTER I

READING *DON QUIXOTE* IN THE MENIPPEAN TRADITION

Miguel de Cervantes's novel *El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha* is an amalgamation of genres, voices, ideas, fantasies, and relationships. The basic plot of a self-made, crazy knight and his simple, loyal squire is interlaced with interactions that take place with a large quantity of characters. These encounters provide for a variety of subplots in the form of anecdotes told by many of the characters, which are relayed to the reader in various forms including verses, short stories, letters, and even a puppet show. Moreover, the text itself is peppered with the narrators' and translator's commentaries, providing additional levels of metafictional activity. In the prologue to Part I, Cervantes implies that *Don Quixote* is a parody of books of chivalry, but I believe this is only one piece of the puzzle. A parody is an imitation of a particular form, made in jest. The type of parody found in *Don Quixote*'s does more than provide humor, however; it opens the door for the evaluation of various ideologies and beliefs. While the readers are not given a conclusive moral or ultimatum with regard to the cultural ideas examined in the text, they are oftentimes provided the opportunity to reflect on the tenability, via its conceptualization, of a particular philosophy, social construct, or ideology. Several cultural ideas or social constructs that surface in *Don Quixote* include the concept of class mobility, woman's role in society, the issue of authority within the family structure as well as between an author and his work, the hazy border between truth and fiction and, of course, the plausibility of chivalric values in a society. Anthony Close, in *Cervantes and the Comic Mind of His Age*, discusses this treatment of cultural issues when he analyzes

Cervantes's *El coloquio de los perros*. Calling it a "weighty, reflective pendant," he places it in the same literary tradition as *The Golden Ass*. Close observes that the type of dialogue found in *El coloquio* is what really sets it apart from Cervantes's other exemplary novels:

This aligns the *Coloquio* with the typically didactic purpose of the Renaissance literary dialogue: that of putting across weighty ideas in accessible form to a wide readership. . . . The *Coloquio* reveals general kinship with numerous Spanish dialogues written from the mid-sixteenth century onwards, which treat serious matter in a free-and-easy, meandering style enlivened by proverbs, anecdotes, edifying examples, jests, scenes from everyday life, satire, narrative. (33)

Close is correct in asserting that the *Coloquio* does fit with other dialogical works within Golden Age literature, but this literary current actually stems from the ancient Greeks. In addition, what he fails to do in his analysis is give this type of narrative dialogue the label with which it has been identified by other critics such as Northrop Frye, Mikhail Bakhtin, and Laura Gorfkle, just to name a few. The form that embodies this device of portraying an idea in a work so as to test it is Menippean satire. It is also a genre whose principal mechanisms are humor and dialogue. Frye and Bakhtin, two critics who have studied Renaissance Menippean satire independently of one another, coincide on several basic points regarding how to define this genre. Neither, however, fully analyzes Cervantes's novel with regard to the literary tradition of Menippean satire, but rather each mentions it in passing. Using mainly these two theorists' definitions, examples of other Menippean satire, and a close reading of *Don Quixote*, I intend to demonstrate how Menippean satire exists within Cervantes's novel and that it serves as an integral aid in enriching the reader's appreciation of the text.

The cynic Menippus of Gadara is given credit for having first used this form of literature during the third century B.C.E. A century later Varro imitated Menippus and in

his honor gave the genre the name of Menippean satire. Within Classical Studies, the term Menippean satire is used to refer to this form, but outside of this field and throughout different areas of world literature, there are a confusing number of labels for this genre, including Menippea, prosimetrum, versiprose, anatomy, and Varronian satire, as well a confusion between defining this form and that of the mock eulogy or paradoxical encomium. This is because this genre in general has been understudied. Eugene Kirk, in *Menippean Satire*, points out that its lack of study within Classics departments, for example, is due to how it is perceived in comparison to other genres:

Remarks in pre-modern authorities are [spare], due to critical notions of a hierarchy of “kinds” or genres within which satire was a vulgar, low, and mimetic literature not worthy of the serious attention deserved by higher forms such as the epic, tragedy, epyllion, or elegy. Menippean satire could not even claim the few points of elegance that might typify formal verse or satire; the genre was a travesty upon every kind of generic conformity, and it sent up whatever was exalted in its design of parody and frequent anti-intellectualism. (xxxii-iii)

In academic circles, for the most part, it was excluded from the canon of genres considered worthy of study. Those who did decide to study it generally chose only to focus on one particular time period or on the utilization of Menippean satire in only one nation’s literature. This has resulted in an incomplete analysis of the genre, with critics creating or incorrectly using terms, as well as making assumptions about it based solely on their nation’s literature. It is necessary to take into account, or at least acknowledge, the history of Menippean satire within the European literary tradition, in order to attain a better understanding of what the purpose of this genre is, how this genre has evolved over time, why this genre was used by so many different and seemingly unrelated authors, and in general, in order to better understand its function in a particular text, such as in *Don Quixote*. In this chapter, however, I offer a brief survey of the history of Menippean

satire, specifically with regard to how *Don Quixote* fits into this literary tradition. By mentioning authors and texts previous to Cervantes that are steeped in the Menippean tradition, I believe this will lend interpretation and a further understanding of particular segments of *Don Quixote* where these references appear.

Kirk provides a concise historical overview of the history of Menippean satire from ancient Greece through seventeenth century Western European literature. This summary begins with Menippus, who directed his satires at the formal schools of Thebes, where he was more than likely not welcomed as he was a foreigner and a former slave:

He chose to parody the established genres of philosophic discourse . . . by exaggerating their fictions and arguments, pushing their logic to an absurd extreme simply by taking the sages completely literally (e.g., Epicurus was born when some atoms fortunately collided), and by thrusting in verses, songs, iambics, curses, and other unexpected and rambunctious material upon the formal learned genres. (xiv)

One century later, Varro borrows Menippus's form because he recognizes its success at keeping an audience's attention, via humor and the mixing of verse and prose. Changing its target, he focuses instead on the charlatans and hypocrites of philosophy rather than on the schools themselves. Over the next three centuries, there were several other principal authors who utilized this form. Several of the most famous representations include Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis (The Pumpkinification of Claudius)*, Petronius's *Satyricon*, Lucius Apuleius's *The Golden Ass*, and Lucian of Samosata's *A True Story* and *Dialogues of the Dead*.

During the Middle Ages, the focus of this genre shifts away from parodying learning, due to its decline, and instead turns to examine fortune and destiny. In the fifth and six centuries, Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae* and Martianus Capella's *Satyricon (On the Wedding of Philology and Mercury and of the Seven Liberal Arts, in Nine Books)*

are the two texts that continue the Menippean tradition. In “The Prosimetrum in the Classical Tradition,” Jan Ziolkowski explains, “Both Martianus and Boethius constructed texts that evidence strong dialogic tendencies, both in the simple sense of containing much talk between characters and in the more sophisticated one of juxtaposing a multiplicity of different viewpoints” (52). They are especially important historically, because they are the only two texts between the sixth and fifteenth centuries linking Classical Menippean satire to its reappearance in Western Europe during the Renaissance. This may be because they are in Latin, whereas the previous texts were written in Greek and would no longer have been read due to a general lack of studying Greek in Western Europe. These two encyclopedic texts are also the reason for the confusion between *prosimetrum* and *Menippean satire*. Because their link to earlier Menippean satire was forgotten, scholars focusing only on medieval literature labeled these works as *prosimetrum*, and they were grouped with any texts where prose and verse appeared together. It is important to note that the overriding element of laughter, so prominent in the classical texts, has now been downplayed, or rather, as Kirk puts it, “Menippean satire in the Latin West degenerated into an educational literature of encyclopedism and allegorizing” (xix). Martianus’s work was interpreted for its scholastic value as a representation of Antiquity and Classic education. Boethius’s text, because of its incorporation of Christianity, was interpreted and utilized as a bridge between ancient classical philosophy and Catholic theology. In discussing various writers of the twelfth century, Kirk observes, “None of these writers seems any longer acquainted with Varro; it is possible that they knew Seneca or Petronius . . . but no reference to such Menippean ancients is found in medieval saturae from the mid-sixth

century onward. Martianus Capella and Boethius seem, to the medieval Menippeans, to be the starting point for the genre” (xvi). In the fifteenth century, the works of Lucian were brought back from Italy, sparking fresh interest in Menippean satire. The re-discovery by Western Europe of many of the texts mentioned above was aided by the invention of the printing press. Kirk highlights, “It is not overstatement to say that Menippean satire was revived, modified, and circulated and promoted for the use of humanists like himself principally by Desiderius Erasmus” (xxii). Whereas Menippus had focused his humor on false learning in Greek schools, Erasmus, as a reformer, harnessed this humor to criticize theological pride and corruption. Kirk explains, “Erasmus learned Greek by working on Lucian, and later, when he worked on the Testaments, he remembered Lucian’s satires and employed them against scholastics, reactionaries, and bigoted Latinists who would not give way academically to the new learning of the ancient languages of the Bible” (xxii). *The Praise of Folly* and *Colloquia* in turn inspired authors such as Rabelais and Cervantes. Cristobál de Villalón’s *El crotalón* and Quevedo’s *Sueños* are two examples of this genre in Spain; the first very much in the tradition of the Ancients, and the second carrying more of a self-righteous tone. In Germany, Caspar Dornau (Dornavius) published his masterpiece *Amphitheater* in 1619, which is a combination of paradoxical eulogies and Menippean satire. Dornavius writes, “these ranting jocundities speak a truth in laughing, and far sweeter is their influence on the mind, far longer their stay there and sharper their effect, than the inculcation of morose and vehement precepts” (*Menippean Satire* xxvi). His comment here is important, because it is a summary of the essential tone of all Menippean satire, regardless of what

the genre targets. In order to better understand this, it is necessary to take into consideration the importance its structure holds in fostering this humorous environment.

According to the majority of critics, one of the principal characteristics of Menippean satire is that it appears in texts where both prose and verse are incorporated. Some critics, basing their assessment of Menippean satire on its structure, refer to it as a *prosimetrum* or *versiprose*. These three terms, however, are not synonymous, although some medievalists have appropriated the label *prosimetrum* to describe Menippean satire outside of Antiquity. Even though changes in Menippean satire have transpired since its inception in ancient Greece, the term *prosimetrum* is an inaccurate appellation for referring only to this genre in medieval literature. Kristin Hanson and Paul Kiparsky, in “The Nature of Verse and its Consequences for the Mixed Form,” clarify,

Whether a narrative mixed form will be prosimetrum or versiprose depends on what the dominant narrative form in the literary tradition is. In a literature where the dominant form of narration is verse, narrative mixed forms will tend to be constructed and perceived as prosimetrum. . . . Conversely, in a literature where the dominant form of narration is prose, narrative mixed forms will tend to be constructed and perceived as versiprose. (36)

In order to refer to a work as either *prosimetrum* or *versiprose*, it would be necessary to examine its structure with regard to the rest of the literature of its era. And while a text may be either *prosimetrum* or *versiprose*, this does not necessarily signify that it is Menippean satire, because these definitions only refer to the structure of the literary work in question. Ziolkowski indicates that the definition of Menippean satire goes beyond structure “to denote not a particular form, in which prose and verse alternate, but rather a tone or spirit than can be detected in what may otherwise be called satires, essays, novellas, novels, and so forth” (46). Menippean satire carries a carnivalesque tone, or spirit of laughter, which differentiates it from the general appellation of *prosimetrum* or

versiprose. Therefore, while Menippean satire does fit the structural definition of *prosimetrum* or *versiprose*, not all *prosimetrum* or *versiprose* are Menippean satire. The insistence by some critics of characterizing Menippean satire according to its structure is nonetheless an important starting point in analyzing this genre, because the mixing of verse and prose does effect the uniformity and tone of a text, which in turn changes the way a text is understood. In their introduction to *Prosimetrum*, Karl Reichl and Joseph Harris discuss the mixing of prose and verse in Old Irish and Old Indic texts and observe, “Prose is seen as fluid, oral, and dependent on the art of the narrator and as a literary medium which is written down only at a later period. The main function of prose is narration, while the role of verse is principally to render the words of the main actors in a story (or myth) and hence to express their attitudes, feelings and moods” (4). Although not all authors adhere to these specific demarcations when choosing to write in verse or prose, in most cultures prose and verse generally have been separated and assigned definite, diametrically-opposed roles. If the two are mixed in a text, the socially-imposed boundaries previously separating them clash. The question is, what would be a reason for intentionally breaking with literary rules by blending these two types in the same text? In examining *prosimetrum* or *versiprose*, Ziolkowski believes that, in works of great length, varying between verse and prose would help facilitate memorization, for those students of medieval grammar schools, for example. Or, in an era when texts were read out loud to audiences, an alternation between prose and verse would help hold the audience’s interest. He also points out that, when mixed with prose,

the verse could function much as do quotation marks in modern typography: to demarcate unmistakably a direct speech or pronouncement, either by a person who participates in the narrative or by the author or narrator as a form of commentary or aside. Similarly, verse could act almost as a fancy exclamation

point in highlighting an episode of special importance or in intensifying drama.
(60)

The interchanging of verse and prose would enable an author to highlight particular points, or enliven a specific passage. If a text were satirical in nature, the structure of *prosimetrum* or *versiprose* could also offer a certain degree of protection to the author. Ziolkowski observes, “The constant changes in form, tone, and outlook protect authors from being held responsible for any of the opinions they voice, since readers can never be entirely certain which views reflect the author’s standpoint and which are simply poses that he strikes to add variety and humor” (49). The structure of Menippean satire, either as *prosimetrum* or as *versiprose*, helps to establish an atmosphere of instability or disorder within the literary work as well as allows the author to distance himself from the text. Most importantly, however, this mixing of prose and verse facilitates laughter by creating instability and contrast, which in turn effects tone and reception. Because it is a combination of these two compositions, Menippean satire is a protean form and is capable of invading or assimilating into almost any genre.

In examining the structure of *Don Quixote*, one may discover a concurrence of verse and prose. The Preliminary Verses of Part I contain sonnets parodying those found in *Amadís de Gaula* and *Belianís de Grecia*. Songs weave in and out of the narrative, such as the one the goatherd Antonio sings in Part I, chapter 11 or those presented at the wedding of Camacho in Part II, chapter 20. At the Duke and Duchess’s palace, Altisidora serenades Don Quixote with a ballad in Part II, chapter 44, to which he responds in kind but with a different message two chapters later. The general events of Parts I and II are relayed by several narrators, a translator, and various characters from many different perspectives. Adding to the multitude of voices are the intercalated stories and other

characters' anecdotes. Practically every figure that enters into the plot brings with him or her a story to relate or a spectacle of some sort, as is the case of Maese Pedro's puppet show. Some stories, like those of "El curioso impertinente" and the Captive's tale, even surpass the length of a chapter and therefore have been criticized for threatening the unity of the regular plot due to their extended digressions.²

The epistolary form also appears in this novel, such as the letters exchanged by the Duchess and Teresa Panza. Impromptu speeches arise, as when Don Quixote waxes poetic about the Golden Age or when Marcela defends her choice of lifestyle in Part I, chapter 13. And lastly, even lectures take place such as the advice given by Don Quixote to the future governor Sancho in Part II, chapter 43. Bakhtin, in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, explains,

The menippea characteristically makes wide use of other genres: novellas, letters, oratory, symposia, etc.; the mixture of prose and verse diction is also characteristic. The inserted genres are presented at various distances from the author's ultimate position, i.e., with various degrees of parody and objectivization. The verse parts are almost always to a certain degree parodical. (97)

This mixing of genres within the novel itself allows Cervantes a variety of ways to play with tone, characterization, technique, and perspective, which all then work together to provoke the assessment of social constructs and ideas. Bakhtin posits that Menippean satire allows for "category-subverting intentions" as these further facilitate the examination of predetermined paradigms. He explains, "There is formed here a new attitude to the word as the material of literature, an attitude characteristic of the whole dialogical line in the development of literary prose" (97). This attitude stresses flexibility in form, coinciding with the genre's overriding intention of extending or exaggerating

² In Part I, "El curioso impertinente" takes up chapters 33-35, and the Captive's tale encompasses chapters 39-40.

borders and horizons, whatever these may be. W. Blanchard Scott, in *Scholars' Bedlam*: *Menippean Satire in the Renaissance*, likewise observes that “in its development in the Renaissance, the Menippean form begins to acquire encyclopedic proportions and to relapse into the related habit of lengthy digressions” (36). The linearity of the narrative is compromised via these textual detours. This is also what takes place within *Don Quixote*, in that there are many deviations from the main plot. Since Cervantes chose a journey as the principal venue, this serves as a blank canvas for many possible divergences as well as additions to the storyline via the characters and adventures that Don Quixote and Sancho encounter.

Another significant feature of this genre is the manner in which diction is utilized. Scott points out, “Just as Menippean satire thumbs its nose at generic norms, so it must grow indignant at lexical restraint or purity, choosing instead a polyglottal approach to style” (34). The mixing of forms and styles provides instability and change. These transitions in turn supply a flexibility of infrastructure. It is because of this flux or hodgepodge of styles that various angles of a particular topic can be explored. In *Don Quixote*, the changes in speech and word usage of the various characters allow not only for a further fleshing-out of what they represent, but also the freedom to additionally explore social constructs. For example, Don Quixote employs antiquated terms and language while his squire speaks with a colloquial tongue. On the one hand, this is the fulfillment of the Aristotelian criterion in terms of accurate representation of character, because both come from different social classes, but on the other hand these changes in types of speech serve to emphasize and bring to the forefront cultural and class issues within the dialogues. There is no need to identify these two characters; their speech

patterns let the reader know which one is speaking. Other characters such as the Biscayan squire and Zoraida add a foreign flavor to the novel due to their linguistic mannerisms. In contrast with the monotone diction utilized in other genres, such as in books of chivalry, here variety is favored.

Not only are speech acts highlighted with character-specific vocabulary in order to reflect the multiple traits, dialects, cultures and mentalities represented in *Don Quixote*, but Cervantes also invents new words. Laura Gorfkle, in *Discovering the Comic in Don Quixote*, observes, “In the text of *Don Quixote*, we find that the scope of word play is so extensive that it can easily be considered one of the primary features in the style of the work” (102). There are puns, sound play, double meanings and innuendos. Terms such as the protective-basin baciyelmo, the pseudo-island Barataria, and the wooden horse Clavileño surface in the narrative and add to the linguistic potpourri. As Scott remarks, “We witness the Menippean form realizing some of its most creative lexical potential. . . . Not only do we meet many words appropriated into the vernacular from other languages for the first time, but we even meet macaronic and invented languages, a testament to the lack of even linguistic stability in the Menippean satire” (32). Through the volatility which this genre imparts, whether linguistic or philosophical, an atmosphere is created which promotes the questioning of established norms. Cervantes parodies the lofty names found in books of chivalry, inventing monikers like *Princess Micomicona* or the giant *Caraculiambro* from the island of *Malindrания*. Northrop Frye, in *Anatomy of Criticism*, notes, “The Menippean satirist, dealing with intellectual themes and attitudes, shows his exuberance in intellectual ways, by piling up an enormous mass of erudition about his theme or in overwhelming his pedantic targets with an avalanche of their own jargon”

(311). An example of this occurs in Part I, chapter 1, when the narrator explains how Alonso Quijano goes mad by reading sentences contained in chivalric romances such as “The reason for your unreasonable treatment of my reason so enfeebles my reason that I have reason to complain of your beauty” (58).³ Here Cervantes is parodying the writing style of Feliciano de Silva, author of the *Segunda Celestina*, noted for his literary verbosity. Words are set against each other, allowing their meanings to overlap and confusion or incongruity to arise, which in turn foment humorous moments or situations. This is also true of the majority of the chapter titles which anticipate each chapter.⁴ Some accurately reflect their chapter’s contents, while others coax the reader into continuing to read the story: “Of the adventure, never before seen or heard of, achieved by the valorous Don Quixote of La Mancha, with less peril than any ever achieved by any famous knight in all the world” (I: 20).⁵ In Part II, Cervantes plays a bit more with these titles. Chapter 9 begins with the initial remarks “In which is told what therein shall be seen,” and chapter 28 announces, “Of things that Benengeli says the reader will learn if he reads them with attention.” For the alert reader, this verbal whimsy sets the stage for a comic situation; at the same time, it makes fun of the purpose of having an epigraph in the first place, because it is understood that they should generally be suggestive of what the chapters are about.

³ “La razón de la sinrazón que a mi razón se hace, de tal manera mi razón enflaquece, que con razón me quejo de la vuestra fermosura” (98).

⁴ Doubts have been raised as to whether Cervantes actually penned the chapter titles; however, I do not believe either the copyists or the publisher would have had the verbal dexterity to imitate Cervantes’s writing style in these titles as well as has been done. To cite Tom Lathrop’s opinion, “Estoy convencido de que Cervantes mismo escribió todos los epígrafes mientras escribía su libro” (117).

⁵ Unless otherwise specified, all quotations in English from *Don Quixote* are taken from the Walter Starkie edition.

Menippean satire generally appears where there is a mixing of genres, and this often includes a borrowing of epigraphs, passages, or ideas from previous texts. By incorporating them into the author's original work, they augment the level of humor, especially if the borrowed section is purposely taken out of context. While it is impossible to know all the literature that Cervantes read, it is possible to see influences of Menippean authors in his texts. One could interpret the inspiration of the man-turned-donkey Apuleius in Cervantes's Berganza, who is possibly a boy transformed into a dog. Another parallel to *The Golden Ass* occurs when Don Quixote thinks he is attacking giants and they turn out to be wine skins. Additionally, Lucian's *A True History* and de Villalón's *El Crotalón* are echoed in Sancho's description of his trip on Clavileño. In the conversations between Berganza and Cipio or between Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, it is important to emphasize that the dialogues often become the mouthpieces through which ideas are pondered. Likewise, in Lucian's "Voyage to the Lower World," the embodiment of Menippus' teachings takes shape in the form of the conversations the character Menippus himself has with others. This is important because the overall objective of Menippean satire is to take a cultural belief or ideology and inject it into a realistic arena of life events within a text with the purpose of allowing the reader to decide whether it is flawed or problematic. In other words, it allows for the putting into practice of a cultural belief or rule within a literary work in order to see in what aspect it is deficient. In the passage from Dialogue 18 that I cite below, Menippus has journeyed across the river Acheron and, after arguing with Charon and refusing to pay him, has asked Hermes to give him a brief tour of Hades. But Menippus has trouble recognizing the different skeletons, as this is all that is left of the once-famous individuals:

MENIPPUS: Where are the handsome men and the beautiful women, Hermes?
Show me the sights, since I am a stranger here.

HERMES: I don't have the time, Menippus. But look over there to the right; there are Hyacinthus, Narcissus, Nireus, Achilles, Tyro, Helen, Leda and in brief, all the beauties of old.

MENIPPUS: I see only bones and skulls stripped of flesh, many of them alike.

HERMES: These bones that you seem to despise are what all the poets marvel at.

MENIPPUS: But still show me Helen; for I should not recognize her.

HERMES: This is the skull of Helen.

MENIPPUS: Was it for this then that the thousand ships were launched from all of Greece and so many Greeks and non-Greeks fell and so many cities were destroyed?

HERMES: But Menippus, you did not see the woman when she was alive; you too would have said it worthwhile "to suffer sorrows so much time for such a woman." [Iliad 3: 157.] For if one looks at flowers when they are dry and have lost their hues, obviously they will seem ugly; but when they are in bloom and have their color they are most beautiful.

MENIPPUS: And so I wonder at this: whether or not the Achaeans realized that they were toiling for a thing so short-lived and so easily destroyed. (Morford, dialogue 18)

Rather than stating outright the maxim that society places too much value on something as fleeting as physical beauty, Lucian fashions the dialogue between Hermes and Menippus to reflect this idea, shrouding it in comic overtones. While generally of a humorous nature, this genre is also considered intellectual and therefore appeals to a smaller, more educated audience. F. Ann Payne explains, in *Chaucer and Menippean Satire*, that Menippean satire is a learned, scholarly form which “has as its purpose the subversion of all claims that the intellect makes to master human experience or construct systematic philosophies” (3). It is a crafty device that pokes fun at philosophies or religions that claim to hold the definitive answers. Metaphorically like casting a spotlight

on or holding a mirror up to certain ideological beliefs of a society, this genre aims to contemplate them to see where they err. Frye explains, “Menippean satire deals less with people than with mental attitudes” (309). The individual character is not studied *per se*, but rather the philosophy or idea he or she professes. It should be kept in mind, however, that Menippean satire does not offer straightforward answers to its provocations and questioning. As James F. Walter points out, “Menippean vision sees a world always in process so it admits of no resolution within that world” (409). Unlike a fable, this is not a didactic form. It offers a space to probe concepts and beliefs but at no time delivers a solution or verdict to the reader. The tales of the Mulla Nasrudin, of which Cervantes may have been familiar, are an example of the essence of Menippean satire in its most basic form, as they are humorous vignettes poking fun at pieces of cultural issues by way of a dialogue between Nasrudin and at least one other individual. While these vignettes can vary in length, they are never long enough to be considered a short story, nor do they offer a proverb or moral. They do, however, provide a twist or a new way of looking at an issue, generally provoking laughter at the same time. I cite two of the shorter examples here in order to provide a sense of the spirit of Menippean satire and to illustrate this genre’s principal characteristics of a humorous tone and playful manner in treating social constructs or beliefs:

Mulla Nasrudin used to stand in the street on market-days, to be pointed out as an idiot. No matter how often people offered him a large and a small coin, he always chose the smaller piece.

Once day a kindly man said to him: “Mulla, you should take the bigger coin. Then you will have more money and people will no longer be able to make a laughing-stock of you.”

“That might be true,” said Nasrudin, “but if I always take the larger, people will stop offering me money to prove that I am more idiotic than they are. Then I would have no money at all.” (Shah 52)

This scene subtly satirizes the villagers who customarily make fun of Nasrudin, whom they understand to be the town idiot. It serves as a concise example of the flux between mockers and mocked. It also reminds me of how *Don Quixote* is tested by many of the characters, who consider him to be a mad fool and therefore are surprised when he renders a wise or shrewd judgment. Another, shorter vignette shows a neighbor’s concern over the Mulla’s missing donkey and Nasrudin’s curious observation. His neighbor says, “Mulla, your donkey has disappeared.” To this, Nasrudin replies, “Thank goodness I wasn’t on it at the time, otherwise I would have disappeared, too!” (Shah 134). This tongue-in-cheek anecdote proffers a different, humorous way of looking at what would generally be considered a misfortune. Like these two examples, Menippean satire should be understood as a playful genre, provoking surprises, offering a refreshing look or a different take on an established tradition and in general disregarding whether a topic should be treated in a literary work with respect or not. Frequently, as the focus of this type of satire deals with the questioning of ideals, social taboos and marginalized issues are incorporated into the dialogues or narrative. A good illustration of this is the lavish banquet of Trimalchio in Petronius’s *Satyricon*, where the discussion amongst the guests touches on topics such as their neighbors’ habits, education and illiteracy with regard to social clout, impersonations, tombstone inscriptions, and stories about a werewolf and witches. The feast of Camacho’s wedding, in Part II of *Don Quixote*, shares several things in common with Trimalchio’s banquet. Both are described as overtly bountiful, with depictions of excessive amounts of food and drink. Both entertain various dialogues,

with an arrangement of characters filtering into and out of the plot. Camacho's wedding also includes an interpretive play, acted out by metaphorical characters including Cupid, Interest, and Poetry. While the feast in *Satyricon* takes up several chapters, Camacho's is a shorter version with the overriding focus, construed in part through the dialogue between Sancho and his master, concerning whether the rich Camacho has more of a right to marry Quiteria, even if the poor Basilio loves her more. At one point, Sancho sums up this ongoing issue by remarking to Don Quixote:

“A fig for the talents of Basilio! What you have is what you’re worth. As my grandmother used to say, there are only two families in the world, the Haves and the Havenots; and she always stuck to the Haves and to this day, master, people prefer to feel the pulse of Have than of Know. An ass covered with gold looks better than a horse with a packsaddle. So, once more I say that I stick by Camacho, from whose posts come the plenteous skimmings of geese and hens.”
(670-71)

Here, Sancho serves as the mouthpiece of his culture, in that the people are defined by what they have and therefore should marry for possessions. His philosophizing comes into contrast with the actions of Basilio, who ends up marrying Quiteria through ingenuity on his part. Echoing the lively dialogues and ostentation found in the *Satyricon*, the events surrounding Camacho's wedding in turn allow for the experimentation of ideologies as well as personal beliefs, reflecting Menippean overtones.

In the prologue of the first part of *Don Quixote*, the fictionalized author is reminded by his friend, “. . . this book of yours aims at nothing more than to destroy the authority and influence that books of chivalry have in the world and among the masses. . .” (47). Although this is the supposed purpose of Cervantes's novel, what he does is more than just parody the formulas of chivalric honor and chivalric love, as endorsed in that type of literature. The values and ideals espoused in chivalry are brought

to life by the character Don Quixote and are tested through his encounters with everyday situations once he leaves the safety of his library. In chapter 4, for example, during his first sally, Don Quixote meets the poor shepherd boy Andrés and his master Juan Haldudo. Don Quixote happens upon them in the woods, where Andrés is tied to an oak tree and is receiving a lashing from his master for having lost several sheep. According to the chivalric code, any knight who comes across the persecution of a defenseless individual or someone in distress becomes responsible for re-establishing order and righting any wrongs. Because he considers himself a knight, Don Quixote interrupts this punishment in order to defend Andrés. After Don Quixote has judged the situation, he demands that Juan pay Andrés his missing wages, to which Juan promises. In the books of chivalry, Juan Haldudo would have kept his promise, Andrés would have been freed, and Don Quixote would have been considered all the more noble for having resolved a disagreement. Unlike what takes place in chivalric romances, Don Quixote actually makes things worse by further infuriating Juan Haldudo and then leaving Andrés to his master's wrath. Don Quixote, following the code of chivalry and ingenuously assuming the master will carry out his promise to free and pay Andrés, adds to the damage rather than alleviates harm or corrects an unfair practice. By parodying this ideal of courtly justice, Cervantes allows for an examination by the reader of the conventions of chivalry. In this way, it becomes possible to see how they, when placed in a realistic situation, prove to be not only antiquated and naive, but also harmful. For Bakhtin, the most important characteristic of Menippean satire is the testing out of an idea. He states,

We emphasize that the fantastic serves here not in the positive *embodiment* of the truth, but in the search after the truth, its provocation and, most importantly, its *testing* . . . It must be further emphasized that we have in mind the testing of an *idea*, of the *truth*, not the testing of a specific individual or social-typical human

character. The testing of the wise man is the testing of his philosophical position in the world, not of one or another trait of his character, independent of that position. (94; italics in text).

The idea being tested in the episode of Andrés is the plausibility and value of the chivalric code of honor, which is glorified in the feudal system and in books of chivalry.

Bakhtin refers to a wise man and his philosophical position and in *Don Quixote* this would be the protagonist himself, who has grown so learned in the realm of chivalric romances that the medieval principles behind knight errantry become not only his philosophy but, as a result, his solution to the world's problems. Bakhtin emphasizes that it is not the individual, in this case the character Don Quixote, but rather the concept that undergoes examination. F. Ann Payne further explains that the Menippean satirist "questions . . . not deviations from an ideal standard but the possibility of ideal standards" (5). It is not so much Don Quixote himself who is parodied and satirized within the novel, but the chivalric notions and ideals that he puts forth as exemplary standards in response to the situations he encounters. The narrative provides a space where the idea of chivalry takes shape, in the form of Don Quixote, who at the same time is forced to confront the textual realities of human nature within a social construct.

It is important to understand that the mechanism of Menippean satire projects an idea or philosophy, as opposed to a character, into the textual arena so as to parody or make fun of the idea itself. Oftentimes, this is done by a character that more closely resembles a caricature or type than a human being. Don Quixote's madness, in the form of his fantastic visions and illogical philosophizing on the traditions of knight errantry, is what is parodied in the novel. But this characteristic of madness is only a part of his personality. Therefore, Don Quixote should be understood as a novelistic character rather

than a Menippean caricature, even though his madness reflects Menippean overtones as explained above.

The chivalric love theme is integral to the chivalric romances, in which the knight and his love are separated and he must overcome tremendous odds to be once again reunited with her. In Part I, chapter 1, the narrator explains that, after Don Quixote has found his armor and named his horse, “he felt that nothing was wanting but a lady of whom to be enamored, for a knight-errant who was loveless was a tree without leaves and fruit, a body without a soul” (60-61). Don Quixote, believing the concept of a love interest to be fundamental to his motivation as a knight as well as the keystone to his honor, quickly sets out to create Dulcinea del Toboso. Cervantes’s parody here is two-fold. For starters, in the beginning Dulcinea is an artificial love interest, since Don Quixote is merely utilizing this construct to fulfill a requirement he sees as essential to his mission of living as a chivalric knight. The fact that he is not in love with anyone and must invent this damsel, which he does by picking a neighboring country lass and renaming her, is an ironic twist of the notion of courtly love. Amadís de Gaula and Oriana, for example, are childhood sweethearts. Belianis of Greece swears eternal servitude to the princess Florisbella of Babylon, whom he knows. Don Quixote, however, does not share any type of relationship previous to the start of the novel with his Dulcinea, or rather Aldonza Lorenzo, because he knows her only by sight; hence he is substituting the concept of true love, so glorified in chivalric romances, for the fulfillment of a prerequisite. It is through the reverse of this chivalric formula that Cervantes utilizes parody to focus on the absurdity of this motivational tool found in the books of chivalry. Consequently, the social structure of chivalric love as a unique motivator is parodied.

In Part II, Don Quixote's is forced to be at the receiving end of a similar fabrication. At the palace of the Duke and Duchess, Don Quixote endures what he believes to be a lovesick lady-in-waiting, Altisidora, who pines for his favor. After a few episodes of fainting, love songs, and other similar strategies of pursuit on the part of Altisidora, Don Quixote finally confides to the Duchess that if Altisidora only had something to do with her life she would be cured of these maladies (552). What Don Quixote does not know is that Altisidora has staged her love for him, as a spectacle for the other characters. It is ironic that Don Quixote, who has created his Dulcinea and now loves and pines for her, is unable to appreciate Altisidora's anguish, albeit fake, over his disdain. Once again and this time ironically through the mouth of a character suffering from the same fabricated malady, Cervantes juxtaposes the ideals of courtly love with the practical values of reality. It is as if Don Quixote had unwittingly seen himself in a mirror and commented on the ridiculousness of that image's aspirations. This parody of chivalric love reflects the influence of Menippean satire. Bakhtin states that within this genre "ultimate philosophical positions are put to the test. The menippea seeks to present a person's ultimate, decisive words and actions, each of which contains the whole person and his whole life in its entirety" (95). Here, Don Quixote is witness to a fabrication of true love, similar to his construction of Dulcinea. Without Dulcinea, Don Quixote would feel immobilized. Due to what he has chosen to value, books of chivalry, he believes he would not be a true knight errant without her because a love interest is the key to a knight's motivation. In Part I, chapter 30, when Dorotea plays the role of Princess Micomicona, she offers herself in marriage if Don Quixote is willing to conquer the giant Pandafilando. When his master initially declines her offer, Sancho attempts to change his

mind, thinking him foolish to pass up an opportunity such as this one. Don Quixote answers him,

Do you not know, rascally knave, that if it were not for the valor [Dulcinea] infuses into my arm, I would not have the strength to kill a flea? Tell me, . . . who do you think has won this kingdom and cut off the head of this giant and made you marquess (for all this I consider already accomplished) if it be not the power of Dulcinea using my arm as the instrument of her deeds? She fights and conquers in me, and I live and breathe and have my life and being in her. (306)

Unlike Avellaneda's Don Quixote, who is quick to exchange Dulcinea for Barbara, Cervantes's protagonist remains steadfast in his loyalty to Dulcinea. It would be easy for him to replace the vision he has created for the existent Princess Micomicona, but he is incapable of considering this, because the definition of his being is completely tied up in his love for Dulcinea. In contrast to this ultimate representation of love, by consciously parodying Don Quixote with a false pretext of love, Altisidora is defined by her actions as superficial as well as disrespectful. Don Quixote believes in his ideals, even if they are based on a faulty logic. This subtle juxtaposition reinforces Don Quixote's love for his creation through Altisidora's mock performance. She satirizes unrequited love, while Cervantes, through Don Quixote, parodies courtly love.

The majority of these incidents in which chivalric ideals collide with reality are presented in a humorous manner in the novel. This is especially important in the Menippea, as it is a genre of laughter and holds many carnivalesque traits. Bakhtin considers the characteristic of the carnivalesque imperative to Menippean satire, citing laughter as carrying "the specific weight of the comic element" (93). Humor, through laughter, holds a dual purpose. On the one hand, it allows for distance from the situation in order to better inspect an idea, while on the other it is cohesive and revitalizing because it provides a manner in which the reader can connect with the characters.

Cervantes also experiments with the limitations between dreams or visions and history or truth. In the Cave of Montesinos, for instance, Don Quixote experiences what he believes to be real-life encounters with Montesinos and with Dulcinea and her damsels. Both Sancho and Basilio's cousin think Don Quixote has fallen asleep and dreamt all this. The concept of time is also brought into the conversation, when the cousin asks how it is possible that so many adventures happened to Don Quixote when only a little more than an hour had passed. Don Quixote answers, "That cannot be, . . . for night came when I was down there and then morning and again a night and a morning three times, so that, by my reckoning, I have been three days in these remote regions hidden from the upper world" (691). Sancho solves this incongruity by explaining, "My master must be right, . . . for since everything that has happened to him is by enchantment, perhaps what seems an hour to us would seem three days and nights down there" (691-92). It is never made clear in the novel what really happened, possibly because Cervantes is intentionally blurring the parameters surrounding visions and reality. Similar to the continual overlapping of madness and sanity, Cervantes provocatively confuses the interface between fiction and fact, invention and truth, and even story and history frequently throughout the novel. Issues are never black and white in real life, and here Cervantes articulates the ever-changing conditions of humanity.

The spirit of Menippean satire can also be injected into another genre, generally serving as a parody of that genre. In the Preliminary Verses of Part I, for example, there are Menippean overtones in Cervantes's parody of the solemn sonnets that normally precede a book of chivalry. In the first prologue, the friend suggests the fictionalized author invent the "sonnets, epigrams, and eulogies that are missing from the beginning

and that should be written by weighty and titled personages” (44), rather than formulate the typical prologue that is found in illustrious books, which is filled with erudite quotes from famous authors. Scott explains, “In its outward form the Menippean satire may assume various shapes: as a mock philosophical symposium, a learned treatise on a foolish topic . . . , a mock academic lecture, a dream vision or trip to the underworld, or a mock romance” (36). In other words, it is capable of permeating and parodying other genres. The prologue in Part I serves as an example of a mock prologue, in that it spoofs the seriousness and formality of other prologues found in literary works. This type of parodying of a genre also occurs in Don Quixote’s invention of Dulcinea and how, although he firmly believes in and falls in love with his invention, it is nonetheless a mock romance for Sancho, the narrators, the translator, and even the reader, who laugh at Don Quixote because they do not see Dulcinea but rather Aldonza Lorenzo. In Part II, chapters 42 and 43, when Don Quixote gives Sancho advice in preparation for his role as governor, this is a solemn moment in the text and the master’s counsel is worthy of recognition. However, this scene can also be read from a humorous angle as a mock lecture, if the reader keeps in mind that Sancho is a mere peasant and that, while the advice is genuine, the situation is ironic because a peasant in sixteenth-century Spain would not be the target of a lecture of this sort. It would be impossible for him to rule over others as a governor given the socioeconomic parameters of the current society. At the same time, however, if the reader do initially read this scene as a mock lecture, they are in for a surprise in chapters 45, 47, 49 and 51, when Sancho does rise to the occasion and judges cases with the same wisdom and poise as King Solomon. Cervantes plays

with the perception of counseling and sets the readers up to be laughed at, once Sancho the peasant governor performs his new duties so well.

Another characteristic with which Bakhtin defines Menippean satire deals with the choice of topics incorporated into the text. He writes, “All violations of the generally accepted, ordinary course of events and of the established norms of behavior and etiquette, including the verbal,” in the form of scandalous scenes or behavior, are to be expected within this genre (96). Considering that Menippean satire’s objective is to playfully muse over society’s rules or ideologies by focusing on more marginalized topics or those considered less socially appropriate, this is more easily facilitated. In *Don Quixote*, these topics include those of a corporeal nature, such as the graphic rendition of when Don Quixote and Sancho both vomit on each other in Part I, chapter 18. Another instance occurs later on in chapter 20, during the adventure of the fulling mills, when Sancho relieves himself at the side of Don Quixote because he is too scared to let go of his master. With regard to etiquette, for example, the Inquisition took umbrage at Cervantes’s depiction of a mad Don Quixote fashioning a rosary out of his dirty shrtails in the Sierra Morena (I: 26) because it was construed to be sacrilegious. Since these cultural taboos are placed in a humorous setting, this allows the reader to distance him or herself and laugh away what might otherwise be interpreted as an unpleasant passage. At the same time, by choosing to focus on these topics, Cervantes seems to be carefully teasing his audience, because these episodes are heightened in humor by the fact that they deal with subjects that are customarily marginalized or withheld from polite conversation.

While perhaps not as integral a component to Menippean satire as those discussed above, and one only mentioned in passing by Bakhtin and Frye, is the concept of journey.

In the majority of works representing this genre, there exists some sort of excursion or movement from one physical place to another. This is true in Apuleius's *The Golden Ass* as well as in Rabelais's *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, two Menippean satires par excellence according to Bakhtin. It also occurs in the *Satyricon*, in Lucian's *A True Story*, in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, in Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*, in Mikhail Bulgakov's *Master and Margarita*, and in Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*. As with these literary works, the majority of texts considered by critics to be Menippean satires incorporate some form of travel in their plots. Nonetheless, in studying this genre, Bakhtin focuses on specific locations, in particular heaven, earth and hell (95), but he never mentions the actual traveling which occurs while the characters are moving from one place to the next. Along with the other Menippean satires mentioned above, the journeying which takes place in *Don Quixote* is accompanied by dialogues. It is my speculation that traveling may be a necessary element to this genre, as movement between fixed locations allows for the same type of instability as mentioned above with regard to diction and to the questioning of cultural beliefs. The character or characters physically leave a city, for instance, and therefore leave behind society and its beliefs only to encounter new approaches to life.

In chapter 2, I explore the mechanisms of journey and humor with regard to how they effect a text. Now, however, it is also important to recognize how journey functions as an element of Menippean satire, provoking an examination of culture or customs through a change of venue. *Don Quixote* serves as an excellent example, as the majority of its plot revolves around travel. In addition, a great part of its narrative is based on dialogues between Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, which take place while they trek

through different parts of Spain. After stressing the importance of the dialogue within a Menippean satire, Bakhtin affirms, “The menippea often includes elements of *social utopia* which are introduced in the form of dreams or journeys to unknown lands. . . . The utopian element combines organically with all the other elements of the genre” (97).

While Sancho Panza and Don Quixote do not travel to foreign lands, they do discover worlds which had previously been unknown to them and it is on both of their agendas to invent or discover their own paradises: Don Quixote holds as his mission the reinstallation of chivalric, if not utopian, values, as can be seen not only in his desire to relate to the world in the same way as described in books of chivalry but also in his speech on the Golden Age in Part I, chapter 11. Sancho’s aim is to find heaven in the form of reimbursement for his services rendered as squire; in particular, he wants an island to govern.

But more importantly, in addition to the protagonists’ quest, the dialogues which occur during their travels often reflect a questioning of ideas and beliefs. One instance when this occurs is the dialogue which takes place as Don Quixote and Sancho begin their first sally together in Part I, chapter 7. Through their conversation, an important issue is raised which tests the feudal structure included in books of chivalry and highlights its limitations. Sancho reminds Don Quixote of his promise to award him an island as payment for his services as squire. The subject raised here concerns whether a knight was obliged to pay a squire, something which was highly unlikely in a feudal state and definitely did not appear in the books of chivalry. In this sense, the dialogue which takes place while they travel touches on the debate between medieval socioeconomic values and the newer capitalistic mentality with regard to labor and economy.

In discussing the encyclopedic, a characteristic cited earlier in this chapter with regard to the definition of Menippean satire and its cataloguing of ideas, Frye mentions the concept of a ‘marvelous journey’ as a mechanism that would enable a continual supplementing of the narrative via detours or deviations from the main plot (97). Because he does not go further with his analysis regarding this narrational device, it seems to me that both he and Bakhtin overlooked or took this feature and its capabilities to provoke change for granted. The majority of Menippean satires that the two critics list include some form of journey in their plots. This type of device would also correspond to the concepts of dissection and disorder that are prevalent in this genre, since the movement signified by transition incorporates yet a further instability in the text. Just as the forms and diction continuously ebb and flow in a Menippean satire, so it should be emphasized that traveling adds to the same precariousness which allows for a continual examination of cultures, habits, or ideologies.

A journey from one place to another also welcomes a variation in scenery and social strata. On the road, Don Quixote and Sancho encounter characters from all economic ranks and from various parts of Spain and the world. They meet religious individuals, such as friars and curates. There are actors, singers and musicians, such as the shepherd Antonio and then later Sancho’s exiled neighbor Ricote. They free a chain gang, have a run-in with officers of the Holy Brotherhood, and then later meet the thief Roque Guinart. Sancho and Don Quixote encounter the gentlemen and women who are living in a type of pastoral Arcadia, intent on creating their own utopia. They are offered lodging by gentlemen and women, including Don Diego de Miranda, the Duke and Duchess, and the Viceroy Don Antonio. They consort with shepherds, soldiers, and even

a woman, Dorotea, disguised as a man. All this occurs while they are on the road and adds to the atmosphere of exploration of realities as, at each turn, they are presented with new aspects of their culture.

The blending of an unusual assortment of caricatures and occupations in *Don Quixote* and Sancho's travels affords the reader a vision of many social elements mixed into one: the bucolic socializes with the urban, the virtuous intermingles with criminal elements and the base associates with the lofty. It is in their journeying specifically that these components are allowed to interact with one another. Again, this contrasting of differences, of the various aspects of a society, furnishes an atmosphere for probing the very beliefs which make up that society. Bakhtin observes, "The organic combination of philosophical dialog, lofty symbolism, fantastic adventure and underworld naturalism is a remarkable characteristic of the menippea" (94). And I add that it is necessary to recognize the importance of the mechanism of travel in order to more fully appreciate, along with dialogue, how this literary device provides spaces in the narrative in which to test social constructs and beliefs.

A clarification should be made at this time regarding the differences between Menippean satire and the novel as genre, especially with regard to *Don Quixote*. Returning to the issue of structure, there has been confusion among critics over whether certain texts are novels or are representations of Menippean satire, based on their construction. With regard to the novel in particular, Frye quips, "Most critical efforts to handle such a generic term . . . are chiefly interesting as examples of the psychology of rumor" (13). Without citing all the various critics who have set down in writing their definitions of the novel, I believe most would agree that it is a fictional narrative written

mainly in prose and of greater length and development than its cousin, the short story. A novel can vary widely in terms of narrative technique, tone, and organization. It can also incorporate other genres into its folds and this is where the confusion arises between labeling a text either a novel or Menippean satire when humor is present. One important aspect of Menippean satire, and why it lends itself well to the novel, is its flexible structure. According to Bakhtin, Menippean satire can invade any form, although it predominantly occurs in literature which combines prose and verse, as mentioned earlier. He explains, “The genre of the menippea at the same time possesses great external plasticity and the remarkable ability to absorb related smaller genres and to penetrate as a component part into other large genres” (98). It is protean in the sense that its external structure can shift to conform to other genres in which it appears. For instance, Menippean satire can stand on its own, as in Lucian’s *A True Story*. It can completely overwhelm another genre, such as in Carroll’s book *Alice in Wonderland* or Quevedo’s sanctimonious *Sueños*. And it can transform a part of another genre, such as in Bulgakov’s *The Master and Margarita*, where it mixes with the novel. I believe *Don Quixote* falls into this last category. In Cervantes’s text, the groundwork is laid for Menippean satire through the combination of prose and verse parodying various ideas and social beliefs. Nonetheless, it should be interpreted first and foremost as a novel.

Don Quixote is considered by many scholars to be the first European modern novel and it is plausible to speculate that the fragmentation of the main plot into a variety of subplots, a characteristic shared with Menippean satire, not only encouraged forays into other subjects not previously represented in literature but was key to the development of the novel in general. It is this idea of the appearance of encyclopedic

works during the Renaissance, with special reference made to Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, which causes Frye to change the name of this genre from Menippean satire to anatomy because “the form uses the method of ‘dissection or analysis’ to make an encyclopedic survey of human society under a general diagnostic category” (28). It is a form, according to Frye, which promotes a cataloguing of ideas or of examining various facets of life and as such caters to the image of anatomy under observation. This is only partially true in *Don Quixote*, if we compare it to texts such as Burton's *Anatomy* or Dornavius's *Amphitheater*. While Cervantes catalogues a variety of experiences and different characters throughout his novel, he works them all into the plot rather than listing them like individual vignettes, in comparison to the Menippean works considered encyclopedic. For me, this is one of the key points in understanding that *Don Quixote* is more a novel than Menippean satire. While it does incorporate different genres, unlike in an undiluted Menippean satire there is cohesion between these genres and they come together to form a complete backdrop or stage via which the characters enter, exit, and above all, develop into entities with individual personalities, rather than remain character types.

At the beginning of his analysis of genres, Frye very clearly delineates between the romance, novel, autobiography, and Menippean satire. In defining them, he does not initially discuss possible overlapping between the genres. His manner of classifying them stems in part from contrasting one with the other and deciding whether they are extroverted, introverted, intellectual, or personal, based on their audiences. Menippean satire, he states, is intellectual and extroverted, which means it would appeal to a more scholarly reader. The novel is personal and extroverted because its focus is on personal

relationships plus it is more available and of interest to the mainstream (308). It is after he has juxtaposed the four genres that he considers how they intermingle in major literary works. According to him, *Don Quixote* is a text which includes his definitions of Menippean satire and the novel. It is saturated with literary references, appealing to a scholarly reader, but at the same time contains a lot of puns, popular proverbs and other word plays which make the novel accessible to the general public. For this reason, there is an overlapping of Menippean satire and the novel, because the former interests more of an intellectual reader and the latter, a popular, or personal, audience. What this means is that Cervantes's text, while mainly pleasing to the public in its representations of individuals within their society, at times makes references or presents episodes in such a manner that it probes scholarly or philosophical issues and therefore appeals to an educated reader. Frye states, "The novelist sees evil and folly as social diseases, but the Menippean satirist sees them as diseases of the intellect, as a kind of maddened pedantry which the *philosophus glriosus* at once symbolizes and defines" (309). In *Don Quixote*, we see a mixing of these two positions. Chivalric romances and their code of honor are not treated in *Don Quixote* as stemming from a society infected with these dubious ideals. Instead, Don Quixote embodies this 'philosophus glriosus' whose madcap literalism with regard to chivalric code is put to trial in the text. His extreme idealism regarding knight errantry is interpreted as madness and laughed at, but for this same reason the other characters are cast in a cynical light and likewise judged by their actions. Their desire to mock Don Quixote can be interpreted as a social cynicism. This is constantly contrasted with Don Quixote's naïve idealism throughout the text. *Don Quixote*, therefore, embodies the overlapping of Menippean and novelistic elements, because

within the text there is the parody of the perfection promoted by the books of chivalry while at the same time what could be called social cynicism or disparagement of this perfection is showcased.

This contrasting of idealism with social cynicism reflects a joining together of two opposing elements. The structure of juxtaposing too differing issues is linked to the role reversal depicted in Carnival, because the contrasting of opposites provokes instability within the text. As Scott explains, “The Menippean satire . . . was a form of carnivalized literature in which the satirist rejects any absolute or ideological presentation of human experience” (27). Menippean satire mocks or pokes fun at any belief system portrayed in society as ideal. Perfection, or the perfect answer, as it may be presented in theology, philosophy or books of chivalry, becomes the object of this genre’s parodying. Many times, the manner in which this is parodied is by contrasting it with an inverse, or opposite, characteristic. When Lucian has Menippus comment on the skull of Helen, in the passage mentioned earlier from “Voyage to the Lower World,” the idea of supreme beauty is contrasted with the ultimate repulsiveness associated with Death. Due to this contrast, the image of Helen’s skull signifies both peerless beauty, because society has immortalized Helen’s visage, and stark ugliness, because Death has stripped her of any distinguishing physical attributes. It is through this contrast that irony surfaces. Because this genre contains a carnivalesque undercurrent, it is an objective of Menippean satire to play with concepts or characteristics that Western logic defines as binary opposites. By contrasting ideas or notions that we have been taught to read as contrary or dissimilar, Menippean satire brings this classification to the forefront and guides the reader in questioning the limits of an understood system of logic. Is black really the opposite of

white? Is an individual ever completely sane, or ever completely crazy? Is there another way to observe life, other than via a binary system of opposites? Menippean satire strives to muddy the waters, so to speak, with regard to this system of logic. As already stated, perfection is the target and motivation of this genre. In *Don Quixote* there is no correct plan of action or ultimate guideline on living as provided by the author or narrators, but rather an arena where certain elements mix, react to one another and foster new events.

James F. Walter observes, “An essential characteristic differentiating the Menippean satire from the novel is its attempt to reach the extreme limits of human experience—physical and intellectual, farcical and serious, obscene and sacred, comic and tragic—at the same time” (395). This happens many times through *Don Quixote*, where two elements which normally would be understood as discordant or divergent, are allowed to interact. Take, for instance, the famous *baciyelmo*. The word represents a fusion of the images of the peerless helmet of Mambrino and the barber’s basin, a receptacle of discarded corporal products such as blood and hair. *Rocinante* is another example. In the narrator’s description of Rocinante in chapter 1 of Part I, the poor horse had “más cuartos que un real.” A *cuarto* was a type of coin, lesser in value than a *real*. At the same time, *cuarto* was a disease affecting the hooves of horses.⁶ The narrator, tongue-in-cheek, is playing with the concept of money (in that Rocinante was worth more than a *real*) but is really saying he’s in worse shape (because of the disease) than a *real* horse (Gorfkle 101). He is a horse of immense worth to Don Quixote, but of hardly any material worth when compared to Babieca or Bucephalus. Another case in point is when, in the Sierra Morena,

⁶ “Abertura longitudinal larga y profunda, que anormalmente se produce en las partes laterales de los cascos de las caballerías,” *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*, 12 Dec. 2004 <<http://www.rae.es/>>.

Don Quixote fashions a rosary out of his soiled shirt, allowing for the sacred and the obscene to merge in one action.

The contrasting of opposites allows for the creation of a new concept, such as what occurs linguistically with an oxymoron. An example of this also occurs when juxtaposing the two protagonists. Don Quixote and Sancho Panza themselves, when together, epitomize this contrast and come together to form a unique entity. They are a pair of opposites, both physically as well as mentally. One is tall, lean and educated; the other is short, heavy and illiterate. One believes in chivalric fantasies and is motivated to bring them to life, only to relinquish this dream to death at the end of Part II; the other begins as no-nonsense and down-to-earth, but then succumbs to the temptation of fantasy by denying his predetermined socioeconomic status when he rises to become governor, if only for a short while. Bakhtin writes, “The menippea is fond of playing with sharp transitions and changes, ups and downs, rises and falls, unexpected coming together of distant and divided things” (97). An accurate embodiment of what Bakhtin is referring to here, this constant contrasting and interplay between the two characters has lead to what many critics, following Salvador de Madariaga, have classified as the quixotization of Sancho and the sanchification of Don Quixote.

We see this same thing also to a certain extent in the representations of the lofty and the base within the text: the ideal chivalric world which Don Quixote continuously fights to recreate is repeatedly in contrast with the misfortunes he is put through by his various physical and emotional pummelings. He is humiliated, beaten, misinterpreted, made fun of, and even stoned while attempting to apply a chivalric process to an event that takes place in the narrative reality of the text. It is through his personage that the

heavenly ideals of chivalry collide with the infernal suffering of reality. He is the medium through which these two opposites mix. This is also a way of understanding how Don Quixote can project both madness and sanity. The rational madman, *el cuerdo loco*, often puzzles the other characters as well as the reader, because they cannot understand how someone so insane as to charge windmills can later proffer such sound judgments and likewise how someone so learned can so fervently argue the benefits of knight errantry. The characters, through their reactions, seem to imply that there is a contradiction in Don Quixote's actions, because he sometimes acts mad and other times acts lucidly. This was the main argument several eighteenth-century critics made in favor of Avellaneda's version. An example is Alain René Le Sage, the French writer who first translated Avellaneda's version of Part II in 1716. In his introduction to this work, Le Sage compares Cervantes's protagonists with Avellaneda's. He writes that, although Cervantes's Part I met with great success,

comme il negligoit d'en donner la continuation, un Auteur Arragonois, appellé Alonso Fernandez de Avellaneda, en sit paroistre une en 1614, qui ne fut pas mal reçue. . . . Il a fort bien soutenu le caractère de Don Quichotte. Il ne le perd point de vœu: il en fait un Chevalier errant, qui est toujours grave, et dont toutes les paroles sont magnifiques, pompeuses et fleuries. Pour son Sancho, il faut demeurer d'accord qu'il est excellent, et plus original même que celui de Cervantes. . . . Le caractère de l'autre Sancho n'est pas si uniforme: tantôt il lui échappe des traits d'ingénuité, et tantôt il tient des discours malins, dont on voit bien qu'il sent toute la malice, qui sont quelquefois trop relevés pour un païsan, et trop sensés pour un valet qui est la duppe des folles visions de son Maître. . . . Il y a une différence sensible entre les deux Sancho: celui de Cervantes veut souvent faire le plaisant, et ne l'est pas; celui d'Avellaneda l'est presque toujours, sans vouloir l'estre. (â ij- â iij)⁷

⁷ “as he is negligent with his sequel, an Aragonese author, named Alonso Fernandez de Avellaneda, published one in 1614, which was not badly received. . . . He had truly established the character of Don Quixote. He does not lose sight of his character: he portrays him as a knight errant, who is always solemn, and whose every word is magnificent, grandiloquent, and ornate. As for his Sancho, we must confess that he is excellent, and is more original than the one of Cervantes. . . . The character of the other Sancho is not uniform: sometimes he lets slip aspects of gullibility, and at other times he holds cunning discourse, in which his maliciousness is revealed, that is sometimes too rich for a peasant, and too thoughtful for a manservant who is the dupe of the mad visions of his Master. . . . There is a perceptible difference between

For Le Sage, Cervantes was inferior to Avellaneda due to his lack of consistency with character description. For Le Sage, Don Quixote should always act the knight errant, being solemn and grandiloquent. Anthony Close observes, “One would hardly expect to find a case of madness like Don Quixote’s if one visited a madhouse; rather, his madness appears initially as a literary device designed to set the wheels of parody in motion” (23). This is definitely one of the effects of the madness of Cervantes’s Don Quixote, as opposed to Avellaneda’s, and in chapter 3 I analyze these differences more in depth with regard to carnivalesque versus political motives. But it is important to point out here that this mixing of supposedly opposite personality traits in Don Quixote is intentional on Cervantes’s part and goes beyond Close’s assertion that this madness is principally a technique of parody. Bakhtin writes,

What might be called moral-psychological experimentation appears for the first time in the Menippea: the representation of . . . insanity of all sorts . . . , split personalities, unrestrained daydreaming, unusual dreams, passions bordering on insanity, suicide, etc. . . . Dreams, daydreams and insanity destroy the epic, tragic integrity of a man and his fate: in him the possibilities of another man and another life are revealed, he loses his finalizedness and singleness of meaning, he ceases to coincide with himself. (96)

This mixing of reality with fantasy is embodied in the character of Don Quixote, but it is different from the other forms of madness we find in other novels, which in turn makes it appear to be more of a literary device, to refer back to Anthony Close’s comment on the previous page. But it is through the daydreams stemming from the chivalric books he has read that Alonso Quijano is motivated to live beyond his established role in society. He becomes the passionate individual who is unafraid to take on the world in order to right

the two Sanchos: Cervantes’s often wants to be pleasing, and is not; Avellaneda’s almost always is, without trying to be” (my translation).

wrongs and instill chivalric values. He sees giants where others see windmills and wine bags. He falls in love and swears undying loyalty to a fictitious woman. He risks life and limb to confront presumed kidnappers and the devil's sorcerers, like the Biscayan squire in Part I, chapter 9 and the clergymen accompanying the casket in Part I, chapter 19, respectively. What is interpreted as madness is juxtaposed against Don Quixote's bouts of sane judgments and wisdom by characters and readers who are perplexed by his duality. Again, for them, a character should always remain relatively the same in a novel, whereas in Menippean satire the focus is on what the character says or does rather than on who he or she is. As mentioned previously, this genre generally employs character types rather than developing, psychological figures. The novel, on the other hand, concentrates on the characters themselves and how they interact and progress or mature throughout the narrative. Ardis Nelson, in *Cabrera Infante in the Menippean Tradition*, explains that where a novel deals with "men, their personalities and characters," in Menippean satire the characters are "stylized, being representatives of a given set of ideas" (xxv-vi). Echoing Frye, Nelson continues, "The novelist essentially transfers theories to personal relationships, but the Menippean satirist intellectualizes and obscures freely, often producing caricatures" (xxvi). By utilizing both genres, Cervantes can mix their approaches, allowing for fluctuations in his characters which would be interpreted as incongruities to someone such as Le Sage, but which, when understood within the context of Menippean satire, demonstrate Cervantes's capability to create multifaceted, diverse characters as opposed to the vapid, predictable characters found in Avellaneda's version. The focus is not on whether the characters maintain their original nature,

something which critics such as Lesage did not understand and instead interpreted as inaccuracies on the part of Cervantes.

On a related note, it has been pointed out by critics such as Antonio Barbagallo that the stereotyping or typifying of characters does occur in the novel. In “Sancho no es, se hace,” Barbagallo argues that Sancho is stereotyped as an unintelligent glutton by the other characters, even though he is rarely found eating to excess and, although he jumbles proverbs and does talk a lot, he also frequently makes sage observations. This type-casting is performed by the narrators, translator and many of the other characters. It is as if they were prejudging him based on his physical appearance, in that his short, squat physique resembles the personage of the Buffoon found in works of theater. Unless the reader is careful to construct his or her image of Sancho based only on his words and deeds, it is easy to misjudge Sancho and view him more as a stereotype or caricature and less as a unique character with his own personality. In Part II, Sancho reacts to the way he is portrayed in Avellaneda’s version. In chapter 49, he defends himself to Don Jerónimo and Don Juan, describing himself as “simple and droll, but not a glutton or a drunkard” (952). Three chapters later, Sancho again attempts to set the record straight regarding who he is. He assures Don Antonio, “You can take it from me that anyone who says I’m a gluttonous and untidy eater is wide off the mark . . .” (970). If the readers look closely and pay attention, they will be able to discern the authentic Sancho from the caricature described by the other characters or by Avellaneda.

Where we see a more obvious example of caricature or character type, rather than a novelistic character, is with Dulcinea. An element of this parody of character types, as the reader finds out from Sancho Panza, is that Dulcinea is far from the pure, beautiful,

archetypal maiden deified in the books of chivalry. Aldonza Lorenzo, to whom Don Quixote gives the name Dulcinea, is a “good-looking country lass with whom he had been in love, although it is understood that she never knew or was aware of it” (61). In Part I, chapter 25, when Don Quixote asks Sancho to deliver a letter to Dulcinea, he describes their relationship, and in a way Dulcinea, to Sancho,

It does not matter if [the letter] is written in a strange hand, for as far as I can remember, Dulcinea can neither read nor write nor has she ever seen my handwriting. For our love for each other has always been of the platonic kind, never going beyond an occasional modest glance at each other, and even that was so rare that I can truly swear that during the twelve years I have loved her more than the light of these eyes of mine . . . I have not seen her more than four times. In fact, I even doubt if she ever noticed me gazing at her—such was the reserve and seclusion in which her father, Lorenzo Corchuelo, and her mother, Aldonza Nogales, brought her up. (247)

Don Quixote has constructed his great love interest on very limited details. He has only seen her four times, but knows who her parents are and that she is illiterate. He has created a caricature based on the pattern of the damsels of chivalric tales and loosely tied it to the peasant girl Aldonza Lorenzo. Whereas Don Quixote only knows her by sight, Sancho knows her as a neighbor, and it is his knowledge of her that converts Don Quixote’s vision of Dulcinea into a parody of the maidens found in books of chivalry. Sancho is surprised to discover that his master’s love interest is none other than a peasant girl. He provides a more proximate description of Dulcinea,

I know her well . . . and I assure you she can pitch the iron bar as well as the strongest lad in our village, God save us! Why, she’s a lusty lass, tall and straight, with hair on her chest, who can pull the chestnuts out of the fire for any knight-errant now or to come who has her for his lady. God, what a woman she is! What a pair of lungs she has, and what a voice! I’ve heard it said that one day she climbed to the top of the church belfry to call her father’s plowmen . . . and though they were more than half a league off, they heard her as plainly as if they were at the foot of the tower. And the best of her is that she’s not at all coy, for she’s a great hand at courting, always joking with the boys and making game of everyone. . . . I wish I was gone, if only to catch a glimpse of her, for it’s many a

day since I saw her, and I'm sure she's changed by now. There is nothing that spoils a girl's face more than to be always working in the fields, exposed to sun and wind. To be frank with your worship, I've been mistaken up to this, for I thought really and truly all this while that Lady Dulcinea was some princess with whom you were in love, or at least some person of such great qualities as to deserve the rich presents you have sent her . . . But when all is said and done, what good can it do Lady Aldonza Lorenzo—I mean, Lady Dulcinea of El Toboso—to have the vanquished whom you send, or may send, falling upon their knees before her? For perhaps at the time they arrive she may be carding flax or threshing, and they would be mortified at the sight of her, and she would laugh or maybe poke fun at the present you sent her. (247-48)

Sancho is amazed to find that Dulcinea is not a princess but rather an inferior peasant, and one that he knows. According to him, Aldonza-turned-Dulcinea is a lively, boisterous, and hard working lass. He relates that she works in the fields, having acquired a weathered look. He describes her as a loud-mouthed, physically strong farmer's daughter and, later on in chapter 31, he insinuates that she smells more of garlic than of roses. Through the contrasting descriptions of Dulcinea, the reader realizes that she is the antithesis of the handsome, unblemished, and wealthy love interests that appear in the books of chivalry. Since it is the damsels who motivates the knight errant, Cervantes undermines this concept by having Don Quixote be motivated by a faulty representation of a peerless maiden. In other words, he falls in love with a figment of his imagination as opposed to a female character in her own right. Because she never makes an appearance in the novel, and because Sancho's earthy description upsets the image given to us by Don Quixote, Dulcinea's caricature of the unequaled damsels is parodied. This is an instance where Cervantes provides for the impossible ideals of courtly love to clash dramatically with the narrative reality contained in his novel. It serves as a good example of the overall function of a Menippean satire, because it demonstrates the upending of an impossible model. Don Quixote's sublime vision of Dulcinea is a large part of his

unwavering conviction in the values and beliefs proffered by books of chivalry. Frye explains, “Thus philosophical pedantry becomes, as every target of satire eventually does, a form of romanticism on the imposing of over-simplified ideals on experience” (231). Don Quixote, in advocating the chivalric code of honor, attempts to instill these unrealistic ideals on the textual reality that surrounds him. He visualizes a beautiful, peerless maiden where others see a peasant girl. He sees giants where others perceive windmills. He interprets kidnappings and crime where others merely observe ordinary transportation. Like a philosopher who champions his beliefs to the point of pedantry, harnessing them to judge the rest of the world, Don Quixote likewise continuously attempts to impose his vision on his surroundings. Because his are over-simplified ideals that are constantly in contrast with the reality of the text, by the end of the novel they ultimately become an impossibility.

Through understanding the nature of Menippean satire and being able to identify this genre within the framework of Cervantes’s novel, the reader attains a fuller interpretation of *Don Quixote*. Cervantes is neither didactic nor moralizing in this work. His characters as well as his audience are parodied: we the readers laugh at Don Quixote for his unrealistic ideals, but we in turn are laughing at ourselves as we come to relate to this character who attempts to rise above the textual real world that surrounds him. This double parody is more easily understood if we as readers comprehend that Cervantes has not set out to deliver us a specific moral or ultimatum, but rather to stir the pot and help us confront the space which exists between our ideals or values and our perception of reality. This is likewise the intention of a Menippean satire, which is why it is my

assessment that the recognition of this particular genre within Cervantes's novel can help to define the complexity of *Don Quixote*.

CHAPTER II

DISTURBING DEVICES: JOURNEY AND HUMOR IN *DON QUIXOTE*

In *Rabelais and His World* and *The Dialogic Imagination*, Mikhail Bakhtin explores humor and the concept of the chronotope, respectively. Steven Hutchinson, in *Cervantine Journeys*, investigates the implications of the chronotope of journey within Cervantes's texts. In this chapter, I employ both authors' analyses and examine how journey and humor affect a text. Bakhtin labels *chronotope* a point in a text where time and space cross. His analysis stems from Immanuel Kant's observation, in "Transcendental Aesthetics," that both time and space are integral ingredients in the process of cognition. Bakhtin examines the role of these forms in the literal representation of literature. Their interactions within a text are of utmost importance because, for him, chronotopes are the deciding factors of a genre (*Dialogic* 85). He further explains that they "are the organizing centers for the fundamental narrative events of the novel. The chronotope is the place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied. It can be said without qualification that to them belongs the meaning that shapes narrative" (250). For Bakhtin, one must pay attention to the relationship between time and space held within the text because "every entry into the sphere of meanings is accomplished only through the gates of the chronotope" (258). Since there are many kinds of temporal and spatial coordinates represented in literature, it is important to examine the knots, or points, where they cross in order to enrich our understanding and interpretation of a text. Each intersection provides a unique point within the narrative that

directly influences the storyline. This junction creates an atmosphere of suggestive possibilities which, as the character passes through, can affect the direction of the text. One type of chronotope analyzed by Bakhtin has been translated as *the road* or *el camino*, and this encompasses “the open road and . . . various types of meetings on the road” (98). Bakhtin explains that the elements of distance and spatial obstacles as well as the temporal motifs of meeting and contact figure into the concept of *the road*. Because he refers to more than just a physical route or thoroughfare, this has lead me to the conclusion that a better translation for this type of chronotope would be *journey*, because it is a word which more effectively incorporates the temporal and spatial coordinates that Bakhtin mentions. Hutchinson, continuing where Bakhtin left off with regard to this chronotope, also uses the word *journey* in reference to these literary interstices, and applies it in analyzing Cervantes’ texts. Hutchinson’s study includes several types of journey. In *Don Quixote*, he examines the geographical expeditions of Don Quixote and Sancho, how journey can be read as a metaphor for the evolution of a character’s life, and how dialogue can be understood as a voyage of language in motion. After reading both Bakhtin and Hutchinson, it is my intent to utilize their analyses as a means of exploring the relationship between journey and humor and the ways in which each effects change in a text. Looking specifically at *Don Quixote*, examples of the concept of journey and of humor-provoking techniques are present in a variety of ways. In this chapter, I plan to examine the effects of both on the text, in order to demonstrate that humor can be understood as a literary device similar to that of journey.

Let me begin by considering the influence that journey and humor have on a text. When either device is used, the narrative becomes unstable. If journey, for example, is

introduced in a storyline, the course of action leaves the previously described or existing boundaries of the text. The plot, in other words, crosses beyond the realm of the familiar. As a result, the storyline is exposed to new concepts that may fragment what could previously be considered a staid narrative. Alonso Quijano's decision to leave the comforts of his library and home and venture out into the world represents the transition from a secure narrative setting to a more vulnerable one, in that through the mechanism of journey the possibility is introduced of encountering things previously unknown to the protagonist. These new experiences in turn enable a change in him, if not also in the storyline. And much in the way that traveling lifts the protagonist out of the norm and into less stable circumstances, so humor also produces an alteration in the text. Anything that creates laughter in many ways parallels the mechanisms of journey: through a fluctuation in coordinates, a change occurs. In the case of comic coordinates sparking a humorous interpretation on the part of the readers, laughter is the outcome. Humor is evoked through a contrast of some sort and, whether the author is employing irony, sarcasm, parody, or another comic technique, when these amusing elements appear in a text, a break or change in the narrative occurs. These comic elements serve as catalysts that carry the readers of the situation away from a staid or predictable atmosphere and move them into reacting with laughter. As a result, the technique of humor should be understood as a narrative journey, which transports the character or readers outside or away from the previous textual linearity. Because authors build comic techniques into the text that they are writing, the uniformity of the plot is compromised and change in the narrative becomes inevitable. Therefore, just as the outcome of journey provokes an alteration or change of some sort, the same is true when humor energizes the text.

When we think about the concept of journey, we invariably think of movement. This movement may be spatial, as in a change from one geographic location to another. It may imply a temporal transition, such as in the maturation of an individual physically or psychologically. It may also be a combination of spatial and temporal changes, where, through the progression of time and activities as well as through the movement from one city to the next, a youth such as Lazarillo de Tormes, for example, is transformed into an adult. The type of journey that appears in a text is largely dependent on how the text is narrated.

In the case of Cervantes's novel, by traveling through new spaces, Don Quixote and Sancho Panza are exposed to different concepts. In coming into contact with new characters, they are introduced to alternative ways of thinking and living. At the same time, being in unfamiliar circumstances, they are vulnerable to misinterpretations and confusion, if not also to practical jokes made by the characters whose space they are invading. By incorporating a change in scenery or environment, Cervantes has opened up the text and facilitated the presence of comicality. During his first sally alone, irony surfaces as Don Quixote mistakes an inn for a castle and two prostitutes for damsels (I: 2). Later, the sacrosanctity of chivalric ceremonies is parodied when the innkeeper takes advantage of Don Quixote's obliviousness by using his ledger rather than the traditional Bible to knight him. Because Don Quixote has transplanted himself into a new venue, his attempt to transpose a fictional world of chivalry onto the textual reality of ordinary characters at an inn offers the other characters, narrators, and readers the opportunity to interpret irony, parody, and other humorous elements in the storyline. Don Quixote's journey is one of the key ingredients to invoking humor here. Had he gone mad but

stayed put in his library by himself, the situation might still be humorous, but on a much smaller scale. Combined with the concept of journey, the possibilities for comic effect are multiplied as the frame within which they can exist is greatly extended. Without travel, this type of comic interlude would never have occurred.

Journey is integral not only to the plot of the novel but also when considering the character description of Don Quixote. He calls himself a knight errant, a title which contains the act of traveling in its name. Michel Foucault, in *The Order of Things*, describes Don Quixote as “a diligent pilgrim breaking his journey before all the marks of similitude” and as “a letter that has just escaped from the open pages of a book” (46). He goes on to explain that, because Don Quixote has fashioned himself out of the examples of knights errant set before him in books of chivalry, “Don Quixote is a true likeness of all the signs that he has traced from his book” and that he is “constantly obliged to consult it in order to know what to do or say” (46). Foucault posits that this book of chivalric romances from which Don Quixote has escaped “is not so much his existence as his duty” (46) and that he must put to the test all the ways in which he resembles the protagonists from these books. I think it is possible to take Foucault’s analysis here one step further. Alonso Quijano does go crazy from reading too many chivalric romances and, based on the heroes of these books, he creates his alter-ego, Don Quixote. In weaving together the ingredients for a knight errant, Alonso Quijano is fashioning a pattern or map through which he explores the world. Don Quixote, in other words, is a map that directs Alonso Quijano’s actions and guides his interpretations of the exchanges he has with the textual world that surrounds him. Foucault believes Don Quixote must interpret his encounters as a reenactment of things he has read in chivalric romances and

that his adventures are “a diligent search over the entire surface of the earth for the forms that will prove that what the books say is true” (47). It seems to me, however, that Don Quixote is the map that Alonso Quijano needs in order to function in and make sense of this world, rather than an artifice that seeks to prove correct the world of chivalric romances. He is not attempting to validate chivalric romances through his actions, but instead seeks to

become a knight errant, roaming through the world with his horse and armor in quest of adventures and practicing all that had been performed by the knights errant of whom he had read. He would follow their life, redressing all manner of wrongs and exposing himself to continual dangers, and at last, after concluding his enterprises, he would win everlasting honor and renown. (59)⁸

His focus is not to prove the principles advocated in the chivalric genre as true; he has already taken this for granted believing the books themselves to be non-fiction. Instead, he takes it upon himself to fix what he interprets to be grievances or offenses in the world, in the hopes of attaining the prestige given to the knights errant he has read about. In Part II, chapter 32, Don Quixote explains to the ecclesiastic at the Duke and Duchess’s palace,

I . . . follow the narrow path of knight errantry, and in practicing that calling I despise wealth but not honor. I have redeemed injuries, righted wrongs, chastised insolence, conquered giants, and trampled on monsters. I am in love for no other reason than that it is an obligation for knights errant to be so . . . My intentions are always directed toward virtuous ends, to do good to all and evil to none. (754)

In becoming Don Quixote, Alonso Quijano turns into the map he has wrought for himself via the patterns found in books of chivalry. As Don Quixote, his need is not necessarily to prove that chivalric romances are correct or ideal, but rather to fit his vision of how the

⁸ Unless otherwise specified, all quotations in this essay in English from *Don Quixote* are taken from the Walter Starkie edition.

world should be onto his environs. His crusade to right wrongs is a journey to mount chivalric values onto the textual reality of his surroundings.

At the same time, because Don Quixote serves as a walking map of the ideals championed in books of chivalry, humor surfaces every time a portion of this map runs into textual reality and is exposed as erroneous or malapropos. The generic formula of chivalric romance, embodied in Don Quixote, contrasts itself against the generic veracity of the novel, and this interaction provokes laughter. To put it another way, because the directions Don Quixote follows are for a different genre, when applied to a novelistic reality, Don Quixote's actions produce laughter from the other characters if not also from the readers. Because Don Quixote is this map of books of chivalry that roams through the textual reality of a novel, the readers laugh when he sees giants but instead collides with the reality of the windmills (I: 8). Later, in chapter 19, when Don Quixote and Sancho come across the funeral procession in the night, Don Quixote's imagination "immediately suggested that this must be one of the chivalrous adventures he had read about. He imagined that the litter was a bier on which was carried some dead or sorely wounded knight, whose revenge was reserved for him alone" (180). When presented with unrecognizable information, Don Quixote interprets the situation according to the coordinates of chivalric adventure that he has gleaned from his readings. But because the narrator has already described the situation as a nighttime funeral procession, the readers can laugh at the incongruity between Don Quixote's vision and the textual reality of the funeral convoy. This continual clash between Don Quixote-as-chivalric-map and the realistic template presented by the novel results in many humorous situations throughout the text. Metaphorically-speaking, Don Quixote is an outdated map roaming over a novel

landscape. It is through the interaction of these incompatible formulae that Cervantes creates laughter in the text.

Another type of journey is that of a character's vision or goal. When Don Quixote first convinces Sancho to accompany him on his adventures, the knight promises to give his squire an island to govern, as payment for his services. During their journeying, Sancho often comments on what he will do with his island, how he will govern it, and in general shares with the readers his future plans for his governorship. Sancho slowly fashions his dream for his governorship along the course of the novel, but when he is presented with the Island of Barataria as a real, physical entity, the readers see how Sancho turns from idealist to realist as he is subjected to the obligations of being governor as well as to practical jokes. When Sancho dreams of his governorship, becomes governor, and then finally abandons this role, the readers are presented with a transitioning character who learns from his experiences as he travels through this phase of his life. Sancho begins by desiring a governorship, but as he passes through the actual experience of being governor, he is affected by what the job entails as well as the Duke and Duchess' pranks, because he is only a source of entertainment for them. This journey alters him psychologically in that he changes his plans and decides to accept and return to his lowly position of squire. By actually living his dream, Sancho moves through and then past it. The ordeal of realizing his dream modifies his mindset and provokes his decision to give it up. As Sancho journeys through the text physically as well as psychologically, humor is interlaced with his adventures as governor, but it is a humor made at Sancho's expense. The humor here mixes with the device of journey to open up the narrative even further and reveal the ulterior motives of the other characters. Both the

parody of King Solomon's court and the satire of Sancho's passion for eating, for instance, expose the underlying hypocrisy and dishonesty of the Duke and Duchess and the other perpetrators of Sancho's Baratarian misfortunes. In this episode, humor also takes the readers on a journey, which begins with Sancho's dream but ends up being a bitter farce for Sancho and an eye-opening satire for the readers.

Interlaced with the psychological journeying of Sancho are the pranks pulled on him of a corporeal nature. Most readers laugh at the dining ordeal between Sancho and the physician Pedro Recio, as it focuses on the abuse of eating, which is one of Sancho's great loves. The physical tormenting by Dr. Recio, under the guise of protecting Sancho both from poisoning and from unhealthy foods, is interpreted by the readers as funny because of the already established passion of Sancho. Humor is born through the contrast of excess with sparsity, and temptation with danger. Sancho's growing agitation only encourages the readers' laughter. It is a different type of humor, however, that occurs on the final night of Sancho's governorship. While slapstick in the whirlwind manner in which Sancho is whisked out of bed, armed with cumbersome equipment, and then beaten and trampled, this type of humor also magnifies the antagonistic cruelty of the perpetrators. It makes the readers laugh but at the same time more clearly exposes the manipulations of the other characters. In other words, Sancho's journey through physical torments while governor spawns different types of comical interludes. These in turn open up the text and more clearly reveal the motives of the various characters.

Humor may take the readers on a mental journey, motivating their awareness with regard to textual relationships or even influencing the perception of events outside of the text and in real life. It can also directly affect the actions of characters within the text. We

have only to think of Sancho's promise in Part II, chapter 35 to lash himself three thousand three hundred times in order to free Dulcinea from her enchantment. The false Merlin, one of the Duke's cohorts, creates this punishment for Sancho for the benefit of the Duke and Duchess. This humor at Sancho's expense motivates him to lie to his master and to fake his punishment by whipping a tree and moaning loudly (II: 71). His farcical actions in turn instill pity in the unknowing Don Quixote and spur him to bring to a halt the castigation. The Duke and Duchess's humorous prank influences both Don Quixote's and Sancho's subsequent actions: Sancho lies to his master and Don Quixote interferes with the process that he believes would free Dulcinea. While the protagonists themselves do not find humor in this episode, the other characters and the readers may, as they have been distanced from identifying with either protagonist because they are aware of the practical joke. As a result, the bystanders are able to interpret humor in what would otherwise be understood as a painful situation due to their detachment from the protagonists and therefore the power to laugh at, rather than commiserate with, them.

An example where both Sancho and Don Quixote themselves find a situation funny, but in turn react differently, occurs during the episode of the fulling mills (I: 20). When both characters realize their foolishness at being scared of only fulling mills and not monstrous entities as they had imagined, they burst into laughter. The absurdity of the situation, of the frightful night they spent in anticipation of encountering something terrible the following morning only to find that all of their fears were completely unfounded, presents a sharp contrast between imagination and reality. Because what they were expecting was so different from what they encountered, this incongruity produces laughter in the characters. The space created by this contrast in the narrative, however, is

quickly filled by Sancho, whose laughter turns to mockery of the heroic speech Don Quixote had made the night before with regard to the unknown terror. In realizing that he is being mocked, Don Quixote's laughter changes to anger and he lashes out at Sancho. Here, the humor of the situation has transported the characters away from their initial fears and, at first, into reacting with laughter. Sancho interprets this humor as stemming in part from the ridiculousness of his master's words, while Don Quixote then understands Sancho's laughter as a personal attack and becomes indignant, hitting Sancho on both the head and back with his lance. Either way, humor has caused both characters to react differently, thereby affecting their physical actions. It is through the transformation of fear into laughter and then laughter into mockery and indignation, that humor creates a change in the characters' actions and in the storyline.

The journey of life also represents a physical transformation within a narrative, when the readers see a character age and then die. At the beginning of the novel, Don Quixote is middle-aged and full of life as he ventures out to fix the world. As he passes through his exploits and receives numerous pummelings and defeats, his body and spirit begin to weaken. After his fall to the Knight of the White Moon, he returns home. There he ends his journey as Don Quixote, becomes Alonso Quijano again after a moment of awareness, and then passes on. The wear and tear of all of his adventures physically affects him to the point where he literally can no longer move. This is a narrative example of the journey of the body through life. It is also a poignant moment in the novel that many critics find difficult to interpret. I do not have the space here to mention all of the many ways in which Don Quixote's death has been interpreted. I do, however, want to mention James Iffland's explanation because it deals specifically with journey and

motion. In *De fiestas y aguafiestas*, Iffland explores the connection between the rejuvenating theory of Carnival as embodied in Don Quixote. His interpretation is noteworthy because it explains how the ups and downs the protagonist undergoes throughout the novel are symbolic of the fluctuations that take place in Carnival, where contrasting values such as the noble and the base or the sane and the mad continuously exchange places. But once Don Quixote's journey ends and he dies, Iffland admits that this is the opposite of what he believes should occur in a truly carnivalesque representation. Because Carnival elicits an incessant rejuvenation process, "la lógica carnavalesca sobre la que está erigido el texto permitiría perfectamente una futura resurrección, seguida por más aventuras" (559). Basing his analysis on what Cervantes writes in the second prologue, Iffland believes that Cervantes changed his original ending and had Don Quixote die as a direct answer to Avellaneda's version. While I believe this assertion to be a definite possibility, I do not think that this serves as the complete explanation of the reasoning behind Cervantes's decision to end the novel with Don Quixote's death. As with the rest of the storyline, the episode surrounding Don Quixote's death is multifaceted. In Cervantes's *La Galatea*, the shepherd Tirsi at one point speaks about the relationship between love and desire as a type of propelling movement in an individual. He speculates that "desire is movement of the appetite with respect to what is loved, and a wanting of what is possessed" (308). In other words, desire is what motivates a character into motion. Through desire, the character is prompted into action or begins to work towards some type of change. This is the same with *Don Quixote*. At the beginning of the novel, the protagonist becomes so enmeshed with his books of chivalry that he desires to live as if he were in one. His original aspiration to pick up his

pen and continue the unending chivalric stories is superseded by the desire to go out into the world and reenact what he has read:

At last, having lost his wits completely, he stumbled upon the oddest fancy that ever entered a madman's brain. He believed that it was necessary . . . that he should become a knight errant, roaming through the world with his horse and armor in quest of adventures and practicing all that he had read. . . . And thus excited by these agreeable delusions, he hastened to put his plans into operation. (59)

In the original version, the last line of this paragraph states, “se dio priessa a poner en efeto lo que desseaua” (folio 2v). Both in the English version and especially in the Spanish version, we see how desire induces Don Quixote to journey out into the world. It is through his love of books of chivalry that desire sparks him into action. It is this same desire that continues to motivate him throughout the novel. In fact, if we examine the chronology of the novel, we find that Don Quixote, throughout all of his adventures, stayed at home approximately a month between the first and second parts. The rest of the time he was in movement, either journeying through the books he read, journeying away from or back to home, or journeying through his conversations with Sancho and the other characters he met along the way. When the Knight of the White Moon imposes the sentence of a year of rest and stillness at home, it is important to keep in mind that Don Quixote no longer has his store of literature in which to escape and that his library no longer exists. Upon arriving at his bookless house, he states that during this year of isolation he will spend his time in the countryside like the shepherds in pastoral novels. Initially, he is encouraged by Sancho, Sansón Carrasco, and the others, who say they will join him. But then two things happen which, to me, may help further explain why he dies shortly hereafter. The first has to do with his housekeeper and niece. Once they hear that

he is planning to venture out as a shepherd during that year's time, they enter his room.

The niece begins,

"We thought that you had come to stay at home and live here like a quiet, honest gentleman, and here you are longing to wander off into fresh labyrinths . . . In truth, uncle, the straw is too old to make pipes of."

"Heaven help us, sir!" added the housekeeper. "How will your worship be able to stand the summer's heat, the winter's frost, and the howling of the wolves in the open country? Pray, sir, you mustn't think of it . . . Stay at home, look after your property, go to confession often, do good to the poor, and let me take the blame if you do wrong." (1043)

By reminding him of his age and by stifling his opportunity to travel, both mentally via a new adventure and physically through the outdoors, they are trying to prevent any type of journey. They want him to stay home and rest and, in every sense, keep from moving. This time, as opposed to the other occasions when they tried to stop him, Don Quixote listens to them. This is the second important difference between this episode and other parts of the novel. He does not reject their plea to stop moving. It is immediately after this that he declares himself unwell, asking for help to be put to bed.

What happens next further emphasizes his immobility. He is "stricken down by a violent fever that confined him to his bed for six days" (1044), after which time he awakens and declares himself sane. Iffland understands this rejection of insanity and affirmation of his lucidity as a way around the Inquisition, with regard to the legal implications of validating a will and being confessed. If he were understood to be crazy, it would be impossible to perform either activity. This is definitely a valid interpretation, but, in my opinion, Cervantes always writes in such a rich way that multiple interpretations of an episode are possible. Iffland's interpretation does not exclude the possibility that, due to Don Quixote's rejection of further journeys and of movement in

general, there no longer exists a space within him for the desire of adventure and discovery to exist. Within the carnivalesque notion of laughter, the element of motion is integral. Without a space where movement is allowed to occur, the carnivalesque is stifled and rejuvenation turns into stagnation. To refer back to what I mentioned earlier, Alonso Quijano has decided to discard the map of chivalric romances that he had been using, Don Quixote, and in doing so he renounces his desire to journey, opting instead to remain still. But journey is an integral part of his life and therefore, by impeding this element, he has come to a dead end. Since this part of Alonso Quijano dies, his spirit follows shortly thereafter. His death could be interpreted to imply that living in stagnation is not really living. This interpretation would also coincide with Iffland's carnivalesque reading, where the only thing that truly kills the possibility of rejuvenation is a stagnant atmosphere.

Directly after his protagonist's death, Cide Hamete Benengeli draws his readers's attention away from the inner text with a speech to his pen. In reference to intratextual movement, the rotation of narrative voices throughout the novel adds to the shifting of the readers's attention from the internal characters' voices, to the extradiegetic commentators' voices, and then back again. By moving the readers's attention back and forth between these narrative frames, humor is produced through the variety of perspectives presented. In Part I, chapter 8, for example, when the first author breaks into the impending battle between Don Quixote and the Biscayan squire to explain that he has run out of the manuscript, the readers are immediately pulled away from the proximate action and not only reminded of the activity of reading in which they are participating but are informed that there is confusion as to authorship of this novel:

But it is most unfortunate that at this critical moment the author of this history leaves the battle in mid air, with the excuse that he could find no more exploits of Don Quixote than those related here. It is true that the second author of this work refused to believe that so curious a history could have been consigned to oblivion or that the wits of La Mancha could have been so lacking in curiosity as not to possess in their archives or in their registries some documents referring to this famous knight. (105)

The realization that there are two authors plus a narrator describing their predicaments of running out of a manuscript call the readers's attention away from Don Quixote's fight.

This shift in focus destabilizes the linearity of the text while adding to the comicality surrounding the scene of Don Quixote's madcap fight with the Biscayan. The readers are reminded that the central activity, the fight, is a mere story. This distances the readers from the internal characters and therefore allows them to laugh at the knight errant and the Biscayan squire, who are fighting using a cushion and swords, rather than identify with the characters's plight. At the same time, the readers are exposed to an external layer of the text; that of multiple authorship. The effect of this technique is also humorous, as it surprises through its ingenuity. This incident represents one of many scenes in the novel in which, through a journey in narrative voice, the contrast provided by the varying storytellers promotes humor. Time and again, as the readers' eyes travel from page to page in the act of reading, so too they move in and out of the many layers of narration in the novel. The readers journey through the act of reading physically, via the act of moving from one word to the next, and mentally, via the concepts created by the words.

In addition to readers traveling through the act of reading, there are also instruments or props that journey in meaning and influence the level of humor. A particular prop can be incorporated into the storyline and, depending on how it is utilized or how often it is mentioned, can increase in comic value. This can serve repeatedly as a

catalyst of laughter once its comic currency is established. When Don Quixote first mentions the balsam of Fierabrás, for instance, it is with reference to a cure-all potion that Fierabrás, a Saracen knight, employs in the chivalric work *Historia del Emperador Carromagno*. According to legend, this potion was used to embalm Christ and therefore holds miraculous powers.

In chapter 10 of Part I, after Don Quixote has been injured in his tussle with the Biscayan squire, he explains to Sancho that the balsam of Fierabrás is a potion of immense power, and he insists that, even if he were sliced in two, Sancho would only have to “take up the part of the body that has fallen to the ground with the greatest nicety before the blood congeals and put it up again on the half that remains in the saddle, taking great pains to fit it exactly in the right place” (113). Then, by drinking only two sips of the balsam, Don Quixote would be completely restored to good health. The balm is introduced to the narrative with the same signification it held in *Historia del Emperador Carromagno*, that of a miraculous elixir. Sancho immediately asks to be given the potion instead of the island he had been promised, as he wishes to sell it and make his fortune that way. Fierabrás’s balsam is at first viewed by Don Quixote as a panacea, while Sancho sees it as an income-producing opportunity. From its initial appearance in the narrative, the balm has already journeyed slightly in terms of what it now signifies. Five chapters later, after Don Quixote and Sancho have been pummeled by the Yanguesan carriers and lay on the ground in pain, Sancho calls out to his master, “I wish, if it were possible, that you would give me a couple of sups of that balsam of Vile Blas, if you have it ready to hand; perhaps it will be as good for broken bones as for wounds” (148). Sancho, unfamiliar with the name *Fierabrás*, inadvertently adds a humorous nuance to

the potion's signification by referring to it as *Vile Blas* (or *Feoblas*). The sanctity of the object's meaning is now contaminated by a comical misnomer, which represents the balm's transitioning further in its journey through the narrative and how it now begins to signify both sacred and base attributes.

In chapter 17, after their tumultuous night at the inn, the bruised and battered Don Quixote calls for Sancho to find some rosemary, salt, oil, and wine to make the balm. He mixes them together, boils the concoction, and then pours it into a tin cruse. "He, furthermore, recited over the cruse more than eighty paternosters and as many Ave Marias, salves, and credos, accompanying every word with a cross by way of blessing" (163). In observing how the balsam is fashioned, the readers are exposed to another dimension of the object's significance. Made from simple ingredients, the balsam is imbued with purgative (rosemary) and curative (salt, oil, wine) elements. By being prayed over, the secular potion assimilates a spiritual dimension. When Don Quixote drinks what is left in the pot after he has filled the cruse, its immediate effect is to make him vomit and sweat profusely. After he rests in bed for more than three hours, he awakes to find himself fully recovered. He is now convinced that he can take part in any type of adventure or dangerous undertaking without worry, as his balsam of Fierabrás will be there to cure whatever physical misfortune he may encounter. Due to Don Quixote's treatment of this liquid, its value transitions from that of an ordinary mixture of common household ingredients to a panacea with supernatural powers.

The balm takes Sancho, however, on an entirely different journey. Understanding his master's recovery to be nothing short of a miracle, and one directly caused by the balsam of Fierabrás, Sancho asks to finish off the liquid remaining in the pot. Drinking at

least as much as Don Quixote, Sancho is immediately affected not only with vomiting but also with diarrhea. Don Quixote opines that this is perhaps because Sancho is not a knight errant and therefore should not be imbibing in a chivalric beverage. Now the balsam is understood as being selective concerning its curative value, aiding only those of the knight errant skein and harming those who are not. Understandably, Sancho is upset and asks Don Quixote why he did not mention this when Sancho first asked to try it. This is a question that goes unanswered, but that nonetheless highlights the incongruity surrounding the balm with regard to its function. Rather than the prop holding a particular value on its own, Don Quixote's observation suggests that it is the characters themselves, or their qualifications, that determine the effectiveness of the balm.

Don Quixote believes the balm of Fierabrás will work. Through this belief, based on his faith in the books of chivalry that he has read, the prayers he has said over the potion, and that he understands himself to be a knight errant, the liquid is imbued with curative powers for him. Sancho is not a knight errant. He does not hold the same faith in the potion that his master does, because he does not ask to try it until after he has seen his master's miraculous recovery. Rather than the potion not having the ideal effect, it is Sancho who does not bring about the desired cure. Don Quixote chalks Sancho's bad experience up to not being in the necessary profession, but it may simply be a case of mind over matter rather than matter, or balsam, over character.

After this point in the text, it becomes clear that the prop means one thing for Don Quixote and quite another for Sancho. The readers are now prepped, as the balsam of Fierabrás becomes a signifier which, because it continues to appear in the text, can produce a specific effect, given that the readers have been conditioned to understand it in

a particular way. After Sancho is blanketed by the traveling merchants, he is overheard by Don Quixote asking Mariternes for something to drink. She offers him water, but Don Quixote interjects, “Sancho, my son, drink no water; drink it not, my son, for it will kill you. Behold, here I have the most holy balsam . . . two drops of this will certainly cure you” (167). The readers, knowing what the potion means for Sancho, anticipate a humorous reaction on the part of the squire. “At these words, Sancho, giving his master a squint-eyed look, replied in a louder voice: ‘You must have forgotten that I am no knight, or else perhaps you want me to spew up what remains of my guts after last night’s bit of work. Keep your liquor to yourself and in the Devil’s name leave me alone’” (167). Sancho’s sarcastic reply emphasizes their opposing viewpoints regarding the balsam, and because the readers understand this, his reply is funnier than if his relationship with the potion had not been previously established in the text.

The balsam of Fierabrás, after its initial insertion in the text, increases repeatedly both in comic value and in meaning every time it interacts with the protagonists or is mentioned in the narrative. It journeys from its initial definition as a chivalric elixir to become a product signifying both miraculous powers and at the same time injurious consequences. Through its narrative journey it likewise journeys in meaning and in humorous effects.

Similar in the manner in which a prop acquires meaning via the way it is used by characters or travels through the text, what a character, place, or thing is named may also transition in meaning as it journeys through a narrative. The word “Barataria,” for instance, evolves in meaning from the point where it first appears in the novel. It continues to transition in significance by leaving the text and taking shape in the form of

a geographical location. Within the narrative, the signifier “Barataria” first emerges in the text as the island granted to Sancho Panza as his governorship. As Sancho journeys to his governorship in Part II, the narrator begins chapter 45 by describing the area Sancho has been given to oversee: “Sancho and his entire suite came to a village of about a thousand inhabitants that was one of the best the duke possessed. They gave him to understand that it was called the island of Barataria, either because Barataria was really its name, or because he had obtained it at so cheap a rate” (843).⁹ The narrator does not offer a lot of information regarding a physical description, except that he adds that the small town is walled. The readers are left to deduce that it may not really be an island, because no mention of crossing water or using a boat is ever made, plus Sancho is able to reach it by riding his mule. In chapter 54, the narrator refers to Barataria as an “island, city, or town,” and explains that Sancho “had never troubled himself to find out what it was” (912).¹⁰ In addition to being a word pregnant with a variety of interpretations, Barataria is further conditioned to signifying uncertainty in reference to its political classification, since even the narrator is unwilling or incapable of clarifying what it is. From its initial appearance in the text, the term “Barataria” provides a space that allows for the readers to be carried through a myriad of interpretations as to what this word signifies. Cervantes, as with many other verbal inventions, has created a word with a certain degree of flexibility concerning its meaning.

When examining the composition of “Barataria,” there are many words which resemble it in structure. Perhaps the most obvious is *barato*, meaning “cheap.” This same

⁹ “... llegó Sancho a un lugar de hasta mil vecinos, que era de los mejores que el duque tenía. Diéronle a entender que se llamaba la ínsula Barataria, o ya porque el lugar se llamaba Baratario, o ya por el barato con que se le había dado el gobierno” (359).

¹⁰ “nunca se puso a averiguar si era ínsula, ciudad, villa o lugar la que gobernaba” (432).

word also appears as slang in Part II, chapter 49, when Sancho listens to the case of the man who expects to receive money from a winning gambler and calls this tip a “barato.” If the connection between these two words is understood by the readers, “Barataria” would trigger an understanding of “cheapness” as well as of an object that is given off-the-cuff or as a small reward for services rendered. In his article “The Baratarian Archipelago: Cheap Isle, Pourboire Isle, Chicanery Isle, Joker’s Isle,” Joseph R. Jones discusses the etymology behind “Barataria” and its possible root origins. He points out that *baratar* means “to swindle” and *baratería* is “judicial extortion or bribery,” both in use during the seventeenth century (139). With regard to the way the Duke gave Sancho this governorship, Jones suggests Cervantes could be utilizing “Barataria” to criticize the nobility’s abuse of authority, in particular “the monopoly of power, unfair and tyrannical practices, extortions of rents . . . , and arbitrary nominations” (143). Seeing “Barataria” in the text for the first time, contemporary readers of *Don Quixote* might have associated a variety of other words to its meaning as well. For especially cultured readers schooled in Classical Latin, “Barataria” could have triggered associations with *Barathrum*, or “an infernal region or abyss,” whereas those familiar with Italian might have recognized *barattare*, which means “to barter.” Readers of Dante’s *Inferno* would have remembered the *barattière*, or corrupt politicians, in the fifth bolgia of Canto XXI.

Another interpretation of Barataria relates to its physical description. By looking at the composition of the word itself, the readers may have been able to infer that the designation of “island” was a fib, by recognizing other words in “Barataria.” *Bara*, for example, is a prefix in Spanish meaning “pesantez” or “gravedad terrestre.” Those readers familiar with French might have recognized the words *barre*, meaning “bar,” and

terre, meaning “land” as forming part of “Barataria.” Lastly, the famous island to which Amadís de Gaula retreats is named *Insula Firme*, which is perhaps a play on “terra firma,” and which also may have influenced Cervantes’s creation of his word. Therefore, in deducing from this word the image of a bar of land, the readers were able to pick up on a humorous undercurrent regarding this supposed island strictly from the makeup of its name. Utilizing this signifier as a source of information and interpreting that the location is a land-locked island, the readers would note humor in this oxymoron. At the same time, readers familiar with Italian would see in “Barataria” the word *barriera*, which means “obstacle.” In Spanish, the suffix *-aria* “se refiere a la persona a quien se cede algo” according to the dictionary of the Real Academia Española. In other words, it is possible to speculate that Cervantes, by choosing a word pregnant with connotations of deceptions or impediments, was possibly intending to tip off the readers as to what Sancho had in store for himself as governor. In this sense, Cervantes provided the readers with a journey in meaning where, rather than taking a word at face value and merely continuing on with the narrative, the readers are transported, possibly via laughter but definitely through interpretation, into understanding other nuances and meanings of this particular episode of the novel.

As the plot continues, the readers see that at the end of his governorship, after ten laborious days of acting as judge, of involuntary dieting, and of being sleep-deprived, Sancho decides he has had enough and renounces his position. This conclusion is reached after a particularly harrowing skirmish with the Duke’s enemies, where Sancho is dressed in cumbersome armor, ganged-up on, and forced to fight a battle that he has no chance of winning. Disillusioned and disappointed, Sancho gives up on his dream. His

governorship of the Island of Barataria was not what he had expected, and he decides he was better off in his lowly role of squire. In summary, with reference to understanding “Barataria” within the framework of the text, the word should be viewed as a carefully-constructed signifier allowing for varying interpretations of deceit, dishonesty, and disappointment. The word has journeyed in meaning from its inception in the text to now encapsulate the unpleasant experiences Sancho undergoes as governor, due to the machinations and foul play of the Duke and his cronies.

It is also possible for a particular word to journey in meaning by leaving the text. Readers who choose to utilize what they read and interpret in a book serve as the medium through which a word departs from the text and continues to assimilate new meaning. This happens when a word is uprooted from its original text and is used in a new work. It is also occurs when the word is transplanted onto a non-textual object, such as a physical location. Because Cervantes is accredited with coining the word “Barataria,” the geographical areas in the Americas which carry this same name offer the opportunity to study how a word journeys in meaning, by how readers of *Don Quixote* interpreted the island of Barataria themselves when they utilized this signifier to stand for their lands. There are three specific locations in the Americas that hold the name Barataria, and they are located in Louisiana, Trinidad, and the Bahamas.

Beginning with Louisiana, in researching the region, I came across several theories about why this section of land located slightly southwest of New Orleans held this name. Of the merchants of the area whose web pages provided a brief history of Barataria or who answered my emails, such as James Gaffney of *Trails.com* and Captain Ripp Blank of *Ripp's Inland Charters*, the majority credit the Pirate Jean Lafitte with

naming Barataria, since he used that area for his headquarters during the early nineteenth century. Lyle Saxon, in *Lafitte, the Pirate*, states that the French word *baraterie*, with its Provençal equivalent of *barataria*, means “a fraudulent breach of duty or willful act of known illegality on the part of a master of a ship, in his character of master, or of the mariners, to the injury of the owner of the ship or cargo, and without his consent” (37). Here, Cervantes’s word has evolved in meaning to include concepts of piracy and lawlessness, for which Jean Lafitte was known. Looking back further in time, Jane Lucas de Grummond, in *The Baratarians and the Battle of New Orleans*, offers the following explanation as to why the land was named Barataria:

The first settlers in Louisiana needed termite-resistant cypress for building their houses . . . and ships. Across the Mississippi from New Orleans was a lush forest of these timbers in a swamp area which was really an island because it was bounded by the Big Lake of Ouatchas . . . However, this swamp forest was inaccessible to those early Frenchmen, so they named it “The Island of Barataria,” after that unattainable island kingdom of Sancho Panza in Cervantes’s immortal *Don Quixote*. (1)

This explanation offers a description that ties the naming of Barataria to an interpretation of Cervantes’s text. Correspondingly, Betsy Swanson, in *Terre Haute de Barataria*, cites that “Claude Joseph Villars Dubreuil . . . claimed to have discovered and named Bayou Barataria and the Isle de Barataria. . . . It is interesting to note that among the books listed as being in Dubreuil’s library at the time of his wife’s death in 1754 was a copy of *Don Quixote*” (54). A reader of Cervantes’s novel, Dubreuil lifted Barataria from the pages of the text and transplanted it to the area around southern New Orleans. Although there is no written explanation as to exactly why Dubreuil chose this name, Swanson believes the reason may be connected to the physical description of the land. If this is the case, this interpretation indicates a further journey in signification, now incorporating into its field

of connotations the value of an inaccessible or unfeasible dream. This signification can be understood as ironic, adding a humorous tone to the nomenclature. By using a name whose textual meaning assimilated comic undertones via the narrator's commentary, Dubreuil would be encouraging a humorous if not sarcastic interpretation of this piece of dubious swamp land.

In researching Louisiana's Barataria, I stumbled across another area of land with the same name on the island of Trinidad. Much smaller than the Barataria of Louisiana, this Barataria lies slightly to the east of Port-of-Spain and to the west of San Juan. Michael Anthony, in *Towns and Villages in Trinidad and Tobago*, writes that Barataria is a dairy farm "where, according to its owners, things were cheap. For 'Barataria' in Spanish is a place where cheap things are found" (142). It is interesting to note that, of all of the chronicles and documents that I researched in reference to the naming of this location, there exists no mention of *Don Quixote* or its Barataria. One local historian, Ronald Emrit, explains on his website *Trinidad and Tobago (From the 20th Century Onward)*, "It is believed that Barataria was named after a 12-plate sugar mill that operated in the community during the early part of the twentieth century. Derived from a combination of different Indian dialects, the name was given by the East Indians who worked on the sugar-cane plantation that covered most of Barataria: *bara* meant twelve, and *taria* meant plate" (<<http://www.bestoftrinidad.com/communities/barataria.html>>). The signifier has traveled so far in meaning that its link to its origin, Cervantes's novel, is lost. Without that history to define it, the word is now open to interpretation on the part of an historian or a local resident.

The last of the Baratarias I mention here is also the smallest, geographically-speaking. Sometimes referred to as *Barataria Settlement* and sometimes listed on maps as *Baraterre*, it is located at the northern tip of Great Exuma Cay, in the Bahamas. While I have yet to find conclusive proof as to when this northern cay was named Barataria Settlement, I did find that during the American Revolution, Great Exuma became an area where American Loyalists found asylum. Since this coincides with the period in which *Don Quixote* had reached its height of popularity in England, it is possible to speculate that it was around that time that this portion of land was given its title. As to why it carries this name, one feasible reason has to do with these same Loyalists. Upon moving to the cays, they attempted to establish cotton plantations. Due both to the poor quality of land and to England's abolition of slavery at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the cotton plantations became unsuccessful economically and were abandoned. This in many ways echoes Sancho's fate concerning his island, because he deserted his dreams of governorship after finding the experience too difficult and demanding.

Looking at the geographical makeup of Barataria Settlement, it is possible to further conjecture as to why it may have been named after Sancho's isle. It is located at the tip of an island, one whose cays hold shallow waters. Therefore, while beautiful and enticing to look at, it is an area that is treacherous to unsuspecting boatmen and therefore deceptive because it is not the paradise it initially appears to be. As with the Trinidadian Barataria, Barataria Settlement is free of historical implications, since written documentation linking its namer and *Don Quixote* to it has disappeared. Once again, this allows for the interpreters who are unfamiliar with Cervantes's text to construe their own signification surrounding the name of this area of land. Ironically, it is curious to note

that, as the signifier has traveled so far beyond the limits of its textual origin, it has come full circle as regards being an ambiguous signifier. While Cervantes's Barataria is elusive in its myriad of possible significations, this extratextual Barataria has become a signifier that, over time, has journeyed from its origin of multiple meanings to become a shell of a word devoid of connotation.

There is one last important device that I would like to examine in connection with humor and journey. While I have just offered examples of geographic, psychological, and physical traveling and comicality, dialogue also corresponds to the scope of journey and humor. Dialogue allows for transitions and elements of change, quite literally altering the direction of a text. Its composition serves to destabilize an otherwise staid narrative. Unlike monologue, where one character relates information but does not necessarily receive input that would influence his or her way of thinking, when a conversation takes place information is exchanged. This exchange has an effect on the characters. When Don Quixote and Sancho discuss the role of a squire in Part II, chapter 28, Sancho learns what is expected of him, because he is directly affected by Don Quixote's explanations. Sancho's question to Don Quixote regarding payment in turn alters Don Quixote's previous understanding of squiredom, since he is forced to reckon with a new notion not formerly mentioned in books of chivalry, which serve as his source of knowledge. Through dialogue, then, bonds to knowledge and belief systems are questioned, reinforced, discarded, or adapted. Conversation carries the individual into a new understanding of him or herself with relation to the world. Dialogue is a journey in mental processing and development.

Depending on the dialogue, or the way in which it is narrated, it may even mimic travel patterns. Sancho, for instance, many times talks in a manner that is similar to the way in which he meanders on his donkey. He is capable of wandering from one point to another, haphazardly making wrong turns and losing himself in proverb after proverb. Don Quixote, like a back seat driver, often fails to appreciate Sancho's ramblings, preferring him to stick to the straight and narrow. As a metaphor for journey, a dialogue is capable of reflecting roaming, deviations, flights, treks, migrations, and other types of travel. It sometimes reaches its destination in the form of a conclusion or agreement but other times is hijacked off into another direction or left hanging up in the air and abandoned. As a result, dialogue can also facilitate humorous episodes, because it is through verbal interactions between two or more characters that confusion arises, contrast in opinion occurs, personalities are made fun of, and jokes are shared, among other things.

In the middle of Part I, when Sancho returns from supposedly delivering Don Quixote's letter to Dulcinea, Don Quixote wants to know about every detail of their encounter. The readers are aware that Sancho never makes it to Dulcinea and that he forgot to take his master's letter with him. In the dialogue that follows, he is inventing what he relays to his master based on the knowledge that Dulcinea is Aldonza Lorenzo, a neighbor of his who works as a farm girl. His rough portrayal of her is in stark contrast to the peerless description Don Quixote expects to hear. When Sancho states that he has informed Dulcinea of Don Quixote's penance in the Sierra Morena and that his master curses his luck, Don Quixote corrects him, and what follows is a humorous exchange of misconstructions:

“There you were wrong,” said Don Quixote. “I do not curse my fortune, but rather bless it, for it has made me worthy of the love of so high a lady as Dulcinea of El Toboso.”

“Aye, so high she is,” answered Sancho, “that she’s a good hand’s breadth taller than I am.”

“How is that, Sancho?” said Don Quixote. “Have you measured yourself with her?”

“It happened,” answered Sancho, “that when I was helping her raise a sack of wheat onto an ass, we came so close together that I couldn’t help seeing that she was taller than me by a good span.”

“True,” answered Don Quixote, “her stature is adorned with a thousand million graces of soul. Now, there is one thing you must not deny me, Sancho. When you approached her, did you not perceive a Sabaean odor, an aromatic fragrance, something sweet – I cannot find a name to describe it – a scent, an essence, as if you were in some dainty glover’s shop.”

“All I can vouch for,” said Sancho, “is that I got a whiff of something a bit mannish; this must have been because she was sweating and a bit on the run.”

“It could not have been that,” answered Don Quixote, “but you must have had a cold in your head or else smelled yourself, for I know well the scent of that rose among thorns, that lily of the fields, that liquid amber.”

“That may be so,” answered Sancho, “for many a time I’ve noticed the same smell off myself as I perceived of her ladyship Dulcinea; but there’s no wonder in that, for one devil is the dead spit of another.” (311)

This is a dialogue of comedy and errors and is a rich example of how two characters take a journey in discourse together, but with each interpreting the other’s words and modifying their perceptions regarding the image of Dulcinea. The humor found in this example is multi-layered, with Sancho’s lie regarding his encounter with Dulcinea serving as the foundation. Because the readers are informed *a priori* about this, a humorous situation is anticipated. The readers are also aware of the huge gap in description between Don Quixote’s vision of Dulcinea and Sancho’s understanding of her. Through this contrast in viewpoints, then, there is space for comic elements to

surface, which is what happens via wordplay and misinterpretation on the part of the characters.

In hearing, for example, Don Quixote refer to Dulcinea as lofty (*alta*), Sancho quips that she is actually taller than himself, the humor here being that this is the opposite of what is desirable in a fair maiden. Don Quixote, however, fails to understand this, since he is only able to filter the information through his chivalric mindset, and instead interprets Sancho's comment as an affirmation of what he just had proclaimed. He quickly changes the subject to ask about Dulcinea's delicate aroma. Sancho, fully enmeshed in his lie, insists that she smells bad. He even goes so far as to confuse the lofty and base images of Dulcinea by referring to her as odiferous and as "her ladyship Dulcinea" all within the same sentence. It is as if Sancho has fooled himself into believing that he has talked with Dulcinea, so insistent is he in making this lie credible to Don Quixote.

From an external perspective, the readers are able to enjoy the various levels of humor present here. The initial lie by Sancho is compounded by Don Quixote's unwavering conviction of Dulcinea's beauty, which in turn leads to Sancho's fraudulent rebuttals maintaining his viewpoint that Dulcinea is just as vulgar and smelly as he is. His refutations of Don Quixote's replies, in the form of puns and word play, add to the comicality of the scene. Both hear the other only to a certain degree and interpret the information exchanged. In Don Quixote's case, it is viewed through a chivalric frame of reference, while Sancho bases his earthy description on what he remembers of his neighbor. The readers, by perceiving the multiple layers of humor present in this dialogue, are able to interpret more fully the innuendos as well as the characters'

mindsets. By understanding the initial deception, Don Quixote's naïveté or monomania, and Sancho's insistence, the readers are provided with a journey vis-à-vis the different levels of humor contained in this brief dialogue.

Another example of a humorous dialogue, albeit for different reasons, takes place in Part II, chapter 5, when Sancho returns home and talks with his wife Teresa about what will happen once he receives his governorship. Their conversation reflects what Bakhtin refers to as the chronotope of encounter, which is the most important chronotope according to him. In the encounter, "the temporal element predominates, and it is marked by a higher degree of intensity in emotions and values" (*Dialogic* 243). In this episode, the readers learn that something has changed regarding how Sancho is perceived by others. While not the first example of what Salvador de Madariaga refers to as the quixotization of Sancho, it is the first time other characters within the text mention it. It takes place after Sancho and Don Quixote have agreed to sally forth again. Sancho returns home to begin preparing for the journey and his wife can tell he is happy. She begins the dialogue by asking what good news he could be bringing that makes him so merry. Sancho answers cryptically, "Wife, if God were willing, I'd be very glad to be less merry than I am this instant" (557). Teresa responds that she does not understand him. What ensues is a lengthy dialogue in which Sancho suggests the possibility of social climbing by way of economic gain, and Teresa reinforces the status quo concerning maintaining the social positions into which they were born. In addition to the subject under discussion, the way in which Sancho expresses himself here is important. Both of these aspects come under scrutiny in this chapter, because they appear to reflect a change in Sancho.

In stopping to analyze how time and space cross here, the readers can deduce that, based on the information provided by the narrator, different factors influencing the temporal realm of this chronotope have changed. Sancho, it appears, is not the same as he was in Part I because both the translator and Teresa react to Sancho's manner of expressing himself with incredulousness. The first line of the chapter begins, "The translator of this history, when he reaches the fifth chapter, declares that he considers it apocryphal because in it Sancho talks in a style that is far superior to what one would expect from one of so limited an understanding, and he makes such subtle comments that they seem beyond the range of his intelligence" (557). As if the narrator had not called enough attention to Sancho's verboseness, he interrupts Sancho later in the chapter with the comment that "it was this style of speech and Sancho's remarks further on that made the translator, so he says, take the chapter to be apocryphal" (560). A page and a half later, the narrator again suspends Sancho's rebuttal to his wife by adding, parenthetically, "(These remarks of Sancho are another reason for the translator's former statement that this chapter is apocryphal, for they are beyond the mental capacity of our honest Sancho)" (562). Through these three interjections, the narrator emphasizes that the translator, at least, takes issue with the Sancho presented to us here, because he appears to be more intelligent and expresses himself more eloquently than in previous occasions.

From within the framework of the conversation, Teresa reinforces the translator's observations several times. At the beginning of this dialogue between Teresa and her spouse, when Sancho mentions that he would be happy to be less merry if God so wanted it, Teresa remarks, "I don't get your meaning, husband" (557). A little later on, she states, "Look here, Sancho, . . . since you've become a limb to a knight errant you talk so

roundabout that nobody can understand you" (558). Teresa underscores that Sancho's manner of speaking has become harder for her to understand since he has begun to work as Don Quixote's squire. Towards the end of their conversation, after a particularly lengthy explanation by Sancho of what a priest had preached about during the previous Lent, Teresa answers, "I can't make head or tail of you, husband, . . . Do what you will, and don't break my head with your orating and speechifying" (562). Her comments coincide with the translator's, in that Sancho is acting differently now. It is through this conversation between Sancho and Teresa that the readers are lead to believe a temporal transition has taken place in Sancho. Sancho voices his opinion, Teresa and the translator react with a certain degree of emotional intensity, and through this juncture the readers understand that a change either in character or in perception has transpired. Comparing Sancho's style of speech in this chapter with how he expressed himself previously, one could say that Sancho was more often portrayed as a simpleton than as an eloquent talker. While he continually attempted to bring Don Quixote down to earth with logical arguments or by pointing out, for instance, that there were windmills rather than giants, Sancho nonetheless tripped over his proverbs and confused words when trying to expound on his opinions. One only has to think of his reconstruction of Don Quixote's letter to Dulcinea in Part I, chapter 26, when he talks with the curate and the barber.

But Sancho was also capable of astute judgment, such as when he saw through Don Quixote's visions and attempted to persuade his master to not attack the flocks of sheep (I: 18) or the barber on his mule (I: 21). Antonio Barbagallo, in "Sancho no es, se hace," offers the explanation that most of what Sancho is accused of being by the narrator and other characters (simple, gluttonous, and a drunkard), does not coincide with how

Sancho actually behaves in the text. As Barbagallo points out, regarding the translator's comments in Part II, chapter 5, "Este supuesto cambio del que habla el traductor, no es otra cosa que la revelación que Sancho hace de sí mismo. Este primer crítico del *Quijote* había llegado a sus conclusiones atendiendo a lo que decían de Sancho, más que a lo que decía Sancho" (52). All of this now begs the question: has Sancho changed or is the perception of Sancho by other characters too stultifying? At the end of Part I, when Sancho loudly laments what he thinks is the death of his master, he extols Don Quixote in a long speech ending with, "Resister of perils, sufferer of affronts, lover without cause, imitator of the good, scourge of the wicked, enemy of the base! In a word, knight errant, which is the highest thing anyone could say!" (512). Save the accidental inversion by Sancho of "O humble to the haughty and arrogant to the humble" (512), Sancho's speech is eloquent, but no one comments on this. While the narrator refers to his lament as droll (*risueño*), one can only assume that this is because of Sancho's exaggerated exclamations as opposed to what is a poetically-stated expression of grief. Neither the narrator nor the translator take issue with Sancho's eulogy, which imitates his master's manner of speaking and reflects a style of speech found in books of chivalry, rather than a peasant's speech. Since Sancho's language is not indicative of his social class, it would be possible to refer to his quixotization here, but no one does. On the very next page, Sancho has arrived home to his wife and informs her that "there's nothing in this world so pleasant as for an honest man to be squire to a knight errant on the prowl for adventures. . . . It's a fine thing to be gadding about spying for chances, crossing mountains, exploring woods, climbing rocks, visiting castles, lodging in inns at our own sweet will, with devil a maravedí to pay" (514). Here, again, he echoes Don Quixote's sentiments on knight

errantry and reproduces his verbal mannerisms, although neither the translator nor Teresa seems to notice.

Since Sancho has always been wordy in his contestations, and because he fluctuates between base vocabulary and eloquent speech, it is difficult to find an exact moment in the novel where he leaves his old peasant mannerisms behind and opts for an erudite method of speech. He alternates between both, even during the dialogue with Teresa in Part II, chapter 5, where he begins by speaking to her using *vos* and then changes to the *tú* form. This is an obvious example of an alteration in linguistic register, from formal to informal speech, and it represents an adjustment in familiarity with his wife. But, again, this is something he does in an earlier conversation with Teresa (I: 52). What this episode highlights is Teresa and the translator's awareness of the articulate side of Sancho and therefore their belief that he has changed.

This conversation between Sancho and Teresa serves as the crux of several variations on the temporal and spatial elements. It functions “as the primary means for materializing time in space [and] emerges as a center for concretizing representation” (Bakhtin, *Dialogic* 250). Within the space of a dialogue held in a home, the readers are privy to Teresa’s perplexity towards a side of her husband that she seems not to have previously noticed. Sancho, through his usage of verbose lexicon and in his passionate support of social mobility, demonstrates his ability to manipulate words with the same ease that his master does. Slightly outside of the space where this dialogue occurs, the narrator penetrates the link between the readers and the inner characters, making his presence known to the readers, all the while bringing to the fore what the translator understands to be an inaccuracy on the part of Sancho. This encounter between Sancho

and his wife represents a journey in perceptions on the part of Teresa and the translator. It also serves as a concrete example of Sancho's development as a character since becoming a squire.

In conclusion, I would like to lead into chapter three by offering a brief analysis regarding the difference in journey and humor as found in Cervantes's *Don Quixote* and Avellaneda's apocryphal Part II. While both tomes employ the techniques of journey and humor, they are integrally different in terms of purpose and effect. The essential distinction concerning how journey is utilized stems from how the two authors employ these literary devices. Cervantes uses journey to open up the narrative and give free rein, so to speak, to his characters. In his novel, journey incorporates elements of autonomy and exploration. Throughout the various types of journeys analyzed above, coupled with humorous effects, there exists an undercurrent of growth and rejuvenation, because the characters learn from their new encounters.

In general, I do not find this to be the case in Avellaneda's book. Here journey is utilized merely as a tool for moving the plot along. The sense of exploration and discovery are absent and, rather than evolving characters, there exists stagnation due to the excessive manipulations of Avellaneda to define and limit his characters' roles. As a result of the lack of journey, or adventure, in this text, the examples of humor that appear are stilted and do not foster growth. Sancho, for example, has been typecast from the beginning of the novel as a court buffoon and he is never allowed to go beyond this role. His dialogues with the other characters, especially with his master, are rarely journeys in discovery or stichomythia, but rather serve just to relay information to the readers and move the plot along. The conversation between master and squire, so rich in opportunity

for both the characters and the readers in Cervantes's version, in Avellaneda's only function as fodder for ridicule on the part of the readers and other characters.

By comparing the concept of journey with regard to humor as presented by both authors, the key difference is that Cervantes's utilization of this mechanism provides for a renewing of the text and characters. Together with humor, there is an encouragement of possibilities. Avellaneda's type of journey, however, does not work to promote growth and therefore only adds to an artistic paralysis in the narrative. His humor is harnessed so as to maintain the well-defined limitations of each character.

In this chapter, I have attempted to analyze the relationship between journey and humor in Cervantes's *Don Quixote* and how they both affect the characters and the storyline. Journey, in the general sense of the word, signifies change. It represents motion as well as transformation, because of exposure to new impressions and encounters. The element of travel within a text increases the probability of humor emerging. Journey not only opens up a narrative to the possibility of comic elements but also has the same destabilizing effect on a narrative that humor does. Humor serves to provoke transitions or changes, the most obvious being laughter on the part of the interpreter. Lastly, it should be pointed out that a symbiotic relationship can exist between journey and humor, where one facilitates the other. With reference to *Don Quixote*, the importance of both journey and humor is essential in understanding that, without either of these two elements, Cervantes's text would literally go nowhere.

CHAPTER III

HUMOR IN CERVANTES AND AVELLANEDA: UN SENDERO QUE SE BIFURCA

The name ‘Avellaneda’ triggers the association of the words ‘impostor’ and ‘copy cat,’ because of this author’s continuation of the original *Don Quixote*. Nonetheless, it is sometimes conjectured that had it not been for the apocryphal version, Cervantes may never have gotten around to publishing his own Part II. Even so, the audacity of Avellaneda continues to overshadow this backhanded favor he did to literary history. Rather than center on different aspects contained in this novel, the research on Avellaneda more often than not strives to identify who he was or focuses on the issue of his impact on Cervantes’s second part. For this reason, in this chapter I compare and contrast the types of humor that surface in both Cervantes’s and Avellaneda’s novels. At first, I discuss the more prominent theories of influence between the two authors, in order to provide background information that will hopefully aid in better understanding the humor in both texts. It is my intent to show that, although the 1614 and 1615 novels share an initial resemblance, their visions of comicality are divergent, thereby rendering both works unique in their own right. Nonetheless, although they are dissimilar in style and humor, both texts need to be read by the scholar who wishes to attain a more complete understanding of Cervantes’s masterpiece.

Although Avellaneda’s novel was published a year before Cervantes’s, there is quite a bit of speculation as to who influenced whom. Some believe that Cervantes had

almost finished Part II and that as he was writing chapter 59, he discovered Avellaneda's version. Stephen Gilman, in *Cervantes y Avellaneda*, observes,

Cervantes no sabía de la existencia del *Quijote apócrifo* antes de escribir el capítulo LIX de la Segunda Parte, por tres razones: en primer lugar, lo dice él mismo, y no tenemos por qué ponerlo en duda; en segundo lugar, imita algunos rasgos del estilo de Avellaneda después del capítulo LIX, pero no antes; en tercer lugar, después de ese capítulo se da prisa en terminar la obra, ocasionando un cambio en el ritmo y en los acontecimientos, perceptible a primera vista para todo lector sensible. Por ello, y rechazando para la mayor parte de los casos de la posibilidad de una coincidencia, Avellaneda tiene que haber imitado a Cervantes. Pero dado el carácter poco preciso de las semejanzas, es de suponerse que Avellaneda no tuvo conocimiento directo del original. Debió haberlo sabido de oídas. (175)

Gilman claims that Avellaneda overheard Cervantes read or discuss a part of his text, which he then stole to fashion his own creation. But critics such as Ramón Menéndez Pidal and Alfonso Martín Jiménez believe that it was Cervantes who obtained a copy of Avellaneda's version, using it as the starting point for his own second part. In *Cervantes y Pasamonte*, Martín Jiménez writes,

Cervantes conoció el manuscrito del *Quijote* de Avellaneda antes de empezar a escribir la segunda parte de su *Quijote* y, como veremos, se sirvió de él para escribir todos los capítulos de esta obra. Y el hecho de que mencione expresamente por primera vez el *Quijote* apócrifo en el capítulo 59, obedece a que fue en ese momento cuando conoció que la obra de su rival había sido por fin publicada, adquiriendo una categoría más preocupante que aconsejaba una respuesta directa. (143)

This theory helps to explain why there are various similarities between the storylines of the two narratives. With regard to Cervantes's decision to mention the apocryphal text and characters in his second part, Menéndez Pidal believes that it was Avellaneda's inflammatory prologue that sparked Cervantes's furious response in chapter 59: "Avellaneda, al imprimir su obra, añadiría el prólogo agresivo, el cual, al ser leído por Cervantes, halló repulsa en el capítulo LIX del verdadero *Quijote*" (64). All of these

critics offer plausible explanations to back up their arguments. However, because we know so little about Avellaneda and because neither author admitted to copying from the other's Part II, it is impossible to reach a completely satisfactory conclusion. All of this begs the question as to why, if Cervantes knew who Avellaneda was, he never named his spurious rival, which may have helped future critics set the record straight in addition to proving who influenced whom. Martín Jiménez credits the apocryphal *Guzman de Alfarache* with affecting Cervantes's decision to not identify the author:

Cervantes, que conocía bien el caso de Mateo Alemán y había leído atentamente sus obras y sus prólogos . . . , quiso seguir su ejemplo, y decidió imitar la segunda parte de Avellaneda para construir la suya. No obstante, y contrariamente a Alemán, Cervantes decidió ocultar que estaba sirviéndose en todo momento de la obra de su rival, seguramente porque el *Quijote* apócrifo, a diferencia de la obra de Mateo Lujan de Sayavedra, aún no había sido publicado y era menos conocido, y Cervantes no se sentía en la obligación de mencionarlo, evitando así que su enemigo cobrara renombre a su costa. Por lo demás, y como también había hecho Alemán, Cervantes denunciaría la falsedad del nombre y del lugar de origen de imitador, y sugeriría en el cuerpo de su obra su verdadero nombre. (176)

But if Cervantes did leave literary clues in the hopes of slyly exposing his rival's name, none of these hints were explicit enough and critics to this day continue to speculate over who Avellaneda was. Vladimir Nabokov, in *Lectures on Don Quixote*, hypothesizes about what motivated Cervantes to write *Don Quixote*. He suggests that poverty played a factor but, in the second part, that Cervantes's development of narrative techniques was overshadowed by a sense of frustration:

This carefree playing with slick devices must have been little in keeping with Cervantes's actual mood in 1603 or 1604. He was working furiously, without rereading or planning. Poverty prodded the writing of the first part. Poverty and exasperation engendered the second part produced ten years later, for during the writing of this second part Cervantes had to cope with an enchanter in real life as cruel as any he had invented to torment his invented hero and more alive than the grave, eloquent, and meticulous historian he invented to record the exploits of his invented hero. (77)

This interpretation of how Cervantes felt, although speculative on Nabokov's part, offers a possible reading into Cervantes's motivation. According to him, Cervantes writes Part II for economic reasons but also as a reaction to his rival's impudence and in order to recuperate his creation. Nabokov's subsequent conjecture is even more interesting. He states,

Generations of Cervantesists have tried to find Avellaneda's real name anagrammatically or acrostically hidden in the first lines of the spurious *Don Quixote*. Let me drop the dark hint that a great-grandmother of Cervantes was called Juana Avellaneda,¹¹ and that some have contended that the fake *Don Quixote* was composed by Cervantes himself for the express purpose of having at hand a new device in the second part that he signed—his own people meeting people belonging to the Avellaneda book. I repeat, nobody knows who Avellaneda really was, and his style is different from that of Cervantes's, being less ample, more pointed, with briefer descriptions. (79)

This is an amazing idea, because it requires an incredible amount of work on Cervantes's part, because the two novels' styles of writing are very different, and because Nabokov does not back up this assertion with any proof in the form of early manuscripts or other evidence. Nonetheless, this theory is appealing to me because it would fit with Cervantes's profound capability to play with the literary parameters of metafiction. It is true that both authors have different styles of writing; however, if Cervantes were capable of imitating the writing style of another author, or altering his own style as he does in comparison to *La Galatea* and *Los trabajos de Persiles y Segismunda*, for example, this would explain why critics have always had problems with the similarities and points of influence between these two texts. There is no doubt that Cervantes would be up to the

¹¹ In the preface of his 1885 edition of *Don Quixote*, John Ormsby discusses Cervantes's heritage and writes, "Of the line that settled in Andalusia, Diego de Cervantes, Commander of the Order of Santiago, married Juana Avellaneda, daughter of Juan Arias de Saavedra, and had several sons, of whom one was Gonzalo Gomez, Corregidor of Jerez and ancestor of the Mexican and Columbian branches of the family; and another, Juan, whose son Rodrigo married Doña Leonor de Cortinas, and by her had four children, Rodrigo, Andrea, Luisa, and Miguel, our author."

task, because he is such a versatile writer, but there is no written proof to back up Nabokov's speculation. Nabokov adds that "writing under another name a pretended, a spurious, continuation in order to intrigue the readers of the authentic one would have been a little moonburst of artistic technique. Avellaneda himself should have turned out to be, in a disguise of mirrors, Cervantes" (81). This would also explain why Cervantes never reveals his rival's name. For Nabokov, it would be just another game, albeit long and drawn out, that Cervantes would be playing with the readers.

At the other end of the spectrum, in pondering why Avellaneda would be inspired to continue Cervantes's work, James Iffland theorizes that this author is a nobleman who felt threatened by the ease with which Don Quixote and Sancho Panza overcame barriers of social hierarchy. He writes,

Mi hipótesis es que se trata de un individuo muy consciente de la enorme crisis socioeconómica que está atravesando España, de las múltiples tensiones que están sacudiendo la formación social. Como tantos otros intelectuales afiliados ideológicamente con el *status quo*, percibe amenazas por todas partes, amenazas que requieren contramedidas apropiadas. No es que el *Quijote* de 1605 represente un ataque directo contra ese orden que quiere proteger, pero sí, en medio de toda su comicidad (y mediante su comicidad), sintoniza oblicuamente con esos vectores desestabilizadores que motivan tanta preocupación. Su peculiar dinámica, con las resonancias que emite, requiere una neutralización eficaz, por encima de cualquier *vendetta* que quiera realizar Avellaneda contra un contrincante del mundo literario. (*De fiestas y aguafiestas* 224)

For Iffland, Avellaneda wanted to rewrite *Don Quixote* and put the subversive protagonists in their place. In the last sentence from the quote above, Iffland is referring to the argument of critics such as Gilman that Avellaneda wrote his novel as a result of the attacks Cervantes made against Lope de Vega in Part I. Gilman explains the possible reason behind Avellaneda's devotion to Lope:

Para Avellaneda, España no sólo se había hecho defensora de la causa divina, sino que había emulado la ontología divina con sus incomparables organizaciones

sociales, militares y eclesiásticas. Y esto fue quizás el verdadero motivo de su admiración por Lope. Aunque Avellaneda mismo carecía por completo del genio creador de Lope, el teatro loresco infundía grandeza a sus valores. (*Cervantes* 138)

Cervantes's cloaked references to Lope de Vega in Part I, therefore, would be interpreted by Avellaneda as attacks against Catholicism. As a result, Avellaneda created a second part in order to reestablish the roles of religious order and social hierarchy, which Cervantes had thrown into question by assailing the Church vis-à-vis Lope de Vega in Part I and also by allowing an *hidalgo* to knight himself and a peasant to dream of a governorship. Iffland interprets Avellaneda's reformation of Cervantes's two protagonists as a way of keeping Don Quixote and Sancho Panza from stepping beyond the roles into which they were born. The apocryphal continuation, for Iffland, was written for political reasons. For Gilman, it was more religiously motivated. However, in *Towards a Revaluation of Avellaneda's False Quixote*, E. T. Aylward sees Avellaneda as more of an opportunistic writer who is eager to cash in on the success of Part I and chooses to imitate the type of humor found at the beginning of the 1605 novel. Avellaneda, along with many other readers of the first part, considered "these 'early' pre-Cardenio adventures to be the 'best' (i.e., the most humorous) chapters, and therefore the episodes most worthy of imitation in a sequel" (11). Aylward posits that the initial chapters of Cervantes's novel do not hold the complexity and artistic development of the characters that the later chapters, beginning around the episode in the Sierra Morena, do. He states, "the sophisticated, 'modern' novelistic techniques we now commonly associate with Cervantes's creative genius actually begin to manifest themselves only in Chapter 23, the strange encounter with Cardenio that launches the Sierra Morena adventure" (11). Avellaneda, either incapable or not interested in imitating the level of narrative

complexity that Cervantes attains by the latter half of his first part, instead attempts to replicate the type of humor found at the beginning of Cervantes's novel. Regardless of his motivation, however, the issue of imitation has always been the topic of concern in the majority of analyses on Avellaneda's text. Martín Jiménez, in reiterating his theory that Cervantes worked from Avellaneda's manuscript, explains why critics through the years have tended to disparage Avellaneda for attempting to usurp Cervantes's text,

El *Quijote* cervantino fue ensalzado por los autores románticos . . . , que veían en don Quijote al prototipo del héroe idealista y fracasado, y la importancia conferida en el Romanticismo a la originalidad creativa determinó que pasara inadvertida la naturaleza imitativa de la segunda parte del *Quijote* cervantino, a la vez que se estigmatizaba y casi se condenaba al olvido la obra de Avellaneda, debido al carácter claramente perceptible y confesado de su imitación. Como consecuencia de ello, la segunda parte del *Quijote* de Cervantes ha venido entendiéndose desde los orígenes de la Historia de la Literatura como una obra autónoma, cuando no lo es, y su supuesta autonomía sólo ha sido cuestionada por algunos autores a partir del siglo XX. (177)

It is important, in other words, to read and compare Avellaneda's text with Cervantes's, if a true appreciation of *Don Quixote* is really desired. Every critic has his or her own theory regarding influence and Avellaneda. I personally believe Avellaneda did not like the direction Cervantes took in Part I and improvised his own version accordingly. When Cervantes realized this, he altered his text to incorporate characters and elements from the apocryphal version, which he had only heard about but had not read, as will be further explained below. Regardless of which theory is completely unfounded, only partially correct, or the most likely, what the speculation does affirm is that there is an inextricable connection between Cervantes's *Don Quixote* and Avellaneda's narrative. I mention this because many critics have spent hours fiercely defending their point of view concerning authorship and chronology of when the texts were written, but there are still very few who have gone beyond these two problems to actually analyze the comicality found in

the apocryphal text, whether in relation to Cervantes's magnum opus, or on its own. It is true that Avellaneda usurped Cervantes's creation and altered it to fit his own enterprise. However, according to my interpretation of his text, he has not chosen to fully imitate Cervantes but rather has selected only certain characteristics from the 1605 novel and exploited them to formulate something very different. Much like a puppeteer stealing someone else's puppets, Avellaneda's aim was not to replicate Cervantes's creation faithfully, but rather to play with it as he saw fit. In other words, the apocryphal version is not a novel intending to seamlessly imitate the original. From my point of view, Avellaneda did not like the course Cervantes had taken by the end of Part I and decided to commandeer the narrative and carry it into a different humorous direction.

Given the varying observations and analyses that have been made over the years regarding influence, several of which I have just mentioned above, it is impossible to prove for certain the degree to which either author imitated the other. However, it is feasible to assess the comic elements present in each text and compare their overall effects. Both Cervantes's and Avellaneda's texts were written in a comic vein, utilizing an array of literary techniques to provoke laughter. The humor found in the two versions of *Don Quixote* incorporates the baser elements of comicality, such as that of a vulgar, physical, or corporeal nature, as well as a more intricate level of wit via dialogue, word play, and narration. As pointed out by Aylward, Cervantes's novel initially favors the physical type of humor, where Don Quixote fights with a windmill, a Biscayan squire, a lusty muleteer, and the galley slaves, among other things. As the novel progresses and then continuing into the second part, this physical humor is still present, but then a more sophisticated humor contained principally in the dialogues and narrative techniques

gradually takes precedence. It is this initial, more physical humor that Avellaneda attempts to imitate in his continuation of Cervantes's novel. This is also true for Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, who do not reach the level of intricacy in Avellaneda's text that they do in Cervantes's. Rather, Avellaneda prefers to keep his protagonists confined to the roles of madman and 'gracioso,' modeling them after the generally shallow caricatures found in theater. Gilman points out, "Avellaneda parece haber sido—y si comprendemos esto, muchos aspectos de su 'arte' quedan en claro—algo así como el posible común denominador del público de la comedia" (*Cervantes* 138). Avellaneda perhaps has in mind a theater audience as his readership. Aylward explains,

it should not surprise us that Avellaneda chose to cast his main characters as stereotypical puppets: Don Quixote in the role of a chimerical lunatic, Sancho as a simple-minded glutton. The Aragonese author's modest goal was simply to write another funny book, which is all that the original *Don Quixote* pretends to be prior to the adventures in the Sierra Morena. As a consequence, Avellaneda opted to continue the story according to the conventions and stereotypes of the popular *comedia*, which is not surprising in view of his plainly indicated dedication to the defense of Lope de Vega. (20)

Whether or not it is out of loyalty to Lope, or rather because a theater audience is the type of readership he envisioned for his novel, Avellaneda keeps the characters in simple, caricature-type roles. It is the 'gracioso,' for instance, who helps move the plot along with his witty repartee or satirical interjections. Because he is usually a servant, as is Sancho here, his commentary adds an unconventional perspective to situations. An example of this occurs in chapter 10 of the apocryphal version, where the readers observe Don Quixote in one of his fits of delirium. Don Álvaro, the Morisco gentleman that interacts with Don Quixote throughout most of Avellaneda's text, has filled the knight errant's head with the illusion of winning the tournament in Zaragoza and has just left the room so that Don Quixote could dress:

Fuése don Álvaro, y quedó el buen hidalgo con la fantasía llena de quimeras; y sin poder reposar, se levantó y comenzó a vestirse, imaginando ahincadamente en su negra sortija; y con la vehemente imaginación se quedó mirando al suelo sin pestañear, con las bragas a medio poner; y de allí a un buen rato arremetió con el brazo muy derecho hacia la pared, dando una carrera y diciendo:

—De la primera vez he llevado el anillo metido en la lanza; y así, vuesas excelencias, rectísimos jueces, me manden dar el mejor premio, pues de justicia se me debe, a pesar de la envidia de los circunstantes aventureros y miradores. A la voz grande que dio, subieron un paje y Sancho Panza; y entrando dentro del aposento, hallaron a don Quijote, las bragas caídas, hablando con los jueces, mirando al techo; y como la camisa era un poco corta por delante, no dejaba de descubrir alguna fealdad. Lo cual visto por Sancho Panza, le dijo:

—Cubra, señor Desamorado, ¡pecador de mí! el etcétera; que aquí no hay jueces que le pretendan echar otra vez preso, ni dar doscientos azotes, ni sacar a la vergüenza, aunque harto saca vuesa merced a ella las suyas sin para qué; que bien puede estar seguro. (111)

Sancho is depicted here as a smart aleck, both reacting to the immodesty of Don Quixote as well as playing with the words ‘etcétera’ and ‘vergüenza’ so as to provide comic relief to what would otherwise be an indecent spectacle. His quips add humor and help transform the scene of madness to one of laughter. This episode is a typical example of how Sancho and his master are portrayed throughout Avellaneda’s novel, with Don Quixote experiencing bouts of insanity while the squire comments on them to anyone who will listen.

Don Quixote continually falls into a delirium that either temporarily immobilizes him while he fantasizes, as in the above example, or he rashly acts out attacking anything in his path. The role of the madman, because it is not as frequently utilized in theater as the ‘gracioso’ and therefore does not offer Avellaneda as solid a template from which to draw, is not as varied as is Sancho’s character. Sancho, as the comic relief element, alternates between humorous bantering and foolishness. The aforementioned scene echoes in some ways the episode in the authentic version of the Sierra Morena, when

Sancho leaves Don Quixote to deliver the letter to Dulcinea. The knight has already mentioned his plan to imitate Amadís de Gaula “haciendo aquí del desesperado, del sandio y del furioso, por imitar juntamente al valiente don Roldán” (303-304). In truth, Don Quixote seems to have been first inspired by Cardenio, about whose attacks of insanity he has just learned. Curiously, the way in which the goat herder describes Cardenio’s madness more closely resembles how Avellaneda’s protagonist acts. Speaking to Don Quixote and Sancho about his encounter with Cardenio, the goat herder explains, “Y estando en lo mejor de su plática, paró y enmudecióse; clavó los ojos en el suelo por un buen espacio, . . . y por lo que hacía de abrir los ojos, estar fijo mirando al suelo sin mover pestaña gran rato, y otras veces cerrarlos, apretando los labios y enarcando las cejas, . . . se levantó con gran furia del suelo, donde se había echado, y arremetió con el primero que halló junto a sí” (290). This abrupt mood swing that temporarily immobilizes Cardenio is also what the apocryphal Don Quixote suffers from. It is possible to speculate that Cardenio’s violent bouts may have served in part as the model for Avellaneda’s Don Quixote. In contrast, the authentic Don Quixote is aware that he is imitating madness in this scene. In order to prove to Sancho that he is mad, he puts on a brief performance replicating his understanding of Amadís’s lunacy. As Sancho leaves with Dulcinea’s letter, Don Quixote puts on a show for his squire: “Y desnudándose con toda priesa los calzones, quedó en carnes y en pañales, y luego, sin más ni más, dio dos zapatetas en el aire y dos tumbas la cabeza abajo y los pies en alto, descubriendo cosas que, por no verlas otra vez, volvió Sancho la rienda a Rocinante, y se dio por contento y satisfecho de que podía jurar que su amo quedaba loco” (317). Whereas Avellaneda’s version is crassly funny, Cervantes’s stab at crude humor is related by the narrator and therefore is less

aggressive. These two examples of raunchy humor serve as accurate representations of how each author treats the baser elements of comedy. In general, Cervantes steers clear of sexual or corporeal profanity, while Avellaneda incorporates it regularly throughout his text. Regardless of the scatological or vulgar references made by both authors, although more so by Avellaneda, it is interesting to note that neither pair of protagonists fall victim to lewdness and that all four characters remain chaste both in thought and deed throughout all of their adventures. On a side note, this is particularly unusual for both Quixotes, considering the knights errant they strive to imitate did often partake in amorous adventures.

Both authors also use dialogue in differing ways. The dialogue Avellaneda creates between his characters tends to be shorter and less involved. The characters speak in order to move the plot along rather than to ponder ideas or share perspectives on a particular topic. Because Avellaneda is more interested in the action of the storyline than in the dimension of the characters, dialogues that are short and fast-paced fit well here. For instance, in chapter 2 of the apocryphal version, Sancho explains to Don Álvaro Tarfe how Dulcinea received his master's letter. Sancho is crass in his description of Don Quixote's love interest:

—¿Quiere saber, señor don Tarfe, lo que hizo la muy zurrada cuando le llevé esa carta que ahora mi señor quiere leer? Estábase en la caballeriza la muy puerca, porque llovía, hinchendo un serón de basura con una pala, y cuando yo le dije que le traía una carta de mi señor (¡infernal torzón le dé Dios por ello!) tomó una gran palada de estiércol que estaba más hondo y más remojado, y arrojómelo de boleo, sin decir ¡agua va! en estas pecadoras barbas. Yo, como por mis pecados las tengo más espesas que escobilla de barbero, estuve después más de tres días sin poder acabar de agotar la porquería que en ellas me dejó perfectamente.
Dióse, oyendo esto, una palmada en la frente don Álvaro, diciendo:

—Por cierto, señor Sancho, que semejante porte que ése no le merecía la mucha discreción vuestra.

—No se espante vuesa merced—replicó Sancho—; que a fe que nos ha sucedido a mí y a mi señor, andando por amor della en las aventuras o desventuras del año pasado, darnos pasadas de cuatro veces muy gentiles garrotazos.

—Yo os prometo—dijo colérico don Quijote—que si me levanto, don bellaco desvergonazdo, y cojo una estaca de aquel carro, que os muela las costillas y haga que se os acuerde per omnia sœcula sœculorum.

—Amén—respondió Sancho.

Levantárase don Quijote a castigarle la desvergüenza, si don Álvaro no le tuviera el brazo y le hiciera volver a sentar en su silla, haciendo con el dedo señas a Sancho para que callase, con que lo hizo por entonces. (32)

Sancho is disrespectful both of Dulcinea and of his master. He refers to Dulcinea as a tart and answers Don Quixote's Latinism with an uppity 'Amen.' Avellaneda is good at formulating rapid-fire repartee, which would work well in the theater, but he is either incapable or uninterested in taking the time to develop these witty dialogues into fuller conversations. Instead, he relies heavily on one character relaying the majority of the information, as does Sancho here, and then often utilizes the narrator to fill in the missing details. The above example is representative of how information is fed to the reader: Sancho does the greater part of the talking and, after Don Quixote reacts to what he has said, the dialogue stops and the narrator explains that Don Álvaro has stepped in to settle the other two characters down. Aylward observes,

It must be admitted that Avellaneda has a certain flair for the kind of action-packed situational comedy we associate with the Golden Age Spanish entremés, but his comic debates are clearly no match for Cervantes's. Avellaneda, whose characters' verbal exchanges . . . are only about half as long as Cervantes's originals, simply lacks the great writer's genius for sustaining any amusing dialogue. The author of the *False Quixote* had an abundance of good comic concepts, but little talent for executing his schemes to their full comedic potential. (47)

Cervantes's dialogues tend to be more complete. He utilizes Sancho's rustic proverbialism to counter the intellectualizing of his master, but these two sides serve as two elements working together to create well-rounded conversations. In chapter 2 of this thesis, I analyzed the dialogue between master and squire in which Sancho is inventing his encounter with Dulcinea and Don Quixote can only comprehend this information through a chivalric frame of reference (I: 31). The conversation stands on its own and the narrator is not needed to explain the result of the dialogue. Whereas the humor contained in Avellaneda's dialogue above stems from Sancho's blatant disrespect, in Cervantes's dialogue laughter is created due to the incongruity between Don Quixote's lofty interpretation of Dulcinea and Sancho's coarse rendition in response. This is not to say that Cervantes does not make use of the narrator in comical dialogues. In Part I, chapter 26, Sancho comes across the barber and curate on his way to deliver the letter to Dulcinea. When he realizes he does not have it, the two friends ask him to repeat it from memory. Here, the narrator is utilized to set the scene and then summarize the experience:

Paróse Sancho Panza a rascar la cabeza para traer a la memoria la carta, y ya se ponía sobre un pie, y ya sobre otro; unas veces miraba al suelo, otras al cielo, y al cabo de haberse roído la mitad de la yema de un dedo, teniendo suspensos a los que esperaban que ya la dijese, dijo al cabo de grandísimo rato:

—Por Dios, señor licenciado, que los diablos lleven la cosa que de la carta se me acuerda; aunque en el principio decía: “Alta y sobajada señora.”

—No diría—dijo el barbero—*sobajada*, sino sobrehumana o soberana señora.

—Así es—dijo Sancho—. Luego, si mal no me acuerdo, proseguía . . . , si mal no me acuerdo: “El llego y faltó de sueño, y el ferido besa a vuestra merced las manos, ingrata y muy desconocida hermosa,” y no sé qué decía de salud y de enfermedad que le enviaba, y por aquí iba escurriendo, hasta que acababa en “Vuestro hasta la muerte, el Caballero de la Triste Figura.”

No poco gustaron los dos de ver la buena memoria de Sancho Panza, y alabáronselo mucho, y le pidieron que dijese la carta otras dos veces, para que ellos, asimismo, la tomasen de memoria para trasladalla a su tiempo. (323)

The laughter is again directed at Sancho, but here he is being enjoyed for his faulty memory as well as for his confusion of word choice, due to his lack of education. Being a simple squire, his attempt to imitate the eloquent speech of his master, who in turn was imitating the flowery language of chivalric romance, becomes a source of laughter. The supplemental information provided by the narrator fleshes out the experience for the reader. By describing how Sancho stopped to scratch his head and chew on his fingertip, the narrator furnishes the readers with the nervousness and anxiety the squire was feeling as he attempted to recall the letter from memory. After the dialogue ends, the narrator steps in to summarize what happened next. Unlike the narration throughout the major part of Avellaneda's text, oftentimes in Cervantes's work the narrator seems to merge with the character he is describing. For instance, after he explains how the barber and curate asked Sancho to repeat the letter several more times, the narrator begins to emulate Sancho's speech pattern when describing the promise Don Quixote has made to Sancho:

Dijo también como su señor, en trayendo que le trajese buen despacho de la señora Dulcinea del Toboso, se había de poner en camino a procurar cómo ser emperador, o, por lo menos, monarca, que así lo tenían concertado entre los dos; y era cosa muy fácil venir a serlo, según era el valor de su persona y la fuerza de su brazo; y que en siéndolo, le habría de casar a él, porque ya sería viudo, que no podía ser menos, y le habría de dar por mujer a una doncella de la emperatriz, heredera de un rico y grande estado de tierra firme, sin ínsulos ni ínsulas, que ya no las quería. (323-24)

The choppy way that the narrator has recounted the information, plus the confusion of "ínsulos ni ínsulas," is an accurate imitation of how Sancho would have spoken. Compared to the drier narrator in Avellaneda's version, Cervantes's adds a richer element of humor to the text.

In general, the narrator in Avellaneda's novel plays a less prominent role and is not as thoroughly developed as Cervantes's narrator. There are very few times when Avellaneda's narrator attempts to play with the readers by not divulging pertinent information and thereby keeping them in suspense, a technique frequently exploited in the 1605 and 1615 versions. This narrator instead systematically relates every detail, frequently to the point of excess, which is similar to the way a script writer delineates a scene, but this unfortunately only bogs down Avellaneda's novel. As Gilman observes, "El estilo de Avellaneda intenta solamente expresar la construcción lógica de los acontecimientos y evita por tanto todo ornamento que pueda distraer. . . . Es un compendio intelectual de todo el material pertinente, y no una selección artística de él" (*Cervantes* 140). Although Gilman is correct in stating that Avellaneda's narrator does relate information in a logical, matter-of-fact manner, his style is frequently so overly detailed and descriptive that it easily distracts or overwhelms the readers with unnecessary material that slows the plot down. This, combined with very few attempts at building suspense into the narrative or reaching out to the readers, takes away from the humorous dialogues and comic actions contained in the storyline. In chapter 12, for instance, Avellaneda's narrator explains to the readers how Don Álvaro and his friends are playing a joke on Don Quixote by having the secretary dress up as a giant. The narrator describes the scene,

Hase de advertir que entre don Álvaro Tarfe, don Carlos y el mismo secretario había concierto hecho de traer aquella noche a la sala uno de los gigantes que sacan en Zaragoza el día del Corpus en la procesión, que son de más de tres varas en alto; y con serlo tanto, con cierta invención los trae un hombre solo sobre los hombros. Pues estando la gente, como he dicho, en la sala, en recibiendo el recado de don Carlos el secretario, entró con el gigante por un cabo della, que de propósito estaba ya sin luz, y encima de la puerta por donde entró estaba en lo alto, junto al techo, una ventana pequeña a modo de claraboya, que venía a dar en

la cabeza del mismo gigante, por ser de su misma altura, y por la cual, arrimado a ella, había, sin ser visto, de hablar el secretario, que en sacando y poniendo en dicho puesto la que traía sobre sus hombros dicho gigante, se volvió a entrar para ponerse en dicha ventanilla. (140)

Rather than having the giant enter the scene and scare everyone, leaving the readers in suspense about what is really going on, Avellaneda has his narrator forewarn the readers and this, combined with the detail ad nauseum surrounding the giant's dimensions and the room's aspect, completely ruins the surprise. If we compare this scene to the episode in Cervantes's Part II, chapter 62, when Don Quixote is introduced to the enchanted head in Barcelona, there is an equally detailed description but because the narrator is more playful, the effect is different. To begin with, Don Antonio mentions the enchanted head to Don Quixote, but only after having him swear to secrecy. He describes how it was made by one of the best enchanters and sorcerers in the world and that its purpose is to answer questions, but that it is mute on Fridays (coincidentally that very day). At the end of Don Álvaro's explanation, the narrator appears: "Admirado quedó don Quijote de la virtud y propiedad de la cabeza, y estuvo por no creer a don Antonio. Pero por ver cuán poco tiempo había para hacer la experiencia, no quiso decirle otra cosa sino que le agradecía el haberle descubierto tan gran secreto" (496). Don Álvaro has planted the seed of curiosity and the narrator, unwilling to give the secret away, only suggests that Don Quixote does not fully believe his host but will wait to cast judgment until he can see it in action the following day. The narrator then changes to another scene, leaving the readers hanging over the outcome of the enchanted head, and does not return to the topic until two pages later. At this point, the narrator explains that Don Antonio, Don Quixote, Sancho, and two other friends enclosed themselves in the room with the enchanted head in order to try it out, ending with, "Y si no eran los dos amigos de don Antonio, ninguna

otra persona sabía el busilis del encanto, y aun si don Antonio no se le hubiera descubierto primero a sus amigos, también ellos cayeran en la admiración en que los demás cayeron, sin ser posible otra cosa: con tal traza y tal orden estaba fabricada” (499).

This is the first time that the narrator tips off the readers that this is some sort of prank, but the readers are still unsure about how it is being carried out or what will happen. It is not until after all of the participants have spoken with the enchanted head and the episode has come to a close that the narrator finally jumps in to explain,

Con esto se acabaron las preguntas y las respuestas. Pero no se acabó la admiración en que todos quedaron, excepto los dos amigos de don Antonio, que el caso sabían. El cual quiso Cide Hamete Benengeli declarar luego, por no tener suspense al mundo, creyendo que algún hechicero y extraordinario misterio en la tal cabeza se encerraba, y así, dice que don Antonio Moreno, a imitación de otra cabeza que vio en Madrid, fabricada por un estampero, hizo ésta en su casa, para entretenerte y suspender a los ignorantes. (501)

The narrator then provides a very lengthy description, even more detailed than the aforementioned example in Avellaneda’s text, where he explains how and of what it was made, and how Don Antonio’s nephew was inside of the mechanism responding to the questions asked. The narrator ends by saying that after ten or twelve days its owner decided to dismantle it for fear of repercussions from the Inquisition, but that Don Quixote and Sancho were never the wiser to this. What is important with regard to the relaying of information here is how this narrator waited to explain the enterprise until after the protagonists were tricked by the enchanted head. As a result, the readers are also caught up in the mystery, even though the narrator had alerted them that a prank was afoot. By weaving the explanation around dialogue, instead of stating all of the facts at the beginning of the scene, Cervantes’s narrator breaks up the monotony of the overly-detailed description. In chapter 18 of the second part, when Don Quixote and Sancho

arrive at Don Diego's home, the narrator jumps in to let the readers know, “Aquí pinta el autor todas las circunstancias de la casa de don Diego, pintándonos en ellas lo que contiene una casa de un caballero labrador y rico; pero al traductor desta historia le pareció pasar estas y otras semejantes menudencias en silencio, porque no venían bien con el propósito principal de la historia, la cual más tiene su fuerza en la verdad que en las frías digresiones” (157). Whether this is a hidden attack on Avellaneda’s style of narrating or not, this narrator seems to understand his audience better and therefore is more adept at maintaining the readers’ attention by eliminating unnecessary details or by planting suspense and intentionally delaying the delivery of pertinent information. A clear example of this can also be seen in the chapter titles. Those of Avellaneda’s text are straightforward, accurate summaries of their corresponding chapters. Cervantes’s narrator, in parodying the style of the ornate but not always reliable chapter titles from chivalric romances, plays with the readers by sometimes correctly describing what takes place in the chapter but also by sometimes switching chapter titles or by describing events in a title that do not take place in the corresponding chapter. The chapter title for Part I, chapter 10 reads “De lo que más le avino a don Quijote con el vizcaíno y del peligro en que se vio con una caterva de yangüeses,” even though the fight with the Biscayan squire had already finished and Don Quixote and Sancho do not run into the Yanguesan carriers until chapter 15. In Part I of the 1605 edition, the chapter titles skipped from chapter 42 to chapter 44, leaving many to speculate that Cervantes either forgot to demarcate where chapter 43 began or what it was about, or that he was once again making sure the readers were paying attention. Tom Lathrop, in “El misterio del epígrafe que falta en el *Quijote* (Capítulo 43, parte I),” believes this was an intentional

error, because “así lo quiso Cervantes, en imitación de los descuidados libros de caballerías” (119).¹² This is a jocular narrator who enjoys playing with his audience.

Avellaneda’s narrator, in comparison, takes the more traditional role of relaying information. When he does incorporate humor, it is strictly of a baser, more vulgar, type, or it is sarcasm. An example of this can be seen in his description of Bárbara, the companion Don Quixote and Sancho rescue halfway through the apocryphal version, and who is a cross between Cervantes’s Maritornes and de Rojas’s Celestina. In chapter 23, an initial description of Bárbara is provided by the narrator, “La mujer era tal, que pasaba de los cincuenta, y tras tener bellaquísimá cara, tenía un rasguño de a jeme en el carrillo derecho, que le debieron de dar siendo moza por su virtuosa lengua y santa vida” (266). She is an ugly, middle-aged woman who, as the narrator sarcastically insinuates, has a scar on her left cheek as punishment for her less-than-virtuous lifestyle. The more detailed description takes place a chapter later, when Don Quixote and Sancho, accompanied by two officials, return to the inn where they had been staying and call out to Bárbara, whom Don Quixote had described as the beautiful Queen of Zenobia:

Salió luego ella de la cocina, donde estaba, con una capa vieja del huésped por saya; porque, como arriba queda dicho, había quedado la pobre en el bosque en camisa, y faltábale el reparo que la había hecho el manto del ermitaño, y después el de la ropa vieja de la mujer del mesonero, que hasta allí la había traído. Apenas la vio don Quijote, cuando, con gran mesura, le dijo:

—Estos príncipes, soberana señora, quieren besar las manos a vuestra alteza.

¹² It should be noted that, although most critics believe Cervantes wrote the chapter titles, there is speculation that these were actually written by his publisher or by someone other than Cervantes. For further information, please see Robert M. Flores’s “El caso del epígrafe desaparecido: capítulo 43 de la edición príncipe de la primera parte del *Quijote*” as well as his *The Compositors of the First and Second Madrid Editions of Don Quixote*, Part 1.

Y entrándose tras esto con Sancho en la caballeriza para hacer desensillar y dar de comer a Rocinante, salió ella a la puerta del mesón con la figura siguiente: descabellada, con la madeja medio castaña y medio cana, llena de liendres y algo corta por detrás la capa del huésped, que dijimos traía atada por la cintura en lugar de faldellín: era viejísima y llena de agujeros, y sobre todo, tan corta que descubría media pierna y vara y media de pies llenos de polvo, metidos en unas rotas alpargatas, por cuyas puntas sacaban razonable pedazo de uñas sus dedos; las tetas, que descubría entre la sucia camisa y faldellín dicho, eran negras y arrugadas, pero tan largas y flacas, que le colgaban dos palmos; la cara, trasudada y no poco sucia del polvo del camino y tizne de la cocina, de do salía; y hermoseaba tan bello rostro el apacible lunar de la cuchillada que se le atravesaba. En fin, estaba tal, que sólo podía aguardar un galeote de cuarenta años de buena boyá. (295)

The narrator, insistent on describing Bárbara's apparel as accurately as possible, reiterates how she came to be dressed that way several times. He also mentions three times that she came out from the kitchen. This overly repetitive attention to detail, however, only partially detracts from his repulsive description of Don Quixote's Queen of Zenobia, because it is so graphic. She is described as just about the farthest thing from ideal beauty, but the narrator nonetheless ends with a sarcastic remark about her beautiful scar and how the only one who might find her attractive would be someone who had been a galley slave for forty years. This narrator's capacity for humor extends beyond sarcasm and into the realm of the grotesque, where his highlighting of Bárbara's ugliness contrasts directly with how Don Quixote envisions her. The narrator's depiction of Bárbara and Don Quixote's treatment of her creates laughter due to this disparity in perceptions and therefore the absurdity of Don Quixote's proposal to have the officials kiss her hands, as if she were someone of prominence. If we compare this description to the way Cervantes's narrator describes Maritornes in Part I, chapter 16, we find an entirely different type of humor: "Servía en la venta, asimesmo, una moza asturiana, ancha de cara, llana de cogote, de nariz romá, del un ojo tuerta y del otro no muy sana. Verdad es

que la gallardía del cuerpo suplía las demás faltas: no tenía siete palmos de los pies a la cabeza, y las espaldas, que algún tanto le cargaban, la hacían mirar al suelo más de lo que ella quisiera” (209). Although this narrator also focuses on the defects of the servant girl, the humor is more tongue-in-cheek and of a completely different tone than that of the grotesque description of Bárbara. Maritornes has a wide face, flat nape and nose, and one crossed eye and the other not too healthy. Instead of coming right out and calling her short, the narrator states that the greatness of her height made up for all the other faults, she not being more than seven hands tall. And rather than directly define her as a hunchback, he remarks that she spends more time looking at the floor than she would probably like due to her condition. In other words, instead of opting for a blatant, in-your-face description that relates every last detail, the narrator allows the readers to guess a little as to what is being inferred. He is glib rather than graphic. Where Avellaneda’s narrator opts for sarcasm and blue humor, Cervantes’s prefers a more subtle, playful type of humor. Take, for instance, the manner in which the narrator goes off on a tangent when describing the types of damsels usually protected by knights errant, in Part I, chapter 9:

de aquellas que andaban con sus azotes y palafrenes, y con toda su virginidad a cuestas, de monte en monte y de valle en valle; que si no era que algún follón, o algún villano de hacha y capellina, o algún descomunal gigante las forzaba, doncella hubo en los pasados tiempos que, al cabo de ochenta años, que en todos ellos no durmió un día debajo de tejado, y se fue tan entera a la sepultura como la madre que la había parido. (158)

This type of humor, describing damsels who wander over hill and dale with their virginity in hand and who die virgins just like the mothers that bore them did, creates laughter through the delivery of an unexpected idea. The narrator has taken the definition of sheltered, virginal maidens as described in chivalric romances and rearranged the

words ever so slightly, and this deviation provides for a humorous interpretation on the part of the attentive readers.

On the whole, Cervantes's narrator is capable of a broad range of humor, embellishing his descriptions with hyperbole, imitating how other characters would speak, or by allowing the readers to experience the course of events in the same way the characters do, leaving the full explanation till after the surprise. Whereas Avellaneda's narrator is adept at base or crude humor, his art does not extend much beyond this narrow field. It is also curious to note that Avellaneda's narrator continually makes references to how the other characters enjoy or even burst out laughing at Don Quixote, Sancho Panza, or other circumstances throughout the novel, an artifice Cervantes's narrator does not do as frequently. It is as if Avellaneda's narrator felt the need to continuously remind the readers to laugh, much in the way canned laughter reminds a television audience.

In turning to the role of the historians in both novels, Avellaneda's historian is barely perceptible. Chapter 1 opens with “El sabio Alisolán, historiador no menos moderno que verdadero, dice que, siendo expelidos los moros agarenos de Aragón, de cuya nación él descendía, entre ciertos anales de historias halló escrita en arábigo la tercera salida que hizo del lugar de Argamesilla el invicto hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha” (17). “El sabio Alisolán” are the first words of Avellaneda's text, yet he is never mentioned again. In fact, the word “historiador” is only mentioned five more times in the novel, the first two of which refer to the impossibility of a historian being able to retell a specific event: “. . . no habrá historiador, por diligente que sea, que baste a contarlas cosas” (100) and “no hay historiador, por diligente que sea, que las baste a escribir” (288). The third mention refers to Alisolán, but portrays him as incapable of

recounting Don Quixote's deeds: "no se atreve el historiador, por ser tan extraordinarias y dignas de elegantísimas exageraciones, a referirlas las cosas que el triste Caballero Desamorado hizo y dijo" (326). The last two times in the novel that a reference is made to a historian, Don Quixote is referring to the author of a theater group whom he runs into several times during his journeys, and whom he has confused with the magicians Alquife and Fristón from chivalric romances. Perhaps Avellaneda began his novel in imitation of Cervantes's wonderfully complex model of Cide Hamete Benengeli, but either did not understand or lost interest in the intricate literary device he was attempting to emulate.

Cervantes's historian plays a great role in the narrative. Cide Hamete Benengeli is very present in both of the 1605 and 1615 texts, and provides entertainment via his witty comments. He appears forty-one times throughout both novels, and always by name. As George Haley, in "The Narrator in *Don Quijote*," summarizes, "He is part wizard because of his omniscience, which does not keep him from using documentary sources; part historian because of his devotion to the truth as he sees it, though he is a Moor and therefore a liar by definition, according to the Christian second author; and he is part poet because of his expressed concern with artistic selection, invention and adornment" (147). He is first introduced in the text in Part I, chapter 9, when the narrator has accidentally come across the continuation of *Historia de don Quijote de la Mancha, escrita por Cide Hamete Benengeli, historiador arábigo* in the Alcaná, or marketplace, of Toledo (158). Although he takes a background role to many of the other protagonists, because he is mentioned in passing several times, the readers come to learn quite a bit about him, if they pay attention. The narrator mentions that he is a historian who is "muy curioso y muy puntual en todas las cosas" and that he knows and may even be related to the lusty

muleteer from Arévalo staying at the inn (I: 16). He later refers to him as “Cide Hamete, puntualísimo escudriñador de los átomos desta verdadera historia” (II: 50) and that he is the “autor arábigo y manchego, en esta gravísima, altisonante, mínima, dulce e imaginada historia” of *Don Quixote* (I: 22). This confusion between being a Spaniard and an Arab, or later, a Christian and a Muslim, is also seen via his exclamations and thoughts throughout the novel. Chapter 8 of Part II begins, “‘¡Bendito sea el poderoso Ala!,’ dice Hamete Benengeli al comienzo deste octavo capítulo. ‘¡Bendito sea Alá!,’ repite tres veces” (81). Because he has already been introduced in the text as a Moor, this type of exclamation probably does not come as a surprise to the readers. What is surprising, and daringly funny, is that he gets away with praising Allah four times, considering the Catholic Inquisition was censuring literature. Later on, chapter 27 begins, “Entra Cide Hamete, coronista desta grande histotria, con estas palabras en este capítulo: ‘Juro como católico cristiano . . .’; a lo que su traductor dice que el jurar Cide Hamete como católico cristiano siendo él moro, como sin duda lo era, no quiso decir otra cosa sino que así como el católico cristiano cuando jura, jura, o debe jurar, verdad, y decirla en lo que dijere, así él la decía, como si jurara como cristiano católico” (234). Cervantes’s narrator is having fun with the concept of swearing, and whether one can swear like a Catholic, being a Muslim. It is comments such as these that cause Anthony Close, in “Cervantes’s Aesthetics,” to regard Cide Hamete as “preposterously contradictory” (104) and mendacious (105). Whereas Close is more concerned with the concept of history and veracity, it is important to understand the significance this historian holds as a literary device utilized to add another layer of humor to the narrative. James Parr, in *Don Quixote: An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse*, refers to Cide Hamete Benengeli as a

“narrative presence,” who only actually appears in the text as a character at the very end of Part II, when he talks to his pen (31). While he may not appear throughout the rest of the storyline as a character, his voice is nevertheless present via translation, surfacing from time to time with witty commentary and thereby adding an additional level of humor to the text. Take the example found in Part II, chapter 48, when Doña Rodriguez has arrived at Don Quixote’s room in the middle of the night to ask him advice. After they scare each other and the confusion of why she is there is clarified, he invites her in to talk. At this point, the narrator interrupts the text with, “Aquí hace Cide Hamete un paréntesis, y dice que por Mahoma que diera, por ver ir a los dos así asidos y trabados desde la puerta al lecho, la mejor almalafa de dos que tenía” (384). Through the voice of the narrator, Cide Hamete’s commentary draws attention to the ridiculousness of the scene: it is midnight and they walk by the light of the candle into his room, she fully cloaked in a long white-bordered veil and he wrapped in a yellow satin coverlet with a nightcap on his head. Regardless of whether his comments are sage observations or funny interjections, Cide Hamete Benengeli’s interruptions add a tone of levity because they break up the text and underline incongruities and potentially comic situations in the narrative.

The most obvious elements of humor within the narratives are the two protagonists. Beginning with the two Don Quixotes, both resemble each other physically and share the same last name, but outside of this they are completely different characters. Don Álvaro, the Morisco nobleman from Granada who befriends Don Quixote in Avellaneda’s novel, makes an appearance in Cervantes’s second part. When asked what the two Don Quixotes have in common, he remarks that both they, along with the two

Sanchos, are “tan conformes en los nombres como diferentes en las acciones” (563). The apocryphal Don Quixote, or Martín Quijada as Avellaneda calls him, is for many critics an imposter. But in order to be an imposter, one must be attempting to emulate an original, and at no time in Avellaneda’s text does Don Quixote say that he is the same knight errant as the one in the first part. It is Avellaneda’s narrator who, in the first line of the novel, proclaims that this is the “la tercera salida que hizo del lugar del Argamesilla el invicto hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha” (17), which could allow for the misinterpretation that this Don Quixote is attempting to be exactly like the first one. However, in his prologue, the fictionalized author states, “En algo diferencia esta parte de la primera suya, porque tengo opuesto humor también al suyo; y en materia de opiniones en cosas de historia, y tan auténtica como ésta, cada cual puede echar por donde le pareciere” (11). Avellaneda’s differing or different sense of humor should also be understood to include his portrayal of Don Quixote. I do not believe he intended to imitate faithfully Cervantes’s creations; rather, he takes Don Quixote’s and Sancho’s more salient traits in Part I and exaggerates them in his version. As a result, and following Aylward’s observation mentioned above, Avellaneda’s Don Quixote never grows beyond the boundaries of the caricature of a madman. If he is to be compared to the original Quixote, it should be in the same way that the Don Quixote from *Man of la Mancha* is judged against Cervantes’s. He is not an imposter so much as an adaptation, remolded to suit Avellaneda’s purpose. Cervantes’s Don Quixote is only partially correct when he complains that Avellaneda’s creation is a “desventurado que ha querido usurpar mi nombre y honrarse con mis pensamientos” (563). Yes, he is given the same name, but the readers never see him attempt to credit himself with the original Don Quixote’s

thoughts and ideas; he is not capable of doing so. Judging from his actions and what he says, with the exception of his name, the apocryphal Don Quixote cannot be seriously considered an imposter. For this very reason, both characters' comic value should be appreciated for what each represents and not only in comparison to each other.

Returning to the passage mentioned above, where the apocryphal Don Quixote is caught with his pants down by Sancho and a page while fantasizing about the jousts in Zaragoza, the readers are presented with a different type of madness than that exuded by Cervantes's character. This newer Don Quixote is constantly afflicted with immobilizing delusions of grandeur, where he sees himself conquering adversary after adversary, or with violent, highly incensed outbursts and rash actions. These fits of mania, in addition to occurring more often in the apocryphal version, last for a long time. Although Cervantes's Don Quixote can haul off and clobber another character, such as Sancho (I: 30),¹³ in reaction to what he has understood to be an insult or affront, his outbursts are not prolonged and he does not lash out at random. The readers never see him gaze off and lose touch with his surroundings, which is what happens to the apocryphal knight.

Avellaneda's Don Quixote also admits to sometimes faking acts of furious bravery or heroism, which come across as madness to the readers because they are not aware of what is really going on. Pretending to be mad is something that the original one only does once, but in an entirely different situation. At the beginning of the apocryphal text, Don Quixote is no longer permitted to read chivalric romances and instead takes up reading religious texts such as Pedro de Ribadeneira's *Flos Sanctorum*, but in chapter 3

¹³ "Don Quijote, que tales blasfemias oyó decir contra su señora Dulcinea, no lo pudo sufrir, y, alzando el lanzón, sin hablalle palabra a Sancho y sin decirle esta boca es mía, le dio tales dos palos que dio con él en tierra" (373).

Sancho brings him a copy of *Florisbán de Candaria*.¹⁴ Taking it from Sancho, he then proceeds to tell him, becoming more worked up with each sentence, how he plans to attend the jousts in Zaragoza and befriend the nobility. He then opens the trunk of armor Don Álvaro has left behind and, as he begins to put on the different pieces, his mood begins to change and he angrily approaches Sancho:

—Espera, dragón maldito, sierpe de Libia, basilisco infernal: verás por experiencia el valor de don Quijote, segundo san Jorge en fortaleza; verás, digo, si de un golpe sólo puedo partir no solamente a ti, sino a los diez más fieros gigantes que la nación gigantea jamás produjo.

Sancho, que le vio venir para sí tan desaforado, comenzó a correr por el aposento; y metiéndose detrás de la cama, andaba al derredor della huyendo de la furia de su amo, el cual decía, dando muchas cuchilladas a tuertas y derechas por el aposento, cortando muchas veces las cortinas, mantas y almohadas de la cama:

—Espera, jayán soberbio, que ya ha llegado la hora en que quiere la Majestad divina que pagues las malas obras que has hecho en el mundo.

Andaba en esto tras el pobre Sancho al derredor de la cama, diciéndole mil palabras injuriosas, y juntamente con cada una arrojándole una estocada o cuchillada larga, que si la cama no fuera tan ancha como era, lo pasara el pobre Sancho harto mal. El cual le dijo:

—Señor don Quijote, por todas cuantas llagas tuvieron Job, el señor San Lázaro, el señor San Francisco, y lo que más es, nuestro Señor Jesucristo, y por aquellas benditas saetas que sus padres tiraron al señor San Sebastián, que tenga compasión, piedad, lástima y misericordia de mi ánima pecadora.

Embravecíase más con todo esto don Quijote, diciendo:

—¡Oh, soberbio! ¡Agora piensas con tus blandas palabras y ruegos aplacar la justa ira que contigo tengo? Vuelve, vuelve las princesas y caballeros que contra ley y razón en este tu castillo tienes; vuelve los grandes tesoros que tienes usurpados, las doncellas que tienes encantadas, y la maga encantadora, causadora de todos estos males.

—Señor, ¡pecador de mí! —decía Sancho Panza—, que no soy princesa ni caballero, ni esa señora maga que dice, sino el negro de Sancho Panza, su vecino y antiguo escudero, marido de la buena Mari-Gutiérrez, que ya vuesa merced tiene media viuda. (46-47)

¹⁴ The full title of this anonymous chivalric romance, printed by Pedro Castro en Medina del Campo in 1542, is *Libro primero del muy noble y esforzado caballero don Philesbián de Candaria, hijo del noble rey don Felinis de Ungría y de la Reyna Florisena*.

In the end, in order to get his master to desist and calm down, Sancho has to pretend to be this adversary that Don Quixote sees. He admits defeat and promises to release to him everyone he supposedly holds captive. The readers think it is Sancho's verbal surrender that has conquered his master's violent delirium, but on the next page, after Don Quixote has Sancho swear to aid the poor and needy and undo "los tuertos y agravios," Sancho responds,

—Yo lo juro y prometo . . . de her todo eso que me dice; pero dígame, en lo de deshacer esos tuertos, ¿ha de entrar también el licenciado Pedro García, beneficiado del Toboso, que es tuerto de un ojo? Porque no me quisiera meter en cosas de nuestra santa madre la Iglesia.

Levantó entonces don Quijote a Sancho diciendo:

—¿Qué te parece, amigo Sancho? Quien hace esto en un aposento cerrado con un hombre solo como tú, mejor lo hiciera en una campaña con un ejército de hombres . . . ¿No ves, Sancho, que era fingido, no más de por darte a entender mi grande esfuerzo en el combatir, destreza en el derribar y maña en el acometer?

(48)

This is one of the few times Avellaneda's narrator surprises the readers by not letting us know earlier on that Don Quixote is faking this insane fit. This theatrical humor, with one character chasing the other around the room, is based on physical actions, although Sancho's short interjections break up the seriousness of the attack and therefore help in creating laughter.

Cervantes's Don Quixote also admits to imitating the actions of a madman, but it is a different circumstance and for a different reason. In chapter 25 of the first part, when he is in the Sierra Morena with Sancho, Don Quixote explains to him,

Tengo de hacer en estas partes una hazaña, con que he de ganar perpetuo nombre y fama en todo lo descubierto de la tierra; y será tal, que he de echar con ella el sello a todo aquello que puede hacer perfecto y famoso a un andante caballero. . . . quiero imitar a Amadís, haciendo aquí el desesperado, del sandio y del furioso, por imitar juntamente al valiente don Roldán. (302-04)

Different from Avellaneda's Don Quixote, who feels the need to act out the violence in order to be convincing in his mad show of courage, Cervantes's character explains where he is coming from, why he has undertaken this task, and how he will imitate Amadís de Gaula and Roldán. The humor here lies in the irrationality of Don Quixote's plan, something that Sancho is quick to point out. But as his master further explains, "volverse loco un caballero andante con causa, ni grado ni gracias: el toque está desatinar sin ocasión y dar a entender a mi dama que, si en seco hago esto, ¿qué hiciera en mojado?" (304). He is willing to imitate a madman to prove his devotion to Dulcinea. He even goes so far as to demonstrate this insanity to Sancho, through a half-naked handstand, which is what he believes to be the actions of a crazy person. There is humor in this episode, due to the initial absurdity of Don Quixote's idea as well as to his interpretive demonstration of insanity, but because he explains beforehand what he plans to do and why, this takes away from the element of surprise. He is also less destructive in feigning madness than the other Quixote.

Where the readers do see him acting out in violence and do not understand initially what is happening is when Don Quixote attacks the wineskins (I: 35). In his sleep, the knight has began to slash at the wineskins in his room at the inn, dreaming that they are his adversaries. Even Sancho believes he is fighting Pandafilando de la Fosca Vista, the enemy giant of the Princess Micomicona, because he exclaims to the other that his master "anda envuelto en la más reñida y trabada batalla que mis ojos han visto. ¡Vive Dios, que ha dado una cuchillada al gigante enemigo de la señora princesa Micomicona, que le ha tajado la cabeza cercen a cercen, como si fuera un nabo!" (429). In this passage,

Don Quixote says very little and it is the narrator who explains how he is dressed and what exactly has happened:

Estaba en camisa, la cual no era tan cumplida, que por delante le acabase de cubrir los muslos, y por detrás tenía seis dedos menos; las piernas eran muy largas y flacas, llenas de vello y no nada limpias; tenía en la cabeza un bonetillo colorado, grasiendo, que era del ventero. En el brazo izquierdo tenía revuelta la manta de la cama, con quien tenía ojeriza Sancho, y él se sabía bien el porqué; y en la derecha, desenvainada la espada, con la cual daba cuchilladas a todas partes, diciendo palabras como si verdaderamente estuviera peleando con algún gigante: que fue tan intensa la imaginación de la aventura que iba a fenercer, que le hizo soñar que ya había llegado al reino de Micomicón, y que ya estaba en la pelea con su enemigo. Y había dado tantas cuchilladas en los cueros, creyendo que las daba en el gigante, que todo el aposento estaba lleno de vino. (430)

The element of confusion adds to the ridiculousness of this scene, where a hairy-legged, dirty, somnambulant Don Quixote is destroying wineskins and his squire is shouting that he has seen him behead the giant. The innkeeper, upset over the lost wine, begins to pummel the still-sleeping knight, so that he is now doing battle with an opponent, although it is not with the giant. In the end, Don Quixote believes he has vanquished Pandafilando and is put back to bed. It is Sancho who continues to believe that he has seen his master win a battle, and that therefore he has gained a county, even after the others have explained the reality of the scene. The narrator relates that, in talking afterwards with Dorotea (Princess Micomicona), Sancho “aseguró a la princesa que tuviese por cierto que él había visto la cabeza del gigante, y que, por más señas, tenía una barba que le llegaba a la cintura, y que si no parecía, era porque todo cuanto en aquella casa pasaba era por vía de encantamiento” (433). Sancho suffers from the same type of vision as his master, incapable of seeing what the others have seen and pointed out. Instead he believes, as would his master, that the differences in opinion are due to enchantments.

This scene in some ways is reminiscent of the episode in *The Golden Ass* when Lucius is the butt of a joke during a town's celebration of the Festival of Laughter. Lucius had returned to the place where he was staying late one night only to be attacked by two would-be muggers. He defends himself and then goes inside to bed. When he awakes, he is arrested for killing these two men, found dead outside his front door. He is lead to the center of town, where everyone has gathered. They boo and jeer at him while he begs for mercy, and in the end he is condemned to death. As he goes to leave the platform, the sheet is pulled off of the two dead corpses, only to reveal slashed wineskins. When the townspeople see Lucius's shock, they burst into laughter, something that the confused Lucius does not reciprocate. They explain to him that this is part of the festival for their worship of the god of Laughter.

In juxtaposing these three similar scenes, we see various types of humor surfacing. In *The Golden Ass*, the narrator pulls the readers along with Lucius, keeping everyone in suspense. Because the readers experience everything from Lucius's point of view, the surprise that comes with the discovery of the wineskins allows for a release of tension and therefore laughter on the part of the readers, who do not have to suffer through Lucius's humiliation. This is humor at Lucius's expense. In the episode from Avellaneda in which Don Quixote appears violently mad while putting on a performance of aggressive valor for his squire, the readers are unaware that Don Quixote is staging this absurd bravado while he chases Sancho around the room. The laughter initially stems from the image of a fearful Sancho ducking and hiding from his delirious master, all the while pleading with him. It is a more physical, slapstick-type humor. When Don Quixote announces, a page later, that he has been faking it, the laughter comes from Sancho's

understandable anger coupled with the ridiculousness of the knight's destructive rampage. He has destroyed his curtains and bed to prove to Sancho his passionate dedication to carrying out his mission. Cervantes's version showcases the ludicrousness of both Don Quixote and Sancho. It is one of only two occasions in the novel in which the knight experiences somnambulism.¹⁵ He dreams he is fighting Pandafilando, and therefore he is blindly slashing around the room, acting out his dream. His actions are similar to those of the apocryphal Don Quixote, but here the humor is less aggressive because he is only accidentally attacking wineskins. Since the readers understand what Don Quixote is envisioning plus they know what is really taking place, they can also laugh at Sancho, who believes he has seen giants and cannot understand any explanation to the contrary. This is also a unique situation, because it is Sancho who is convinced of his vision, when he is normally the one who attempts to argue with Don Quixote otherwise. Both he and his master share this fantasy but, where Don Quixote is returned to his bed never the wiser about the wineskins, it is Sancho who must face the truth of the situation and who adopts his master's ideas of enchantment to explain the incongruities. All three scenes center around the chimera of vision, and all three create different types of laughter, based mainly on the discrepancy between what is imagined and what actually takes place.

The manner in which both Quixotes are depicted in these scenes also serves as a fairly accurate representation of how they act throughout their respective novels. Cervantes's Don Quixote interprets ambiguous signs such as dust clouds or loud, thumping noises, through a mental filter built on formulas from chivalric romances. This

¹⁵ The first time occurs in Part I, chapter 7, after his initial sally. Here, however, he is barely up before the curate and barber forcibly return him to his bed.

allows him to interpret marching armies or other fantastic adventures. Humor is created because what he envisions is contrasted with what is really there, and the incongruity produced through this contrast makes his actions laughable. The apocryphal knight, embodying the reactionary aggressiveness and dangerous madness of the original Don Quixote, along with bouts of paralyzing delirium, is a one-sided lunatic who in general does not demonstrate the signs of intelligence nor perception that the other does. Aylward, in describing the redeeming qualities of Avellaneda's protagonist, comments that he finds him more gentle and caring: "Don Quixote's tender and generous response to the tears he sees on Barbara's scarred cheek—even if he doesn't quite understand why she is crying—shows a compassionate and charitable side of his personality that Cervantes himself somehow neglected to portray" (50). But this tenderness is much scarcer in the apocryphal version than the compassion the original knight errant frequently shows Sancho. Avellaneda has infused his character with some of the ingredients of the original Don Quixote, and although there are a few instances in the novel where this tender side surfaces, because Avellaneda mostly uses his protagonist to create raucous scenes of physical humor, this author does not attain the depth in character profile that his contemporary does. His Don Quixote is a funny character, but on a narrower scale: his mad fantasizing, violent outbursts, and otherwise outlandish behavior are predictable and are therefore capable of charging a scene with humor because the readers can anticipate to a certain degree what will happen. This knight also creates laughter through his manner of speaking, overly exaggerating the original Don Quixote's habit of emulating how knights errant in chivalric romances speak. In chapter 24, for

example, his word choices are excessively archaic and pass into the realm of ridiculous.

He is speaking to a crowd gathered in a plaza, but he thinks they are all princes:

—¡Oh, vosotros, infanzones, que fincastes de las lides, que no fincárades ende!
¿Non sabedes por ventura que Muza y don Julián, maguer que el uno moro y el
otro a mi real corona aleve, las tierras talan por mi luengo tiempo poseídas, y que
fincar además piensan en ellas? Tan cuellierguidos están con las victorias que
asaz contra razón han ganado, fugiendo nosotros de sus airadas faces, non
faciendo la resistencia que a tales infanzones y hombres buenos atañen, non
considerando las cuitas de nuestras fembras, ni los muchos desaguisados y fuerzas
que aquestos malandantes, con infinitos tuertos, cuidan facer en pro de Mahoma y
en reproche de nuestra fe, fablando cosas non decideras, llenas de mil sandeces.
(290)

Avellaneda has augmented the original Don Quixote's habit of incorporating archaic vocabulary into his orations. Here almost every word the apocryphal knight uses is a grotesque exaggeration of this old-fashioned form of speech, rendering him completely laughable as well as practically unintelligible. Avellaneda's Don Quixote is nothing short of absurd and the laughter he creates when he speaks is the same as that of a court jester. He appeals to the readers who find pompous buffoons amusing.

In Cervantes's novel, the role of clown is mostly reserved for Sancho, whose jumbled slogans and incessant chatter provide humorous accompaniment to his master's interpretive fantasies. His use of proverbs or sayings, strung one after the other and often times without rhyme nor reason, add levity to the narrative. One example of this takes place in chapter 25 of the first part, when Don Quixote is explaining to him that Madásima and Elisabat, two characters from *Amadís de Gaula*, were not romantically involved and that anyone who thought differently would be lying. Sancho replies,

—Ni yo lo digo ni lo pienso—respondió Sancho—; allá se lo hayan; con su pan se lo coman. Si fueron amancebados o no, a Dios habrán dado la cuenta. De mis viñas vengo, no sé nada; no soy amigo de saber vidas ajenas; que el que compra y

miente, en su bolsa lo siente. Cuanto más, que desnudo nací, desnudo me hallo: ni pierdo ni gano; mas que lo fuesen, ¿qué me va a mí? Y muchos piensan que hay tocinos y no hay estancas. Mas ¿quién puede poner puertas al campo? Cuanto más, que de Dios dijeron. (302)

Sancho is comical here because he has said more than was necessary and has botched the saying *donde se cree que hay tocinos, no hay estacas*, affects that make him sound silly plus exacerbate Don Quixote. His remarks often break up a more serious or informational conversation, such as in the case above. As a result, he inadvertently adds levity if not laughter via his rustic expressions, and mispronounced proverbs or words.

Sancho's rusticity helps to make him a comical character. Cervantes initially casts him in the role of a poor, clumsy, and uncouth villager. He depicts Sancho as short and fat, and his wife Teresa refers to him as a “pastor de cabras” (II: 52), while the narrator describes him as “un labrador vecino de Don Quixote . . . de muy poca sal en la mollera” (I: 7). According to Mauricio Molho, in *Raíces folklóricas*, Sancho initially fits the role of the folkloric simpleton: “El bobo es un ser de un primitivismo extremo. Su simpleza e ingenuidad son infantiles, y no sólo le inducen a cometer toda clase de torpezas, sino que provocan la agresividad burlona de los circunstantes” (236). He also displays characteristics of the theatrical *gracioso*. Joseph Silverman, in “El gracioso de Juan Ruiz de Alarcón y el concepto de la figura del donaire tradicional,” defines this character type as a “cobarde, impertinente, fiel, representante del sentido común, consejero de su amo” (64). Cervantes’s Sancho is a combination of both the simple peasant and the *gracioso*, affecting a wider, more versatile personality. Depending on the episode, he is gullible, rough mannered, cowardly, shrewd, witty, or logical. His personality contrasts with the lofty idealism of Don Quixote and the resulting combination produces humor more often than not.

As Cervantes's novel develops, Sancho-as-simpleton is still visible, but he often goes beyond this initial, restrictive role and exudes a keener wit than what is expected of him. This does not mean that the other characters stop playing him for the fool they think he is. But it is a subtle irony that arises, for example, in his governing of Barataria, when he judges cases with a Solomon-like rational. The joke is on the other characters who had expected to see a fool in action and come away surprised by his shrewd decisions. It is this practical side of Sancho that some critics regard as inconsistencies on the part of his character and that we do not see in Avellaneda's version. Even the translator, in Part II, chapter 5, believes that this particular section of the text must be apocryphal because Sancho has stepped beyond his mold of simpleton and speaks with a finesse unexpected of him. Molho explains, "Ahí está precisamente la diferencia entre Sancho Panza y los bobos sus congéneres. Un bobo se caracteriza por su credulidad radical, absoluta, infinita. Sancho, en cambio, se rige por un principio contradictorio y reversible de *credulidad + incredulidad*, operante en todo el *Quijote*" (238). Cervantes continually plays with the readers' response to his rural squire who develops beyond the confines of the simpleton role. Sancho is often chastised or singled out by the translator, his wife, Don Quixote, and other characters, whenever he acts or speaks differently than would a stereotypical peasant. By overlapping the traditional peasant role and that of the *gracioso*, Cervantes imbues Sancho with a broader range of characteristics and he therefore becomes a more multifaceted figure. In Part II, chapter 49, when Sancho and Don Quixote are first introduced to the apocryphal version, Don Jerónimo tells Sancho, "... no os trata este autor moderno con la limpieza que en vuestra persona se muestra: píntaos comedor, y simple, y no nada gracioso, y muy otro del Sancho que en la primera parte de la historia

de vuestro amo se describe” (474). Cervantes is underlying the difference between his creation and what he understands to be Avellaneda’s. Cervantes has fashioned a character who develops beyond the limits of his stereotypes or caricatures, and this in turn challenges the receptivity of the other characters and readers, who expect only to encounter a simple minded, clumsy laborer at whom they can laugh.

This preliminary version of Sancho Panza is what Avellaneda takes from Cervantes and then exaggerates to the point of grotesqueness for a purely comic effect. He does not seem interested in delving into the complexities of rendering a character as life-like as Cervantes does, but rather prefers to exploit the caricature of the rustic peasant/court buffoon. Aylward observes, “The matter of gluttony aside, Sancho’s character in the 1614 sequel is really no more offensive than the typical *gracioso* of the Spanish Golden Age *comedia*. If Avellaneda can be said to create here a gross oversimplification/stereotype of the stock dim-witted peasant character, he has done no more than elaborate upon the personality created by Cervantes in the early adventures of the original *Don Quixote*” (34). As Silverman has pointed out above, however, the *gracioso* is generally impertinent and cowardly, as well as loyal and steeped in common sense. Avellaneda’s Sancho embodies only the first two characteristics and lacks common sense. His loyalty to Don Quixote is also very questionable. At the end of Avellaneda’s novel, Sancho leaves Don Quixote to live with the Gran Archipámpano as his page in Madrid. The Archipámpano asks him how Don Quixote will react to his farewell, to which Sancho replies,

—No tenga vuesa merced . . . que yo le hablaré claro antes que vaya a Toledo, y le volveré su rucio, . . . Y más, que le diré se vaya con Dios, pues desde aquí al día del juicio reniego de las peleas, sin querer más cosa con ellas; . . . Y, aunque él me quiere tanto, que entiendo me dará lo que me tiene prometido, que

es la gobernación de algún reino, provincia, ínsula o península, todavía diré mañana cómo no puedo ir allá con él, por estar ya concertado con vuesa merced, y que lo que podrá hacer será enviármela, que tan hombre seré para gobernarla acá como allá. (434-35)

Sancho's stupidity here is eclipsed by his lack of loyalty to his master. He has found a better offer and is taking it. In the end, because the others have taken the knight to the mental hospital in Toledo, Sancho and Don Quixote do not even have the opportunity to say goodbye. Sancho's unfaithfulness underlines the main differences between this character and that of Cervantes.

Much in the same way Avellaneda took what he wanted from the original Quixote and fashioned his own knight, Avellaneda has a different vision of Sancho. The clumsy, loyal, uneducated original who has a fondness for eating becomes an ignorant, disrespectful, glutinous clown in the apocryphal version. In chapter 12, Sancho has joined Don Carlos and Don Álvaro in an inn where they are dining. They introduce him to meatballs and his reaction is bizarre:

—¡Oh hi de puta, traidores, y que bien me han sabido! Pardiez que pueden ser pelotillas con que jueguen los niños en limbo. A fe que si torno a mi lugar, que en un huerto que tengo junto a mi casa he de sembrar por lo menos un celemín dellas, porque sé que no se siembran en todo el Argamasilla; y aun podrá ser, si el año se acierta, que los regidores me las pongan a ocho maravedís la libra; y si es así, no serán oídas ni vistas.

Decía esto Sancho tan sencillamente, como si en realidad de verdad fuera cosa que se pudiera sembrar. Y viendo que todos se reían, dijo:

—Sólo un desconveniente hallo yo en sembrar éstas, y es que como soy de mi naturaleza aficionado a ellas, me las comería antes que llegasen a madurar, si no es que mi mujer me pusiese algún espantajo para que no llegase a ellas, y aun Dios y ayuda que bastase. (138)

Avellaneda has fashioned a very different creature out of Cervantes's original mold. He has not taken and faithfully reproduced the early Sancho found in the initial chapters of

the 1605 version, but has dumbed him down and made him ruder. Throughout the novel, this Sancho continually swears, eats anything he can get his hands on, and completely lacks any understanding of social hierarchy, insulting and even attacking mayors, noblemen, and other social superiors such as the Gran Archipámpano of Sevilla. Sancho's rudeness combined with his lack of common sense creates laughter, but it is completely derogatory. He is, in effect, a traveling buffoon, who unwittingly provides fodder for the spectators' laughter via his outrageously brash mannerisms. In chapter 35, after he has accepted the Archipámpano's offer to work for him in Madrid, Sancho dictates a letter to his wife. He is dictating it to Don Carlos, a nobleman, and they are in front of a large group of people, including the Archipámpano and his wife. Sancho allows himself to be the laughing stock of the room. He begins,

—Escribamos por cierto . . . con la bendición de Dios. Pero vuesa merced advierta que ella es un poco sorda y será menester que la escribamos un poco recio para que la oiga. Haga la cruz y diga: “Carta para Mari-Gutiérrez, mi mujer, en el Argamesilla de la Mancha, junto a Toboso.” Ahora bien, dígale que con esto ceso, y no de rogar por su ánima.

—¡Qué es lo que decís, Sancho! —le dijo don Carlos—Aún no le habemos dicho cosa, ¡y ya decís: “con esto ceso”!

—Calle—respondió él—; que no lo entiende. ¿Quiere saber mejor que yo lo que tengo de decir? El diablo me lleve si no me ha hecho quebrar el hilo que llevaba, con la más linda astrología que se podía pensar. Pero diga que ya me acuerdo. “Habéis de saber que desde que yo salí del Argamesilla hasta agora, no nos hemos visto; mi salud dicen todos que es muy buena; sólo me duelen los ojos de puro ver cosas del otro mundo, plegue a Dios que tal sea de los vuestros. Avisadme de cómo os va del beber y si hay harto vino en la Mancha para remediaros la sed que mi presencia os causa, y mirad, por vida vuestra, escardéis bien el huertecillo de las malas hierbas que le suelen afligir. Enviadme los zaragüelles viejos de paño pardo que están sobre el gallinero, porque acá me ha dado el Arcapámpanos unos zaragüelles de las Indias, que no me puedo remecer con ellos: guardarlos he para vos, que quizás se os asentarán mejor, más que sin mucho trabajo traeréis guardado el hornillo de vidrio, pues tienen por delante una puerta que se cierra y abre con una sola agujeta. Si queréis venir, ya os tengo dicho lo que nos dará el Arcapámpanos cada mes de salario; y así, os mando que antes que esta carta salga

de aquí, os vengáis a servir a la Arcapampanesa, trayendo todos los bienes muebles y raíces con vos; que ahí están, sin dejar un palmo de tierra ni una sola hoja del huerto. Y no me seáis repostona, que me cансo ya de vuestras impertinencias, y tanto será lo de más como lo de menos; y no os haya de decir, como acostumbro, con el palo en la mano: ‘jo, que te estriego, burra de mi suegro.’ . . . Ya os digo, Mari-Gutiérrez, que estaremos aquí lindamente; que aunque vos seáis enemiga de estar en casa destos hidalgotes, todavía el Arcapámpanos está tan hombre de bien, que me ha jurado que, en estando vos aquí, nos vestirá a ambos y nos dará el salario de dos años adelantado, que es un ducado por bestia cada mes: el uno a mí y el otro a vos. Mirad, pues, si por lo menos vivimos mil meses, si tendremos harto dinero. Del señor don Quijote sólo os digo que está más valiente que nunca y le han hecho nuncio de Toledo; . . . La Arcampanesa, vuestra ama, con quien habéis de estar, os besa las manos y tiene más deseo de escribiros que de veros. Es mujer muy honrada, según dice su marido, si bien a mí no me lo parece, por lo que la veo holgazana, pues desde que estoy aquí, jamás le he visto la rueca en la cinta. Rocinante me dicen está bueno y que se ha vuelto muy persona y cortesano; no creo lo sea tanto el rucio, o a lo menos, no lo muestran su pocas razones, si ya no es que calla, enfadado de estar tanto tiempo en la corte. (433-34)

Sancho is rude and ignorant. He orders Don Carlos to be quiet, describes the Archipampanesa as lazy and not very honorable, and cannot even say her and her husband's names correctly. Sancho also lacks common sense, telling Don Carlos to write loudly since his wife is hard of hearing. He tells Teresa that she had better be in Madrid before this letter leaves his hands, and tells her that she should bring everything with her, including the soil and every last leaf from the garden. This ridiculousness, coupled with the boorish lack of respect he demonstrates, allows only for a laughter that derides and debases. It is burlesque humor based on the stereotypical mannerisms of the rustic peasant and reveals Sancho at his most unintelligent and disloyal.

The original Sancho also writes his wife a letter, right before leaving for his governorship, but it is humorous in a different way. In Part II, chapter 36, Sancho has asked the Duchess to read his letter, to make sure it sounds the way a governor's letter should, showing his concern for posterity. The letter reads,

Si buenos azotes me daban, bien caballero me iba; si buen gobierno me tengo, buenos azotes me cuesta. Esto no lo entenderás tú, Teresa mía, por ahora; otra vez lo sabrás. Has de saber, Teresa, que tengo determinado que andes en coche, que es lo que hace al caso, porque todo otro andar es andar a gatas. Mujer de un gobernador eres; ¡mira si te roerá nadie los zancajos! Ahí te envío un vestido verde de cazador, que me dio mi señora la duquesa; acomódale en modo que sirva de saya y cuerpos a nuestra hija. Don Quijote, mi amo, según he oído decir en esta tierra, es un loco cuerdo y un mentecato gracioso, y que yo no le voy en la zaga. Hemos estado en la cueva de Montesinos, y el sabio Merlín ha echado mano de mí para el desencanto de Dulcinea del Toboso, que por allá se llama Aldonza Lorenzo; con tres mil trescientos azotes, menos cinco, que me he de dar, quedará desencantada como la madre que la parió. . . . De aquí a pocos días me partiré al gobierno, adonde voy con grandísimo deseo de hacer dineros . . . ; tomaréle el pulso, y avisaréte si has de venir a estar conmigo, o no. El rucio está bueno, y se te encomienda mucho, y no le pienso dejar, aunque me llevaran a ser Gran Turco. La duquesa mi señora te besa mil veces las manos: vuélvele el retorno con dos mil, que no hay cosa que menos cueste ni valga más barata, según dice mi amo, que los buenos comedimientos. No ha sido Dios servido de depararme otra maleta con otros cien escudos . . . ; pero no te dé pena, Teresa mía, que en salvo está el que repica, y todo saldrá en la colada del gobierno; sino que ha dado gran pena que me dicen que si una vez le pruebo, que me tengo de comer las manos tras él, y si así fuese, no me costaría muy barato, aunque los estropeados y mancos ya se tienen su calonjía en la limosna que piden; así que, por una vía o por otra, tú has de ser rica y de buena ventura. Dios te la dé, como puede, y a mí me guarde para servirte. Deste castillo, a veinte de julio 1614. (303-304)

It is a much gentler letter than that of Avellaneda's text, and the humor is more subtle. Sancho begins, as could be expected, with a variation on a popular saying, only here he does not jumble it but rather modifies it as a reference to his promise to disenchant Dulcinea in exchange for the governorship. Curiously, Sancho ends his letter with the date of July 20, 1614, which was more or less when Avellaneda published his version. Whether this was intentional or not on Cervantes's part, due to several other similarities between the two letters, it is possible to speculate that Cervantes, or his narrator, is in some way responding to the apocryphal letter and to his adversary's crasser squire. The original Sancho includes a green dress with his letter, something more appropriate for a woman than the undergarment that the other Sancho does not want and plans to give to

his wife. This Sancho is also much more tender, calling her “Teresa mía” instead of threatening to beat her if she does not listen. He also mentions that his master is viewed in those parts as a *cuerdo loco* and a funny madman, and that he himself was not far behind him. This comment reflects his awareness of public opinion, something he neither refutes nor confirms. Perhaps this is Cervantes’s attempt to differentiate his characters from Avellaneda’s, where the two protagonists are only regarded as a *mentecapto* and a *gracioso*. Here, however, Sancho shows circumspection, as when he tells Teresa not to join him until he has fully investigated this new opportunity, as well as folly, because he proceeds to tell her matter-of-factly about Merlin and how Dulcinea/Aldonza Lorenzo will become as disenchanted as the mother that bore her. His letter is funny, but it is of a completely different tone and humor.

Although the two Sanchos are mostly divergent characters, there are several features or characteristics that they have in common. They both share a strong kinship with their donkeys, for example. Cervantes’s Sancho weeps in Part I, chapter 25, when he discovers his Dapple has been stolen. Upon finding his beast, Sancho talks to it, exclaiming, “¿Cómo has estado, bien mío, rucio de mis ojos, compañero mío?,” bathing him in kisses (376). When he and his master reach the Duke and Duchess’s palace in chapter 31 of the second part, Sancho goes out of his way to tell the Duchess’s lady-in-waiting, Doña Rodríguez, to make sure she takes good care of his donkey, because he had understood that in books of chivalry it is the ladies-in-waiting who look after the knight’s mount. This provokes a hilarious dialogue between the two of them, where he defends his request stating, “es tan grande el cariño que tengo a mi jumento” (260). In the letter mentioned above, Sancho goes so far as to declare his refusal to exchange him for

anything better “aunque me llevaran a ser el Gran Turco” (304). Sancho’s affection for his donkey reflects loyalty and adds a softness to his rusticity, all the while providing fodder for comic situations.

Throughout the major part of the novel, Avellaneda’s Sancho is even more expressive about his love for his animal. In chapter 6, when Sancho discovers that Dapple is nowhere to be found, he cries,

—¡Ay asno de mi ánima! ¡Y qué pecados has hecho para que te hayan llevado de delante de mis ojos? Tú eres la lumbre dellos, ¡asno de mis entrañas, espejo en que yo me miraba! ¡Quién te me ha llevado? ¡Ay jumento mío, que por ti solo y por tu pico podías ser el rey de todos los asnos del mundo! ¡Adónde hallaré yo otro tan hombre de bien como tú? ¡Alivio de mis trabajos, consuelo de mis tribulaciones, tú solo me entendías los pensamientos, y yo a ti, como si fuera tu propio hermano de leche! (80)

This exaggerated proclamation is an amplification of the fondness the original Sancho displayed for his donkey. Both think of their asses as steadfast companions, although Avellaneda’s takes it to the extreme by insinuating they were raised together as brothers. A little later on, when talking with the cleric Mosén Valentín, Sancho mentions that he can communicate with his donkey because he understands “la lengua asnuna muy lindamente” (85). In chapter 33, Sancho greets Don Quixote by asking, “Sea mi señor muy bien venido, y gracias a Dios que acá estamos todos; mas, dígame vuesa merced, ¿acordóse de echar de comer al rucio la noche pasada? Que estará el pobre del asno con gran pena por no haberme visto de ayer acá; y así, le suplico le diga de mi parte cuando le vea, que les beso las manos muchas veces a él y a mi buen amigo Rocinante” (406). This scenario is similar to when the original Sancho asks Doña Rodríguez to look after his donkey at the Duke and Duchess’s; however, because Sancho is asking this of his master instead of an unknown lady-in-waiting, this smacks of greater disrespect. Avellaneda’s

Sancho is incapable of distinguishing between appropriate and inappropriate social behavior. He does come across as silly, though, because he requests that his donkey be told that he sends his regards. Lastly, this Sancho mentions his donkey when he writes to his wife, too, stating that he does not think it to be fond of the Court.

For the greater part of the novel, the apocryphal Sancho's love for his donkey is similar to the relationship the original squire has with his beast. Nevertheless, at the end of the novel when Sancho is offered employment with the Archipámpano, he suddenly has no problem parting with his jument. Avellaneda presents the readers with a Sancho who is loyal neither to his donkey nor to his master. The apocryphal Sancho as a whole serves as an excessive representation of gluttony and uncouthness. He is grotesquely funny. Also, where Cervantes fashions a well-rounded character, Avellaneda takes to an extreme degree the supposed incongruous duality that the original Sancho espouses and that the translator cites as apocryphal. Whereas the original Sancho is sometimes uneducated and naïve and at other times shrewd and logical, Avellaneda's Sancho has unaccounted for character flaws. For example, he also does not know how to read, but he is still capable of incorporating Latin phrases into his sentences, like when he tells a soldier "y seamos amigos usque ad mortuorum" (165). In addition, he references Greek mythology, albeit incorrectly, such as when he says he can swim like Leander and Nero (275). His error lies in that he has confused Nero with Hero, which is a very humorous mistake, considering the difference in these two figures, but because the readers already know he is uneducated, these erudite references create disparity and inverisimilitude in his character. Aylward, in comparing the two Sanchos, comments,

The Aragonese author's main goal in composing his sequel was to make his readers laugh. He sought to achieve that end by magnifying the abundant comic

traits of the simple-minded squire Cervantes had sketched so skillfully in Part One, especially in the early episodes of Chs. 1-22. On the whole, he succeeded. But then the fates began to conspire against him. In the course of writing his own Second Part, Cervantes decided to endow what had originally been little more than a buffoon with a genuine human personality, including a sly, subtle wit and a previously undeveloped native intelligence that some would later call folk wisdom or plain old common sense. Avellaneda's Sancho, unlucky for the author, was doomed. (40)

Avellaneda may have been attempting to imitate what others interpreted as a dubious duality found in the original Sancho. He may have been caught up in making his Sancho as preposterous and outlandishly funny as possible. Either way he has taken his stereotyped character into the vein of the absurd and as a result has created something that departs from the original Cervantine mold and goes in a very different direction.

Cervantes's characters can also be understood as stereotypes, but in a very different sense from Avellaneda's. Giovanni Papini, in *Retratos*, sums up *Don Quixote* by stating, "no hay tan sólo la sátira de los libros de caballería, sino de *todos los géneros literarios* sin excepción" (24). But rather than being a tool that attacks or ridicules various types of literary genres, this novel is actually more like the playing ground for these forms. It provides the space for these genres to interact, where the generic formulae for chivalric romances, pastoral and sentimental novels, and the picaresque take shape in the form of characters such as Don Quixote, Grisóstomo, Anselmo, and Ginés de Pasamonte, who then intermingle with one another. And it is via the contrasting of these literary boundaries, played out by the actions and dialogues of different characters, that the clashing of these formulae gives rise to humor. Don Quixote, for instance, personifies books of chivalry, but because these coordinates do not function in a novel the same as they would in a chivalric romance, his grand gestures and eloquent language collides with the stark, unforgiving pattern presented by the novel. Avellaneda does not understand this

and instead allows for the realism and pragmatism of the novel to take precedence over the chivalric vision of Don Quixote, which thereby relegates this character to the restrictive mold of maniac. Cervantes's Sancho combines many of the characteristics of the rustic peasant and the theatrical *gracioso* types. Placed in the realistic setting of a novel, and paired with Don Quixote, Sancho loyally follows his master on his crazy escapades and, although clumsy at times, he is allowed to go beyond the possibilities of the two character types. Rising to the occasion of the governorship, for instance, he develops beyond the capabilities of the peasant and the *gracioso*. However, whenever he steps beyond the prescribed boundaries of his character types, he is singled out and attention is called to this supposed transgression. Avellaneda, possibly more accustomed to working with the *entremés* as Aylward has suggested, does not understand or does not care to allow his characters to go beyond the roles that he defines them with. Because his Sancho is only gluttonous, ignorant, and disrespectful, Avellaneda has limited him to the part of a laughing stock. Even though there are many *graciosos* who exude a keen wit and make situations funnier by playing with words or tricking their masters, Avellaneda has not imbued his squire with these capabilities.

Perhaps the greatest disparity between Cervantes's and Avellaneda's novels occurs in their treatment of Dulcinea. In Cervantes's work, she is Don Quixote's motivator. Derived from the blueprints of chivalric romances, she is fashioned by Don Quixote, being a necessary ingredient to his motivation as knight errant. The irony here is that Don Quixote, attempting to replicate the formula found in books of chivalry in order to validate his knight errancy, not only is not in love (in the traditional sense) with his damsel but has chosen a peasant girl as his model instead of a lady of class. The readers

learn from Sancho that she is loud and also “tira tan bien una barra como el más forzudo zagal . . . es moza de chapa . . . [y] no es nada melindrosa, porque tiene mucho de cortesana: con todos se burla y de todo hace mueca y donaire” (310-11). Her parents’ last names also add to her description, as Gabriel Maldonado Palmero, in *Quién es quién en el Quijote*, points out:

el apellido Corchuelo remita al alcornoque, sinónimo de torpeza (lo mismo que Nogales), por lo que los apellidos ponen de relieve la rusticidad de los progenitores de Aldonza. Por las peculiaridades que se le atribuyen, además, aparece como una campesina hombruna y recia que “tiene mucho de cortesana,” lo que la transforma en mujer libre y licenciosa. Es decir, que la adorada dama del Caballero de la Triste Figura es la antítesis de las delicadas doncellas del universo caballeresco. (32)

Again, Cervantes is playing with generic concepts, where the vision of an unattainable, peerless damsel collides with the textual reality of a natural peasant girl. Don Quixote’s need for a damsel transforms Aldonza Lorenzo into Dulcinea, but when Sancho realizes who Dulcinea really is, the transformation is exposed. Because she never appears in the text, this contrast between Don Quixote’s vision and Sancho’s disenchantment of Dulcinea remains without resolution throughout the duration of the novel, providing a continual element of humor. Don Quixote, through necessity, conjures a princess from a peasant girl. Sancho discovers her true identity and through this discovery disenchants her. But then in Part II, chapter 10, through necessity also, Sancho enchants another peasant girl and convinces Don Quixote that she is Dulcinea. Why is the knight unable to see the vision of Dulcinea as Sancho describes it to him and instead can only witness an unkempt wench smelling of garlic? Because Don Quixote created a chimera in fashioning Dulcinea and probably would not have been able to recognize her for the peasant girl she stemmed from if he had chanced to meet her in the text, especially judging from how

Don Quixote interprets Sancho's earlier rendition of meeting with her in chapter 31. In chivalric romances, the characters are hollow stereotypes, fitting the roles of hero, beautiful maiden, evil sorcerer, etc. Don Quixote understands this and has built his vision of Dulcinea upon the protocol of the beautiful maiden; Dulcinea is a hollow chimera very loosely based on the neighbor girl Aldonza Lorenzo. Whether or not he realizes that he would not recognize Aldonza if she appeared before him is not important; he cannot recognize her because he is visualizing a superficial image based on what he has read. This vision is exposed to the readers by Sancho's disenchantment of her in the Sierra Morena, but for Don Quixote it continues to remain steadfast, much to the amusement of everyone else. This is why he cannot recognize the peasant girl that Sancho has transformed. Because he actually sees her, he cannot envision her as anything but what he sees. His vision is entirely based on what he has read, therefore the realistic image of a labor girl cannot make it through his chivalric filter; it simply does not compute.

Coincidentally, Sancho's enchantment of the peasant girl comes back to hurt him later on when the Duke and Duchess pick up where he left off. In chapter 34 of the second part, the Duke and Duchess and their cohorts give Sancho the lofty responsibility of disenchanting Dulcinea, in that he must give himself three thousand three hundred lashes. With regard to Dulcinea's enchantment here, the disguised Merlin claims, “Sue su encantamiento y su desgracia, / y su transformación de gentil dama en rústica aldeana” (295). Dulcinea's enchantment consists of her transformation into a peasant girl, which is ironically what Sancho had done by disenchanting her for the readers in the Sierra Morena. Cervantes continually plays with the borders between history and fiction, fantasy and reality, and truth and lies. The enchantment/disenchantment of Dulcinea is no

different, since it is built around Don Quixote's faith in books of chivalry as well as Sancho's knowledge of Aldonza and his enchantment of the country lass, information he let slip to the Duchess in chapter 33. The irony lies in how the Duke and Duchess have fashioned a punishment for Sancho out of Dulcinea's disenchantment and the peasant girl's enchantment, of which he has played an integral part. Sancho is pulled into his own creation and therefore must also create, or rather carry out, his punishment. He has given credence to Don Quixote's belief in Dulcinea by enchanting the peasant girl and by lying to his master. If he admits this now, he exposes himself to everyone as dishonest. He is in a pickle and therefore finally agrees to the self-punishment, also because the Duke puts his governorship on the line. In accepting Merlin's sentence, Sancho lets slip, "yo procuraré salir de la deuda lo más presto posible, porque goce el mundo de la hermosura de la señora doña Dulcinea de Toboso, pues, *según parece, al revés de lo que yo pensaba, en efecto es hermosa*" (300; my emphasis). Although it is possible to interpret that Sancho undergoes a transformation himself, believing now that what he knew of Dulcinea is incorrect, it is more likely that he is being a smart aleck here and getting in the last word.

None of this teasing or complexity surrounding dis/enchantments or un/truths exist in Avellaneda's version. In fact, Dulcinea is relegated to a very small role. She appears in chapter 2 through a letter addressed to Don Quixote, which is in response to one he had sent her two days previously. Sancho describes how he delivered Don Quixote's letter to Dulcinea and how he found her in the stables taking care of the horses. According to the squire, upon seeing him she threw a shovelful of manure at him, coating his beard with the foul matter. The readers can only assume that Sancho is telling the

truth and not inventing another encounter in the same way the original Sancho did in Part I because no indication of this is provided by the narrator. This rendition of Dulcinea paints the crassest image of a peasant girl for the readers. She comes across as hostile and aggressive, an image that is further substantiated by her letter two pages later:

A Martín Quijada, el mentecapto.

El portador désta había de ser un hermano mío, para darle la respuesta en las costillas con un gentil garrote. ¿No sabe lo que le digo, señor Quijada? Que por el siglo de mi madre, que si otra vez me escribe de emperatriz o reina, poniéndome nombres burlescos como es *A la infanta manchega Dulcinea del Toboso* y otros semejantes que me suele escribir, qué tengo de hacer que se le acuerde. Mi nombre propio es Aldonza Lorenzo o Nogales, por mar y por tierra. (34)

She is just as rude as the apocryphal Sancho is, which is perhaps an indication of how Avellaneda interprets country folk. But like what frequently happens with Sancho, Aldonza utilizes words such as *portador* and *burlescos* which, in judging from the rest of her word choices, do not quite fit the type of rustic speech Avellaneda is attempting to emulate. Don Quixote, who is aggravated by her responses, does nothing but complain to Don Álvaro about her in the second chapter and throughout the rest of the novel. Because the knight never speaks highly of her, the readers are not privy to his visions of Dulcinea and instead only hear about the brutish, angry Aldonza. The Dulcinea the readers had come to know through Cervantes's knight never surfaces in the apocryphal text. Instead, she is utilized as the target of Don Quixote's bitterness and in the majority of the seventeen times her name is mentioned, it is proceeded by the word *ingrata*. In chapter 4, for example, Don Quixote changes his nickname from the *Caballero de la Triste Figura* to the *Caballero Desamorado*, something he does due to "las ingratitudes de la infanta Dulcinea del Toboso, causa total de mi desamor" (53). Two chapter later, as he passes

through Ariza with Sancho, it occurs to Don Quixote to have posters put up around town that make the following challenge:

que cualquier caballero natural o andante que dijese que las mujeres merecían ser amadas de los caballeros, mentía, como él sólo se lo haría confesar uno a uno o diez a diez. Bien que merecían ser defendidas y amparadas en sus cuitas, como manda el orden de caballería, pero que en lo demás, que se sirviesen los hombres dellas para la generación con el vínculo del Santo matrimonio, sin más arrequives de festeos, pues desengañaban bien cuán gran locura era lo contrario las ingratitudes de la infanta Dulcinea del Toboso. (70)

With one stroke, Avellaneda has severed Don Quixote from his Dulcinea and removed the underlying principle behind his motivation as knight errant. P. E. Russell, in “The Madness of Don Quixote,” stresses that Don Quixote’s love for Dulcinea is “the very keystone of his hallucinatory existence as a knight errant” (84). Perhaps Avellaneda was concerned with emphasizing marriage over what he interpreted to be the worshipping of women in books of chivalry, or maybe he did not understand the importance Dulcinea played in the formation of Don Quixote, but as a result Dulcinea has been demoted to the stifling role of ungrateful country wench and throughout the novel only serves as the target of Don Quixote’s bitterness over unrequited love. At the same time, this means that Don Quixote has been cut loose from his religion of chivalric romances, in the sense that the propelling motivator of his actions, Dulcinea, is no longer there to guide him. He is set adrift on a sea of rash madness since he no longer has a purpose and now only imitates the fighting and archaic language from books of chivalry. He is no longer a *loco cuerdo* and instead the readers and characters only see him as a maniac.

I mentioned earlier on page 8 that Cervantes never fully read Avellaneda’s text. Had he done so, I believe he would have placed greater emphasis on Don Quixote’s continual devotion to her in Part II. Although Don Quixote often declares his constancy

and love for her, he never learns about the false Quixote's dismissal of her. Judging from the way both Sancho and Don Quixote react to the apocryphal text in chapter 72, had Cervantes read Avellaneda's text completely and seen how Dulcinea was treated, he would have underscored Dulcinea's importance to Don Quixote or at least have mentioned her in contrast to Bárbara.

In Avellaneda's text, Dulcinea's replacement does not enter the scene until chapter 22, a little more than halfway through the novel. On page 51 above, Maldonado Palmero refers to Dulcinea as embodying the antithesis of the damsels of chivalric romances because Cervantes has based her on the loud, indelicate, and smelly Aldonza (32). Bárbara, however, is even more strikingly the antithesis of Don Quixote's vision of Dulcinea and thus the converse of the delicate, feminine, and chaste maidens of chivalric romance lore. She is around Don Quixote's age, is dirty and lice-infested, and works in Alcalá de Henares as both a madam and a prostitute, although Don Quixote refers to her as Zenobia, Queen of the Amazons. She is ugly, speaks crassly, and wears a scar on her face from earlier run-ins with the law. Whereas Cervantes's Dulcinea is loosely based on a poor farm girl, at least she is "una moza labrador de muy buen parecer" (103). With Bárbara, it is as if Avellaneda wanted to get away from any kind of beauty that could have been associated with Aldonza Lorenzo. He therefore creates an entirely new character representing the worst traits of a woman. The contrast is all the more shocking and ridiculous when Don Quixote can only see Bárbara as possessing a "rara y peregrina fermosura" (267). This narrative tactic coincides with the overriding derogatory humor in the novel. Bárbara, with her crudeness and sexual provocations, adds another layer of humor to the storyline. But as with Don Quixote and Sancho, she produces laughter at her

expense and the readers only very rarely laugh with her. Where Cervantes has juxtaposed the medieval representation of female beauty against a realistic country lass, Avellaneda only portrays the grotesque vision of female ugliness. By the end of the novel, she is written out of the picture and is deposited in a “casa de mujeres de su calidad,” or, as the chapter title informs, in “las arrepentidas” (424). Bárbara, therefore, is the opposite of Cervantes’s Dulcinea.

At the end of my previous chapter, I touched on the difference in treatment of journey and laughter in Cervantes’s and Avellaneda’s texts. In comparing both versions’ comicality in this chapter, it is obvious that Cervantes has woven a much more intricate craft, where humor is evidenced on many levels. Avellaneda’s novel for the most part exhibits crude, less refined humor, which in many ways works to confine the characters and leads to stagnation in the text. This being said, it is impossible to demarcate the two novels to a carnival/stagnation dichotomy, as Iffland insinuates in *Fiestas y aguafiestas* and as I had originally hoped to do. After analyzing both works, it now seems clearer to me that some of the carnivalesque elements of the 1605 version somehow found their way into the apocryphal text, whether intentionally or inadvertently. At the same time, the reverse also occurs in Cervantes’s Part II, where the type of humor Avellaneda harnesses is similar to the humor showcased by Sansón Carrasco and the Duke and Duchess. Perhaps in part as a reaction to Avellaneda’s humoristic style, Cervantes has amplified the satirizing of his protagonists, contrasting this with his novel’s original, carnivalesque humor, or what Iffland refers to as “el enfoque erasmiano de la locura como una efervescencia creadora” (186n207). Carnival laughter, in other words, is an uplifting mirth that provokes rejuvenation of the text as well as of the spirit. Its essence is

generally demonstrated via the inversion of opposites, especially with regard to sociopolitical positions. There is also a frequent submersion of the sacred or sublime into the base or corporeal realm, where the former is destroyed or dismantled only to be reborn and therefore to initiate this cycle all over again. Mikhail Bakhtin, in *Rabelais and His World*, defines this type of mirth as a festive laughter: “It is not an individual reaction to a ‘comic’ event. Carnival laughter is the laughter of all the people. . . . It is directed at all and everyone, including the carnival’s participants. The entire world is seen in its droll aspect, in its gay relativity. . . . This laughter is ambivalent: it is gay, triumphant, and at the same time mocking, deriding. It asserts and denies, it buries and revives” (11-12). From the very beginning of Cervantes’s novel, in the prologue of Part I, this laughter is demonstrated through the fictionalized author and his friend, who make fun of the necessity to begin a book with a lofty prologue as well as an “innumerabilidad y catálogo de los acostumbrados sonetos, epigramas y elogios que al principio de los libros suelen ponerse” (80). This fictionalized author also mentions, “También ha de carecer mi libro de sonetos al principio, a lo menos de sonetos cuyos autores sean duques, marqueses, condes, obispos, damas o poetas celeberrimos” (80). The friend suggests he invent all of these things, an act which undermines the reason behind other authors before him who have followed this practice. Both characters are making fun of this part of the literary process. At the same time, however, they also are admitting that Cervantes did not obtain sonnets from wealthy patrons. And although it is not specified whether this is intentional on Cervantes’s part or whether he has avoided or could not obtain the extensive financial support normally provided by wealthy patrons to successful authors, they are nonetheless allowing themselves to be laughed at. The humor is directed both at the artifices of the

publication and marketing of literature and at themselves. From the start, therefore, the readers understand that the laughter is multidirectional; it is for everyone and directed at everyone. In *Letter and Spirit in Hispanic Writers*, Alan Trueblood believes that, with regard to Cervantes's overall comic vision, Cervantes wrote in the hopes of alleviating sadness in his readers. Trueblood states, "Cervantes estaba convencido de que el arte cómico, y la risa que despertaba, tenía eficacia terapéutica, al disipar los humores melancólicos y restablecer un buen equilibrio temperamental" (79). We see proof of this again in the prologue, when the fictional author hopes that in reading this text "el melancólico se mueva a risa" (84). Trueblood also interprets an underlying message in what he describes as the mono-dialogue Cervantes-as-author has with Cervantes-as-friend. When the former showers the latter with his worries about publishing his novel and the latter responds by "disparando en una carga de risa," Trueblood understands this to be a reflection of Cervantes's underlying message of 'don't take yourself too seriously.' Trueblood observes, "Su vía de acceso a un equilibrio de seriedad no es lo grave, sino lo leve" (65). According to Trueblood's reading, Cervantes's designs allowed for the readers not only to laugh at what was found within the text but also to take away from the text a healthier, more alleviated mentality, attained through laughter.

With regard to Cervantes's novel, there are many examples of this rejuvenating laughter. The duality of the characters, who evolve and develop both individually and as a pair, foments growth through their spirit of adventure and conquest. Returning to my earlier idea of visualizing various characters in the text as personifications of different genres, their interactions and collisions produce laughter by way of contrast. This is the same kind of laughter that levels the playing field within the text and allows for an

inversion of stereotypes, such as when the peasant Sancho becomes governor. It also plays with dualities, an example of which is Don Quixote as *cuerdo loco*. In mixing dualisms or reversing social order, the boundaries between society and its taboos either disappear or are set in contrast with each other, which in turn allows for the mingling of the vulgar or base with the polite or noble. Because the novel is composed of journeys and because the characters make frequent stops at inns, there is ample opportunity for the interacting of characters from all different walks of life, some of whom have been fashioned by Cervantes as representations of literary genres. At the inn, Don Quixote confuses Maritornes with the damsels that he thought would be waiting for him, following the protocol he remembered from chivalric romances. Sancho is subjected to a blanketing at the same inn by a group of traveling merchants. Later on, the Captive and Zoraida relate their tale, which is filled with Byzantine overtones. Along the sentimental vein, Luscinda and Cardenio, Dorotea and Fernando, and Luis and Clara encounter each other in the inn. It is here, too, that Sancho and Don Quixote run into the picaresque Ginés de Pasamonte, disguised as Maese Pedro. These characters' comings and goings, coupled with the various adventures that they bring, help juxtapose and put into contrast their lifestyles as well as the literary traditions from which they stem. While not all the stories produce laughter, humor often emerges through irony or parody. At the same time, the interaction between differing generic patterns is an upheaval of literary routine and a rejuvenation of literary technique. Bakhtin points out that carnival represents a constant cycle of seriousness/laughter, of oppression/freedom that allows for a society's enrichment, rebirth, and growth. Aspects of this are visible in Cervantes's novel, where things such as social hierarchies, chivalric values, and fact versus fiction are unsettled

and exposed by laughter. Bakhtin explains, “Laughter demolishes fear and piety before an object, before a world, making of it an object of familiar contact and thus clearing the ground for an absolutely free investigation of it. Laughter is a vital factor in laying down that prerequisite for fearlessness without which it would be impossible to approach the world realistically” (*Dialogic* 23). In Cervantes’s case, it is the ambience of laughter that allows for literary formulae as well as social ideologies to be played out and examined by the characters and readers.

When analyzing carnival, Umberto Eco uses very specific coordinates: “Carnival, in order to be enjoyed, requires that rules and rituals be parodied, and that these rules and rituals already be recognized and respected. One must know to what degree certain behaviors are forbidden, and must feel the majesty of the forbidding norm, to appreciate their transgression. Without a valid law to break, carnival is impossible” (*Carnival!* 6). Whereas Don Quixote never realizes he transgresses any laws, the readers are aware that at times civil, social, and religious laws are challenged or broken within the narrative. For example, Don Quixote frees the galley slaves and inadvertently violates civil law. Ironically, Don Quixote has judged that a chivalric law was being breached, spurring him into action to right wrongs, even though his act now contravenes another type of law. Furthermore, he breaks social as well as religious laws, such as when he knights himself in chapter 3 and later when he interferes with the nighttime funeral procession and attacks a clergyman in chapter 19 of Part I. In books of chivalry, the laws that knights strive to uphold generally coincide with the social, civil, and religious laws of the societies that they represent. Cervantes, however, has inverted the relationship between these laws. They are no longer compatible and, through Don Quixote’s visions, they contradict one

another. Eco understands these and other incidences of carnival in *Don Quixote* to be a criticism of society overall: “Reading Cervantes, we are not subjugated by the majesty of an ‘eternal’ or rediscovered law, and we are not presupposing a law that also holds for ourselves. Simply, we criticize with Cervantes a set of cultural and intertextual frames. Thus the performance of humor acts as a form of social criticism. Humor is always, if not metalinguistic, metasemiotic: through verbal language or some other sign system it casts in doubt other cultural codes” (8). Rather than being a platform for criticizing society in the sense Eco means, I find that the laughter in *Don Quixote* allows for an examination of different aspects of this culture. It does not judge but rather provokes reflection. As discussed in the initial chapter of this thesis, the contrasting of ideas, aside from producing laughter in Cervantes’s novel, allows for the questioning of ideas. Whether these cultural codes are cast in doubt or are simply observed depends on the reader. Conversely, it is in Avellaneda’s text that critical laughter appears, where Don Quixote and Sancho are punished time and again for attempting to reach beyond their positions in society.

One of the most obvious ways that Cervantes arranges for this thought-provoking laughter is through parody. Ardis Nelson, in *Cabrera Infante in the Menippean Tradition*, labels parody as an important ingredient of the carnival attitude (17). Don Quixote is, of course, parody par excellence of the knights found in books of chivalry. The episode of Marcela and Grisóstomo in Part I, chapters 12 through 14, is another form of parody of the pastoral romance. In *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, Bakhtin interprets parody as “the creation of a double which discrowns its counterpart” (105). Don Quixote, by bringing to life books of chivalry within the realm of a different genre, de-crowns this

form for the readers. Although he believes he is otherwise, for the characters and readers, Don Quixote is the antithesis of many of the characteristics associated with literary knights errant. Whereas knights errant should right wrongs, Don Quixote often times ends up wronging rights. His imitation of knight errantry accidentally parodies, or discowns, the very creed he wants to follow.

Likewise, Marcela, by stepping out of the pastoral romance into which she has been cast, declares herself free, refuses to follow the protocol everyone else expects of her, and therefore turns this genre's dynamics upside down as well. Yvonne Jehenson, in "The Pastoral Episode in Cervantes' *Don Quijote*: Marcela Once Again," explains that in this episode "Cervantes subtly undermines the conventions of the pastoral genre and has Marcela explode traditional literary codes" (17). Because she refuses to play the part of the pastoral shepherdess as prescribed in literature and instead speaks out and defends her lifestyle, "she erupts into the circumscribed world of the goatherds and explodes it by assuming a negative function" (26). In her own way, her actions turn the pastoral genre on its head, which would be interpreted as a negative function within the realm of this genre, according to Jehenson. However, outside of the realm of the pastoral and within the more cynical parameters of the novel, Marcela's action exposes the inconsistencies of pastoral literature and could be interpreted as satirical. What Don Quixote does next adds another element of humor to this episode. Jehenson summarizes: "Don Quijote, sword in hand, leaps to her defense. He will let no one harm Marcela—a Marcela whom we have seen is perfectly capable of taking care of herself" (28). It is precisely because the readers are aware that she is capable of defending herself that irony surfaces through the knight's reaction, because Marcela's inversion of the pastoral genre's parameters renders Don

Quixote's chivalric attitude obsolete. Because these two characters serve in some way as allegories of literary genres, their interactions within the new arena of the novel highlight the generic imperfections from whence they were created and therefore allow humor to surface.

Looking at the original and apocryphal novels of *Don Quixote* on a broader scale, parodying is also visible here: the 1605 text is supposedly created as a parody of chivalric romance. Avellaneda's narrative in turn discowns Cervantes's and returns the two protagonists to the limited roles of madman and servant. Cervantes has the last word, however, when he parodies in his Part II the critical laughter found in the apocryphal text.

I have already discussed many of the elements of comicality in Avellaneda and have shown how the protagonists are harnessed and tricked into performing or overreacting for their social superiors. In general, the humor contained in this text is unidirectional and is almost always at the expense of Don Quixote, Sancho, or Bárbara. The readers are encouraged to laugh at these three protagonists by the narrator, who indicates after almost every episode how the other characters laughed at them. The majority of the comic interludes in this novel provide laughter for some at the expense of others, but rather than creating an upheaval of established norms or by equalizing the playing field, this laughter more closely resembles Schadenfreude, or epicaricacy, which is the act of taking pleasure from someone else's misfortune. This kind of laughter is disparaging and is very different from the type contained in the original *Don Quixote*, although it does exist there, too. If it is the main representation of laughter in the text, the overall tone is negative or stagnant. The carnival spirit of laughter is not one of immobilization and repression, but rather of a recycling and rejuvenation where all

hierarchies are leveled and there is a mixture of all aspects of society. In Part I, both types of humor appear and I believe they set the stage for the differing directions Avellaneda's and Cervantes's texts take in the second part. One of the clearer examples of carnival laughter takes place at the inn in Part I, chapter 17, when Sancho is spirited outside and blanketed by a group of traveling merchants who were “gente alegre, bien intencionada, maleante y juguetona” (224). Sancho is tossed up and down many times, representing the cyclical movement of carnival where life passes from one extreme to the other and then repeats the process. They use his blanket from the night before that, thanks to his experience with the balsam of Fierabrás, he had dirtied. His returning to the earthiness or crudity of life is put into contrast with the sublimity the sky represents as Sancho falls only to be again hurled repeatedly into the air. This is a very physical and emotional experience for Sancho who is treated “como un perro por carnestolendas” (224). He has been temporarily transformed into an animal here, de-crowned from his position as human and humiliated. This is an incident that effects him considerably, something that he mentions several times throughout the rest of the novel. But it is a very different kind of humor than that of chapter 52, when the goat herder Eugenio and Don Quixote come to blows. Although this fight contains elements of carnival, such as when Eugenio de-crowns Don Quixote by knocking him off his horse and how they proceed to roll around in the food laid out for lunch, it is the actions of the bystanders that alter the tone of the scene. No one attempts to break up the fight or aide Don Quixote except Sancho. The canon and curate do keep the goat herder from getting a hold of a knife “mas el barbero hizo de suerte que el cabrero cogió debajo de sí a don Quijote, sobre el cual llovió tanto número de mojicones, que del rostro del caballero llovía tanta sangre como del suyo.

Reventaban de risa el canónigo y el cura, saltaban los cuadrilleros de gozo, zuzaban los unos y los otros, como hace a los perros cuando en pendencia están trabados” (584).

Iffland associates all of this with the carnival atmosphere: “se trata de ‘regocijo y fiesta’ como el narrador lo describe” (115). But I think it is important not to overlook the dynamic of this scene. Although there frequently exists an element of violence in carnival activities, in this scene the violence is exploited for the benefit of non-participants. Don Quixote and Eugenio have started a fight, but rather than actively taking part in the fight, or trying to prevent it, the other characters convert this scuffle into a spectacle for their own amusement. It is only the sound of a horn from a religious procession that distracts the knight and stops the fighting. Carnival laughter takes precedence again as he mounts his horse and rides off to confront the procession of the Virgin Mary, believing her to be an abducted damsel. Interestingly, here the barber and curate step in to try and stop him, something they do not do in the previous mêlée. Instead, they and the other onlookers thoroughly enjoyed the fight, goading on the two opponents. This is one of the most obvious examples in Part I of Schadenfreude, where Eugenio’s and Don Quixote’s brawl is turned into a spectator sport. The narrator emphasizes everyone’s laughter and merriment, with the exception of Sancho who is held back from assisting his master by one of the canon’s servants. Previously in the novel, other characters enjoyed the mad antics of Don Quixote, but this is the first time they do not actively participate in them, but rather go out of their way to enjoy the spectacle and do not attempt to stop the fight. This sharp contrast between participant and spectator represents a humor that differs from carnival laughter, where everyone takes an active part. It reestablishes hierarchies, with the viewers looking down on the contributors. In Avellaneda’s novel, almost all of the

humor is of this type, and Don Quixote, Sancho, and Bárbara are continuously provoked into performing for an audience. Cervantes also plays with this type of humor in Part II, in particular during the episodes with the Duke and Duchess. Similar to the way Avellaneda harnesses his protagonists for the amusement of the other characters and readers, the Duke and Duchess also stage several adventures for Don Quixote and Sancho. But because there is a much stronger current of carnival laughter in Cervantes, this overshadows what might otherwise be understood as a more satirical, repressive tone. Anthony Close, in *Cervantes and the Comic Mind*, observes that the jokes and tricks played by the Duke and Duchess and their cohorts “are filled with a merrily ludic, theatrically creative, and celebratory spirit . . . They are ludic, because, though designed to make fun of the two heroes, they set out to do so in such a way as to nourish their illusions of fulfillment and elicit their active participation in further adventures without suffering injury or offense. . . . The joy that they express . . . [is] a spontaneous one which unites all participants, temporarily dissolving hierarchies, bitterness, and rancour” (331). Although I disagree that there exists a point during the episodes with the Duke and Duchess in which the boundaries between social hierarchies ever completely disappear, it is true that all of the characters participate in the pranks and activities. In Avellaneda’s novel, those of higher class are rarely ever more than observers, and instead have their servants or pages dress up as the Black Knight or the giant Bramidán de Tayajunque, for example. The Archipámpano only observes the antics of Sancho and Don Quixote. Even Don Álvaro, who interacts with Don Quixote and Sancho throughout most of the storyline and comes to their rescue several times, never acts in any of the pranks that he and his friends fashion. It should also be pointed out that the apocryphal Quixote always

loses his battles and is even incarcerated at one point. In other words, he never discowns but instead is always subdued or overcome. Cervantes's Quixote both subverts and is de-crowned, therefore representing the two sides of carnival activity. This is the purpose of carnival laughter, something that is very different from the majority of the condescending laughter found in Avellaneda. As Iffland points out, the humor in the apocryphal version "parte con preferencia desde instancias aristocráticas o nobles, desde arriba para abajo" (236).

Although the laughter in Avellaneda's text is generally repressive and does not permit the characters to develop beyond their set roles, there are two aspects which interfere with this fixed humor. The first aspect is Sancho, whose impudence and gluttony contradict the norms of social decency. Avellaneda makes him the laughing stock, along with Don Quixote, but his actions and language nonetheless continually transgress social hierarchies. Even though Sancho is denied development or growth, because he is never truly isolated nor entrapped by this laughter to the point that his actions cease to attack the established norm, Avellaneda's attempt to control and relegate Sancho to the role of a harmless target of laughter fails. Iffland states that in Avellaneda "puede haber Carnaval, pero servirá sólo para ejemplificar lo risible, lo irrisorio, del proyecto de ascenso" of Sancho and Don Quixote (268). But, in copying some of the initial characteristics of the original Sancho, that of speaking out of turn and saying too much, Avellaneda is unable to contain his Sancho to a role of subservience. Also, because the apocryphal squire is gluttonous and continues to identify with his donkey in imitation of the original Sancho, these factors associate him with the baser, more animalistic side of carnival. The laughter produced by his excessive eating and by his

demonstrative love for his beast accidentally injects the text with a light spirit of rejuvenation. This mixing of the mundane with the refined and an emphasis on corporeal attributes serve as attempts to fertilize an otherwise stagnant text. I say accidentally because this aspect of Sancho appears to have been overlooked or misunderstood by Avellaneda and goes against the grain of the rest of the novel. Nevertheless, because this type of laughter is contradicted by the overall repressive tone of the novel, and because Sancho gives up his donkey and agrees to a more refined lifestyle with the Archipámpano in Madrid at the end of the novel, this weak element of carnival laughter is finally overpowered by the rest of the text.

The other element of carnival laughter in Avellaneda's novel is its ending. In the penultimate chapter, Avellaneda consigns Sancho to the city of Madrid as the Archipámpano's buffoon. Bárbara is deposited at a house for wayward women. The final chapter is dedicated to explaining how Don Quixote was tricked into going to the Casa del Nuncio, an insane asylum in Toledo. After Don Álvaro visits Don Quixote for a while, to make sure he is adjusting to confinement and to otherwise look after him, Don Álvaro returns home and the narrator writes that this concludes the story that had been found in the Manchegan archives. But the book does not end here. Instead, the narrator continues to talk about Don Quixote:

Lo que toca al fin desta prisión y de su vida, y de los trabajos que hasta que llegó a él tuvo, no se sabe de cierto. Pero barruntos hay, y tradiciones de viejísimos manchegos, de que sanó y salió de dicha Casa de Nuncio; y pasando por la corte, vio a Sancho, el cual, como estaba en prosperidad, le dio algunos dineros para que se volviese a su tierra, viéndole ya al parecer asentado. Y lo mismo hicieron el Archipámpano y el príncipe Perianeo, para que mercase alguna cabalgadura, con fin de que se fuese con más comodidad; porque Rocinante dejólo don Álvaro en la Casa del Nuncio, en servicio de la cual acabó sus honrados días, por más que otros digan lo contrario.

Pero, como tarde la locura se cura, dicen que en saliendo de la corte, volvió a su tema y que comprando otro mejor caballo, se fue la vuelta de Castilla la Vieja, en la cual le sucedieron estupendas y jamás oídas aventuras . . . y él, sin escudero, pasó por Salamanca, Ávila y Valladolid, llamándose el Caballero de los Trabajos, los cuales no faltará mejor pluma que los celebre. (447-48)

Although the narrator frames this information around “barruntos” and “tradiciones de viejísimos manchegos” and mentions that this last piece of the knight’s history is not known for certain,¹⁶ he implies that even though Don Quixote is imprisoned in the insane asylum, he is later released and then returns to his old ways of madness. In the imitation of books of chivalry, Avellaneda appears to have left the ending open and, similar also to how Cervantes ended Part I, he invites someone else to continue the tale. This open-endedness of the narrative structure, coupled with Don Quixote’s return to madness, undoes all that the suppressive laughter managed to contain in the previous pages of the text. Rather than the closed ending of the 1615 novel (the protagonist’s death), or possibility of permanent institutionalization of Don Quixote that initially occurs in the Avellaneda sequel, the ending of the apocryphal *Quixote* in some ways represents rejuvenation, because Don Quixote will have the opportunity to roam free once again. This is why it is representative of carnival laughter. Iffland observes that the spirit of carnival holds the possibility of a continuation, as part of its process of life-death-rebirth. This is in direct contrast to Cervantes’s definitive ending, where Don Quixote dies and automatically negates any possibility of a continuation. Alain René Le Sage, the eighteenth-century writer who liberally translated Avellaneda’s novel to French, changed Avellaneda’s ending and had Don Quixote die after a fight with the Santa Hermandad.

¹⁶ Here the narrator, in imitating the mannerisms of troubadours and other story tellers, adds ambiguity to his narrative. This is something Cervantes’s narrator also does, such as in Part I, chapter 2: “Autores hay que dicen que la primera aventura que le avino fue la del Puerto Lápice; otros dicen que la de los molinos de viento; pero, lo que yo he podido averiguar en este caso, y lo que he hallado escrito en los Anales de la Mancha . . .” (107).

This, or the confinement of the insane asylum, would have been the logical conclusion to a text that so repressed its protagonists. Avellaneda, however, has chosen an open ending, which undermines the stagnant, repressive laughter that had overwhelmed the rest of the text. Iffland believes that “la obra de Avellaneda sólo se puede entender como una reacción contra la dimensión profundamente carnavalesca del *Quijote* de 1605” (62). For the most part, I agree with this statement. But the conclusions of the two texts nevertheless go against the overriding tones of their respective works. Taking into consideration the disposition and direction of both novels, it is as if Cervantes and Avellaneda swapped endings. Salvador Fajardo, in “Closure in *Don Quixote I*,” points out, “In a novel that seeks to highlight the unreliability of many traditional forms of authority, . . . the decision to end seems especially vulnerable to ironic treatment” (43). Ironic, because the ending opposes the direction of Cervantes’s text up until this point, where the protagonists have been free to journey, seek adventure, and otherwise overcome boundaries.

Due to his defeat by the Knight of the White Moon in Barcelona, Don Quixote agrees to a year of rest at home, thus circumventing any type of journey during this time, which is an immobilization that leads to his death. In contrasting the tones and overall intent of the two *Quixotes*, Nabokov would have preferred to see the two protagonists duke it out rather than have Don Quixote lose to Sansón Carrasco:

All along [Part II] we have been meeting people who were personally acquainted with the false Don Quixote. We are as ready for the appearance of the false Don Quixote as we are for that of Dulcinea. We are eager for Avellaneda to produce his man. How splendid it would have been if instead of that hasty and vague last encounter with the disguised Carrasco, who tumbles our knight in a jiffy, the real Don Quixote had fought his crucial battle with the false Don Quixote! In that imagined battle who would have been victor—the fantastic, lovable madman of genius, or the fraud, the symbol of robust mediocrity? My money is on

Avellaneda's man, because the beauty of it is that, in life, mediocrity is more fortunate than genius. In life it is the fraud that unhorses true valor. (81)

Nabokov's cynical interpretation highlights the discrepancy between these two Quixotes and at the same time summarizes the temperament of both narratives. Ironically, these two figures seem to swap places in the last chapter of each other's novels. In looking at the overriding carnival laughter in Cervantes's novel and the almost complete lack thereof in Avellaneda's, the endings of their text clash with the rest of the storyline. I explained in an earlier chapter that Cervantes's allows Don Quixote to die as a way of personifying the carnivalesque notion that stagnation is death. Avellaneda's ending, however, defies the message of the rest of his text. The ending and the character of Sancho serve as the two main representations of carnival laughter in Avellaneda's text, even though they are out of sync with the rest of the story.

José Antonio Millán, in his prologue to the Poliedro edition of Avellaneda's novel, comments that the apocryphal text is

una obra . . . respetuosa con la de Cervantes. Respetuosa porque es perfectamente coherente con el hilo argumental de la primera entrega, y hace un buen ejercicio de continuación. . . . Si un improbable hallazgo documental demostrara que Lope (o un partidario suyo) había encontrado ya escrita una continuación del *Quijote*, sin especial *animus iniuriandi* contra Cervantes, y se había limitado a ponerle un prólogo y a hacer una interpolación menor, nos lo creeríamos inmediatamente. . . . La sutura de la obra avellanedesca con la Primera parte . . . es un constante. (xx-xxi)

In this chapter, however, I hope to have proven the opposite: that there are several factors that change the atmosphere of each storyline, which as a result create two very different novels. The humor found in both novels is one of the main points of difference. In order to fully appreciate the richness of Cervantes's masterpiece as well as the important role humor plays in this novel's design, it is necessary to read Avellaneda's work. Both texts

offer a very different vision of laughter. They use as a starting point the journey of a mad knight and his simple squire, but since each narrative holds a dissimilar view of laughter, the concept from which they originate divides very early on and sets them on distinct courses of comicality. Each novel is an essential compliment to the understanding of the other. But like a fork in the road, the humor in each novel should be understood as stemming from the same original source and then taking two very different directions.

CHAPTER IV

MADNESS AND LAUGHTER: INGENIOUS INTERPRETATION

Many critics have attempted to diagnose or explain Don Quixote's madness, while others have focused on labeling the types of humor found in *Don Quixote*. Looking briefly at both of these issues below, in this chapter I examine the relationship between madness and humor, in order to better understand Cervantes's humanistic vision within *Don Quixote*. Having analyzed in previous chapters Menippean satire, humor as journey, and humor unique to Cervantes's novel, my final concern in this thesis is to look at the correlation between humor and madness, because the latter is a theme central to *Don Quixote*. I begin by considering the universality of madness, a subject frequently promoted in humanistic texts such as *Praise of Folly* and *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. Next, I look at the types of madness Don Quixote exhibits as well as how his character is formulated in part based on the contemporary humoral theories of Cervantes's day. Lastly, most of the characters in *Don Quixote* demonstrate some sort of foolishness, insanity, or silliness. Because these actions fall within the wide parameters of madness, I discuss how this reflects the humanistic idea surrounding the universality of madness and how everyone acts madly at some point or another in their lives. All of the aforementioned topics are addressed with regard to the multi- and uni-directional humor found in Cervantes's novel.

Although it should go without saying, *Don Quixote* is more than just a book about a madman and his faithful squire. This description is what is often given in layman's

terms when Cervantes's classic is mentioned, but anyone who has read the book knows that this definition is oversimplified. Even though Don Quixote is regarded as the leading mad character and Sancho Panza is labeled as the most foolish, there are many other characters throughout the novel who act in silly or crazy ways, and almost all of their actions take place in a humorous context. While not all of the laughter-provoking scenes are at the direct expense of madness, the underlying current of comicality is interlaced with the follies, mad antics, and otherwise nonsensical actions of most of the characters that appear throughout the text. From the extradiegetic angle, for example, the intentional ramblings and uncertainty provided by the historian Cide Hamete, the translator, and any of the other authors mentioned offer silliness to the readers at the outermost layer. Within the text, there are characters who disguise themselves to fool others, who cross-dress, who create utopias away from civilization, who dare try to transcend their social status, and who provoke chaos by testing the limits of spousal fidelity, to name just a few of the many scenarios where characters act in what might have been deemed by seventeenth-century Spanish standards as crazy or outlandish. The laughter celebrated in this novel continuously offers examples of madcap antics, folly, and foolishness to the readers and reinforces the humanistic vision that recognizes these characteristics as an integral part of what it means to be human.

It is in Erasmus's *The Praise of Folly* that the spirit of madness is so strongly equated to being human. The madness that comes from foolishness, writes Erasmus, "brings a great delight not only to them that are possessed with it but to those also that behold it . . . [and] I scarce know anyone in all mankind that is wise at all hours, or has not some tang or other of madness" (31). Not only are folly and madness, or being "out

of one's wits" (30), interrelated according to Erasmus, but they are integral characteristics of what it means to be human and they are also representative of the comic element of life. In *History of Madness*, Foucault points out that for Humanists such as Erasmus madness serves as "the comic punishment of knowledge and its ignorant presumption" (23). Rather than celebrate only the rational aspects of the mind, society should embrace as a part of humanity the less serious or dignified facets as well. Through literature such as *The Praise of Folly* and Rabelais's *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, society is reminded to do this via laughter. Foucault observes that "madness . . . is in fact a subtle relationship that man has with himself" (*History* 23). In other words, madness forms a part of the human psyche. To ignore this side of human nature, or to shun or marginalize it, would be unhealthy. Mikhail Bakhtin, in *Rabelais and His World*, writes that madness and laughter are intertwined in carnivalesque humor, and that this is the same type of humor found in *Don Quixote*. Cervantes's knight errant is similar in some ways to a jester, who can make the court laugh at and with him at the same time, although he is not always aware of his role. P. E. Russell, in "The Madness of Don Quixote," clarifies, "Madness portrayed as a comical condition and laughter nearly always elbowing out compassion are the features of *Don Quixote* that many modern readers find it difficult to accept. It is important to realize, however, that this kind of problem did not trouble readers during the first century and a half of the book's existence" (85). The relationship between laughter and what were deemed to be foolish or insane actions and individuals reflected both the nature of laughing at and laughing with the subject. It is a relationship very similar to that of the institution of Carnival, where fools and madmen take turns with those that are considered to be wise or sane in crowning and de-crowning one another. Everyone

collaborates in the foray. The fluctuation and inversion of social hierarchies during Carnival emphasizes that we as humans are equals in this game of life. Bakhtin adds, “The carnivalesque basic element in Cervantes’s *Don Quixote* . . . is quite obvious: his novel is directly organized as a grotesque play with all its attributes” (*Rabelais* 275). The grotesqueness Bakhtin mentions refers to the physical attributes of being human, which would include highlighting universal actions such as eating, drinking, defecating, dying, and any of the activities that could be interpreted as celebrating the meaning of the body and how it undergoes transformation throughout life. Madness is definitely a principle corporal action, because it affects everyone physically in some way and because it creates an alteration within individuals regarding how they interact with themselves as well as how they live in a community.

In today’s society, perhaps most people would take umbrage at being associated with madness, but it is important to keep in mind that from an humanistic point of view, madness formed part of the definition of humanness. Rabelais’s novels also serve as a good example of how mad actions and foolishness intermingle with learning, war, and other serious ventures. It is understood as a part of life. In his *Pensées*, Blaise Pascal comes to phrase it in the following way: “Men are so necessarily mad that not to be mad would amount to another form of madness” (414). Whether acting out of line, being foolish, allowing your beliefs to oppress you, or even envisioning something that no one else can see, everyone at some point or another experiences what could be termed a form of madness.

Foucault explains that around the sixteenth century, the conception of madness begins to be understood in two different ways. Initially, madness is viewed as a condition

“that is merely there for the instruction of the wise [in the form of] an exemplary, didactic odyssey whose purpose is to highlight faults in the human character” (*History* 26). The second understanding, however, sees madness as a dangerous menace to society because it is deemed to encourage sloth and vagrancy rather than productivity. It is this image which eventually takes precedence during the Enlightenment. But the initial, didactic vision of madness that Foucault mentions is that which encompasses the humanistic definition and which surfaces in *Don Quixote*. Erasmus, speaking as Folly, also refers to this type of madness in comparison to a second, more destructive kind:

the one that which the revengeful Furies send privily from hell, as often as they let loose their snakes and put into men's breasts either the desire of war, or an insatiate thirst after gold, or some dishonest love, or parricide, or incest, or sacrilege, or the like plagues, or when they terrify some guilty soul with the conscience of his crimes; the other, but nothing like this, that which comes from me and is of all other things the most desirable; which happens as often as some pleasing dotage not only clears the mind of its troublesome cares but renders it more jocund. (30)

For Erasmus, there exists a vicious as well as a creative lunacy. The latter serves as a mirror and reflects back to the observer their own traits of foolishness and insanity. It reminds people not to take life too seriously. This is also the role of many of the characters deemed mad or eccentric in Renaissance literature. Elizabeth Chesney, in “The Theme of Folly in Rabelais and Ariosto,” contends,

If, from an Olympian viewpoint, all men are fools, however, such is not the case within society. There, rational order has been imposed upon chaos, and folly made exception to the “reasonable” rule. The duality of this perspective—which balances the intrasocial, partitive definition of madness against its universal, extrasocial double—is particularly important in the area of character development, and to the understanding of the demented figures around whom the works revolve. Not only comic devices, used to titillate our sane superiority, here fools also serve now to satirize, now parody, those established dementias which frequently pass for “normality.” (75)

This duality of madness, where the madman or jester serves to highlight the insanity or illogicality of supported forms of insanity such as war, social hierarchies, or extreme religious beliefs, offer the readers or audience a new way to examine their culture. Because these works tend to be of a comic nature, they are not found to be as offensive and therefore are more successful at exposing the flaws of a culture or ideology. The works of Erasmus, Rabelais, and Ariosto, for instance, share in common the desire to show that there is a truth beyond reason, and that reason and its quest to control unreason is equally chaos-forming and ludicrous. *Don Quixote* follows in this tradition. To begin with, madness is not marginalized but rather remains at the center of attention and affects just about every character in the plot. In addition, Cervantes plays with the boundaries between sanity and lunacy and between dreams and obsession, allowing most of his characters to fluctuate between these tendencies in some way or another, showing that even those who hold positions of power within a society, such as the curate, the Duke and Duchess, and Don Antonio Moreno, are subject to whimsy and other forms of irrationality.

Looking at the basic structure of the plot, Cervantes pits a character who dares to live out his vision together with a simple squire, against other characters representing mainstream society who, in attempting to control the madman, go to such lengths at times that they themselves appear mad. Cervantes humorously prods the readers into questioning where the boundaries lay between rationality and irrationality, between fact and fantasy, and between truth and fiction. All of this is directly related to the type of humor found in this text. It is a humor that does not satirize or put down its subject, but rather playfully focuses light on particular issues and encourages both laughter of and

with the subject. Bakhtin believes that this type of laughter was reflective of a kind of attitude held during the Renaissance, but which began to disappear as the age of the Enlightenment drew near. He writes, “Rabelais, Cervantes, and Shakespeare represent an important turning point in the history of laughter. Nowhere else do we see so clearly marked the lines dividing the Renaissance from the seventeenth century and the period that followed” (*Rabelais* 66). This type of humor naturally affects the construction of madness in *Don Quixote* and prevents it from being derisive or debilitating, something that latter day critics such as Nabokov and Unamuno were unable to see or chose to interpret in a very different manner. Bakhtin continues,

The Renaissance conception of laughter can be roughly described as follows: Laughter has a deep philosophical meaning, it is one of the essential forms of the truth concerning the world as a whole, concerning history and man; it is a peculiar point of view relative to the world; the world is seen anew, no less (and perhaps more) profoundly than when seen from the serious standpoint. . . . Certain essential aspects of the world are accessible only to laughter. (*Rabelais* 66)

For Bakhtin, the humor encouraged during the Renaissance was universal in scope and non-divisive. It was multidirectional in that rather than dominating a subject through degrading laughter, its focus incorporated every participant. In *Don Quixote*, a good example of this occurs in the fulling mills episode in Part I, chapter 20. Don Quixote and Sancho are traveling along in the early evening in search of water when they hear the sound of a river close by. Before they can fully rejoice, however, suddenly loud thumping noises accompanied by what sounds like the creaking of chains reach their ears. The narrator amplifies the level of suspense by adding, “de manera que la soledad, el sitio, la escuridad, el ruido del agua con el susurro de las hojas, todo causaba horror y espanto, y más cuando vieron que ni los golpes cesaban, ni el viento dormía, ni la mañana llegaba” (246). Night has fallen, adding to the feeling of imminent danger, and then the two

protagonists spend the hours of darkness with the courageous Don Quixote attempting to investigate this new adventure and the fearful Sancho insistent on forestalling any separation between him and his master. The readers are entertained by Sancho's antics, but because they are not provided with any extra information by the narrator, they are equally caught up in the suspense. Dawn arrives and Don Quixote bids Sancho farewell and gives him a list of things to do should he never return. Sancho breaks into tears, Don Quixote goes off to confront whatever is making the incredible noise, and Sancho follows close behind. At the most climactic moment, just when the protagonists are to come face to face with the source of the noise, the narrator interrupts to tell the reader what he may already suspect, that they are nothing more than six hammers of a fulling mill beating the water. The knight's and squire's reactions break the tension:

Cuando don Quijote vio lo que era, enmudeció y pasmóse de arriba abajo. Miróle Sancho, y vio que tenía la cabeza inclinada sobre el pecho, con muestras de estar corrido. Miró también don Quijote a Sancho, y viole que tenía los carrillos hinchados y la boca llena de risa, con evidentes señales de querer reventar con ella, y no pudo su melancolía tanto con él que, a la vista de Sancho, pudiese dejar de reírse; y, como vio Sancho que su amo había comenzado, soltó la presa de manera que tuvo necesidad de apretarse las ijadas con los puños, por no reventar riendo. (254)

This is a contagious laughter, which catches by surprise not only Don Quixote and Sancho, but also the readers. The suspense and expectation of a possibly dangerous encounter gives way to something completely unexpected. Because every participant, including the readers, is taken in by the surprise, everyone has the opportunity to laugh at themselves and at each other's foolishness. This is one of the many examples of the multidirectional laughter that surfaces in *Don Quixote* and it is a laughter that arises from foolishness.

Madness, too, can be multidirectional, in that it can affect more than one individual. It has the possibility of also holding a deep philosophical meaning, as does laughter, if it serves as a door that opens on to new worlds or experiences. The labels of madness, or to be mad, are often interchangeable with words such as folly, absurdity, violent rage, or foolishness, amongst other things. It is used as a blanket term or it can refer to a specific act, but like the term ‘humorous,’ it is always a subjective label. The 1611 Covarrubias *Tesoro de la lengva castellana o española* offers the following definition of *locura*: “insania, dementia . . . loquear, hazer locuras, o burlarse, y holgarse descompuestamente” (527). It is interesting to note that this definition takes into account not only the mental state of an individual but also includes doing crazy things, making fun of someone else, and having too much fun. Likewise, *Don Quixote* serves as a catalogue of absurdities, follies, and many other different representations of madness. The most obvious example is that of the ingenious gentleman of La Mancha, who embodied madness both through his idealism and through his physical appearance.

Foucault points out that a change begins to take place around the 1600s regarding how society understood the cause of madness. During the Middle Ages, it was viewed in connection with the possession of evil spirits. By the seventeenth century, however, madness begins to be understood as a physiological phenomenon related to the intermixing of the four humors within the body. Daniel Heiple, in “Renaissance Medical Psychology in *Don Quijote*,” believes that Cervantes had a particular interest in medicine: “Criticizing the chivalric novel for its lack of realism, Cervantes set out to correct such abuses and he based his hero’s madness and actions on the firmest scientific knowledge that was known” (70). In fashioning his hidalgo, Cervantes followed the

humoral theories that were in circulation at the time, gleaning his information from the leading proponent of humoral psychology in Spain, Juan Huarte de San Juan. His book, *Examen de ingenios para las ciencias*, would have been accessible to Cervantes, possibly through either his father, a surgeon, or his sister Andrea, a nurse. Heiple confirms that the ideas contained here “must have been familiar to Cervantes from childhood” (67).

Published several times between 1575 and 1594 in Spain, *Examen de ingenios* was a very influential book. Within several decades of its initial publication, it was translated into Latin, French, Italian, English, and German. In it, Huarte posited that the four opposing factors of heat, coldness, moisture, and dryness combined to have different effects on the body. If a body was overly cold and moist, then an excess of phlegm was made, leading to lethargy. If a body was too cold and dry, black bile was overproduced, and this caused melancholy. A body that was excessively hot and moist created too much blood, which lead to ignorance. Lastly, a body that was too hot and dry produced too much yellow bile, giving way to a choleric temperament. For Huarte, the element of dryness was what lead to madness. Where a body was consistently overly dry and hot, the person would experience acts of violent insanity. If the body was generally too dry and cold, then the person suffered from extreme sadness and despair.

In addition to his classification of these four personality types, Huarte also mentions the *ingeniosos*, or those individuals who are ideal learners of a calm and tranquil nature who only rarely vacillate between choleric and melancholic temperaments. This is similar to Covarrubias’s definition of *ingenioso*, or “el que tiene

sutil y delgado ingenio” (504), which comes from the word *ingenio*.¹⁷ Several critics, including Carroll Johnson in *Madness and Lust*, cite Cervantes’s word choice of ‘el ingenioso hidalgo’ as proof of a direct influence by Huarte on the novelist’s description of Don Quixote. Heiple, in “*El licenciado Vidriera y el humor tradicional del loco*,” also points out that there existed a traditional Spanish saying, “‘No hay gran ingenio sin su ramo de locura’” (70), which may or may not be directly the result of Huarte’s influence on society, but which also may have been what Cervantes had in mind when he named his knight.

With regard to his usage of the term *ingenioso*, Huarte defines a man of this nature in the following way: “el que fuere más disciplinable e ingenioso nace de tener el celebro más bien templado; y si por alguna ocasión o enfermedad se le alterase el buen temperamento del celebro, perdería luego la prudencia y habilidad” (89). In the first chapter of *Don Quixote*, the narrator begins by describing Alonso Quijano as an ordinary hidalgo somewhere in his fifties who rarely did anything unusual. But upon becoming obsessed with books of chivalry, the hidalgo holes himself up in his library where he does nothing but read day in and day out: “él se enfrascó tanto en su lectura, que se le pasaban las noches leyendo de claro en claro, y los días de turbio en turbio; y así, del poco dormir y del mucho leer se le secó el celebro de manera que vino a perder el juicio” (100). Huarte mentions at one point the ill effects of not allowing the brain to regain its moisture through sleep and notes that wakefulness unchecked dries out and hardens the brain (105). This obsession of Alonso Quijano not only dries out his mind and alters his temperament, but adds too much heat to his body. Making a connection between the

¹⁷ “vulgarmente llamamos ingenio vna fuerça natural de entendimiento inuestigadora de lo que por razon y discurso se puede alcançar en todo genero de ciencias, disciplinas, artes liberales, y mecanicas, sutilezas, inuenciones, y engaños” (504).

mental side of the individual and his physical attributes, Huarte notes, “el hombre que es caliente y seco . . . tiene muy pocas carnes, duras y ásperas, hechas de nervios y murecillos, y las venas muy anchas” (257). In chapter 43 of the first part of *Don Quixote*, when Maritornes asks for the knight to place his hand through the barred window, he does so while describing his hand in the following manner, “No os la doy para que la beséis, sino para que miréis la contestura de sus nervios, la trabazón de sus músculos, la anchura y espaciosidad de sus venas” (517). His description of his hand parallels that of Huarte and reflects how his physique resembles that of a choleric man.

At another point in his book, Huarte discusses how fasting, prayer and meditation, and sleeping, if at all, on the ground and fully dressed, make a man “flaco y amarillo” because all of these actions cool and dry out the body, making it less choleric and more melancholic (70-72). These are some of the principle actions of knights errant mentioned in chivalric romances when they, curiously enough, are undergoing penance and are suffering from melancholy. Amadís de Gaula, for instance, acts this way when performing his penance in Peña Pobre for Oriana. In attempting to imitate Amadís and other knights he has read about, Don Quixote inadvertently would be cooling off his cholera, which would affect his temperament according to Huarte. This description coincides with the narrator’s in the initial chapter of the novel, who describes Alonso Quijano as “de compleción recia, seco de carnes, enjuto de rostro” (98). Adding to this preliminary image, the hidalgo is described as ‘flaco,’ ‘seco,’ and ‘amarillo’ several times throughout the novel.¹⁸ He is also frequently warding off sleep, keeping vigil, and fasting, which according to Huarte, would only encourage this type of complexion.

¹⁸ “le había hallado desnudo en camisa, flaco, amarillo y muerto de hambre” (I:29); “la extraña presencia de don Quijote, viendo su rostro de media legua de andadura, seco y amarillo, la desigualdad de sus armas y

Huarte claims that “los que tienen mucho calor son hombres de grande imaginativa” and that they frequently become great leaders, due to their ability to inspire others (161). Don Quixote clearly suffers from an over-active imagination and while he is only able to inspire Sancho to officially follow him, the curate, barber, and Sansón Carrasco choose to also pursue him, if only under the guise of attempting to cure his illness. Interestingly enough, Huarte explains how a person of a hot, dry temperament can oscillate between being at times articulate and at others only reactionary: “Los coléricos, estando en paz, aciertan muy bien a hablar por tener entonces el punto de calor que ha menester la lengua y la buena imaginativa; pero, enojados, sube el calor más de lo que conviene y desbarata la imaginativa” (157). This would help to explain how Don Quixote could wax poetic one moment and then react so insanely the next. On a related note, Heiple interprets the success of Don Quixote’s two most lucid and well-articulated speeches, when he talks about the Golden Age (I: 11) and when he delivers the discourse on arms and letters (I: 38), as having to do with the humoral practices of blood letting and sleep. Heiple explains, “Before the first discourse, [Don Quixote] had lost half his ear in battle with the Viscayan [sic] and spent the afternoon bleeding from the head” (“Renaissance” 69). Patients were frequently bled when they showed signs of having an excess of a particular humor. Due to Don Quixote’s blood loss, his humors would have balanced out, which in turn would allow him to be more eloquent when speaking. Likewise, before his lecture about arms and letters, Don Quixote had just awoken from the nap in which he had fought with the wineskins. Because it was culturally understood

su mesurado continente” (I:27); “venía flaco y amarillo” (I:52); “venía tal el triste, que no le conociera la madre que le parió: flaco, amarillo, los ojos hundidos en los últimos camaranchones del celebro” (II: 7); “le vio tan alto y tan amarillo” (II: 48); “Era cosa de ver la figura de don Quijote, largo, tendido, flaco, amarillo, estrecho en el vestido, desairado, y, sobre todo, no nada ligero” (II: 62).

that sleep re-moisturized the brain, Heiple posits that this would explain his ability to articulate himself so well. Heiple surmises, “Clearly Cervantes meant to show both the bleeding, a removal of the damaging humors, and the long sleep, a restoration of the humidity, as predispositions for a return to rationality” (“Renaissance” 69-70). Cervantes described the actions of his knight according to the medical theories of his day, which includes the work of Huarte de San Juan.

Carroll Johnson, in discussing the end of Part II, links Don Quixote’s death to his temperament. He believes that at the end of the novel, Don Quixote arrives at his home after suffering cruel disillusionments and humiliations “which have the effect of dissipating his yellow bile (choler) and replacing what is lost with black bile (melancholy). This, aided by the sleep that restores moisture to his dried-out brain, swings his personality from the pathologically choleric to its opposite, the melancholic. This in turn results in his death, because melancholy . . . has the unfortunate side effect of constricting his heart” (194). Don Quixote’s very aspect as well as his emotional fluctuation from choleric to melancholic, therefore, would help explain to the knowledgeable readers of Cervantes’s day how he could produce actions and speech reflecting both madness and sharpness of mind.

On a related note, although Huarte lauds the *ingenioso* for being the most well-balanced individual, he nonetheless esteems the choleric and melancholic personality types, because “destos nace la prudencia y sabiduría que tienen los hombres” (118). He recognizes that those individuals who suffer these humoral imbalances nonetheless are necessary to a society, because only melancholic individuals have the correct disposition that favors understanding and wisdom and only those who fall into the choleric category

are capable of great imagination and leadership, which in turn lead to advances in a civilization. Huarte's understanding of the value of unbalanced or unstable individuals to their society coincides with the humanistic vision of relishing madness and folly.

When discussing the art of leadership, Huarte mentions that those of a hot temperament generally hold a talent for eloquent speech, stating that “la oratoria es una ciencia que nace de cierto punto de calor” (91). He then goes on to discuss a case of a simple page who, due to an illness, began to say the most amazing things. “El cual [maníaco] era tenido en sanidad por mozo de poco ingenio; pero caído en la enfermedad, eran tantas las gracias que decía, los apodos, las respuestas que daba a lo que le preguntaban, las trazas que fingía para gobernar un reino del cual se tenía por señor, que por maravilla le venían gentes a ver y oír, y el propio señor jamás se quitaba de la cabecera rogando a Dios que no sanase” (91-92). In many ways, this anecdote parallels the experience Alonso Quijano undergoes. He dries out his brain by reading too much, which spurs him into becoming a knight errant and acting on his visions. And his colleagues and friends, under the guise of helping him return to sanity, follow Don Quixote on his adventures and often provoke him into reacting, so that they can enjoy his follies all the more.

We also see mirrored in Huarte's anecdote Don Quixote's desire to rein so that he can “cobrase eterno nombre y fama” (101). Huarte explains, “El colérico, según la irascible, adora en la honra, en la vanagloria, imperio y mando, y ser a todos superior” (29). Similar to the simple page who, through a fever, envisions himself as king, Don Quixote also shares in visions of vainglory. Huarte's anecdote ends with the doctor, who is finally able to cure the page:

Librado el paje de esta enfermedad, se fue el médico que le curaba a despedir del señor, con ánimo de recibir algún galardón o buenas palabras; pero él le dijo de esta manera: “Yo os doy mi palabra, señor doctor, que de ningún mal suceso he recibido jamás tanta pena, como de ver a este paje sano; porque tan avisada locura no era razón trocarla por un juicio tan torpe como a éste le queda en sanidad. Paréceme que de cuerdo y avisado lo habéis tornado necio, que es la mayor mísera que a un hombre puede acontecer.” (92)

The lord's response is very similar to the reply in Part II, chapter 65 that Don Antonio gives to Sansón Carrasco, who as the Knight of the White Moon has just defeated Don Quixote and is forcing him to return home for a year so as to cure his madness:

-¡Oh señor -dijo don Antonio-, Dios os perdone el agravio que habéis hecho a todo el mundo en querer volver cuerdo al más gracioso loco que hay en él! ¿No veis, señor, que no podrá llegar el provecho que cause la cordura de don Quijote a lo que llega el gusto que da con sus desvaríos? (522)

While it may seem to modern day readers that Don Antonio only wishes to continue enjoying the spectacles made at Don Quixote's expense, from his point of view he is not harming Don Quixote but rather allowing him to be the unique individual he has become thanks to his madness. For Don Antonio, if Don Quixote returns home and is cured, not only is the world deprived of his great character, but Don Quixote also misses out on any new and exciting adventures, returning instead to his dull way of life and a personality that is so nondescript that not even the narrator remembers where exactly he is from or what his real last name is.

Up until this point, I have discussed what might have influenced Cervantes's understanding of madness and how this is played out in his construction of Don Quixote. There are many critics who have attempted to categorize the knight's madness according to modern-day psychology. Although this type of analysis is anachronistic and also dangerous, because it focuses on a character instead of on an actual human being, I mention some of the more contrastive cases to show the wide range of categories of

madness by which Don Quixote has been defined. In “Un aspecto en la elaboración del *Quijote*,” Ramón Menéndez Pidal, for instance, sees the knight errant as suffering from monomania. Miguel de Unamuno, however, discusses what afflicts Don Quixote in “The Essence of Quixotism” and states, “the essence of his madness is that which . . . I call ‘herostratism,’ the mad craving for immortality which, should we doubt of living on in spirit, makes us long to leave behind at least our eternal name and fame” (356). Ruth El Saffar considers the knight errant to be delusional. Carroll Johnson thinks Don Quixote is sexually repressed and that this is what leads to his lunacy. At the other end of the spectrum, Giovanni Papini and Vladmir Nabokov believe that the knight is only faking his madness. Likewise, Mark Van Doren and Gonzalo Torrente Ballester judge that Don Quixote is merely acting. It seems to me that some of the critics’ interpretations are more autobiographical in nature, reflecting how they relate to the protagonist, which ironically would fit with how Cervantes plays with reality and fantasy or truth and interpretation within his novel. This does not invalidate their interpretations in any way but rather emphasizes Cervantes’s gift for fashioning a figure that allows so many readers to relate to him.

Don Quixote’s madness is representative of his own personality. At the same time, because many readers can relate to him, they in turn interpret his madness many different ways. Even in using only Huarte’s definitions of the personality types, we find that Don Quixote oscillates between phlegmatic, choleric, and melancholic throughout the storyline. This ambiguity regarding cataloguing the knight errant’s madness should not be read as erroneous or as an inconsistency on Cervantes’s part. Cervantes has modeled his characters not on theater types but rather on human attributes, which is why

they are often perceived to be authentic and believable. Because his characters are so well-rounded, they are similar to human beings in that they, too, are difficult to classify. Avellaneda's Don Quixote does fit the standard description of a maniac and never goes beyond the boundaries of a theatrical caricature. Cervantes's knight, however, does not correspond to just one prescribed mold. He is both mad and sane, choleric and melancholic, rash and prudent, foolish and wise. Although some critics, such as Le Sage or Nabokov, read this versatility as amateurism or as inaccurateness on the part of Cervantes, in my opinion they seem to have missed how Cervantes appeared more inclined to construct his characters so that they held more humanistic qualities and therefore were more than just caricatures. Don Quixote, as the *cuerdo loco*, is alternatingly sensible, angry, foolish, passionate, judicious, and delusional. Stemming from the humanistic undercurrent that runs through the novel, it is natural that he be at times mad and at others sane.

The universal scope of madness that Erasmus highlights so clearly in *The Praise of Folly*, under which fall acts of madness, foolishness, or silliness, is ever-present in Cervantes's novel and not only with regard to Don Quixote. As Heiple points out,

Las obras satíricas que trataban de la locura en los siglos XVI y XVII parten de dos tradiciones que tenían hondas raíces bíblicas y clásicas. Según la primera, todo el mundo está loco, una idea que siempre se resumía con el dicho bíblico: "El número de los locos es infinito" (Eclesiastés, I:15). La segunda es el concepto del loco cuerdo, el que parece ser loco, pero se aprovecha de su inocencia aparente para ridiculizar a los que se creen cuerdos. ("Licenciado" 17)

Heiple claims that *Don Quixote* is the first work to incorporate both types of madness. The majority of the characters who play a substantial role in the plot take part in actions that reflect aspects of folly, absurdity, or even insanity. I have already mentioned Don

Quixote, but it is important to take into consideration at least the more prominent examples of madness in the other characters.

Sancho Panza is one such character. He is originally depicted by the narrator in Part I, chapter 7 as an “hombre de bien—si es que este título se puede dar al que es pobre—pero de muy poca sal en la mollera” (142). Following Huarte’s guidelines, Sancho would probably fall under the phlegmatic profile, because “el flemático estima más hartarse de dormir que todos los señoríos del mundo” (29) and who also generally has a bad memory (104), which would explain why Sancho rarely gets his proverbs and sayings exactly right. But this understanding of Sancho, however, collides dramatically with his actions in Part II as Governor of Barataria, where he doles out judgments that rival the wisdom of King Solomon. If the readers accept that Sancho is in fact wise at least in the area of common sense, which they must after seeing how he judges his cases, then it becomes difficult to accept Sancho’s initial decision to give up both his sustenance as laborer and his family in order to become the squire of someone whose sanity he is already questioning by the adventure with the flocks of sheep in Part I, chapter 18.

Giovanni Papini, in *Four and Twenty Minds*, offers an interesting interpretation on Sancho’s mentality:

Nor can Sancho Panza be fairly regarded as the representative of common sense and materialism. Sancho has more actual belief than Don Quixote. Don Quixote believes (or professes to believe) in the olden cavaliers; but Sancho believes in Don Quixote, and that is a much more difficult faith. Sancho finds in his increasing veneration for his master a terrestrial ideal far removed from his sure possessions. He dreams a dream; and when—in his island—his dream becomes true he reveals himself more enamored of justice than of gain. In short, the only real madman in the book is Sancho. (263)

Papini interprets Sancho to be crazy because he willingly follows around a madman and also because he does not use his position as governor for economic gain, which is what

he initially states he will do. This assessment, especially the latter part, seems to speak more about Papini than about Sancho's mental state. Nevertheless, it is true that Sancho suffers from the same delusions of grandeur that his master does, in that he allows himself to believe that he can and will ascend from his social position of laborer to that of squire and then governor. In addition, it is also one thing for an idiot to follow around a madman, but it is quite another for someone with the common sense and imagination that Sancho sometimes exhibits to readily believe the dreams of someone he is not entirely sure has his wits about him. Sancho even declares to himself, in Part II, chapter 10, "Este mi amo, por mil señales, he visto que es un loco de atar, y aun también yo no le quedo en zaga, pues soy más mentecato que él, pues le sigo y le sirvo, si es verdad el refrán que dice: 'Dime con quién andas, decirte he quién eres'" (94-95). Like two birds of the same feather, Sancho is very similar to his master in that he fluctuates between contrastive qualities, too. P. E. Russell believes that this forms part of Cervantes's technique of pairing the two main protagonists. He writes that with "the alternation of foolish credulity and astute scepticism . . . Sancho mirrors his master's alternation between insane hallucinations and 'lucid intervals'" (79). Throughout the novel, Sancho can be level-headed as well as unstable, acting at times prudently, unwisely, circumspectly, and rashly. Although this does not necessarily signify that he is thoroughly mad, it does substantiate the idea that there is at least a little bit of insanity or foolishness in everybody.

Sansón Carrasco appears in the second part of the novel, and for many critics he plays the role of the anti-Quixote because he goes out of his way to destroy the visions and chimeras of Don Quixote and in the end tricks him into returning home for a year of

solitude and confinement. Giovanni Papini, for instance, writes a rather vitriolic summary of the bachiller's role in the text:

La verdadera contrafigura de don Quijote, el anti-don Quijote por excelencia, es un personaje poco estudiado por los comentadores y que, sin embargo, tiene una parte breve pero importantísima en la obra de Cervantes: el bachiller Sansón Carrasco. Es el tipo del sabio a medias, del hombre mediocre, ni perfectamente ignorante como Sancho, ni perfectamente iluminado como don Quijote, el cual, en su pasión por la sabiduría común, quiere a toda costa rendir y desenmascarar la locura de don Quijote. Él no tiene ni la fe del carbonero ni la fe del santo: no conoce sino el buen sentido; y para reducir la feliz vehemencia de don Quijote a la melancolía desilusionada del buen sentido, recurre a todos los expedientes: se disfraza de caballero errante; vence en singular combate al heroico loco, y lo constriñe a prometerle no empuñar más ni lanza ni espada . . . Sansón Carrasco—símbolo siempre vivo de la pequeña burguesía, medio instruida, enemiga de toda audacia, es la verdadera contraposición y el verdadero asesino del alma y del cuerpo del inmortal don Quijote. Él, y no Sancho, representa la contradicción y el mentís al valeroso e infortunado buscador de aventuras; y todos los locos, todos los idealistas, todos los héroes, todos los mártires del mundo deben execrar en el nombre de Sansón Carrasco a quienes levanten las rejas de la prudencia contra los vuelos del ensueño y del genio. (*Retratos* 17-18)

Although he would appear to represent one of the rational or logical figures in the text because of his education and his outspoken desire to help Don Quixote, two of his actions in particular bespeak a certain degree of irrationality if not madness.

To begin with, the text states that he is a recently-graduated bachiller, which implies that he is intelligent. Nonetheless, he decides to take up after Don Quixote and Sancho, disguising himself on two separate occasions as a knight and challenging Don Quixote to a joust. Perhaps the first instance when Sansón is dressed up as the Knight of the Mirrors in chapter 12, could be chalked up to mere folly. He is, after all, a bit of a jokester. The narrator describes him as a “muy gran socarrón, . . . pero de muy buen entendimiento . . . de nariz chata y de boca grande, señales todas de ser de condición maliciosa y amigo de donaires y de burlas” (46). But when he is toppled by Don Quixote in chapter 15, his reaction is anything but joking or benign. Tomé Cecial, his “squire,”

even comments to the effect that they both are at least as foolish as Don Quixote, stating, “Don Quijote loco, nosotros cuerdos: él se va sano y riendo, vuesa merced queda molido y triste. Sepamos, pues, ahora, cuál es más loco: ¿el que lo es por no poder menos, o el que lo es por su voluntad?” (134). Sansón, however, clarifies the difference between his and Don Quixote’s follies. He replies, “La diferencia que hay entre esos dos locos es que el que lo es por fuerza lo será siempre, y el que lo es de grado lo dejará de ser cuando quisiere” (134). He believes his foolishness is controllable, but he does not seem to be in control of himself when he responds in his very next breath that he vows revenge and to carry out his mission of defeating Don Quixote “hasta haber molido a palos a don Quixote” (134). This no longer sounds like the actions of a level-headed, sensible individual. Either through the inability to accept defeat or due to a driving need for revenge, Sansón appears to be behaving unreasonably. It is also curious that he believes he needs to avenge himself. Given the circumstances, he created this adventure and challenged Don Quixote. Don Quixote bested him fair and square. In theory, one is not entitled to revenge unless he or she has been wronged, which furthers the argument that the bachiller is being unreasonable if not irrational. He is an otherwise sane character who, by taking up an absurd venture that is unsuccessfully carried out, becomes maddened by his failure. This turns into an unappeasable need for revenge. In the end, Sansón comes to symbolize the first of the two madnesses of which Erasmus speaks: he embodies the dishonest or revengeful insanity and he cannot rest until he has conquered the folly-driven madness that Don Quixote represents.

After Sansón Carrasco, the Duke and Duchess are two other characters in the second part who go out of their way to make sport of Don Quixote and Sancho. The

lengths they go to in order to carry out their pranks, however, reach the fuzzy border between frivolity and excessiveness or absurdity. The narrator even points out, in chapter 70, Cide Hamete's observation that “tiene para sí ser tan locos los burladores como los burlados, y que no estaban los duques dos dedos de parecer tontos, pues tanto ahínco ponían en burlarse de dos tontos” (549). Because they work so hard at having fun at Sancho and Don Quixote's expense, the Duchess and Duke do come across as unbalanced. But rather than this leveling the playing field, as with carnivalesque laughter, the humor produced at the expense of the Duchess and Duke's machinations reinforces the power hierarchy. The jokes are made at the expense of Sancho and Don Quixote and none of the antagonists are ever de-crowned, resulting in an uneven playing field and unidirectional laughter. Altisidora, the lady-in-waiting who feigns unrequited love for the knight errant, is the best representation of this humor dynamic. She symbolizes the underlying boredom-turned-injuriousness that exists at the heart of her mistress and master's existence, something which comes into evidence when Doña Rodríguez mentions to Don Quixote that the Duchess has “dos fuentes . . . en las dos piernas, por donde se desagua todo el mal humor de quien dicen los médicos que está llena” (387). This hidden illness reflects an underlying corruption. Altisidora, directly connected to the Duchess as her lady-in-waiting, forms a part of this decadence. In addition, because the readers are never shown any other side of her, Altisidora's entire personality is based on her over-exaggerated role as scorned love interest. Because her existence is fully dependent on the presence of Don Quixote, her actions are interpreted as ridiculous if not absurd. She would not exist without Don Quixote and only appears in the text in order to torment him. She is like a harpy, uncontrollable and irritating. Don Quixote at one point

comments to the Duchess, “Señora mía, sepa Vuestra Señoría que todo el mal desta doncella nace de ociosidad, cuyo remedio es la ocupación honesta y continua. Ella me ha dicho aquí que se usan randas en el infierno, y pues ella las debe de saber hacer, no las dejé de la mano; que ocupada en menear los palillos, no se menearán en su imaginación la imagen o imágenes de lo que bien quiere, y ésta es la verdad, éste mi parecer y éste es mi consejo” (552). Her lack of purpose, with the exception of baiting Don Quixote, summarizes the entire Duke and Duchess experience in the novel, because her actions reflect the emptiness, and hence the futility, of all of their lives. Without Don Quixote and Sancho, they are insipid and superfluous.

At the end of the second part, Don Antonio Moreno also sees Don Quixote and Sancho as a form of personal entertainment, but in a slightly different way than the Duke and Duchess. As the narrator explains in chapter 62, Don Antonio is a “caballero rico y discreto, y amigo de holgarse a lo honesto y afable, el cual, viendo en su casa a don Quijote, andaba buscando modos como, sin su perjuicio, sacase a plaza sus locuras. Porque no son burlas las que duelen, ni hay pasatiempos que valgan si son con daño de tercero” (493). Although it might be a stretch to state that the Duke and Duchess reveled in tormenting their guests, their idea of humor is nonetheless different from Don Antonio’s. The spectacles at the Duchess and Duke’s take place outside of civilization, for one, in a castle that encapsulates the experiences and retains the laughter to a restrictive number of individuals. With Don Antonio, however, he shares the knight errant and the squire with the city of Barcelona. When he walks with Don Quixote around town, he is encouraging the dissemination of the knight errant’s madness to the other passersby. The Castilian who stops and shouts for Don Quixote to return home does not

understand this need for madness, but he is nonetheless correct in one assertion. He says, “Tú eres loco, y si lo fueras a solas y dentro de las puertas de tu locura, fuera menos mal; pero tienes propiedad de volver locos y mentecatos a cuantos te tratan y comunican” (497). Madness and acts of follies are contagious and Don Quixote is the spark that has inspired everyone else’s joie de vivre, so to speak. This is later echoed by Don Antonio in the answer he gives to Sansón Carrasco, where he questions the benefit of erasing harmless madness from the world in order to promote dullness and mediocrity. Don Antonio helps celebrate Don Quixote’s insanity the same way he fools all of his guests with the enchanted head. He is a responsible gentleman who enjoys good entertainment and the readers note quite a bit of the folly Erasmus promoted in the lengths to which Don Antonio goes to pull pranks on his friends and guests.

With regard to harnessing the antics of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza as a form of entertainment, the Duke, Duchess, Altisidora, and Don Antonio are the main culprits. This theme of utilizing another as a source of diversion is truly brought to the foreground and developed much more in depth during Part II. In the first part, this theme also surfaces but to a much lesser degree and as a spontaneous measure rather than as a planned out activity. The most salient example in the 1605 novel takes place in chapter 51, when the goat herder and Don Quixote get into a bloody scuffle and the curate, barber, and canon are there as spectators egging them on. Although this type of humor reflects aspects of carnivalesque laughter, such as the de-crowning of Don Quixote or the mixing of blood (violence) with food (celebration), its focus is still unidirectional in that there is a distinct division between the participants and the observers. For this reason, this

type of spectacle would fall more closely under the lines of an abusive or degrading humor, rather than be representative of the folly that Erasmus commemorates.

Before fully turning our attention to Part I, there is one last character from the second part that needs to be discussed with regard to representing madness and laughter, because his introduction in the text naturally carries with it the confusion between reality and fiction. Don Álvaro Tarfe is a special character because he has been adopted by Cervantes from the apocryphal second part of *Don Quixote*. By incorporating a fictional character from a previous text into his novel, Cervantes is at the same time validating this character's existence, thereby making him more real in some ways while at the same time maintaining his fictional status because, after all, Part II is still only a work of fiction. Critics such as Vladimir Nabokov, Miguel de Unamuno, Cesáreo Bandera, Edward Friedman, and Carroll Johnson have speculated over the relationship between Cervantes's 1605 and 1615 novels, where the fact that some of the characters in the second part have read the first part signifies that the 1605 Don Quixote and Sancho have become historical figures in the 1615 text, rather than strictly fictional characters. This same ambiguity would also apply to Don Álvaro's relationship to Cervantes's text. Does he become more real than the fictional character he was in Avellaneda's version because Cervantes has incorporated him in his own Part II? The situation is even further complicated because Cervantes uses him as a source of reference, to refute the differences between the apocryphal and the "real" Don Quixote. Not only is Don Álvaro a real character from another text, but Cervantes makes him a specialist in determining the authenticity of Don Quixote, thereby privileging him with the deciding voice over whether the two knights errant are at all alike. This is even further backed up in chapter

72 by the legal affidavit that Don Álvaro agrees to sign in front of the mayor (564).

Blurring the borders between fact and fiction, or real and fake characters, Cervantes adds a tone of absurdity to his novel. The readers, stepping back from the text, are left to ponder where the limits of fiction begin and end. The true ludicrousness, which further enriches the humorous elements of the text, comes from Don Álvaro's confusion, because he himself is unsure whether to trust his senses or to trust his intuition. He states,

tengo por sin duda que los encantadores que persiguen a don Quijote el bueno han querido perseguirme a mí con don Quijote el malo. Pero no sé qué me diga; que osaré yo jurar que le dejo metido en la casa del Nuncio, en Toledo, para que le curen, y agora remanece aquí otro don Quijote, aunque bien diferente del mío . . . y vuelvo a decir y me afirmo que no he visto lo que he visto, ni ha pasado por mí lo que ha pasado. (564)

He is certain that he left Don Quixote in the mental hospital of Toledo, but he is also positive that this new Don Quixote is the real knight errant from Part I. Since logically both of these things cannot be true in his mind, he chooses the only other option that he considers to be possible, which is that of an enchanter having tricked him. This option, too, is comical because Don Álvaro supposedly stands for reason yet chooses to believe the fantastical possibility of a magical enchanter, who of course is a figure from chivalric romances. The confusion of logic, facts, fiction, and characters in this episode augments the existent comicality and reinforces the tension between madness and sanity that forms the foundation of the novel.

In Part I, the interpolated story of *El curioso impertinente* also challenges the question of sanity, but the traces of humor it reflects are more bittersweet than jovial. Anselmo, also a metacharacter because he is a character the other characters read about, is at the same time a metadramatist who invents a plot of his own by daring to test the faithfulness of his virtuous wife, Camila. His initial test, however, ends up leading him to

the borders of obsession, because he refuses to be convinced and continually concocts new and jeopardous ways to determine whether her faithfulness is perfect or flawed. Anselmo goes above and beyond reason in his quest and it is his own foolish obsession that serves as the catalyst to the downfall of their marriage and, in the end, leads to his own death. His hubristic venture serves as an example of the folly behind looking beyond the wealth one already has and thereby overreaching one's limits. As Anselmo finally realizes, when it is way to late to make amends, "yo fui el fabricador de mi deshonra" (437). Although this might appear to go against the humoristic current of the novel, it in fact fits perfectly within the realm of madness and laughter because it serves to remind the readers of the danger in obsessing about pride, honor, or other social decoys that not only prevent an individual from enjoying what good fortune they already have but become detrimental if taken too seriously.

The story of Zoraida is also one of risky ventures, depending on the reader's perspective. Here is a character who voluntarily undergoes separation from her family, her religion, her culture, and her language because she wants to be a Christian and "ver a Lela Marién," or the Virgin Mary (479). To a *cristiano viejo* of Cervantes's time, these actions no doubt were interpreted as admirable and courageous. At the same time, however, the underlying religious zeal the young girl has carries her into acting outside of the norm of reasonable behavior, especially considering the troubles that await her once she reaches Spain, where the edict banning *moriscos* is being enforced. To a non-religious reader, her actions would probably fall under the category of foolish or ludicrous. This begs the question as to whether there is anything worth going to such an extreme. A Muslim reader would probably interpret her actions to be completely

irrational when considering the manner in which she betrayed and then abandoned her father, as well as sacrificed her culture and religion. In a way, she commits a form of suicide, in that she attempts to sever herself completely from the cultural signifiers that previously defined her. This action is highlighted in chapter 37, when she reacts vehemently to being called Zoraida. She cries out, “¡No, no Zoraida: María, María! . . . Zoraida macange!” (454). She rejects her previous self by rejecting her Muslim name and asking to be called Maria. What her story reflects above all is how her actions can be deemed courageous, foolish, or suicidal depending on the perspective of the reader. The subtle humor that surrounds this story has less to do with making the reader laugh and more to do with coaxing the readers’ boundaries of interpretation.

Whether there are journeys that take place at sea or on land, *Don Quixote* is a novel that allows its characters to explore new spaces. With the exception of Barcelona (II: 61-65), the spaces in which the characters interact are all located in the outskirts of towns, in the fields and forests, or in the mountains. One of the most integral areas, where five different characters partake in irrational or mad acts, is in the Sierra Morena. This particular geographical location serves as a curious locus amoenus, one that invites unusual exploits or chance happenings, as can be seen by the narrator’s comment in chapter 23: “Así como don Quijote entró por aquellas montañas, se le alegró el corazón, pareciéndole aquellos lugares acomodados para las aventuras que buscaba” (283). This mountain range sets the stage for acts of folly. The first case of madness to take place in here occurs in chapter 23, when Don Quixote and Sancho hear the story about “un muy gentil y agraciado mancebo” (290), whom they later learn is named Cardenio. It is interesting to note how many different ways the narrator refers to him within the first few

pages of his introduction: he is “el desdichado loco” (291), “el Roto de la Mala Figura” (291), the “astroso cabellero de la Sierra” (291), and finally the label for which he is best known, “El Caballero del Bosque” (293). Although dealing with a character who by his actions has lost his mind, the narrator establishes a tone of buoyant laughter through his creatively humorous descriptions. The fact that all of these epithets refer to Cardenio’s mental state as well as to his location is also important, because they reflect just how much a part of his wild surroundings he has become due to his madness. He sleeps in the hollow of a “grueso y valiente alcornoque” (289), his clothes are torn and ragged, and he walks around talking to himself. Don Quixote and Sancho’s first glimpse of him reveals his current state:

iba saltando un hombre, de risco en risco y de mata en mata, con estraña ligereza. Figurósele que iba desnudo, la barba negra y espesa, los cabellos muchos y abultados, los pies descalzos y las piernas sin cosa alguna; los muslos cubrían unos calzones, al parecer, de terciopelo leonado, mas tan hechos pedazos, que por muchas partes se le descubrían las carnes. (287)

Physically, he has become a product of his environment. He is disorderly, uncivilized, and dangerous. The way Cervantes characterizes him, Cardenio seems to be suffering from mania, or what the 1734 *Real Academia Española* describes as an “enfermedad de la phantasía que la altera y desordena, fijandola en una especie, sin razon ni fundamento” (478).¹⁹ Foucault explains that by the seventeenth century, Western society began to categorize the different types of madness and that maniacs were classified as those who “invariably live with audacity and ‘furor’” (*History* 269). Huarte cites that mania is “una destemplanza caliente y seca del cerebro” (33) that is brought on by an over-active imagination (106). Interestingly enough, these are the same mental conditions that Don

¹⁹ Neither “mania” nor “maníaco” are defined in the Covarrubias *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*.

Quixote shares, which might help explain why *El Caballero de la Triste Figura* and *El Roto de la Mala Figura* embrace the way they do when they first meet:

En llegando el mancebo a ellos, les saludó con una voz desentonada y bronca, pero con mucha cortesía. Don Quijote le volvió las saludes con no menos comedimiento, y . . . le fue a abrazar, y le tuvo un buen espacio estrechamente entre sus brazos, como si de luengos tiempos le hubiera conocido. El otro, . . . después de haberse dejado abrazar, le apartó un poco de sí, y, puestas sus manos en los hombros de don Quijote, le estuvo mirando, como que quería ver si le conocía; no menos admirado quizá de ver la figura, talle y armas de don Quijote, que don Quijote lo estaba de verle a él. (291)

They are brothers of the same infirmity and perhaps are capable of recognizing this in one another.

Cardenio's madness is short-lived, compared to the knight errant's. In fact, as soon as Dorotea tells him that Luscinda can still be his wife, no mention of his illness nor spontaneous bursts of violence are seen again. He leaves his madness in the Sierra Morena, where he found it.

The insanity of Cardenio, aside from forming an interesting part of the storyline, is important to Don Quixote. It serves as the catalyst for the knight's three-day imitation of the madness of Amadís de Gaula, which is a voluntary penance that he offers to Dulcinea to prove his love and sincerity. Don Quixote had previously heard from the shepherd that Cardenio mentioned that he had come to the Sierra Morena "para cumplir cierta penitencia" (289), something that Cardenio further adds to at the end of chapter 27 by explaining, "Yo no quiero salud sin Luscinda, y pues ella gustó de ser ajena, siendo, o debiendo ser, mía, guste yo de ser de la desventura, pudiendo haber sido de la buena dicha" (340). His love for Luscinda and what he understands to be her disdain prevent him from any other alternative, from his point of view. He cannot take revenge against Fernando's betrayal because he believes that Luscinda said yes when she should have

said no. Trapped by his love for her and the impossibility of her reciprocation of this love, Cardenio sees no other option but the self-destructive path that has lead him to the Sierra Morena, where he will live out his miserable life until “el cielo sea servido de conducirle a su último fin” (340). This echoes the penance that Amadís undergoes for his Oriana, when he changes his name to Beltenebros and retreats to Peña Pobre. This idea immediately takes seed in Don Quixote’s already overly imaginative mind and he thereby becomes the second character to experience madness in the Sierra Morena.

Perhaps the conscious imitation of mad acts does not constitute authentic madness, but rather falls under the guise of folly. However, because Don Quixote is already deemed mad before arriving at the Sierra Morena, he would still be mad in imitating madness. He is a madman who could be judged as even madder for attempting to imitate insanity. He tells Sancho in chapter 25, “Loco soy, loco he de ser hasta tanto que tú vuelvas con la respuesta de una carta que contigo pienso enviar a mi señora Dulcinea; y si fuere tal cual a mi fe se le debe, acabarse ha mi sandez y mi penitencia; y si fuere al contrario, seré loco de veras, y, siéndolo, no sentiré nada” (304). His imitation of madness is, in other words, a meta-madness. It is quickly resolved, nonetheless, once Sancho returns with the (invented) news of Dulcinea’s reception of his letter.

The last three characters associated with madness in the Sierra Morena are not crazy in the traditional sense, but rather partake in mad acts. Dorotea, for instance, ends up in this mountain range after a succession of unfortunate and perilous events. The daughter of a rich farmer, she believes Don Fernando’s amorous promises of marriage, even though she knows they are from different classes. She gives in to his desires instead of resisting him or alerting her parents to his intrusion into her room, as she probably

could have. Dorotea is deceived and falls victim to one of the oldest tricks in the book, and this inspires her to perform a number of unconventional and very hazardous deeds as she seeks to reclaim her honor. In hearing that Fernando plans to marry a girl in another town, Dorotea explains that “en lugar de helárseme el corazón en oílla, fue tanta la cólera y rabia que se encendió en él, que faltó poco para no salirme de las calles dando voces, publicando la alevosía y traición que se me había hecho” (352). Her anger, however, turns to ingenuity and she devises the risky plan to disguise herself as a boy in order to find and confront Fernando. Not only is she escaping from her house without notifying her parents, but she is also breaking the law by dressing as the opposite sex. In Cervantes’s time period, Dorotea’s actions would have been interpreted as mad, if only for the dishonor that she is bringing upon her household. When she reaches the town where she expects to find him, not only has Fernando disappeared but Dorotea learns that the wedding never went through as planned. She decides to flee into the woods, however, because she hears that her parents are looking for her and are offering a reward for her discovery. The servant that had helped her up to this point now attempts to take advantage of this situation and rape her. Here Dorotea does to the servant what she could not, or did not want to, do to Fernando: she defends herself. She relates, “con mis pocas fuerzas, y con poco trabajo, di con él por un derrumbadero, donde le dejé, ni sé si muerto o vivo” (355). Now, for all she knows, Dorotea could have killed a man. Regardless of the fact that the servant deserved this fate, or that her actions were performed in self-defense, the act of taking someone’s life generally carries with it an alteration in perception or understanding. It falls outside of what is normally considered to be rational behavior or at least impacts in some way those involved in the act. Dorotea, however,

barely mentions it and this lack of awareness or recognition on her part makes the act seem frivolous. After the incident with her servant, rather than continue looking for Fernando, she turns to hiding from her parents in the mountains and spends several months working for a farmer (355). Dorotea's initial surrender to Fernando is what has inspired this course of irrational events, but now ironically it appears that she is more concerned with hiding than with finding and making amends with Fernando. Dorotea's decisions so far have been out of the ordinary and although they do not signify that she is mentally unstable, she is nevertheless choosing more foolish rather than prudent actions. As another possible interpretation, because she does not appear to be in a hurry, the Sierra Morena could be interpreted as her way out of the conflict between dishonoring her parents and marrying someone whom she has to force into carrying out his promise. The mountains, therefore, serve as both a mental and physical escape from her real life.

With the introduction of Cardenio into her life, Dorotea agrees to go back to civilization and look for Fernando with his help. But when the barber and curate divulge their plot to trick Don Quixote into returning home with them, Dorotea offers to take the curate's place as the Princess Micomicona, which would appear to forestall once again her search for Fernando. However, Yvonne Jehenson, in "The Dorotea-Fernando/Luscinda-Cardenio Episode in *Don Quijote*," makes the case that in becoming Princess Micomicona, Dorotea is only partially play-acting, because she is at the same time soliciting the help of Don Quixote to aide her in her plea to Fernando. Jehenson states, "Don Fernando has stolen her kingdom and the reader is cognizant of the double meaning as Queen Micomicona asks Don Quijote for 'venganza de un traidor que, contra todo derecho divino y humano, me tiene usurpado mi reino' (29:365)" (212). So what

seems to be folly—Dorotea’s willing and exuberant performance as a princess from a fairytale-like kingdom—could actually be a true entreaty for help, which very much parallels the damsel-in-distress motif. After the group succeeds in getting Don Quixote off the mountain and back to the inn, they run into Fernando, who has captured Luscinda. Following a dramatic encounter, amends are made and each character ends up with their corresponding partner. Although Don Quixote does not play an integral part in this honorable conclusion, he thinks he has because immediately beforehand, while sleepwalking, he believes he has destroyed the giant that held Princess Micomicona’s kingdom captive. Dorotea’s final words to Don Quixote on the subject are, “Señor mío, vuestra bondad vuelva la honra al padre que me engendró, y téngale por hombre advertido y prudente, pues con su ciencia halló camino tan fácil y tan verdadero para remediar mi desgracia, que yo creo que si por vos, señor, no fuera jamás acertara a tener la ventura que tengo” (451). Jehenson explains, “The ultimate incorporation and assimilation of the ludic and the serious is to be found in Dorotea’s public avowal to Don Quijote that by his participation in her make-believe world he has actually rectified the real world” (212). In the end, however, it is not because Don Quixote takes up the Princess Micomicona/Dorotea’s plea that she is rescued, but rather Dorotea’s willingness to participate in the curate and barber’s performance. It is this undertaking that gets her out of the Sierra Morena and back to the inn, where she accidentally runs into Fernando. Dorotea’s choice of actions, beginning with the acceptance of Don Fernando’s promise and ending with their confrontation at the inn, can be summarized as foolish, insanely dangerous, and even audacious for a young girl of her time period. This madness is nevertheless what enables her to attain her goal of reclaiming Fernando. Had she abided

by the rules set out for her by society, she may never have been able to get her husband or her honor back. Her choice of madness, or rather her preference for risk-taking ventures and for disobeying social laws, is what saves both her and her lifestyle.

The last two characters tied into the madness of the Sierra Morena are the two friends of Don Quixote, the barber and the curate. They are individuals who are both crafty and witty, and they often add levity to the plot. Throughout the novel, the two of them continually claim that their intent is to help Don Quixote be cured of his madness, particularly by bringing him home where they hope bed rest will bring him round. This wish to help him, however, is constantly eclipsed by their desire to have a good time, which they often do at Don Quixote's expense. In chapter 6, for example, they take it upon themselves to purge their friend's library of what they deem to be the root of his madness. Once they begin to peruse Don Quixote's collection, they become caught up in the stories themselves and end up saving quite a few for their own entertainment. Immediately after this scrutiny, they are called into Don Quixote's bedroom by his shouting. Don Quixote is talking in his sleep, using the archaic speech from books of chivalry as he believes he is Reinaldos de Montalbán. The curate answers him in kind, asking him if he isn't "mal ferido" (140). This technique of imitating Don Quixote is something the barber and curate take turns doing throughout the novel, leading the readers to question whether they are just enjoying making fun of their friend. The narrator explains a little later on that the fifteen days that Don Quixote remained resting at home, his two friends visited frequently and discussed with him the importance of knights errant, with Don Quixote emphasizing the world's need for him to resuscitate knight errantry. "El cura algunas veces le contradecía, y otras concedía, porque si no

guardaba este artificio no había poder averiguarle con él” (142). Where the readers would understand that the curate and barber were only instigating Don Quixote into acting out his madness, by imitating chivalric language or by testing his beliefs on the subject of knight errantry, the two friends claim to act this way in order to be able to gauge whether their friend is mad or not. The curate especially seems to be under the impression that by imitating the actions and speech of books of chivalry, they will be able to better control their friend. Their true intentions for Don Quixote, whether they want to cure him or enjoy his madness, come into question several more times throughout the novel. In the Sierra Morena, for example, the pair go to elaborate lengths to fool Don Quixote into coming home. At the end of chapter 26, after accidentally running into Sancho and hearing about Don Quixote’s penance in the mountains, the curate comes up with a plan.

The narrator explains:

El se vestiría en hábito de doncella andante, y que él procurase ponerse lo mejor que pudiese como escudero, y que así irían adonde don Quijote estaba, fingiendo ser ella una doncella afligida y menesterosa, y le pediría un don . . . [para que] se viniese con ella donde ella le llevase, a desfacelle un agravio que un mal caballero le tenía fecho, y que le suplicaba asimesmo que no la mandase quitar su antifaz, ni la demandase cosa de su facienda, fasta que la hubiese hecho derecho de aquel mal caballero . . . y que desta manera le sacarían [a don Quijote] de allí, y le llevarían a su lugar, donde procurarían ver si tenía algún remedio su estraña locura. (325)

They then proceed to borrow all types of clothing and adornment from the innkeeper and his wife to complete their disguise. This plan is so farfetched, however, that it appears to be as crazy as the one Don Quixote is currently carrying out in the form of penance. In executing their scheme, they go to such great lengths to smooth out any discrepancies that they become just as laughable as their knight errant, much to the amusement of the readers. It is here in the Sierra Morena more than anywhere else in the novel that the

curate and barber show their true colors as jesters, acting out their roles as if in a play. While they add amusing commentary to the text and frequently provoke both Don Quixote and Sancho into reacting outlandishly for their comic benefit, Cervantes has cast the curate and the barber in roles that, although initially seeking to uphold the authority of logic, actually succumb to what Erasmus refers to as the madness of Reason. By going out of their way to reign in Don Quixote's insanity, they go overboard in their efforts and thereby participate in their own dance of madness, albeit slightly different from their friend's.

Within the textual boundaries of *Don Quixote*, Cervantes's vision of the universality of madness is played out through a variety of actions and characters. The comicality that exists in the novel helps to carry the contagiousness of madness out of the text to where the readers can both experience and interpret it. Manuel Duran, in "Erasmo y Cervantes," believes that "el *Quijote*, entre otras varias interpretaciones, es el elogio no de la locura, sino de un loco, que, irónica y paradójicamente, ayuda, con su locura, a definir y corregir la visión en apariencia normal de los que lo rodean" (970). It is Don Quixote who, in acting out his visions, inspires others to partake in additional acts of madness by following their own dreams (Sancho), by attempting to harness his (the Duke and Duchess), or by scheming to bring him back to their version of reality (Sansón Carrasco). All of these feats bespeak some degree of folly or foolishness. Cervantes's blurring of the traditional division between madness and sanity, via the various characters he employs to represent one or the other, proves the humorous contention behind Erasmus's *The Praise of Folly*: one man's wisdom is another man's idiocy and that the

universal truth regarding humanity inextricably implies madness, or rather an ingenious interpretation of life.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis is to look at the connection between comicality and madness as represented in *Don Quixote*, an issue I believe to be important for several reasons. Primarily, in analyzing this connection, it is possible to better define where *Don Quixote* fits in the history of comic literature. It continues the Menippean tradition, for example, which stems from the Classic Age. This novel allows madness to take center stage and at the same time incorporates everyone into its vision of madness, something that differentiates it from the early modern and modern current of isolating the fool or marginalizing basic human characteristics by designating them as undesirable or delinquent. The awareness of the scope of madness found in this novel affects the overall understanding of the work itself, in that madness is an integral aspect of what it is to be human. This philosophy is embedded in the Menippean tradition as well as in Humanism and this is also why the carnivalesque mechanism of multi-directional laughter is so available in Cervantes's text.

Regarding the organization of my thesis, I hope that the reader will have found method in my madness. In the initial chapter, "Reading *Don Quixote* in the Menippean Tradition," I began with an analysis of Menippean satire and how and where this surfaces in Cervantes's masterpiece. It was the chapter that dealt most explicitly with Carnival, and I wanted to establish the framework for this dissertation regarding the type of comic vision that embodies *Don Quixote*. The main purpose of Menippean satire is to question social ideas and philosophies, something done through laughter, and because the majority

of this questioning takes place in this novel through dialogues and other types of journeys, this led me into the second chapter.

Titled “Disturbing Devices: Journey and Humor in *Don Quixote*,” in this chapter I looked at the similarities between the mechanisms of laughter and journey. Laughter occurs through a psychological movement, where a contrast or break in the linearity of a previous idea provokes a humorous interpretation on the part of the observer. Likewise, things such as dialogues, physical and psychological maturation, and geographical adventures require movement of some kind. In Cervantes’s novel, the journeying that takes place often provokes laughter, which is likewise a journey in interpretation.

Because journeys tend to imply that there is a destination to be reached, I thought it logical to follow chapter 2 with the analysis of the differences, and therefore the dissimilar outcomes, between Cervantes’s and Avellaneda’s novels. In chapter 3, “Humor in Cervantes and Avellaneda: Un sendero que se bifurca,” the different effects of uni- and multi-directional laughter are examined. In analyzing the contrast between Cervantes’s and Avellaneda’s texts, I emphasized the validity of each work but that they produce very different products in terms of humor and its place in a society. Above all, in this section I stressed the importance of reading Avellaneda. By understanding the direction the apocryphal text took, the readers can return to Cervantes’s novel with a better sense of its unique vision and therefore can more fully appreciate the complex comicality found in his *Don Quixote*.

Just as a particular comic vision will lead a text to a distinct outcome or interpretation, so also different types of madness allow for characters to display the ways in which they view their own textual reality. In chapter 4, or “Madness and Laughter:

Ingenious Interpretation,” I looked at the ethical and historical dimensions of laughter especially with regard to madness from the vantage point of Humanism. I posited that madness, like laughter is a fundamental human experience. They are also destabilizing mechanisms in several different ways. By focusing on the subversiveness of madness and its relationship to humor, I return to my initial chapter on Menippean satire. And so, much in the way that Carnival is represented by recurring actions of death and rebirth or a pattern coming full circle, I wanted the direction of my thesis to imitate the cyclical nature of Carnival.

With respect to where this thesis fits within the realm of Golden Age studies, I believe it helps to reevaluate the humoristic value both of *Don Quixote* and the singularity of Cervantes’s comic vision. Drawing on the viewpoints of James Iffland, E. T. Aylward, and a number of critics who have focused on comicality and Cervantes, I have sought to further delineate several of the more important humorous components of *Don Quixote*, emphasizing its uniqueness not only within Golden Age literature but also within the tradition of comic literature throughout the ages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anthony, Michael. *Towns and Villages in Trinidad and Tobago*. Port of Spain: Circle Press, 1988.
- Aylward, E. T. *Towards a Revaluation of Avellaneda's False Quixote*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1989.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 2004.
- . *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. R. W. Rotsel. New York: Ardis, 1973.
- . *Rabelais and his World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.
- Bandera, Cesáreo. *Mimesis conflictiva: ficción literaria y violencia en Cervantes y Calderón*. Madrid: Gredos, 1975.
- Barbagallo, Antonio. "Sancho no es, se hace." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 15.1 (1995): 46-59.
- Blank, Captain Ripp. "Barataria the Spanish Fraze." E-mail to Rachel Bauer. 8 Feb. 2000.
- Brantley, Franklin O. "Sancho's Ascent into the Spheres." *Hispania* 53.1 (1970): 37-45.
- Bulgakov, Mikhail. *The Master and Margarita*. Trans. Diana Burgin and Katherine Tiernan O'Connor. New York: Vintage International, 1995.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha I*. Ed. John Jay Allen. Madrid: Cátedra, 1990.
- . *Don Quijote de la Mancha II*. Ed. John Jay Allen. Madrid: Cátedra, 1994.
- . *Don Quixote*. Trans. Walter Starkie. New York: Penguin, 2001.
- . *La Galatea*. Ed. Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1987.
- . *El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Madrid: Juan de la Cuesta, 1605.
Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes. 5 Feb. 2007
<<http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?portal=0&Ref=4944>>.

- Close, A. J. *Cervantes and the Comic Mind of His Age*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.
- . “Cervantes's Aesthetics of Comic Fiction and His Concept of ‘La verdad de la historia.’” *Modern Language Review* 89.1 (1994): 88-106.
- Covarrubias Horozco, Sebastián de. *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*. Madrid: Luís Sanchez, 1611.
- Duffield, Alexander James. *Don Quixote, His Critics and Commentators*. London: C. K. Paul, 1881.
- Durán, Manuel. “Erasmo y Cervantes: Fervor, ironía, ambigüedad.” *Cervantes: su obra y su mundo*. Ed. Manuel Criado de Val. Madrid: EDI-6, 1981. 969-73.
- . “El Quijote a través del prisma de Mikhail Bakhtine: carnaval, disfraces, escatología y locura.” *Cervantes and the Renaissance*. Ed. Michael D. McGaha. Easton, PA: Juan de la Cuesta, 1980. 71-86.
- El Saffar, Ruth. “Cervantes and the Imagination.” *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 6.1 (1986): 81-90.
- Emrit, Ronald. *Trinidad and Tobago (From the 20th Century Onward)*. 20 Dec. 2006 <<http://www.bestoftrinidad.com/communities/barataria.html>>.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Praise of Folly*. Trans. John Wilson. Project Gutenberg, 2005. <<http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/9371>>.
- Fajardo, Salvador J. “Closure in *Don Quixote I*: A Reader's Canon's.” *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 14.1 (1994): 41-60.
- Fernández de Avellaneda, Alonso. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*. Barcelona: Poliedro, 2005.
- . *Nouvelles avanturnes de l'admirable Don Quichotte de la Manche*. Trans. Alain René Le Sage. Paris: Par la Compagnie des Libraires, 1716.
- Flores, Robert M. “El caso del epígrafe desaparecido: capítulo 43 de la edición príncipe de la primera parte del *Quijote*», en *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 28.2 (1979): 352-60.
- . *The Compositors of the First and Second Madrid Editions of Don Quixote*, Part 1. London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1975.

Foucault, Michel. *History of Madness*. Trans. Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalfa. New York: Routledge, 2006.

---. *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage, 1994.

Friedman, Edward. *Cervantes in the Middle: Realism and Reality in the Spanish Novel from Lazarillo de Tormes to Niebla*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 2006.

---. “Novel Groupings: The Order of Things.” *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 37.4 (1983): 237-61.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1973.

Gaffney, James. “Barataria.” *Trails.com*. http://www.trails.com/tcatalog_trail.asp?trailid=XGP112-SO02.

Gilman, Stephen. *Cervantes y Avellaneda: estudio de una imitación*. Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1951.

---. *The Novel According to Cervantes*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.

Gorfkle, Laura. *Discovering the Comic in Don Quixote*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1993.

Haley, George. “The Narrator in *Don Quijote*: Maese Pedro's Puppet Show.” *MLN* 80 (1965): 145-65.

Hanson, Kristin, and Paul Kiparsky. “The Nature of Verse and its Consequences for the Mixed Form.” *Prosimetrum: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Narrative in Prose and Verse*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997. 17-44.

Harris, Joseph, and Karl Reichl, eds. “Introduction.” *Prosimetrum: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Narrative in Prose and Verse*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997. 1-16.

Heiple, Daniel. “El licenciado Vidriera y el humor tradicional del loco.” *Hispania* 66.1 (1983): 17-20.

---. “Renaissance Medical Psychology in *Don Quijote*.” *Ideologies and Literatures* 2.9 (1979): 65-72.

Huarte de San Juan, Juan. *Examen de ingenios para las ciencias*. Electroneurobiología 3:2 (1996). 9 Jan. 2007. <http://electroneubio.secyt.gov.ar/Juan_Huarte_de_San_Juan_Examen_de_ingenios.htm>.

Hutchinson, Steven. *Cervantine Journeys*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1992.

- Iffland, James. *De fiestas y aguafiestas: Risa, locura e ideología en Cervantes y Avellaneda*. Madrid: Iberoamérica, 1999.
- Jehenson, Myriam Yvonne. "The Dorotea-Fernando/Luscinda-Cardenio Episode in *Don Quijote*: A Postmodernist Play." *MLN* 107.2 (1992): 205-19.
- . "The Pastoral Episode in Cervantes' *Don Quijote*: Marcela Once Again." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 10.2 (1990): 15-35.
- Johnson, Carroll. *Madness and Lust: A Psychoanalytical Approach to Don Quixote*. Berkeley: U of CP, 1983.
- Jones, Joseph R. "The Baratarian Archipelago: Cheap Isle, Pourboire Isle, Chicanery Isle, Joker's Isle." *Ingeniosa invención: Essays on Golden Age Literature for Geoffrey L. Stagg in Honor of His Eighty-fifth Birthday*. Ed. Ellen M. Anderson and Amy R. Williamson. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1999. 137-47.
- Kirk, Eugene P. *Menippean Satire: An Annotated Catalogue of Texts and Criticism*. New York: Garland P, 1980.
- Lathrop, Tom. "El misterio del epígrafe que falta en el *Quijote* (Capítulo 43, parte I)." *IV Congreso Internacional de la Asociación de Cervantistas*, Lepanto, Greece, October 1-8, 2000. 114-20.
- Lucas de Grummond, Jane. *The Baratarians and the Battle of New Orleans*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1961.
- Lucian of Samosata. "Dialogues between Charon and Menippus and Hermes and Menippus." Eds. Mark P. O. Morford and Robert J. Lenardon. *Classical Mythology*. 7th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2003. <www.us.oup.com/us/companion.websites/0195153448/studentresources/archives/lucian_menippus/?view=usa>.
- Maldonado Palmero, Gabriel. *Quién es quién en el Quijote*. Madrid: Acento, 2004.
- Martín Jiménez, Alfonso. *Cervantes y Pasamonte: La réplica cervantina al Quijote de Avellaneda*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2005.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. "Un aspecto en la elaboración del *Quijote*." *De Cervantes y Lope de Vega*. Madrid: 1964.
- Molho, Mauricio. *Cervantes: Raíces folklóricas*. Madrid: Gredos, 1976.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. *Lectures on Don Quixote*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983.

Nelson, Ardis L. *Cabrera Infante in the Menippean Tradition*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1983.

Papini, Giovanni. *Four and Twenty Minds*. Trans. Ernest Hatch Wilkins. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1922.

---. *Retratos*. Barcelona: Luis de Caralt, 1958.

Parr, James. *Don Quixote: An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1988.

Pascal, Blaise. *Pensées*. Trans. W. F. Trotter. Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 2002. <<http://www.ccel.org/cCEL/pascal/pensees.html>>.

Payne, F. Anne. *Chaucer and Menippean Satire*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1981.

Quevedo, Francisco de. *Sueños y discursos de verdades descubridoras de abusos, vicios y engaños en todos los oficios y estados del mundo*. Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2005.

Rabelais, Françoise. *Gargantua y Pantagruel*. Trans. J. M. Cohen. New York: Penguin, 1955.

Riley, E. C. *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1992.

Rushdie, Salman. *The Satanic Verses*. New York: Picador, 1988.

Russell, P. E. "The Madness of Don Quixote." *Cervantes*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985. 73-81.

Saxon, Lyle. *Lafitte, the Pirate*. New York: Century, 1930.

Scott, W. Blanchard. *Scholars' Bedlam: Menippean Satire in the Renaissance*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 1995.

Shah, Idries. *The Subtleties of the Inimitable Mulla Nasrudin*. 1st ed. New York: Dutton, 1973.

Silverman, Joseph H. "El Gracioso de Juan Ruiz de Alarcón y el Concepto de la Figura Del Donaire Tradicional." *Hispania* 35.1 (1952): 64-69.

Swanson, Betsy. *Terre Haute de Barataria*. Harahan, LA: Jefferson Parish Historical Commission, 1991.

Torrente Ballester, Gonzalo. *El Quijote como juego*. Madrid: Ediciones Guadarrama, 1975.

- Trueblood, Alan S. *Letter and Spirit in Hispanic Writers*. London: Tamesis, 1986.
- Unamuno, Miguel de. "The Essence of Quixotism." *Our Lord Don Quixote: The Life of Don Quixote and Sancho, with Related Essays*. Trans. Anthony Kerrigan. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1967. 356-60.
- Van Doren, Mark. *Don Quixote's Profession*. New York: Columbia UP, 1958.
- Villalón, Cristóbal de. *El crotalón*. Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 1999.
- Walter, James F. "A Psychronology of Lust in the Menippean Tradition: *Giles Goat-Boy*." *Twentieth Century Literature* 21.4 (1975): 394-410.
- Ziolkowski, Jan. "The Prosimetrum in the Classical Tradition." *Prosimetrum: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Narrative in Prose and Verse*. Ed. Joseph Harris and Karl Reichl. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997. 45-66.