

INTRODUCTION

*The Unknown History of the Conception
 of the Don Quijote*

Folly, where the values of another age, another art, another morality are put into question, and also, where all the forms, even the most distant, of the human imagination, are mixed up, troubled, and strangely compromised by one another in a common chimera.¹

Writing at the perigee of what could be called the modern era (mid-fifteenth century–mid-twentieth century), Michel Foucault historicized madness in civilization as a “nouvelle incarnation du mal” that came to replace the socio-cultural role of leprosy – a periphery that denotes a center – between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries as leprosy was eradicated from Europe.² A “nouvelle incarnation de l’homme,” Cervantes’ *DQ* situated the first modern novelistic character at that “obscure limit, indeterminate but constant, that passes between those who are fools and those who are not.”³ Through the use of an original protagonist, in the *DQ* Cervantes placed the periphery at the center of the modern novelistic plot. As Lukàcs observed, the modern European novel as a literary genre is generated by a protagonist who occupies a fundamental

¹ “Folie, où sont mises en question les valeurs d’un autre âge, d’un autre art, d’une autre morale, mais où se reflètent aussi, brouillées et troublées, étrangement compromises les unes par les autres dans une chimère commune, toutes les formes, même les plus distantes, de l’imagination humaine,” (M. Foucault, *Histoire de la folie. L’âge classique*, Paris: Gallimard, 1972, 57).

² “c’est le sens de cette exclusion, l’importance dans le groupe social de cette figure insistante et redoutable qu’on n’écarte pas sans avoir tracé autour d’elle un cercle sacré” (M. Foucault, *Histoire de la folie à l’âge classique*, Paris: Gallimard, 1972, 18–66, esp. 18–21). Foucault’s analysis is more complicated and includes the figures of venereal disease and death. When he resituates the errant fool of the *Narrenschiiff* from the periphery of the social milieu to its center, the interior functions as another periphery, an exiled core, the interiorization of death: “Dans la littérature savante également, la Folie est au travail, au cœur même de la raison et de la vérité” (*ibid.*, 29).

³ “limite obscure, indéfinie, mais constante qui passe entre les fous et ceux qui ne le sont pas” (M. Foucault, *Folie, langage, littérature*, eds. H.-P. Fruchaud, D. Lorenzini, and J. Revel, Paris: J. Vrin, 2019, 89). On madness in the *DQ*: (C.B. Johnson, *Madness and Lust: A Psychoanalytic Approach to DQ*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983). For Cervantes’ intersection with early modern humoral theory via Huarte de San Juan’s *Examen de ingenios*: (O. Green, “El ingenioso hidalgo,” *Hispanic Review*, 1957, vol. XXV, 171–193).

divide between interior and exterior. For Cervantes, this was not a simple movement of inversion. In the *DQ* the boundary between folly and reason, drawn by the limits of language itself, destabilizes the gesture of putting the outside in or turning the inside out.⁴ There is little question that this unsettling revolves around the mad knight errant, dQ. But this study shifts the focus away from the Knight of the Lions to his maker. Not to Cide Hamete Benengeli, nor to the archivists of La Mancha, not even to the translator or the unwieldy narrator. This study is interested in AQ, a modern author, the author of dQ. He is a special kind of maker caught up in a special kind of making: poesis. This study of poetic practice and the conception of the first modern European novel is interested in AQ, the poet, and in the poet who made him, Miguel de Cervantes.

Hero or fool? is the question that society asks of the poet, and finally the question that the poet must ask of themselves.⁵ At once poet and pseudonym (AQ and dQ), Cervantes' most infamous literary character takes up the limits of language, again and again, as the site of articulation by way of which the intimate lyric interior attempts to become legible within the socialized history of a human life.⁶ While the modern European novel has habitually been studied and theorized as a version of the classical literary genre of epic poetry, this study seeks to demonstrate that the modern European novel—what makes it possible and what makes possible its dialectic with madness—is actually a form of lyric poetry which problematizes the role of the human interior within the social whole or “common chimera.”⁷

⁴ For the continuation of this theme in contemporary thought: (eds. O. Custer, P. Deutscher, and S. Haddad, *Foucault/Derrida Fifty Years Later*, New York: New Directions, 2016). As Lynne Huffer observes in the same volume, “It would be more appropriate, Foucault writes, to approach the [*History of Madness*] as a study of ‘the structure of experience’: not a linguistic structure, but a *historical* one ‘whose seat is,’ paradoxically, at that structure’s ‘margins [*confins*]’ (HMP xxxii/192). This ‘experience,’ Foucault suggests, does not reside *outside* of history (it ‘is,’ after all, ‘history through and through’), but on the very border that tells us what history is, the very border that constitutes the experience of madness as limit, exclusion, or confinement (as the original French ‘*confins*’ suggests). . . . And that ‘structure of experience’ is historical in a specifically Foucauldian, archival sense: not as a historical totality, but as a ‘precarious’ (AK 17/29) seat on the border of time that Foucault calls ‘this blank space from which I speak’ (AK 17/29)” (“Looking Back at *History of Madness*,” in eds. O. Custer, P. Deutscher, and S. Haddad, *Foucault/Derrida*, 25–27).

⁵ (J. Allen, *DQ, Hero or Fool?*, University of Florida Press, 1969, vol. I–II).

⁶ As Foucault observed, “Cervantès, c’est la littérature même dans la littérature” (Foucault, *Folie, langage*, 91). Mary Gaylord on the *Galatea* has written, “Cervantes here makes the central issue of pastoral art not sentiment but the way that sentiment can be expressed” (M. Gaylord, “The Language of Limits and the Limits of Language: The Crisis of Poetry in *La Galatea*,” *MLN.*, n.2, 1982, vol. XCVII, 254–271).

⁷ In *Theory of the Novel*, Lukács comes very close to the lyric as modern novelistic fiction, especially when his analysis is focused on the *DQ*, but he consistently misidentifies this as an epic impulse: “The epic and the novel, these two major forms of great epic literature, differ from one another not by their authors’ fundamental intentions but by the given historico-philosophical realities with which the

The Unknown History of the Conception of the DQ

3

At the same time that madness took up an exiled center within the domains of reason and truth in European thought, the *figura of the poet* went underground.⁸ Once central to the structure of court patronage, during the final decades of the sixteenth century the practice of lyric poetry began to disappear from spheres of socio-political power.⁹ Coincident with the rise of proto-capitalism, religious extremism, urban economic sprawl, and the growing efficacy of the Cartesian *cogito*, over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the gradual devaluation of the lyric human interior, as an exiled space of unreason, recast the *figura of the poet* as madman, a figure whose very *raison d'être* was viewed as folly.¹⁰ At the

authors were confronted. The novel is the epic of an age in which the extensive totality of life is no longer directly given, in which the immanence of meaning in life has become a problem, yet which still thinks in terms of totality" (G. Lukács, *Theory of the Novel: A historico-philosophical essay on the forms of great epic literature*, trans. Bostock, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987, 54–56). While Bakhtin severed poetry from the heteroglossia of the novel, lyric practice in sixteenth-century Spain was utterly heteroglot, aptly though unwittingly described in the following comment: "The word, breaking through to its own meaning and its own expression across an environment full of alien words and variously evaluating accents, harmonizing with some of the elements in this environment and striking a dissonance with others, is able, in this dialogized process, to shape its own stylistic profile. Such is the *image in artistic prose* and the image of *novelistic prose* in particular" (M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, M. Holquist and C. Emerson (trans. and eds.), University of Texas Press, 1981, 277–278, emphasis in original). I treat lyric as a force of heterogeneity within the hegemonic language of empire (G. Ponce-Hegenauer, "Lyric and Empire," *MLN*, 136.2, 2001, 423–440). For poesis and the novel in Cervantes: (A. Cascardi, "Orphic Fictions': Poesia and Poesis in Cervantes," in eds. A. Cascardi and L. Middlebrook, *Poesis and Modernity in the Old and New Worlds*, Vanderbilt University Press, 2012, 19–42; 20); (A. Cascardi, *The Subject of Modernity*, Cambridge University Press, 1992, 72–124).

⁸ "La dénonciation de la folie devient la forme générale de la critique . . . Il n'est plus simplement, dans les marges, la silhouette ridicule et familière: il prend place au centre du théâtre, comme le détenteur de la vérité . . . Dans la littérature savante également, la Folie est au travail, au coeur même de la raison et de la vérité" (Foucault, *Histoire de la folie*, 29).

"Ainsi ont-ils tous les deux, au bord extérieur de notre culture et au plus proche de ses partages essentiels, cette situation «à la limite» – posture marginale et silhouette profondément archaïque–où leurs paroles trouvent sans cesse leur pouvoir d'étrangeté et la ressource de leur contestation" (M. Foucault, *Les mots et les choses. Une archéologie des sciences humaines*, Paris: Gallimard, 1966, 63–64).

⁹ Many nobles were patrons and poets. It is not my intention to uphold the aristocracy as an ideal alternative to proto-capitalism and imperial expansion. The distinction is that under the aristocratic order the poet was legible within cultural discourse as a reasonable actor.

¹⁰ The backlash occurs in the nineteenth century with Romanticism, which, in its resistance, reified the *figura of the poet* as madman. "It could be said that the tears of sympathy shed by birds, brooks, and flowers in Heinrich Heine's garden as the young poet sat reading *Don Quixote* aloud symbolize a new epoch for Cervantes' masterpiece, an epoch in which the reader's reaction to the work has been conditioned by his own awareness that he, just like the demented knight-errant, is a homeless wanderer, lost somewhere between the world as he would like it to be and the world as he knows it to be" (A. Forcione, *Cervantes, Aristotle, and the Persiles*, Princeton University Press, 1970, 7). As shall be seen, the tension between lyric sempiternity and narrative emplotment will be conversant with the Romantic view of the *DQ* which Close registers within the "Perspectivist movement" (A. Close, *The Romantic 'DQ': A Critical History of the Romantic Tradition in 'Quijote' Criticism*, Cambridge University Press, 2010, 218–220). For *DQ* and the modern subject: (Cascardi, *Subject of Modernity*, 72–124).

same time, lyric life did not disappear from the spheres of human experience and its cultures. In literature the lyric entered the space of novelistic fiction in the form of an indeterminate human interior whose internal-external dynamism generated novel plots. While not all novelistic protagonists are as explicitly mad as in the Cervantine model, this creative tension between the poetic and the prosaic, between unreason and reason, lies at the heart of the novel as genre. Interior and exterior, it is also a dialectic between lyric temporality (sempiternity) and the historical time of narrative. This slow transition from lyric to novel began midway through the sixteenth century with the pastoral prosimetric works of Sannazaro, Montemayor, Gálvez de Montalvo, and Cervantes; in these, the *figura of the poet* was progressively transformed into the modern character of the novel.¹¹

In his 1915 *Theory of the Novel*, Gyorgy Lukács inferred this lyric struggle in modern novelistic fiction as a rift between the interior and the exterior, which he called *transcendental homelessness*, particularly in his analysis of the *DQ*. But he consistently misidentified lyric struggle as epic impulse.¹² In epic the hero's many conflicts never threaten his own status as an exemplar within his own particular social order. When Odysseus descends to Hades, it is not the inner hell of Robert Lowell, but a collectively recognized underworld.¹³ When dQ enters the Cave of Montesinos, he goes alone as a sole witness to "the other side."¹⁴ In epic, the hero may be a negative or positive exemplar, but he is never peripheral to that "obscure limit". In lyric, the "I" of the speaker is only ever-at-stake. Beginning in Queen Mab's dream world of vision and the ineffability of sempiternal interior experience, the lyric of the sixteenth century begins on the other

¹¹ *L'Arcadia* (1504); *La Diana* (1559); *El pastor de Filida* (1582); *La Galatea* (1585), respectively. See also Lope de Vega's *Arcadia* (1598).

¹² "Since Lukács defines the novel as the outward reflection of a cultural totality whose substance has been lost but whose forms have remained more or less intact, he sees the problem posed by disenchantment as the reintegration of the internal and external aspects of experience, of substance and form, of *Wesen* and *Leben*" (Cascardi, *Subject of Modernity*, 73–74). For lyric and novel in eighteenth-century English prose: (G. Starr, *Lyric Generations: Poetry and the Novel in the Long Eighteenth-Century*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004, 8).

¹³ "A car radio bleats, / 'Love, O careless Love . . . ' I hear / my ill-spirit sob in each blood cell, / as if my hand were at its throat . . . / I myself am hell; nobody's here— . . ." (R. Lowell, "Skunk Hour", in *New Selected Poems*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2017, 82–83). Lowell, of course, is drawing on Milton's Satan, "Which way I fly is Hell; myself am Hell" (*Paradise Lost*, Book IV, line 75).

¹⁴ As a lyric in prose, Joyce's *Ulysses* repeatedly falls out of language. For the "other side": (G. Ponce-Hegenauer, "La muerte de Aldonza Lorenzo," *Anuario de Estudios Cervantinos: La muerte en Cervantes*, XVII, (2021), 83–96).

The Unknown History of the Conception of the DQ 5

side of language (which is always historical) with the ineffable.¹⁵ It is significant that Foucault also situated the rift between image and text at this early modern juncture.¹⁶ From Cervantes' AQ to Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* to Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, these eponymously titled exemplars of modern novelistic fiction all tell the story of the lyric interior as an order other than the one it is meant to engage.¹⁷ Formally speaking, the modern novel as a literary genre concerns itself with that "obscure, indeterminate, and constant limit" between individual interiority and shared communal history, which Leo Spitzer called "linguistic perspectivism," and which is the content and the action of lyric poetry.¹⁸

That the first modern novel, the *DQ*, was born of sixteenth-century poetry has been known for some time. As early as 1924, Ramón Menéndez Pidal had intervened in discussions initiated by Adolfo Castro on the *Entremés de los romances*, as a source text for the premises of the *DQ*.¹⁹ The anonymous interlude, which pertains largely to chapters 4, 5, and 7 of

¹⁵ Recently, the lyric as genre has come in for considerable debate in English literary criticism. The debate returns to contention over generic form as either historical or transhistorical. While the answer is likely both, both sides of the current polemic are inflected by nineteenth-century understandings of poetry. For an intervention into the debate: (S. Burt, "What Is This Thing Called Lyric?" *Modern Philology*, 113.3, 2016, 422–440). For the transhistorical: (J. Culler, *Theory of the Lyric*, Harvard University Press, 2015). For historical poetics: (V. Jackson and Y. Prins, *The Lyric Theory Reader: A Critical Anthology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014) and (V. Jackson, "Lyric," in ed. R. Greene, *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton University Press, 2012, 826–834). The present study attends to the historical particularities of sixteenth-century poetic practices, and in so doing questions any understanding of the lyric as limited to nineteenth-century and/or English literary practices. For poetry writ large: (Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. and ed. R. Janko, Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987, 51b1–51b15). For *poiesis* and Cervantes: (Cascardi, "Orphic Fictions").

¹⁶ "Entre le verbe et l'image, entre ce qui est figuré par le langage et ce qui est dit par la plastique, la belle unité commence à se dénouer; une seule et même signification e leur est pas immédiatement commune. Et s'il est vrai que l'Image a encore la vocation de *dire*, de transmettre quelque chose de consubstantiel au langage, il faut bien reconnaître que, déjà, elle ne dit plus la même chose" (Foucault, *Histoire de la folie*, 33).

"De là sans doute, dans la culture occidentale moderne, le face à face de la poésie et de la folie. Mais ce n'est plus le vieux thème platonicien du délire inspiré. C'est la marque d'une nouvelle expérience du langage et des choses" (Foucault, *Les mots*, 63).

¹⁷ "Il est le joueur déréglé du Même et de l'Autre" (Foucault, *Les mots*, 63).

¹⁸ (L. Spitzer, "Linguistic Perspectivism in the *DQ*," in *Linguistics and Literary History: Essays in Stylistics*, New York: Russel & Russel, 1962, 41–85). On the epistemological stakes of perspectivism: (A. Cascardi, "Perspectivism and the Conflict of Values in *DQ*," *Romance Quarterly*, 34.2, 1987, 165–178). The play of proper names in the *DQ* discussed by Spitzer is something that Cervantes took from the play of pseudonyms in the practice of Pastoral Petrarchism.

¹⁹ (R. Menéndez Pidal, *Un aspecto en la elaboración del Quijote*, Madrid: Cuadernos Literarios, 1924). The Spanish *romance* (a narrative verse ballad often of folk or quasi-folk tradition) should not be confused with the prose fiction genre of the Romance or Byzantine Romance which found early modern inspiration in the rediscovery (1534) and translation of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. Nor should it be confused with the English term: Romances of chivalry.

the first part of the *DQ*, has seen considerable debate over the identity of the author (Cervantes and Lope de Vega, among others) and the primacy of the source (whether the *DQ* draws on the *Entrémés* or vice versa).²⁰ While it is curious to consider the possibility of Cervantes and Lope de Vega intertwined in yet another story, given the commonalities between the *Galatea* and the *Dorotea* discussed in Chapter 5, this study makes no pretense of determining either the author or the primacy of the *Entrémés*. More importantly, the shared premise takes the reader so little way into Cervantes' *DQ* that it would be imprudent to suggest that the modern novel is generated from the interlude. What is interesting here is that the *Entrémés de los romances* was not comprised of *libros de caballería* (romances of chivalry) but of *romances* (narrative ballads). The *romance* was a type of narrative poetry written in verse. Its origins were medieval and folk, but during the 1580s, its revival was brought about by an erudite group of poets known as *los modernos*, which included Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Liñán de Ríaza, and many of their peers.²¹ Just as *romances* inspired Lope's new theatre (such as *El caballero de Olmedo*), Cervantes may have drawn upon, authored, or inspired the *Entrémés de los romances*. Many of the stories from *libros de caballería* which *dQ* recalls in the early chapters are in fact taken from popular *romances*. Casually then, one could conjecture that the *DQ* came from a theatrical interlude which itself came from (narrative) poems. This, however, does not answer the question of lyric poetry and the modern novel but rather attests to the shared thematic or topographical content across various genres of poetry in sixteenth-century Castile. The interlude constructed out of ballads may provide the content of the burlesque, but it does not transform the burlesque into a novel. *Cervantes the Poet: The Don Quijote, Poetic Practice, and the Conception of the First Modern Novel* attends to the practice of lyric poetry and the *figura of the poet* in the culture of Pastoral Petrarchism during the 1560s, 1570s, and 1580s in the Habsburg territories, Europe, and the Mediterranean in order to examine the conception of the first modern novel through the early works of Cervantes. This poetry developed the lyric subjectivity of the speaker both in the *rime sparse* of individual verse poems and within the fabric of prosimetric narrative fiction. From this introduction of lyric subjectivity into narrative fiction, the modern novel was organically conceived.

²⁰ (G. Stagg, "DQ and the 'Entrémés de los romances': A Retrospective," *Cervantes*, 22.2, 2002, 129–50).

²¹ (Lope de Vega, *Romances de juventud*, ed. A. Sánchez Jiménez, Madrid: Cátedra, 2015); (A. Carreño, *El Romancero Lírico de Lope de Vega*, Madrid: Gredos, 1979, 28).

The Unknown History of the Conception of the DQ

7

As a modern poet, Cervantes was the first among many to make famous the history of a lyric life in prose. But he was not only a poet of modern prose fiction. He was also, and primarily, a poet of the sixteenth century who lived through the foreclosure of his own lyric practice within the poetics of Pastoral Petrarchism.²² This form of Petrarchism, writ within literary conceptions of classical Arcadia in which poets assigned pastoral pseudonyms to themselves and to their beloveds, produced new poetic figurations of the Petrarchan lover and beloved within a highly conventionalized and idyllic state of nature, which Cervantes in the *Galatea* refers to as a *tercia naturaleza*, and which Elias Rivers has called the “pastoral paradox of natural art.”²³ While Petrarchism has often been dismissed as

²² For Petrarchism: (W. Kennedy, *Petrarchism at Work: Contextual Economies in the Age of Shakespeare*, Cornell University Press, 2016); (I. Torres, *Love Poetry in the Spanish Golden Age: Eros, Eris and Empire*, Tamesis, 2013); (A. Ramachandran, “Tasso’s Petrarch: The Lyric Means to Epic Ends,” *MLN*, n.1, 2007, vol. CXXII, 186–208); (M. Lefèvre, *Una poesia per l’Imperio. Lingua, editorial e tipologie del petrarchismo tra Spagna e Italia nell’epoca di Carlo V.*, Rome: Vecchiarelli, 2006); (G. Braden, *Petrarchan Love and the Continental Renaissance*, Yale University Press, 1999); (H. Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and Its Counterdiscourses*, Cornell University Press, 1995); (I. Navarrete, *Orphans of Petrarch: Poetry and Theory in the Spanish Renaissance*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); (R. Greene, *Post-Petrarchism: Origins and Innovations of the Western Lyric Sequence*, Princeton University Press, 1991); (A. Cruz, *Imitación y Transformación: El Petrarquismo en la Poesía de Boscán y Garcilaso de la Vega*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1988); (M. Waller, *Petrarch’s Poetics and Literary History*, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1980); (A. Deyermond, *The Petrarchan Sources of La Celestina*, Oxford University Press, 1961); (S. Vento, *Petrarchismo y concettismo in Antonio Veneziano e gli spiriti della lirica amorosa italiana: ricerche e studi*, Rome: E. Leoscher, 1917).

Literature on the pastoral – Antique, Renaissance, Spanish – is broad. T. Rosenmeyer (*The Green Cabinet: Theocritus and the European Pastoral Lyric*, University of California Press, 1969) developed a long historical scope dating to Theocritus, while W. Empson (*Some Versions of the Pastoral*, New York: New Directions, 1974) leaned toward a decidedly theoretical, English, and Marxist investigation. R. Poggioli (*The Oaten Flute: Essays On Pastoral Poetry and the Pastoral Ideal*, Harvard University Press, 1975) provided a firmly biblical and essentializing analysis of vast historical scope. A comparative analysis by P. Alpers (*What is Pastoral?*, University of Chicago Press, 1996) takes good account of Spanish literary history. M. Collins (*Imagining Arcadia in Renaissance Romance*, Routledge, 2016) examines the blending of romance with arcadian fictions in the sixteenth century. See also: (M. Scalabrini and D. Stimilli, “Pastoral Postures: Some Renaissance Versions of Pastoral,” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance*, t.71.1, 2009, 35–60); (G. Velli, “‘Tityrus redivivus’: The Rebirth of Vergilian Pastoral from Dante to Sannazaro (and Tasso),” in eds. D.J. Dutschke, P.M. Forni, F. Grazzini, B.R. Lawton, and L.S. White, *Forme e parole: Studi in memoria di Fredi Chiappelli*, Rome: Bulzoni, 1991, 67–79, esp. 68–72); (W. Kennedy, *Jacopo Sannazaro and the Uses of Pastoral*, Lebanon: University Press of New England, 1983, 29); (J. Spargo, *Virgil the Necromancer: Studies in Virgilian Legends*, Harvard University Press, 1934); (N. Lindheim, *The Virgilian Pastoral Tradition: From the Renaissance to the Modern Era*, Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2005). The definitive study for Spanish pastoral remains: (J.B. Avallé-Arce, *La Novela Pastoral Española*, Madrid: Ediciones Istmo, 1974).

²³ “Aquí se ve en cualquiera sazón del año andar la risueña primavera con la hermosa Venus en hábito subcinto y amoroso, y Céforo que la acompaña, con la madre Flora delante, esparciendo a manos llenas varias y odoríferas flores. Y la industria de sus moradores ha hecho tanto, que la naturaleza, incorporada con el arte, es hecha artífice y connatural del arte, y de entrambas a dos se ha hecho una

a collection of uninspired and recycled tropes, images, motifs, and verse forms, within the mid-sixteenth-century practice of Pastoral Petrarchism, the immediate particularities of each poet's lived experience (real or feigned) reinvigorated literary form with the *novedades* of contemporary life. The *figura of the poet*, Petrarch, became for Cervantes and his peers a model by which to sketch their own literary lives and afterlives. From Petrarch's lady Laura to Montemayor's Diana, Gálvez de Montalvo's Fílida, Cervantes' Silena, AQ's Aldonza Lorenzo, and dQ's Dulcinea, the path to an immortal life in letters ran by way of the beloved.

Whether blunt satire or tragic irony, the thematic of the Cervantine oeuvre has typically been reduced to the *burlas y veras* of picaresque prose fiction, another genre to which the modern novel has been attributed.²⁴ Dubbed *ingenio lego*, Cervantes has come to be known as a master of Spanish Realism. As such, the forty-year literary career that he cultivated as a pastoral poet prior to the publication of the *DQ* (Part I, 1605) rests on the other side of Lethe in formations of Golden Age literary history. Situated at the transition from the Renaissance to the Baroque: (the pitfalls of periodization notwithstanding), most of Cervantes' literary career occupied a curious midway point in the 'siglo' *de oro*, which is generally taken to run from the poetry of Garcilaso in the early sixteenth century to the works of Calderón de la Barca and Juana Inés de la Cruz in the late seventeenth. While Foucault, and more recently Rodrigo Cacho Casal, have been careful to distinguish between the hidden secrets of signs in Renaissance texts and their arbitrary play in those of the "Classical" and Baroque, subsequent readings of Cervantes' *DQ* and Velázquez's *Las Meninas* have tended to collapse this complex period of transition, a transition in the very understanding of meaning and madness, into a single conceptual plane.²⁵

tercia naturaleza, a la cual no sabré dar nombre" (M. de Cervantes, *Galatea*, ed. J.B. Avall-Arce, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1961, vol. II, 170; all citations of the *Galatea* are given from this edition, unless otherwise noted). For art and nature in Arcadia: (E. Rivers, "The Pastoral Paradox of Natural Art," in *Talking and Text: Essays on the Literature of Golden Age Spain*, Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, 2009, 83–101).

²⁴ (F. Rico, *The Spanish Picaresque Novel and the Point of View*, trans. H. Sieber and C. Davis, Cambridge University Press, 1969, 28).

²⁵ Recently, Cacho Casal has glossed Foucault's thought within early modern Spanish literature: "El Renacimiento aspira a la unidad y la armonía cultural para alcanzar la verdad oculta, y es por ello que en esta época tienen tanto predicamento también otras ramas del saber que pueden considerarse pseudociencias caracterizadas por una pretensión totalizadora: la magia, la alquimia, la quiromancia, la fisiognomía, la astrología, la mnemotecnia . . . Hasta el Renacimiento la doctrina analógica es la que predomina en el pensamiento europeo, que ve el universo y sus partes como un tejido entrelazado de relaciones ontológicas tan sutiles como profundas . . . Todo nuevo paradigma cultural y epistemológico se impone y se asienta en un determinado momento histórico en oposición al que lo precedió. En este sentido, el Barroco supone una respuesta, a veces polémica, a algunos de los ideales del Renacimiento y su forma de percibir y analizar el mundo. Sin embargo, este

The Unknown History of the Conception of the DQ 9

Cervantes' literature is about literature. Velázquez's painting is about painting. This compression of the internal machinations in Renaissance and Baroque Iberian culture, and Cervantes' novel within it, into a single era continues to obscure the lyric origins of modernity's favorite and most mysterious poet: Cervantes.

Housed in the Museo del Prado, Velázquez's portrait of *El bufón don Juan de Austria* (oil on canvas, 210 cm × 123 cm, ca. 1632), completed some sixteen years after Cervantes' death, offers an alternative and unlikely metonymy in miniature for the trajectory of his literary career and its first period of posthumous reception.²⁶ Velázquez's painting of a jester – whose satiric identity was modeled on the illegitimate and ill-fated step-brother of Philip II, the “hero” of the Battle of Lepanto, Don Juan de Austria (1545–1578) – active in the court of Philip IV (r. 1621–1640), illustrates the transformation of early modern Spanish poetics metonymically from Don Juan de Austria in the court of Isabel de Valois (1560–1568) to *el bufón don Juan* in the court of Philip IV (1560–1632).²⁷ Like a worn-out rhapsode, Velázquez's *bufón* looks out from his theatrical attire, the iconography of *armas* in which he is cloaked and which forms the backdrop of his portrait, as if to convey his exhaustion with the scene. Like AQ *el Bueno* come home to die at the close of the *DQ II*, the weary visage of the *bufón* points beyond the figure of the jest toward the lyric life of the actor himself. What kind of life could this have been? This palace scene, as is known, would have been enveloped in the practices of a hyperbolic religious fanaticism which sought to collapse the ontology of representation

tipo de esquematismos no siempre resultan eficaces para explicar momentos de transición como el que se vive entre mediados del siglo XVI y comienzos del XVII” (R. Cacho Casal, *La esfera del ingenio: las silvas de Quevedo y la tradición europea*, Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2012, 37–41, emphasis mine). For a summary of this view: (A. Close, *Romantic Approach to dQ*, 220). See also: (R. El Saffar, *Distance and Control in DQ: A Study in Narrative Technique*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975, 19).

²⁶ (J. Portús Pérez, “Velázquez, pintor de historia. Competencia, superación y conciencia creativa,” in *Fábulas de Velázquez: Mitología e Historia Sagrada en el Siglo de Oro*, ed. Portús Pérez, 2007, 14–71; 47, 67, 328)

²⁷ “el bufón don Juan de Austria, que recibió ese apodo del héroe de la batalla de Lepanto, y que trabajó al servicio de la corte entre 1624 y 1654. Velázquez, como en muchos de sus cuadros a lo largo de toda su carrera, juega con la paradoja narrativa, en la que era un auténtico maestro. Nos presenta a un bufón vestido como el héroe que le dio nombre (1545–1578), y extrema el contraste entre su expresión atemorizada y huidiza y el entorno bélico del que se rodea: su traje militar, el bastón de mando o las armas, pertrechos y armaduras que se esparcen por el suelo. Al fondo, se presenta de manera prodigiosa una batalla naval que es alusión inequívoca a Lepanto, y que por su valentía y soltura revela lo mucho que aprendió el maestro español de la pintura de Tiziano. . . . *en esta obra, a través de la paradoja, está proponiendo al espectador un juego sutil e inteligente sobre los límites entre la realidad y la ficción, entre la identidad individual y la identidad histórica o social*” (Portús Pérez, *Fábulas de Velázquez*, 328, emphasis mine).

and represented into a single phenomenon.²⁸ The political paranoia of palace life in the 1630s would have imbued this military burlesque with a degree of uncomfortable reality. “If folly leads everyone into a blindness where each is lost, the fool, to the contrary, calls each to their truth.”²⁹

Like a riddle of reason, his self-denial, submerged in the madness of his socio-religious and political moment, renders the *bufón* a figure of truth whose gaze questions the viewer’s very place in a shared chimera. This candor that Velázquez details in the eyes of his subject arrests the viewer in a confrontation with an incredulous actor who has quit his own scene. Lyrically speaking, what is at stake in Velázquez’s portrait is neither a tragic nostalgia for the age of Don Juan nor the satiric comedy of an unhinged Baroque court, but rather the figure of an actor at the crossroads of human immediacy and authorial distance, history and allegory, mimesis and poesis, for whom the semiotics of his attire are called into question by the corporeal gesture of his visage. His sorrowful countenance introduces a human immediacy to the core of his theatrical burlesque and therefore throws the dialectic between reason and folly into question.

Cervantes the Poet: The Don Quijote, Poetic Practice, and the Conception of the First Modern Novel takes seriously the body of poetic work produced prior to the publication of the *DQ* through a recontextualization of that work within the various circles of poetic practice in which and for whom Cervantes wrote.³⁰ While both philological and theoretical studies of Cervantes tend to cast him as a novelist of the seventeenth-century Spanish Baroque, this study resituates the author of the *DQ* within the very milieu of the original Don Juan (just two years his senior) and the poetics of Pastoral Petrarchism patronized by Isabel de Valois and in other European courts during the second half of the sixteenth century.³¹ Miguel

²⁸ (F. Pereda, “Cultures de la représentation dans l’Espagne de la Réforme catholique,” *Perspective: Actualité en histoire de l’art*, n.2, 2009, 287–300) for Velázquez’s crucifix paintings and the collapse of represented and representation in the reign of Philip IV.

²⁹ (Foucault, *Histoire de la folie*, 29).

³⁰ There is an obvious temptation to understand sixteenth-century poetic practice and the makings of the modern novel by way of the theories of literature proposed within nineteenth-century German Romanticism. However, this study takes the eighteenth-century English satirist and nineteenth-century German Romantic points of view as indicative of the dialectics that the *DQ* inspires. As such, the productive work to follow on this study would be to attempt to understand nineteenth-century German Romanticism by way of the paradigms of sixteenth-century Pastoral Petrarchism, rather than the other way around. For a cogent and precise (if not also limited) look at German Romanticism: (P. Lacoue-Labarthe and J-L Nancy, *The Literary Absolute*, trans. P. Barnard and C. Lester, State University of New York Press, 1988).

³¹ Don Juan de Austria should not be confused with the literary Don Juan of Tirso de Molina (*El burlador de Sevilla*, 1616–1630), Lord Byron (*Don Juan*, 1819–1824), José Zorrilla (*Don Juan Tenorio*, 1844), George Bernard Shaw (*Man and Superman*, 1905), etc.