



All Theses and Dissertations

2017-12-01

Madness in the *Quijote*: Don Quijote as Alonso Quijano's True Self

Paul J. Schmidt
Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Spanish and Portuguese Language and Literature Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Schmidt, Paul J., "Madness in the *Quijote*: Don Quijote as Alonso Quijano's True Self" (2017). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 6670.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/6670>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Madness in the *Quijote*: Don Quijote as

Alonso Quijano's True Self

Paul J. Schmidt

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

Dale Pratt, Chair
Alvin Sherman
Erik Larson

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Brigham Young University

Copyright © 2017 Paul J. Schmidt

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Madness in the *Quijote*: Don Quijote as
Alonso Quijano's True Self

Paul J. Schmidt
Department of Spanish and Portuguese, BYU
Master of Arts

This thesis examines the dichotomy of *locura/cordura* in Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quijote de la Mancha* (1605/1615), specifically the nature of the madness of the titular character. Two different aspects of the *Quijote* are discussed: (1) the dual nature of the personality of Don Quijote/Alonso Quijano as being "sanely insane," that is, that although Don Quijote exhibits symptoms unmistakably indicative of madness, he maintains his sanity underneath this mad façade; the dedicatory sonnets that precede Part 1, the epitaphs that follow the end of Part 1, and the two poems that serve as an epilogue to Part 2 are examined in length in order to show that Don Quijote, and not "Alonso Quijano el Bueno," is the true protagonist of the *Quijote*; and (2) the roles that the various *encantadores* play in the *Quijote* and how they interact with Don Quijote are discussed in order to further explore this dichotomy of *locura/cordura*.

Keywords: Don Quijote, madness, *locura/cordura*, Cervantes, *encantadores*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to “El Pratt” for first teaching me the *Quijote* and inspiring me to write my thesis on it, and for instilling in me a profound passion for Cervantes’ magnum opus. I would also like to thank Dr. Larson for encouraging me to pursue graduate studies in Spanish, and Dr. Sherman for opening my eyes to the complex humanness of *La Guerra Civil*. I also express my sincere gratitude to every single professor and adjunct professor from whom I took a Spanish course at BYU, both in my undergraduate and graduate studies, for I would not be where I am today without all of you. Lastly, I would like to express my gratitude to my father, Clark Paul Schmidt, and my mother, Laurie Nelson Schmidt, for never giving up on me and pushing me to finish my thesis.

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Prologue	1
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	5
Chapter 2: The Real “Man of La Mancha”	15
Chapter 3: Los sabios encantadores.....	43
Works Cited	78
Appendix A: Dedicatory Sonnets, Epitaphs, and Poems.....	80

Prologue

The nature of the madness of the protagonist of the *Quijote* is uncertain, if not completely ambiguous altogether. Granted, it can be argued that Don Quijote is undoubtedly mad, which claim is foundationally derived from the narrator's account of the madness that befalls our protagonist, whose exact identity at the time of this account in the opening chapter of the novel is conjectural at best. However, as critical readers of the *Quijote*, we should at least consider the possibility that the narrator, however omniscient he may be, may be biased in his retelling of the events that lead to the emergence of an entirely new protagonist, one we can justifiably call, borrowing the term from Rogelio Miñana, the "true protagonist of the *Quijote*." On the other hand, we can retroactively name our protagonist "Alonso Quijano el Bueno," after his "true" identity is revealed in the concluding chapter of the second part. Our previously unnamed "Man of la Mancha" is finally given a name befitting a fifty-something *hidalgo* who had, due to madness induced by his gratuitous consumption of chivalric romances—which madness had rendered him unfit for society—taken upon himself the imagined, fictitious persona of a knight-errant, which persona he promptly renounces after "supposedly" having regained his sanity, on his deathbed no less.

It is without a doubt that even Cervantes intended for the protagonist of what would become his *magnum opus* to be none other than *el ingenioso hidalgo/caballero Don Quijote de la Mancha*, as prominently articulated in the title of the first and second parts, respectively. It is also apparent that the name "Alonso Quijano" was more of an after-thought by Cervantes, rather than a name that had been selected from the outset, for, if it had been, it could have been considered a pivotal piece of the enigma that is our adventurous "Man of la Mancha." Instead, it is only mentioned out of necessity, for if our protagonist is going to renounce the identity that he

has maintained throughout the entire novel, it follows that he must be given a name, not merely an educated guess based on hearsay. “Alonso Quijano” is simply a generic placeholder that could be replaced with any other arbitrary name, whereas “Don Quijote” has acquired an iconic, near-legendary status among not only the “storied” archives of la Mancha and the annals of Western literature, but has also obtained a place in the world literature canon.

Alonso Quijano *cannot* be the actual protagonist of the *Quijote* by very definition of the word—Alonso Quijano as a character only appears at both ends of the novel, that is, in the first chapter of the first part and the last chapter of the second part. In this sense, our “Man of la Mancha” is definitively Don Quijote in over 99% of the entire text, which means that whoever Don Quijote was in his entire 50+-year existence prior to the beginning of the novel (and, supposedly, in the final moments of his mortal life) is of little to no significance. Everything we associate with the protagonist of the *Quijote* is embodied in the “Don Quijote” persona we interact with throughout the course of the novel. It is likely that anyone who has read the *Quijote* can relate to the protagonist’s desire to realize his “dream” of becoming the incarnation of his favorite literary figures—to imitate them in every respect: their dress, their words, and their heroic deeds. Nonetheless, our protagonist’s decision to become a knight-errant is, admittedly, perhaps not the most practical direction he could have taken, yet we cannot necessarily condemn him for it. It is indeed a romantic notion that drives Don Quijote’s very existence, and, despite the countless beatings he takes and all the unintended mayhem his (mis)adventures cause, he certainly succeeds in making a name for himself, however tarnished it may be.

I posit that Don Quijote is the one and only protagonist of the *Quijote* and hence the most logical candidate for the identity of our elusive “Man of la Mancha.” I further contend that Don Quijote’s deathbed confession that he was never “Don Quijote” is merely a ploy to appease his

family and friends. He is completely cognizant of what is at stake as he prepares to pass on—he knows he cannot go to his grave branded as a madman, for that would sully the reputation of the family he would leave behind. He even realizes that the source of his madness is the innumerable *libros de caballerías* that he had considered to be historical accounts of real-life people, rather than works of fiction. Don Quijote knows he is on the brink of death, and he responds accordingly, as any sane man would do: he sets his affairs in order, receives his last rites, and quietly exits mortality. By this point, it appears to be fairly clear-cut that the character we have known as “Don Quijote” has now died as “Alonso Quijano el Bueno,” which implies that the character of “Don Quijote” has ceased to exist—Don Quijote has been “rebranded” as the same fifty-something *hidalgo* we met at the beginning of the *Quijote*. To say that Don Quijote dies Alonso Quijano is to negate his existence as a knight-errant, to say that everything he saw, said, and did while he donned the knightly garb is of no consequence, that it means nothing, even to go as far as to label his time with Rocinante and Sancho Panza as “nonsense” or “rubbish,” is to discredit the creative genius of Cervantes in every respect, to dismiss “Don Quijote” as a deranged lunatic and nothing else.

We can, in deed, refer to Don Quijote as being “insanely sane” because I believe that, despite his words, imaginations, and outward actions, Don Quijote is still entirely as sane as he has ever been—he appears to be acting out the fantasy of being a knight-errant while simultaneously remaining quite cognizant of what he is doing.

This thesis consists of two separate papers that each examine a distinct aspect of the *Quijote* as it relates to *locura/cordura* and the true identity of this “Man of la Mancha.” The first paper (Ch. 2) contends that Don Quijote is the one and only protagonist of the *Quijote* and that “Alonso Quijano el Bueno” is merely a ruse Don Quijote employs at the end of his life to

appease his family and friends, for he does *not* die Alonso Quijano, but rather dies and is further immortalized as Don Quijote de la Mancha. The second paper (Ch. 3) examines the various *encantadores* who appear in the *Quijote* and how they interact with Don Quijote influences his joint *locura-cordura* personality. I believe that these are significant aspects that cause the student of the *Quijote* to question traditional interpretations of the nature of the madness of Don Quijote/Alonso Quijano, as well as the concluding chapter of the second part. It causes us to reconsider the entire framework of the novel and the reasons Cervantes gives for writing it. Lastly, it helps us better understand the entire human experience as seen through the eyes of a very *ingenioso caballero*.

Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis interrogates Don Quijote's madness. Not because the theme of *cordura/locura* has been ignored by generations of critics, but because the hermeneutical import of that madness, especially in terms of the supposed restoration to sanity of "Alonso Quijano el Bueno" at the end of the novel, has been misunderstood. Rather, I argue that a superficial understanding of the last chapter of Part 2 of the *Quijote* fails to recognize the complexity and completeness of the personality of Don Quijote, who is born of madness. To arrive at any deep understanding of the final chapter, we must review the main critical visions of Don Quijote's madness.

Critical views on Don Quijote's madness

In *Don Quixote in the Archives*, Dale Shuger presents a detailed study of historical Spanish Inquisition trials from roughly a hundred-year period from 1540 to 1650 in which the defendant was accused of madness, whether self-attributed by the defendant or judged as so being by family and acquaintances and/or the tribunal itself. Shuger quotes extensively from the original documents to orient the reader regarding the sheer number of cases and the varying factors involved, as well as the circumstances surrounding the onset of the madness and whether or not the individual ever regained his/her sanity and returned to normal life. The purpose of Shuger's study is to attempt to establish a precedent for the madness of Don Quijote to give a context to back up the plausibility of a middle-aged *hidalgo* leaving his estate and embarking on a quest as a knight-errant which results as the culmination of his over-zealous consumption of chivalric romances, indicated from the beginning of the novel as the reason for his madness. In fact, Shuger's study reveals many similarities between real-life cases of madness and the madness of Cervantes' ingenious character. There are, as the author suggests, evidences that

Cervantes was most likely aware of at least some of these cases of madness from the Inquisition records and that he even may have read some of them.

According to Shuger, there are three main currents when it comes to the significance of madness in the *Quijote*. First, those who dismiss the concept of madness altogether as unimportant and irrelevant within the overall sphere of the novel, and thus redirect the focus on the madness in itself into a starting point on which to base the ludic nature of the adventures of Don Quijote. Second, there are those who read the novel in the context of psychology and/or psychoanalysis and by so doing attempt to diagnose the exact nature of Don Quijote's malady to discover some kind of hypothetical "underlying fear" that drove him over the edge, so to speak. Lastly, there are those that, in contrast with the first group, do view Don Quijote's madness as central to the interpretation of the novel (Shuger 3-4). Among these are the Romantics, as previously mentioned, who view, to varying degrees of affinity, Don Quijote's madness as essentially his "salvation," that is, his self-discovery as a man of purpose and conviction who lives his life with undeniable passion and whole-hearted dedication.

In *Madness and Lust*, Carroll Johnson analyzes the madness of Don Quijote through the lens of Freudian psychoanalysis. Johnson starts out with an overview of the understanding of psychology in Cervantes' day, elaborating the traditional belief in the various body humors, which was still the predominating theory in 16th/17th century Europe with origins in antiquity, specifically Ancient Greece. The author then proceeds to present the various divisions in the human life cycle as defined by both ancient and contemporary thinkers. Central to Johnson's argument is the so-called "mid-life crisis" which generally onsets at 50 years of age, which just happens to correspond, not coincidentally, with the approximate age of Alonso Quijano at the start of the novel. Johnson then places Don Quijote in the proverbial therapist's *chaise longue*

and instructs him to “Start from the beginning,” which is essentially impossible considering we are told nothing of Alonso Quijano’s life before the start of the novel. Even so, Johnson manages to create a hypothetical back story deeply rooted in Freud’s model of psychosexual development. The author then hastily labels Don Quijote as sex obsessed (76) and cites multiple examples from the text to support his claim. According to Johnson, Alonso Quijano has secretly lusted after his young niece, but then is able to transfer this desire to Aldonza Lorenzo, and eventually to His Lady, Dulcinea del Toboso, whose beauty and virtue have no equal. Johnson is obviously a firm adherent to Freudian psychology and I see this as a weakness in his argument because it seems that he refuses to consider anything foreign to Freud as valid, and as such his interpretation is limited in its scope and purpose. The connection between Don Quijote’s alleged repressed sexuality and Freud’s sex-centric theory is blatantly obvious and I find myself less than convinced of its plausibility. True, Don Quijote does often allude to the illicit relationships of various well-known knights of literature and legend, but I think to claim that he always has “sex on the mind” is a little far-fetched to say the least. Granted, such a connection is only the logical outcome of the Freudian model and thus it follows that Johnson’s argument would reach that conclusion. Nevertheless, I find it a little harsh to simply write off such a round, complex character as a sex-crazed lunatic, for to do so tarnishes his honorable and noble reputation intrinsic to knight-errantry.

Another critic takes a different approach: “Aunque ha sido frecuente tildar de loco a Don Quijote, su locura quizás solo sea aparente” (Rodríguez González 164). In other words, the author is suggesting that the traditional diagnosis of “madman” or “lunatic” is perhaps not entirely accurate—that maybe there is something more going on in the brilliant mind of our

hidalgo than is manifested by his outward behavior. Maybe there is more to his “insanity” than meets the eye:

... el hidalgo manchego había intuido que la vida auténtica está en otro lugar... para que mudado el nombre de todos los seres y cosas, sobrepuesta la realidad del sueño y del deseo a las evidencias de un cotidiano aburrimiento, pudiera devolver a la tierra la primera y más inocente de sus alboradas” (José Saramago, *El País*, 5/22/2005, cited in Rodríguez González 164).

Here we discover a key concept: the reason of Don Quijote’s unreason (cf. Charles Aubrun) is not, as we naturally suspect, his obsessive reading of nonsensical chivalric romances, it is rather the result of the unbearable monotony of his existence up to that point in his life—that maybe, as romantic as it may sound, he was destined for something better, something that could bring meaning and purpose to his otherwise dull day-to-day life. Be that as it may, we can still credit the chivalric romances with instilling this most magnificent of ideas: that of becoming a knight-errant of yesteryear in a quest to revive the once prestigious order of chivalry to infuse the then-stagnant society of 17th-century Spain with new life and purpose. Rodríguez González continues: “Su agonía [la de Don Quijote] reside, por lo tanto, en este aparentar loco para tratar de imponer una ilusión, demasiado grande y profunda para ser cuerda, o tan cuerda, que su logro no es nada más que una insensata locura” (164). Prior to this, the author asserts that Don Quijote’s *aparente locura* is, in actuality, *fingida*, and thus does not fall into what is termed “clinical psychosis,” but is rather, according to the author, a *patología literaria*—literary because it was born of literature. Returning to the quote, Rodríguez González plays on the *locura/cordura* dichotomy, stating that Don Quijote’s constructed reality, as fantastical and unrealistic as it may seem, is either *cuerda* or it is not. Regardless of exterior assessment, it results, at least at the surface and to all who

know him and interact with him, no more than a *insensata locura*, or, in other words, an idealized fantasy that cannot be maintained without considerable effort on Don Quijote's part, which, as it turns out, is exhausted in the end.

The tendency is to label Don Quijote a *loco* through and through, and, at the same time, discard his aspirations and dreams as absurd and unrealistic. Such people affirm that it is obvious that Don Quijote is mad because of all the ridiculous (and most-times comical) situations he creates in the course of his many adventures. However, I would like to argue for the grandeur and the incomparable inspiration that make up his being. We must be more cognizant of how accurate or inaccurate our supposedly "unbiased" scrutiny of Don Quijote actually is. Going back to the absurd predicaments which always seem to befall our good knight and his usually good-natured squire, perhaps even though these external actions seem to be entirely insane and devoid of good judgment, it is indeed possible that it has to do with something else altogether. It might be as if he were "drunk" with his own ambitions, and thus this figurative "drunkenness" serves as the impetus that motivates Don Quijote to do everything he does, because he is completely determined to achieve his dream, and because he "[has] dream[ed] the impossible dream," borrowing the lyrics of the famous song from the hit Broadway musical *Man of La Mancha* (which premiered in 1965). I would like to comment on the last two verses of this song:

And I know if I'll only be true
To this glorious quest
That my heart will lie peaceful and calm
When I'm laid to my rest

And the world will be better for this
That one man, scorned and covered with scars
Still strove with his last ounce of courage
To reach the unreachable star (Darion 1965).

This song, although not intended to be part of a direct adaption of the novel (as continuously maintained by Dale Wasserman who wrote the book for the musical), expresses Don Quijote's strong desire to realize his dream of dreams, one that you could only bring to fruition one time in your whole life, one that would redefine the course of whatever you might face thereafter. Nevertheless, the song never expressly states whether our protagonist will end up accomplishing it, yet this is not what truly matters—what really matters is that this peculiar dream of his is something for which he has fought with all his might. Perhaps the message is that we will learn that what is truly important is the effort, the sweat, blood, and tears, that we put in to realize our precious dreams, because we know that we can accomplish nothing without first making the attempt to make it reality.

In *The Humble Story of Don Quixote*, Cesáreo Bandera provides a study of the *Quijote* revolving around the popular claim that it is the first modern novel. The first part of the book deals with the strong influences that the picaresque novel had on Cervantes and the genesis of the *Quijote*, citing two prominent works published around the time of the first part of the *Quijote*: *Guzmán de Alfarache* (1599 and 1604) by Mateo Alemán and *El buscón* (circa 1604) by Francisco de Quevedo. Bandera then discusses madness in the *Quijote* by extensively quoting from Foucault's *Madness and Civilization* to provide a more concrete context in which to establish the veracity of a preexisting Alonso Quijano's descent into insanity, yet the author is

adamant in clarifying that Don Quijote, although mad, is not *entirely* mad, and thus will be receptive to attempts to restore his sanity. Bandera, however, is quick to point out that he believes that Foucault's conception of madness as pertaining to the *Quijote* is incorrect: madness is not, as asserted by Foucault, a manifestation of despair; rather, "it is a sign of hope" (Bandera 111). Essential to Bandera's argument is Alonso Quijano's restoration to sanity, which is the direct result of his deathbed renouncement of his escapades as Don Quijote, culminating in his death. Later in the book, the author uses similarities between the popular pastoral romances of Cervantes' day and the various intercalated stories in the *Quijote* to formulate the concept of the "desire of the obstacle" that is so prevalent in these stories. Bandera mentions numerous instances in which a character, who is initially infatuated with a particular person, soon begins to lose interest in the original object of his/her affection and starts to feel attracted to the love interest of his/her close friend, after which a competition of rival love interests ensues. The author relates this desire of the obstacle in the pastoral genre to Don Quijote's desire to emulate his idol, the one and only Amadís de Gaula—yet Bandera suggests that Don Quijote's desire extends beyond emulation to the point of surpassing Amadís, essentially dethroning him in order to become the very best knight-errant in all of history and thereby establishing himself as the new standard by which all other knights-errant should be judged. Bandera later begins a thorough analysis of Miguel de Unamuno's unique *quijotismo*, concluding that the writer is too dependent on parallels between the *Quijote* and Christianity, calling Don Quijote "un loco divino," yet qualifying this statement as follows: "Un loco, sí, aunque no el más divino de todos. El más divino de los locos fue y sigue siendo Jesús, el Cristo" (cited in Bandera 133). By Bandera's terms, there is no doubt: the *Quijote* has been sufficiently grounded in what can be called the "modern novel." The fact that the *Quijote* is a modern novel impacts our perception of

Don Quijote and the nature of his madness—the roundness of his character and his development throughout the novel speaks to the innate creativity of Cervantes’ narrative genius.

Concerning the madness of Don Quijote, there is no reason to doubt the explanation given by the narrator in the first chapter of the novel:

Es, pues, de saber que este sobredicho hidalgo, los ratos que estaba ocioso –que eran los más del año–, se daba a leer libros de caballerías, con tanta afición y gusto, que olvidó casi de todo punto el ejercicio de la caza y aun la administración de su hacienda...

En resolución, 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 cerebro de manera que vino a perder el juicio (I:I 28-30).

In other words, the madness of our good *hidalgo* is directly linked to his over-zealous consumption of *libros de caballerías*. In fact, Cervantes never shies away from his purpose for writing the *Quijote* to begin with: namely, to expose *libros de caballerías* for what they really are—fantastical fictional stories with no redeemable quality except that of entertaining the gullible reader. It is, therefore, no surprise that Cervantes would be so bold as to place the blame of the maddening of our “Man of La Mancha” entirely on the obsessive reading of chivalric romances. It appears that Cervantes’ estimation of such books was not very high, especially considering that it ended up being the impetus to the engendering of what would become his magnum opus, yet we cannot necessarily dismiss chivalric romances as having no merit whatsoever. To do so would be essentially to discredit an entire literary genre that enjoyed great popularity in the 16th century. Regardless, there was definitely something about this literary genre that simply did not sit right with Cervantes—in writing the *Quijote*, Cervantes was

embarking on a mission to create a work that would transcend the substance-less chivalric romance and, although unbeknownst to Cervantes at the time, give birth to what would later be called the “modern novel.”

Thus, we can declare that Don Quijote is not *loco* but rather *ingenioso*, as indicated by the title of the novel. Regarding the distinction between *locura* and *cordura*, Rodríguez González offers the following:

Locos son ... los que buscan acomodar sus vidas a la tiranía de la masa y a la supuesta objetividad de la mayoría, basada en la reacción de una conciencia que solo se sostiene en la percepción de los sentidos y en lo efímero y cambiante. Cierdos son, por otra parte, los que luchan, como Don Quijote, por un ideal y por valores trascendentes, los que siguen un proyecto de humanidad heroica, un camino hacia la libertad, la ilusión de una conciencia individual que se sostiene en el misterio y el prodigio de una percepción subjetiva o creación de un mundo imaginario. En otras palabras, lo eterno e inmutable (166).

Per this definition of *cordura*, the image of Don Quijote is reflected in a new light, a light more lucid and radiant. Don Quijote has obtained a newfound freedom and a new life purpose (and for his inevitable, untimely death). Don Quijote has broken the heavy chains of stale mediocrity with which he was once bound. His avaricious reading of those books, the majority of which have been branded dangerous and harmful, have actually been his literal salvation and the key to his “rebirth.” It was without a doubt his destiny to become a knight-errant; there was nothing that anyone could have done to deny him this opportunity that he so rightly deserved.

As we have seen, the matter of the *locura* of Don Quijote has been one of much debate, scholarly and otherwise. Carl Good writes: “Although we refer to this madness almost casually, it is, strictly speaking, equally difficult to argue whether don Quijote is or is not mad” (55). Good proceeds to explain that many scholars are divided due to the apparent duality of *locura/cordura* that manifests itself in Don Quijote’s character. There are many instances in the novel in which the narrator comments on the indecision of many people to judge him mad or sane, that they are unsure whether he is actually insane, or whether it could be possible to be both at the same time. Good summarizes it succinctly: “Don Quijote is most certainly mad. Don Quijote is most certainly not mad” (ibid.). It is as if Don Quijote possessed two different personalities: one insane and the other sane. It appears that these two incompatible divisions within the mind of Don Quijote are voraciously competing to take control over our knight, but neither of the two arises the sole victor and thus they must coinhabit the space within Don Quijote’s (sub)conscious mind. Erich Auerbach in his seminal work *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (1946) puts it this way: “... the kindly, intelligent, and amiable figure, Alonso Quijano el bueno ... coexists with the mad adventurer. ... There is evidence everywhere that we have to do with an intelligent don Quijote and a mad one, side by side, and that his intelligence is in no way dialectically inspired by his madness ... “(349). As we can clearly see, there exists substantial research that espouses this theory of the duality of *locura/cordura* that coexists in the personality of Don Quijote/Alonso Quijano. As Auerbach explains it, Don Quijote is intelligent and rational and mad at the same time, and we, as readers, must make our own psychological evaluation of this both simple yet complex man that has been the focus of countless criticism over the centuries following the publication of the *Quijote* over 400 years ago.

Chapter 2: The Real “Man of La Mancha”

The ending of the *Quijote* at first glance appears to be fairly straightforward: Don Quijote, whose real name we at long last learn in the final chapter, renounces his “Don Quijote” persona and professes that he is “Alonso Quijano el Bueno” and that he has always in reality only been Alonso Quijano. That is, he confesses that, as everyone around him had observed, he had indeed lost his mind by reading so many chivalric romances and that this had caused him to take on the identity of “Don Quijote de la Mancha.” He even apologizes to Sancho for having dragged him along on all his ridiculous adventures. In essence, we are to understand that Alonso Quijano has regained his sanity and that by renouncing his identity as Don Quijote and cursing all the *libros de caballerías* for all the “damage” they had caused him, he was able to die, not as the lunatic Don Quijote, but rather as a *buen cristiano* and completely sound in body and mind. I maintain that this traditional reading is clearly superficial and uninspiring in more ways than one.

I want to propose an alternate, more dynamic reading of the death of Don Quijote: Don Quijote’s deathbed confession is simply a ruse to appease his family and friends, along with the reader. That is, Don Quijote is merely putting on a mask to say that he was “Alonso Quijano” when in reality he is still as much Don Quijote as when he first set out on his adventures in the second chapter of the novel. Don Quijote dies Don Quijote. I contend that the person we know as Don Quijote does not even begin to exist as a character until he becomes Don Quijote at the end of the first chapter of the novel because it is clear that whoever he was in the 50+ years of his previous life is entirely irrelevant to his character and personality. Señor Quijada/Quesada/Quijana was an entirely lifeless, even pitiful character who had nothing to his name besides his house, property, and personal effects, and, because he had never married, he had no children to pass on the family name (whatever it is). It is without a doubt that the

protagonist of the *Quijote* is Don Quijote and certainly not Alonso Quijano. It is also significant that neither the narrators nor any character in the novel, even the preeminent authorial voice of Cervantes himself ever refers to Don Quijote by any other name but Don Quijote (with the notable exception of Don Quijote's neighbor Pedro Alonso who refers to him twice as "Señor Quijana" [I:V 56, 58]).

It is as Don Quijote than our protagonist truly "creates a name for himself," the most appropriate evidence for which is when we learn at the beginning of the second part of the *Quijote* that a book of all his adventures has not only been published, but has been read by nearly everyone in La Mancha and elsewhere, to the extent that he and Sancho have indeed been indelibly engraved into knightly lore, just as Amadís, Orlando, and every other "person" worthy of mention. It is also noteworthy that by becoming characters in a book, Don Quijote, along with Sancho, have literally been transformed into "real" people about whom a written record of their deeds exists. Note that this book is most certainly not about the near-nameless *hidalgo* who appears in the beginning pages of the novel but about the brave and gallant Don Quijote de la Mancha and his impeccable loyalty to his fair lady Dulcinea del Toboso, for whom he would do anything to protect her honor and purity, even lay down his own life if the need arose.

I also contend that the persona of Don Quijote is his authentic self, his authentic identity and that it is his destiny, divine or otherwise, to shed the shackles of monotony and recreate an entirely new man—one with purpose, one with unbreakable determination and uncanny perseverance. Once he takes on the identity of Don Quijote de la Mancha he is "reborn" and shortly thereafter is christened a knight (by a common innkeeper albeit), after which his new identity is made sure, cemented so tightly in his mind that it will guide the entire course of his future life, disregarding how relatively short it ends up being. To say the authentic, genuine

identity of Don Quijote is Alonso Quijano is to rescind everything we have grown to love about him as a not-so-graceful knight with whom we have been constant companions throughout 126 chapters and 1100+ pages of both parts of the *Quijote*! But the last chapter of the second part is not the narratorial equivalent of a palinode. To espouse this idea is to literally crush our humble knight into oblivion and literary obscurity—even the title of the novel itself testifies of how severe such an injustice would be! Imagine if the novel were titled “El ingenioso hidalgo Alonso Quijano el Bueno (que una vez se hizo un caballero andante)”? What novelty and attraction would such a title contain? We know from when we first read the cover of the book that this is a story about “El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha” because Don Quijote, not some run-of-the-mill middle-aged man, is undeniably the one and only and true protagonist of the *Quijote*.

Other critics have read against the grain to question the validity of “Alonso Quijano el Bueno” and his supposed recovery. For example, Rogelio Miñana contends in “El verdadero protagonista del *Quijote*” that the true protagonist of the *Quijote* is neither Alonso Quijano nor Don Quijote, but rather the synthesis of the two into one man. This person boasts not just a dual identity, but is in fact a man who is capable of taking multiple identities at will. Miñana cites the well-known episode in Chapter 5 of the first part where Don Quijote seemingly believes he is two separate characters from one of his books of chivalry (first, Valdivinos and later, Abindarráez) and that his neighbor Pedro is also one of those characters (first, el Marqués de Mantua and later, don Rodrigo de Narváez). Miñana focuses on the following quote from Don Quijote: “... y sé que puedo ser, no sólo los que he dicho, sino todos los Doce Pares de Francia, y aun todos los nueve de la Fama, pues a todas las hazañas que ellos todos juntos y cada uno por

sí hicieron se aventajarán las mías” (I:V 58). Hence Miñana draws his notion of a multiplicity of identities which remains a recurring point throughout his essay.

Miñana reiterates and expands upon the idea of a “Quijano artista que crea a don Quijote,” citing Esther Bartolomé Pons that “Quijano no está loco, sino que finge, crea y pone en la práctica a su personaje caballeresco, don Quijote” (Miñana 33). This is also an idea that Francisco Rico brings up in his edition of the *Quijote* in the footnotes, that of Don Quijote in reality being a real-life “actor” in a “play” in which he only pretends to be mad but is really only acting out his imagined reality with the real world as his “stage” (II:XI 627, note 23). In the episode of *Las Cortes de la Muerte*, in his conversation with the actor dressed as *El Diablo*, Don Quijote gives us a small glimpse into one facet of his childhood:

Por la fe de caballero andante –respondió don Quijote– que así como vi este carro imaginé que alguna grande aventura se me ofrecía, y ahora digo que es menester tocar las apariencias con la mano para dar lugar al desengaño. Andad con Dios, buena gente, y haced vuestra fiesta, y mirad si mandáis algo en que pueda seros de provecho, que lo haré con buen ánimo y buen talante, porque *desde muchacho fui aficionado a la carátula [máscara], y en mi mocedad se me iban los ojos tras la farándula [compañía de teatro ambulante]*” (II:XI 627, emphasis added).

This quote is unique in two respects: (1) He consciously admits that what he had first “imagined” is most likely not the actual reality (at least everyone else’s reality), and that he is impelled to literally touch the figures and actors to bring a particular emotion to the surface that practically never appears: that of unmistakable “desengaño;” and (2) For the very first time, we hear from the mouth of our protagonist a segue, although very brief, into his life long before he became Don Quijote: specifically that he used to love going to the theater as a boy, and that this

fascination with theater continued at least into his adolescent years. This obviously leads us to the plausibility of the above suggestion that Don Quijote may in fact consider himself an actor on the world's biggest stage. This idea of being an actor on a stage is significant in that it relates back to the proposal that Don Quijote is simply feigning madness while being completely aware of his words and actions, using his apparent insanity to his own advantage to further cement his identity as "Don Quijote de la Mancha," a valiant Manchegan knight.

Miñana's reading of the character of Alonso Quijano/Don Quijote is more centered on the creative genius (Alonso Quijano, the *hidalgo*) who literally, in Miñana's words, "birthed" the *caballero* we know as Don Quijote. In Miñana's view, there are no limits to the creative literary "power" of our protagonist, who, as suggested by Miñana, is literally "pulling his own strings:" "[Nosotros como lectores] pierden de vista el poder creador del hidalgo Quijano que *maneja los hilos de su historia con maestría sin igual*" (34-35, emphasis added). This analogy creates quite the interesting visual: we have one man with two separate, distinct personas, one *loco* and the other *cuerdo*. This man, while under the identity of Don Quijote, is actually being manipulated at every turn by the "man behind the curtain," a man controlling a marionette on a stage, to use a different analogy, yet this case is unique because it is literally impossible within the constraints of reality, for in this case the man controlling the puppet and the puppet are one in the same. To borrow from the field of psychology, we could say that this "Man of La Mancha" is experiencing a mild form of dissociative identity disorder, more commonly called multiple personality disorder or simply a "split personality." Along these lines, we can say that the dominant personality is certainly Don Quijote, at least the man we know from the novel, which, although it encompasses a relatively short period of time in his entire life (as compared to the over 50 years of his life before he became Don Quijote), it is assuredly the most meaningful and rewarding,

and it is pretty much the only name by which we know our elusive protagonist throughout the entire novel. Miñana, however, argues the exact opposite—that is, that the true genius behind our loveable knight in arms is actually the man who existed before Don Quijote ever came into existence, namely, Alonso Quijano, and, ergo, that the *hidalgo* is the dominant persona by virtue of his absolute control over his other persona. I disagree. I maintain that just as the story begins with an unidentified *and* unidentifiable “lugar de la Mancha,” the novel’s “Man of la Mancha” is and *must* remain unidentified and unidentifiable. He is not Alonso Quijano, but, in a way, is “Everyman.”

Miñana then introduces the idea of Alonso Quijano/Don Quijote as a “monster”—not in the modern sense of hideous, grotesque, scary, evil, and inhuman, but in the original sense of the word: “en el sentido de portento o ser prodigioso” (39), the word “monster” deriving from the latin *monstrum*, meaning an evil omen or portent, from which the verb *monstrare* is derived, which means “to show.” To back up his case, he cites Calderón de la Barca’s most famous work *La vida es sueño* and its protagonist, the “monstrous” Segismundo, with whom Miñana draws another parallel in Don Quijote’s temporary imprisonment tied up in a cage and Segismundo’s much longer imprisonment in the dungeon. Miñana also cites Cervantes when he branded Lope de Vega a “monstruo de naturaleza” in the prologue to a collection of Cervantes’ *comedias* and *entremeses* published in 1615. According to Miñana, what the “monster” most desires is to be seen by others, by which it can be inferred that he/she seeks first and foremost fame and recognition, and this is exactly what Don Quijote seems to do in every situation in which he interacts with other people. The first thing he does is to announce who he is, usually accompanied by his profession of the unrivaled beauty and chastity of his lady Dulcinea, to whom he more or less demands they pay her obeisance.

I agree with Miñana for the most part in the “monster” appellation he applies to Alonso Quijano/Don Quijote, yet I do not concur with his conclusion—that is, the answer he gives to the central question of his essay: “¿Quién es el verdadero protagonista del *Quijote* de Cervantes?” (31). In my view, Miñana refuses to “pick a side” and rather opts to lump the dual-personality “Man of La Mancha” into one multi-faceted, composite being. To me, this is blatantly avoiding a direct answer to the question. I believe there can be only one unique protagonist in the *Quijote*, and that is *not* a “man” who possesses the capacity to become an infinite number of different “characters” at any time, whose identity, being multi-faceted, is inherently uncertain and not unique. On the contrary, the protagonist I envision has one unique, constant identity throughout the entire novel—this protagonist is not some hybrid monstrosity (to borrow from Miñana), but rather simply Don Quijote de la Mancha. Our “Man of La Mancha” is none other than Don Quijote.

In addition, I find Miñana’s label of “fame-seeker” for our protagonist too one-sided and thus leaning toward an absolutist point of view. Towards the end of his essay, Miñana makes the following claim: “Quijano/Quijote y Cervantes, hasta cierto punto, utilizan la misma estrategia para lograr *su objeto último de alcanzar la fama*” (54, emphasis added). Here Miñana is asserting that all Alonso Quijano/Don Quijote wants is to achieve fame and make a name for himself. Although I will admit that this is indeed one aspect of Don Quijote’s intentions, to state that he only exists to seek fame is to whittle down the dynamic personality he possesses into a single, limited, and, admittedly, selfish ambition. I contend that Don Quijote is seeking more than fame and renown: he is step-by-step, carefully crafting a new identity, one that, to quote Miñana, “no puede ser más diferente a su progenitor [Alonso Quijano]” (47).

What Miñana fails to recognize is that the reason why the persona of Don Quijote is, as he says, the “extremo opuesto” (47) of the “original” man, Alonso Quijano, is precisely because our Man of La Mancha’s life before he dubbed himself Don Quijote was devoid of meaning and purpose, and thus it dawned on him that he was in dire need of radically altering his lifestyle, or else he would be “destined” to live out the remainder of his life an obscure *hidalgo* with neither progeny nor renown. Our Man of La Mancha would not be the dynamic, living character we know him as if he had never decided to become a knight-errant and pursue adventure. Put another way, if this were the case, the *Quijote* would probably never have been written and the ingenious idea that would become Don Quijote de la Mancha would still be “buried in the archives of La Mancha,” never to be discovered and brought into existence.

Alonso Quijano, “llamado comúnmente «don Quijote de la Mancha»” (II:LXXIV 1104), throughout the course of 125 chapters of the *Quijote*, is only known by three different surnames: the narrator states lackadaisically in the opening chapter that some people say his name is “Quijada” or “Quesada,” yet others still conjecture that his name is actually “Quijana,” although apparently no one knows for sure. Not surprisingly, the narrator explicitly states: “Pero esto importa poco a nuestro cuento” (I:I 28), as if to say that this fifty-something *hidalgo* doesn’t even exist—or even if he does, not a single facet of his personality or character prior to his transformation into “Don Quijote” is even worth mentioning. Although this could be termed *in medias res*, it is clear from the very beginning that the “author” has no interest whatsoever in establishing a substantial “back story” for Don Quijote, considering that by the end of the first chapter our good *hidalgo* is already fully armed in the traditional knightly attire and sallies forth in the very next chapter. We might have never known Don Quijote’s “real” name if not for his death-bed confession in the very last chapter of the novel, where he states with solemnity mixed

with melancholy: “Dadme albricias, buenos señores, de que ya yo no soy don Quijote de la Mancha, sino Alonso Quijano, a quien mis costumbres me dieron renombre de «bueno»” (II:LXXIV 1100).

The last chapter of the *Quijote* is not a palinode. When we accept this, it affects our understanding of the whole book. A “palinode” (also “palinody”) is derived from Ancient Greek *πάλιν* (“pálin”) meaning “again” and *ὠδή* (“oidé”) which is the source of the English word “ode,” which in turn derives from *αἰείδω* (“aeído”) meaning “to sing.” In Latin it was calqued “recantatio,” which by way of French became “recantation” in English. Thus, in its literal sense, a “palinode” is an ode/song repeated or sung again. In a not-so-literal sense, it has come to specifically refer to a poem (or by extension another type of text, literary or otherwise) in which the author retracts a statement made in another poem, which could theoretically be in the same poem (or other text)—in which it would be placed at the very end—although the writing of a palinode as an “after-thought” or amendment later in an author’s life appears to have become more common in the modern age, yet there exist palinodes within the same poem dating back to Classical Antiquity. A famous example of a palinode is contained at the very end of Geoffrey Chaucer’s masterpiece *The Canterbury Tales*, where there appears a type of “confession” that his writings may not have been the most virtuous and spiritual, with an accompanying plea to God for forgiveness for his “sins” in his various written works throughout his life.

Prologue to Part I

In the preliminary dedicatory sonnets in the prologue to the first part of the *Quijote*, we notice that there are none dedicated to “Alonso Quijano el Bueno,” but rather to his reawakened persona of Don Quijote de la Mancha. Of these included in the prologue to the first part, five are addressed directly to Don Quijote (out of ten total) by various different literary figures: Amadís

de Gaula (the protagonist from the various incarnations of the book of the same name, popularized by Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo's version published in 1496), Don Belianís de Grecia (from *Historia de Belianís de Grecia* (1547-1579) in four volumes by Jerónimo Fernández), Orlando (protagonist of the famous Italian epic poem *Orlando furioso*, published in 1532 by Ludovico Ariosto, having achieved great fame in Spain), el Caballero del Febo (protagonist from *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros* [1555] by Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra), and Solisdán (of unknown origin).

(Refer to "Appendix A" for the complete text of these sonnets, epitaphs, and poems.)

Amadís de Gaula a Don Quijote de la Mancha

What we should note at the very beginning is the fact that these preliminary sonnets are directed not to the "original" characters in themselves, but rather the identities that they take on following the "birth" of Don Quijote. There are sonnets addressed to "Dulcinea del Toboso," not Aldonza Lorenzo who is supposedly the "true" identity of Dulcinea and even to "Rocinante," which is the new identity that Don Quijote's horse assumes following the coming forth of Don Quijote. Even though there are sonnets addressed to Sancho Panza, who is indeed the original character, it should be noted that he is not being addressed as the poor farmhand but rather as the "dignified" squire of Don Quijote de la Mancha, which we can certainly say is akin to taking on a new identity. This idea of assuming a new identity to become one's authentic self is an important concept that is present throughout the entire Quijote—in fact, there are many other characters in the novel that assume different identities at different times that are in stark contrast to their "original" selves. Take Sansón Carrasco, for example: on two separate occasions he assumes the identity of a knight-errant. First as "el Caballero del Bosque/de los Espejos," where

he is unsuccessful in conquering Don Quijote in battle, and secondly as “El Caballero de la Blanca Luna,” where he finally succeeds in defeating the proud knight and forces him to return home and renounce the life of a knight for a season. Although it may well be said that these identities that Sansón assumes are entirely feigned and fantastical, in a way Sansón, as a knight-errant, seems to only find satisfaction with his encounters with Don Quijote in the guise of a fellow knight in arms, for this seems to be the only way that he can relate to Don Quijote within his version of reality. It is also significant that when Sansón is defeated in the first encounter and his helmet is removed, revealing the face of Sansón Carrasco, Don Quijote refuses to believe that this noble knight was in fact the *bachiller* Sansón, and thus he ascribes this impossibility to the malignant enchanters that seek to thwart him at every turn. So, in the mind of Don Quijote, it was an enchanter who transformed the identity of “El Caballero de los Espejos” into that of Sansón to deprive Don Quijote the satisfaction of ascertaining the true identity of the knight whom he had bested in singular combat.

In this first sonnet from Amadís, the “sin par flor de la andante caballeria” himself essentially sings the praises of the comparatively obscure and humble Don Quijote de la Mancha, as if he (Amadís) cannot even light a candle to the unparalleled superiority that is inherent in the persona of Don Quijote. Once again, we should note that this sonnet is directed at Don Quijote, not at the lifeless figure of the “Man of La Mancha” or of “Alonso Quijano el Bueno,” for, as previously mentioned, it is as Don Quijote that this character truly comes alive and begins to experience the joys and afflictions of life. Nevertheless, Amadís concedes that Don Quijote did many things in imitation of himself (Amadís), particularly when Don Quijote performs his “penitence” in the Sierra Morena in the same style as Amadís did in La Peña Pobre. In the case of Don Quijote, we can say that he is mostly driven by imitation of all the great heroes of

chivalric romances, as well as historical figures such as El Cid, and thus there seems to be little, if any, traces of desiring to become superior to these “people,” for, as we know, the knights of every chivalric romance were just as real as El Cid, Charlemagne, or the *Doce Pares de Francia*.

Amadís also gives a sort of prophecy when he states: “tendrás claro renombre de valiente.” The question we need to ask ourselves is: did Don Quijote succeed in establishing his fame of being “valiente” throughout the course of his many adventures? The adventure of the lion is certainly one that seems to come to mind in this respect, but it wasn’t so much the intimidating bravery of Don Quijote that “tamed” the ferocious lion but rather the disinterest of the lion to waste his time in leaving his cage to contend with a scrawny middle-aged man who was undoubtedly trembling with fear of losing his life. We can certainly say that Don Quijote always entered into “battle” with undaunting courage and firm bravery, despite how much embarrassment the adventure resulted in on the part of Don Quijote and the spritely yet insecure Sancho, as well as whoever else was involved. I believe that such undeterred resolve is more than enough to imprint an indelible seal of bravery on the figure of Don Quijote because, despite his consecutive failures, he always gets back up, often with the kind assistance of Sancho, and looks for the best in what he has “accomplished” with his mighty arm, while admitting many a time that a particular adventure didn’t end up going as he had planned or had “envisioned” at the start.

Amadís continues: “tu patria será en todas la primera.” This is very interesting in the sense that, although popularized in the Spanish language, Amadís originates not from Spain but from Gaula, a city on the island of Madeira, part of Portugal. Even so, the fact that the saga originated from a Spanish author (Garci Rodriguez de Montalvo) should not be overlooked, and the reference of “tu patria” is probably analogous with the adopted “patria” of Amadís, and thus

Amadís is attempting to propose a commonality with himself and the Manchegan knight, perhaps to say, “In this we are equals,” yet this is obviously inferior to the overall greatness that sets Don Quijote apart from all the rest.

Amadís concludes with not another praise to the greatness of Don Quijote, but rather to his creator: “tu sabio autor, al mundo único y solo.” Despite initial appearances, this may not necessarily be self-praise by Cervantes, but perhaps a reference to the imagined *historiador arábigo* Cide Hamete who is touted as the “authentic” author of the Quijote. This concept of the majority of the Quijote having been composed originally in Arabic and then translated into Castilian is indeed a unique literary device because it is as if Cervantes does not feel it necessary to ascribe the genius of the Quijote to his own ingenuity and intelligence, for he considers Don Quijote not entirely his own creation: “Pero yo, que, aunque parezco padre, soy padrastro de don Quijote...” (I:P 7). This is a unique admission indeed—if Don Quijote is not Cervantes’ “son,” but rather his “godson,” what does this imply in our reading of the novel?

When Amadís says “tendrás claro renombre de valiente,” it is without a doubt that the person whom he is addressing is Don Quijote, not whoever he may have been prior to the assumption of this identity, as also explicitly stated in the title of this sonnet. It can only be Don Quijote who will have “renombre de valiente” because his former self was presumably devoid of anything that could be considered “brave” or “courageous,” whereas our protagonist, Don Quijote de la Mancha, is certainly deserving of such an epithet, although most people who interact with him would probably disagree. In addition, if we backtrack a little bit, we see that this phrase is qualified by “eternamente,” which, by definition, implies that the fame of Don Quijote will endure long past his death. It logically follows that Don Quijote must maintain his

“Don Quijote” persona, even in death, which fuels the argument that Don Quijote’s “confession” should not be taken at face value and merits reevaluation.

Don Belianís de Grecia a Don Quijote de la Mancha

This sonnet by Don Belianís is essentially a delineation of his own deeds, which at the beginning appear to be entirely self-aggrandizement but when we reach the very last stanza of the sonnet, we finally understand the reason why Don Belianís gave a long list of everything he accomplished that supposedly made him great and worth of emulation, yet, as indicated by the interjection of “mas,” Don Belianís is setting up a comparison—that of himself and Don Quijote. He unashamedly confesses that he is envious of the grandeur of Don Quijote—yes, Don Belianís is admitting that he cannot even compare in prowess and skill in front of the “gran Quijote.” This sonnet is an example of *superatio*, but in reverse—that is, Don Belianís is not asserting his own superiority, but rather deferring to the new standard for knight-errantry, the newly-crowned epitome of all the virtues extolled by the knightly order, that of the one and only Don Quijote de la Mancha, who has, in the eyes of all of these fictional, yet real in the eyes of the one who is to be emulated, characters, become the *flor y nata de la andante caballeria* in word and in deed. If we accept this declaration by Don Belianís, we must also accept the fact that Don Quijote has been and always will be Don Quijote—the man who was once known as Alonso Quijano ceased to exist the very moment in which he donned the armor and weapons of knighthood, dubbed his weary horse “Rocinante,” and sallied forth toward adventure. Although it is true that his first sally was fairly short and not very fitting to the greatness innate in the character of the great Don Quijote, the idea that knights went on multiple sallies is very well documented in chivalric romances and thus it should not be counted against our noble knight for having failed miserably in his first attempt at adventuring.

Another part of this sonnet should catch our attention: the third stanza in which Don Belianís states “...y traje del copete mi cordura...” The dichotomy of *locura/cordura* is essential to our understanding of the entire corpus of the *Quijote*, and it is no coincidence that the quality that is opposite the one normally associated with Don Quijote (*locura*) is mentioned here. The fact of whether Don Quijote is mad or sane is not as relevant to our discussion as the idea of the preeminence of the reality of Don Quijote remaining Don Quijote ever since the opening chapter of the novel, continuing throughout the course of the total 126 chapters even beyond his supposed deathbed-renunciation of his “Don Quijote” persona. It can be claimed with reasonable certainty that Don Quijote possesses a sort of dual mad/sane personality in which each distinct part manifests itself at different times depending on the situation Don Quijote finds himself in.

Once again, it is Don Quijote who is the center of attention—it is Don Quijote whom Don Belianís envies and to whom he is deferring his greatness. Don Belianís is admitting defeat in the face of the unrivaled grandeur of Don Quijote, which grandeur Alonso Quijano certainly did not possess, nor is there any indication that anyone would have been particularly envious of his life. He was essentially wasting away in mundaneness and insignificance and it was only by means of his voracious reading of chivalric romances that finally “snapped” him out of it.

Orlando furioso a Don Quijote de la Mancha

This sonnet by Orlando is, unlike the previous one by Don Belianís, replete with direct praises of Don Quijote, rather than an enumeration of his own heroic feats. Orlando begins calling Don Quijote unique in not only glory and fame, but also in virtue and goodness, claiming that on Earth he has no equal and that he stands alone in the finest representative of chivalry and knight-errantry. He continues, dubbing Don Quijote “invicto vencedor,” in order to emphasize

the mighty power and singular bravery that Don Quijote inherently possesses, further claiming that he has never been defeated, although this is negated in the second part of the novel after being bested by Sansón disguised as El Caballero de la Blanca Luna. Even so, the fact that Don Quijote was defeated in battle and was forced to lay down his arms for a season was only a necessary plot device to make it possible for Don Quijote to be willing to quit the office of knight-errant to bring the novel to its fitting end.

Orlando then admits his inferiority when placed next to Don Quijote and explicitly states that he cannot be Don Quijote's equal simply because he pales in comparison to such an exquisite knight. Like Don Belianís, Orlando makes specific mentions of Don Quijote's "proezas," yet Orlando goes even further by appending to this his "fama," which further exalts Don Quijote above himself (Orlando), despite the indisputable renown and fame he had, no doubt, accrued over the centuries. Another interesting line in this sonnet is that Orlando draws a direct corollary between himself and Don Quijote when he says, "...puesto que [aunque], como yo, perdiste el seso..." The insertion of "although," which naturally carries a negative connotation, is fascinating as well, mainly because it is unclear, at least superficially, whether Orlando is unabashedly criticizing both himself and Don Quijote for having gone "mad," yet it is apparent that such a condemnation is only temporary because both Orlando and, supposedly, Don Quijote eventually regained their sanity, albeit in the case of Don Quijote it was much delayed. We can identify both similarities and differences between the madness of both characters: (1) In a similar vein, both the madness of Orlando and Don Quijote result in destruction, although the destruction is more severe in Orlando's case; and (2) Orlando initially goes mad because he is rejected by his love Angélica, whereas the root of Don Quijote's madness does not stem from having been spurned by his lady Dulcinea, but rather due to his

rabid consumption of *libros de caballerías* as asserted by the narrator in the first chapter of the novel. Nevertheless, the poem is written by “Orlando furioso,” not the Orlando who later regains his sanity.

Another interesting aspect of Orlando’s sonnet is that immediately following his unequivocal declaration that he can in no way be Don Quijote’s equal, he suddenly changes course and insists that he and Don Quijote will be, in fact, equals, provided the fulfilment of a particular stipulation: “...si al soberbio moro y cita fiero domas...” We can be assured that Don Quijote never does defeat “moros” and “[es]citas,” because of which we can logically assume Don Quijote does not end up as Orlando’s equal—at least not in that respect. Still, we can assert, based on Orlando’s sonnet, that in other particulars Don Quijote certainly proved superior, and thus it is safe to say that, overall, Don Quijote emerges triumphant in “unrivaledness.”

Although Orlando draws a commonality between himself and Don Quijote when he says “perdiste el seso,” we should recognize that the nature of their respective madness is not the same. Unlike Orlando, who essentially turns into a raging beast with no regard to the chaos and destruction his fury may cause, Don Quijote, although possessing some proclivity to occasional unbridled destruction of property, tends to be more rational in his escapades, albeit to varying degrees depending on the circumstance.

It is interesting that Orlando seemingly retracts his high estimation of Don Quijote by modifying his original statement that he cannot be Don Quijote’s equal to a clarification that they can, in fact, be equals after all. In this sudden reversal of facts we can see traces of latent pride that was not present at the beginning of the sonnet, yet we certainly cannot say that Don Quijote is the pinnacle of humility himself, for he has constructed an identity that exudes supremacy in every aspect of his being, and he never shies away from announcing the fame he is bound to

acquire. Even so, there is still some degree of humility inherent in the way Don Quijote professes his loyalty and devotion to his lady Dulcinea del Toboso, and he accepts his defeat at the hands of Sansón Carrasco with grace and submission, resigning himself to his fate.

El Caballero del Febo a Don Quijote de la Mancha

In the first stanza of this next sonnet, el Caballero del Febo lauds the incomparable majesty of Don Quijote over his base self, overtly stating that he is even transcended in glory by the grandiosity of Don Quijote. The second and third stanzas discuss the various feats of el Caballero del Febo, focusing on his love for Claridiana, ostensibly claiming that “el propio infierno temió mi brazo.” Yet despite all that, the sonnet concludes, like Don Belianís’, with the negating “mas,” where el Caballero del Febo once again trembles in adulation of the singular greatness of Don Quijote, calling him “godo,” “ilustre,” and “claro,” and connecting his love for Claridiana with that of Don Quijote’s for Dulcinea, while admitting that Don Quijote’s love for Dulcinea supersedes even that of his own, for “por Dulcinea sois al mundo eterno.” The very designation of Don Quijote as “eterno” is further evidence of the infinite longevity and “immortality” of Don Quijote as Don Quijote, not here and not ever as “Alonso Quijano el Bueno,” whose name we learn for the first time in the concluding chapter of the novel! It is as if this Alonso Quijano never even existed until the very end of the novel, and even then, we as readers refuse to relate to him because during the entire novel we have known him exclusively as Don Quijote de la Mancha, and not as some obscure, middle-aged hidalgo with nothing to his name. This man has only his house and property to his name and has remained unmarried his entire life and thus will have no one to carry on his family name, which name at this point is not even known with certainty.

This idea of *eternidad* is significant not only as it relates to the perpetuity of the legacy of Don Quijote, but also because it is specifically referring to the relationship between Don Quijote and Dulcinea, which will also live on for the rest of time. Even though Dulcinea is not a real person *per se*, the love and dedication Don Quijote expresses to her is indeed real and sincere and just as “tangible” as that of el Febo and Claridiana, Orlando and Angélica, Amadís and Oriana, and every other storied romance of renown. It is through this everlasting love that the farmgirl Aldonza Lorenzo is transformed into the stunning beauty of Dulcinea del Toboso who remains alive in the mind and heart of our beloved knight. If Don Quijote must live on, then he cannot do so alone—where he goes, Dulcinea is right behind.

De Solisdán a Don Quijote de la Mancha

This sonnet, written in the antiquated “pseudo-fabla” that Don Quijote employs when speaking, is different from the others in that it is fairly sarcastic and even derogatory in tone. Nevertheless, the first stanza is perhaps somewhat less “course” in that it indicated a type of “saving grace” for Don Quijote despite his madness, which Solisdán appears to imply has been the cause of Don Quijote’s “downfall.” Essentially, Solisdán is saying that although it may be true that most of the world will judge him as “mad,” he will at least not be ridiculed for having propagated “obras viles y soeces,” for no one would say that Don Quijote ever did anything with the intent to do harm to or belittle anyone. His motives were, for the most part, pure and unadulterated and devoid of any sinful intention. The second two stanzas are quite pessimistic and even demeaning, for Solisdán speaks of Don Quijote being offended or dishonored by Dulcinea, which is entirely inconceivable in the mind of Don Quijote (despite the rudeness with which he was greeted by the “enchanted” Dulcinea on the outskirts of El Toboso), and Solisdán

even goes as far as to say that Sancho was “necio,” Dulcinea “dura,” and Don Quijote “no amante,” which is extremely insulting to both a knight and his beautiful lady.

Despite the intentionally brusque tone of this last sonnet, it should be noted that all of the previously discussed sonnets are at least partially sarcastic or in jest because we, as readers, know full well that Don Quijote’s adventures never amount to anything worthy of being chronicled alongside the knights of yesteryear, at least superficially, or at least in the eyes of everyone else (not including Sancho). Even still, his and Sancho’s exploits were published and disseminated throughout Spain (in the reality of the novel) and enjoyed moderate success among the residents of La Mancha, yet the popularity of the novel was largely due to the comedic value derived from the ridiculousness of the story’s content, certainly not because it was considered aesthetically appealing as a chronicle of a knight’s deeds. Yet this is once again only true for those outside of Don Quijote’s reality, because for him, the publication of this book is the literal fulfilment of one of his greatest desires: to be recorded in the annals of knighthood to cement his legacy alongside all the other greats with his own unique and authentic seal of excellence carved by his own hand, so to speak. This legacy is what makes Don Quijote such an enduring literary figure who will continue to live on in the imaginations of readers, both new and seasoned.

Epilogue to Part I

At the very end of Chapter 52 of the first part of the Quijote, we find three epitaphs and three sonnets: two epitaphs for Don Quijote and his tomb and one epitaph for the tomb of Dulcinea; one sonnet for the praise of Dulcinea, one for Rocinante, and one for Sancho Panza. What makes these six unique from the ten poems in the prologue to the first part is that they are centered on the death of Don Quijote and his fellow adventurers, rather than being centered on the living Don Quijote and company. The symbolism of death is very appropriate as it acts a

type of foreshadowing for the second part of the novel, seeing as the “Man of La Mancha” indeed passes away in the final chapter after having condemned his senseless reading of chivalric romances and supposedly denounces his second identity as Don Quijote de la Mancha. Be that as it may, I intend to argue that although on the surface Don Quijote dies as “Alonso Quijano el Bueno,” he really, on the contrary, dies as Don Quijote. It is also of note that the various narrators of both parts of the Quijote never refer to Don Quijote as Alonso Quijano—“Don Quijote” is always “Don Quijote,” and no one else. It seems entirely absurd to even call Don Quijote “Alonso Quijano” no matter how hard you try—the reason for this is that whoever Don Quijote was prior to the first chapter is completely irrelevant to our understanding and reading of the *Quijote*. Simply put, we cannot conceive of Don Quijote being anyone other than Don Quijote, for it is Don Quijote with whom we have traveled on all his adventures—even his closest friend and confidant Sancho calls him Don Quijote, for this is the only name by which Sancho has known him since he has been in the service of his master ever since Don Quijote’s second sally. By becoming Don Quijote, he begins to gain “relevance,” not only in the eyes of everyone who comes in contact with him in the novel, but also to us as readers—Don Quijote only became relevant when he donned the knightly garb and set out to realize his full potential and grab hold of his seemingly unachievable, idealistic fantasy of a dream. Yet that fantasy begins to materialize in his own eyes, bit by bit, as he maintains the Don Quijote persona for more and more time.

El Monicongo, académico de la Argamasilla, a la sepultura de Don Quijote

A cursory reading of this epitaph may result in some degree of uncertainty as to whom it is addressed, provided, of course, that it is read without the heading, although any student of the *Quijote* would be able to recognize two key clues to ascertain the identity of this person: (1) The

mention of La Mancha; and, which silences any further doubt, (2) the mention of Rocinante, whose owner is, of course, Don Quijote de la Mancha. This epitaph is structured in a way that every two lines or so contains a specific description that accentuates a unique aspect of Don Quijote, and it is clear that all of these lines are leading up to an inevitable climax, yet when we finally arrive at the last line of the epitaph we suddenly feel “desengañados” because we are expecting to see some sort of triumphant entry of this hero among men, yet that is not what we actually encounter. After all this praise and building-up of characteristics worthy of emulation, we read that this “man among men” has, in reality, been dead for who knows how long and that, despite his never-before-seen feats of daring and bravery, he is now most likely a mass of decayed bone, lying beneath the cold earth. It is almost as if our once illustrious *caballero* has been erased, not only from the obscure “archives of La Mancha,” but from literary history itself.

It is also significant that the author mentions both Amadís and Belianís, who had previously “written” sonnets to Don Quijote in the prologue to the novel, yet this connection is even more expansive in that the author uses both Amadís and Belianís in the plural (i.e. “los Amadisés” and “los Belianisés”). This plurality of Amadisés and Belianisés encompasses not solely the “Amadís” of Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo and the “Don Belianís” of Jerónimo Fernández, but every other iteration of these two characters. This may be a reference to Don Quijote’s “Yo sé quién soy” episode and his supposed multiplicity of identities (see Miñana above), but perhaps it is simply an intensifier that magnifies the greatness of Don Quijote many times over.

Also interesting is one line that seems at least minutely critical of Don Quijote: “aquel que en Rocinante *errando anduvo*” (emphasis added). The use of the verb “errar,” which, according to Francisco Rico’s note, used to mean more like “vagar” (II:LII 530, note 35), seems

to imply that Don Quijote was simply a “wanderer” of sorts, which further implies that he journeyed about without a purpose or goal in mind. However, I believe that Don Quijote was very much purpose-driven and goal-oriented, albeit the exact purpose and goal are not always so clear. His “wandering” is of the existential sort. His unofficial motto of “enderezando tuertos” and “desfaciendo agravios” (I:XIX 170) is the driving force behind what he does and how he reacts to various situations throughout the course of the novel.

Despite the apparent “death” of Don Quijote referenced in the final chapter of the first part, he is effectively “revived” for the continuation of the *Quijote* which appeared ten years after the publication of the first part, and only about one year after the publication of the spurious second part by Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda, whose true identity remains unknown. It is clear that the appearance of this false *Quijote* had a significant impact on the way Cervantes ended up writing the second part because there are specific references to it in several places in the second part of the *Quijote*, including when Don Quijote learns of the publication of this false continuation (II:LXII) and when he meets a character from Avellaneda’s *Quijote*, Don Álvaro Tarfe, who is compelled to recant that he had previously met “Don Quijote” (II:LXXII).

Del Cachidiablo, académico de la Argamasilla, en la sepultura de Don Quijote

Once again, the verb “yacer” is used, but this time in the first line of the epitaph as to make it clear from the beginning that this epitaph concerns the dead Don Quijote, along with the dead Sancho, who is, alongside his master, also “lying” in a tomb. Compared to the previous one, this epitaph carries a much more pejorative tone: Don Quijote is reduced to “bien molido y malandante,” Sancho is scoffed at as a “majadero,” and even poor Rocinante is not immune to debasement (albeit to a much lesser degree). Despite all this mockery, it is safe to say that where the author calls Sancho “escudero el más fiel que vio el trato de escudero,” that it is not with

sarcasm, for Sancho is more than deserving of this epithet to his great integrity and unwearied fidelity and devotion to his *señor*.

Another detail worthy of mention is the dual meaning of the word “sepultura,” for it can refer to either the actual burying of a deceased person or the physical burial site or tomb of the deceased. For example, in the first volume, we witness the *sepultura* of Grisóstomo, but afterwards he has no permanent resting place. I believe this play on meaning is deliberate because of both the *locura/cordura* dichotomy and the dual personality of Alonso Quijano/Don Quijote. Even so, the appropriate meaning is easily ascertained by the choice of preposition: “*a la sepultura*” vs “*en la sepultura*,” the former referring to a spoken epitaph at the burial or funeral/wake, and the latter referring to an epitaph engraved in stone on the actual tombstone or any other prominent location that forms part of the tomb. Despite the lack of ambiguity in this regard, we can still make some pertinent observations by means of analogy. When we speak of Don Quijote being laid to rest, we can say that not just the parchments of original manuscripts containing the story of Don Quijote are buried in “los archivos manchegos” (I:LII 529), but now the actual physical body of Don Quijote is, in a similar manner, interred in these same archives. It is almost as if Cervantes “killed off” his protagonist prematurely, only to “resurrect” him in the second part, but then is he not only Don Quijote de la Mancha, but he has achieved at least modest fame because of the book that was published detailing his many adventures, giving him and Sancho even more of an impetus to once again leave behind the (false) comforts of home and sally forth even more eager than before.

On the other hand, we can view these epitaphs retroactively in relation to the end of the second part, where Don Quijote dies and is buried, although no details concerning his burial and funeral are provided, only that his bones are resting in a tomb somewhere in La Mancha.

Viewed in this regard, these epitaphs take on a more somber tone and provoke feelings of sadness and regret, as if Don Quijote were taken from us too soon, for we had only begun to become acquainted with him and we theorize he could have done so much more good if he had been permitted to live, or rather, if he had maintained the will to live. Just as Don Quijote comes back to life in the second part, his essence persists even after his early demise.

Epilogue to Part II

These last two poems that appear at the end of the last chapter of the *Quijote* are similar to the epitaphs that appear in the last chapter of the first part in that they are included within the chapter itself and not separated from the text like the preliminary sonnets are. However, unlike the epitaphs at the end of the first part, which are prefaced with a heading (i.e. “Los académicos de la Argamasilla... [I:LII 530]) and have specific titles that indicate the author and to whom the poem is addressed, in the case of these last poems, they simply appear embedded within the text of the chapter without any headings or titles. It is interesting that the author refers to Sansón’s poem as one of “los nuevos epitafios de su sepultura [la de Don Quijote],” in direct contrast to the previous epitaphs that were given at the end of the first part.

Versos del bachiller Sansón Carrasco

We see the use of the verb “yacer” for the third time now, and thus we cannot undermine its significance. Nevertheless, this “yacer” is different from the other two because whereas before Don Quijote was “lying” in his tomb, in this instance Don Quijote is still “lying” on the bed on which he made his supposed confession and left the land of the living. This “lying” on his literal deathbed precedes his later “lying” in eternal slumber in his dark, dank tomb, and thus

this first instance is more of a romantic ideal since Don Quijote has just expired and is still visible to his family and friends in the same physical appearance as they had known in life.

Sansón does not shy away from exclaiming supreme adulation to the greatness of our “Man of la Mancha,” affirming that “la muerte no [le] triunfó.” This idea of conquering death and still maintaining a living presence despite of it is tantamount to the elaboration of this more dynamic reading of the death of Don Quijote because it asserts that death will not be his end and that he will continue to live on for all time and eternity. Nevertheless, Sansón has a different “protagonist” in mind: that of Alonso Quijano el Bueno who has supposedly regained his sanity after having renounced his “false” and “mad” identity of Don Quijote. The strongest evidence for this is in the concluding line to the poem: “su ventura [la de Alonso Quijano/Don Quijote] [fue] morir cuerdo y vivir loco.” I disagree with this statement. To say that Don Quijote “died sane” and “lived mad” is to separate the two inseparable facets of our “Man of la Mancha”’s personality, the two aspects that define who he is as an individual—they are firmly interlocked in a way that he cannot be “cuerdo” without being “loco,” and vice versa. These two personas co-inhabit the genius (or *ingenioso*) mind of Don Quijote in a way that he can act “loco” in one given moment and “cuerdo” in another.

Now that our “Man of la Mancha” is, at long last, dead and buried, his many heroic and not-so-heroic adventures and journeyings have come to their natural end, as no one can escape his or her own death, even the decorated Don Quijote. Cervantes wanted to make sure that never again will a book be written containing any further adventures of Don Quijote: “... y que el tal testimonio pedía [el cura] para quitar la ocasion de que algún otro autor que Cide Hamete Benengeli le resucitase falsamente y hiciese inacabables historias de sus hazañas” (II:LXXIV 1104). This was included to discourage the publication of a third part alluded to by Avellaneda

in his *Quijote*, which was never written, although countless imitations and continuations in various languages have appeared since the 17th century.

La pluma de Cide Hamete Benengeli

This brief epitaph, which is not an original work of Cide Hamete but borrowed from another source, explains explicitly to the reader that the one and only “true” author of the *Quijote* is Cide Hamete Benengeli, and, not only that, but also that it was his “destiny” to become the chronicler of the deeds and adventures of Don Quijote and Sancho Panza (“porque esta empresa [la de escribir el *Quijote*] ... para mí estaba guardada”). The author, or rather, the author’s *pluma*, elaborates further: “Para mí sola nació don Quijote, y yo para él” (II:LXXIV 1105). We, as readers, can apply this statement to ourselves individually: “for me (the reader) was Don Quijote born, and I for him.” In this way we can more fully relate to the authentic human struggle that Don Quijote endures and we can apply his ironclad resolve and perseverance as encouragement whenever we feel discouraged and start to doubt our own dreams and aspirations, believing we will never realize them. When we think this, we can remember our “Man of la Mancha” and derive inspiration therefrom, for, to use a clichéd expression, if he can do it, so can we.

We can extend the exclamation of Cide Hamete’s *pluma* to Cide Hamete himself, and from there to Cervantes as the creator of our “Man of la Mancha,” better known as “Don Quijote,” not “Alonso Quijano.” Both parts of the *Quijote* most certainly deal with the life and times of a fifty-something *hidalgo* who resolves to become a knight-errant and does just that, and that is why the character known as “Alonso Quijano” only appears two times in both parts of the novel, and even then the only reason for the existence of this “Alonso Quijano” is to introduce or bid farewell to his “Don Quijote” persona, although the latter is used in a more figurative sense.

It is also why none of the sonnets, epigraphs, or poems discussed are addressed to “Alonso Quijano el Bueno,” but rather to “Don Quijote de la Mancha,” who is, without a doubt, the true “incarnation” of our noble “Man of la Mancha.”

Chapter 3: Los sabios encantadores

We can say that Don Quijote views reality through the narrow lens of *caballeros andantes* and *libros de caballerías*, and thus it is only logical that things would appear quite different to him than if they were viewed through a generic, universal lens that is not filtered to fit only specific parameters. This unique lens is essential to the *loco* persona of our “Man of la Mancha” because it dictates how he interacts with different people and situations throughout his many adventures in the novel. Key mediators between Don Quijote and reality are the *sabios encantadores*, some of whom support his quests (see first sally, when Don Quijote speaks of the *sabio* who will chronicle his exploits) and others who seek to thwart him. This chapter analyzes the different sets of *encantadores* Don Quijote invokes to explain his defeats and mishaps. To better understand the vocabulary Don Quijote employs, we must first examine the famous *Jardín de flores curiosas* (1570), by Antonio de Torquemada (1507-1569). Given that Don Quijote’s library includes a copy of Torquemada’s chivalric novel *Don Olivante de Laura* (1564), and that the priest excoriates the *Jardín* itself, we can assume that Don Quijote’s *encantadores* bear a strong resemblance to those discussed by Torquemada.

In this chapter I will show that the dichotomy of Don Quijote’s *locura* and *cordura* leads to his interpretation of reality as being manipulated by “sabios encantadores”—sometimes in his favor, and sometimes against. My taxonomy of these “encantadores” and “encantamientos” will be informed by contrasting them with Antonio de Torquemada’s discussion of enchantments in *Jardín de flores curiosas* (1570). To conclude, Don Quijote’s madness belies a certain logic, a real-life example of “la razón de la sinrazón.”

Antonio de Torquemada’s *Jardín de flores*

El jardín de flores curiosas by Antonio de Torquemada is divided into six *tratados*: “... los casos monstruosos que se describen en el primero de ellos, sobre alteraciones fuera de lo común que la Naturaleza hace en los hombres; ... y, por encima de todo, las sorprendentes experiencias con fantasmas, brujas, y hechiceros que se narran en el tercero de ellos” (Rodríguez Cacho xxxvi). It should be noted that *encantadores* are featured along with *hechiceros* concerning the differences between the two. It is also of note that Cervantes used Torquemada’s *Jardín* in writing his *Coloquio de los perros*, “aunque después se uniera al criterio de quienes lo despreciaron como ‘colección de patrañas’” (ibid.). Thus it is not an understatement that he despised Torquemada’s *Jardín de flores*.

In the third *tratado* of Antonio de Torquemada’s *Jardín de flores curiosas* (1570), various supernatural phenomena and people believed to possess supernatural powers are discussed in a series of dialogues, which deals with *encantadores* (among other things). The character Bernardo inquires of his friend Antonio concerning “qué diferencia hay entre encantadores y hechizeros, y cómo usan los unos y los otros de su arte” (714), to which Antonio gives the following explanation:

... «encantadores,» llamamos a los que pública y descubiertamente tienen tratos y conciertos con los demonios, y así, obran cosas que en la apariencia son muy maravillosas, porque entrando en cercos los hacen parecer y hablar, y consultan a los mismos demonios, aprovechándose de su favor y ayuda en todas sus obras, y los mismos demonios las hacen por ellos (714).

Per this explanation, the most distinguishing characteristic of the *encantador* is his non-secretive pact with “devils” or “demons,” and, not only is he in league with them, but regularly “consults” them and benefits from their assistance in a sort of mutually-beneficial relationship. This

contrasts with the *hechicero*, who, according to Antonio, is unwittingly deceived by the Devil to perform his works by mixing “natural magic” with “demonic magic” through association with various objects and signs. In other words, the *encantador* is complicit in his affiliation with the Devil whereas the *hechicero* is innocent insofar as he does not profess allegiance to the Devil or the “dark arts.”

What is particularly noteworthy about this work by Torquemada is that it is mentioned by name in Chapter 6 of the first part during the priest and barber’s scrutiny of Don Quijote’s personal library. The priest, after noticing another book by Torquemada, offers the following commentary: “El autor de ese libro [*Don Olivante de Laura*] ... fue el mismo [Antonio de Torquemada] que compuso a *Jardín de flores*, y en verdad que no sepa determinar cuál de los dos libros es más verdadero o, por decir mejor, menos mentiroso; sólo sé decir que éste irá al corral, por disparatado y arrogante” (I:VI 62). *Don Olivante de Laura* (1564) is significant in that it is the only *libro de caballerías* authored by Torquemada, yet it is immediately dismissed as unfit for our “Man of la Mancha,” as we expect. Yet what we do not necessarily expect is the lumping together of *Jardín de flores*, which is clearly not a *libro de caballerías*, with *Olivante*. It seems that *Jardín de flores* is simply mentioned in passing to make a comparison with Torquemada’s *Olivante*, which is plausible, considering the majority of the books mentioned are *libros de caballerías*, along with a good amount of *novelas pastoriles* (including Jorge de Montemayor’s *Diana* and, appropriately, Cervantes’ own *Galatea*) and various epic poems. Still, the priest is unable to determine which of these two books is “más verdadero” or, put more succinctly, “menos mentiroso,” which seems to imply that both are replete, to nearly the same degree, with blatantly fictitious and/or false information. Cervantes’ inclusion of these two works by Torquemada indicates that Cervantes was not only familiar with them but also

probably held them in the same esteem as all *libros de caballerías*, to the extent that he felt it necessary to issue a harsh critique of two well-known works by his near-contemporary.

After having explained the differences between *encantadores* and *hechiceros*, the character Antonio concedes that the two are a lot more similar and interconnected than he originally had portrayed them:

Pero, en fin, todos se pueden dezir hechizeros y encantadores, a lo menos quando con la magia natural, que es la de estas cosas a quien naturaleza dio estas virtudes y propiedades ocultas, van mezclados algunos signos y caracteres y palabras que los mesmos que las dizen no las entienden ni saben lo que es, y no quieran dexar de aprovecharse dellas para sus hechizerías y embaymientos (715).

Here a point of contact is established between the *encantador* and the *hechicero*: the use of “natural magic” as a starting point and later embellishing it with “words” and “signs” commonly associated with the supernatural, witchcraft, sorcery and the like, despite the fact that they don’t understand what they are doing or even know what this is all about, and before they know it, they have made a pact with Satan, usually in the form of a he-goat. Antonio goes on further to say that these people are naively “taking advantage” of these secret arts to perform their various “spells” and magic “tricks.”

Up to this point, the *encantadores* as described by Torquemada stand in stark contrast to the *encantadores* of the *Quijote*. In the first place, Torquemada’s *encantador* is portrayed as a man who can interact with other people in the “real world,” whereas in the *Quijote* the *encantador* is depicted as an other-worldly entity who cannot be seen by the human eye nor is ever revealed in the “real world.” Second, Torquemada’s *encantador* is linked with an

ambiguous malevolent being or a multitude of beings, whether it be the Devil as portrayed in Christianity (aka “Lucifer” or “Son of the Morning”) or a generic group of “devils” or “demons,” whereas the *encantadores* of the *Quijote* display a level of autonomy equal to that of deity and thus are not dependent on some other entity or being. Third, Torquemada’s *encantadores* are branded as “evil,” by association with the Devil, whereas the *encantadores* of the *Quijote* can oscillate between *buenos* and *malos*, although admittedly the vast majority are *malos*.

Nevertheless, later on we come across a description that resonates with us as readers of the *Quijote*—the idea of the appearance of people and objects being changed into something else than what they really are:

... y muchas vezes, no solamente a ellas mismas, pero también engañan los ojos de los que las miran y veen. Porque el Demonio forma en ellas aquel cuerpo fantástico alderredor del suyo con aquella apariencia engañosa, y lo mesmo hazen también los encantadores; que muchas vezes nos engañan a la vista, como lo hicieron Circe y Medea y otras que usaron esta arte mágica, que tornavan a los hombres en brutos animales, y todos los que los miravan los tenían por tales, no siendo verdaderamente assí (723).

The key phrase is “engañan los ojos de los que las miran y [ven]” because this is a perfect description of the primary artifice of the *encantadores* who always get in the way of Don Quijote and his adventures: they “deceive the eyes” of the beholder by transforming people and things into something they are not, and thereby succeed in distorting the reality of everyone else except Don Quijote himself, who nonetheless later “sees” what everyone else had seen from the beginning. Although the specific reference of *encantadores* turning men into wild animals is not as salient in the context of the *Quijote*, it is not a far cry from inanimate objects (windmills)

being turned into large humanoid creatures (giants), and thus a parallel can be drawn between the two works.

Our friend Antonio further obscures the distinction between *encantadores* and *hechiceros*, while haphazardly throwing in *brujas* and *nigrománticos* just because they share some basic characteristics with the other two. He explains that the existence of such beings is not a modern phenomenon but has been recorded since Antiquity, and then proceeds to comment on their “benefit” (or lack of) on humankind: “... que muchos autores antiguos tratan dellas [de las brujas], y de los hechizeros, nigrománticos y encantadores, que no son menos pestilenciales y perjudiciales al género humano, pues que, dexando de ser hombres, se vuelven demonios en sus obras” (729). Once again we observe this generic grouping of different types of people who are, in this case, branded “pestilenciales” and “perjudiciales,” which is just another way of saying “evil” or “demonic,” which in turn is simply a blanket term for ostracizing people who are different or “alien” to the societal norm. In the words of our friend Antonio, these people are no longer men because they have turned into “demons” themselves, perhaps as a punishment for their adscription to demonic or occult practices, and hence their inevitable association with the Father of All Lies and the Author of Sin. This is, once again, in direct contrast to the *sabios encantadores* of the *Quijote*, who are portrayed more as mischievous troublemakers who are keen at meddling in knightly affairs, rather than the manifestation of pure evil. We also observe a distinction in tone: Torquemada’s *Jardín de flores* is dark and somber, while Cervantes’s *Quijote* is comparatively more light-hearted and conducive to self-reflection.

The *encantadores* of the *Quijote*

When discussing the destruction of his personal library with his niece, Don Quijote is provided with the explanation devised by the barber and the priest following their “scrutiny” of

the library, yet the niece refers to this enchanter as “el sabio Muñatón,” whose name she had to come up with out of her own imagination, since this enchanter was never granted a name in the original plan. Don Quijote, upon hearing this, is quick to correct her: the enchanter’s name, she meant to say, is actually “Frestón.” Francisco Rico suggests that the name “Frestón” derives from the purported author of *Don Belianís de Grecia*: “Fristón” (I:VII 71, note 8). Don Quijote then proceeds to detail his “strained” relationship with Frestón:

Así es –dijo don Quijote–, que ése es *un sabio encantador, grande enemigo mío*, que me tiene ojeriza, porque sabe por sus artes y letras que tengo de venir, andando los tiempos, a pelear en singular batalla con un caballero a quien él favorece y le tengo de vencer sin que él lo pueda estorbar, y por esto procura hacerme todos los sinsabores que puede; y mándole yo que mal podrá él contradecir ni evitar lo que por el cielo está ordenado (I:VII 71, emphasis added).

The first two traits that Don Quijote associates with this particular *encantador* is that he is not only *sabio* but also his “great enemy,” the reasons for which Don Quijote elaborates on for the rest of the above quote: put simply, Frestón “has it out to get him” and will thus employ any tactics to achieve this goal. Despite anything that Frestón can throw at him, Don Quijote remains certain that there is no way that his honorable “mission” can be thwarted, because he views it as being divinely sanctioned (“lo que por el cielo está ordenado”) and thus he possesses a type of divine mandate that will guarantee his success, for, as everyone surely knows, no *encantador*, no matter how *sabio*, can trump Almighty God.

Despite this seemingly intimate connection between knight and enchanter, the name “Frestón” is peculiarly only mentioned three times in the entire novel, all of which appear early on in the first part: twice in Chapter 7 (I:VII 71) and the very last mention appears in the

subsequent chapter at the beginning of Don Quijote's second sally in the episode of the windmills (I:VIII 76). Even still, we cannot underplay the high occurrence of the verb *encantar* and all its various derivations (i.e., *encanto/s*, *encantado/a/os/as*, *encantamiento*, and *encantador* [both as a noun and adjective]) throughout both parts of the *Quijote*: there are approximately 265 unique occurrences in the entire novel (an approximate number because at least a few of these occur in the notes and not in the actual text). The very frequent mention of *encantadores* and similar words is concrete evidence of just how dependent Don Quijote's "reality" is on these unseen, yet omnipresent beings who seem to serve as "puppet masters" who are clandestinely "pulling the strings" in Don Quijote's adventures as a knight-errant.

The *encantadores* are always first to be blamed by Don Quijote following an adventure that did not quite turn out as "heroic" or "glorious" as he had originally envisioned upon coming across it, and it makes sense that the easiest way to nullify the failure just accrued is to assign all the blame to a "scapegoat" figure. The best choice for a scapegoat is, of course, an imaginary figure with whom no interaction is even possible (which means that there cannot develop a complicated relationship between the two parties), and who fits the bill in the fantastical reality of Don Quijote de la Mancha. The *sabio encantador*, initially identified as "Frestón," is later consolidated into a generic amalgam of *sabios encantadores*. Who these *encantadores* actually are is not important; all that matters is that they maintain a constant presence through which they can exercise a certain degree of influence in the life of Don Quijote. We can even go as far as to say that the "relationship" between knight and *encantador* is, despite how it may seem, mutually beneficial, perhaps even symbiotic in nature—we can certainly say that one would cease to exist without the other because they both "feed" off the nearly palpable tension that exists between them. They exist in perpetual combat, one always seeking to surpass the other.

The tension between Don Quijote and the *encantadores* is parallel to the tension between the two distinct personas of our “Man of la Mancha” (*loco/cuerdo*). We can without a doubt make the same assertion about the dual-persona of our “Man of la Mancha” as we did with the *encantadores*—that is, the two personas coexist within his mind, and thus we can say that a *loco* Don Quijote would not exist without a *cuerdo* Don Quijote, and vice versa, because the two combined make up his authentic self.

The *encantadores* of the *Quijote* can be classified as either (1) *bien intencionados*; or (2) *mal intencionados*. In other words, there are *encantadores* who exist to assist a knight on one hand, and those who exist to debase him on the other (also known as *buenos* and *malos*, respectively).

The very first mention of an *encantador* is found in the second chapter of the first part as Don Quijote first sets out as a knight-errant. Here he is pontificating on the future day when there will be published a book containing his own adventures: “¡Oh tú, *sabio encantador*, quienquiera que seas, a quien ha de tocar el ser coronista de esta peregrina historia! Ruégote que no te olvides de mi buen Rocinante, compañero eterno mío en todos mis caminos y carreras” (I:II 35, emphasis added). The *encantador* first appears as a benevolent figure who will have the privilege of being the one to keep a written record of the many “*fazañas*” of Don Quijote exactly as they transpire in word and in deed, albeit with additional embellishment as necessary (to preserve dignity of character). It is not until the barber and priest burn the vast majority of Don Quijote’s library of *libros de caballerías* in an attempt to restore him to sanity that the concept of a *maligno encantador* is invented to basically cover up their own actions by transferring the blame to a certain unnamed *encantador*, who is later christened “Frestón” by the good knight.

Later in Chapter 13 of the first part, we encounter another reference to more friendly *encantadores* in Don Quijote's conversation with Vivaldo: "... y que si a los que a tal grado subieron les faltaran encantadores y sabios que los ayudaran, que ellos quedaran bien defraudados de sus deseos y bien engañados de sus esperanzas" (I:XIII 113). This particular comment by Don Quijote not only acknowledges the existence of *encantadores* who offer help and support to a knight but also that their assistance is prerequisite to the knight attaining his ultimate goal and purpose in life. This dependence of the knight on these near-Messiah figures is even stronger and more intense than the degree of dependence previously discussed. This comment by Don Quijote seems starkly atypical of our noble knight because it seems to devalue the worth and individual merits of the knight and to reduce him to a powerless, soulless "puppet" figure who is no different than anyone else and is therefore not unique or "special"—he is stripped of any individuality and becomes just another "face in the crowd."

In the last chapter of the first part, Don Quijote hints at a power struggle that exists between "good" and "evil" *encantadores*: "... aunque yo espero en Dios nuestro Señor que no ha de poder tanto la fuerza de *un encantador malicioso*, que no pueda más la de *otro encantador mejor intencionado* ..." (I:LII 521, emphasis added). We are now dealing with an additional duality: the juxtaposition of two completely opposite dispositions within the sphere of the *encantador* (i.e. the *encantador bueno* who is a loyal ally of the knight and the *encantador malo* who is the sworn enemy of the knight and will stop at nothing to bring him down). It is not entirely clear why there are two sides to the *encantador* "coin," but perhaps it relates to the necessity of the existence of opposition, for without a "negative" counterpart, the "positive" counterpart would be devoid of meaning because there would be nothing to compare it to, there would be no point of reference to establish the base values of each polar extreme. This statement

is also interesting in that Don Quijote is supplicating both Deity and an *encantador* at the same time, which seems to equate the power of God and the power of the *encantador*, however blasphemous that may be. In other words, he appears to be placing the perfect majesty of God on the same pedestal as the mystery of the *encantador*, yet this may not be as far-fetched as it sounds: after all, is not “God” also an unseen entity whose existence cannot be scientifically proven, just as the *sabios encantadores* cannot be seen nor proven to exist? Although it could be argued that the Christian God has “existed” for much longer than the *encantador* of the chivalric romance, it cannot be denied that the belief in the existence of people with supernatural powers (such as sorcerers, soothsayers, wizards/witches, fortune tellers, etc.) long predates even Biblical times, going back to Classical Antiquity and even earlier.

In Chapter 25, long before the reencounter of Don Quijote and Sancho with the barber to whom the “yelmo de Mambrino” belongs, Don Quijote gives an explanation to Sancho of why it is that the same object that he calls the “yelmo de Mambrino” appears to Sancho to be a barber’s basin:

Mira, Sancho, por el mismo que denantes juraste te juro ... que tienes el más corto entendimiento que tiene ni tuvo escudero en el mundo. ¿Que es posible que en cuanto ha que andas conmigo no has echado de ver que todas las cosas de los caballeros andantes parecen quimeras, necedades y desatinos, y que son todas hechas al revés? Y no porque sea ello así, sino porque andan entre nosotros siempre una caterva de encantadores que todas nuestras cosas mudan y truecan, y las vuelven según su gusto y según tienen la gana de favorecernos o destruirnos; y, *así, eso que a ti te parece bacía de barbero me parece a mí el yelmo de Mambrino y a otro le parecerá otra cosa* (I:XXV 237, emphasis added).

Don Quijote first expresses his frustration that Sancho still does not seem to understand how the adventures of a knight-errant work (cf. “Bien parece que no estás cursado en esto de las aventuras” [I:VIII 75]) despite all the time they have spent together as knight and squire up to this point. Don Quijote explains that everything that has to do with knights-errant “son todas hechas al revés,” the reason for which is that all the *encantadores* are always altering the appearance of people and things in an attempt to discredit the accomplishments of the knight and to make it seem to other people that he must be out of his mind to make such absurd claims. The most important part of this quote, however, is the very last sentence in which Don Quijote recognizes the variability of multiple “realities” that are unique to every individual, and thus what appears to Sancho as a barber’s basin appears something entirely different to Don Quijote, namely the “yelmo de Mambrino,” and it therefore follows that this same object may appear to be something entirely different to another person based on his/her unique perspective of reality.

In Chapter 32 of the second part, Don Quijote and Sancho are enjoying the company of the Duke and Duchess in their castle. The Duke and Duchess begin to ask Don Quijote about some discrepancies in the novel written about him and how these events happened in real life. Later, Don Quijote laments to the Duke and Duchess his great disappointment when he was denied the opportunity of beholding his lady Dulcinea in the flesh due to her having been transformed into a lowly peasant girl. When asked who could have been behind this injustice, Don Quijote replies without hesitation:

¿Quién puede ser sino algún maligno encantador de los muchos envidiosos que me persiguen? Esta raza maldita, nacida en el mundo para escurecer y aniquilar las hazañas de los buenos y para dar luz y levantar los fechos de los malos. Perseguido me han encantadores, encantadores me persiguen, y encantadores me persiguirán hasta dar

conmigo y con mis altas caballerías en el profundo abismo del olvido, y en aquella parte me dañan y hieren donde ven que más lo siento (II:XXXII 799).

This time, Don Quijote labels these *encantadores* “envidiosos,” as if to suggest that they are “jealous” of the great deeds Don Quijote can potentially achieve if it weren’t for their meddling. Don Quijote further calls them “esta raza maldita,” reiterating the fact that their sole purpose is to “aniquilar las hazañas de los buenos [caballeros],” returning to this idea of them being “envious” of all the good knights-errant can accomplish if left unhindered and unpersecuted. Unlike other instances, this time Don Quijote seems to admit some degree of despair regarding his fear that these *encantadores* will continue to pursue him for the rest of his life, “hasta dar conmigo y con mis altas caballerías en el profundo abismo del olvido.” In other words, Don Quijote is doubting the efficacy of his calling as a knight and is perhaps starting to consider the apparent futility of all of his *hazañas* up to this point. It is not, however, that he is questioning his identity as “Don Quijote de la Mancha,” but rather that he is indicating at least a small degree of disillusionment with his knightly calling. Even so, our “Man of la Mancha” is not one to remain discouraged and down-trodden for an extended period of time, and with the help of the ludic artifices of the Duke and Duchess, Don Quijote quickly regains his knightly vigor and determination, particularly relating to the “disenchantment” of Dulcinea (much to the chagrin of Sancho, however).

Steven Nadler in “Descartes’s Demon and the Madness of Don Quixote” draws a parallel between what the 17th century French philosopher and mathematician René Descartes termed the “genius malignus” (aka “le mauvais génie”) and the madness of Don Quijote, specifically concerning the *encantadores* that always persecute our knight. According to Descartes, as outlined in his *Meditations* (1641), there exists a conflict between a benevolent God who seeks to

bless mankind and a malignant entity who seeks to corrupt and destroy mankind. Descartes further explains that we cannot be entirely certain who it is that gave us our mental faculties and nature, for both God and this evil entity cannot be seen and therefore cannot be empirically proven to exist. Nevertheless, Descartes is entirely convinced of the existence of God, as he elaborates on in this same work.

Nadler compares the *genius malignus* with the *malignos encantadores* who seek to deprive Don Quijote of the glory and honor he deserves as a result of his adventures. Yet the *encantadores* of Don Quijote's world are considerably more intrusive than the entity conceived of by Descartes in that they have the power to change the appearance of people and objects to look like someone or something entirely different from what they "really" are.

Nadler poses an intriguing question related to the reliability of our own sensory perceptions of the world in light of the possibility of the *genius malignus*: "... in the face of the possibility of ongoing deception by some powerful and malicious being, how can we possibly trust our sensory and rational faculties to provide us with true and reliable knowledge?" (Nadler 42). According to Nadler, this idea of our individual perceptions of the world around us being not entirely trustworthy or even completely accurate is the key to unraveling the nature of Don Quijote's madness. There are numerous examples in the *Quijote* which demonstrate this disconnect between the reality of Don Quijote and the reality of everyone else, yet we are obliged to question whether Don Quijote's version of reality is, in fact, valid and thus worthy of recognition. It seems only logical to discard Don Quijote's reality because it does not match the reality of the outside world, or even our own perception of the circumstances as readers of the novel, yet because we, as readers, view the "reality" of the characters of the novel through the eyes of Don Quijote, we begin to catch a better glimpse of the inner workings of the psyche of

our “Man of la Mancha.” We also begin to empathize with him and his unique perspective, not necessarily accepting it as valid, but we are inclined to commiserate with Don Quijote because as we experience his adventures, we long for his success and realization of his dreams, which we realize can only be accomplished through his obsession with knight-errantry. When we put on the shoes of our “Man of la Mancha,” we come to recognize that there is no one who can force his/her view of reality upon someone else because what is “real” and “valid” for one person will not necessarily be true and valid for anyone else. Even if Don Quijote’s reality is unique to him and him alone, it does not mean that his perception of the world is wrong or insignificant, it simply means that he possesses a much more creative mind than the average person, albeit a one-track creative mind based entirely on the many chivalric romances that our good knight has read over the course of his life. Be that as it may, we are not naïve to the absolute absurdity of Don Quijote’s reality, which is made clear by the narrator from the onset, for our view of reality is not obscured by an obsession with knight-errantry and chivalric romances.

Nadler further comments on the problematic assumptions that we as rational beings make that, theoretically, may not be true in every instance:

The demon fiction forces one to ask the question: is that which is subjectively certain (when it is being attended to) also objectively and indubitably true? Just because my senses tell me, with a persuasive authority, that there is an external world out there, can I therefore confidently conclude that there is such a world? Just because my reason tells me, with even greater persuasive authority, that $2+3=5$, am I therefore warranted in adopting that belief? (46).

Granted, at first glance, the answers to these rhetorical questions seem fairly obvious, yet through the lens of philosophy they take on new significance. If we are to accept the “evil

genius hypothesis,” we must also accept the fact that our senses may in reality be deceiving us—that is, the influence of the *genius malignus* may be distorting our perceptions of reality as we have always known it, where perhaps we are experiencing a type of “virtual reality” in which we are immersed in a fictitious world in a sort of “dream state” (cf. the Wachowski Brothers’ *Matrix* trilogy [1999-2003]). We can apply this same line of thinking to Don Quijote’s perception of reality, yet in reverse: could perhaps the *encantadores* be creating a false reality for everyone else where the reality as perceived by Don Quijote is unadulterated and genuine?

Nadler makes an important observation concerning Don Quijote’s decision to reconsider his initial instinct to charge into battle when he comes across the traveling theater company (*Las cortes de la muerte*):

It is significant that in the one instance when Don Quixote self-consciously recognizes things for what they are, and fails to have explanatory recourse to malicious enchantment, it involves a situation where a kind of enchantment is naturally already at work. For these are actors in costume, whose job just is to play with appearances and create a kind of illusion. In this case there already *is* a gap between appearance and reality, and the wicked enchanter’s skills are not needed (51-52).

This particular instance is unique in that Don Quijote forbears what he perceives as his knightly duty to preserve the integrity of the actors and what they represent to audiences when they perform on the stage. This behavior seems entirely uncharacteristic of our knight, yet, as Nadler astutely points out, it is still an appropriate response in the current circumstances because “a kind of enchantment is naturally already at work.” In this case, “the wicked enchanter’s skills are not needed,” which implies that, at least in this moment, Don Quijote’s reality is not filtered through the lens of knight errantry to the same degree to which it normally is. Ergo, Don Quijote still

views these play actors as the literal incarnation of the characters they represent, yet he refrains from engaging with them in battle like he is normally inclined to do. This is significant because this means that our “Man of la Mancha,” while in the persona of “Don Quijote,” is capable of distinguishing between two distinct realities: one filtered through knight errantry and the other not, which corresponds to the “reality” of the everyday man who has not pledged his loyalty to the strict codes of knighthood.

Nadler sums up the control the *encantadores* exercise on Don Quijote and how they serve to reconstruct his multifaceted vision of reality:

What, then, is Don Quixote's problem? He is, he believes, plagued by an evil enchanter (or a team of them) and thus (from his own perspective) finds himself in a world in which the reports of his sensory faculties are no longer trustworthy. Either objects themselves are literally (ontologically) and unpredictably transformed or manipulated; or, what seems more often to be the case, things are not what they appear to be. The evil enchanter is wreaking havoc with appearances, causing things to look other than what they really are. What Don Quixote knows to be giants look (to others, and perhaps even to him) like windmills; what are armies look like flocks of sheep; a hero's helmet looks like a barber's basin; and the most beautiful and noble woman in the world looks and acts and smells like, well, a mule-driver (53).

To answer Nadler's question, Don Quijote's worldview is essentially predicated on the will and whim of the *encantadores* who maliciously and tirelessly persecute him every chance they get, and because of this overarching influence that they have over the way he perceives reality, Don Quijote's reality is bound to the manner in which the *encantadores* alter reality to cause him to stumble and fail in his noble knightly pursuits, much to his chagrin and disappointment. It is

almost as if these malignant beings are the true architects of Don Quijote's apparent "madness," as their influence is present from the interlude between his first and second sallies when his library is destroyed.

Nadler concludes with some remarks on madness as defined by Descartes and offers his tentative theory on the nature of Don Quijote's madness:

Madness, for Descartes, consists in a lack of control over one's faculties. Even if one considers those faculties to be systematically faulty, originating in the diabolical powers of an enchanter, one is still reasonable as long as one is in control over those faculties. Descartes's meditator is, at least, in control of his reason, although that reason may be sabotaged. Don Quixote does not think that it is his faculties that are enchanted, it is the world; but then again it is not clear that he is in control of those faculties, and therein, perhaps, lies his madness (54).

It is apparent that, according to Nadler, the central issue concerning Don Quijote's madness revolves around whether he is in control of his mental faculties. Nadler admits, however, that "it is not clear that he [Don Quijote] is in control of those faculties," and then uses this assumption to give some insight into why Don Quijote is considered "mad" by everyone around him. True, Descartes' definition of madness is irrefutable in a strict sense, yet it lacks the profundity inherent in the "madness" of our "Man of la Mancha." I contend that Don Quijote constantly maintains control of his mental faculties despite his words and actions that hint at insanity. The case of Don Quijote is much more complex because the origin of his "madness" may not be as straightforward as it seems.

Albert Schütz in his article “Don Quixote and the Problem of Reality” also tackles the issue of the *encantadores* and their role in determining the reality of Don Quijote as knight-errant. Schütz relies on the theory of psychologist William James concerning how our system of belief, and thereby disbelief and doubt, is constructed, stating that there are two underlying principles on which this system of belief is based: “first that we are liable to think differently of the same object; and secondly, that when we have done so, we can choose which way of thinking to adhere to and which to disregard” (Schütz 135). These two principles are consistent with the way Don Quijote views reality because, as we know from the many episodes in the novel, Don Quijote does indeed view people and things quite differently from most everyone else, and it is evident that Don Quijote consciously chooses to adhere to his own version of reality and thus disregard the alternative one offered by Sancho and others. It is by this logic that Don Quijote can consider his reality valid and thus reject any other version of reality, no matter how rational or plausible, for his “reality” is all he sees through his mind’s eye and thus it is exponentially more rational and plausible than the reality that everyone else so adamantly maintains to be the only “true” one. Now this must be viewed exclusively through the filtered reality of Don Quijote, for in any other context, rationality and common sense would undoubtedly prevail, as is the case for Sancho when confronted with two conflicting views of reality—the one provided by his master and the one he sees with his own eyes. Without exception, Sancho rejects the fantastical reality propagated by Don Quijote and latches onto that which makes the most sense in his simple understanding of how the world works. One might think that Don Quijote could be swayed by the insistence of his squire, yet experience shows that Don Quijote favors his own version of reality over anyone else’s simply because it conflicts with his knightly ideals and aspirations, and to reject such behavior would be to discredit his self-proclaimed calling of

knight-errant and resign himself to return to his mundane pre-Don-Quijote reality. To do so would be to crush his dream of becoming an equal to Amadís and *Los doce pares de Francia*, necessitating his renouncement of his name and fame as the valiant knight Don Quijote de la Mancha, which in turn would mean that he and his deeds would not be recorded in the archives of La Mancha. Such an attitude is what naturally leads to his deathbed confession, at least according to his family and friends, which is not what it seems to be per the argument of this paper.

Schütz proceeds to ask some fundamental questions that seem to contradict what is considered rational by every other character in the novel except our “Man of la Mancha”:

How does it come that Don Quixote can continue to bestow the accent of reality on his subuniverse of phantasy if it clashes with the paramount reality in which there are no castles and armies and giants but merely inns and flocks of sheep and windmills? How is it possible that the private world of Don Quixote is not a solipsistic one, that there are other minds within this reality, not merely as objects of Don Quixote's experience, but sharing with him, at least to a certain extent, the belief in its actual or potential reality?
(136)

To answer the first question, Don Quijote repeatedly and intentionally places his “accent of reality” on a reality that appears to be fantastical in the very fiber of its being because this is the reality that he has chosen to see. He has consciously “reprogrammed” every aspect of his life ever since he decided to become a knight-errant and join the cause of chivalry in defense of his fair lady Dulcinea del Toboso. For Don Quijote, there is no longer any other reality besides that which he has crafted from his *libros de caballerías*—once he took on the persona of “Don

Quijote,” the man he was before ceased to exist because he had been “born anew” with a new purpose in life.

Schütz’s comment on Don Quijote’s world not being unique to himself is interesting because Schütz is suggesting that there are, in fact, other participants in Don Quijote’s reality who may actually be convinced of the plausibility of this “imagined” reality in comparison with what they have originally considered to be the “only” reality. This assertion implies that any reality that is initially conceived in the mind of one person has the potential to branch out to the minds of other people to whom this reality is entirely foreign and nonsensical, yet by mutual association, this new reality somehow begins to take center stage and merges with, or replaces completely, the “original” reality of that individual.

Schütz describes the *encantador* as a “sage, necromancer or magician who looks after the knight's affairs - and certainly every knight, to be a true one, has such a friend” (139). For example, Amadis’s *encantadora* is Urganda la Desconocida. Schütz makes specific reference to the ability of the *encantador* to magically transport a knight from one location to another one in the blink of an eye, no matter how far apart the two places are. This speaks to the mysterious nature of the powers of these *encantadores*, for it is apparent that there is not a particular standard of whether there exist limitations on their God-like powers and abilities, for the line separating Deity and *encantador* is very much blurred to the extent that occasionally there is an overlap of the two and the distinction gradually begins to dissipate until the *encantador* is sitting quite contently on God’s throne. Schütz’s choice of words is also interesting. “Sage” is most likely a calque of the Spanish “sabio,” whereas the other two are considerably more significant.

“Necromancer” seems, at least in a general sense, a bit of a stretch, since necromancy refers to divination of the dead, yet if we are to accept the episode of *La Cueva de Montesinos*

(II:XXIII) as valid, then the *encantadores* certainly possess necromantic powers as various dead people are brought back to life, which brings to mind the grotesque image of Belerma holding her beloved Durandarte's heart which had been torn out by Montesinos. Even still, this is the only episode in which there is even a hint of necromancy, and it should also be noted that Don Quijote himself repeatedly questions whether what he saw in the cave actually happened or was just a dream, evidenced by his questions to both Maese Pedro's *mono adivino* at the inn and Don Antonio Moreno's *cabeza encantada* in Barcelona (to which he is answered both times with the ambiguous response of "part was real/part was imagined").

"Magician" seems to be the most appropriate because it is analogous to "sorcerer" or "enchanter." All three of these words refer to the use of supernatural "magic powers" that can be used either for good or evil, which is certainly also the case for the *encantadores* who pursue Don Quijote. "Magician" is also fitting because it contains the word "magic," which essentially refers to any type of supernatural, other-worldly abilities used for various purposes. The more modern sense of "magician" as "illusionist" or "stage magician" can also be applied, as many "magic tricks" involve the use of illusions, which is exactly how Don Quijote's *encantadores* can alter reality by supposedly creating the "illusion" that certain things and people are different from what they may "seem" to be.

Schütz goes on to comment on the role the *encantadores* play in Don Quijote's unique reality:

All this is due to the work of the enchanters, the friendly and the hostile ones, who fulfill in Don Quixote's sub-universe the role of causality and motivation. Their activity is the basic category of Don Quixote's interpretation of the world. It is their function to translate the order of the realm of phantasy into the realms of common-sense experience,

to transform the real giants attacked by Don Quixote, for instance, into phantoms of windmills. Enchanters, so we learn, can transform all things and change their natural shapes (139).

Schütz is quick to point out that there are two different types of *encantadores*, classified according to their intent to either harm (“hostile”) or assist (“friendly”) Don Quijote. It is safe to say that there are a lot more “hostile” *encantadores* who are the constant thorn in the side of our hero than “friendly” ones, and that the most common ploy of these *encantadores* is to transform Don Quijote’s reality into that of Sancho and everyone else, the whole purpose of which, as claimed repeatedly by Don Quijote, is to deny him the glory and honor he deserves as a knight-errant in the service of the defenseless and less-fortunate.

Schütz comments further on the “function” of the *encantadores* and their indispensability as the force that dictates the outcome of Don Quijote’s adventures:

Thus, it is the function of the enchanters' activities to guarantee the coexistence and compatibility of several sub-universes of meaning referring to the same matters of fact and to assure the maintenance of the accent of reality bestowed upon any of such sub-universes. Nothing remains unexplained, paradoxical or contradictory, as soon as the enchanter's activities are recognized as a constitutive element of the world. But to Don Quixote the existence of enchanters is much more than a mere hypothesis. It is a historical fact proved by all the sacred source books reporting on matters of chivalry (140).

The idea of multiple “sub-universes” is significant because it allows for multiple interpretations of reality—in fact, this idea presupposes the existence of an infinite number of possible realities

that share the same “base” reality as viewed through an infinite number of different individuals at any given time. In addition, these multiple realities are not cemented in stone but are rather fully dynamic and thus can change and evolve at any time. We observe this time and time again in the many adventures of Don Quijote as his “original” reality degenerates into the mundane reality of everyone else, yet despite this apparent “degeneration” of sorts, Don Quijote never wavers in his belief that he without a doubt really did see what he said he saw at the start, and that it must be the work of malicious *encantadores* who have altered reality from what it originally was.

When Schütz states that the true function of the *encantadores* is “to guarantee the coexistence and compatibility of several sub-universes of meaning,” he is reasserting his claim of multiple coexisting realities that are valid for each individual who is experiencing “the same matters of fact” (i.e. the same circumstances or series of events) and that are not only in joint existence but are also compatible with one another. That is, they are not necessarily compatible in the sense of not contradicting each other, but rather in the sense of being plausible at least in the mind of their originators, although this does not necessarily preclude the clash of more than one reality, most notably as in the episode of the windmills.

Schütz later seems to contradict his previous claim of the compatibility of the reality of Don Quijote and that of everyone else: “The social world which Don Quixote meets on each of his three expeditions takes a radically different attitude to his private world of phantasy, which is to him a highly meaningful one, but a world of madness to his fellow-men” (141). Now it is obvious that there is a certain degree of “disconnect” between Don Quijote’s idealistic, fantasized reality of chivalry and knights-errant and the otherwise universally-accepted, yet banal, reality of the world around him: for, as correctly noted by Schütz, Don Quijote’s

romanticized version of reality is nothing more than a “world of madness” in the eyes of all who know him, not limited to his close friends and family, but also every single person with whom Don Quijote interacts throughout the course of his adventures as a hardly dignified knight errant of yesteryear. Despite all this opposition to his version of reality, the integrity of our knight remains immovable. No matter what anyone else says or thinks, he knows that he is in actuality the famous Don Quijote de la Mancha—of this there can be no doubt in his mind, for this is the person he has chosen to be: a man of valor, a man of honor, a man of integrity who is true to himself.

In Chapter 18 of the first part, Don Quijote and Sancho come across two flocks of sheep converging onto their location. Although Sancho only sees sheep, Don Quijote sees two armies coming together to battle, and he is determined to rush to the aid of the *cristianos*, which, as we have assumed, ends with Don Quijote battered on the ground, lifeless as if he were dead. Sancho, after rushing to his master’s aid, tries, to no avail, to explain that he had been right all along in that those “armies” were really merely sheep. Despite Sancho’s futile pleas, Don Quijote does not hesitate in throwing the blame on the magic of a *sabio encantador*:

Como eso puede desaparecer y contrahacer aquel ladrón del sabio mi enemigo. Sábeta, Sancho, que es muy fácil cosa a los tales hacernos parecer lo que quieren, y este maligno que me persigue, envidioso de la gloria que vio que yo había de alcanzar de esta batalla, ha vuelto los escuadrones de enemigos en manadas de ovejas. Si no, haz una cosa, Sancho, por mi vida, porque te desengañes y veas ser verdad lo que te digo: sube en tu asno y síguelos bonitamente y verás como, en alejándose de aquí algún poco, se vuelven en su ser primero y, dejando de ser carneros, son hombres hechos y derechos como yo te los pinté primero (I:XVIII 162)

In this instance, it appears that Don Quijote is alluding to the *encantador* known as Frestón, whom Don Quijote labels once again as “mi enemigo.” It is interesting to note that in this explanation, Don Quijote does not use the word *encantador*, but rather refers to this being as “aquel ladrón,” “[el] sabio,” and “este maligno,” all of which describe key characteristics associated with *encantadores mal intencionados*: (1) he is a “thief” who has stolen the glory Don Quijote was entitled to from this adventure; (2) he is “clever” (with a more negative connotation such as “sly” or “cunning”) in his deceitful magic; and (3) he is completely “evil” to the core and thus openly seeks to destroy our valiant knight and deny him the fame that should accompany his illustrious deeds. Don Quijote repeats the idea of being endlessly “persecuted” by this particular *encantador*, almost as if to submit defeat in the face of this malevolent being who seems to have ultimate power and control over the outcome of his adventures.

At the end of Chapter 44, a certain barber from whom Don Quijote and Sancho had stolen his barber’s basin and his donkey’s packsaddle happens to come across the two at the inn. When the barber boldly claims that what Don Quijote had stolen is not the “helmet of Mambrino” but simply a barber’s basin, Don Quijote is quick to respond: “Y quien lo contrario dijere [que la ‘bacía’ no es yelmo] –dijo don Quijote–, le haré yo conocer que miente, si fuere caballero, y si escudero, que remiente mil veces” (I:XLV 466). Don Quijote’s reaction here is typical in his various interactions with people throughout the novel—he is not afraid to be bold, even if it amounts to a shallow threat, and is firm in his resolve that he is in the right and that he is prepared to force anyone who says otherwise to admit his/her intentionally fabricated “lie,” because Don Quijote is convinced to the very core that he is always right and that the way he sees things is the way things are, without even the smallest deviation from that “reality.”

Maese Nicolás (who is a good friend of Don Quijote) takes the initiative and comes up with a “game” in which he and various other friends and acquaintances will play off Don Quijote’s “madness” in order to distort the other barber’s “reality” concerning his basin—that it is, in fact, *not* a basin, but rather, exactly as Don Quijote has claimed, a “helmet.” This ploy by the barber is similar to what is colloquially termed an “inside joke,” because only he and certain other people who are familiar with Don Quijote’s imaginations and fantasies are privy to the *burla*, whereas all outsiders, particularly the other barber, are clueless as to the fact that they are being deliberately *burlados*. Don Quijote, however, does not fit into either group: he is not a *burlador* because he is unaware of the *burla*, yet he is not being *burlado* either, at least not in the same way as the other barber and company. Don Quijote serves as the vehicle that keeps the joke going and is also the central player, for it was originally his idea, however illogical, that the basin was none other than the fabled and highly-coveted *yelmo de Mambrino*.

Don Quijote makes an interesting statement when commenting on the many strange things that have happened to him and Sancho while at that particular inn: “...quizá por no ser armados caballeros como yo lo soy no tendrán que ver con vuestras mercedes los encantamientos de este lugar, y tendrán los entendimientos libres y podrán juzgar de las cosas de este castillo *como ellas son real y verdaderamente, y no como a mí me parecían*. (I:XLV 467, emphasis added). Here Don Quijote is appealing to his superior knowledge and experience in the ways of “armed knights” to justify his own interpretation of what has transpired while at the inn, yet he defers his expertise to the unexplainable workings of “encantamento” propagated, of course, by “[sabios] encantadores” (although the reference to the “encantadores” in this case is implied rather than stated explicitly). The pervasive omnipresence of these “enchanters” is frequently alluded to throughout the novel, yet, despite their seemingly limitless power and influence,

which seem to be mostly malicious and for the sole purpose of denying Don Quijote all the glory and recognition he rightly deserves, their exact nature remains a complete mystery. We should also note that Don Quijote never actually encounters one of these “enchanters” in “real life,” so it is safe to say that they only exist within his own imagination, similar to the existence of Dulcinea, whom Don Quijote has never seen in her true form and beauty (as we can discard his encounter with the “enchanted” Dulcinea of Sancho’s invention). Even still, the fact that someone or something only exists within the confines of one’s imagination does not make that person or thing any less “real” to the person in whose imagination they exist—on the contrary, the idea that someone exists uniquely in the psyche of a certain person creates an even stronger bond between “creators” and their “creations” because they know that their “creations” are exclusively theirs and theirs alone, which means they have them all to themselves and are in no way obligated to share with anyone else. This is exactly the kind of “monopoly” that Don Quijote possesses with his Dulcinea, for, as he is quick to profess, she is, without a doubt, the fairest lady in the land because she *belongs* to him—not in a male-chauvinistic-kind-of way, but rather as a knight considers it an honor to protect the honor and dignity of his lady-in-waiting, for whom he has sworn absolute fidelity and devotion.

At the end of the above quote, Don Quijote appears to make the conscious concession that his “reality” does, at least at times, conflict with that of everyone else; he goes even further to suggest that how things “appear” to him are *not* “as they really and truly are.” This is a perfect example of an instance in which Don Quijote’s *cordura* personality succeeds in breaching the surface of his consciousness and makes a brief appearance (with a captive audience, no less). This statement by Don Quijote seems to contradict his internal, core beliefs, because his speech is almost always constructed in a way that makes it obvious that he considers

any other “reality” other than his own to be “faulty” or “skewed” from the one and only “true” reality, which is entirely subjective and profoundly tied to Don Quijote’s inner psyche—specifically the usually dominant, *loco* personality that for the most part dictates all his words and actions. This *locura* is linked intrinsically to his newly-assumed persona of knight-errant, which is based entirely on the models of knight-errantry that Don Quijote has read about in his (now-destroyed) personal library of *libros de caballerías*. His deathbed confession aside, it is almost unheard of for Don Quijote to admit to being in the wrong and thereby accepting a version of reality that differs significantly from his own. As we expect, he is normally very insistent on the validity of his own “imagined” reality, no matter how absurd it may seem to everyone else.

An evidence of the fickle nature of Don Quijote’s “reality” can be found in this same episode when Don Quijote refuses to confirm that the donkey’s packsaddle is actually a horse’s harness, despite being suggested by the barber of La Mancha, and even states that he thinks it is actually just a packsaddle: “A mí albarda me parece, ... pero ya he dicho que en eso no me entremeto” (I:XLV 267). By this candid statement we can deduce that the “delusions” of Don Quijote do not apply universally to everything and everyone, but rather are more selective in nature, with a heavy preference for things and people that relate to his office of knight-errant. This is additional evidence that supports the dual-identity theory of Don Quijote’s personality, that of the *cordura/locura* dichotomy. Don Quijote is not “duped” by his friend the barber into believing something that seems “ridiculous” to him, although, as we all know, what Don Quijote considers “ridiculous” generally does not correspond to the average person’s idea of absurd or improbable—in fact, Don Quijote, in his *loco* state of mind, considers “realistic” and “logical” exactly what a “normal” person would consider “unrealistic” and “illogical.” Whether Don

Quijote is being *engañado* by his own dual self is a trite matter when compared to what he perceives as the “true” reality and his never-failing commitment to maintain this “reality” regardless of what anyone around him might suggest to the contrary. Once he makes up his mind, he is rock-solid in his defense of his perspective, so much so that we can say that his “reality” is firmly “cemented” into his mind without the possibility of that cement ever becoming compromised by doubt or uncertainty—his foundation is solid and cannot be moved, except in the case that his *cuerto* persona takes center stage in a moment of lucidity and he begins to become aware of the absurdity of what he has been saying and doing and then proceeds to attempt to rectify what he has said and done to “save face,” as it were, in the presence of other people in a public setting. This is only natural because it seems that being recognized and making a name for himself is one very important aspect of his service as a knight-errant, which means he wants to avoid ridicule and embarrassment at any cost, yet this does not seem to particularly bother him after adventure after adventure ends, more often than not, disastrously for all involved.

The narrator sums up the result of this whole basin-helmet/packsaddle-harness dispute as follows: “Finalmente, el rumor [de la pelea] se apaciguó por entonces, la albarda se quedó por jaez hasta el día del juicio, y la bacía por yelmo y la venta por castillo en la imaginación de Don Quijote” (I:XLV 470). The key phrase here is “en la imaginación de Don Quijote”—that is, the narrator is limiting the resulting conclusions solely to one person, the same person who was essentially the “butt” of the joke concocted by the barber of La Mancha. This is significant in that the narrator does not say that this is also what the other barber had concluded, nor anyone else who was not aware of the *burla*; rather, more appropriately, these “transformed” objects are restricted solely within the confines of the “imagination” of Don Quijote, that is, they only exist

in their “transformed” or “enchanted” state in the distorted “reality” of Don Quijote, which is exactly what we, as readers, are expecting, for to result as anything else would be wholly uncharacteristic of our rather elusive “Man of la Mancha”—it would be a complete departure from his most salient attribute, that of his unique *locura*.

Another interesting part of the above quote is the reference to the perpetuity of these “transformations” by means of an allusion to the Final Judgment, stating that these objects will remain thus-transformed until, essentially, the end of the world or the end of time. From this observation, we can use the clichéd phrase “once enchanted, always enchanted,” when it comes to Don Quijote’s “reality.” Nevertheless, we come across other episodes in the *Quijote* that seem to contradict this assertion, perhaps most famously in the episode of the windmills. This takes us back to the omnipotent “enchanters” who seek to thwart the progress of our good knight at every turn. In this episode, Don Quijote explicitly mentions not simply *encantadores* in a general sense, but rather the name of a specific *encantador* who had previously destroyed Don Quijote’s library: *el sabio Frestón*, who is, according to Don Quijote’s own description, his mortal enemy and the principal *encantador* who seeks to destroy him.

In Chapter 10 of the second part, Sancho succeeds in “enchancing” Dulcinea and her two accompanying *doncellas*, who in reality are three rustic farm girls who happen to be passing by El Toboso. Upon seeing these three girls whom Sancho asserts are Dulcinea and two *doncellas*, Don Quijote is beyond belief, yet he eventually accepts Sancho’s assertion despite what he is seeing. He once again, not surprisingly, resorts to the universal explanation that it must be the work of that *maligno encantador*:

Y tú, ¡oh extremo del valor que puede desearse, término de la humana gentileza, único remedio de este afligido corazón que te adora!, ya que el maligno encantador me persigue

y ha puesto nubes y cataratas en mis ojos, y para sólo ellos y no para otros ha mudado y transformado tu sin igual hermosura y rostro en el de una labradora pobre, si ya también el mío no le ha cambiado en el de algún vestiglo, para hacerle aborrecible a tus ojos, no dejes de mirarme blanda y amorosamente, echando de ver en esta sumisión y arrodillamiento que a tu contrahecha hermosura hago la humildad con que mi alma te adora (II:X 620).

In this case, Don Quijote claims that this *encantador* has literally altered his vision by “clouding” up his eyes. He also singles out himself as the only person whose vision has been affected by this unseen being, and further suggests the possibility of his own appearance having been transformed in a way that would make him look “hideous” to Dulcinea. This suggestion is further evidence of the sheer power that these *encantadores* possess. In this instance, the devastating attack of the enchanter(s) is a two-edged sword—there is no escape because both Don Quijote and “Dulcinea” may be “enchanted” simultaneously, which would certainly explain the rudeness with which “Dulcinea” treats her loyal, “captive” knight. Here is another example of Don Quijote’s reality *not* being viewed through the usual lens of knight-errantry: he simply sees the three girls as any “normal” person would see them—uncouth girls of lowly status. Normally it is Don Quijote who attempts to impose his reality onto his squire, yet in this case it is Sancho who imposes a “false” reality onto his master. However, this feigned reality may contain more truth than it seems, for later on at the Duke’s castle, the Duchess succeeds in convincing Sancho that the girl he thought was only a rustic peasant girl was, without a doubt, Dulcinea del Toboso in the flesh, yet under “enchantment” which served to mask her true beauty from both knight and squire (II:XXXIII).

In the same chapter, after “Dulcinea” and her two companions depart into the distance on their majestic “horses,” Don Quijote laments the great insult that the *encantadores* did to him in denying him the once-in-a-lifetime privilege of beholding the unrivaled beauty of his fair lady Dulcinea:

Sancho, ¿qué te parece cuán mal quisto soy de encantadores? Y mira hasta dónde se extiende su malicia y la ojeriza que me tienen, pues me han querido privar del contento que pudiera darme ver en su ser a mi señora. En efecto, yo nací para ejemplo de desdichados y para ser blanco y terrero donde tomen la mira y asiesten las flechas de la mala fortuna. Y has también de advertir, Sancho, que no se contentaron estos traidores de haber vuelto y transformado a mi Dulcinea, sino que la transformaron y volvieron en una figura tan baja y tan fea como la de aquella aldeana, y juntamente le quitaron lo que es tan suyo de las principales señoras, que es el buen olor, por andar siempre entre ámbares y entre flores. Porque te hago saber, Sancho, que cuando llegué a subir a Dulcinea sobre su hacanea, según tú dices, que a mí me pareció borrica, me dio un olor de ajos crudos, que me encalabrinó y atosigó el alma (II:X 621-622).

In this case, Don Quijote’s *maligno encantador* of the previous exchange has mutated into a generic group of unnamed *encantadores* who desire the exact same thing as *el sabio Frestón*—to deprive Don Quijote of the respect and honor he is deserving of as a righteous knight-errant. Don Quijote’s language becomes stronger than before: his “enemigo” has now become a band of “traidores” who will never cease to interfere with and taint his knightly deeds. In Don Quijote’s view, to have “transformed” Dulcinea into something she’s not is not the biggest insult: the *encantadores* had the audacity to turn the *sin par* loveliness and supreme beauty of Dulcinea del Toboso into something so “low” and “ugly” as a rustic “village girl,” to do so being the basest of

insults to her naturally refined disposition and safely-guarded virtue. Also interesting is that the one characteristic that stood out the most to Don Quijote was how “Dulcinea” smelled: that her odor should be pleasant and fragrant, yet the odor that the enchanted “Dulcinea” gave off was that of disgusting “raw garlic.” This idea of the *encantadores* being able to alter not just the physical appearance of people and objects, but also other sensory properties, such as smell in this case, gives yet another proof of how extensive the power and influence of these *encantadores* actually are. The fact that they have unbridled dominion over potentially all five senses fuels the argument that these mysterious beings can exercise complete control over Don Quijote’s perception of reality and even that of Sancho and many others. Although there are occasional references to God throughout the novel, it almost seems more appropriate, at least for Don Quijote and Sancho, to say something along the lines of “Encomiéndome a los sabios encantadores” instead of the standard “Encomiéndome a Dios,” because these *encantadores* seem to behave like Deity and even transcend the never-changing Christian God with their dual personality of good and evil and their mischievous nature which is more akin to the gods of Ancient Greece and Rome than the Holy Trinity of Christendom. We can also see strong parallels between Descartes’ *genius malignus* and the *malignos encantadores ingeniosos (sabios)* of the *Quijote*.

It is significant that Don Quijote refers to his fear of being “forgotten” because, as we well know, the idea of him and his deeds being “immortalized” in the annals of history is of particular importance: for all the heroic exploits of Amadís, Belianís, and all the rest are preserved in writing, and it is this written record that gives them permanence and continued relevance throughout the ages. If our “Man of la Mancha” were to renounce his “Don Quijote” persona, he would be essentially purging all record of his existence as a knight-errant; it would

mean the literal death of Don Quijote. If we are to accept that our “Man of la Mancha” dies as “Alonso Quijano el Bueno,” we must in turn renounce the existence of “Don Quijote” and everything associated with it—this would mean to toss out the entirety of the novel, for the *Quijote* is most certainly about Don Quijote, *not* Alonso Quijano. To reject Don Quijote would cause the realization of the fear expressed here by our good knight—do we really want to harbor the everlasting guilt of having been the *verdugos* who killed off Don Quijote? We cannot afford to taint ourselves with so indelible a stain—Don Quijote must live on, not only for his sake but also for ours and for all generations to come.

Works Cited

- Aubrun, Charles. "The Reason of Don Quixote's Unreason." *Critical Essays on Cervantes*. Ed. Ruth El Saffar. Boston: Hall, 1986.
- Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Princeton UP, 1953.
- Bandera, Cesáreo. *The Humble Story of Don Quixote: Reflections on the Birth of the Modern Novel*. The Catholic U of America P, 2006.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. Francisco Rico. Punto de Lectura, 2008.
- Darion, Joe y Mitch Leigh. "The Impossible Dream" from *Man of La Mancha*. Broadway, 1965. Song.
- Good, Carl. "Don Quijote and the Law of Literature." *Diacritics* 29.2 (1999): 43-67.
- Johnson, Carroll B. *Madness and Lust: A Psychoanalytical Approach to Don Quixote*. U of California P, 1983.
- Miñana, Rogelio. "El verdadero protagonista del *Quijote*." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 25.2 (2005): 31-58.
- Nadler, Steven. "Descartes's Demon and the Madness of Don Quixote." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 58.1 (1997): 41-55.
- Rodríguez González, Ángel. "Realidad, ficción y juego en 'El Quijote': locura-cordura." *Revista Chilena de Literatura* 67 (2005): 161-175.
- Schütz, Alfred. "Don Quixote and the Problem of Reality." Ed. A. Brodersen. In *Collected Papers II: Phaenomenologica*. Springer, 1976.

Shuger, Dale. *Don Quixote in the Archives: Madness and Literature in Early Modern Spain*.

Edinburgh UP, 2012.

Torquemada, Antonio. *Obras completas, I*. Ed. Lina Rodríguez Cacho. Turner Libros, 1994.

Appendix A: Dedicatory sonnets, epitaphs, and poems referenced in Chapter 2

Prologue to Part I

Amadís de Gaula a Don Quijote de la Mancha

Tú, que imitaste la llorosa vida
que tuve, ausente y desdeñado, sobre
el gran ribazo de la Peña Pobre,
de alegre a penitencia reducida;
tú, a quien los ojos dieron la bebida
de abundante licor, aunque salobre,
y alzándote la plata, estaño y cobre,
te dio la tierra en tierra la comida,
vive seguro de que eternamente,
en tanto, al menos, que en la cuarta esfera
sus caballos aguije el rubio Apolo,
tendrás claro renombre de valiente;
tu patria será en todas la primera;
tu sabio autor, al mundo único y solo (1:P 18).

Don Belianís de Grecia a Don Quijote de la Mancha

Rompí, corté, abollé y dije y hice
más que en el orbe caballero andante;
fui diestro, fui valiente, fui arrogante;
mil agravios vengué, cien mil deshice.
Hazañas di a la Fama que eternice;
fui comedido y regalado amante;
fue enano para mí todo gigante,
y al duelo en cualquier punto satisface.
Tuve a mis pies postrada la Fortuna,
y trajo del copete mi cordura
a la calva Ocasión al estricote.
Mas, aunque sobre el cuerno de la luna
siempre se vio encumbrada mi ventura,
tus proezas envidio, ¡oh gran Quijote! (1:P 19)

Orlando furioso a Don Quijote de la Mancha

Si no eres par, tampoco le has tenido:
que par pudieras ser entre mil pares,
ni puede haberle donde tú te hallares,
invicto vencedor, jamás vencido.
Orlando soy, Quijote, que, perdido
por Angélica, vi remotos mares,
ofreciendo a la Fama en sus altares
aquel valor que respetó el olvido.
No puedo ser tu igual, que este decoro
se debe a tus proezas y a tu fama,
puesto que, como yo, perdiste el seso;
mas serlo has mío, si al soberbio moro
y cita fiero domas, que hoy nos llama
iguales en amor con mal suceso (I:P 22)

El caballero del Febo a Don Quijote de la Mancha

A vuestra espada no igualó la mía,
Febo español, curioso cortesano,
ni a la alta gloria de valor mi mano,
que rayo fue do nace y muere el día.
Imperios desprecié; la monarquía
que me ofreció el Oriente rojo en vano
dejé, por ver el rostro soberano
de Claridiana, aurora hermosa mía.
Amela por milagro único y raro,
y, ausente en su desgracia, el propio infierno
temió mi brazo, que domó su rabia.
Mas vos, godo Quijote, ilustre y claro,
por Dulcinea sois al mundo eterno,
y ella, por vos, famosa, honesta y sabia (I:P 23)

De Solisdán a Don Quijote de la Mancha

Maguer, señor Quijote, que sandeces
vos tengan el cerbelo derrumbado,
nunca seréis de alguno reprochado
por home de obras viles y soeces.

Serán vuestas fazañas los joeces,
pues tuertos desfaciendo habéis andado,
siendo vegadas mil apaleado
por follones cautivos y raheces.
Y si la vuesa linda Dulcinea
desaguisado contra vos comete,
ni a vuestas cuitas muestra buen talante,
en tal desmán vueso conhortete sea
que Sancho Panza fue mal alcagüete,
necio él, dura ella y vos no amante (I:P 23-24)

Epilogue to Part I

El Monicongo, académico de la Argamasilla, a la sepultura de Don Quijote

El calvatuerno que adornó a la Mancha
de más despojos que Jasón de Creta;
el juicio que tuvo la veleta
aguda donde fuera mejor ancha;
el brazo que su fuerza tanto ensancha,
que llegó del Catay hasta Gaeta;
la musa más horrenda y más discreta
que grabó versos en bronceína plancha;
el que a cola dejó los Amadises
y en muy poquito a Galaotes tuvo,
estribando en su amor y bizarría;
el que hizo callar los Belianises,
aquel que en Rocinante errando anduvo,
yace debajo de esta losa fría (I:LII 530).

Del Cachidiablo, académico de la Argamasilla, en la sepultura de Don Quijote

Aquí yace el caballero
bien molido y malandante
a quien llevó Rocinante
por uno y otro sendero.
Sancho Panza el majadero
yace también junto a él,
escudero el más fiel
que vio el trato de escudero (I:LII 533).

Epilogue to Part II

Versos del bachiller Sansón Carrasco

Yace aquí el hidalgo
fuerte que a tanto extremo llegó
de valiente, que se advierte
que la muerte no triunfó
de su vida con su muerte.
Tuvo a todo el mundo en poco,
fue el espantajo y el coco
del mundo, en tal coyuntura,
que acreditó su ventura
morir cuerdo y vivir loco (II:LXXIV 1105).

La pluma de Cide Hamete Benengeli

—¡Tate, tate, folloncicos!
De ninguno sea tocada,
porque esta empresa, buen rey,
para mí estaba guardada (II:LXXIV 1105).