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ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the significance of the print book as an object in Don Quijote. It examines the ways in which Cervantes uses print books to illustrate the changes and complexities within Golden Age Spain: though Cervantes’s use of the novel to offer literary criticism is a widely studied topic, the author also uses the presence of books as a way to develop his characters and to consider and often satirize his environment. I analyze Cervantes’s inclusion of print books as a symbol around three themes: changes in readership and the shift from oral to print culture; collections, preservation, and libraries in Golden Age Spain; and the regulation surrounding this new technology and its effects on authorship and a nascent concept of authors’ rights. The use of print books as a new technology in Don Quijote celebrates good literature but also cautions Cervantes’s contemporaries about the complexities of this new way of disseminating and interpreting information.
Chapter 1

CHANGES IN COMMUNICATION AND READERSHIP IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY SPAIN

*Don Quijote* is a book about literature, and the symbol of the printed book is one manifestation of Cervantes’s passion for knowledge, reading, and literary criticism. Martín de Riquer observes that “sin la presencia de los libros, y concretamente libros impresos, la obra de Cervantes no sería imaginable,” noting the important distinction between printed books and literature, as the latter has been transmitted through other formats for centuries (5). Riquer’s analysis suggests that Alonso Quijano’s descent into insanity from reading only is viable in the world of print books: the stories themselves are not the direct cause of the protagonist’s mental decline. Instead, it is the confluence of the books’ contents, Alonso Quijano’s passion for collecting, and the changing reading habits in Cervantes’s era that serves as the catalyst for the protagonist’s madness. The symbol of the book in *Don Quijote* is a clear marker of a transition from a world centered on oral culture to a new, print-focused environment.

While the contents of the books undoubtedly are important to Don Quijote’s development, Cervantes highlights the books as objects themselves as a central symbol in the work. Print books are significant as an emerging technology in seventeenth-century Spain, and the novel contrasts this new development with print’s predecessors, oral storytelling and manuscripts. The rise of print culture changed the way individuals with different levels of literacy interacted during the time Cervantes is
writing. The print book in *Don Quijote* serves as an example of a disruptive technology that both highlights and catalyzes many of the social and political tensions Cervantes observes in Golden Age Spain.

The printed book represents a new technology of which Don Quijote is enamored but potentially not ready to fully utilize or understand: like the windmills he confuses for giants, the printed book has ushered in a new and uncertain time.¹ Michael Budd discusses the book as a new medium in the context of *Don Quijote*. He describes Spain in Cervantes’s era as a time of “exciting innovation and political turmoil,” noting that “from printed books, optical and musical instruments, to sailing ships, gunpowder weapons, and the windmills his character Don Alonso sees as giants, dramatic new potentialities were being developed for seeing and recording the world” (115). Cervantes portrays a character not only strongly influenced by the rise of print culture, but who is also experiencing an additional series of dramatic changes in warfare, transportation, scientific exploration, and communication in general throughout his lifetime.

José Antonio Maravall describes the environment in which Cervantes writes and he analyzes the climate of crisis prevalent in baroque society. This feeling of baroque crisis carries over to Cervantes’s characterization of his protagonist. Maravall discusses the political tensions in Spain, the “economic and social disturbances that

¹ In a well-known episode from the novel, Don Quijote does not recognize windmills and views them through his lens of chivalric fiction. The reaction confirms that the protagonist does not adapt smoothly to new technologies. Francisco Rico notes that although windmills were well-known in Spain, the specific type that Don Quijote encounters was probably unfamiliar. It was likely a new type of windmill introduced in 1575 in Europe’s Low Countries (94).
prevailed,” and notes that “individuals acquired relative consciousness of the phases of crisis that they were undergoing” (21). This pervasive feeling of crisis, both on an individual and a societal level, creates the context for the fragile mental state in which the reader finds Don Quijote at the beginning of the novel. Maravall notes that in the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Cervantes is publishing both parts of his novel, “the social consciousness of crisis weighing upon human beings provoked a world view wherein the minds of the epoch felt overwhelmed by an innermost disorder” (149). Though Maravall does not explicitly talk about the introduction of the printing press and books as an element of baroque crisis, the melancholic “disorder” he describes seems embodied by Alonso Quijano’s reaction to his immersion in individual reading and print culture. The protagonist is a product of his society, both in the general attitude cultivated by the feeling of crisis as well as in the rampant technological changes that affect his perspective on the world around him.

A particularly strong example of the protagonist’s responses to change, the themes of Don Quijote’s armas y letras discourse demonstrate that he has gained knowledge from reading books but also has developed a sense of nostalgia for the Middle Ages. His discourse focuses on the appeal of an era in which chivalry and bravery were valued and in which more precise warfare dominated. For the protagonist, modern technology has created greater opportunity for senseless or accidental deaths. He disparages modern weaponry and laments “haber tomado este ejercicio de caballero andante en edad tan detestable como es esta en que ahora vivimos” (Cervantes 448-9). This discussion of a “detestable era” is ironic: Don Quijote is not completely unprepared to welcome technological advances, as evidenced by his love of collecting and reading books, but he does sharply criticize the
capabilities of bullets and gunpowder. He imagines that if he survives his time as a knight-errant, he will be even more esteemed than his predecessors because he will have suffered “mayores peligros … que se pusieron los caballeros andantes de los pasados siglos” (Cervantes 449). Don Quijote emphasizes the danger he perceives in contemporary arms development; though he does not contrast those developments with the printing press, or changes in technology that affect the way that letras are communicated, print was undoubtedly among the emerging technologies that caused concern and confusion for a person experiencing uncertain crisis.

This ironic contrast in Don Quijote’s reception of inventions suggests that the protagonist is not fully certain of the ramifications of the development of the printing press, though readers are meant to understand the dangers print books have presented to his mental health. Maravall’s depiction of the baroque crisis suggests that Alonso Quijano would have a multitude of reasons to feel pessimistic about his own era. He describes the baroque-era presence of violence in many forms: not only did Spaniards experience the pain of warfare and the Inquisition, but they also heard news of the “homicides, robberies, and other criminal acts committed daily” (161). Maravall notes that the “spectacle of violence, pain, blood, and death” that was “popularly supported and displayed before the masses” not only took place on a regular basis in person, but also was depicted in baroque art (Maravall 163). Individuals were exposed to a regular depiction of violence, which may inspire anxiety and fear in the protagonist who is nostalgic for a simpler, more courteous era of Spanish culture. The irony, of course, is that Don Quijote is reading about that era, one in which the technology of the printed book did not exist, in his collection of print books.
The emphasis on the book as a new and somewhat mysterious entity that represents changes in culture and society also is notable in the second part of the novel, when Don Quijote visits a printing press in Barcelona. Upon seeing the sign that announces “[a]quí se imprimen libros,” Don Quijote seemed very happy “porque hasta entonces no había visto emprenta alguna y deseaba saber cómo fuese” (Cervantes 1142). The narrator describes Don Quijote moving around to watch the work being completed throughout the press, and he finally sees “toda aquella máquina que en las emprentas grandes se muestra” (Cervantes 1143). Don Quijote’s visit to the printing press implies that he is fascinated by the production of books, but more importantly, emphasizes that he has never witnessed any aspect of book production until his trip to Barcelona. The use of the word máquina is a poignant reminder that this process and its equipment are very new to the protagonist: he has great interest in exploring this new technological process, but his mind has not been conditioned to fully understand every aspect of print culture, which includes having familiarity with production of these new objects or being able to adequately process the content within them.

The author’s characterization of the press as a máquina also suggests destruction or at least a negative attitude toward the apparatus. In his entry for máquina, Sebastián de Covarrubias defines the term as a “fábrica grande e ingeniosa” and that “maquinar alguna cosa significa fabricar uno en su entendimiento traças para hacer mal a otro” (788). Don Quijote is seeing a large, relatively new invention that he has never before seen, much like the dangerous tools of modern warfare he laments. His brief encounter serves as a reflection of the damage that the printing press has caused to the protagonist’s state of mind and to the society that individual reading
has fragmented and isolated. The definition Covarrubias offers suggests that Cervantes’s contemporaries were not likely to have greeted the word máquina with excitement, but rather with the suspicion that unintended, damaging consequences would follow, just as they are seeing in Don Quijote’s behavior.

The word máquina appears shortly after the protagonist’s visit to the printing press in another context. After Sansón Carrasco defeats Don Quijote, the narrator notes that Sancho was sad and that it “parecíale que todo aquel suceso pasaba en sueños y que toda aquella máquina era cosa de encantamiento” (Cervantes 1161). Though the context of máquina is different here, it echoes the episode in the printing press and the harmful, potentially damaging machine that Don Quijote viewed there. Sancho experiences the regret of what might have happened if the protagonist had managed to reach his full potential and achieve glory through his adventures. It is notable that Don Quijote still is in Barcelona when he is finally defeated. Cervantes’s combination of vocabulary and setting suggests that the episode in the printing press truly does shift the protagonist’s trajectory: he is defeated by a character who has provided him with details about the spurious continuation of his story in the location in which he became disillusioned with the printing press and its significance.

Throughout the novel, Don Quijote experiences the effects of print books causing him harm, as he makes choices that seem noble according to his code of ethics but that in practice yield negative consequences. Cervantes uses the protagonist’s adventures to portray a society that is experiencing shifts in literacy and reading habits. This society is attempting to make sense of the confluence of two worlds: groups of individuals still immersed in an oral culture, and others who can read and write. As one representation of the challenges facing the interactions between these
two different cultures, Cervantes not only mentions printed books in the novel, but he also introduces examples of communication and storytelling through manuscripts. The novel’s contrast of manuscripts with print books symbolizes this progressing transition to the print era. Cervantes describes manuscripts that are unique and have mysterious origins, such as the found manuscript that tells Don Quijote’s story, to emphasize the difference between unique documents and printed books with a wider distribution.

The narrator, presumably Cervantes, says that he encountered a boy selling “unos cartapacios y papeles viejos” and that he had to read them as “aficionado a leer aunque sean los papeles rotos de las calles” (Cervantes 107). In his authoritative study Orality and Literacy, Walter J. Ong describes a series of primarily oral cultures in which individuals hoard scraps of paper whose contents may be outdated or irrelevant but that seem to be “remarkable” or to have “intrinsic value” to literate and illiterate people alike (92). Cervantes’s depiction of an individual who collects scraps of paper just to read them emphasizes this transition to the print era: just as Ong describes individuals collecting scraps of paper because they are so rare to a society that does not revolve around the printed world, Cervantes’s contemporaries are also collecting scraps of paper and demonstrating the fact that having something available to read may be a rare occasion. Print has not yet saturated Cervantes’s society, and unique, handwritten manuscript materials exist alongside printed materials that have been machine-produced. The contrast between print books and manuscripts is poignant given the author’s characterization of the printing press in terms of a potentially dangerous machine. Handwritten materials could forge a personal connection with readers that may not exist with the printing press. This loss of personal connection parallels Don Quijote’s lament for the loss of an era in which people were more
courteous. The protagonist observes an ailing society riddled with mechanical violence, and similarly, communication has also taken on a mechanical aspect that alienates individuals.

The reference to reading papers in the streets creates an image of a voracious and eager reader demonstrating his ability to read, much like Don Quijote, and also captures the transitory nature of some manifestations of the written word. Important information can be discarded and pages can be ripped, and when only single copies of written communication exist, the ideas contained within them will be difficult to preserve. The descriptions of the media that readers might encounter are notable: the manuscripts being sold are both notebooks and papers, which are more personal and ephemeral objects than mass-produced books. The notebook’s language also adds an element of mystery and complication to the understanding of its contents, since the narrator recognizes that the text is written in Arabic and needs to seek assistance from a translator. The blurred lines among narrator, translator, reader, and truth create tension within the novel, a tension that produces one of the major themes of the Quijote. Both manuscripts and print books appear in the novel as symbolic witnesses to the conventions governing truth and fiction, as well as to the role of author, narrator, translator, and printer as purveyors of those truths.

Roger Chartier observes that in the dissemination of print books, readers may not find that they are reading the words as the author intended them: “the form and the layout of the printed text … did not depend on the author, who delegated decisions about punctuation, accents, and spelling to those who prepared the copy or composed the pages” (Author’s 18). When contrasted with the manuscript, print represents a potential for imprecision and complication of meaning, much like the warfare
technology Don Quijote laments in his discourse. The author’s intentions might be misrepresented by printing changes made in the process of the máquina producing copies of each book.

Elizabeth Eisenstein confirms that manuscripts also were not exempt from production problems or errors, noting that “all texts in manuscript were liable to get corrupted after being copied over the course of time” but adding that there was a “reliance on oral transmission” prior to the rise of print (10-11). Manuscript culture and oral transmission provide many more opportunities for interaction with a reader because of the communal reading and individual manuscript annotations that were common prior to the emergence of print. Independent print reading does not depend upon groups of people uniting together to hear and interpret texts, and Cervantes suggests that Alonso Quijano loses his mind from reading alone in silence. The protagonist suffers the physical effects of sleep deprivation, but his behavior is a result of his obsessive reading in solitude. The individual who reads mass-produced, printed material in isolation is deprived of the personalized nature of the hand-copied or hand-annotated manuscript. For example, prior to recounting Don Quijote’s adventure in the cave of Montesinos, the narrator pauses to comment that Cide Hamete Benengeli has written notes in the margin of his manuscript to question the episode’s verisimilitude and to encourage the reader to make his or her own decision about what to believe (Cervantes 829). Cervantes emphasizes the novel’s themes of truth and authorship using this contrast between manuscript and print. The manuscript’s author guides the reader in ways that the individual reading a print book in solitude would not be able to experience. The role of the individual in copying and potentially reading a
manuscript emphasizes the personal connections forged in the context of manuscript culture prior to a reliance on machines to disseminate knowledge.

Like Riquer, Gemma Gorga argues that it is only the rise of print culture that could have caused a story like Don Quijote’s: his “consumo irracional de libros (de ahí la importancia del detalle cuantificador) es solo imaginable en el nuevo contexto de la modernidad tipográfica” (El mundo 110). It is not likely that an individual would have been able to obtain and voraciously read manuscripts the way that Don Quijote has consumed printed books, nor would those manuscripts in Don Quijote’s era have been such a symbol of change and upheaval. It is assumed that the protagonist’s decision to become a knight-errant is a direct reflection of his obsessive reading habits, whether because “perdía el pobre caballero el juicio” from the illogical plots of his novels or because he did not sleep and as a result, “se le secó el celebro de manera que vino a perder el juicio” (Cervantes 38-39). The protagonist has clearly lost his sense of good judgment, perhaps from physical deprivation due to so much time spent reading, or because of his inability to cope with the strains placed upon him by an emerging written culture.

Another notable example of manuscripts appears in the final pages of the first part of Don Quijote. The narrator notes that the people of La Mancha knew that Don Quijote went on a third excursion and travelled to Zaragoza, but that the details were unknown until he had the good fortune to find “un antiguo médico que tenía en su poder una caja de plomo … en la cual caja se habían hallado unos pergaminos escritos con letras góticas, pero en versos castellanos, que contenían muchas de sus hazañas” (Cervantes 591). The narrator notes that he had to search “todos los archivos manchegos por sacarla a luz” (Cervantes 591). The image of the parchment being
stored in an iron box creates another sharp contrast to the printed book which, as Don Quijote observes in his visit to the printing press and Chartier notes in his analysis, disseminates intellectual output in a more mechanical way, involving a multitude of people performing distinct jobs. Eisenstein supports that concept, stating that with print, “the transmission of written information became much more efficient” (66). This account of Don Quijote’s third adventure has not been produced in multiple copies and distributed; instead, it is kept locked away, at risk of never being read, until the narrator seeks out the manuscript. This description of the missing manuscript also emphasizes and parodies the elite readership within manuscript culture. Although Cervantes describes individuals who might engage with notebooks and scraps of paper, the parchment that contains Don Quijote’s third adventure is in the hands of one person.

The manuscripts in the novel serve as a reminder of the drastic changes in the dissemination of knowledge that occur during the transition from manuscript to print culture. Cervantes’s contrast of these two different objects demonstrates changes in the ways his contemporaries were reading, thinking, and understanding both the written word and the world around them. He introduces this concept again in the second part of the novel with Sansón Carrasco, who, in summarizing the reach of the first part of the novel, concedes that “como las obras impresas se miran despacio, fácilmente se veen sus faltas” (Cervantes 654). Sansón talks about the discrepancies critics observed in the first part of the novel, but his commentary is also important in highlighting the fact that individuals read print differently than they read manuscripts, even if it is only because they are looking for errors.
The structure of the printed book itself has a profound influence on the changes happening in Cervantes’s lifetime: Eisenstein observes that “[i]ncreasing familiarity with regularly numbered pages, punctuation marks, section breaks, running heads, indices, and so forth, helped to reorder the thought of all readers, whatever their profession or craft” (102-103). Readers may study a personal copy of a printed book more closely than a listener would be able to focus on the reading of a single copy of a manuscript, or that reader may take time with a relatively unfamiliar object. Cervantes and his contemporaries must have been well aware of these shifts in practice. Sansón’s assessment of the public’s reaction to the first part of the novel is another subtle reminder that Cervantes is depicting a time of turbulent change: reading habits are not only changing in the sense that individuals are reading independently, but the very structure of the print book is affecting the way that readers think and approach the words on a page. Alonso Quijano’s mental health may have changed not only because of his lack of sleep and obsessive reading of chivalric novels, but also because the structures of the objects he studied altered the way his brain processed information.

This contrast between manuscript and print not only suggests that Don Quijote is grappling with the effects of an emerging technology, but it also illustrates changes in which individuals are engaging with texts throughout the knight’s lifetime. Stories are no longer being read by one person to a group from a single manuscript because literate individuals can acquire printed copies of those stories and read them privately; alternatively, books widely disseminated in print might be read across multiple regions of Spain. Additionally, many individuals have the opportunity to hear or read texts that may not have been as easily available in a time of limited reading materials.
Fernando Bouza observes that in the world of the printing press, the “borders between literate and illiterate cultures become blurred” (Communication 70). The dynamic between Don Quijote and Sancho Panza illustrates this statement. Don Quijote represents the literate, middle-class contrast to Sancho Panza’s illiterate, lower-class character, but the two characters begin to demonstrate elements of the other’s traits as the novel progresses. A clear example of Sancho’s *quijotización* is illustrated by the Clavileño episode in Part II, when Sancho recalls that “pues volábamos por encantamiento, por encantamiento podía yo ver toda la tierra y todos los hombres por doquiera los mirara” (Cervantes 965). Sancho’s insistence on having flown on a magical horse demonstrates the significant change in his behavior from the time that he began his adventures with Don Quijote. The episode demonstrates that Sancho has begun to adopt a fictional framework similar to the protagonist’s.

The *quijotización* also is evident in Sancho’s oral communication: for example, near the end of the novel, Sancho discusses the apocryphal second part with Don Álvaro. Sancho responds to a question with a sustained argument and language that echoes chivalric fiction. He calls Don Quijote “el desfacedor de agravios, el tutor de pupilos y huérfanos, el amparo de las viudas, el matador de las doncellas” (Cervantes 1206). The adventure with Clavileño and the changes in Sancho’s way of speaking are concrete examples of the blurring of lines, or cultures, that Bouza observes. Sancho Panza, who previously had not had access to the rich, fiction-inspired, and imagined life that Alonso Quijano enjoyed, now inhabits an intellectual space that is similar to that of the voracious reader portrayed at the outset of the novel.

The shift in Don Quijote and Sancho’s behavior might also be explained in the context of Ong’s analysis of the psychodynamics of orality. Ong describes scholars’
fieldwork with oral cultures and he contrasts the differences in responses to certain
questions posed to both literate and illiterate individuals. He notes that the responses
from primary oral cultures are more based in experience: “oral folk assess intelligence
not as extrapolated from contrived textbook quizzes but as situated in operational
contexts” (Ong 55). Sancho, a character who cannot read and who has not been
immersed in any element of print culture prior to his agreement to travel with Don
Quijote, takes on a type of apprenticeship in being Don Quijote’s squire. He is, of
course, literally taking the position of assisting the protagonist with his adventures. He
also becomes a type of literary apprentice throughout the novel in that he too begins to
see the world according to the script that Don Quijote has internalized and acted out
for Sancho to adopt. Sancho is learning by example, exactly as a member of a
primarily oral culture does. As Sancho continues on his journey with Don Quijote, he
asks questions and follows the protagonist’s example of how a knight-errant and his
squire should act: Don Quijote’s knowledge, of course, is entirely derived from his
background in chivalric fiction rather than from professional experience, but Sancho’s
interactions with him have strong similarities to an apprenticeship.

Sancho states early on in the novel that he cannot read: “La verdad sea –
respondió Sancho – que yo no he leído ninguna historia jamás, porque no sé leer ni
escribir” (Cervantes 114). By the end of the novel, Sancho has gained knowledge of
the stories that Don Quijote has used to govern his time as a knight-errant. He has
become more inclined toward seeing the world through Don Quijote’s fiction-based
lens, as in the example with Clavileño. Ong also explains that people in primarily oral
cultures “learn a great deal and possess and practice great wisdom, but they do not
‘study’... they learn by apprenticeship” (9). Ong notes that this type of apprenticeship
may include “listening, by repeating what they hear, by mastering proverbs and ways of combining and recombining them” (9). This explanation provides insight into Cervantes’s portrayal of Sancho as an individual who routinely relies upon proverbs to speak and to analyze information he is given. While Don Quijote does not specifically teach Sancho how to read or write, he does provide a type of apprenticeship as he immerses him in a literary experience that could not have occurred without Don Quijote’s own reaction to his immersion in print culture.

Chapter XXV emphasizes that Sancho has unknowingly undertaken a type of literary apprenticeship through immersion: even though he argues with Don Quijote about Mambrino’s helmet and the need for penitence, Sancho does engage with Don Quijote’s description of literary characters. Sancho notes that it seems to him that “los caballeros que lo tal ficieron fueron provocados y tuvieron causa para hacer esas necedades y penitencias” and asks what has made Don Quijote crazy enough to carry out his acts of penitence (Cervantes 276). In not dismissing the protagonist’s actions as completely insane, but rather by placing them in the context of the literary world Don Quijote has created, Sancho demonstrates that he too has become an example of a person straddling both oral and print cultures. In calling them necedades, Sancho assesses Don Quijote’s actions as foolish, but wonders what could have provoked previous knights to behave in such a ludicrous way. The squire does not reject Don Quijote’s harmful behavior because it seems to be a typical step in a knight-errant’s adventure.

Sancho analyzes and observes the world through proverbs, which, as Ong observes, is a type of apprenticeship adopted by oral individuals, but Sancho also has begun to ask questions and make decisions within the framework and rules of chivalric
fiction that he has begun to learn from Don Quijote. Even throughout the second part of the novel, there are many references to Sancho’s use of proverbs. The duke assures him that that he will govern his island well, “[c]on tan buena memoria,” a comment that reflects his representation of the oral culture’s collective memory (Cervantes 969). His success as a governor confirms that he remains very capable of drawing on his own experiences, rather than on Don Quijote’s example, in order to make decisions: Sancho does not come out of his experience with the protagonist as a literate man, but rather one who has received exposure to a new world that print has made possible. Sancho’s multifaceted apprenticeship highlights Cervantes’s depiction of oral and written culture in conflict, but also emphasizes Bouza’s depiction of the blurring lines between social classes in Golden Age Spain. Sancho has become somewhat conversant in a genre to which he had not been previously exposed.

Cervantes uses the contrast between manuscripts and books to illustrate new opportunities for the democratization of knowledge: just as Sancho has been changed by his exposure to Don Quijote’s book-centered approach to life, the availability of multiple print copies of one work can bridge social classes in a new way. The author illustrates these social changes with a lively debate at the inn, during which the innkeeper Juan Palomeque, his family, and his guests discuss both literature and its effects on Don Quijote. The episode captures the power of this new technology to unify groups of individuals who previously may not have interacted: a discussion that ranges among several social classes takes place on the subject of chivalric romances.

Maxime Chevalier discusses the single known reference to a public reading of a book in sixteenth-century Spain, but notes that it is possible that readings like the one depicted at the inn may have occurred (91-92). He does express doubt, however,
that they happened frequently, and questions how rustic listeners like Sancho might have reacted to the “construcción literaria tan complicada y tan alejada de la realidad familiar del campo” (Chevalier 92). Despite his speculation on the frequency of group readings, Chevalier’s studies of the readership of chivalric novels conclude that the novels were read across social classes, indicating that the printing press democratized literary production in a way that could reach a larger number of readers2 (71). The episode at the inn does suggest that Cervantes either experienced or could imagine the print book bridging social classes and blurring lines between them in this way. Some have not read the novels but have heard a reading; the fact that so many have read or heard stories from the same genre is symbolic of the impact of the printed book. Such an episode could not have taken place prior to the advent of print culture, as the same stories could not have been widely distributed in manuscript form.3

The discussion at the inn demonstrates that chivalric romances have been read and heard far and wide in Golden Age Spain. Cervantes illustrates that print has had an impact that a manuscript of few copies could not achieve, even if ownership of the books and the ability to read them remained concentrated among higher social classes. Roger Chartier observes that the rise of the printing press involved “printing multiplied objects that were unknown or unfamiliar in the age of the manuscript and

2 B.W. Ife also notes increased readership of fiction and of specialist materials by non-specialist audiences in Golden Age Spain, noting the wider dissemination of knowledge as a result of print (7).

3 J.N.H. Lawrance discusses the growth of lay literacy in Castile in the period leading up to the Golden Age, and notes a rapid rise in vernacular publications by Spanish presses in the late fifteenth century. He also notes, however, that it is estimated that nearly 80 percent of Castilians were illiterate “well into the Golden Age” and that a growth in print sales does not necessarily represent a growth in literacy (86-87).
made them familiar” (*Author’s 60*). The mix of individuals at the inn includes the 
innkeeper and his family, Maritornes, the priest, the barber, Dorotea, and Cardenio, 
some of whom have not read these novels because they cannot read, but for whom the 
print book is a familiar mechanism for communicating a story. Like Sancho’s 
exposure to Don Quijote’s world, the presence of illiterate participants in the 
discussion reflects Bouza’s observation about the blurring of lines between two 
different cultures, the oral and the literate.

The group’s discussion about chivalric novels and the debate about whether the 
stories are fiction or non-fiction sharply illustrate the differences in classes that may have had some exposure to these works. The priest warns Juan Palomeque about the 
dangers of believing that the novels are true, and concludes the debate by saying: 
“Esto se hace [printing chivalric books] para entretener nuestros ociosos 
pensamientos; y así como se consiente en las repúblicas bien concertadas que haya 
juegos de ajedrez, de pelota y de trucos … así se consiente imprimir y que haya tales 
libros, creyendo, como es verdad, que no ha de haber alguno tan ignorante que tenga 
por historia verdadera ninguno de estos libros” (*Cervantes 374*). The discussion 
highlights a major divide between two social groups, as the priest speaks to the 
innkeeper with authority. He announces that he wants to communicate his complaints 
to someone who can remedy the problem he perceives in printing these books, and in 
the meantime, he hopes to educate his contemporaries about superior reading choices. 
Although the innkeeper is familiar with the same novels as the literate priest, their 
differing interpretations of the fictional books highlight a divide between them. The 
priest’s conjecture that these items are printed “para entretener nuestros ociosos
pensamientos” emphasizes the shifts in literacy and reading patterns that provide an eager audience for printed books of fictional entertainment.

Cervantes includes Sancho’s notable reaction to the debate: Sancho “quedó muy confuso y pensativo de lo que había oído decir que ahora no se usaban caballeros andantes y que todos los libros de caballerías eran necedades y mentiras, y propuso en su corazón de esperar en lo que paraba aquel viaje de su amo” (Cervantes 374). This sentence emphasizes Sancho’s participation in Don Quijote’s adventures without actually realizing that the life of a knight-errant was neither a realistic nor relevant undertaking for the protagonist. Sancho’s lack of understanding, shaped primarily by his grounding in a lower-class, oral culture, leaves him confused and thoughtful after hearing accusations about the novels that Don Quijote has used to shape their entire course of action. More importantly, the narrator chooses the phrase “había oído decir” to describe how Sancho has learned about this perplexing contrast between what Don Quijote has told him and what others believe to be true. A reflection of his identification with a primarily oral culture, Sancho has learned important information both through hearing it and by receiving it through another person’s filter. He is neither reading chivalric novels nor forming his own opinion about their value or Don Quijote’s decisions, but rather hearing what others have to say about them and reacting to the delivery of those messages.

Oral communication between Don Quijote and the innkeeper also is indicative of the divide between the literate and the illiterate. Earlier in the novel, Don Quijote’s dialogue with Juan Palomeque and his family is described as though the protagonist “hablara en griego,” and the innkeeper’s wife and her daughter, “no usadas a semejante lenguaje” look to the protagonist with admiration (Cervantes 170).
Although these individuals have been exposed to literary works, they are illiterate and have also heard them read aloud by a person who could, perhaps, provide “translation” of unknown concepts, phrases, or words. A performer or reader even might have adapted his or her storytelling to match the audience’s interests and experience. Gorga notes that in many episodes of the novel, “la incomprensión … funciona en ambos sentidos: los analfabetos no entienden a los letrados, pero los letrados tampoco entienden a los analfabetos” (El mundo 47). Just as the innkeeper does not understand what Don Quijote is saying, the priest also cannot comprehend the arguments that the innkeeper presents in defense of his literary tastes. The rise of print has served a role in unifying diverse groups of readers and listeners, but it has not quite alleviated all communication barriers between those groups. These tensions are clear examples of Cervantes’s observations of the transition from oral to written culture.

José Manuel Martín Morán also identifies Don Quijote as a representation of the shift from an oral to a written culture and notes that “Don Quijote tal vez sea el primer ejemplo de hombre alienado por la nueva tecnología contenida en el producto de la misma” (“El juglar zurdo” 122). Don Quijote’s absence from the group reading and discussion at the inn emphasizes the alienation that Martín Morán observes. After the debate about chivalric fiction and its value, the priest says that he wants to read El curioso impertinente, which interests him because of its title and the fact that it is written “de tan buena letra” (Cervantes 374). Cardenio, Dorotea, maese Nicolás, and Sancho also want to hear the story, and the priest offers to read aloud “si no fuera mejor gastar este tiempo en dormir que en leer” (Cervantes 375). This reference to sleeping instead of reading evokes Don Quijote’s loss of judgement partially because he has spent his nights reading rather than sleeping. It also reminds readers of the
irony that Don Quijote sleeps during a communal discussion of literature and the reading that follows. Don Quijote’s absence from this episode emphasizes the theory that his reading habits and troubled transition into written culture have isolated him and have caused the lack of good judgement consistently mentioned throughout the text to describe the protagonist’s state of mind.

The priest agrees to read the story, “entendiéndol que a todos daría gusto;” previously, Juan Palomeque had noted that “a algunos huéspedes que aquí la han leído les ha contentado mucho, y me la han pedido con muchas veras” (Cervantes 375). The shared interest in the story and the idea that previous guests have enjoyed it illustrate an idea that Don Quijote had shared earlier in his Edad de Oro discourse: the concept of the common good over the needs of the individual. Just as the protagonist demonstrates a longing for a previous, simpler era in his armas y letras speech, Don Quijote’s prior remarks to the goat herders suggest his nostalgia for an earlier and more peaceful era. He begins by introducing “[d]ichosa edad y siglos dichosos aquellos a quien los antiguos pusieron nombre de dorados, y no porque en ellos el oro, que en esta nuestra edad de hierro tanto se estima” (Cervantes 121). Don Quijote’s distinction between a golden age and an iron age suggests that he does recognize the presence of complex technological changes, among other shifts from past traditions to present practices, just as he demonstrates with his armas y letras speech. Don Quijote says that in the golden age, individuals “ignoraban estas dos palabras de tuyo y mío” because they shared “todas las cosas comunales” (Cervantes 121). This discussion of possessions in a previous age, one presumably dominated by oral communication, and in particular communal reading, strongly reflects elements of manuscript culture as they are depicted in the novel. Though the high cost of production and the scarcity of
manuscripts catered to an elite audience, Cervantes demonstrates that these documents nonetheless had great potential for exposing individual titles to a larger group of listeners or readers.

The discourse itself is another example of the tension between oral and written literacy, just as it is an example of a change from a golden to an iron age: since Don Quijote is speaking in the elevated language of a well-read and literate individual, the goat herders are not prepared to fully understand what they are hearing. The narrator describes the discourse as an “inútil razonamiento” (Cervantes 123). The goat herders immediately follow Don Quijote’s speech with a request that a young man, Antonio, entertain their guest with music. The introduction of a song to tell a story emphasizes the dominance of oral culture in an area of Golden Age Spain in which written culture does not yet appear to have a strong influence on communication methods. The juxtaposition of the goat herders’ storytelling through song and Don Quijote’s discourse is a perfect illustration of the tension Cervantes depicts between oral and print culture.

Ong analyzes the difference between the thought patterns and communication methods of oral poets and members of a written culture. He notes that “an oral poet is not working with texts or in a textual framework. He needs time to let the story sink into his own store of themes and formulas, time to ‘get with’ the story” (Ong 60). One of the goat herders argues that Antonio should sing for Don Quijote in order to show “este señor huésped que tenemos que también por los montes y selvas hay quien sepa de música” (Cervantes 124). Don Quijote’s discourse undoubtedly resembles Ong’s idea of the textual framework: he speaks in long paragraphs that lack the elements, such as formula and repetition, which characterize oral culture. Antonio’s song has a
consistent meter and assonance, both of which are more in line with the formulaic verse Ong describes. Don Quijote and the goat herders are speaking different linguistic registers but the goat herders do not imply that Don Quijote is superior to them because of his grounding in written and print culture. They suggest the song as a means of demonstrating that they may not necessarily be impressed by or speak the language that Don Quijote’s discourse features, but that they are actively communicating in a thoughtful and meaningful way.

Communication to a group of individuals through song shows strong parallels to manuscript culture, in which reading is necessary but not by all participants. Ong also observes the similarities between oral culture and manuscript culture, noting that “manuscript culture had preserved a feeling for a book as a kind of utterance, an occurrence in the course of conversation, rather than as an object” (123). Ong notes that the presence of elements like a book title immediately transforms the printed book into an object, whereas neither oral communication nor manuscript communication conceptualizes its contents in the form of a concrete item. He observes that “Homer would hardly have begun a recitation of episodes from the *Iliad* by announcing ‘The *Iliad*’” (123). This example is a crucial point in understanding the different framework through which individuals in Don Quijote’s world are receiving information and processing thought: in a sense, they are speaking different languages, and Don Quijote’s inability to fully process the words he has read is only one example of the
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4 Ong describes manuscript culture as largely “oral-aural” despite the presence of some written texts: manuscripts were often difficult to read, and when they were read, they were read slowly and aloud in order to memorize the contents and be able to recall them later (117).
multitude of challenges associated with the collision of oral, manuscript, and print
cultures in the novel.

Shifts in Don Quijote’s lifetime from primary orality to print culture have
strong implications for individuals and communities. Martín Morán argues that Don
Quijote’s behavior can be explained by the limits of his mind: as an older member of a
generation that grew up in an oral culture, his brain is not prepared to comprehend a
linear novel. He argues that the episode at the inn, in which the protagonist sleeps
through the group discussion of literature, demonstrates that Don Quijote has adopted
new technology without the proper intellectual preparation, and this lack of
preparedness has pushed him to the point of apparent insanity (“El juglar zurdo” 139).
Martín Morán also analyzes what Don Quijote chooses to read and the novels’
demonstration of the protagonist’s longing for a past era rather than a connection with
the present (“Don Quijote en la encrucijada” 343). Don Quijote is both a beneficiary
and a victim of new technology: he has readily adopted and been entertained by new
technology without being prepared for the changes in society created by the rise of the
printed book.

Bouza observes that individual reading, like the activity in which Don Quijote
is engaged, allows for more personal interpretation of a text’s meaning, which could
be one reason that Alonso Quijano becomes obsessed with executing the plots and
ideals of the novels he reads. Bouza notes that “oral readings enabled the illiterate to
become familiar with texts … on the other hand, however, oral delivery of texts could
also be understood as a means of controlling reading, a matter particularly significant
in the case of devotional readings” (Communication 52). The shift from oral to print
culture represents a departure from the traditional ways information was shared, and
the rise of the individual reader decreases the importance of an authoritative figure to provide interpretation and guidance on texts. Just as Sancho is perplexed by others’ ideas about the novels that he cannot read himself, Don Quijote’s reading habits are on the opposite end of this spectrum, having isolated him from any other readers or listeners who may challenge his assumptions about how to process the plots and characters he is furiously reading.

In oral culture, storytelling takes place as a group activity, and similarly, group reading is common in manuscript culture. The reader also may serve as an interpreter or a didactic aide to the audience who may not be expected to understand what they are hearing. Ong confirms that “in manuscript culture and hence in early print culture, reading had tended to be a social activity, one person reading to others in a group” (128). In this sense, manuscripts serve as a form of common good, just as Don Quijote describes in his discourse before the goat herders: the written word in a group reading is shared for all to enjoy, just as oral storytelling could not take place without other individuals participating, or at least listening to the speaker. Juan Palomeque explains that he will not allow guests to take the manuscript containing *El curioso impertinente* because it is not his to give away. It is reasonable to assume that he keeps the manuscript available at the inn not just because it gives him joy, but also because it adds value to guests’ experience when they are able to read or hear an enjoyable story. The participation of many individuals in hearing and interpreting *El curioso impertinente* sharply contrasts with the isolated and independent reading that has, perhaps, caused Alonso Quijano to become Don Quijote.

Ong notes that print “produced books smaller and more portable than those common in manuscript culture, setting the stage psychologically for solo reading in a
quiet corner, and eventually for completely silent reading” (128). B.W. Ife specifically analyzes Don Quijote and affirms that he might have remained mentally sound “had he not read … holed up in his study beyond the protective company of his fellow men” (8). Alonso Quijano is, of course, Cervantes’s exaggerated and parodic example of what may happen to an individual who is engaged in the activity of reading alone rather than hearing stories in a communal, social setting.

Although Juan Palomeque cannot effectively communicate with Don Quijote, just as the goat herders do not successfully understand his message, the innkeeper does share Don Quijote’s fondness for chivalric fiction. He serves as an example of manuscript culture in a nuanced contrast to Sancho Panza: although both are illiterate, Juan Palomeque has heard the tales upon which Don Quijote is basing his adventures, while Sancho has not. The innkeeper defends his love of chivalric fiction to the priest, though he concedes that “no seré tan loco que me haga caballero andante, que bien veo que ahora no se usa lo que se usaba en aquel tiempo, cuando se dice que andaban por el mundo estos famosos caballeros” (Cervantes 374). The innkeeper, straddling the divide between oral and print culture, has heard stories like Don Quijote has read and has trouble discerning fiction from fact, but perhaps has received enough guidance from a reader or has independently been able to discern that nostalgia for a past era is neither practical nor realistic. His comment that “se dice que andaban” is another reminder of his grounding in oral culture: he does not say that he has read about the behavior of knights-errant, but rather has heard their stories.

The shared manuscript as a common good evokes the theme of Don Quijote’s *Edad de Oro* discourse and it symbolizes the era for which he longs, perhaps a suggestion that he subconsciously understands, or at least has identified, the
consequences of his exposure to independent reading of print books. His reading has caused damage to his mental and physical health, but it has also literally isolated him from the community, both at home and in the inn: again, it is notable that he sleeps through the entire shared experience of reading/hearing *El curioso impertinente*. The concept of shared goods also is important in introducing another important aspect of the print book in *Don Quijote*: not only does the novel point out that individuals’ hearing and understanding of stories change in the transition from oral to print culture, but it also shows the significant changes in how intellectual objects are curated, collected, and preserved.
Chapter 2
THE CURATION AND PRESERVATION OF PRINT IN GOLDEN AGE SPAIN

In addition to examining ways that individuals are hearing or reading stories, *Don Quijote* provides insight into the emerging methods through which information was curated, collected, preserved, shared, and scrutinized once print became a more popular medium. Unlike manuscripts with only a few extant copies and a concentration of holdings in university, monastic, or aristocratic libraries, books with larger print runs encouraged private acquisitions. Individuals or institutions in turn needed a place to house them. Private collections in the novel both symbolize characters and emphasize that access to print materials continues to expand. The most notable example of the private library in the novel is that of Don Quijote himself, which contains fictional books in a variety of genres. It also is subjected to harsh censorship when the priest, barber, niece, and housekeeper work together to try to save Don Quijote from his insatiable desire to read. The destruction of this library, an
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5 For a discussion of monastery and royal collections, as well as characteristics of manuscripts and book binding in medieval Spain, see Juan Pérez de Guzmán, “El libro y la biblioteca en España durante los siglos medios.”

6 J.N.H. Lawrance notes that there are “early signs of the rise of private book-collecting amongst the laity in Castile” in the early fifteenth-century (81).
obvious commentary on the ongoing censorship stemming from the
Inquisition, contributes to the protagonist’s madness.

Cervantes describes Don Quijote’s library as containing “más de cien cuerpos
de libros grandes, muy bien encuadernados, y otro pequeños” (76). He has acquired
the books by giving up his land: “vendió muchas hanegas de tierra de sembradura para
comprar libros de caballerías en que leer” (Cervantes 37). In La biblioteca de don
Quijote, Edward Baker notes that a personal library of this size is not typical for an
individual in Golden Age Spain, as the high cost of folios and the high-quality binding
found in Don Quijote’s collection would be prohibitive for most collectors of Alonso
Quijano’s socioeconomic status (112-113). According to Baker, it was normal to
classify books by size, as Cervantes does in describing this personal library; however,
Baker also observes “la desproporción entre los libros grandes y pequeños” in
comparison with the catalogs of other private libraries held by seventeenth-century
Spaniards (102-110). Baker’s extensive data on private libraries in Cervantes’s era
suggest that the library is a symbol that represents the protagonist’s imbalance: just as
Alonso Quijano has chosen to spend his money on more books than he can reasonably
afford, Don Quijote is unable to make good decisions or think clearly about the
fantasy of a life as a knight-errant in La Mancha.

Baker notes that there is little evidence Alonso Quijano has traveled
extensively outside of La Mancha, yet “es razonable suponer que no había ni libreros
ni mucho menos encuadernadores” in Don Quijote’s world (119). This important
detail, in addition to the imbalance that Baker analyzes, suggests that Cervantes has

7 In his notes to chapter VI, Francisco Rico explains that this episode is an allegory of
the Spanish Inquisition (77).
crafted an unrealistic protagonist in order to illustrate the extremity of Don Quijote’s actions. Baker additionally observes that “la biblioteca costó una fortuna que don Quijote manifiestamente no poseía” (110). Alonso Quijano has curated a collection that defies reason, and his library acts as a symbol of the individual who also acts in ways that defy normal expectations.

Cervantes suggests that Don Quijote’s behavior is an extension of the unbelievable or unreasonable plots and themes of chivalric fiction. The narrator says that no one would be able to answer the questions Alonso Quijano asks about the novels in his attempt to make sense of them, not even “el mismo Aristóteles, si resucitara para solo ello” (Cervantes 38). Just as the novels Cervantes criticizes are unrealistic and offer plots that reasonable readers would not believe to be true, the author has also created a character that possesses a library that would be unbelievable to his contemporaries in considering the limitations of his social and economic status.

Baker also analyzes the classifications of typical private libraries of Golden Age Spain beyond those based upon size. He includes the taxonomy for books cataloged in the Bibliotheca hispana. Religious texts comprised more than half of the typical private library in Cervantes’s era, yet Don Quijote’s library does not contain any sacred books (Baker 134). Many readers also collected books related to their professions, such as legal or medical texts (Baker 135). These libraries contained some literary works or books for entertainment, but Don Quijote’s collection consists exclusively of this type of text: his library includes chivalric fiction, pastoral novels, and both collections of poems and epic poetry (Cervantes 76-87). With no references to historic, religious, or professional texts, the reader assumes that Alonso Quijano had
no interest in collecting a more balanced selection of titles, let alone in reading books that might curb his consumption of fiction, in particular chivalric novels.

Just as monks might need to collect a large number of religious books, Don Quijote needs to collect entertainment books because his sole vocation is to be a reader, according to Baker’s theory (135). He calls Alonso Quijano the opposite of the “desocupado lector,” arguing that his books are “el fundamento de su vida espiritual y antes de sus salidas de caballero andante a ellos se dedica plena y exclusivamente” (Baker 49). Baker bases this analysis on Don Quijote’s words to Cardenio, when he explains that his “más de trescientos libros … son el regalo de [su] alma y el entretenimiento de [su] vida” (Cervantes 268). The protagonist offers a clear view of someone who appears obsessed by his hobby, yet Baker suggests that he is simply devoting himself to his avocation, and that “los libros de entretenimiento constituyen su sola y demencial ocupación” (49). This assessment places the protagonist in direct contrast to the idle, leisurely reader who only seeks amusement when reading fiction.

Using definitions from Covarrubias and others, Baker notes that *entretenimiento* does not necessarily equate with consuming frivolous content and may, in fact, connote “trabajo, dedicación vital, en una palabra, vocación” (Baker 49). Don Quijote’s contemporaries might not necessarily select chivalric fiction to pass the time between activities or chores, and indeed, the priest’s assertions at the inn suggest that reading chivalric fiction for entertainment has negative consequences. Don Quijote’s words, and Baker’s analysis, however, suggest that the idea of reading for entertainment does not always signify an idle activity, and it may be enlivening.

Building upon Baker’s analysis of Don Quijote as the opposite of the “desocupado lector,” it seems that Cervantes is providing subtle commentary on the
printing press’s ability to move the focus of reading or listening from the sacred to the profane. Just as the second part of the novel suggests that nearly anyone can be an author, the first part of the Quijote demonstrates that anyone can develop and demonstrate a devotion to fiction rather than religion and adopt reading fictional books as an avocation. Don Quijote’s words to Cardenio suggest a religious experience: chivalric fiction has nurtured his soul in a way that others might have experienced as a result of religious devotion. He also suggests that he is a professional, not in his book collecting but rather in his dedication to being an excellent knight-errant.

While explaining his need for penitence to Sancho, Don Quijote lectures him on the importance of imitation in order to master an art form, and he uses a comparison with painting: “cuando algún pintor quiere salir famoso en su arte procura imitar los originales de los más únicos pintores que sabe” (Cervantes 274). There is, of course, an element of literary criticism here, as Cervantes has incorporated disparaging remarks about the inferior work of the many authors who imitated Amadís de Gaula into his work. Don Quijote’s remarks about a painter also support Baker’s theory that reading is the protagonist’s profession: he sees himself as someone who needs to actively act upon the text he has read. He is not passively taking in the stories in his books, but rather reading the novels as an instructional manual for his chosen profession, and it is his job to craft a reliable and admirable imitation of his ideal model.

A contrast to Don Quijote, Cervantes portrays the Caballero del Verde Gabán, or Don Diego de Miranda, as another collector in the book who has developed a much more realistic and well-balanced library. Augustin Redondo summarizes Don Diego well: “lo que caracteriza fundamentalmente a don Diego es su discreción, su
prudencia” (279). Redondo also notes that Don Diego is a representation of one who looks forward (as the verb, mirar, is part of his name) while Don Quijote, in contrast, persists with dwelling in Spain’s past (267-8). This character is a foil to Don Quijote, who acts in extreme ways such as selling his land to buy books and showing impaired judgment by devoting himself to knight-errantry.

Don Diego describes himself as “más que medianamente rico” and spends time hunting, fishing, or with his family and friends (Cervantes 754). As an individual who carries the title “don,” readers understand that Don Diego is reflective of a member of an upper class in Golden Age Spain, unlike Don Quijote who has given himself the title that Alonso Quijano does not have. This short autobiography sharply contrasts with that of Alonso Quijano, whose sole hobby is reading and who does not have a spouse, children, or friends with whom to spend time that might balance out his schedule of constant reading. Don Diego continues to describe his library: “[t]engo hasta seis docenas de libros, cuáles de romance y cuáles de latín, de historia algunos y de devoción otros; los de caballerías aún no han entrado por los umbrales de mis puertas. Hojeo más los que son profanos que los devotos, como sean de honesto entretenimiento” (Cervantes 754). This description of the books’ contents corroborates Redondo’s analysis of the character as prudent, and he specifically says that the dangerous novels that have harmed Don Quijote have never been allowed into his home.

This personal library is a symbol of Don Diego’s life and his character, just as Don Quijote’s library reflects him. Don Diego is well-rounded: though he presumably
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8 Francisco Rico’s footnote explains that hidalgos did not carry the title ‘don’ in Cervantes’s era (42).
could afford the hundreds of books collected in Don Quijote’s library, he only owns six dozen, and rather than spending day and night reading, he engages in other hobbies. Baker calls Don Diego’s library the representation of balance: he collects books about history and religion, and reads them in both Spanish and Latin. Don Diego has “una biblioteca-modelo” for the beginning of the seventeenth century (Baker 153). Baker observes that, like Montaigne, Don Diego sees the book as “un objeto cuya finalidad en la vida es proporcionar a quien lo lee un rato de placer conseguido mediante el ‘honneste amusement,’ ‘el honesto entretenimiento’ que para don Diego se encuentra principalmente en los libros profanos” (150). The Caballero del Verde Gabán’s library demonstrates the reading habits of a “sane” contemporary of Don Quijote’s. His moderate and well-balanced collecting habits illustrate that some literate men of Don Quijote’s age encountered a smoother transition from oral to print culture. The differences in the two characters demonstrate that the Golden Age increase in print materials impacted individuals in a variety of ways. Unlike Don Quijote, Don Diego maintains balance and sanity despite the introduction of new, disruptive technology into his life.

Cervantes portrays the innkeeper’s collection of books as another contrast to Don Quijote’s library, and as a sharp contrast to Don Diego’s, illustrating the differences in literacy and collecting potential in the men’s social classes. Juan Palomeque’s personal collection is significant as a reflection of its owner and his social standing. The innkeeper tells the group at the inn that he has access to books and manuscripts, “dos o tres dellos, con otros papeles, que verdaderamente me han dado la vida, no solo a mí, sino a otros muchos” (Cervantes 369). He does not technically own these items, but rather has assumed responsibility for them and their
container, a “maleta olvidada” that a previous guest left behind at the inn (Cervantes 375). The idea that the books have given Juan Palomeque life serves as another contrast between him and the protagonist: while Don Quijote is selling his land to purchase books, being ridiculed throughout his adventures, and generally shunning his “normal” life, Juan Palomeque has experienced a type of invigoration from hearing these stories. The life-giving nature of Juan Palomeque’s collection seems much more grounded than the enlivenment Don Quijote experiences: both men argue that books have inspired them, but only Don Quijote is suffering derision as a result. The innkeeper’s small collection of manuscripts and print books has inspired readers and listeners, but there is no evidence that the contents have pushed any of them to the extreme of experiencing the insanity and physical harm that Don Quijote suffers. Juan Palomeque’s small collection is limited both by the innkeeper’s socioeconomic status and his inability to read: Cervantes suggests that the character would not have the means to purchase Don Quijote’s library even if he wanted to do so. The character’s collection, however, is yet another example of a person engaging with print texts in moderation, a contrast to Don Quijote’s behavior.

Later in the novel, Don Quijote debates the question of truth and fiction in printed texts. He cites the large groups of people who enjoy reading fiction and defends his love for this genre with a long and detailed story to illustrate all the ways a chivalric novel might delight readers (Cervantes 569-572). This argument suggests that the genre has given life to many individuals, and not just to Juan Palomeque. The protagonist specifically asserts that novels can help any person because they “destierran la melancolía que tuviere y le mejoran la condición, si acaso la tiene mala” (Cervantes 571). The irony of his statement is, of course, that books have worsened his
melancholic condition and caused him to experience a form of mental illness: while he presents a well-structured, reasonable defense of fiction, the subtext is that he cannot distinguish reality from fictional books. The life-giving characteristics of Juan Palomeque’s suitcase are notable, but they do not reflect the negative effects of print culture that Don Quijote is representing, even if he would argue otherwise.

The description of the suitcase and its contents evokes an important element of oral culture that Ong discusses: he notes that “oral culture simply does not deal in such items as geometrical figures, abstract categorization” (54-55). While formal Golden Age libraries were storing books arranged according to a system based upon their size, Juan Palomeque’s suitcase is an imprecisely-described mix of an uncounted number of items and other papers. The papers, of course, suggest Ong’s description of scrap paper discussed earlier: to someone who cannot read, these scraps may seem far more precious than a reader would judge them to be. The innkeeper’s collection of manuscripts, books, and scrap papers together in one place may be a reflection of the fact that he has not been accustomed to thinking in terms of classification of knowledge: he simply has accumulated these items, which serve him and his guests as a form of common good, and it is not part of his framework to arrange or to classify these objects in the same way that literate readers organize and categorize the books they have collected.

The innkeeper’s suitcase is not a private library in the same sense as the protagonist’s book collection: the collection was not personally curated by Juan Palomeque, nor did he pay for the items contained within it. Instead, the collection evokes elements that serve as a precursor of a modern lending library: in a sense, the books and manuscripts are borrowed and loaned. The innkeeper does not imply that
the collection’s owner specifically loaned the suitcase to him, as indicated by the word “olvidada.” However, his language also suggests an important principle of a lending library: he tells the priest that, because he is a Christian, “se los he de volver” (Cervantes 375). The books may be enjoyed on a short-term basis by readers (or listeners) even if they have neither curated the collection nor acquired the individual titles. Cervantes may introduce the idea of returning the books in order to further characterize the innkeeper: the suggestion that Juan Palomeque might have stolen or claimed the suitcase as his own could be a commentary on the reputation of innkeepers in early seventeenth-century Spain. It also provides insight into the ways that both manuscripts and print books reached their readership through both sales and through loans.

The priest asks to examine Juan Palomeque’s collection, and he complies: “entrando en su aposento, sacó dél una maletilla vieja, cerrada con una cadenilla, y, abriéndola, halló en ella tres libros grandes y unos papeles de muy buena letra, escritos de mano” (Cervantes 370-371). The possession of only three borrowed print books confirms that the innkeeper is of a lower social class than Don Diego or even Don Quijote, since he enjoys chivalric fiction but has amassed neither an average number of books (as has Don Diego) nor an excessive number of them (as has Don Quijote). Baker also observes that the location of the library is very telling: unlike the domestic spaces that host the hidalgos’ libraries, “la maleta del ‘zurdo’ Palomeque reproduce simbólicamente y con gran exactitud la condición de biblioteca ambulante, pues para aquellos libros, lo mismo que para las personas que paran momentáneamente en aquella casa, la venta no es más que un breve hito en su camino de vida” (142). Baker calls the innkeeper’s collection “improvisada,” an accurate assessment of a group of
items that has not been specifically curated or collected (142). There is a suggestion, of course, that the innkeeper would not be able to afford the number of books that Don Diego or Don Quijote may purchase. It does not seem, though, that Juan Palomeque assigns any less value to his collection than the higher-class libraries in the book. His assertion that the novels have given him life, and the fact that they are protected in their suitcase with a chain, suggests that even for a person who is more entrenched in oral than written culture, copies of print books are extremely valuable and necessary objects.

Bouza confirms that during the Golden Age, books stored in homes typically were “on shelves in a librería (the name generally used for the modern Spanish biblioteca, or library), or in chests and drawers” (Communication 45). The innkeeper’s lack of a formal library serves as an interesting contrast to Don Quijote: both men are enamored of chivalric fiction, yet have differing economic and social agency for acquiring and preserving the books they like to read or hear. Don Quijote has land to sell so that he can purchase books, and he has the space to house his collection within his home, whereas Juan Palomeque is not from a social class that would provide him with those same resources. The alignment of Don Quijote with an illiterate character is another suggestion that the protagonist experiences great difficulty in the transition between oral and print culture. Both men’s lives have been unquestionably influenced by their collections, but Alonso Quijano’s response to reading these works of fiction is drastically different from Juan Palomeque’s actions, or lack thereof, after hearing his books and manuscripts read aloud to him.

The private libraries in Don Quijote reflect characteristics of their owners. As Francisco López Estrada suggests, Don Quijote’s library represents an act of
The curator has selected, acquired, arranged, and preserved works in a way that is unique to that one individual: even if the protagonist had owned a more balanced library, it is unlikely that any of Don Quijote’s contemporaries would have assimilated the same titles and grouped them in the same way that the protagonist has done. In this way, the destruction of the library early in the novel is a violent attack on Don Quijote, not just on his taste in literature, but on a collection he personally has curated.

Cervantes describes the “donoso y grande escrutinio” of the library as a destruction of the order in Alonso Quijano’s life, which perhaps serves as a turning point that further encourages Don Quijote’s transformation into a knight-errant (76). The destruction of his library is an eradication of the protagonist’s mental and physical space, which might further impair his judgment and inspire him to leave his habits and his house behind as he leaves on a second adventure. This chapter also contains strong criticism of two elements of Cervantes’s era: popular literature and the Inquisition. As in other notable parts of the novel, the protagonist is absent from the action: he sleeps as the priest, the barber, his housekeeper, and his niece remove his books from their shelves to examine them and determine whether each title deserves to be preserved or destroyed. The barber orders the housekeeper to throw “todos los grandes” outside to be burned (Cervantes 83). As Baker describes, the large-format items were undoubtedly works of chivalric fiction, so it is clear from Cervantes’s text that the items being censored belong specifically to that genre.

López Estrada posits that Don Quijote cannot bear the thought of the priest and the barber mistreating his creation, and as a result, he believes that an enchanter has stolen his books. The carefully-curated collection reflects Don Quijote’s individualism
and his ideological structure, which permits much of his philosophical thought to remain organized and emerge in his logical, lengthy discourses throughout the first part of the novel (López Estrada 197-99). Eisenstein notes that medieval library catalogs and most pre-sixteenth-century reference works were not in alphabetical order; rather they were “idiosyncratically arranged” (90). The arrangement of both physical books and their contents represents an act of curation and individual expression because there is not an overarching classification system in place in libraries of any type. Iván Jaksic asserts that Cervantes uses the novel and its collections to emphasize “the importance of books in providing the basis for individualistic reading and choice of lifestyle” (90). Again, it is not a coincidence that Don Quijote leaves his home shortly after the destruction of his library: his curated collection is a representation of his personality, beliefs, and interest. The library’s destruction is a catalyst for further decline into madness and for clinging to his plan to become a knight-errant. His reaction to this shocking event demonstrates the poor judgement that his friends observe in him throughout the first part of the novel. He immediately reverts to the archived knowledge he has preserved, recognizing that his enemy, the enchanter Frestón, has caused this destruction, which perhaps is easier for the protagonist to accept than the fact that his friends and family have taken away a crucial component of his identity.

Cervantes introduces the idea of conservation after the priest and the barber have made decisions about Don Quijote’s books: “[a]quella noche quemó y abrasó el ama cuantos libros había en el corral y en toda la casa, y tales debieron de arder que merecían guardarse en perpetuos archivos; mas no lo permitió su suerte y la pereza del escrutinador” (89). This observation is a form of literary criticism as well as a
criticism of censorship, as Cervantes suggests that one person’s concept of a harmful or low-quality book may be received by another reader in a completely different way. Just as collections are personal and may be idiosyncratic, so too are decisions about preservation and conservation of print materials. It is important to note that Cervantes mentions that some books that were burned deserved to be archived or preserved permanently: this phrase demonstrates that conservation beyond the level achieved in a private library is essential. The shift from manuscript to print culture has introduced multiple copies of a single item, but that duplication does not imply that print books should merit any less care in terms of archiving content and making it available for both contemporaries and future generations to read.

The importance of preserving stories and knowledge also is mentioned in the break in narration at the end of chapter VIII, when the second author tells readers that he did not want for that “tan curiosa historia estuviese entregada a las leyes del olvido” (Cervantes 104). The pause in narration is interesting because it injects an element of humor and metaliterary commentary into the novel: the story ends in the middle of the action of Don Quijote preparing for combat with the vizcaíno because the first author could not find a manuscript that continued the narrative. The second narrator highlights the importance of preserving Don Quijote’s adventures so that they would not be forgotten. He continues to say that he knew that the people of La Mancha would be curious to know if in some archive or desk in the region there might be “papeles que deste famoso caballero tratasen” (Cervantes 104). Although this text reflects the common story that chivalric novels originate from found manuscripts, the reference to “archivos” continues the idea that stories must be captured and made available for subsequent readers, whether for their edification or entertainment.
Cervantes’s references to conservation signal his interest in recording and disseminating knowledge, and Gorga also analyzes the preservation of Don Quijote’s library even after it is physically destroyed, both through rearrangement and burning of specific items. She argues that the absence of physical books does not deter Don Quijote from remembering their content, and the transformation of Alonso Quijano into Don Quijote is a form of archiving (“El libro” 41). Don Quijote serves as an agent of preservation in that the physical items in his library, such as novels of chivalry of which the priest and the barber do not approve, are destroyed, yet the protagonist continues to tell their stories, invoke their characters, and embody their themes through his actions and through his dialogue with individuals encountered throughout his adventures.

The idea of Don Quijote preserving censored books represents a cycle that proves that knowledge and creative production can never be permanently repressed: individuals can preserve materials in personal collections and actively maintain the wisdom or knowledge gained from those items even if they are destroyed later. Memory and cultural preservation may appear to be in direct conflict with the ideas of censorship and destruction, but individuals like Don Quijote are examples of successful rebellion against intellectual repression. Gorga argues that during Cervantes’s time “el censor se aplica con entusiasmo a la destrucción de la parte (el libro como objeto material) por el todo (el libro como objeto de conciencia)” (El mundo 10). The destruction of the method of communication does not negate the message itself, and it is clear that Don Quijote has absorbed a great deal of content from the books he has read.
One of the most compelling arguments for Don Quijote as an agent of preservation deals not with his extensive, encyclopedic knowledge of chivalric fiction, but rather is represented by his short-lived interest in becoming a shepherd and following the model of pastoral fiction toward the end of the novel. When the priest and the barber scrutinize Alonso Quijano’s library, the niece begs them to burn the books that contain this genre of fiction: “bien los puede vuestra merced mandar quemar como a los demás, porque no sería mucho que, habiendo sanado mi señor tío de la enfermedad caballerescas, leyendo estos se le antojase de hacerse pastor” (Cervantes 84). The priest agrees that the books should be burned and that the niece’s argument has merit, yet the end of the novel shows the niece’s fear being realized: Don Quijote returns home and announces that for the next year, he plans to become a shepherd, providing new fictional names for his friends and telling them that he will spend the year “en la soledad de los campos” thinking about “sus amorosos pensamientos” (Cervantes 1213).

Cervantes makes no mention of Don Quijote returning home and studying pastoral novels after his adventures as a knight-errant. Instead, he suggests that the protagonist is able to concoct a new fictional reality based on another set of print books he has read, even though it has presumably been years since he has owned and read them. There are themes of the pastoral throughout the novel, but Cervantes does not portray Don Quijote as engaging with any text related to these themes. His specific reference to walking the fields thinking about love seems to highlight this point, as his love for Dulcinea is completely invented. The woman Don Quijote says he loves is inspired not by the characteristics of Aldonza Lorenzo herself, but rather by the mold
that the protagonist is following based on his archival knowledge of the genre he has decided to imitate.

In this line of inquiry, Jesús Botello López-Canti adds that Don Quijote itself is portrayed as the product of an archive, and Don Quijote himself is a type of archivist: “[e]n su toma de decisiones diaria y sobre todo al enfrentarse a nuevos contextos, don Quijote busca en su ‘archivo mental’ situaciones análogas leídas en sus libros de caballerías que le sirvan de guía” (110). The protagonist serves as an example that archives, libraries, and personal collections not only reflect the way a person views his or her personal environment, but also can have a significant impact on an individual’s view of the world on a greater scale. Don Quijote, a character who would not exist if not for the rise of the printing press and his ability to obtain popular fiction, has turned into his own form of archival collection, referring to the knowledge that he has assimilated in order to make decisions about his daily life as a knight-errant.

While private libraries in Don Quijote help to describe characters and demonstrate the individuals’ book collecting habits in Golden Age Spain, an underlying assumption should be understood: lending on a larger scale was taking place as a means of sharing information and literature. In his analysis of the readership of chivalric fiction, Chevalier describes the novels’ circulation: “las novelas de caballería son libros que se pueden pedir prestados, libros que se pueden alquilar, libros que un hombre entrado en años había desechado, vendiéndolos o regalándolos” (73). He notes that the staff of aristocratic families might read the books collected in employers’ libraries (Chevalier 23). This practice suggests that even private libraries played a role in enabling circulation of print books beyond the small group of individuals able to afford them. Cervantes includes this model in the Quijote: though
there are no explicit references to his housekeeper reading books from his library, her opinion that each “encantador” within Alonso Quijano’s library should be burned suggests some familiarity with the novels’ contents (Cervantes 77).

It is clear that many methods of sharing print books were in place even though libraries “oficialmente abiertas al público” beyond El Escorial did not exist in Spain until the eighteenth century (Chevalier 20). In examining the antecedents of the modern Spanish library, however, Luis García Ejarque argues that “los primeros intentos de la autoridad española … por ofrecer a sus ciudadanos una biblioteca pública se remontan al siglo XVI” (1). García Ejarque discusses Juan Páez de Castro, chronicler to both Charles V and Philip II, and his recommendation for a large royal library in Valladolid which eventually turned into plans for the library at El Escorial (1-4). These plans “nos dan una idea cabal de lo que se entendía en España por biblioteca pública de patrocinio real en el siglo XVI” (García Ejarque 4). The plans for the library at El Escorial and the subsequent construction would have influenced Cervantes’s vision of a “public” library. Not only is society dealing with changes in reading habits as a result of the rise of the printing press, but collection methods are also changing: in addition to private and monastery libraries, plans for government libraries were setting the stage for preservation on a much larger and more public scale than previous types of libraries.

The library at El Escorial presents an interesting perspective on collection and preservation during Cervantes’s time. Philip II, a contemporary of Cervantes, constructed El Escorial to be the “intellectual and cultural center of Spain” (Dopico Black 103). It is likely that this large collection influenced Cervantes’s perception of libraries: even if he did not personally visit the library, it was being constructed during
his lifetime and prior to the publication of *Don Quijote*, as planning for the library began in 1564 (Williams 690). Additionally, Botello López-Canti’s research describes Philip II’s reliance upon written communication; he concludes that in “el contexto sociocultural y político de Cervantes, la escritura, sus alcances y sus limitaciones, está indisolublemente asociada a la figura de Felipe II” (117). Given the magnitude of Philip II’s influence on Cervantes’s society, it is reasonable to examine the collection at El Escorial as both a contrast to the small, private libraries in the novel, but also to view it as an example of another model of personal curation or collection that may have inspired Cervantes’s work and his characters. El Escorial represents a place for archiving the written communication for which Philip II was famous, just as *Don Quijote* is a symbol that emphasizes the need to preserve and archive knowledge.

Lorenzo Niño Azcona goes a step beyond the idea that El Escorial shapes Cervantes’s thoughts on curation and preservation: he argues that the novel itself satirizes El Escorial and “los defectos administrativos que pudo observar Cervantes en su época,” including the fact that Philip II was constructing a large complex but not paying the military for their service (12-13). Niño Azcona suggests that Cervantes may have visited El Escorial. There are several reasons that he may have spent time there, including his employment with Nuncio Acquaviva and opportunities provided by his friends who held permanent positions at the monastery (13-17). He analyzes similarities he views within the novel and contemporary connections to El Escorial; for example, he argues that the name “Aldonza Lorenzo” is a clear link between *Don Quijote* and the monastery at San Lorenzo (Niño Azcona 21). Niño Azcona’s arguments are conjecture: he produces many similarities between names of people associated with El Escorial and the novel, but he does not produce any specific
evidence of Cervantes’s connection with the library or any part of El Escorial. Nevertheless, the author’s meticulous analysis makes a strong argument for examining Philip II’s construction in the context of Cervantes’s perspective as he writes his novel, and the library at El Escorial must have been a primary focus for an author who was writing a novel that discusses the effects of the very items being collected in Philip II’s library.

El Escorial’s library, originally planned as part of the convent, was constructed to be in a central part of the building near the Basilica, partially due to architectural changes but also to reflect “la progresiva importancia que adquirió la Biblioteca laurentina en los programas escurialenses. Felipe II quiso realizar una biblioteca real que excediera en importancia a la de los papas de Roma, para lo que debía superar la idea tradicional de una biblioteca conventual” (Checa Cremades 262). This intent shows the shift in Golden Age libraries which move beyond the traditional university and monastery models. Philip II’s advisors suggested that he collect manuscripts and works “caracterizados por su singularidad” (Checa Cremades 368). Like many collectors, including Alonso Quijano, Philip II is curating a specific collection: he is selecting items that are valuable because of their worth and uniqueness, and the royal library demonstrates a commitment to preserving these valuable items in their decision to acquire them.

El Escorial’s library also included scientific instruments and secular art, which Checa Cremades argues provides a distinct contrast to the typical image of El Escorial as a monument to the Counterreformation (248). As a collector, Philip II assimilated not only manuscripts and books that might be approved by the priest and the barber during their evaluation of Alonso Quijano’s library, but also a wide variety of cultural
and scientific objects from around the world. Checa Cremades argues that El Escorial’s initial purpose was a burial site for Philip II’s ancestors, but it also became a reflection of political aspirations and a place of refuge for the king (201-202). With the extensive collections in the library and other parts of the structure, El Escorial “se convirtió … en un lugar abundantísimo en estos objetos preciosos y de gran lujo” (Checa Cremades 286). Just as Don Quijote demonstrates the connection between characters’ libraries and their social status, the large collection of unique materials in El Escorial is an apt reflection of a monarch and his wide-ranging aspirations. As an example of a large-scale preservation and collection effort with which Cervantes would have been familiar, El Escorial provides historical concordance to the themes surrounding collections and the use of printed materials throughout the novel.

Checa Cremades describes the origins of the collections at El Escorial’s library. He notes that many were personal copies donated by of Philip II, and major intellectual figures of the time also deposited their books in El Escorial (378). The collections and arrangement of the library demonstrate a multitude of purposes: materials were housed in one of three rooms based on their classification. The first room contained materials related to law, medicine, and philosophy; the second room collected materials related to nature, including scientific instruments; and the third was an archive of major documents of the state (Checa Cremades 376-377). The three rooms suggest the development of a modern library: the classification of materials, which are housed in specific rooms, would be a significant change for some Spaniards who were housing their books in drawers as Bouza describes, or in suitcases as Juan Palomeque does. The wide-ranging topics found in El Escorial’s library sharply and obviously contrast with Don Quijote’s library: while Alonso Quijano’s emphasis on
collecting only fiction demonstrates his imbalanced character, Philip II curates a more balanced collection, including literature, science, and medicine, perhaps reflecting the strength of Spain during the Golden Age. The difference in their collections is not just reflective of a difference in resources: the library of El Escorial demonstrates the balance and breadth of subjects that Alonso Quijano fails to achieve by investing all of his funds in works of fiction.

Another highlight of the library at El Escorial is its collection of Arabic manuscripts, a practice that has been questioned by scholars in the context of the sociopolitical climate of seventeenth-century Spain. While people of Arabic descent were being expelled from Spain, the library at El Escorial was collecting Arabic manuscripts and preserving them: Dopico Black views this collection as a paradox (“morisco bodies out of Spain, Arab manuscripts in”), but observes that the tension is resolved “if we imagine the Escorial library as a machine of incorporation that swallows whole the cultural output of a group expelled as waste from the national body” (106). Though the manuscripts were shelved on the highest shelves and Philip II received permission from the Pope to collect them during the Inquisition, their existence as part of a collection that is to form the intellectual center of Spain is notable.

Libraries today strive to provide both preservation and access services for materials, and Chevalier’s research demonstrates that lending print materials from private libraries was already taking place in Cervantes’s time. In addition to preserving intellectual output, El Escorial’s library also provided a new level of access by being open to the public. However, the Arabic manuscripts, hidden from view, were not part of the collection that visitors could read (Williams 690). They were simply preserved
in the royal library as part of Spain’s cultural heritage. It is, of course, also possible that the manuscripts were preserved with less-noble motives as a measure of studying Spain’s enemy: if moriscos are seen as a threat, then scholars or government officials might wish to read the group’s cultural output in order to make informed decisions about policy and strategy.

In the prologue to Aurora Cano Ledesma’s index of El Escorial’s Arabic manuscripts, Teodoro Alonso Turienzo confirms that “[e]n El Escorial, en tiempo de Felipe II, se puso un Archivo de la Inquisición, librando de su destrucción un gran número de obras prohibidas, por lo que la Biblioteca Escurialense quizá sea la única española depositaria de alguna de estas obras” (8). While this description of works being preserved from destruction may not specifically mention Arabic manuscripts, it confirms the ideals of both building and archiving a collection that reflected the power of Spain. Therefore, the manuscripts’ inclusion in the library and the fact that many of them have been well-preserved and still exist today⁹ suggest that there may have been a longer-term vision of capturing this significant piece of Spain’s cultural history.

A veteran of the Battle of Lepanto, Cervantes may have been quite familiar with the existence of Arabic manuscripts that were in the library’s collection: approximately 20 Arabic, Persian, and Turkish manuscripts were seized from a boat

---

⁹ El Escorial’s website estimates that 2,000 Arabic codices remain preserved in the collection. The number of manuscripts initially housed there was much higher: several accidental fires, including a major incident in 1671, resulted in substantial losses of manuscripts, books, art, and other items. Accounts of the 1671 fire estimate that 6,000 unique manuscripts in a variety of languages were destroyed, but a disproportionate 2,500 Arabic manuscripts survived: because many of them were shelved in a different location, the fire did not destroy the Arabic collection with the same magnitude that other collections were affected (Cano Ledesma 23-5).
during the battle in 1571 and subsequently deposited in the library at El Escorial (Cano Ledesma 14). This connection may have encouraged or maintained the author’s interest in these unique materials. Mark Williams states that in a subsequent confrontation, 4,000 Arabic manuscripts were seized from Moroccan ships and eventually deposited in the library at El Escorial in 1614 (690). Dopico Black notes that the manuscripts “destined for the library of the Sultan of Morocco, were seized by Pedro de Lara, captain of the Spanish galleys in the Mediterranean, from two of the sultan’s ships traveling along the Barbary Coast” (106). Cano Ledesma adds that the works were originally taken and held in order to negotiate with the Sultan and to encourage him to release captive Christians (22).

Cervantes portrays a similar episode in the second part of the Quijote, written after these manuscripts had been acquired by the collection at El Escorial: a Spanish ship overtakes a Moorish boat. Don Quijote and Sancho are visiting the galleys when the general receives word of an Algerian boat nearby. The Spaniards do not seize manuscripts or books from it; instead, the episode ends with Ana Félix, the “morisca cristiana” who has been on the Barbary Coast, being reunited with her father, Ricote, and the captain sparing the lives of the soldiers who killed his men (Cervantes 1155-6). Cervantes’s episode is not identical to the origin story of the Arabic manuscripts in El Escorial’s library, but the similarities are striking: Spanish soldiers engage in a conflict with Moorish boats and do not completely destroy everything, or everyone, they encounter. Cervantes uses the example of Ana Félix to confirm that things are not always what they appear to be, as the young Moorish boy is revealed to be a Christian woman. Similarly, manuscripts that may appear to have little cultural value to a library
like El Escorial are seized and preserved there after an encounter much like the one Cervantes describes.

The fictional original author of the Don Quijote manuscript also is Moorish: in translating an Arabic work into Spanish and publishing it, even despite the frequent assertion that Cide Hamete Benengeli cannot be trusted because of his ethnicity, the narrator of the Quijote gives legitimacy to the stories captured by those groups of people being expelled from Spain. In the novel, Cervantes provides a strong argument for the preservation of every culture’s intellectual output, much like El Escorial’s library intends to do for Golden Age Spain.

In making the content of Cide Hamete Benengeli’s fictional Arabic manuscripts open to all through translation and publication, Cervantes demonstrates the importance of access to information to all readers and listeners. This theme could be a subtle criticism of Philip II: while the library at El Escorial provides strong examples of a dedication to preservation of cultural heritage and intellectual output, García Ejarque notes that Cervantes’s contemporaries were very critical of the relative inaccessibility of the collection due to its location outside of an urban center (4). Though it is possible that Cervantes visited the monastery and perhaps used the library at El Escorial, he may still have been satirizing the structure because of its inability to serve a common good. Susan Byrne also emphasizes the difficulty citizens may have experienced in trying to interact with the materials archived and collected by Philip II, arguing that the “out-of-reach archives” that continue Don Quijote’s story in Part I “can be read as an echo of Simancas, created by Phillip II as an archival repository for historians, but inaccessible to most” (111-12). The concept of the Quijote as a satire of Philip II’s government helps to contextualize the idea of preservation that Cervantes
seems to be promoting. He likely has noted the extensive attempt at preserving Spanish intellectual output present in the creation of El Escorial, but perhaps promotes the idea that the items being archived cannot accomplish much if they are locked away and shielded from public access.

Dopico Black points out that library collections provide individuals with a context for understanding the past and the present (115-116). In addition to illustrating a private library in Golden Age Spain, Don Quijote’s library is a reflection of the character, both in what he chooses to collect and in how he continues to preserve censored or condemned knowledge. The censorship of Don Quijote’s library is a clear commentary on the intellectual repression taking place during Cervantes’s time, though at the same time, the collections in El Escorial provide paradoxical evidence of the Spanish government’s attempt to collect, preserve, and provide access to information on a national level. Other private collections in the novel, such as those belonging to Don Diego and Juan Palomeque, also serve as a reflection of their owners, both as characterizations and representations of the divide between oral, manuscript, and print culture in the novel. Examples of knowledge-sharing in Golden Age Spain exist both in large-scale projects like El Escorial and in informal lending arrangements like the innkeeper’s, and the curation and lending of the written word may lead to questions about intellectual property and ownership of the items that are being loaned and read.
Chapter 3

AUTHORSHIP, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, AND VERACITY IN PRINT TEXTS

*Don Quijote* raises questions about authorship, creation, and freedom of expression. Cervantes explores these themes within the context of a world in which the print book has changed the way communities receive information and entertainment. The printing press disseminates information at a faster pace and to a wider audience than the manuscript did, and in a format that is fixed in a way that oral communication is not. Cervantes’s invention of a fictional Moorish author and translator provides rich metafictional commentary on literary production. The presence of Cide Hamete Benengeli also offers insight into issues of economics and of veracity in the new era of the printed book. As a standard practice in book production, there are multiple people involved in the process of ensuring that an individual’s words are accurately represented on the printed page. There is even more difficulty with fidelity if a translator must be employed to make a manuscript’s words accessible to the audience of a print book. The number of people associated with the creation of a mass-produced document may cause doubts about the difference between the author’s manuscript and the printed version that the reader has received.

The second part of the *Quijote*, which references Avellaneda’s spurious continuation of the novel, introduces a message of caution to Cervantes’s audience about the nature of the printed book. Another author has tried to capitalize on *Don Quijote* for personal gain, perhaps either economic (to attempt to sell copies of the
work) or professional (to criticize Cervantes’s work and damage his reputation). Jaksić analyzes Don Quijote’s interaction with the printing press in Barcelona and notes that the protagonist sees that “just about anything can be published when the happy combination of printer, author, money and market occur” (93). Don Quijote’s disillusionment in the second part of the novel comes partially from the revelation that his carefully-curated collection of knowledge and expertise may not hold as much meaning, or truth, as he had once believed. When Don Quijote wakes up at the end of the novel to declare that he is Alonso Quijano again, he adds that he now rejects chivalric novels, saying he recognizes “sus embelecos” (Cervantes 1217). This characterization implies that Don Quijote sees his investment (both financial and intellectual) in these works of fiction as a result of a con rather than as a valuable, rewarding vocation.

Don Quijote’s visit to the printing press is brief, but it allows Cervantes to ask serious questions about authorship and veracity. Chartier argues that Don Quijote’s warning to the translator “recalls the contemporary condemnations of printing and book-selling, trades which were considered to corrupt at one and the same time the integrity of texts, which were distorted by ignorant mechanicals, the literary code of ethics, by introducing cupidity and piracy into the commerce of letters” (“Don McKenzie” 26). The protagonist learns that authors may be producing books for less noble reasons than he imagined when he set off on his quest to emulate the characters in the books he had feverishly read. Chartier’s use of the term “literary code of ethics” is poignant: Don Quijote follows a clear and rigid code of ethics during his time as knight-errant, and the unethical authors who come to the protagonist’s attention may well fall under the category of people from whom others need to be saved. By
contrasting the legitimate and illegitimate continuations of *Amadís de Gaula* during the destruction of Don Quijote’s library, Cervantes sets the tone early in the novel for cautioning readers that some authors are writing not to create an excellent work of art but rather to achieve fame or some other less admirable outcome.

In addition to the episode at the printing press, Cervantes uses Basilio’s cousin to present an image of an author whose low-quality works are disseminated because of the rise in print culture. The cousin is characterized as a humanist, a profession with negative connotations in that era, according to Francisco Rico’s footnote (Cervantes 811, n. 25); his publications do not constitute strong contributions to the literary world. The cousin insists that his books are “de gran provecho y no menos entretenimiento para la república” and describes his publications, which include a catalog of 703 outfits and an attempt to provide the details, forgotten by a historian, of the person who had the first cold in the world (Cervantes 811-813). Sancho is fascinated by the cousin’s apparent encyclopedic knowledge but Don Quijote’s commentary summarizes what Cervantes is likely feeling about the explosion of poor-quality books. The humanist characterizes examples of publications that do not constitute original, creative, or useful books (such as the catalog of clothing) or that contain works of fiction masquerading as fact (for example, person who suffered the first cold). Don Quijote tells Sancho that “hay algunos que se cansan en saber y averiguar cosas que después de sabidas y averiguadas no importan un ardite al entendimiento ni a la memoria” (Cervantes 814). Cervantes shows that nearly anyone can be an author in Golden Age Spain: the printing press has allowed for mass production of works that may be fascinating to some (as Sancho demonstrates) but that intellectuals may recognize as poor-quality contributions to society.
James A. Parr also discusses the representation of authorship in the novel. His conclusions about the significance of books with multiple producers and readers echo Bakhtin’s theory of carnival. He talks about the role of critic and author, noting that authors capture what has already been written, while the reader is responsible for discerning significance: “authors are automata; critics are creative. \textit{El mundo al revés}” (Parr 182). This phrase evokes the idea that the printing press and books have contributed to the carnivalesque atmosphere in Golden Age Spain: libraries and manuscripts are no longer concentrated in the hands of an intellectual elite, but rather available to a wide number of individuals who may either read or hear the stories within them.

Although El Escorial was criticized for being a public library that was not accessible to large numbers of people, Chevalier has demonstrated that there was an active, informal lending network from aristocratic libraries that allowed many social classes access to printed materials. Access to materials was growing in Cervantes’s time through personal libraries and other networks. Bakhtin notes that due to the “suspension of all hierarchical precedence … all were considered equal during carnival” (10). The idea of carnival, or “el mundo al revés,” is present in episodes throughout \textit{Don Quijote}, and perhaps Cervantes is using carnivalesque episodes to emphasize this greater theme of the disruption caused by advances in printing and literacy. Anyone can be an author, and while not everyone can own printed books, many individuals have access to them and can develop their own interpretation of what the contents represent.

The existence and characteristics of Don Quijote’s library also suggest a carnivalesque atmosphere, or the idea of the world turned upside down. In addition to
noting that the size of Don Quijote’s library is disproportionate to his income and social status, Baker also analyzes the location of the library in Don Quijote’s house. He observes that the library is “el espacio donde se produce una ruptura de su hasta entonces tranquila vida doméstica” (91). Baker describes Alonso Quijano’s repetitive and uneventful life prior to his quixotic transformation, noting that the novels he read served as the basis for fantasies about a more exciting existence. Just as carnival allows for individuals to move outside their normal social classes for a short period of time, the concept applies to the arrival of printed books in Alonso Quijano’s life. The books have disrupted his domestic space and provided the materials he needed to imagine, and then attempt to fulfill, a fantasy of a more exciting and productive life. The print materials that have created a carnivalesque atmosphere in Don Quijote’s domestic space have also disrupted the way that he is consuming his reading materials: the world has also turned upside down in the sense that the reader becomes an author.

Cervantes provides a clear image of Alonso Quijano’s life prior to the emergence of Don Quijote. The novel’s beginning, “[E]n un lugar de la Mancha, de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme, no ha mucho tiempo vivía un hidalgo…” evokes an immediate reaction in the reader, who understands both the novel’s jocular tone and the idea that the protagonist did not begin as a memorable individual (Cervantes 35). Those details that the narrator does share depict a monotonous, meager life: the protagonist consumes “una olla de algo más vaca que carnero, salpicón las más noches, duelos y quebrantos los sábados, lantejas los viernes” (Cervantes 35-36). Cervantes’s details of Alonso Quijano’s uneventful and rote existence prepare the reader for the significant changes that occur when he becomes the author of his own fictional adventures.
The narrator’s tone shifts in the second paragraph, moving from the vague details of the protagonist’s life to his hobby or vocation: reading chivalric fiction, which Alonso Quijano does “con tanta afición y gusto” (Cervantes 37). These adjectives illustrate that the protagonist’s reading has instilled a passion in him that was not present in his unadventurous former life. This shift in characterization sets the stage for action: the protagonist shifts from being Alonso Quijano, a boring man about whom details need not be recounted, to Don Quijote, a character who reaches a level of fame that an unremarkable hidalgo would not have achieved. The change in tone signifies a move from passive to active behavior, which includes the protagonist’s participation in creating his own storyline. Alonso Quijano, the reader, claims a role in authorship of the novel because he has read and interpreted chivalric fiction in a way that is both unique to his experience and that will govern his future actions.

Carlos Fuentes discusses Don Quijote as one of the first modern novels and observes the layers of reading that exist within the work. Don Quijote is “the master of the previous readings that withered his brain,” but at another level, “becomes the master of the words contained in a verbal universe of the book titled Don Quijote” (Fuentes 56). The protagonist has gone from being a passive reader to being an active participant in the books he has read; later, in the context of Cervantes’s publication, “Don Quixote, the reader, is read” (Fuentes 58). Fuentes’s analysis reflects the effects of a technology that may be obtained, and therefore interpreted, by many readers. He posits that Cervantes’s final questions are: “Who writes books and who reads them? Who is the author of Don Quijote?” (Fuentes 69). Fuentes observes that reading in the era of the modern novel assumes a cyclical pattern because writers and readers are constantly revisiting and interpreting the words on a page. The Quijote, for Fuentes, is
“written by everybody, read by everybody” (69). Eisenstein confirms the effects of mass-distributed print works on the reader: she says that in an environment in which an individual is reading in solitude, rather than hearing from a storyteller in a group, “new imaginative and sympathetic faculties were brought into play” (150). Again, in a society experiencing a notable shift from oral to print culture, a major change occurs for readers who are no longer hearing stories in a communal setting or with the assistance of the interpretation of the person who is reading from a manuscript. In print culture, the author’s words are subject to personal interpretation in a way that manuscript reading and storytelling did not engender.

Just as Don Quijote portrays an individual adapting to changes in technology, communication, and society, it also demonstrates these changes in authorship and meaning. Bouza notes that during the Enlightenment, there was a “presupposition of the triumphant, individual authorial genius … [an author was a] sort of heroic creator who put forth his ideas to an audience that received them submissively” (Communication 48). Bouza’s selection of the word “hero” is significant in the context of the Quijote, as the knight himself has read novels featuring heroic protagonists and he uses their adventures to structure his own. Bouza is talking about the author as hero, but Don Quijote himself has become an author in his attempts at heroism and his execution of the norms of chivalric fiction as he narrates his own story.

Bouza confirms that the habits of individuals in the print era bring on a “much more dynamic role for readers, who in one way or another participated actively in the process of reading, becoming not simply judges but almost co-authors of what they read” (Communication 50). Baker presents a similar argument, noting that “la autonomía de don Quijote como lector tenía un cierto paralelismo con la de este
personaje como autor,” referencing the author as narrator in the first part’s prologue (Baker 63). Alonso Quijano has become a sort of autonomous co-author by attempting to re-enact works of fiction that he has assimilated into his body of knowledge.

As Don Quijote, the protagonist describes the ways in which his famous acts will be preserved. Shortly after Alonso Quijano’s transformation into Don Quijote, he praises his adventures and the time in which they take place: “Dichosa edad y siglo dichoso aquel adonde saldrán a luz las famosas hazañas mías, dignas de entallarse en brones, esculpirse en mármoles y pintarse en tablas, para memoria en lo futuro” (Cervantes 47). This declaration is significant in that it invokes classical heroes depicted in art and also confirms the permanence of what Don Quijote hopes to do: he intends for his heroic acts to be remembered by future generations. Other heroes have been permanently memorialized in fixed media, including precious materials like bronze and marble; others have been painted so that they might be admired for one of their acts. Don Quijote is not only the hero of the tale that Alonso Quijano co-authors, but he is also a co-author of each of the novels that he has previously enjoyed, since he has assumed responsibility for acting according to their plots and publicly defending the honor of their characters. The protagonist needs to ensure that examples of his heroism are captured and preserved for posterity, not only as an individual knight but as an author contributing to the genre he admires. This reference to capturing his heroic efforts for future generations also echoes the references throughout the novel to the importance of preservation.

The individual’s ability to interpret words independently is one consequence of the rise of print culture, but Cervantes also raises the question of whether these fixed, printed materials themselves can be trusted. Despite acknowledging the psychological
changes in interpretation that must occur in shifts between oral, manuscript, and print culture, Ong seems to dispute the idea that the reader is a co-author of books that he reads, arguing that print “represents the words of an author in definitive or ‘final’ form,” and that dialogue is more common with manuscripts in the form of their “glosses and or marginal comments” (130). Cervantes suggests that despite notations or dialogue, even manuscripts might not yield the interpretation that an author intended, nor can they be assumed to be trustworthy. The narrator notes that he instructed the translator of Don Quijote’s story to provide him with a complete translation of the notebooks into Castilian, but warns the reader that if someone has “alguna objeción cerca de su verdad, no podrá ser otra sino haber sido su autor arábigo, siendo muy propio de los de aquella nación ser mentirosos” (Cervantes 110). Cervantes, of course, is ironically commenting on the negative perception of Arabic culture in seventeenth-century Spain, but also reminding readers that lies can easily be printed in a way that suggests they are actually facts.

As mentioned previously, Cide Hamete Benengeli himself makes notes in the margin of his manuscript to question the verisimilitude of the Cave of Montesinos episode. There are “notes” in the text that suggest that he is recounting stories, even though he cannot believe himself that they are true, such as Sancho’s conversation with Teresa early in the second part of the novel (Cervantes 663). Cervantes plays with the idea of authorship in introducing the idea of multiple individuals responsible

10 Just as the transition from manuscript/oral to print culture inspires dramatic changes in readership and interpretation, it also represents a shift in the idea of who is an author, what constitutes authorship, and how readers respond to their consumption of text. For an overview of theories of authorship in the centuries leading up to Cervantes’s work, see A. J. Minnis, Medieval Theory of Authorship.
for the print book that the reader is holding. He also notes that a history is only as
good as the word of the person recording it, and even then there may be changes in
meaning stemming from the actions of either the printers or the readers. The second
part of the novel and the frequent references to the apocryphal sequel demonstrate that
any print book could be written under an untrustworthy pseudonym and that a reader,
such as Alonso Quijano, might not be seasoned enough to recognize fiction from non-
fiction.

The consequences of the multiple producers involved with print materials also
lead to questions about veracity. When Sansón Carrasco tells Don Quijote and Sancho
about the discrepancies in the story about Sancho’s donkey, Sancho replies that he
doesn’t know how to respond to Sansón’s question and that perhaps “el historiador se
engañó, o ya sería descuido del impresor” (Cervantes 657). Sancho suggests that the
historian who has written their story was mistaken. This comment exemplifies
Cervantes’s questions about whether everything one reads in print may be believed,
even if it is presented as fact. The other option, that the printer made a mistake,
highlights the idea that the words on a printed page may not necessarily reflect the
intentions of the author: since multiple individuals were responsible for ensuring that
the author’s original manuscript was set and reflected on the page that was produced
for binding, mistakes were a typical part of the production process. Errors in the
print shop had the potential to completely change the meaning of what the author had
hoped to communicate to the reader.

11 Bouza and Chartier, among other scholars, discuss the production of early printed
books and note that multiple people were responsible for typesetting, binding, and
other important jobs.
Cervantes’s commentary on truthfulness and authorship does reflect the concerns of his contemporaries, according to Fernando Bouza, who confirms a notable shift from writing manuscripts to printing books. He states that “la escritura impresa, fruto de la estampación mecánica de tipos idénticos, borra de sí misma cualquier recuerdo de autoría personal … es absolutamente imposible determinar quién fue el autor del texto dado a la imprenta” (Escribano 36-37). With regard to truth in print books, Bouza notes that “la conciencia de la mayor privacidad y cercanía que tenía el manuscrito frente al impreso tuvo un inesperado efecto en la mentalidad colectiva: la suposición que los manuscritos debían estar naturalmente más cerca de la verdad” (Escribano 43). The introduction of another fictional, but false, publication about Don Quijote himself strengthens Cervantes’s argument, demonstrating that no one can really be trusted when authors can both be anonymous and widely distributed.

Cervantes uses the second part of *Don Quijote* to condemn Avellaneda’s spurious publication. The imagery surrounding the apocryphal continuation is laden with images of demons and disapproval, beginning immediately with the prologue. In his references to Avellaneda, Cervantes asserts: “bien sé lo que son las tentaciones del demonio, y que una de las mayores es ponerle a un hombre en el entendimiento que puede componer e imprimir un libro con que gane tanta fama como dineros y tantos dineros cuanta fama” (Cervantes 618-619). This statement encapsulates the change in tone between the first and second parts’ prologues. The first prologue presents a narrator that jokes with his reader, while the second demonstrates that Cervantes has written a continuation in part to answer to his contemporaries who, like Basilio’s cousin, write seeking fame over quality. Bouza also analyzes the images of the demons and concludes that perhaps “la parte más irresistible de la tentación …
estuviera en ver su nombre impreso en capitales al frente de un libro y que, por poco dinero, podía llegar a hacerse universalmente conocido” (Escribano 70). Bouza’s evocation of temptation is telling: the printing press has provided individuals with an opportunity to gain renown even if that decision does not contribute productively to society, just as demons traditionally tempt humans to make ineffective or harmful choices.

Cervantes more closely links Avellaneda with imagery of demons when a “resurrected” Altisidora describes Hell to Don Quijote and Sancho, including the devils’ use of “libros nuevos y viejos” as balls in a game (Cervantes 1194). Altisidora continues to describe how “a uno dellos, nuevo, flamante y bien encuadernado, le dieron un papirotazo, que le sacaron las tripas y le esparcieron las hojas” (Cervantes 1195). The description of the book as “bien encuadernado” suggests money: though the book might have little intellectual value in Cervantes’s opinion, the owner has invested in binding it well. The images of destruction echo the censorship executed on Don Quijote’s library in the first part, but none of those books is eviscerated in the same way that Don Quijote’s library is thrown out the window and burned. One devil asks the other about the book, and he reveals that it is the “Segunda parte de la historia de don Quijote de la Mancha, no compuesta por Cide Hamete, su primer autor, sino por un aragonés” (Cervantes 1195). This imagery makes clear Cervantes’s feelings about another author having used his character in a book that he feels has no literary value.

The appropriation of Cervantes’s work for use in something of low quality is clearly not well-received, and Don Quijote manages to insult Avellaneda’s work by observing that the author’s words are “dignas de reprehensión” because of the
prologue, its Aragonese style, and the mistakes the author makes with Sancho’s wife’s name, which of course comes from the various names given to Teresa Panza in Cervantes’s first part (Cervantes 1112). A notable criticism of Avellaneda, however, comes from Don Juan, who asserts that “si fuera posible, se había de mandar que ninguno fuera osado a tratar de las cosas del gran don Quijote, si no fuese Cide Hamete, su primer autor” (Cervantes 1114). Don Juan’s words are strong: no one else should dare to write about Don Quijote, and if it were possible, he would advocate for a requirement that no one but the original author write about the protagonist. Though Don Juan’s comments could be interpreted as a superficial comment on style, and a suggestion that readers do not like the plots and characterizations in the apocryphal second part, they also make a strong case for regulation: it should be widely established that no one but the original author has the right to continue the story of Don Quijote.

Cervantes presents the irony of an intellectual environment in which materials are censored (for example, in the treatment of Don Quijote’s library and in the shelving of the Arabic manuscript collections of El Escorial), but in which parodies and stories of questionable origin may be published, widely read, and interpreted in ways that the author did not initially intend. Both parts of the novel introduce questions about the government’s role in regulating the printing press as an emerging technology that makes content more accessible to readers. For example, when the priest and Don Quijote debate the value of chivalric narratives, the priest identifies them as fictional tales and recommends instead the books that are “tan verdaderos como valientes,” like those of Caesar, Hannibal, or El Cid (Cervantes 563). The protagonist insists that his novels cannot be classified as harmful or untruthful because
they were printed with license from the king: “los libros que están impresos con licencia de los reyes y con aprobación de aquellos a quien se remitieron, y que con gusto general son leídos y celebrados” (Cervantes 568). The author reminds readers that there is some government intervention in the publication of printed materials, though those efforts are not focused on delineating fact from fiction for unseasoned readers.

Don Quijote goes on to describe the groups of readers who have enjoyed the books because of their wide distribution, and he insists that they wouldn’t be read and celebrated by so many diverse individuals if they were full of lies, asking “¿habían de ser mentira, y más llevando tanta apariencia de verdad, pues nos cuentan el padre, la madre, la patria, los parientes, la edad, el lugar y las hazañas, punto por punto y día por día, que el tal caballero hizo, o caballeros hicieron?” (Cervantes 568). The second part of the novel continues to portray Don Quijote clinging to the idea that chivalric novels must be true stories. Don Diego de Miranda asks “¿hay quien dude … que no son falsas las tales historias?” Don Quijote replies: “[y]o lo dudo,” adding that he hopes he can change Don Diego’s opinion (Cervantes 754). This attitude again relates to the changes that occur when the print book replaces more social forms of reading and storytelling, as evidenced by the two men having very different answers to the basic question of whether the novels are fiction or non-fiction. The relatively new presence of print materials causes this sort of dispute: readers may believe, understandably, that if the government has approved the printing of these materials, especially after they have undergone scrutiny in the form of censorship, they must be legitimate and truthful.
The second part of the novel causes self-doubt in Don Quijote because, as Jaksić observes, “a book on his own life and adventures is being printed, one that he knows to be highly inaccurate” (93). Cervantes uses the printed book to challenge the authority of the written word throughout the novel: although materials are being judged both in terms of the Inquisition’s guidelines for determining the “appropriateness” of printed materials and the legal rights granted to printers, there is no guarantee that a book is accurate or has been created by the author that purports to have written it. In fact, the apocryphal second part raises questions about the protection of individuals’ intellectual property in an age of mass-produced print books: Avellaneda’s novel, which appropriates Cervantes’s creation, is printed with royal license. Carmen Vega-Carney argues that Cervantes intentionally uses the episode in the printing press to criticize the lack of authors’ rights in seventeenth-century Spain, and she notes that publishers at the time “appear to have little regard to the as yet undeveloped notion of the rights of the author” (565). Don Quijote is full of literary criticism, but Cervantes also uses the novel to examine the role of the person who creates the literary works he discusses.

Jaime Moll describes the success of the first part of the novel and the numerous editions that follow, as well as the lesser commercial success of the second part of the novel. He explains the work of Francisco de Robles, Cervantes’s editor, to obtain privilege to print the first part of the novel in Portugal in February 1605, only to learn that two editions of the work had already been published in that country. Moll observes that it is unlikely that the editors of those two editions acted maliciously because they may not have known about the newly-granted privilege. However, Moll also goes on to quote Cervantes’s order to Robles to “querellar y acusar
criminalmente … la persona o personas que sin el dicho mi poder an ympreso o ymprimieren el dicho libro en qualesquier partes de estos reynos de Castilla y en el de la Corona de Portugal” (21-23). Just as Don Juan suggests that someone ought to regulate the appropriation of an author’s original creation, Cervantes wants to criminalize unauthorized print runs of his own novel.

Moll’s data about book sales and publication history are certainly significant in understanding the impact of the Quijote on its readers. More importantly, his inclusion of Cervantes’s invocation of legal punishment for those who did not have legal privilege to print his novel demonstrates a very early version of a sense of intellectual property rights. Although Cervantes presumably is thinking (at least primarily) within the context of early seventeenth-century Spain and the royal license to print, his words show a clear acknowledgement of the necessity of preventing printers, editors, and others from profiting from others’ work without permission. In both his fictional criticism of Avellaneda and in his own interactions with his editor, Cervantes seems to make an argument for authors’ rights, a concept not codified or widely embraced in his time because there was not yet a perceived need for the protection of individuals’ intellectual property or copyright in a new era of literary production.

As previously discussed, the shift from manuscript to print books coincides with shifts in readership and interpretation. This change also is reflective of changes in the concept of literary production and the rights surrounding it. In his study of the evolution of Anglo-American copyright law, Mark Rose notes that in the Middle Ages, “the owner of a manuscript was understood to possess the right to grant permission to copy it” (9). Rose’s important clarification of medieval manuscript culture supports the idea of the manuscript as a shared, common good, and it also
highlights another ramification of the print book: the origins of the concept of intellectual property. Reading habits and individuals’ ways of thinking about what they read have changed, and readers may participate in a co-authorship that they never would have experienced prior to individual, silent reading of print materials. The reader’s role is changing, but so is the author’s, and Cervantes shows a sense of ownership of his work that was uncommon in the seventeenth century.

Although not articulated in such terms, Cervantes begins his prologue to the first part of *Don Quijote* with a reminder to the reader that the ideas and words in books represent an author’s intellectual property. The prologue begins with a link between paternity and authorship, mentioning “este libro, como hijo del entendimiento” in the novel’s first sentence (Cervantes 9). Even before Avellaneda’s spurious continuation, and even if Cervantes’s idea of author’s rights was not articulated in legal terms, his prologue demonstrates that he possessed a rudimentary understanding of the concept and that it was meaningful to him. The idea of a writing piece being like a son provides no closer tie between author and work.

The narrator goes on to clarify that “aunque parezco padre, soy padrastro de don Quijote” (Cervantes 10). This characterization refers to Cervantes’s fictional role in publishing the story in Cide Hamete Benengeli’s manuscript: Cervantes ensured that the historian’s story was published, but his final, printed version comes from both the original author and the translator who could read the original Arabic. This subtlety is another example of Cervantes’s commentary on intellectual property and author’s rights, as he does not take credit for another person’s creative output in the context that Cide Hamete Benengeli is the true author who fathered the protagonist and the novel. Cervantes had a role in “raising” the child, but did not specifically contribute to
its initial creation. The familial language also accomplishes another important goal: it suggests not that Don Quijote is a fictional character, but rather a knight about whom a text has been written, as the narrator could not be responsible for the creation of a non-fictional figure. This detail is also yet another example of the novel’s exploration of fact and fiction in the minds of readers and listeners.

Vega-Carney argues that Cervantes indeed provides “evidence of a very modern position in regard to issues of authorship” (563). She also analyzes the language of father and stepfather in the prologue to the first part and observes that the familial relationship changes in the prologue to the second part, where the image of birth “creates the illusion of a permanent biological bond between parent and child” (Vega-Carney 567). Cervantes begins his second prologue disputing those readers who believe that they will find attacks against Avellaneda’s continuation of Don Quijote, the one that “se engendró en Tordesillas y nació en Tarragona” (617). By negating the details of the apocryphal second part’s “birth” with this more forceful choice of words, Cervantes cements a connection between himself and both the story and its characters.

The narrator notes that readers have surely been awaiting this second prologue so that they can “hallar en él venganzas, riñas y vituperos del autor del segundo Don Quijote” (Cervantes 617). Vega-Carney notes that in Cervantes’s time and before it, “it was not unusual for a writer other than the creator of a particular fictional character to continue the saga of a protagonist without any particular regard for the integrity of the dramatic persona created by the previous author” (564). Contemporaries of Cervantes were not forbidden by law from continuing their favorite story’s creations, or, perhaps, parodying them, a concept which even today is protected by law in the United States. Readers and authors would not have been surprised to discover
continuations of popular works. Again, Avellaneda may have written his continuation of the *Quijote* not for financial gain but to provide his own version of literary criticism through a fictional story, or to carry on the tradition of continuing stories that readers wish to read. Cervantes’s reaction confirms that he is an early proponent of the nascent concept of intellectual property rights because he is viewing continuations of popular works in a new light.

Vega-Carney confirms that the limited profits from print sales typically were earned by the publisher, not the author, and that “the desire to receive credit and recognition for one’s own creations preoccupied the writers and eventually became a legal issue” (564). Ong observes that attitudes with regard to using others’ work do indeed change when print culture becomes dominant, noting that “print created a new sense of the private ownership of words” (128). Cervantes uses his second prologue to continue his discussion of authorship, though in this case, he is providing a contrast between his creation and his feelings about the person who has continued Don Quijote’s story in his own novel. The author may not feel deprived of the profits that his rival may have earned in publishing his novel, but he does wish to make his disapproval of the appropriation of Don Quijote, and the characterizations that Avellaneda attributed to Cervantes’s creations, clear. Even if it is not yet codified that one may not reuse another’s fictional invention, Cervantes provides clues that he has begun thinking about the unnamed concept of copyright law.

Rose also writes about the idea of paternity in relation to intellectual property and authors’ rights, using Cervantes’s prologue as one example of an author who has used this metaphor for literary production. He posits that the paternity argument resonates with sixteenth- and seventeenth-century readers because of society’s intense
focus on the patriarchy and lineage (39). It seems reasonable to assume that Cervantes, especially in writing a novel that illustrates so many elements of the divide between social classes in Golden Age Spain, would have understood that this argument might be effective, given that lineage and family history governed individuals’ standing within existing class structures. Rose also characterizes the development of copyright law in the context of property: eighteenth-century advocates of intellectual property rights in England viewed the author’s rights as comparable to those that owners of real estate hold in relations to their private property (40). He studies Anglo-American copyright law, and chronicles the development of contemporary intellectual property law from the Statute of Anne, through numerous lawsuits, and to the late nineteenth-century, but the philosophical foundation seems universal to the European societies adapting to the rise of the printing press. Though not explicitly articulated as such in Don Quijote, an interpretation of the prologues of both parts demonstrates clear undertones in these major arguments posited in the development of copyright law: an author’s production is both a child and a piece of real estate over which the author has exclusive domain.

The first prologue extends its theme of authorship and intellectual property beyond the references to Cervantes as father or stepfather. The narrator, continuing the humorous tone, tells his friend that he cannot publish his book when it lacks standard elements, such as dedicatory poems or a bibliography, which other books contain. He continues: “soy poltrón y perezoso de andarme buscando autores que digan lo que yo me sé decir sin ellos” (Cervantes 13). This statement is a commentary on the nature of writing and originality: many works of literature contain themes and ideas that others have said in different ways; comically, the narrator says that he is too lazy to seek out
philosophers or other authors who might have written materials that support his own ideas for the novel.

This thread of the prologue also continues the emphasis on providing credit to authors when their work is cited or used in another person’s work. The friend presents counterarguments to the narrator’s declaration that he must include references to other scholars in his work: he asserts that the author can write his own front matter and simply attribute it to a person who may or may not have been a famous author or poet. The friend continues on to say that if “hubiere algunos pedantes y bachilleres que por detrás os muerdan y murmuren desta verdad, no se os dé dos maravedís, porque, ya que os averigüen la mentira, no os han de cortar la mano con que lo escribistes” (Cervantes 14). This exchange likely attempts to inspire readers to think about the veracity of what they read: even if what an author has written is not true, it still has been printed for all to read and discuss, and there is no real punishment for an author who falsely attributes work to another author.

Although intellectual property legislation was an emerging idea and not a reality in Cervantes’s era, Fermín de los Reyes Gómez does provide a comprehensive explanation of the laws surrounding publishing in Spain before, during, and after Cervantes’s life. He notes that the first known privileges, granted in fifteenth-century Venice, were “en realidad, monopolios de impresión para determinados territorios,” and this same concept transferred to Spain, where the first known privilege was for printing bulls at the start of the Crusades (de los Reyes Gómez 27, 65). Another required element for publication, the license, is “la autorización para imprimir, mientras que el privilegio implica exclusiva” (de los Reyes Gómez 40). The elements that granted a person the legal right to print a book did not actually protect the work of
the author, but rather were issued from the point of view of the commercial aspects of printing and the market for books.

Don Quijote’s commentary in the print shop, which invokes the idea of printing as a trade, has clear contemporary context: print culture evolved in Europe and exposed a new need for legislation governing the right to print and to sell. Ong notes that “with writing, resentment at plagiarism begins to develop” (129). It seems, however, that until authors like Cervantes\(^\text{12}\) both articulated and then championed the concept of intellectual property rights, there was no perceived need for legislation that protected authors’ rights. The intellectual community was still moving away from a culture that involved a more participatory form of literature, both in the cases of oral audiences for stories, the manuscript that allows for notes that “dialogue” with the author, or the ease with which individuals could copy and reproduce manuscripts without any concern for the moral questions that arise when the author’s word is fixed and disseminated in print.

De los Reyes Gómez characterizes legislation and regulation as necessary outgrowths of the printing press, and describes the three related categories of materials found as front matter in the publications by Cervantes and his contemporaries. He argues that these three categories of material reflect motivations for having enacted legislation on this emerging technology. The first reason is commercial: “surge la posibilidad de imprimir en exclusiva en una zona, editar una obra sin competencia o comercializar sin impuestos gravosos” (de los Reyes Gómez 23). This reason explains the presence of the privilegio and the tasa required for publishing the novel. The

\(^{12}\) Similarly, Rose describes how authors, specifically Daniel Defoe, helped to drive English legislation to protect authors’ intellectual property (30-41).
second reason he describes is ideological: works created under the supervision of the Church or the Crown required “licencias, aprobaciones, fes de errata, [and] datos de las portadas” (de los Reyes Gómez 24). The final category de los Reyes Gómez describes is aesthetic: he notes that some required materials are based upon current cultural movements, and may include poesías lauditorias, prólogos, and dedicatorias, some of which may be governed by law, as was the case with Charles III in eighteenth-century Spain (24). These requirements address the challenges that were evident to the monarchs ruling Spain during the emergence of the printing press: regulating the market for print, ensuring that content was not in opposition to the government or the Church, and following cultural norms that acknowledge patronage and other materials viewed as necessary for publication.

Many of these elements are discussed in the prologue of the first part of Don Quijote, perhaps as a contrast to the theme of authors’ rights that Cervantes seems to be articulating. Again, the elements required of authors, publishers, and booksellers existed for purposes of commercial regulation, but not in a sense of preservation of intellectual property rights: instead, the set cost and parameters for publication were to ensure that works were published without competition. If the manuscript is viewed as a common good, the print book represented the property of a bookseller for sale, though once purchased, the contents inside of it were words for anyone to study and enjoy. Perhaps the narrator’s struggle to include required or traditional front matter in his work is a suggestion that the government is not providing oversight for the right reasons: rather than recognizing the nascent concern for the protection of an author’s work, works are scrutinized for their moral appropriateness and price.
As discussed in chapter 2, censorship was another aspect of print culture that weighed on authors’ minds in Golden Age Spain. Byrne analyzes *Don Quijote* from a legal perspective, and she describes the chaotic legal culture in Golden Age Spain. Laws were not always followed, and she argues that the *Quijote* overall is Cervantes’s criticism of the laws of his time. She adds that “[c]ontemporary censorship would not have perceived the work as a threat because it was, after all, only a critique of the silly books of knight-errantry… [This premise] was a cover for an incisive legal gloss” (107). Byrne suggests that both parts of the novel are two very different, yet related, veiled critiques of the legal system in Cervantes’s time. She observes that “in 1605, Don Quixote is the resurrected memory of a past ideal, created as part of a full discussion and debate on the law, history, politics, philosophy, and religion. In 1615 he is a literary character and Cervantes will, in a stunning statement of creative autonomy, kill his protagonist to as to retain creative copyright over him” (145). Don Quijote’s physical (by way of his conflict with Sansón Carrasco) and emotional (in becoming disillusioned during the visit to the printing press) defeat in Barcelona are strong indications that the knight’s death is coming. After his fall from Rocinante, the protagonist defends Dulcinea to Sansón “como si hablara dentro de una tumba, con voz debilitada y enferma” (Cervantes 1160). The knight’s illness after defeat is a new form, different from his mental state at the outset of the novel when Cervantes first introduces him. Don Quijote’s decline begins in Barcelona at the printing press and he is finished off by Sansón Carrasco; Cervantes needs only to bring him home to La Mancha in order to finally kill him and prevent future unwanted continuations.

Byrne’s analysis of the two parts of the novel and their legal context aptly captures the differences that the reader might observe in the protagonist throughout the
course of the novel. Her analysis of the novel as a specific response to, and criticism of, contemporary law cements the idea that Cervantes is writing not only to discuss literature but also to examine the ramifications, including those related to the law, of the print book in Golden Age Spain. With regard to censorship laws prevalent in Cervantes’s time, de los Reyes Gómez describes the legislation passed by the Catholic Monarchs, including 1502’s *Pragmática*, which blurs the lines of power between civil and religious law and establishes a need for censorship of previously-published works (96-99). Penalties for the “aparición de libros … viciosos, apócrifos y reprobados” or “libros nuevamente hechos de cosas vanas y supersticiosas” included being subjected to a “quema pública en la plaza” (96). Cervantes undoubtedly experienced this sort of censorship during his lifetime and used it as inspiration for the scrutiny of Don Quijote’s library. De los Reyes Gómez discusses subsequent developments in the *Santo Oficio*’s censorship of works and notes the program’s profound effects on authorship, noting that there was a real danger of self-censoring by writers in order to avoid later problems. He observes that “la consecuencia más importante de las prohibiciones es la alteración de los mecanismos de la producción intelectual y de los hábitos académicos” (de los Reyes Gómez 142). Cervantes depicts a narrator who seems stifled by these specific mechanisms and practices.

The prologue of the first part of *Don Quijote* depicts a comical disruption of intellectual production: he laments to his friend that he wants to publish Don Quijote’s story “desnuda, sin el ornato de prólogo, ni de la innumerabilidad y catálogo de los acostumbrados sonetos, epigramas y elogios que al principio de los libros suelen ponerse” (Cervantes 10). Critics have observed that this statement is a criticism of Lope de Vega and the amount of front matter that accompanied his works, but the
struggle to write a typical part of a published book also suggests a disruption in the narrator’s ability to write as he wishes to write; in other words, the requirement of these materials acts as a form of internalized censorship on an author’s craft. Cervantes observes the need to have specific, typical components to his text, just as he will be required to supply a licencia, privilegio, and the government-established tasa, or price, in his publication. The humorous prologue and the dialogue with the narrator’s “friend” do not directly mention censorship, as mentioning the practice would undoubtedly have not been approved under censors’ scrutiny. Instead, these elements of the prologue provide clear examples of the type of intellectual disruption that de los Reyes Gómez describes, and highlights the inability of the author to publish his work exactly as he wishes to write it.

De los Reyes Gómez observes that in this era of intellectual repression, rulers preferred illiterate citizens, and provides a quote from Cervantes’s La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo as an illustration of that sentiment (de los Reyes Gómez 161). In this context, it is valuable to analyze Cervantes’s use of Sancho Panza as an illiterate governor in the second part of Don Quijote. Botello López-Canti argues that Sancho’s tenure as governor of Barataria serves as “un ejemplo de la supremacía de la oralidad sobre la escritura en el Quijote, y una crítica cervantina a la justicia del momento” (120). Although it does serve as a notable example of orality, Sancho’s government might also be a criticism of this desire to maintain an illiterate culture that

13 When asked if he can read, Humíllos replies: “No, por cierto, / ni tal se probará que en mi linaje / haya persona de tan poco asiento, / que se ponga a aprender esas quimeras / que llevan a los hombres al brasero / y a las mujeres a la casa llana. / Leer no sé, mas sé otras cosas tales, / Que llevan al leer ventajas muchas” (quoted in de los Reyes Gómez, 161).
cannot read materials that may be deemed dangerous or inappropriate, all of which require government regulation to control. Cervantes may be satirizing the monarchs who are in control of intellectual output but unable to comprehend, or are uninterested in rectifying, the ramifications of their actions on the creativity of authors.

Observers in Barataria express some surprise at Sancho’s ability to govern despite his illiteracy. The doctor tells Sancho: “estoy admirado de ver que un hombre tan sin letras como vuesa merced, que a lo que creo no tiene ninguna, diga tales y tantas cosas llenas de sentencias y de avisos, tan fuera de todo aquello que del ingenio de vuesa merced esperaban los que nos enviaron y los que aquí venimos” (Cervantes 1025). The doctor’s words illustrate the joke that backfires on the duke and duchess when Sancho’s attempt at governing does not yield the entertaining failure they had anticipated, but rather shows the intelligence and wisdom of an oral culture. The doctor continues to say that sometimes “los burladores se hallan burlados,” a comment that emphasizes the carnivalesque nature of Sancho’s role as a wise governor (Cervantes 1025). The doctor, of course, serves as the literate, educated professional contrast to Sancho’s illiterate, inexperienced new governor, but in yet another episode illustrating the carnivalesque, or “el mundo al revés,” Cervantes reveals that the latter is far wiser and more capable than the former.

Sancho’s reasonable, well-received judgments might be seen as a threat to individuals who have depended upon written legislation to guide their thinking: those who enforce laws in Golden Age Spain might be troubled by an illiterate person who manages to display a sense of justice and influence that defies written orders. Sancho’s episode as governor certainly relates to the novel’s exploration of oral and written culture, but it also provides a powerful look into the legal system that Cervantes
needed to navigate. Not only were there laws governing what may or may not be published, but there appeared to be an active interest in maintaining an illiterate population as a tool for promoting intellectual repression and censorship. Cervantes shows, of course, that an illiterate population does not necessarily equate with a group of individuals who do not have a sense of natural justice.

When Sancho is given the opportunity to rule, he does not provide the entertainment of failed decisions that the duke and duchess anticipated. The image of Sancho as a wise governor critiques the contemporary justice system, but it also emphasizes the complexity of Sancho’s environment: even if he cannot read laws as they have been published, illiteracy as a form of censorship does not work if individuals have developed their own sense of judgment from their experience. Sancho as governor briefly grapples with the novel’s questions about truth and authority: among his decrees is one that orders “que ningún ciego cantase milagro en coplas si no trujese testimonio auténtico de ser verdadero, por parecerle que los más que los ciegos cantan son fingidos, en perjuicio de los verdaderos” (Cervantes 1053).

Sancho’s decision demonstrates his character’s growth: he can discern that not everything he hears is true. It also acts as a carnivalesque form of censorship in that he has forbidden the telling of miracles because they are not true; in contrast, the items that are being censored by the Spanish Inquisition include fiction and poetry, as “cosas fingidas,” but the perspectives on truth offered by Sancho and the Inquisition are in sharp contrast (de los Reyes Gómez 168). Cervantes has masterfully used Sancho’s reign as governor of Barataria not only to comment on the oral culture depicted in the novel, but also to continue the novel’s inquiries into censorship, veracity, and
authority, which, as examined by de los Reyes Gómez, are not clarified by Spanish laws surrounding publishing in Cervantes’s time.

Maravall’s analysis of baroque culture provides a good way to synthesize the tension between government regulation and violations of what would later be identified as intellectual property. He notes that in the face of crisis, the monarchy increases its control over its subjects, both physically and psychologically (Maravall 46). De los Reyes Gómez clarifies that the Spanish government was acutely aware of the need to regulate printed material in order to maintain control over what was published and to ensure that readers were not exposed to materials that might challenge their authority or the Church’s. In contrast, Maravall also depicts baroque individuals as conscious of their surroundings in a way that differed from previous generations. As conscious beings, baroque individuals depended on visual media: the culture of the baroque “considered that even our own eyes can deceive us” (Maravall 253). This important theme exists throughout Cervantes’s questions about veracity and the written word, and also relates to this idea of government control. Readers familiar with the Inquisition, for example, could understand that they needed to read between the lines to gather meaning that an author may have been unable to state directly. Just as readers were more conscious of the world around them and their place in it, so too were authors, and individuals like Cervantes likely observed the irony of the growing democratization of information contrasted with stronger government control over intellectual output. The result, perhaps, is the author questioning his role in literary production and the ability of the individual to control and perhaps profit from the content that he produces now that it will be mass-produced.
Both parts of *Don Quijote* advise readers to question authority in an age when government control of intellectual output is widespread, yet printed materials can be distributed to, and interpreted by, a growing number of literate individuals. The novel also, particularly in the prologues, presents a very early argument for authors’ rights and the concept of intellectual property, ideas that were nascent in seventeenth-century Europe. Cervantes shows that the evolution of print culture catalyzed a shift in authors’ perception of their intellectual output, whether they are seeking fame like Basilio’s cousin, attempting to damage a reputation like Avellaneda might be doing, or recognizing that an author has an inherent right to publish his own materials and maintain ownership over them, as Cervantes himself implies with his novel.
Chapter 4
CONCLUSION

Don Quijote is a novel about literature and books, which are two distinct but related concepts. Cervantes uses the print book as a crucial literary device: the plot of Don Quijote is dependent upon the protagonist’s reaction to an insatiable urge to collect print volumes and read them. The perspective he develops inspires him to look backward by way of chivalric fiction, perhaps in an effort to make sense of the changes and pervasive feeling of crisis in the baroque society Maravall describes. In doing so, he relies upon the archived knowledge he has gathered from the novels he has read and uses them as a rigid model for his actions. Don Quijote loses the ability to discern fact from fiction, assuming that everything he reads is true and plummeting into a state of nostalgic longing for a time in which knights-errant offered protection from evil and saved individuals in distress.

Cervantes demonstrates that the print book is not only a catalyst for Don Quijote’s madness and adventures, but also a symbol of the many changes taking place in Don Quijote’s world. The protagonist observes turbulent change, and the printing press is a growing technology that contributes to the uncertainties of the era. The Edad de Oro discourse represents a longing for a simple and mythical time that provided for shared, common goods, much like the manuscripts that Cervantes presents as a contrast to print books. Reading habits change with the emergence of the printing press: the democratization of knowledge (or, at least, the potential for it) and bridging of social classes are major accomplishments of this growing technology, but
print also encourages isolation and a more personal interpretation of the materials being read.

Books are not exclusively hoarded by individuals in Cervantes’s novel: knowledge-sharing is clear at Juan Palomeque’s inn, and the mixing of social classes throughout the novel suggests the potential for lending from aristocratic private libraries. Books, even if loaned, remained private property, and were a strong reflection of the person who had collected them. Cervantes uses libraries and collections to characterize Don Quijote, Don Diego, and Juan Palomeque, and the content of these collections promotes interpretations of their mentalities and reading habits. Cervantes’s novel may be interpreted as a satirical look at contemporary government, including the expenditures going into El Escorial, and the library at Philip II’s palace is symbolic because it too is a reflection of the king’s goals and aspirations for Spain. El Escorial’s library also is notable because it is a precursor to the modern Spanish lending library, a model that collects and provides access to materials in a way that codifies the democratization of knowledge that the print book suggests. The Arabic manuscripts housed in El Escorial, which likely were familiar to Cervantes from his participation in the battle of Lepanto, served as a paradox in seventeenth-century Spain. Don Quijote portrays a conflict between Spaniards and a Moorish ship that echoes the events that led to the seizure of the manuscripts accessioned by Philip II. Both the collection and the episode provoke questions about the preservation of Spain’s cultural heritage.

The symbols of the library and of the curation of print in the novel reflect the questions surrounding not just the physical books, but the content within them. Modern law and ethics surrounding scholarship would dictate that books represent the
intellectual property of the author, but Cervantes’s contemporaries had not yet developed a sense of the moral rights of the author. Cervantes alludes to the nascent concept of authors’ rights throughout the novel, undoubtedly strengthened by his reaction to Avellaneda’s apocryphal continuation. Cervantes implies that not only can the printed book be privately-owned property, a change in itself from the manuscript as a common good, but the content itself may be considered the property of the person who created the characters and carefully designed the plot. The print book changes the participation of the reader and his engagement with the text, but Cervantes clarifies that the author of the print book is the person who has the right to characterize, promote, profit from, or even kill off his character.

*Don Quijote* emphasizes new ways of reading, collecting, sharing, accessing, and creating information, and Cervantes accomplishes this theme with examples of printed books. The literary criticism and Cervantes’s reaction to the reading public’s fascination with chivalric fiction is certainly an aspect of the book’s importance within the novel, but while *Don Quijote* is looking back to the past, Cervantes is squarely in the present examining the substantial changes that the printing press has ushered into Golden Age Spain.
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