

## Cervantes and the Sequel: Literary Continuation in Part I of *Don Quijote*

---

WILLIAM H. HINRICHS

LITERARY CONTINUATION IS A little considered and even less understood element of *Don Quijote*. This is all the more unfortunate because the sequel plays a central role in the creation of *Don Quijote* and *Don Quijote* in the creation of the sequel.<sup>1</sup> The same holds for *Don Quijote*'s elected precursors and the genres they found, namely the chivalric, pastoral, Celestinesque and picaresque novels. The present article proposes a new lens for reading the *Don Quijote* and its antecedents: a focus on the form and function of the sequel and the means and motivation of the sequelist. Indirectly, it suggests a way of tracing the history of the Early Modern Spanish novel through the prism of literary continuation.<sup>2</sup>

Such continuation imbues every page of Part I of *Don Quijote*. It is present in the front matter, where Cervantes meditates on the challenges of continuing his own stalled career two decades after *La Galatea*'s failure to yield a second part; in the early discussion of *Don Quijote*'s favorite writer, the era's great sequelist Feliciano de Silva; in the Scrutiny of Books episode, where every work considered either is a sequel or generates sequels; and in the very structure of the work, which alludes to various con-

---

1 I focus on modern prose narrative sequels whose characters and arguments are forged from specific authors' imaginations at specific points in time, and in particular on works continued while originating authors were alive and able to respond. This specificity allows allographic and autographic continuators to make and argue over claims to owning the characters they create or continue and the imaginative worlds that they come to inhabit. Authors of works based on religion, popular tradition, mythology and history cannot make such claims to originality or ownership.

2 I adapt this article from a book-length study of sequels in Early Modern Spain.

tinuation traditions through its division into *partes*.<sup>3</sup> Finally, a quest for continuation's necessary complement, closure, is a major topic of the final *parte* of the novel.

Among the continuations that Cervantes reads most productively in Part I are the rival *La Diana* sequels of Alonso Pérez and Gaspar Gil Polo, his own *La Galatea* and the genre-generating *Amadís de Gaula* and *La Celestina* sequels of Feliciano de Silva. Fernando de Rojas' *La Celestina*, initiator of the sequel in Early Modern Spanish letters, also proves crucial, particularly to the structure of the work.<sup>4</sup> Each adds to the story of the sequel; each is absorbed within Part I's pages, which collectively constitute a veritable summa of the sequel.

### 1. The Sequel and the Pastoral Novel: From Silva to Cervantes

Perdí mi bien, perdí mi Feliciano;  
muerta es la gracia, el ser, la soteleza,  
la audacia, ingenio, estilo sobrehumano.  
(Jorge de Montemayor  
"Elegía a la muerte de Feliciano de Silva")

In 1559, the prohibitions of the Valdés Index effectively end publication and sale of sequels to *La Celestina* (1499/1501), *Amadís de Gaula* (1508) and *Lazarillo de Tormes* (1554) on the Iberian Peninsula. In 1561, the death of Jorge de Montemayor has a similarly stifling effect on sequels to the pastoral *La Diana* (1559). Together these events augur the end of the era of literary continuations that Fernando de Rojas begins and that Montemayor's friend Feliciano de Silva embodies until his death in 1554.

Happily, the continuations of *La Diana* by Alonso Pérez and Gaspar Gil Polo (1563 and 1564, respectively) revive the sequel in Spain in the second half of the sixteenth century. In their pioneering efforts, Pérez and

---

3 What we now call Part I of *Don Quijote* was originally divided into four *partes*. After the publication of what we now call Part II of *Don Quijote*, editors would generally eliminate these internal divisions and reserve the term for distinguishing the 1605 *Don Quijote* from the 1615 continuation. In this article I use the English "Part" for the latter distinction and maintain the use of the Spanish "parte" for the former structural division.

4 Numerous critics have credited Rojas with the invention of modern drama and the modern novel. I would argue that he is also the inventor of the modern sequel, all of whose major forms exist inside the 1501 version of *La Celestina*, from continuation and completion of a found work to internal expansion of a closed work to self-continuation.

Gil Polo add new and notable meditations on the means and motivations of the continuator to the story of the sequel while also helping refine and define the art of the Peninsular pastoral novel that Silva first sketches and that Montemayor first masters. Among their most attentive readers is Miguel de Cervantes, who responds to them as pastoral novelists in Part I of *La Galatea* and as sequelists in Part I of *Don Quijote*.

When his best friend Feliciano de Silva dies, Jorge de Montemayor honors his memory first with a poem, the “Elegía a la muerte de Feliciano de Silva,” (1554) and then with a novel, *La Diana* (1559). The former mourns the loss of the pen of Silva the sequelist; the latter resurrects it. Montemayor revives, resuscitates and expands Silva’s work as a continuator by becoming one himself. The 1559 Index bans Montemayor’s religious poetry and forces him to seek a new direction as a writer.<sup>5</sup> In reviving Silva’s legacy, Montemayor will also revive his own career.

In *La Diana*, Montemayor takes the seeds of the pastoral prose novel planted in Silva’s *Florisel de Niquea* (1532), *Segunda Celestina* (1534) and *Amadís de Grecia* (1535) and produces its first and greatest flower in Spanish literature. Silva had served as heroic continuator of *La Celestina* and the chivalric novels of *Amadís*, and now thanks to Montemayor’s continuation of his vision, he serves retroactively as initiator of the Spanish pastoral novel as well.<sup>6</sup> Enthusiastic Iberian readers made Montemayor’s effort the third greatest bestseller of the sixteenth century—exceeded only by the sequels to the old bawd’s and hero’s tales penned by Silva—and swiftly honored it with the ultimate accolade, a continuation tradition.<sup>7</sup> Montemayor’s *La Diana* produces the last important series of sequels of the sixteenth century.

Before Montemayor can add to his promising 1559 effort—he intimates at the conclusion of the first part that there will be a second one, though not in the front matter or title—he meets a violent end in 1561. His death

---

5 The exact prohibition reads, “Obras de George de Montemayor, en lo que toca a devocion y cosas Christianas” (59).

6 Pierre Heugas notes: “[I]l a l’intuition de ce que pourra être la pastorale en prose et quand, par deux fois, dans son *Florisel de Niquea* et dans la *Seconde Celestine*, il est le précurseur de Jorge de Montemayor” (270). Subsequently, Juan Bautista Avallé-Arce reiterates the same sentiments—“iniciador de la moda” (37-38)—as does Sydney Cravens—“inició el tema pastoril” (109).

7 To be more precise, it was the third best-selling “libro de entretenimiento.” Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo writes: “Fué el mayor éxito que se hubiese visto en libros de entretenimiento, después del *Amadís* y la *Celestina*” (250).

leads to an upsurge in popularity and interest in his work among readers, most notably Alonso Pérez and Gaspar Gil Polo. The former produces the most commercially successful allographic sequel of the sixteenth century, the latter the most critically acclaimed allographic sequel in Spanish literature in the seventeenth century, particularly after Cervantes' effusive allusions to it in *Don Quijote*.<sup>8</sup>

In their respective responses, the rival continuators present two unique visions of the allographic sequelist's qualifications to succeed the autographic originator, namely, Montemayor. In arguing his case as successor to Montemayor, Pérez stresses love, loyalty and intimate knowledge of the originator's intentions; Gil Polo, in contrast, touts his superior command of prose and verse composition and an express moral mission (a warning against love's excesses). One claims to be a better reader, the other a better writer. The former implicitly follows Montemayor's model of loyal fulfillment of a fallen friend's vision. The latter explicitly follows his own desires.

In the front matter to his sequel, Pérez shares with his readers precisely why he has decided to undertake his continuation:

Si nuestros deseos (claro Lector) Dios fuera servido cumplírnoslos, en que nos otorgara merced de gozar del famoso poeta lusitano, no sólo a mí, que tampoco valgo, más aun a otro que de mayores quilates fuera, deste emprendido trabajo hubiera escusado. Empero como tan célebre varón nos falte, parecióme que ninguno mejor que yo podía en sus obras suceder. Y esto no por mi suficiencia (vaya fuera toda arrogancia) mas por la mucha afición que a su escritura, con justa causa, siempre he tenido. Y de no ser yo solo deste parecer, entiendo que pasión no me ciega. Desengáñese quien pensare ygualarle en facilidad de composición, dulçura en el verso, y equivocación en los vocablos.<sup>9</sup>

8 In measuring commercial success, I follow Keith Whinnom's methods outlined in "The Problem of the 'Best-Seller' in Spanish Golden-Age Literature," which focuses on numbers of editions printed. This method builds on Menéndez y Pelayo's *Orígenes de la novela*, which also takes into account numbers of editions. Cervantes' *Don Quijote*, like Menéndez y Pelayo's study, was capable of reviving or suppressing interest in novels. Silva and Pérez suffered for the judgments of them rendered by characters in *Don Quijote*, and Polo benefited. That none of these judgments can be taken for Cervantes' own—we are never certain who is speaking in the narrative portions and with what degree of sincerity—has often eluded his readers.

9 I cite from the 1622 Madrid edition by Alonso Martín's widow, housed at the Hispanic Society of America. All citations are from unnumbered pages of the prologue,

He loves Montemayor and his work and wants to honor its promise of continuation by finishing what Montemayor has left unfinished, that is, by writing the sequel Montemayor would have written if he had lived. Having been by Montemayor's side in life, he wants his work to be by his side in death, a wish amply confirmed in a multitude of hybrid editions that house their works under a common cover. In sum, Pérez's work is an elegy to Montemayor and to their long friendship, as Montemayor's was to Silva's.

As an aficionado of both the first part and its writer, Pérez preemptively declares his and his fellow readers' desire—"nuestros desseos"—that Montemayor had continued the work himself. If such a work had been produced he would have been excused from his labor—"de este emprendido trabajo hubiera excusado." Just as Montemayor respectfully waits until the Mirobrigian dies before taking up his legacy, and just as everyone from Silva (to both Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo and Fernando de Rojas) to Juan Martí (to Mateo Alemán) has given or will give originating authors ample time to self-continue, so Pérez only offers his services when it becomes clear that Montemayor cannot do so himself. Quick as the Salamancan doctor is, the Valencian Gil Polo still almost relieves him of the task. According to Pérez, fear of a rival sequel's being published first—"el temor que tuve de que saldría otra segunda parte primero que ésa"—spurs him to accelerate his efforts.

Pressure to publish quickly is but the first and most obvious consequence of the threat of a rival successor. Secondly, the novice writer also finds himself compelled to make a stronger case for his unique qualifications to be Montemayor's sequelist—"ninguno mejor que yo podía en sus obras suceder." Fortunately, Pérez has a trump card far more valuable than claims of "afición" for text or author: knowledge of authorial intent. According to Pérez, Montemayor had confided his intentions for the second part to his friend: "Antes que de España se fuesse Montemayor, no se desdeñó de comunicar conmigo el intento que para hazer segunda parte a su Diana tenía." In consequence, Pérez's allographic sequel will be the closest thing to an autographic sequel that readers can find.

This is not all. In their discussion, Montemayor had revealed to Pérez his plans to marry the original lovers, Diana and Sireno, after removing

---

except when otherwise noted. To my knowledge, no modern critical or electronic facsimile edition exists, and this one seems to be among the best of available early editions.

the obstacle of Diana's husband, Delio. Pérez disagreed with the idea and persuaded the Portuguese writer to change it:

Como yo le dijese, que casándola con Sireno, con quien ella tanto deseaba, si había de guardar su honestidad, como había comenzado, era en algún modo cerrar las puertas para que no poder della escribir, y que mi parecer era, que la hiciese viuda, y requestada de algunos pastores juntamente con Sireno, le agradó, y propuso hazerlo.

The sequel that Montemayor would have written had he lived, and that Pérez does eventually write, was then originally Pérez's idea. Thanks to their conversation, Pérez saves Montemayor from a disastrous happy ending: Pastoral protagonists should remain eternally frustrated in their love lives. He also makes Montemayor consistent with his own previously stated beliefs. For instance, in Montemayor's *La Diana*, the namesake's suitor Silvano declares that if a love affair can be requited, it is no true love at all: "[P]orque el amor de aquellos amantes cuyas penas cesan después de haber alcanzado lo que desean, no procede su amor de la razón, sino de un apetito bajo y deshonesto" (I, 4; 301).

In a precedent-setting quest to use continuation to restore generic orthodoxy, a few decades earlier Feliciano de Silva had saved Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo from destroying the chivalric tradition when the latter writer let his hero Amadís age, weaken and cede primacy to Esplandián in the final volume of *Amadís* and his first sequel to it, the *Sergas de Esplandián* (1510). Chivalric heroes should remain eternally strong and young according to Montalvo's own orthodoxy elaborated in the early books of *Amadís*. Silva's sequel is corrective, Pérez's preemptive. In any case, Silva's first *Amadís* sequel restores this orthodoxy as do its successors in the face of challenges from later allographic continuators.

To underscore the unity of the resulting hybrid work by Montemayor and Pérez—the first and subsequently most popular form of *La Diana* in the age included Pérez's sequel<sup>10</sup>—the Salamanca trained doctor insists that the plot summary from the first part of *La Diana* serve for his work as well: "Por ser esta obrezilla, segunda parte de la Diana, no requiere argumento, pues prosigue lo comenzado en su primera, más de lo que en breves palabras diré." It is a book in two parts rather than two books.

<sup>10</sup> Most sequels were bound with originals, particularly if they were allographic, a combination of mutual commercial benefit.

The earlier summary holds the parts together figuratively as the binding of its hybrid editions holds the works together literally. Rather than summarize his addition in his front matter, Pérez uses the space of his “Argumento deste libro” to make an argument *for* the book, namely why it should be written and why *he* should write it. He tells the story of its composition rather than the story he has composed.

After initially subordinating himself to Montemayor’s vision and limiting himself to fulfilling it, Pérez apparently finds putting down the pen more difficult than he had expected, especially when he realizes that he has generated enough material for a second book:

Assi que a quién esta leyere, no le debe pesar porque Diana enviude, y por ahora no se case, siendo de algunos beneméritos pastores en competencia requerida, pues queda agradable materia levantada para tercera parte, que saldrá presto a luz, si Dios fuere servido.

The reader who always wants another page to read becomes the writer who always wants another page to write.

Having asserted his right to succeed Montemayor with the second part, Pérez now tries to control any future continuations by declaring he will bring his own to light soon—“presto.” In short, he is ready and able to return to defend his and his friend’s shared legacy, just like Silva with his *Amadís* and *Celestina* sequels. To make the threat more imminent, he claims at the close of the work to have already written the third part. Supposedly, only the overwhelming length of the collective work prevents his publishing it in its entirety:

Quien quisiere pues ver las obsequias de Delio, la competencia de Sireno, Fausto, y Firmio, y hallarse al recibimiento de todos, y recibiere contento de saber quien es Stela, y desseare saber sus trabajos, con los de Crimene, Delicio, y Partenio, y en que pararon, con los amores de Agenestor Princia de Eolia, y Luztea, hija de Diſteo, y Dardanea, aguardeme la tercera parte desta obra, que presto se imprimirá, si Dios fuere servido. No se puso aquí, por no hazer gran volumen.

Notably, Mateo Alemán echoes these assertions four decades later in Part I of *Guzmán de Alfarache*. In its prologue, Alemán claims to have finished a larger work, of which the present 1599 volume is but the first part,

and to have divided the work in two only for publishing convenience.<sup>11</sup>

Joan Mey published the first edition of Pérez's work—bound with Montemayor's first part—in Valencia in 1563. Editions proliferate thereafter. A year later, Mey published Gaspar Gil Polo's rival continuation, *Diana enamorada*, rather than Pérez's promised third part. This choice puts Pérez's claims into doubt. The now popular Pérez would have had a much more likely audience for a third part than the novice Gil Polo for an alternative second part. Mey likely only printed it for lack of another option. On the other hand, the work does offer readers a different trajectory for Diana. What Pérez rejects—a happy ending—Gil Polo embraces. Readers of the era ultimately voted with Pérez, and made Gil Polo's effort at best a minor publishing success.<sup>12</sup>

While Alonso Pérez and Gaspar Gil Polo differ in many respects, they prove equally generous in revealing the thinking behind their decisions to continue Montemayor's work. Early on Gil Polo takes pains to explain his title and by extension his reasons for writing a continuation: "A este libro nombré *Diana enamorada*, porque, prosiguiendo la *Diana* de Montemayor, me pareció convenirle este nombre, pues él dejó a la pastora en este trance" (82). The explanation does not represent adequately the full title, which clarifies Gil Polo's expansive ambitions. The full title's two lines in fact read "*Primera parte de Diana enamorada; Cinco libros que prosiguen los siete de la Diana de Jorge Montemayor.*" Therein the ordinal "Primera" announces that this is but the first part of a longer work.<sup>13</sup> Gil Polo willfully ignores Pérez's intervening work, which he aims to displace, and deviates from the title of Montemayor's work, which he aims to subordinate as a mere pre-

---

11 He wrote in Part I's prologue:

Teniendo escrita esta poética historia para imprimirla en un solo volumen, en el discurso del cual quedaban absueltas las dudas que ahora, dividido, pueden ofrecerse, me pareció sería cosa justa quitar este inconveniente, pues con muy pocas palabras quedará muy claro. (113)

No such work saw the light until Alemán's supposed rival Juan Martí gave him material to work with in an unauthorized 1602 allographic sequel.

12 Gil Polo's work saw but five editions by the end of the century and those largely included Pérez as well. Cervantes' *Galatea* saw but one edition in Spain (Alcalá, 1585) and one in Portugal (Lisbon, 1590) in the same period. In contrast, Pérez's work had four editions in its first year and seventeen in its first century.

13 Notably, Montemayor included no such ordinal. Though he does promise a continuation at the end, he does not in title or front matter.

cursor. Gil Polo admits the Portuguese writer as antecedent, but he plans to be his own successor.

In a sonnet supposedly penned by a friend and voiced by Diana herself in conversation with a typical reader, Gil Polo confirms the title's indication of a budding rivalry with the originator and adds to it a rivalry with *La Diana's* first continuator, namely, Pérez:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>LECTOR</p> <p>—Buen libro, <i>Diana</i>.</p> <p>—¿Qué sientes de él?</p> <p>—¿Y qué es la pena?</p> <p>—¿Y el gozo?</p> <p>—¿Es Jorge o Pérez?</p> <p>—¿Qué cosa hay más alzada?</p> <p>—¿En qué tuvo primor?</p> <p>—¿Quién juzga eso?</p> <p>—¿Tanta luz da?</p> <p>—¿Cuál quedará su patria?</p> <p>—¿Y los poetas todos?</p> <p>—¿Y él, cómo se dirá?</p> | <p>DIANA</p> <p>—En todo extremo es bueno.</p> <p>—Placer de andar penada.</p> <p>—Amar cosa olvidada.</p> <p>—Ver por cuya industria peno.</p> <p>—No, que es muy terreno amarme a mí.</p> <p>—Hacerme Gaspar Gil enamorada, que lo estoy yo más de él que de Sireno.</p> <p>—En verso y prosa.</p> <p>—Ingenios delicados.</p> <p>—Alumbra todo el suelo.</p> <p>—Muy dichosa.</p> <p>—Afrentados.</p> <p>—Polo del cielo. (84-5)</p> |
|--|---|

After ignoring Pérez's prior work in his title, in this poem Gil Polo concedes that he has read his rival, but he does so only to assert his superiority on aesthetic grounds. His artistic "primor" lies with his better "verso y prosa." Through Diana he claims to surpass not just Pérez but Montemayor as well—"Jorge o Pérez." Focusing on writing quality in claiming superiority, he offers a direct rebuke and refutation of Pérez's claim that no one could equal Montemayor as prose stylist or poet: "Desengañese quien pensare ygalársele en facilidad de composición, dulçura en el verso, y equivocación en los vocablos." It is a powerful response to Pérez's "ninguno mejor que yo" assertion of exclusive right to continue Montemayor.

Notably, in this sonnet Diana is both the protagonist of the story and a reader of it. By letting her choose him as author above not only his rival authors but even her great love, Sireno, Gil Polo converts her into an ultimate authority. This notion of a character selecting the author and authen-

tic authored text to continue her story will inform the Sayavedra and Tarfe episodes of Parts II of *Guzmán de Alfarache* and *Don Quijote*, respectively. Therein, characters from prior allographic continuations by Juan Martí and Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda appear in autographic continuations by Alemán and Cervantes to undermine their own allographic authors' authority and underscore that of the originating authors.<sup>14</sup>

At work's end, Gil Polo elaborates on his plans for a second part of *Diana enamorada*:

Las cuales [fiestas] y lo que de Narciso, Turiano, Tauriso y Berardo aconteció, juntamente con la historia de Danteo y Duarda, portugueses, que aquí por algunos respectos no se escribe, y otras cosas de gusto y provecho, están tratadas en la otra parte de este libro que antes de muchos días, placiendo a Dios, será impresa. (315)

The Valencian's promise proves as empty as the Salamanca's. Neither writes again.

Twenty years after Alonso Pérez and Gil Polo publish their rival responses to *La Diana*, Miguel de Cervantes also initiates his career as a novelist in the pastoral genre. Like his precursors, he promises to make *La Galatea* (1585) but the first part—*Primera parte*—of a longer work. In its final lines, he informs his readers that he will publish a conclusion shortly—"El fin de este amoroso cuento e historia... con brevedad" (6, 629). However, he does add one condition to his promise of a second part, that readers receive the first one with open arms—"Si con apacibles voluntades esta primera viere recibida." They do not honor their end of the bargain, so he in turn does not honor his. *La Galatea's* commercial and critical failure succeeds in only one regard, keeping him from publishing for twenty years.<sup>15</sup>

## 2. Cervantes' Second Act: Part I of *Don Quijote* as Part II of Cervantes' Career When Cervantes returns to writing with 1605's *El ingenioso hidalgo don*

<sup>14</sup> More precisely, Sayavedra is the pseudonym used by Martí to write his allographic sequel. Alemán has a stand-in for his rival author declare the superiority of the autographic sequel; Cervantes has a character and reader taken from his rival author's work—Álvaro Tarfe—do so.

<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, no pastoral novelist wrote his own continuation in the era, not Montemayor, not Pérez, not Gil Polo.

*Quijote de la Mancha*, he aims to avoid his previous mistakes: Rather than wait on his readers' request for continuation in a second *parte*, he simply includes one alongside the first. In fact, he delivers not just a second *parte*, but a third and fourth as well, three sequels within a single volume. Each of the work's four *partes* alludes to and inscribes the text in a different continuation tradition: a found work as first part *a la* Fernando de Rojas' *La Celestina* (1499/1501); a coda-like continuation as second *a la* Nicolás Núñez's 1496 sequel to Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de amor* (1492); an autonomous sequel-like second sally as third *a la* Silva's *Segunda Celestina* (1534); and an ambiguous invitation to continuation at another's hands in the fourth *a la* Montemayor's *La Diana* (1559).

Given Cervantes's age—at thirty-seven he is old to start a career as a novelist, at fifty-eight he is even older to start over—and the lack of commercial or critical acclaim for *La Galatea*, he has little cause for optimism regarding reader reception:<sup>16</sup>

Porque ¿como queréis vos que no me tenga confuso el qué dirá el antiguo legislador que llaman vulgo cuando vea que, al cabo de tantos años como ha que duermo en el silencio del olvido, salgo ahora, con todos mis años a cuestras... (Prólogo 8)

A quick comeback after *La Galatea* might have changed readers' low opinion of him, but years of silence—"tantos años"—has only confirmed it and, further, suggests he shares it. A lifetime of failure weighs on his back—"todos mis años a cuestras"—forcing him to produce a greater success to free himself of their cumulative burden.

This burden—not the challenge of writing poems or inserting scholarly allusions that Cervantes claims impedes him—explains the "vacío de mi temor...el caos de mi confusión" (10) he confronts in writing his prologue:

Porque te sé decir que, aunque me costó algún trabajo componerla, ninguno tuve por mayor que hacer esta prefación que vas leyendo. Muchas veces tomé la pluma para escribille, y muchas la dejé, por no saber lo que escribiría...me tenía de suerte que ni quería hacerle, ni menos sacar a luz sin él las hazañas de tan noble caballero. (8)

<sup>16</sup> This pessimism may explain the lack of an ordinal adjective in the title of what only later was known as Part I of the *Quijote*.

Physically first, the prologue is compositionally last. It is his final chance within the novel and as a novelist for redemption after *La Galatea's* failure.

Notably, Cervantes' great rival novelist, Mateo Alemán, expresses similar sentiments in the preface to Part II of *Guzmán de Alfarache* (1604):

Aunque siempre temí sacar a luz aquesta segunda parte, después de algunos años acabada y vista, que aun muchos fueran pocos para publicarla, y que sería mejor sustentar la buena opinión que proseguir a la primera, que tan a brazos abiertos fue generalmente de buena voluntad recibida, dudé poner en condición el buen nombre, ya porque podría no parecer tan bien o no haber acertado a cumplir mi deseo, que de ordinario donde mayor cuidado se pone suelen los desgraciados acertar menos. (20)

If Alemán delays his follow-up for fear that he will not equal his first effort, Cervantes does the same out of fear that he will. The latter confronts the obstacle of prior failure, the former of prior success.

While the Sevillian's experience—he does manage to write a second part—proves crucial for prodding Cervantes past the prologue and thus *Don Quijote* out onto the presses, another author's success inspires the substance of the work's narrative and, in particular, its grand theme of continuation, Feliciano de Silva, the most successful sequelist of the sixteenth century, whether in his *Amadís* continuations or his resurrection of *La Celestina*. Silva resurrects their attendant literary genres with his sequels and defines their generic orthodoxy each and every time a rival deviates from his vision of the originating authors' intentions. No one writes a second sequel after he denounces them expressly or allegorically in his continuations.

In the opening pages of the opening chapter of Part I of *Don Quijote*, Cervantes informs readers that Alonso Quijano prefers Silva's novels above all others—“[D]e todos [los libros de caballerías], ningunos le parecían tan bien como los que compuso el famoso Feliciano de Silva” (I, 1; 28)—and that the hours of reading them produce a fundamental transformation in his judgment: “Con estas razones perdía el pobre caballero el juicio” (29). Silva serves then as engine of the action of the work, just as Sayavedra, the pseudonym of Juan Martí, allographic continuator of *Guzmán de Alfarache*, launches Alemán's Part II of *Guzmán de Alfarache* by convincing Guzmán

to leave his present job and life in Rome, and just as Álvaro Tarfe's mentioning of a plan to participate in the jousts in Zaragoza incites the action of Avellaneda's Part II of *Don Quijote* by provoking Don Quijote to follow him.

Silva's work as resurrector of genres and restorer of generic orthodoxy and honor of characters and chronicles inspires Don Quijote himself to take up the pen to right the wrongs he discovers in Jerónimo Fernández's *Belianís de Grecia* (1545). He has a sense that the work needs to be made consistent with the rules of romances of chivalry as outlined by Silva through corrective continuation and that he is the man for the job:

No estaba muy bien con las heridas que don Belianís daba y recibía, porque se imaginaba que, por grandes maestros que le hubiesen curado, no dejaría de tener el rostro y todo el cuerpo lleno de cicatrices y señales.

Finding evidence of such signs and scars lacking in the work, he decides to write a continuation to fill in the details.

While the idea of generic correction through continuation derives from Silva, the ultimate purpose is all his own, for in making *Belianís* consistent with the rules of romances of chivalry, Don Quijote also wants to change them. Though he praises the author for ending the work with the promise of unending adventure—"Alababa en su autor aquel acabar su libro con la promesa de aquella inacabable aventura"—he now wants to provide just such an end, to finish the unfinishable: "[M]uchas veces le vino deseo de tomar la pluma, y dalle fin al pie de la letra, como allí se promete."<sup>17</sup> He wants to undermine the very structural characteristic he praises. He is, in short, Cervantes himself.

Faced with such a monumental task, the Manchegan *hidalgo* vacillates, like Cervantes. The phrase "[M]uchas veces le vino deseo de tomar la pluma" echoes Cervantes' own description of his hesitancy in writing his prologue—"Muchas veces tomé la pluma para escribille..." (Prólogo 8). Unlike Cervantes, however, Don Quijote never manages to take up the pen: "[Y] sin duda alguna lo hiciera, y aun saliera con ello, si otros mayores y continuos pensamientos no se lo estorbaran" (I, 1; 29). Pulled in a dozen directions by grander thoughts—"mayores pensamientos"—Don Quijote

17 Don Quijote, like Silva, also expects authors to be as honest as narrators. If a promise is made in a chivalric novel by chivalric knight or novelist, it must be fulfilled.

cannot focus enough to write a concluding continuation, but he can live one out. He can finish in life what he cannot finish in print, enacting a continuation rather than writing it.

Rather than reducing his ambitions on realizing his failure as a writer, Don Quijote expands them. He decides to take on and conclude *all* the major chivalric tales in his own lived novel:

Sancho amigo, has de saber que yo nací por querer del cielo en esta nuestra edad de hierro para resucitar en ella la de oro, o la dorada, como suele llamarse. Yo soy aquel para quien están guardados los peligros, las grandes hazañas, los valerosos hechos. Yo soy, digo otra vez, quien ha de resucitar los de la Tabla Redonda, los Doce de Francia y los Nueve de la Fama, y el que ha de poner en olvido los Platires, los Tablantes, Olivantes y Tirantes, los Febos y Belianises, con toda la caterva de los famosos caballeros andantes del pasado tiempo, haciendo en este en que me hallo tales grandezas, extrañezas y fechos de armas, que escurezcan las más claras que ellos hicieron. (I, 20; 175)

Notably, on exchanging pen for sword, Don Quijote breaks with the continuation tradition of responding to a single work—as everyone from Nicolás Núñez to Alonso Pérez to Juan Martí had done<sup>18</sup>—and moves instead towards an omnivorous ambition. As Silva resurrects Celestina after three decades' silence and returns Amadís to his position as first amongst knights errant after several disparaging novels, so Don Quijote will bring new life and honor to these heroes.

Further, he will not merely revive their stories but be their protagonist(s): “Yo sé quien soy—respondió don Quijote—, y sé que puedo ser no sólo los que he dicho, sino todos los Doce Pares de Francia, y aun todos los nueve de la Fama...” (I, 5; 58). He will, in effect, be a proto-Du Verdier, the arguably mad French author, Gilbert Du Verdier, who in seven volumes published between 1626 and 1629 took for his task in his *Roman des romans*, the wrapping up, the closure of the loose ends, of every open novel of chivalry. His ambitions, like Cervantes', embrace an entire genre, not a single text.

Notably, after the chivalric novels of Feliciano de Silva send Don Quijote off on his very first adventure in its very first chapter, the pastoral novel of Jorge de Montemayor brings him back at its conclusion in

<sup>18</sup> Nicolás Núñez had written a 1496 continuation of Diego de San Pedro's 1492 *Cárcel de amor*.

its fifth chapter. When the badly beaten Don Quijote encounters Pedro Alonso, a laborer from his village, the knight thinks that he, Alonso and Dulcinea are characters in *La Diana's* interpolated tale of *Abencerraje y Jarifa*. This chivalric interpolation in a pastoral text neatly inverts Silva's pastoral interpolations in chivalric texts. They are the alpha and omega of Don Quijote's initiation into knighthood, and the frame of what was likely Cervantes' original plan, a brief *novella*. Once again, Montemayor finishes what Silva starts, first the creation of the Spanish pastoral novel, second the novelistic kernel of *Don Quijote*.

In the subsequent Scrutiny of Books episode, the work moves from treating Don Quijote as sequelist, and the work as sequel to Cervantes' first phase as a writer, to a consideration of sequels themselves. If Don Quijote defines himself as a *writer* of sequels—albeit an eccentric one who takes on multiple narratives, lives out what he cannot write and seeks closure rather than open ended continuation—the priest and the barber define him as a *reader*, in fact a misreader, of sequels. Before his second major sally, Cervantes opens a parenthesis in the story for a meditation on the material that inspires his and his protagonist's foray.

In this famous sixth chapter episode, the local priest and barber review Don Quijote's library governed by one primary interest, continuations. Every work they examine either is a sequel or generates sequels. Through their discussions about which works to save and which to burn, they elaborate a philosophy of continuation, which need not be taken for Cervantes'.<sup>19</sup> Notably they prefer originals and originating works to their continuations. Don Quijote's old friends first turn their attention to the knight's and Silva's favorite work, *Amadís de Gaula*. In short, they begin with the beginning, the initial text of the chivalric novel in Spanish letters. The priest declares:

Parece cosa de misterio ésta, porque, según he oído decir, este libro fue el primero de caballerías que se imprimió en España, y todos los demás han tomado principio y origen de éste; y así, me parece que, como a dogmatizador de una secta tan mala, le debemos sin excusa alguna condenar al fuego. (I, 6; 61)

---

19 That readers do so throughout the work helps explain the fate of Silva and Pérez after 1605. Reviled in Part I of *Don Quijote* at various times, both soon disappeared from Spanish presses after its publication.

Its generative power offers reason to burn it, but its superlative quality offers more persuasive reason to spare it. As the barber argues: “[E]s el mejor de todos los libros que de este género se han compuesto; y así, como a único en su arte, se debe perdonar.” Don Quijote later echoes the sense of it as original and originating: “No he dicho bien *fue uno*: fue él solo, el primero, el único, el señor de todos cuantos hubo en su tiempo en el mundo” (I, 25; 234). The book, like its protagonist, is without peer.

The offspring of Montalvo’s *Amadís*, namely the autographic *Sergas de Esplandián* and the allographic *Amadís de Grecia*, do not enjoy the clemency granted their parent text: “[Q]ue no le ha de ver al hijo la bondad del padre” (I, 6; 61). The priest feels so strongly about getting rid of *Amadís* progeny that he would burn his own father alive, but not the father text *Amadís de Gaula*, to rid the world of Silva’s *Amadís de Grecia*:

[Q]ue a trueco de quemar a la reina Pintiquinestra, y al pastor Darinel, y a sus églogas, y a las endiabladas y revueltas razones de su autor, quemaré con ellos al padre que me engendró, si anduviera en figura de caballero andante. (62)

Given the Mirobrigian’s status as the great *Amadís* continuator, and author of this particular work, and given the use of the phrase “endiabladas y revueltas razones”—a clear echo of the “razón de la sinrazón” speech (I, 1; 29) from the first chapter aimed at lampooning Silva’s style—the target of the priest and barber’s ire could not be clearer. Ironically, this very work serves as one of the seeds of *La Diana* that the priest and barber will proceed to praise.

After dispensing with continuations of *Amadís*, the priest and barber move on to Montemayor’s novel and the rest of Don Quijote’s works of the pastoral genre—“del mismo género” (I, 6; 66). The priest declares them less harmful than romances of chivalry and wishes to spare them: “Éstos no merecen ser quemados, como los demás, porque no hacen ni harán el daño que los de caballerías han hecho.” After further consideration, they refine their initial dispensation. Once again, they save the progenitor for being first, “la honra de ser primero en semejantes libros.”

They then turn from progenitor to the first pair of continuations that it generates, sparing one and skewering the other:

—Este que se sigue—dijo el barbero—es *La Diana* llamada *segunda*

del Salmantino, y éste, otro que tiene el mismo nombre, cuyo autor es Gil Polo.

—Pues la del Salmantino—respondió el cura—, acompañe y acreciente el número de los condenados al corral, y la de Gil Polo se guarde como si fuera del mismo Apolo; y pase adelante, señor compadre, y démonos prisa; que se va haciendo tarde. (67)

Here Cervantes evinces his thorough knowledge of the *Dianas*, that is, of the continuations engendered by Montemayor's text, and inserts an evaluation of Gil Polo consistent with his approbation and appropriation of the work in his own *La Galatea*. Obliquely, he defends his imitation by praising its source. To do so, the priest and barber must break with their professed preference for originals. Further, by reminding readers of *La Galatea*'s failure, in contrast to the success of the present work, he undermines the priest's argument of harmlessness by reminding readers that the pastoral had inspired a far greater disaster for him personally than reading romances of chivalry.

Right after praising and pardoning the pastoral continuation of the Valencian, the priest and barber turn to a far more obscure work—Cervantes' *La Galatea*. The immediate transition underscores the intended genealogy:

—*La Galatea*, de Miguel de Cervantes—dijo el barbero.

—Mucho años ha que es grande amigo mío ese Cervantes, y sé que es más versado en desdichas que en versos. Su libro tiene algo de buena invención: propone algo, y no concluye nada; es menester esperar la segunda parte que promete: quizá con la enmienda alcanzará del todo la misericordia que ahora se le niega; y entre tanto que esto se ve, tenedle recluso en vuestra posada, señor compadre. (68)

Cervantes quite literally finds a place on the shelf for his work beside the great pastoral novels of the sixteenth century. He also puts himself there as author. With a delightful pun—"más versado en desdichas que en versos"—Cervantes' priest lets him concede his misfortunes and his inept writing of poetic verses—*desdichas* as bad luck and as badly spoken words and *versado* as "versifying" and "adept."

After admitting his failure as a poet and insinuating a lament at the commercial failure of his first novel, Cervantes adds a second and greater

reproach, failure to conclude:<sup>20</sup> The only thing worse than a bad work is a bad unfinished work. Here, the poetics of continuation take a new tack. Having praised origination and originals, the priest and barber now turn to the question of works left opened and promises unfulfilled. Cervantes knows full well that none of the pastoral *Dianas* arrived at conclusion and *all* of them promised it in a displaced future installment. His then would exceed them, he suggests, if he were to write the second part to *La Galatea*. As with the chivalric novel, it would also transform the genre by introducing closure to it. Both find the structural parallel to unrequited love in the open ending. Cervantes may be signaling here his intentions for Part II of *Don Quijote*.<sup>21</sup> Finally, when the priest proclaims that the work could be redeemed by a second part that would give it its just end, Cervantes sketches a larger corrective function for sequels in fixing the errors of earlier works or earlier bodies of work.<sup>22</sup>

Indirectly, Cervantes insinuates that such a happy ending will not be a second part to *La Galatea* but a new beginning in *Don Quijote*. The future of *La Galatea*, he implies, will be inside *Don Quijote*, and its continuator, its primary reader, will be Don Quijote himself. This will be the better work that redeems the earlier, converting it into a rehearsal of a portion of *Don Quijote*, into a piece of the larger *mappa mundi* of the sequel that Cervantes draws. *La Galatea*—despite the fulsome promises Cervantes will later make—is not to be continued in the traditional sense.

Through the Scrutiny of Books, Cervantes alludes to and inscribes his present work in the vast continuation tradition of the chivalric and pastoral novels, and implicitly links the genres to each other through the common lens of literary continuation. Cervantes is more subtle but also

---

20 This is not a minor concession in an age when—even more than today—“poetic” and “prosaic” were proxies for “good” and “bad” or “exalted” and “dull” at least as much as they were generic categories.

21 In Part II, Don Quijote himself considers a pastoral “sequel” of sorts to fill the year he is required to spend refraining from knightly activities. Symbolically, Cervantes considers a pastoral sequel to Part II. In rejecting it, he opts instead to kill the protagonist and close the novel forever.

22 He also suggests a role for the sequel: corrector and redeemer of a prior part—the desired “enmienda”—whether allo- or autographic. It had been crucial for Silva in continuing *Amadís*, and it would be crucial for Cervantes in Part II of *Don Quijote*, in which he vigorously defends Part I’s poetics—inclusion of interpolated tales, for instance—and argumentative lapses—the notorious disappearing donkey, Sancho’s wife’s varying name and other like failures of argumentative consistency—even while tacitly accepting the criticism of these defects by avoiding their repetition.

more persuasive in inscribing himself in the tradition of continuation of *La Celestina*, that is, the other part of Silva's legacy. Among other means, he does so through his structural division of the work into *partes*. The most notable physical feature of the *partes* is their uneven length: eight chapters (1-8); six chapters (9-14); thirteen chapters (15-27); and twenty-five (28-52). The varied durations evoke the uneven size of the twenty-one *autos* in *La Celestina*.

Cervantes invokes Rojas' work not just in the length of the *partes* but in his transition from the first to the second *partes*. While Rojas declares himself the author of the second *auto* onwards, Cervantes declares himself the author of the second *parte* onwards. Within Rojas' prologue and within Cervantes' text itself both rescue an incomplete text and complete it, and both make an argumentatively illogical break between first and second structural divisions to highlight the change in authorship. Rather than hiding his dependent and subordinate role as sequelist, Rojas celebrates it by keeping the first found *auto* intact and separate.<sup>23</sup>

Cervantes creates his continuation conceit between the first and second *partes* not just to honor Rojas—whose work contains the seeds of all the major sequelistic forms including prequel (first *auto*); allographic sequel (2-16) and internal sequel (additional *autos* in the 1501 version)—but also to comment more generally on the task of the continuator. He highlights the reader's frustration with being left in suspense, which he himself knows well as an avid reader of romances of chivalry. Unlike Alemán, he never sees such suspense as a mere "inconveniente." He uses this frustration to underscore the heroic response of the passive reader who rises to the challenge of fulfilling the promise of an unfulfilled work by becoming its active continuator:

Pero está el daño de todo esto que en este punto y término deja pendiente el autor desta historia esta batalla, disculpándose que no halló más escrito de estas hazañas de don Quijote, de las que deja referidas. Bien es verdad que el segundo autor de esta obra no quiso creer que tan curiosa historia estuviese entregada a las leyes del olvido, ni que hubiesen sido tan poco curiosos los ingenios de la Mancha, que no tuviesen en sus archivos o en sus escritorios algunos papeles que de este famoso caballero tratasen; y así, con esta imaginación, no se desesperó de hal-

23 Notably, Cervantes begins with his own text and follows with a found text whereas Rojas begins with a found text and follows with his own.

lar el fin de esta apacible historia, el cual, siéndole el cielo favorable, le halló del modo que se contará en la segunda parte. (I, 8; 83)

He makes his work the result of at least two authors and subordinates himself as second author. As with Rojas, continuation and conclusion will define his effort, not initiation or origination. That said, Cervantes' inscribed allographic continuation is a literary conceit, Rojas' an historic reality.

The second *parte* of Cervantes' novel begins in the following chapter with a more detailed meta-fictional story of its discovery and translation. As Alonso Pérez would use the "Argumento deste libro" in his *Segunda Diana* to give the argument of and for his work's creation, so Cervantes would use the narrative to tell the story of the why and how of its continuation. He would make himself a continuator *within* the narrative. Speaking as a reader himself he reminds us where the first *parte* left the story:

Dejamos en la primera parte de esta historia al valeroso vizcaíno y al famoso don Quijote con las espadas altas y desnudas, en guisa de descargar dos furibundos fendientes...y que en aquel punto tan dudoso paró y quedó destroncada tan sabrosa historia, sin que nos diese noticia su autor dónde se podría hallar lo que de ella faltaba. (I, 9; 84)

Reproaching the originator, as he lets the priest reproach him for not finishing *La Galatea*, he voices the anger of the reader at being left hanging. This is not the sadness of a story coming to an end, but the dissatisfaction with a story's *not* coming to an end:

Causome esto mucha pesadumbre, porque el gusto de haber leído tan poco se volvía en disgusto de pensar el mal camino que se ofrecía para hallar lo mucho que a mi parecer faltaba de tan sabroso cuento...

Cervantes then dramatizes his own conversion into the wise man—"sabio"—who will bring closure to this "savory tale"—"sabroso cuento." In the second *parte*, he goes on a quest for conclusion and finds the answer by fortuitous accident. After chancing upon Cide Hamete Benengeli's continuation and having it translated, Cervantes congratulates himself for his heroic effort, "por el trabajo y diligencia que puse en buscar el fin desta agradable historia" (85).

The narrative of the second *parte* that follows this story of Cervantes' transformation into a continuator is rather brief, ending with the pastoral funeral for Grisóstomo. It serves as a sort of coda—like Nicolás Núñez's 1496 expansion of the sentimental novel, the *Cárcel de amor* (1492), which nearly always accompanies the original in editions of the era—and conclusion to the first *parte*, adding little new material, mainly wrapping up and fleshing out that which came before. Its most important consequence consists of foreshadowing: Implicitly, such a miracle can and will take place again for the narration of the third sally. Cervantes rehearses the creation of an external second *parte* to tell this story—Part II of *Don Quijote*—through the story of the creation of the internal second *parte*. He also presages his own supplanting and succession. But that story is for later. At this point, Cervantes has two internal *partes* left.

In the third *parte*, Cervantes offers a number of highlights of the novel, including the galley slave episode, Sancho's blanketing at the inn, the "bál-samo de Fierabrás," the night of the *batanes*, and the "baciuelmo" episode. He includes more physical humor, more narrative complexity, more new elements and, quite literally, more text than in either of the prior *partes*. It is his *tour de force* innovation-filled continuation, a resounding riposte to Part II of *Guzmán de Alfarache's* successful surpassing of Part I of *Guzmán de Alfarache* and a complement to Silva's full length innovation-filled *Segunda Celestina*, which offers African slave speech and pastoral narrative elements for the first time in Spanish prose fiction. Inside the text, Cervantes competes with and defeats himself before anyone can pose the question or raise the doubt about his capacity for successful self-continuation outside it.

Notably, this third *parte* underscores its autonomy by beginning to loop back not to episodes from the first two *partes* but to its own material. Characters, particularly Sancho Panza, make analogies to past experience in the text to understand present experience. For instance, in the Sierra Morena, the narrator declares of Sancho's thinking:

Y aunque no halló más de lo hallado, dio por bien empleados los vuelos de la manta, el vomitar del brebaje, las bendiciones de las estacas, las puñadas del arriero, la falta de las alforjas, el robo del gabán, y toda la hambre, sed y cansancio que había pasado en servicio de su buen señor, pareciéndole que estaba más que rebién pagado con la merced recibida de la entrega del hallazgo. (I, 23; 215-16)

All these scenes come from the third *parte*. While they may allude to earlier episodes—the fulling mill blades episode revisits the windmill episode in a certain sense—they also stand on their own. Cervantes begins to build his work on itself. The first two *partes* and the third itself have now become part of the Library. In Part II of *Don Quijote*, Cervantes opens with regular evocation of episodes from Part I—a crucial binding strategy—but eventually moves towards internal reference to episodes from Part II, granting autonomy to the new endeavor.

Cervantes goes on to close the third *parte* with Don Quijote still in the high mountains. The hero vacillates as to which hero to imitate there, Amadís or Roland. Figuratively, he picks up and sets down his pen without arriving at resolution. He needs a new inspiration to continue onward with his adventure. Cervantes seems to ask himself a similar question: How can he find an exit for character and chronicle? He and Don Quijote are both stuck.

If in the front matter Cervantes considers dispensing with the prologue for fear of concluding badly, in the fourth *parte* he takes an opposite tack, adding endlessly and listlessly to its story while seeking and failing to find an answer to the question of how to conclude. An unrealized quest for conclusion then becomes the theme of the fourth *parte*, where Cervantes balances the first three *partes'* exploration of the art of continuation with an attempt to find their necessary complement, the invention of the art of the ending. Drama offers Cervantes a model of violent death and happy marriage as conclusion to tragedy and comedy. Narrative prose fiction, save the generically hybrid *La Celestina*, does not, nor do any of the traditions on which he draws, from the resolutely paratactic pastoral and chivalric novels to the equally inconclusive picaresque. All are “inacabables.”

To succeed in his quest, Cervantes will have to find a different route, invent a new art. Over twenty-four chapters—the story goes on for nearly as long as the rest of the work combined—Cervantes struggles to develop this art only to end with a concession of defeat. This concluding section is the most challenging part for Cervantes to write and the least satisfying for readers to read. It is also a searing critique of the structure of romances of chivalry and the pastoral novel as well. When Cervantes' friend writes of *Don Quijote's* purpose in the front matter—“[N]o mira a más que a deshacer la autoridad y cabida en el mundo y en el vulgo que tienen los libros de caballerías...” (13)—he could well mean the paratactic structure of romances of chivalry as much as their content.

Cervantes highlights his own challenges with closure through the Canon's discourse on trying to write a chivalric novel:

Verdaderamente, señor cura, yo hallo por mi cuenta que son perjudiciales en la república estos que llaman libros de caballerías; y aunque he leído, llevado de un ocioso y falso gusto, casi el principio de todos los más que hay impresos, jamás me he podido acomodar a leer ninguno del principio al cabo... (I, 47; 489)

When he complains of never being able to read all the way to the end of a romance of chivalry, he implies that the problem lies with the works' lack of any satisfying end. A division between *partes* or *libros* can be as meaningful or meaningless as between volumes. In an essentially paratactic genre, the only definitive conclusion is running out of pages to read. Endings to open ended novels are meaningless, and in consequence, so are middles and beginnings. They are bodies without head or feet, or even a spine to hold them up. No wonder he cannot make heads or tails of them. The same can be said for the pastoral novel.

The Canon's main objection then to romances of chivalry is structural, and derives from his sense that they lack integrity, structural integrity:

No he visto ningún libro de caballerías que haga un cuerpo de fábula entero con todos sus miembros, de manera que el medio corresponda al principio, y el fin al principio y al medio, sino que los componen tantos miembros, que más parece que llevan intención a formar una quimera o un monstruo que a hacer una figura proporcionada. (491)

The Canon gives up because he cannot find a way to perfect, to finish, one of these works. If the Canon surrenders, Cervantes does not, though success will elude him until the close of Part II.

Part I does end with what appears to be definitive closure—death of the major players—extending so far as to leave Don Quijote, Dulcinea and even Rocinante dead and buried in the archives, a proleptic flash-forward like Part I of *Guzmán de Alfarache's* description of the protagonist in the galleys. That said, the closure does not fill in the intervening story. It is an end but not an ending. As the prologue takes for its topic the difficulty of closing a prologue, so the conclusion narrates only its own story's failure to close, of having insufficient material to bring the work to its proper end.

We learn that Don Quijote and his friends are dead, but not how he got there:

Pero el autor de esta historia, puesto que con curiosidad y diligencia ha buscado los hechos que don Quijote hizo en su tercera salida, no ha podido hallar noticia de ellas, a lo menos por escrituras auténticas... (I, 52; 529)

The heroic continuator who found Cide Hamete's story in the hands of a Toledan rag salesman now cannot find its end. There is no second miracle.

The "autor desta historia" does, however, offer rumors from the public memory, but without authentication:

[S]ólo la fama ha guardado, en las memorias de la Mancha, que don Quijote la tercera vez que salió de su casa fue a Zaragoza, donde se halló en unas famosas justas que en aquella ciudad se hicieron, y allí le pasaron cosas dignas de su valor y buen entendimiento.

In so doing, the author—a proxy for Cervantes—gives a rough sketch of a continuation that offers no more but also no less detail than Alemán's sketch of Part II of *Guzmán de Alfarache* made in a front matter *promise* of a second part. Aware that he is not ready to write a second part, Cervantes makes no such promises. Indirectly, he also suggests that no one else is ready either. It serves as a rare confession of incapacity on the part of a novelist upon reaching a text's physical conclusion, and a direct reproach to Alemán's overreaching promises of prior completion of Part II of *Guzmán de Alfarache* in Part I's prologue. Yet Cervantes does not take away hope for himself or his readers. Aware that a sequel can redeem an original, and may need to redeem the present work, he merely postpones the greater challenges to a future work.

In an echo of the second *parte's* continuation of the first, the author tells of a discovery of materials that could produce a Part II and give the collective work "fin y acabamiento":

Ni de su fin y acabamiento pudo alcanzar cosa alguna, ni la alcanzara ni supiera si la buena parte no le deparara un antiguo médico que tenía en su poder una caja de plomo, que, según él dijo, se había hallado en

los cimientos derribados de una antigua ermita que se renovaba; en la cual caja se había hallado unos pergaminos escritos con letras góticas, pero en versos castellanos, que contenía muchas de sus hazañas y daban noticia de la hermosura de Dulcinea de Toboso, de la figura de Rocinante, de la fidelidad de Sancho Panza y de la sepultura del mismo don Quijote, con diferentes epitafios y elogios de su vida y costumbres.

Good fortune—“la buena parte”—will provide—“deparara”—a basis for a possible sequel to him, that is for the next *parte*, “the good part.”<sup>24</sup> First, however, for the story of the third sally to be told—the external second *parte* must be translated from verse to prose—as the internal second *parte* must be translated from Arabic to Spanish. There the story is complete, not fragmentary. Here, the parchments offer but the beginning of an ending.

After the collection of verses that follow—the poor quality of which stands in for what would have happened had Cervantes written a Part II “con brevedad”—Cervantes claims that another writer filled in the blanks in the found verses through conjecture—“conjeturas.” This would constitute “imaginative expansion” in its most explicit sense. Buried at the end of the text, this paragraph sits like a hidden add-on to a movie rolling after the credits, or a lead box buried in a hermitage’s foundation, rewarding only the most dedicated of seekers:

Éstos fueron los versos que se pudieron leer; los demás, por estar carcomida la letra, se entregaron a un académico para que por conjeturas los declarase. Tiénese noticia que lo ha hecho, a costa de muchas vigiliyas y mucho trabajo, y que tiene intención de sacallos a luz, con esperanza de la tercera salida de don Quijote. (534)

The verses that the writer cannot decipher have been passed on to another, who now intends to publish the expanded result. Herein, Cervantes dramatizes the passing off of the pen inside the narrative.<sup>25</sup> He then goes on to dramatize it outside the narrative by ceding the text to another author in his closing invitation to continuation. The use of a different script

<sup>24</sup> It is a sly foreshadowing of the final invitation to sing with a better instrument. Implicitly, Cervantes will exceed himself when he succeeds his earlier self.

<sup>25</sup> Reminding readers that the material is dubious, he also undermines allographic continuation even as he asks for it.

and language highlights the desired transfer: “Forse altro canterà con miglior plectro.”<sup>26</sup>

Cervantes opens the text at its end but only so that he can better close it later, something he is not able or willing to do in 1605. An allographic sequel will offer a rehearsal of his own continuation, along with the intimate commentary of an allographic continuator on the original. It will help him hone his own sequel, give him material to borrow, give him material to avoid and give him a continuation story to inscribe. He aims, in short, to repeat the extraordinarily productive sequence of allo- and autographic sequels of Juan Martí and Mateo Alemán to Part I of *Guzmán de Alfarache* (1602 and 1604 respectively), the former of which was the best-selling allographic sequel of the time, the latter a great success as well. Finally, he wants the fame and honor that come with being continued. Like Alemán, he knows such continuation would consecrate his work. The Sevillian discovers the benefits of rivalry after publishing his Part II, which owed so much to Martí’s earlier efforts. Cervantes counts on these benefits in provoking would-be continuators such as Avellaneda and providing them with a sketch of the new work’s plot.

In Part I of *Don Quijote* Cervantes creates an autonomous novel, but one capable of becoming—retroactively—the first part of a longer one. He offers an opening, but unlike Alemán, he does not promise one. That said, he also ultimately repeats his prior mistake from *La Galatea* by putting the fate of continuation in his readers’ hands. There they fail to buy his work, so he fails to continue it. Here, they fail to offer allographic continuation for years, so he fails to offer autographic continuation until it is almost too late. His supposed rival Avellaneda’s only insult is simply that he takes too long. When Avellaneda does heed Cervantes’ call, his work, alongside Rojas’, gives Cervantes the means and motivations to add the necessary complement to Part I’s art of continuation, the art of closure.

BARD HIGH SCHOOL EARLY COLLEGE  
bhinrichs@bhsec.bard.edu

---

26 The source of the phrase, Ludovico Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* (1516) proves significant. That very work takes as its task the completion of Matteo Maria Boiardo’s unfinished *Orlando Innamorato* (1495). Here Cervantes suggests that another complete him as Ariosto had Boiardo, and does so by ceding the final word to another. He dramatizes the possibility of succession—preferably by someone of Ariosto’s caliber—even as he challenges someone to succeed him.

## Works Cited

- Alemán, Mateo. *Guzmán de Alfarache*. Part I. Ed. José María Micó. Madrid: Cátedra, 1994.  
 ———. *Guzmán de Alfarache*. Part II. Ed. José María Micó. Madrid: Cátedra, 1987.
- Avalle-Arce, Juan. *La novela pastoril española*. Madrid: Ediciones Istmo, 1974.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. Francisco Rico. Madrid: Alfaguara/Real Academia Española, 2005.  
 ———. *La Galatea*. Ed. Francisco López Estrada and María Teresa López García-Berdoy. Madrid: Cátedra, 1995.
- Cravens, Sydney. *Feliciano de Silva y los antecedentes de la novela pastoril en sus libros de caballerías*. Chapel Hill: Estudios de Hispanófila, 1976.
- Fernández de Avellaneda, Alonso. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Ed. Luis Gómez Canseco. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2005.
- Gil Polo, Gaspar. *Diana enamorada*. Ed. Francisco López Estrada. Madrid: Castalia, 1987.
- González Echevarría, Roberto. *Celestina's Brood: Continuities of the Baroque in Spanish and Latin American literatures*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.  
 ———. *Love and the Law in Cervantes*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Heugas, Pierre. *La Célestine et sa descendance directe*. Paris: Institut d'Études Ibériques et Ibéro-Américaines de l'Université de Bordeaux, 1973.
- Martí, Juan. *Segunda parte de la vida del pícaro Guzmán de Alfarache*. Ed. David Mañero Lozano. Madrid: Cátedra, 2007.
- Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino. *Orígenes de la novela* II. Ed. Enrique Sánchez Reyes. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1962.
- Montemayor, Jorge de. *La Diana*. Ed. Asunción Rall. Madrid: Cátedra, 2008.  
 ———. *Poesía completa de Jorge de Montemayor*. Ed. Juan Bautista de Avalle-Arce. Madrid: Biblioteca Castro, 1996.
- Rojas, Fernando de. *La Celestina*. 11<sup>th</sup> edition. Ed. Dorothy Severin. Madrid: Cátedra, 1998.
- Valdés, Fernando de, et al. *Arte de prohibir libros: Índice de Libros Prohibidos 1559*. Ed. Carlos Clavería. Barcelona: Edicions Delstres, 2001.
- Du Verdier, Gilbert Saulnier. *Le Roman[t] des romans, ou on verra la suite e la conclusion de Don Belianis de Grèce, du Chevalier du Soleil et des Amadis*. Paris: T. du Bray, 1626-29. 7 vols.
- Whinnom, Keith. "The Problem of the 'Best-Seller' in Spanish Golden-Age Literature." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* LVII (1980): 189-198.