

WHO READ THE ROMANCES OF CHIVALRY? ¹

By Daniel Eisenberg

THE ROMANCES OF CHIVALRY WHICH ARE THE SUBJECT of the present discussion are those which were written in Castilian in the sixteenth century. The conclusions should also be valid for *Tirante el Blanco*, *Amadís de Gaula*, and the *Sergas de Esplandián*, all of which were probably considered to be sixteenth-century Castilian works by the readers of the period. Specifically excluded are those short works, of the fifteenth century or earlier, translated into Spanish, such as *Oliveros de Castilla*, *Partinuplés de Bles*, or *Enrique fi de Oliva*; they are quite different works, and to a degree were translated and published for a different public. (They are scarcely mentioned in the *Quijote*.) In any event, they do not form part of Spanish literature. ²

¹ This article was read in the Spanish 2 section of the December, 1972 meeting of the Modern Language Association of America. Its research was greatly facilitated by the Smith Fund and the University Research Council of the University of North Carolina, and by the Brown University Library.

I would like to express my appreciation to Keith Whinnom, Merritt Cox, and James Burke for reading this paper and making helpful suggestions; to Juan Bautista Avallé-Arce for his assistance with sections of the Appendix; and to Ricardo Arias for permitting the Hispanic Society of America to make a copy of *Rosán de Castilla* for my examination.

² These works, printed in large quantities at modest prices, are lumped together as "menudencias" in the book order reproduced by Irving Leonard, "Best Sellers of the Lima Book Trade, 1583," *HAHR*, 22 (1942), 30-31, and elsewhere; it is, of course, to them that Julio Caro Baroja, *Ensayo sobre la literatura de cordel* (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1969), pp. 317-27, and Antonio Rodríguez-Moñino, *Construcción crítica y realidad histórica en la poesía española de los siglos XVI y XVII*, 2nd ed. (Madrid: Castalia, 1968), pp. 45-49, refer.

This discussion is also limited to Castilian readers; excluded are the Portuguese, about whom it is often hazardous to extrapolate from data gathered in Spain. Although the romances were virtually dead in Castile by 1590, for after that we have only the publication of *Policisne de Boecia* in 1602 (written before 1600; see Luis Astrana Marín, *Vida ejemplar y heroica de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra*, V [Madrid: Reus, 1953], 493-94)

The accepted opinion concerning the Spanish romances of chivalry during their heyday, the sixteenth century, is that they were works which were read by all classes of society, from the highest to the lowest, but with a considerable predominance of the more numerous lower classes. Thus, we find Rodríguez Marín making a distinction between the readers of the fifteenth and those of the sixteenth centuries: in the fifteenth century, the works were read by the nobility, but in the sixteenth century "cuantos y cuantas supieron leer perecíanse por el dañoso pasto de los libros de caballerías," inasmuch as "siempre lo que habla a la fantasía se llevó de calle a las gentes."³ For Salvador de Madariaga, the romances of chivalry were the melodrama of the time, "género, como es sabido, favorito del pueblo. Porque el pueblo, a quien no se le da un bledo la construcción estética ni la consecuencia, cuyas ideas sobre la verosimilitud se apartan sabiamente de las exigencias de nuestra científica edad, y cuyo instinto se pone siempre de parte de la juventud y del amor, el pueblo busca ante todo en la literatura una distracción a la monotonía de su vida."⁴ "Los campesinos leían los libros de caballerías," boldly affirms Aubrey Bell.⁵

and the reprint in 1617-23 of the *Espejo de príncipes* (the 1636 edition of *Florisel de Niquea* found in Simón Díaz is a ghost), we see not only that the Spanish romances continued to find favor in Portugal (a Lisbon, 1596 reprint of *Amadís de Grecia*, and a 1598 one, though "alimpiado," of *Primaleón*), but that Portuguese romances continued to be written and reprinted in both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. I would be surprised if the conclusions reached in this article did not hold true for Portugal, but I prefer to leave the demonstration, as well as the whole topic of Spanish chivalric literature in Portugal, for another scholar.

³ *Don Quijote*, "nueva edición crítica," IX (Madrid: Atlas, 1949), 58. Quotations from the *Quijote* are taken from this edition.

⁴ *Guía del lector del Quijote*, 6th ed. (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 1967), p. 42.

⁵ As translated by Eduardo Juliá Martínez, *El renacimiento español* (Zaragoza: Ebro, 1944), p. 81. Actually, what Bell originally wrote, in *RHI*, 80 (1930), 296, was that "the peasants listened to the romances of chivalry," a statement obviously inspired by the *Quijote*. The slight mistranslation is itself revealing.

The examples can easily be multiplied: Irving Leonard, *Books of the Brave* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1949), pp. 13, 20; Angel Valbuena Prat, *Historia de la literatura española*, 8th ed. (Barcelona: Gili, 1968), I, 489; Martín de Riquer, *Aproximación al Quijote*, 3rd ed. (Barcelona: Teide, 1970), p. 19; with salutary doubts, Jole Scudiere Ruggieri, "Per uno studio della tradizione cavalleresca nella vita e nella cultura spagnola medioevale (I)," in *Studi di letteratura spagnola* (1964), p. 59. Indeed, with the lone exception of Menéndez

The immediate sources of these observations need not concern us here. Their ultimate source is undoubtedly the *Quijote*, since in it the romances of chivalry are discussed in more detail than in any other contemporary work. Don Quijote himself says that the romances "con gusto general son leídos y celebrados de los grandes y de los chicos, de los pobres y de los ricos, de los letrados e ignorantes, de los plebeyos y caballeros, finalmente, de todo género de personas de cualquier estado y condición que sean" (I, 50). Cervantes' unnamed friend of the Prologue to Part I is more specific: "Esta vuestra escritura no mira a más que a deshacer la autoridad y cabida que en el mundo y en el vulgo tienen los libros de caballerías." The canon from Toledo concurs in naming the *vulgo* as the most important group of readers: "Yo he tenido cierta tentación de hacer un libro de caballerías... [pero] no quiero sujetarme al confuso juicio del desvanecido vulgo, a quien por la mayor parte toca leer semejantes libros" (I, 48).

These passages are important, and we will return to them, but they should not be accepted uncritically as the final word on the subject. There is, in fact, a considerable quantity of other data which bears on the problem. We may begin by noting that although many moralist writers of the period criticized the romances of chivalry, with varying degrees of justification, we will look in vain among their comments for any indication that the books affected members of the lower classes.⁶ There is evidence to the contrary,

dez Pelayo. *Orígenes de la novela*, 2nd "edición nacional" (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1962), I, 461, to find someone who rejects this view we must go back to Diego Clemencin (see p. 992 of the reprinting of his edition of the *Quijote*, 2nd edition? [Madrid: Castilla, 1966]), whose direct acquaintance with a large number of romances of chivalry enabled him to speak with an authority which on the whole remains unsurpassed. (See my article "Don Quijote and the Romances of Chivalry: The Need for a Reexamination," *HR*, 41 [1973].

⁶ Elsewhere I have given the references to those scholars (Thomas, Krauss, Bataillon, Riquer, and Glaser) who have collected these attacks (n. 59 to the introduction of my edition of Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra's *Espejo de príncipes y caballeros*, Clásicos Castellanos [Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1973]). I have only two notes to add here. The first of these is a late criticism which has been overlooked, by Benito Remigio Noydens, editor of Covarrubias' *Tesoro*, which shows the vague ignominy into which the romances of chivalry had fallen. In 1666 Noydens published in Madrid his *Historia moral del dios Momo*, a work inspired by the *Momo* of Leon Batista Alberti, translated into Spanish a century before. The prologue begins:

in that several critics (and the unsuccessful petition of 1555, requesting the prohibition of the romances) speak of the uselessness of guarding a daughter when she has the *Amadis* to read, or of the time which boys lose in reading the romances which they could better spend studying more useful books.⁷

"Esta Historia Moral escrivo para dirigir las costumbres a una Cristiana Política por líneas de la Moral Filosofía, y para desterrar Novelas y libros de Cavallerías, llenos de amores y estragos, y tan perjudiciales a las Conciencias que viene a dezir un Autor grave, que si por algo pudieran imprimirse y salir a luz, es solamente para venir a alumbrar desde las hogueras de la Santa Inquisición a los que no cegaron con sus engaños y errores." He comments on the romances of chivalry in the body of his work as follows: "Huyan [las donzellas] de los libros de las Novelas y Cavallerías, llenos de amores, estupros, de encantos y estragos. Son unas píldoras doradas, que con capa de un gustoso entretenimiento lisongan los ojos, para llenar la boca de amargura, y tosigar el alma de veneno. Yo me acuerdo aver leído de un hombre sumamente vicioso, que hallándose amartelado de una y sin esperanza de conquistarla por fuerza, se resolvió a cogerla con engaño y maña, y haziéndola poner los ojos en uno destos libros, con título de entretenimiento, le puso en el corazón tales ideas de amores, que compoñiéndola [sic] a su exemplo, descompusieron en ella, y arruynaron el honesto estado de su recato, y de su vergüenza" (p. 286).

Secondly, and of considerably greater importance, is a scrap of information found in a forgotten work of eighteenth-century criticism, Francesco Henrion's *Istoria critica e ragionata. Sull' origine, incontro generale, successiva persecuzione costante, estermínio, e rarità singolare di tutte l'Istorie o Romanzi di Cavalleria e Magia dei Secoli XV e XVI, come quelle della Tavola Redonda, di Amadis di Gaula, ec. Con la Biblioteca Italiana di tutte le Istorie predette, di cui son mancanti al presente i bibliografi, e le biblioteche e collezioni più scelte. E perciò offerta alla repubblica letteraria da...* (Florence, 1794). On p. 76, he says that the romances of chivalry, and specifically the *Amadis*, were denounced at the Diet of Worms by Cardinal Girolamo Aleandro il Vecchio, a papal representative, as a force contributing to the Reformation. Citing a "Commentarius de Lutheranismo. Tom. I, Lib. I. p. 149. Ediz. II," which neither I nor several reference librarians have been able to identify, he adds "che in Vitemberga, prima residenza di Lutero, si facessero andare in giro con tanto credito i romanzi di cavalleria, e segnatamente quello di Amadis di Gaula per eccitare colla lettura di essi i cristiani ad avere in ludibrio le cose sacre e gli ordini religiosi."

Three considerations cast suspicion on this statement: the romances did not in fact have anything to do with the Reformation, the later critics of them do not associate them with Protestantism, and it seems incredible that Hispanists who have studied the documents connected with this event, so important for Carlos V, would not have noticed such a comment. Nevertheless, were it true, it explains admirably the moralist writers' constant protests against them, which began only three years later, with the publication of Vives' *De institutione christianae feminae* (1524).

⁷ Similarly, Jerónimo de San Pedro says, in the "Epístola proemial" to Volume I of his *Caballeria celestial* (Antwerp, 1554): "para que después

This note on the youthfulness of readers corresponds with the familiar names of several nobles who "wasted time" with them when young (Juan de Valdés, the future saints Íñigo de Loyola and Teresa de Cepeda), and many of the books were dedicated to young patrons.⁸ Other nobles, however, remained interested in them as

deste pasto, como suelen algunos padres recitar a sus hijos las patrañas de los cavalleros de burlas [= fictional], les cuenten y hagan leer las maravillas de los guerreros de veras."

We may safely assume that adult members of the lower classes would even less have had the idle time in which to read these lengthy books, in an age when reading speed was far lower than today, nor could they afford the cost of illumination to read them by. (See Rodríguez-Marín, *Quijote*, IX, 58 and 63, for two texts which mention the time necessarily spent on them.)

⁸ The predominance of youthful readers has been seen as more striking than it is through comparison with other genres, in which dedication to a very young patron is more exceptional. I have not in every case been able to determine the age of the recipient of the dedication at the time of publication of the first edition of the work, but the following figures, if not exact, will give a reliable picture: Luis de Córdoba and Cristóbal de Guardiola were both addressed as sons of their fathers and referred to as being of "tiernos años," Felipe (II) was 18; Rodrigo Sarmiento, Martín Cortés, and María de Austria, 23; John III of Portugal, about 24; Juan de la Cerda, 25; Fernando Álvarez de Toledo, 26; Luis Cristóbal Ponce de León and Íñigo López de Mendoza, 28; Fernando de Aragón, 29; Mencía de Mendoza, 32; Pero Álvarez Osorio was almost certainly in his 30's; Charles de Lannoy, 36; Pedro Fajardo, 39; Diego López Pacheco, 42; Jorge, Duke of Coimbra, 45; Juan Vázquez de Ávila could hardly have been less than 50; Diego de Deza, 67; Diego Hurtado de Mendoza "el Grande," 69.

If the anecdotes referred to in the following note concerning Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, the poet, are true, he would have been in his early 20's.

The question of the age of the authors of the romances is neither as relevant nor as easy to settle as that of the patrons, since the authors are generally more obscure than their patrons, and authors of many periods have written, for financial gain or other reasons, books which were tangential to their own literary tastes. I summarize briefly those cases in which there is any indication of the author's age: Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra excluded himself from the "ancianos," but was at least in his 20's; Marcos Martínez, author of Part III of the *Espejo de príncipes*, confessed himself to be, although a *licenciado*, of "tiernos años." Jerónimo López, in the prologue to *Clarían de Landanis*. Part II, says that "dos causas me movieron [to write this book]. La primera, fallarme de aquellos negocios familiares que la cargada edad suele consigo traer tan desocupado que tuve por mejor en esta ocupación honesta ocuparme, que no seguir aquellos apetitos que la floreciente juventud a los de mi edad suelen traer." Oviedo was 41 when *Claribalte* was published in 1519. Antonio de Torquemada, author of *Olivante de Laura* (1564), was perhaps born about 1510, conjectures J. H. Elsdon, *On the Life and Work of the Spanish Humanist Antonio de Torquemada*,

adults⁹ — notably Carlos V and many of his court, which set a model for the country by its interest in romances of chivalry and in chivalric spectacle.¹⁰ When we examine the dedications of the romances, we find they are dedicated not just to nobles, but to the very highest nobility of sixteenth-century Spain — Diego Hur-

University of California Publications in Modern Philology, No. 20 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1937), p. 128; according to Latassa, Fernando Basurto, author of *Florindo* (1530), fought with distinction in the conquest of Granada. Pedro de Luján, usually accepted as author of *Silves de la Selva* (1546), probably was rather young. Feliciano de Silva, might have been born in 1492, which would mean that he was still writing romances in his 50's (E. Cotarelo y Mori, "Nuevas noticias biográficas de Feliciano de Silva," *BRAE*, 13 [1926], 137). Silva comments on his age in the prologue to Part IV of *Florisel de Niquea* (cf. with the prologue to the *Novelas ejemplares*, or the words of Don Quijote in the final chapter).

Francisco Delicado was probably in his 50's when he published his editions of the *Amadís* and the *Primaleón*.

⁹ We know of various noble figures who owned copies of romances, such as Isabel la Católica (though not the indigenous Castilian ones), Diego de Colmenares, the historian of Segovia, who owned a copy of *Primaleón*, noteworthy at so late a date (*apud* E. García Dini, "Per una bibliografia dei romanzi di cavalleria: Edizioni del ciclo dei 'Palmerines'." in *Studi sul Palmerín de Olivia. III. Saggi e ricerche*. [Pisa: Istituto di letteratura spagnola e ispano-americana dell'Università di Pisa, 1966], p. 31). Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (Sir Henry Thomas, *Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry* [Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1920], p. 80), to whom are attributed two attacks on Feliciano de Silva, that in the "Carta del Bachiller de Arcadia," and the "Carta de D. Diego de Mendoza en nombre de Marco Aurelio, a Feliciano de Silva," both of which may be found in Paz y Meliá's *Sales españoles*, 2nd ed. by Ramón Paz, *BAE*, 176 (Madrid: Atlas, 1964), pp. 35 and 85-86 (the authorship of these is questioned by R. Foulché-Delbosc, "Les oeuvres attribuées a Mendoza," *RHi*, 32 [1914], 13-15 and 20, whose opinions are copied without comment by A. González Palencia and E. Mele, *Vida y obras de Don . . .* III [Madrid, 1943], 205-06 and 223; among the surviving lists of his books I find only a vague reference to a "Profecías de Metlín," *ibid.*, III, 542), and the Duke and Duchess of Calabria, whose considerable library, including many romances of chivalry, was given to the monastery of San Miguel de los Reyes (Valencia); an inventory of this library was published in the *RABM*, 4 (1874), 7-10, 21-25, 38-41, 54-56, 67-69, 83-86, 99-101, 114-17, and 132-34. (For further information on the Duke of Calabria, see *Claribalte* in the Appendix.)

¹⁰ One discussion of this topic can be found in the speech of Juan Menéndez Pidal upon his reception into the Real Academia (Madrid, 1915). A sizable bibliography of contemporary accounts of chivalric practices and festivities may be found in Jenaro Alenda y Mira, *Relaciones de solemnidades y fiestas públicas* (Madrid, 1903); some of these are accessible in recent reprintings.

tado and Íñigo López de Mendoza, Dukes of the Infantado, Pero Alvarez Osorio, Marquis of Astorga and Count of Trastámara, Juan de la Cerda, Duke of Medinaceli, and many others, including various members of Carlos V's court (see Appendix). Some of these dedications are perfunctory and formal, in that they are an appeal on the part of the author to someone he knew slightly or not at all,¹¹ but it should be remembered that a dedication was more meaningful in the sixteenth than in the seventeenth century, on which our image of them is based,¹² and moreover, some of the dedications, such as those to *Palmerín de Olivia* and the *Espejo de príncipes*, have a familiar air about them, suggesting that the author knew the person to whom the work was dedicated and had reason to expect that he would like it. (Were this not a factor, one would expect the books to be dedicated to older patrons, who might be more pleased by the flattery and in any event in a better position to reward the author.) There are a significant number of cases (again, see Appendix) in which an author dedicated successive books to the same person, or in which one romance was dedicated to a husband, and later a different one to his wife,¹³ or to a

¹¹ Such as, for example, those of the second *Lisuarte de Grecia* (*Amadís*, Book VIII) or *Felixmarte de Hircania*.

¹² See the discussions of Rodríguez Marín, *Quijote*, IX, 9-19, and Gracián, *Crítico*, ed. M. Romera-Navarro, III (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940), 197-98 and notes. Dalmiro de la Válgoma y Díaz-Varela, in the introduction to his *Mecenas de libros. Su heráldica y nobleza*, I ([Burgos, the author?], 1966), is primarily concerned with dedications as biographical sources.

Theodore Beardsley, Jr. has pointed out, in his important bibliography of *Hispano-Classical Translations Printed between 1482 and 1699* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne, 1970), p. 121, how the whole question of Golden Age patronage has hardly been explored. Yet for those who would dismiss these dedications as purely formal and not indicating anything about the tastes of their recipients, it is revealing to compare the list in the Appendix with the dedications recorded in Beardsley's study, which can be taken with, I believe, less cause for objection as indicating patrons of learning. There is surprisingly little overlap, which suggests that both the authors of romances of chivalry and the translators of classical works exercised at least a modest amount of care in choosing a patron.

¹³ A knotty problem is the question of the sex of the readers of the romances, or more specifically, whether or to what extent their readers were members of the fair sex. Besides the sources already referred to, there are in the moralist writers references to female readers; some romances are dedicated to women, and in other cases, such as Part III of the *Espejo de príncipes*, the author directs himself to them. There are also other

father and then to his son. Still other romances, as can be seen from the dedications, were written by members of the same household, and there is no doubt that in certain cases the publication of the work was subsidized by the *mecenas* involved.

It is still true, of course, that the receiver of a dedication might not be pleased by a book, but we can nevertheless safely assume that he would not have felt the dedication to be an insult; works printed expressly for popular consumption, such as the *pliegos sueltos* and the *libros de cordel*, had no dedications at all.

The books themselves, as physical objects, offer us considerable information. They are, almost without exception, folio volumes; the exceptions are themselves significant, since they were printed outside of Spain.¹⁴ The editions were small. The printing, except for a few

contemporary references, usually derogatory ones, to women as readers of romances; Santa Teresa's comment on her mother, quoted by Menéndez Pelayo, *Orígenes*, I, 459, n. 1; Oviedo, *Quincuagenas*, cited by A. Farinelli, *Italia e Spagna* (Torino: Bocca, 1929), I, 50; Cervantes, *El vizcaino fingido*, p. 530 of the edition of Francisco Ynduráin, *BAE*, 156 (Madrid: Atlas, 1962); *Guzmán de Alfarache*, II, iii, 3 (p. 787 of the edition of Francisco Rico in *La novela picaresca española*, I [Barcelona: Planeta, 1967]), for an earlier period, Hernán Mexía, in Menéndez Pelayo, *Antología de poetas líricos*, "edición nacional," II (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1944), 335.

Without being able to resolve this question completely, two comments can be made: I have already noted elsewhere (n. 12 to the introduction of my edition of the *Espejo de príncipes*) that not all the romances of chivalry are identical, and that certain later ones, in which the love element is more pronounced, may have been directed to a female audience. Beyond this, however, it should be kept in mind that whatever influence women may have had in the field of contemporary secular literature was not restricted to the romances of chivalry alone, and that one should indeed go with leaden feet in qualifying the readership of the romances as exceptionally feminine. In the "courts" with a literary orientation the women played a very active rôle, and we find such works as the *Diana enamorada*, the *Selva de aventuras* and the translation of Straparola dedicated to women. In this case, of course, the participation of women is even more obviously an upper-class phenomenon.

¹⁴ The priest, in *Don Quijote*, I, 6, clearly realizes this: "Estos [pequeños] no deben ser de caballerías, sino de poesía."

There are only two editions of the "indigenous" romances which were not in folio: the Venice, 1534 edition of *Palmerín de Olivia*, and the Louvain, 1551 edition of *Amadis de Gaula*, which was inexplicably chosen as the basis of the Aguilar "Libros de Caballerías" edition by Felicidad Buendía, who, were she worthy of the term "scholar," it would only be with the qualifications of "slipshod" and "dishonest" (see Martín de Riquer, *Tirant lo Blanc* [Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1970], I, 98).

reprints of the final quarter of the century, ranges from good to excellent in quality;¹⁵ some of the editions are illustrated with woodcuts. Their purchasers had them bound in bindings of high quality.¹⁶

Some documents provide us with concrete evidence that these books commanded a high price. An important source for the early part of the century is the well-known catalogue of the library of Fernando Colón, reproduced in facsimile by Archer Huntington in 1905.¹⁷ This partial listing of the contents of his library includes for each entry the price paid, as well as the place and date of purchase, information invaluable for a study of contemporary book distribution. He evidently purchased as many romances of chivalry as he could obtain; the prices he paid for them are as follows:

Item Number		(1 real = 34 maravedíes)
4000	<i>Lisuarte de Grecia</i> (<i>Amadís</i> , Book 7) (1514 edition)	130 maravedíes
4076	<i>Arderique</i>	95 maravedíes ¹⁸

¹⁵ Of most romances which I have examined the same could be said as of *Claribalte*: "La impresión del *Claribalte* es realmente primorosa: papel magnífico, tipos bellísimos, anchos márgenes, composición limpia, en suma, un conjunto tipográfico exquisito" (Agustín González de Amezúa y Mayo, prologue to the facsimile of *Claribalte* [Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1956]).

¹⁶ Books were, as today, usually sold in paper bindings (*Viaje del Parnaso*, ed. Rodríguez Marín [Madrid, 1935], p. 127), although among the small stock of leather-bound books of Benito Boyer, incompletely reproduced by Pérez Pastor (see n. 23, *infra*), we find 2 copies of *Cristalián* and one each of the *Caballero del Febo* and the *Amadís*, at 102, 152, and 51 maravedíes for the binding, respectively, and in the order reproduced by Leonard (*v. supra*, n. 2), most of the books are ordered "en pergamino."

¹⁷ *Catalogue of the Library of Ferdinand Columbus, reproduced... by Archer M. Huntington* (New York, 1905). The items relevant to Spanish literature may be more easily consulted in Gallardo's *Ensayo de una biblioteca de libros raros y curiosos*, Vol. II (Madrid: Rivadeneira, 1866), Item No. 1870.

¹⁸ *Arderique* is a romance deserving of considerably more attention than it has received, which is, in a word, none whatsoever. None of the writers on Spanish Arthurian literature (Entwistle, Bohigas, María Rosa Lida) has realized that, superficially at least, it is an Arthurian work. It was written some years before it was published, probably in the fifteenth century, and its original language may well not have been Castilian. Although the declaration on the title page — "traduzido de lengua estrangera en la común cas-

Item Number		(1 real = 34 maravedíes)
2708	<i>Floriseo</i>	128 maravedíes
4118	<i>Leoneo de Hungría</i> "encuadernado en pergamino"	170 maravedíes
4069	<i>Lepolemo</i> (1521 edition)	95 maravedíes
3976	<i>Tirante el Blanco</i>	260 maravedíes ¹⁹
3331 & 3332	<i>Sergas de Esplandián</i> (1510 edition) and <i>Florisando</i> (<i>Amadís</i> , Book 6; 1510 edition)	13 reales (together)
4120	<i>Clarián de Landanís</i> , Part II (1522 edition)	6 1/2 reales
4119	<i>Clarián de Landanís</i> , Part III, "encuadernado en pergamino"	7 reales
4124	<i>Palmerín de Oliva</i> (1516 edition)	4 reales
4125	<i>Primaleón</i> (1524 edition)	5 reales

In comparison, Colón purchased his copy of the *Visión deleitable* (item 2076) for 36 maravedíes, the *Corbacho* (item 4024) for 40 maravedíes, and the lengthy *Propaladia* (item 4032) for only 75 maravedíes. The romances of chivalry are clearly the most expensive Spanish literary works in his library.

We also find evidence of these high prices later in the sixteenth century. In the 1529 inventory of the possessions of Jacob Crom-

tellana" — could merely be a *topos* (see my "The Pseudo-Historicity of the Romances of Chivalry," *Qib*, in press; but why did it mislead the compiler of Fernando Colón's catalogue to note that it was "en español"?), the names are foreign in origin, and a valuable document reproduced by José María Madurell Marimón, *Documentos para la historia de la imprenta y librería en Barcelona (1474-1553)* (Barcelona: Gremios de Editores, de Libreros y de Maestros Impresores, 1955), No. 179, provides us with solid evidence of a Catalan version, or possibly original, existing in 1500.

In the document, a book inventory, *Arderique* is given a low value, possibly because it was written on paper rather than parchment; it also might reflect the lack of interest in chivalric works in Cataluña, which Madurell found noteworthy: "Ni una vez tan sólo he visto citado el *Amadís* y el *Tirant lo Blanc* únicamente en el contrato de edición" (p. 103*).

¹⁹ As noted at the beginning, *Tirante el Blanco* does not, rigorously speaking, have a place in the present discussion, as it is not a Castilian work. Yet it is revealing to note how it is by quite a margin the most expensive of the romances of chivalry in Colón's library. Its cost may have contributed to its rapid fall into oblivion.

berger,²⁰ in the inventory of the books of Juan de Timoneda made at his death in 1583,²¹ and in registers of book shipments reproduced by José Torre Revello,²² we find that the romances consistently commanded a high relative price (irrespective of the inflation which affected Spanish money in this period).²³

²⁰ Reproduced by José Gestoso y Pérez, *Noticias inéditas de impresores sevillanos* (Seville, 1924), pp. 36-56; the *Visión deleitable* is valued at 40 maravedies and the *Enquirdión* at 31, while Book VIII of the *Amadís* is 111 maravedies, unspecified "Amadisés" are 150, *Clarián* is 108, etc.

²¹ José Enrique Serrano y Morales, *Reseña histórica... de las imprentas que han existido en Valencia* (Valencia: F. Doménech, 1898-99), pp. 548-59.

²² *El libro, la imprenta y el periodismo en América durante la dominación española*, Publicaciones del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, n.º 74 (Buenos Aires, 1940); his document No. 30, dated 1594, is an inventory of a shipment to Indies, with prices; see also No. 24.

²³ The standards used in assigning the values, as well as the prices charged Colón, need some discussion. In a similar document reproduced in part by Cristóbal Pérez Pastor, *La imprenta en Medina del Campo* (Madrid, 1895), pp. 456-62, the inventory of the possessions and stock of the wealthy bookseller Benito Boyer, who died in 1592, we find book values assigned exclusively on the basis of number of pages. It is likely that the cost of the paper exceeded the value of the printing, and that both of them exceeded any factors such as the book's subject, or rights due the author, which affect modern prices (see Agustín González de Amezúa, *Cómo se hacía un libro en nuestro Siglo de Oro* [Madrid: Imprenta de Editorial Magisterio Español, 1946], pp. 22-31; reproduced in his *Opúsculos histórico-literarios* [Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1951], I, 348-59). Similarly, the concerns of modern bibliophiles as to a book's printer or edition were completely irrelevant (Colón never or rarely bought more than one edition of the same text, although in many cases he could have); the age of a book was a negative, not a positive factor, which could perhaps explain why, in a seventeenth-century inventory, we find reasonable, but not high, values assigned to *Policisne de Boecia* and to the 1588 edition of the *Sergas de Esplandián* (inventory of the books of Pedro de Párraga by Martín de Córdoba, published by the Marqués del Saltillo, "Bibliotecas, libreros e impresores madrileños del siglo XVII," *RABM*, 54 [1948], 261-63).

The inventory of Boyer, which can be taken as indicating the stock-in-trade of a large peninsular bookseller of the time, whose trade with the new world was only a small portion of his business, provides evidence that the romances had not completely fallen into disfavor in the peninsula as the century drew to a close, but still retained some popularity. In his unbound stock, he had 70 copies of *Palmerín de Olivia*, a book which, like the "cuatro del Amadís," had lost much of its earlier popularity, 43 of *Primaleón*, 64 of the *Sergas de Esplandián*, 34 of the "segunda de la quarta" of *Florisel* (*Amadís*, Book XI), 53 of both parts of the *Caballero de la Cruz* [*Lepo-lemo*], and 31 more of the first part alone, 59 of the Tercera Parte of the *Caballero del Febo* [*Espejo de príncipes*], and 18 of *Cristalián*; on the other hand, he only had 13 copies of the *Amadís*, 2 of *Belianis*, 3 of Parts I and

Upon examining the printing history of the genre, we can also draw some conclusions. The number of romances of chivalry is itself revealing. Although the romances began as a genre, like the pastoral novel, with some works which were great commercial successes, and there were several later works which were frequently reprinted, there is an extensive list of works published which were reprinted only once or not at all, indicating a modest sale. Some of these publications, as stated above, were subsidized, but the majority were treated by their publishers like any other work. Surely it was not the case that publishers brought out, year after year, expensive books which would fail commercially. The figures seem to point instead to a small but consistent demand, which these publications filled, on the part of a limited group of *aficionados* with the means to indulge this expensive taste.²⁴

11 of the *Caballero del Febo*, and 6 of *Celidón de Iberia*. (My attempts to identify the editions from the number of "pliegos" have not been overly successful.) The quantity of romances of chivalry contrasts with lesser quantities of works one would have thought to be more popular: 8 *Dianas* of Montemayor, 16 of the *Lazarillo*, 2 of the *Flos Sanctorum*, 10 of the *Jardín de flores curiosas*, 2 of the Chronicle of Ocampo, 24 of Garcilaso and 27 of the *Celestina*.

It may be objected that these figures represent the books that Boyer did not sell, rather than those he did, and perhaps this is why he had 19 copies of *Olivante de Laura*, whose unique edition appeared 25 years previously (though it is also found in Document No. 30 of Torre Revello). Yet the same pattern is found in the inventory of the books of Juan Cromberger (Gestoso Pérez, pp. 90 ff.), and it can be safely assumed that Boyer would not have been as successful as he was if he had not been possessed of shrewd business sense (some idea of his business methods may be found in documents reproduced by [Francisco Fernández del Castillo], *Libros y libreros en el siglo XVI*, Publicaciones del Archivo General de la Nación, 6 [México: 1914], pp. 260-88, in which is also found an inventory including some romances of chivalry), and at the same time other booksellers were underwriting editions of romances of chivalry, as Benito Boyer himself had underwritten the 1563 edition of *Primaleón*: among them his cousin Juan Boyer, who had printers bring out the 1586 edition of *Espejo de caballerías*, and the 1583/86 edition of the *Espejo de principes*.

²⁴ The sudden growth in popularity of the romances in the opening years of the sixteenth century — which led printers desperately to publish whatever chivalric material they could lay their hands on, such as the ancient *Caballero Cifar*, and perhaps *Tirante el Blanco* — is also explained by noble preoccupations. As Marañón has pointed out, in *Los tres Vélez*, 2nd ed. (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1962), pp. 45-46, these years were not the happy ones they are commonly said to have been. The great military endeavor of the reconquest was concluded, and the army suffered a sudden decline in impor-

It is also revealing to look at the dates of the reprints of the popular works, which are more closely tied to public favor than is the production of new works.²⁵ After the abdication of Carlos V, which marks a cut-off point for the writing of new romances,²⁶ we find that reprints were not produced uniformly throughout the conclusion of the century (as was the case with *pliegos sueltos*²⁷ and other popular literature), but instead appeared in groups. We find between 1556 and 1562 not a solitary reprinting, but in 1562 we find printings of *Palmerín*, of *Lepolemo*, and of the *Espejo de príncipes*, in 1563 of *Primaleón*, of *Amadís*, and two of *Lepolemo* (with the publication of its Second Part), and in 1564 of *Belianís*, *Lisuarte de Grecia*, and *Amadís de Grecia*, with the publication of *Olivante de Laura*. The production then abruptly drops off again, with a lone reprint of the *Amadís* in 1565, and aside from minor exceptions²⁸ there are no further reprints until 1579. In this latter year we find both parts of *Belianís* printed, and

tance. The discovery of America was of no particular interest. The centralizing tendencies which we see as the foundation of a modern state were seen by many as the erosion of traditional aristocratic privileges. The marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella meant that after her death, Castile was ruled by an Aragonese king, who did not hide the fact that his interests were Aragonese and not Spanish. (And even he was preferable to the Flemish Carlos V.)

It is not hard to understand why, at this time especially, the nobility would turn to the romances of chivalry to read about a world which was in many ways superior to the one they lived in, in which the nobility still had a clear-cut and essential function, where life was varied, exciting, and adventurous, and in which the individual still had abundant opportunities to show his abilities and win status.

²⁵ Beardsley, pp. 129-30.

²⁶ We only have *Olivante de Laura* (with a dedication by the printer, not the author, which suggests an earlier date of composition), *Rosíán de Castilla* (a short work and not a true romance), *Lidamante de Armenia* (which I have not been able to see), and *Policisne de Boecia* published after this date, although there are written and published continuations of earlier works, such as those of the *Espejo de príncipes* (whose first edition is of 1555—during the reign of Carlos V—not of 1562, as is found in all the bibliographies).

²⁷ This can be seen from the splendid bibliography of Antonio Rodríguez-Moñino, *Diccionario bibliográfico de pliegos sueltos poéticos (Siglo XVI)* (Madrid: Castalia, 1970), pp. 34-45 and 643-46.

²⁸ The 1568 *Florisel* edition and the 1575 *Amadís* edition; the publication in 1576 of *Febo el Troyano* was almost certainly subsidized by its patron.

the *Espejo de príncipes*; in the following year two editions of the *Amadís*, one each of *Belianís* and *Palmerín*, and the publishing and reprinting of Part II of the *Espejo de príncipes*, as well as a reprint of the first part. After editions of *Amadís de Grecia* in 1582 and two of *Florisel* in 1584, the last great surge of publishing of romances of chivalry gets underway, with 3 reprints in 1585, 5 in 1586, and 8 in 1587, including the publication of Part III of the *Espejo de príncipes* and the first edition in 45 years of the *Sergas de Esplandián*.²⁹ But once again the commercial interest in the romances disappears abruptly, with only a possible reprint of *Florisel* in 1588, reprints of the *Espejo de príncipes* in 1589, and the publication of *Lidamante de Armenia* in 1590. Except for the anomalies mentioned in n. 2, *supra*, this completes the Castilian printing history of the romances of chivalry.

In the truly popular genres, as just mentioned, we find a much more constant production. Moreover, the dates of the fluctuations, which parallel, though imprecisely, the changes in popularity of the epic poem,³⁰ themselves suggest an upper-class audience. The first "low point," from 1556-1561, can be explained as caused by the upheaval surrounding Carlos V's abdication and death, and the adjustments needed by the installation of a new king. The second lacuna, from approximately 1567-1579, corresponds well to the military activities directed by Don Juan de Austria — first, the *morisco* rebellion, then the naval activities in the Mediterranean, in which he was accompanied by a significant portion of the Spanish nobility.³¹ That

²⁹ In 1585, two reprints of the *Espejo de príncipes*, Part II, and one of the *Primaleón*; in 1586 the *Amadís*, *Cristalián*, the *Espejo de príncipes*, and two of the *Espejo de caballerías*; in 1587 the *Amadís*, two of the *Sergas* and of *Lisuarte de Grecia*, *Belianís* and its second part, and the publication of Part III of the *Espejo de príncipes*.

³⁰ Lest it be thought that this fluctuation was present in all types of publishing except the very lowest, it can quickly be confirmed that the two periods referred to as virtually devoid of commercial interest in the romances of chivalry (1556-61, 1567-79) witnessed an intense activity in the fields of scientific and religious publishing, fields less subjects to external vicissitudes, and to a somewhat lesser but still significant degree in the fields of belles-lettres and poetry (cf. the printing history of Montemayor and Garcilaso, for example).

³¹ Croce has already stated how "innumerevoli attestazioni" (of which he unfortunately gives but one — a quotation from Jerónimo de Urrea) pointed to the romances of chivalry as the soldiers' reading matter (*La Spagna nella vita italiana durante la rinascenza*, 4th ed. [Bari: Gius., Laterza,

the final rise and decline were situated around the year of 1588 cannot be a coincidence, for whatever the effect of the Armada's defeat on Spain's naval power, there can be no doubt that the expedition aroused interest in chivalric matters, and that in its defeat was lost a considerable sector of the cream of the nobility.³²

Taking all the factors mentioned into consideration, it is reasonable to conclude that the romances were read by the upper or noble class, and perhaps by a few particularly well-to-do members of the bourgeoisie.³³ Certainly they were not read by, nor to, the peasants.³⁴ We have still, however, to reconcile this with the

1949], p. 210). Probably the editions of the romances published outside the peninsula were printed with the soldiers in mind.

³² "Los historiadores de aquel tiempo no convienen en la pérdida total que tuvo la escuadra de los españoles... Lo cierto es que la desgracia fue tal que cubrió de luto toda la España, porque no había familia ni casa de las distinguidas en todo el reino donde no se llorase la muerte de algún hijo, hermano o pariente, de manera que Felipe, temiendo el efecto que podría producir sobre el pueblo este luto general, publicó un dicto como hacían los romanos en semejantes circunstancias, mandándolo cesar" (José Sabau y Blanco, chronological tables to Mariana's *Historia general*, XVI [Madrid, 1820], lxxii).

³³ An example of a member of the middle class who read romances of chivalry would be Fernando de Rojas, a *converso* who never rose above the position of mayor of Talavera. Among the books he owned when he made his will (1541) we find two "libros del *Amadís*" (two books of the *Amadís* cycle), *Esplandián*, *Palmerín*, *Primaleón*, *Platir*, and the *Segunda Parte de Don Clarián* (see Appendix). In the inventory it was noted that these books were "traídos y viejos y algunos rotos," presumably from use, as no note is made on the condition of a group of legal books he also owned. (Taken from Fernando del Valle Lersundi, "Testamento de Fernando de Rojas," *RFE*, 16 [1929], 382.)

³⁴ I am convinced that were it not for Juan Palomeque's comments, no one would even have suggested that the indigenous Castilian romances were read to the peasantry. Honesty compels me to mention the *proceso* of Román Ramírez, summarized by A. González Palencia in "Las fuentes de la comedia *Quien mal anda en mal acaba*, de Don Juan Ruiz de Alarcón," *BRAE*, 16 (1929), 199-222 and 17 (1930), 247-74, yet the data it presents is so contradictory and difficult to evaluate that I prefer not to include it with my main argument. In 1595 Ramírez, a *morisco* of Deza, was denounced to the Inquisition. He was a farmer (*labrador*), the son of a farmer, and lived from an orchard "arrendado del Duque de Medinaceli," and as a *curandero*. According to his own declaration, he had once owned romances of chivalry, whose titles he specified (the bad spelling no doubt due to the amanuensis): "Floranuel [Florambel], los doce [!] de Amadís, Don Cristalián, Don Olivante del Aura [de Laura], Primaleón y Don Duardo [I do not believe, as González Palencia suggests, that he is referring to the Portuguese *Duardos*, Book VII, in Gayangos' enumeration, of the *Palmerín*

statements in the *Quijote* quoted at the outset. With regard to Don Quijote's remark, we are free to dismiss anything he says, particularly in Part I, as the misconceptions of an insane person, for if he can believe windmills to be giants and sheep to be soldiers, he could just as well fantasize that the romances of chivalry were read with enthusiasm by all; he is not a reliable source. Furthermore, considering the tone of the Prologue to Part I, and the narrow interpretation Cervantes' friend takes of the purpose of the *Quijote*, the statement there could be merely another ironic note.

"cycle"; rather to the same *Primaleón*, which on the title pages promises to present as well the deeds of Duardos, prince of England], Don Clarián del Amadís [de Landanís], el Caballero del Febo, Don Rogel de Grecia, Don Felís Malo [Felix Magno]... y otros que al presente no se acuerda" (257-58). When he was tested and it was found he could only read with great difficulty, he declared that he knew these books because "antes que él supiese leer ni lo hubiese deprendido, sabía ya de memoria los libros de caballerías de los cuales dichos, porque Román Ramírez, padre deste confesante, leía muy bien y muchas veces en presencia deste y así este confesante iba tomando en la memoria lo que le oía leer" (260). He also claimed to have written a romance of chivalry, entitled *Florisodoro de Grecia*.

Because of his extraordinary memory, which he first claimed to have lost and then explained he never had (he memorized the main plots of the romances and then invented details to fit them), he was often called upon, as a curiosity, to recite romances of chivalry before various nobles, and as a result of a petty squabble because one evening he could not be two places at once, he was denounced to the Inquisition out of spite, as having a memory inspired by the devil. He died before his case was settled, in 1599, having confessed to being a *cripto-moro* (and the Inquisition, with its usual thoroughness, went on to condemn him to death posthumously).

All of this seems suspect in the extreme. An illiterate farmer could scarcely, from his earnings, afford even one of the books which Ramírez said he had in such abundance, but which he no longer owned and could not produce. It seems more likely that he claimed this extensive knowledge to make himself more in demand as the owner of a prodigious memory, which was, no doubt, highly profitable for him. I wish, likewise, that it could be concluded from his testimony alone that the romances of chivalry were regularly read aloud among the nobles of this period, but it seems that the interest was more in his memory than in what he actually recited.

interest was more in his memory than in what he actually recited. (Roger M. Walker tackles the always knotty problem of oral reading of written texts with regard to the *Cifar*, in *FMLS*, 7 [1971], 36-42, without reaching any firm conclusion.)

I hope it is unnecessary to point out, finally, that the romances of chivalry were only incidental to his denunciation and later condemnation.

The comment of the canon from Toledo is not to be so easily dismissed. Whether or not he speaks for Cervantes,³⁵ he is presented as a sober and serious man, deeply concerned about the course literature is taking. He is knowledgeable, and he does not make jokes.

We can understand this comment properly if we remember that *vulgo*, in a literary context, meant in practice "the uneducated," without reference to a particular social class.³⁶ This is spelled out

³⁵ Bruce Wardropper maintains that he does not, in "Cervantes' Theory of the Drama," *MP*, 52 (1954-55), 217-21, although F. Sánchez Escribano and A. Porqueras Mayo, without giving any reasons, reject this article as "totalmente desenfocado," in *Preceptiva dramática española del renacimiento y el barroco* (Madrid: Gredos, 1965), p. 21, n. 21. Wardropper is supported, on different grounds, by Alban Forcione, *Cervantes, Aristotle, and the Persiles* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), pp. 108-27.

³⁶ This is probably what the friend in the Prologue to Part I meant by the term.

There is on the word *vulgo* a considerable bibliography. In a penetrating article, which deserves to be reprinted in a more accessible form, Werner Bahner discusses the change in the term from its original sense of, more or less, the peasantry, to mean the uneducated or the half-educated ("Die Bezeichnung 'Vulgo' und der Ehrbegriff des spanischen Theaters im Siglo de Oro," *Omaggio Iliu Torgu Iordan*, ed. B. Cazacu et. al. [Bucharest: Editura Academia Republicii Populare Romini, 1958], pp. 59-68). It might be added as well that *vulgo* is invariably defined negatively, as being people lacking something which the writer possesses; none of the writers who use the term include themselves in it (except, satirically, Cosme de Aldana, in a work which has been overlooked by the critics writing on the topic, despite its accessibility in BAE, 36: "Invectiva contra el vulgo y su maldiciencia," opening sonnets, p. 496: "No creas que esta inventiva [sic] / contra el vulgo, de autor compuesta sea / que se exima del vulgo, y que no crea / ser del mismo en cuanto obre, hable y escriba"), even though they might be of obscure or non-existent lineage.

The following may also be consulted: Otis Green, "On the Attitude toward the *Vulgo* in the Spanish Siglo de Oro," *Studies in the Renaissance*, 4 (1957), 190-200; Américo Castro, *El pensamiento de Cervantes*, Anejo 6 of the *RFE* (Madrid, 1925), pp. 210-12; Aubrey F. G. Bell, *Renacimiento*, pp. 113-17; Amado Alonso, *Castellano, español, idioma nacional*, 4th ed. (Buenos Aires: Losada, 1968), pp. 68-74; Werner Bahner, "El vulgo y las luces en la obra de Feijoo," *Actas del Tercer Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas*, ed. Carlos H. Magis (México: El Colegio de México, 1970), pp. 88-96; A. Porqueras Mayo, *El prólogo como género literario*, Anejo 14 of the *Revista de Literatura* (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1957), pp. 156-58, *El prólogo en el renacimiento español*, Anejo 24 of the *Revista de Literatura* (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1965), pp. 21-25, and *El prólogo en el manierismo y barroco españoles*, Anejo 27 of the *Revista de Literatura* (Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1968), pp. 17-19; Lope de Vega, *El sembrar en buena tierra*, ed. William Fichter (New York: M.L.A., 1944), pp. 198-99; E. C. Riley, *Teoría de la novela*

in the well-known comment of Don Quijote to the Caballero del Verde Gabán: "Todo aquel que no sabe, aunque sea señor y príncipe, puede y debe entrar en número de vulgo" (II, 16). In the light of this passage, the canon's comment is indeed explicable. The intelligentsia (of which the canon would have formed a part) was never the class that read the romances of chivalry; they were responsible for the Erasmian and moralist complaints against them. If, but only if, the word *vulgo* is understood without class implication, as merely meaning "todo aquel que no sabe," it is true that the romances were read by the *vulgo*.³⁷

en Cervantes, trans. Carlos Sahagún (Madrid: Taurus, 1966), pp. 178-82. Two other references to the *vulgo* in which the uneducated are the class referred to are found in Fernández del Castillo, p. 563: "no sólo se consumían en cenizas libros prohibidos, sino otros muchos 'porque no fuesen en el vulgo ocasión de errar,'" and Prudencio de Sandoval, *Historia de Carlos V*, BAE, 80. 116: "Ninguno que lo fuese [dotor] hacía caso de Luterio, ni le tenía en más de lo que merece un... instrumento de Satanás, para ganar infinitas ánimas de perdición, de gente vulgar y idiotas semejantes a él, sin letras ni entendimiento verdadero..."

Aside from a passage in the prologue to the *Quijote* of Avellaneda, obviously based on the passage in Cervantes' prologue quoted at the outset, and an isolated and undated scrap of information in Gayangos (BAE, 40, p. lxxii, col. a, l. 6), I have found only one other contemporary reference to the *vulgo* as readers of romances of chivalry, in the *Florisando*, Book VI of the *Amadis* series, a work which Cervantes almost certainly did not know (see n. 16 of my article referred to *supra*, n. 5). In the prologue to this work, the author says that the *Amadis* and the *Sergas de Esplandián* were read "ansí del palacio como del vulgo," and expresses his concern that "rústicos" might not have been able to tell the good in them from the bad. I think that this statement from the author of so tangential a work, who has such a hostile attitude toward the romances as they then existed (see Maxime Chevalier, "Le roman de chevalerie morigéné. Le *Florisando*," *BHi*, 60 [1958], 441-49) is of little value. See also the prologue to Part III of *Espejo de cavallerías*.

³⁷ I would thus accept, though for different reasons, Pérez Pastor's statement in *Bibliografía madrileña*, I (Madrid, 1891), xiii-xiv "La falta de libros de caballerías impresos en Madrid desde 1566 hasta 1600, aunque es una prueba negativa, dice mucho en contra de la opinión generalizada por varios cervantistas, pues viene a demostrar: 1.º, que entre la gente ilustrada de esta época, los libros de caballerías estaban en completa decadencia; 2.º, que en la Corte no había un solo autor, traductor, ni editor que se atreviera a poner manos en libros de caballerías..." (If this latter argument were extended, it would imply that because romances of chivalry were printed in Salamanca, that they were read by the university community, which was on the whole quite untrue—but see n. 32 to the introduction of my edition of the *Espejo de príncipes*).

In conclusion, we should note that the evidence deduced from the *Quijote* about the readers of the romances of chivalry was never as unequivocal as it might have been. It is not true, as Madañaga says, that there is no one in the *Quijote*, except "perhaps" Sancho, who has not read the romances or heard them read.³⁸ When did Don Quijote's *ama*, or Tomé Cecial read them? Had la Tolosa, or the galley slaves heard them read? A moment's reflection shows how extreme this statement is. Neither should the fact that the innkeeper Juan Palomeque had two romances of chivalry be taken to mean that they were read at every harvest in all the remote corners of Spain. The books were there because some traveler forgot them,³⁹ and the illiterate innkeeper has no plans to buy any others. His wife didn't listen to them being read, his daughter didn't understand them, and Maritornes, who didn't know what a *caballero aventurero* was (I, 16), listened for the worst possible reason.

From a slightly different perspective — looking at those characters who were *well* acquainted with the romances of chivalry — we find that the *Quijote* in fact confirms the thesis of this paper, that the romances were read by the middle and upper classes. Don Quijote, the barber (on the rather weak evidence of Chapter I, 1) and the priest, the canon, Dorotea, the various people at the ducal palace, and, perhaps, Luscinda and Sansón Carrasco, knew the romances well, but there is no representative of the peasantry among them. Yet only one, the canon, can clearly be excluded from the *vulgo*, as defined above.

THE CITY COLLEGE

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

³⁸ P. 34 of the edition cited. The qualification concerning Sancho is not found in the original edition.

³⁹ I am glad to see that, in a 20-page monograph which reached me only after the present article was all but completed, Maxime Chevalier agrees with this point (*Sur le publique du roman de chevalerie* [Talence: Institut d'Études Ibériques et Ibéro-Américaines de l'Université de Bordeaux, 1968], p. 15). (My thanks to Alan Trueblood for calling this study to my attention.) It will be noted by the reader that this article is completely independent of Chevalier's study.

APPENDIX

Dedications of the Spanish Romances of Chivalry

The date(s) of the edition(s) consulted are given for those cases in which I have not been able to consult the *princeps*. No works which I have been able to examine have been omitted.

Amadís de Gaula, Books I-IV: No dedication.

Sergas de Esplandián (*Amadís*, Book V): No dedication.

Florisando (*Amadís*, Book VI): Juan de la Cerda (1485-1544), second Duke of Medinaceli.

Lisuarte de Grecia (*Amadís*, Book VII; 1548 edition, and according to Gayangos, 1525 edition): Diego de Deza (1443/44-1523), archbishop of Seville, "para descanso del trabajo de su mucho estudio." Deza was in the 1480's *catedrático de prima de teología* in Salamanca, *inquisidor general* of Castile from 1501 to 1507, and from 1504 on archbishop of Seville.

The dedication to such a religious figure as Deza, who was almost 70, is indeed surprising. The author of the work, commonly accepted to be Feliciano de Silva, says in the prologue that he received "criança e mercedes" from Deza, but there is no known connection of Silva with this figure. I hope to discuss the question of Silva's authorship of this work more fully on another occasion.

Lisuarte de Grecia (*Amadís*, Book VIII): Jorge, Duke of Coimbra (1481-1550), bastard son of John II of Portugal.

Amadís de Grecia (*Amadís*, Book IX; 1535 and 1549 editions): Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (1461-1531), third Duke of the Infantado, Marquis of Santillana, called "el gran duque." Silva, before his marriage (which took place near 1520; Cotarelo [*supra*, n. 8], p. 138), had falsely attributed the paternity of his wife Gracia Fe to this licentious figure.

The author of the *Guerra de Granada*, about whom the anecdote referred to in note 9 is told, belonged to a different branch of the family.

Florisel de Niquea (*Amadís*, Book X; 1566 edition): No dedication.

Rogel de Grecia (*Florisel de Niquea*, Part III; *Amadís*, Book XI): Francisco de Zúñiga de Sotomayor, third Duke of Béjar, the great-grandfather of the sixth Duke of Béjar, to whom Part I of the *Quijote* was dedicated.

Perhaps it was in the Duke of Béjar's library, if there was a collection of romances of chivalry, that Cervantes read these books which he knew so well (see my article referred to in n. 5). I hasten to point out that this is pure speculation, based on what may well be a coincidence.

Florisel de Niquea, Part IV (*Amadís*, Book XI): María de Austria (1528-1603), daughter of Carlos V and wife of Maximilian II of Hungary. Juan Rufo, much later, dedicated to her his *Austriada*.

Don Silves de la Selva (*Amadís*, Book XII): Luis Cristóbal Ponce de León (1518-1573), second Duke of Arcos, patron of the musicians Cristóbal de Morales and Juan Bermudo.

Pedro de Luján, author of *Silves*, later dedicated his translation of *Leandro el Bel*, as he did his *Coloquios matrimoniales*, to Juan Claros

de Guzmán (1518-1556), Count of Niebla, eldest son of Juan Alfonso de Guzmán, Duke of Medina-Sidonia.

Arderique: No dedication.

Belianis de Grecia, Parts I and II: Pero Suárez de Figueroa y de Velasco, "deán de Burgos y abad de Hermedes y arcedian de Valpuesta, señor de la villa de Cozcurrita [Zamora]," "suplicando se reciba con aquella voluntad con que todos los antiguos criados de vuestra casa son tratados." He was probably a younger son of the counts of Feria. In *Relaciones de los reinados de Carlos V y Felipe II*, ed. Amalio Huarte, II, Sociedad de Bibliófilos Españoles, 2ª época. Vol. 25 (Madrid, 1950), pp. 183 ff., can be found coplas of Bernardino de Avellaneda dedicated to Suárez, "mi señor"; the date is 1546, one year earlier than the first edition of *Belianis*.

"Criado" did not necessarily mean, in this context, *servant*, but could merely mean anyone supported by a noble and who lived with him. Cervantes signs himself *criado* in the dedications to the Conde de Lemos (as does Sancho in his letter to Don Quijote).

Belianis de Grecia, Parts III and IV: "El licenciado Fuenmayor, cavallero de la orden de Santiago, del consejo real y cámara de Su Magestad [Felipe II] mi señor." The dedication is by Andrés Fernández, the author's brother, who is the one who tells us how the continuation was written because Carlos V so much liked Parts I and II.

I believe that Fuenmayor, head of the council which granted the book's *licencia*, was Juan Díaz de Fuenmayor, to whom, after the King and the kingdom of Jaén, Argote de Molina dedicated his *Nobleza de Andalucía*.

Cirongilio de Tracia: Diego López Pacheco (1503-1556), second of this name, third Marquis of Villena. He was armed a knight in 1520 (Sandoval, *Carlos V*, BAE, 80, 208), and he was "al lado de Carlos V" in Italy (Fernández de Bethencourt, *Historia genealógica y heráldica de la monarquía española*, II [Madrid, 1900], 226), as was the Count of Astorga (v. *Florambel*, *infra*; Sandoval, BAE, 81, 366-67, also Pedro Mexía, *Historia de Carlos V*, ed. J. de Mata Carriazo [Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1945], p. 550, etc.).

Clarián de Landanís, Part I, Book I: Charles de Lannoy (1482-1527), *caballerizo mayor* of Carlos V and from 1522 viceroy of Naples. (On the honorary office of *caballerizo* see the description in the *Diccionario de Autoridades*.) An extremely important person, with whom the king jousted (Mexía, *Historia de Carlos V*, p. 86; on his later importance see p. 307 and *passim*). The book was allegedly "sacada de lenguaje alemán en italiano por Faderico [sic] de Maguncia obispo de Lanchano, por mandado del serenísimo rey Fernando de Nápoles, primero deste nombre."

—, Part I, Book II (1535 edition): Álvaro Pérez de Guzmán, Count of Orgaz, by "maestre Álvaro, físico suyo."

In the preface, the author says that "vuestra señoría... me mandó que una obra que ovo venido a sus manos, que fue principiada por otro, y es la segunda parte del muy famoso cavallero don Clarián de Landanís, de la qual no estavan aún escriptas treinta hojas, que la acabasse yo, porque fue informado vuestra señoría que la avía llevado a Sevilla e a Valladolid e a Toledo e a otras muchas partes para que la concluyessen."

Considering the lengths to which authors of romances of chivalry went to disguise their part in their works (see my article "The Pseudo-Historicity..." cited above, in n. 18), this statement, that he is concluding the work of another, could be untrue, and an imitation of the letter of "el autor a un su amigo" of the recent *Celestina*. However, I believe it is true, because there exist, in point of fact, two different continuations of Part I of *Clarián*, the one presently under discussion, and the one treated of immediately following; they are not continuations of each other. I have not been able to examine thoroughly the present book, usually called Part I, Book 2 (however, it and the following "true" Part II begin with the same sentence); probably a proper study would clear up this problem, though the longevity of the controversy over the *Celestina* does not permit excessive optimism.

Floramante de Colonia (Clarián de Landanis, Part II, 1550 edition): John III of Portugal (1502-1557), "por saber de cierto que a semejantes cosas sois tan inclinado."

Despite the fact that in the colophon the author of this part is stated to be Jerónimo López, "escudero fidalgo de la casa del rey d'Portugal," who we know wrote the following two parts, it has been noted by Gayangos, who had a good eye for such things (in Gallardo, *Ensayo*, I, No. 540), that in the verses at the end of the book, ostensibly written by "el trasladador" and directed to John III, there is an acrostic, formed by the first letter of each stanza, which spells Pedro Cabreor. Gayangos asks if Cabreor was a misprint for Cabrero, but it is not, and would be a most unusual Hispanic name. (It should be noted that in several places López refers to himself as the "trasladador," or translator; *trasladar* meant both to copy and to translate, as *traducir* was a much newer term and not as widely used.)

In any event, that Jerónimo López is not a pseudonym is firmly established by the fact that he edited (not wrote, as Gayangos, citing Cardoso, says, in *BAE* 40, p. lxxv^a) Fray João Álvares' *Cronica do... Iffante dom Fernando*, describing himself in the colophon of the first edition of 1527, which has since disappeared, with exactly the same words: "corregida e emendada por Ieronimo Lopez escudeiro fidalgo da Caza delRey Nosso Senhor" (*apud* João Álvares, *Obras*, ed. Adelino de Almeida Calado [Coimbra: Acta Universitatis Conimbrigensis, 1960], I, xx). In this case, the only way López could fail to be the true author would be if someone else published a three volume work, spread out over several years, under his name; this is unlikely in the extreme.

The identity and rôle of Cabreor await further investigation. I think it may be accepted, however, that there was no edition of this, the "true" Part II, prior to 1550, as Gayangos believed. Instead, the Toledo printer Villaquirán, who brought out the complete set (apparently he stopped printing from 1524 to 1530, which explains why Gaspar de Ávila, who had underwritten the printing of Part I, published Part IV; F. J. Norton, *Printing in Spain, 1501-20* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966], p. 54), mistook the work of "maestre Álvaro" as the true Part II and used it to make up his set, not noticing that Part III was not a continuation of his Part II.

Clarián de Landanis, Part III: John III of Portugal, "por un fidalgo de sua casa e criado a las migallas de sua mesa que ha por nombre Gerónimo López."

Lidamán de Ganayl (*Clarián de Landanís*, Part IV): Not stated, but clearly from the same author to John III: "O rey magno y bienaventurado, ¿por qué assí vuestra alteza se olvida de un menor siervo e criado suyo, no queriendo recebir ni aceptar mi trabajo y desseo por servicio?"

Claribalte: Fernando de Aragón (1488?-1550?). Duke of Calabria. The circumstances of this dedication are discussed in detail by Antonello Gerbi, in "El *Claribalte* de Oviedo," *Fénix*, 6 (1949), 385-90.

It was mentioned above (n. 9) that the Duke of Calabria had at his death many romances of chivalry in his library, including one (*Leonis de Grecia*) which would otherwise be unknown to us. In 1526, he married Germaine of Foix, who was the widow of Fernando el Católico and of the Elector of Brandenburg, and older than he; they held in Valencia a literary court, described in *El cortesano* of Luis Milán, who later had as patron John III of Portugal. When she died in 1537, he married Mencía de Mendoza (see *infra*, s.v. *Valerian*).

I have not been able to see Luis Querol. *La última reina de Aragón, virreina de Valencia* (Valencia, 1931).

Cristalián de España: Prince Felipe [II].

Espejo de caballerías, Part I (1533 edition): Martín de Córdoba y Velasco, "señor de las villas de Alcaudete y de Montemayor." "corregidor al presente en la imperial ciudad de Toledo."

——, Part II (1533 edition): Diego López de Ayala, "vicario y canónigo y obrero en la santa iglesia de Toledo." One of the most important figures in the sixteenth-century Spanish church, who already in 1516 was Cisneros' agent in Flanders.

Espejo de príncipes y caballeros [*El caballero del Febo*], Part I: Martín Cortés (1532-1589), second Marquis del Valle, son of Hernán Cortés.

——, Part II (1617 edition): No dedication.

——, Part III [and IV]: Lucas Rodríguez, Count of Melgar. This romance has introductory sonnets, which was unusual for a romance of chivalry: besides those of the author, there is one of a certain Núñez de Figueroa, "médico andaluz," to Rodríguez, one of Luis Díaz de Montemayor to the same, and one to the author from Lorenzo de Zamora, who two years later was to dedicate his epic *Historia de Sagunto* to Victoria Colona, the wife of Rodríguez.

——, Parts III and IV (1623 edition): Rodrigo de Sarmiento de Silva (1600-1664). Duke of Híjar and later a personage of considerable importance.

Febo el Troyano: Mencía Fajardo y Zúñiga, Marquise of los Vélez, "suplicando se reciba con aquella voluntad con que todos los criados de su casa son tratados." She was the widow of Luis Fajardo (†1575), second Marquis of los Vélez, son of the first Marquis, to whom *Floriseo* was dedicated. This romance has introductory sonnets of Luis Alariv, Josepho Roger, and Benito Sánchez Galindo, the latter of whom published the same year (1576) his *Christi victoria*.

Felix Magno (1549 edition): Fadrique de Portugal, bishop of Sigüenza and viceroy of Cataluña, who ordered it printed, by his "criado," who notes "aunque el principal officio de vuestra señoría sea la malicia eclesiástica, en el qual, como aya resplandecido, no ay quien no lo conozca y con grande admiración lo publique, no por esso se han embotado en vuestra

señoría los ejercicios militares, así por la línea y descendencia de sus reales progenitores, como por las virtudes y animosidad de su corazón."

Felixmarte de Hircania: Juan Vázquez de Molina, secretary of the *consejo de estado* of Felipe II, *trece* of the order of Santiago. He was a nephew of Francisco de los Cobos, secretary of Carlos V; see Hayward Keniston, *Francisco de los Cobos* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959), *passim*. In 1523 he was already a "criado" of Cobos (Keniston, p. 71). Cobos, Molina, and the author Ortega were all from Úbeda.

Florambel de Lucea: Pero Álvarez Osorio, fourth Marquis of Astorga, Count of Trastámara. An important figure in Carlos V's court, who was faithful to him during the *comuneros'* revolt, and who was at the head of the army in Italy during the sack of Rome.

The romance was written by a certain Enciso, his *criado*. See also *infra*, *Platir*.

Florando de Inglaterra: "A los caballeros, dueñas y donzellas de Ulixea" [Lisbon].

Florindo: Juan Fernández de Heredia († 1549), count of Fuentes (whom the author refers to as "mi señor").

Floriseo: Pedro Fajardo y Chacón (1477?-?), first Marquis of los Vélez, *adelantado* of the kingdom of Murcia. See Gregorio Marañón, *Vélez* (*supra*, n. 24), pp. 31-57.

——, Book 3 (*Reymundo de Grecia*): No dedication.

——, Part II (?), *Polismán* (Biblioteca Nacional ms. 7839): Juan Franco Cristóbal de Yxar, Count of Belchite.

Lepolemo (Seville, n. d., edition): Íñigo López de Mendoza (1493-1566), eldest son of Diego Hurtado (v. *supra*, *Amadis de Grecia*), and later fourth Marquis of the Infantado. The title "Count of Saldaña," which is all that appears on the book itself, was held by the oldest son of the Duke of the Infantado during the life of his father.

At his marriage in 1514 to Isabel de Aragón, cousin of Fernando el Católico, Fernando and Germaine de Foix were *padrinos*.

Lidamante de Armenia: Luis Enríquez de Cabrera, Duke of Medina de Rioseco (?). No one since Clemencín, *Biblioteca de libros de caballerías*, Publicaciones cervantinas, 3 (Barcelona, 1942), p. 36, has seen the printed edition. Clemencín gives the title as Duke of Medina-Sidonia, which must be erroneous; if this information is correct, the person whose biography is found in *CODOIN*, 97, 131-70 must be homonym.

Lidamor de Escocia: Fernando Álvarez de Toledo (1508-1582). Duke of Alba.

Olivante de Laura: Felipe II (by the printer, not the author).

Palmerín de Olivia: Luis Fernández (1482-1554) de Córdoba, son of Diego Hernández de Córdoba, Alcaide de los Donceles, to whom was dedicated the *Cárcel de Amor*. See Diego de San Pedro, 7th *Obras*, ed. Samuel Gili Gaya, Clásicos Castellanos, 133 (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1967), pp. xxviii-xxix, and Bethencourt, IX (Madrid, 1912), 53-60.

——, (1563 and 1566 editions): From Benito Boyer, who had the 1563 edition printed, to Juan Álamos de Barrientos, "capitán de S. M. y regidor de Medina del Campo."

Primaleón: Luis Fernández de Córdoba.

Platir (a continuation of the preceding): Pero Álvarez Osorio and María Pimentel (see *Florambel de Lucea*, *supra*; it is likely that they were

written by the same person, and they were published by the same printer, Nicolás Tierri). I believe that María Pimentel was the daughter of Alonso Pimentel (?-1528?), fifth Count of Benavente, who fought with Osorio in resisting the *comuneros*, and that she was widow of Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, who died in 1531, and mother of Íñigo (v. *supra*). *Florambel*, published in 1532, is dedicated to her husband alone, whereas *Platir*, of 1533, was dedicated to the two, suggesting a recent marriage.

Polindo (independent of *Palmerín* and *Primaleón*): No dedication.

Philesbián de Candaria: No dedication.

Policisne de Boecia: Antonio Álvarez Boorques, member of the order of Santiago, "gentilhombre de la casa real de su magestad [Felipe III], y veinticuatro de la ciudad de Córdoba."

Rosán de Castilla: Cristóbal de Guardiola, son of Juan Guardiola, of the "consejo supremo de su magestad."

Valerían de Hungría: Mencía de Mendoza (1508-1554), second Marquise of Zenete, second wife of the Duke of Calabria (v. *supra*, *Claribalte*). She herself was the widow of Henry, Count of Nassau, another friend of Carlos V. "¿Qué princesa cultivó con más fruto la literatura griega y latina? ¿En quién despertaron más fervor los estudios?" asks García Matamoros, *Pro adserenda hispanorum eruditione*, ed. and trans. by José López de Toro, Anejo 28 of the *RFE* (Madrid, 1942), p. 227. There is an extensive note on her in Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmus y España*, trans. Antonio Alatorre, 2nd ed. (México: Fondo de Cultura, 1966), p. 487.

It is noteworthy that the book was printed in Valencia, where she lived. Gayangos thought that in it were disguised the deeds of her father, Rodrigo de Vivar y Mendoza; I can neither confirm nor deny his statement at present.