

Seeing Cervantes as More than a Soldier, or How to Reframe our Portrait of the Artist

Rachel Schmidt

Our dominant image of Cervantes derives largely from the reference to “un soldado español llamado tal de Saavedra” (*Don Quixote*, II, 40) (a Spanish soldier, a so-called Saavedra), found in “The Captive’s Tale,” in which the author refers obliquely to his personal experience as a prisoner of war held by the Ottoman Turks in Algiers between 1575 to 1580. The captive describes Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra:

el cual, con haber hecho cosas que quedarán en la memoria de aquellas gentes por muchos años, y todas por alcanzar libertad, jamás le dio palo, ni se lo mandó dar, ni le dijo mala palabra; . . . y si no fuera porque el tiempo no da lugar, yo dijera ahora algo de lo que este soldado hizo, que fuera parte para entreteneros y admiraros harto mejor que con el cuento de mi historia. (*DQ*, I, 40)¹

(who, having done things that will be remembered by those peoples for many years, and all in order to gain his freedom, never received a beating, nor was it ordered that he be beaten, nor was he spoken badly of; . . . and if it were not for the lack of time, I would tell you now all that this soldier did, for it would be more entertaining and marvelous for you than my story.)

In this way, Cervantes hints of a greater story, circulating, yet not told, surely teasing the reader, but also pointing toward a connection with the parodied would-be military man, Don Quixote, who also imagines his feats circulating and ensuring his lasting fame. As he frames both himself and his literary

character in *Don Quixote*, Cervantes and Don Quixote share a burning desire for liberty. Escaping the machinations of the duke and the duchess's serving maid, Altisidora, Don Quixote declaims: "La libertad, Sancho, es uno de los más preciosos dones que a los hombres dieron los cielos; con ella no pueden igualarse los tesoros que encierra la tierra ni el mar encubre; por la libertad, así como por la honra, se puede y debe aventurar la vida, y, por el contrario, el cautiverio es el mayor mal que puede venir a los hombres" (*DQ*, II, 58) (Freedom, Sancho, is one of the most precious gifts heaven gave to men; the treasures that cover the earth and the sea are not its equal; for liberty, as for honor, one can and should risk one's life; captivity, to the contrary, is the worst evil that can befall men). The word *cautiverio* (captivity) calls to mind more parallels: Don Quixote expresses a desire for liberty after being subjected to the indignities of the fake trials orchestrated for him by the duke and the duchess, while Saavedra fights for liberty from the indignities of captivity. Both male characters desire freedom, and rank it equal to honor in the scale of social capital. Cervantes's self-portrait should be read, then, as an ironic distortion of dominant models or images for behavior rather than a mimetic reflection of his own being as he understood it. The implicit parallel between Cervantes and Don Quixote creates an association between author and character that is potentially uncomfortable for twenty-first century readers dutifully schooled in distinguishing between the two.² As David Castillo and William Egginton (C&E) argue in *Medialogies: Reading Reality in the Age of Inflationary Media*, Cervantes occupied a privileged view point of modern medialogy, and used it to "depict himself, us, his contemporaries, in the act of being formed by that medialogy" (216). In this vein, I will begin to explore the links between honor and masculinity that underlie the image of author and protagonist to try to reveal an ironic view embedded in Cervantes's self-presentation that has largely escaped our notice.

Economic and political crisis were linked in early-modern Spanish discourse with defective or effeminate masculinity. *Arbitristas*³ built their denunciations of the Spanish debt crisis, the devaluation of the coinage, and the increasing investment in rental properties based on *mayorazgos* (estates founded on primogeniture) rather than industry or agriculture on the metaphorical link between fiscal value and personal valor, both being coined *valor*. For example, the materially unproductive, or "'feigned money,' in the form of both credit and rent income, becomes the cause of indulgence and effeminacy" (Vilches 217). The upper aristocracy grew to depend on the income, the *censos* generated by large tracts of land, *mayorazgos*, ceded to them by the crown. This income guaranteed loans used to finance the lavish lifestyles required of nobles in their new role as courtesans. Nonetheless, the crown collected taxes from the nobles, and so doing created a vicious circle of dependency capable of emasculating the upper nobility economically and politically (Carrasco Martínez 42–43). Men of

the working classes were enrolled into military service for the Hapsburg Empire in a modern army. This new model was not based on the medieval one of noble knights offering service to their monarch. Such change involved a redefinition of the rights and responsibilities of all the social classes.

As part of the wave of print media produced in Cervantes's period, non-fictional genres proliferated that were dedicated to molding forms of masculinity suitable to this new social order: treatises on noble lineage, military behavior, dueling and *verdadera honra* (true honor). These non-literary genres bolstered the notion of male honor as a function of military prowess, proper education, marital control over women, and noble lineage defined to a greater or lesser degree in terms of *limpieza de sangre* (blood purity). Nonetheless, it is not misguided to approach male honor as ideology in the Marxist sense, as false consciousness covering (rapidly deteriorating) economic reality. The need to discipline male behavior so that individuals would conform to social orders, such as a hierarchical modern army, is made clear by Jerónimo Jiménez de Urrea when he labels dueling as the irrational loss of life and personal honor. Instead of dueling (which was declared illegal in 1563 by the Council of Trent), in the case of an offense between equals, he recommends seeking out the advice of the man most famed for his virtue, honor, and prudence in the land. Moreover, if the offense comes from someone of higher rank, one should seek the advice of a noble or prince: "pues el verdadero oficio de los Príncipes y Reyes es tener sus súbditos en paz" (Jiménez de Urrea 34r) (the true office of princes and kings is to keep their subjects in peace). The man possessing "true honor" is to find and hold his place in the body politic, trusting that his betters will protect his interest.

Even Cristóbal de Acosta's *Tratado en contra y en pro de la vida solitaria* (Treatise Against and for Solitary Life), which praises a life withdrawn from the honor-seeking crowd, nonetheless contains passages that reveal the ways in which anxiety concerning economic uncertainty and *limpieza de sangre* contributed to the crisis of masculine honor. In the closing section titled *Otro contra los hombres que mal viven* (Another Against Men who Live Poorly), Acosta denounces those who live by deceit, aiming to marry their daughters to sons of families of higher classes, buying silk clothes and ornate jewels to adorn themselves, and then failing to pay their debts (Acosta 225v–226r). In Acosta's critique of these "evil living men," the economies of both marriage and personal status signifiers, such as clothing, lead toward insolvency, as men trade in deceitful currencies unworthy of their true value. The concept of untainted lineage, which attained previously unseen importance during Cervantes's lifetime, also destabilized notions of honor. Thus, Francisco de Ávila argues for a *verdadera honra* based not on inherited nobility, but rather on noble actions. As he writes, "Yo digo que si hubiera una sangre sana y tan limpia que no inclinara a pecar, quisiera ser más de aquella que de cuantos

Césares tiene el mundo” (80v) (I say that if there were a blood so healthy and clean that it did not incline one to sin, I would want to be of that rather than of the one shared by however many Caesars there are in the world). Ávila’s stab at lineage-based nobility represents a minority position within the genre, but serves as a useful context within which to read Don Quixote’s discourse on the two types of family lineages, the inverted and the upright pyramid, as well as the frequently repeated phrase “hijo de mis obras” (son of my works).

Treatises explicitly directed at forming female behavior and family life also have at their core an anxiety about masculinity. By 1560, birth rates began to fall in the Kingdom of Castile, initiating a demographic decrease that did not reverse until the middle of the eighteenth century (Alvar Ezquerro 47–48). The drop in marriages between young men and women was due, in no small part, to the participation of these men in Spain’s foreign wars and colonial enterprise, leading to a restructuring of social roles at home. Foreign visitors to Seville, for example, noted the absence of young and middle-aged men in the port to the Americas, and commented that the city was left for the women to run (Perry 215). Pedro López de Montoya, in his *Libro de la buena educación y enseñanza de los nobles; en que se dan muy importantes avisos a los padres, para criar y enseñar bien a sus hijos* (Book on the Good Education and Teaching of Nobles, in which are Given Many Important Recommendations to Parents for the Raising and Good Instruction of their Children), compares the family unit to the body politic’s stomach from which issues the majority of a society’s ills since parents have not done their proper job instructing children in virtue and undoing the vices that accompany human nature (2r).⁴ What follows is a long treatise, mostly on the education of boys, to whom he would have assigned a male tutor, rather than to the mother. Fray Luis de León’s *La perfecta casada* (The Perfect Wife) also reveals concern about the way women’s behavior may be weakening men.⁵ Fray Luis cites the example of a young soldier who, upon returning home victorious in battle, presents his wet nurse with a gold chain, but his mother with only a silver ring. Fray Luis exhorts the married woman to take up breastfeeding so that her male child will have more of his father’s blood. He bases his argument on the belief that breast milk was coagulated blood; subsequently, the wet nurse’s blood made the boy a sort of bastard, endangering the father’s bloodline, the son’s nobility, and the family’s honor. Fray Luis even turns to masculine imagery to describe the mother’s role, asking who would take up the dangerous and burdensome *oficio* (service) of motherhood if not she: “No esgrima la espada el soldado, ni se oponga al enemigo, porque es caso de peligro y sudor” (León 234) (Let the soldier not wield the sword, nor oppose the enemy, because it is a dangerous and sweaty affair). Like the brave soldier who takes up his sword, in spite of danger and sweat, the good mother will take her son to the breast. Underlying this call to arms is the implicit anxiety found in much of this literature on family governance: that the “true man” in baroque

Spain might be a woman. In a society where *limpieza de sangre* played an ever increasingly important role in male honor, the power of the woman to subvert or uphold honor, based on blood lineage through her own sexual behavior, becomes ever more terrifyingly great.

Concurrent with this anxiety is an abundance of laws (or Law) promulgated by fiction and non-fiction defining what a man is to supposed to be. In the prologue to Part I of *Don Quixote*, Cervantes presents the desire to be told how to write the novel, his own desire for a master.⁶ Following Kant, Žižek recognizes that humans prefer a master to the anxiety of freedom, given that fully accepting freedom means taking responsibility for one's own existential and moral choices (91). In the move described by Kierkegaard, the master then becomes the Law, which, in turn, creates the desire to transgress that same Law: "The dialectic of Law and its transgression does not reside only in the fact that Law itself solicits its own transgression, that it generates the desire for its own violation; our obedience to the Law itself is not 'natural,' spontaneous, but always-already mediated by the (repression of the) desire to transgress it" (Žižek 90). In the prologue, Cervantes suffers from writer's block as he attempts to pen the prologue that convention demands. He splits his own authorial self into: 1) law-giver, 2) fictional friend who suggests that his novel be a parody of the chivalric romance, and 3) law-breaker, the likewise fictional self who seems to accede. Cervantes's silent assent to his friend's *razones* (reasoning) repeats a dialectic of Law and transgression at work as much in his novel as in the social norms created in this mediologistic era. Cervantes accepts his friend's reasons for writing *Don Quixote* as Law: "Con silencio grave estuve escuchando lo que mi amigo me decía, y de tal manera se imprimieron en mí sus razones, que sin ponerlas en disputa las aprobé por buenas y de ellas mismas quise hacer este prólogo, en el cual verás, lector suave, la discreción de mi amigo" (*DQ*, I, Prologue) (With a grave silence I was listening to what my friend was saying to me, and in that way his reasons imprinted in me, and without disputing them, I accepted them as good, and from them I tried to make this prologue, in which you will see, gentle reader, my friend's discretion). The rest of the novel transgresses these same reasons, for although it is a parody of chivalric romance, it is also much more than that. The actual body of the novel is the transgression of the stated authorial intention that would, in its turn, set itself up as a Law in the eyes of the reader. The novel becomes the ironic statement of the Law.

If irony is the weapon of choice in a mediatized world (Castillo and Eginton 184), then irony is more than meaning the opposite of what one says. It can be performed as a character, as the American comedian Stephen Colbert does (182), but it can also be spun into the long, complicated narrative that is the novel as a genre, in which it becomes an ironic, fictional world, defined as a space spun by the tensions between Law, liberty, desire, and transgression. It is because Cervantes ironizes the play between Law, liberty, desire, and trans-

gression that theories of the modern novel rooted in idealist and neo-Kantian thought use *Don Quixote* as their foundational text. As a young free-thinker, Friedrich Schlegel found in the witty humor created by the arabesque interweaving of scholastic idiocy and earthy stupidity, created through Don Quixote's and Sancho's interchange, the creative freedom necessary to both critique modernity and create a modern literary form in the novel.⁷ In the figure of the arabesque, a form of infinite assertion and contradiction, Schlegel posits the shifting grounds of the novel (Schmidt 2011, 73-78). This is the foundation that founds and unfounds, as it lays down a limit it turns back to transgress, in interwoven loops that carry their own unraveling. This notion of a form that contains within itself its own instability or openness repeats throughout theories of the novel based on *Don Quixote*, whether it be in the chasm that separates and binds the individual to modern society in Georg Lukács's thought, in the contradiction and dissonance of Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogism, or in the kaleidoscopic fracturing of vision in José Ortega y Gasset's perspectivism.

One of the many instabilities in *Don Quixote* is the way Cervantes struggles with the slipperiness of authorial power and intent. In Part II, Don Quixote realizes he is a media sensation, and traverses the long road toward disillusionment with his chivalric dream, just as Cervantes fumes over Avellaneda's appropriation of his literary creation. Authorship, understood as simple authorial intention, cannot exist in a society in which the print medium multiplies the image and the text. Don Quixote slips from Cervantes's hands as soon as the text hits the printing press. Even Don Quixote understands this: he has now been read by strangers, while a strange double goes in his stead to Zaragoza, a destination he decides he will forever avoid. The mediatized self becomes unfounded and bears within him/herself a profound rift. Like all rifts or splits, this space can become productive, whether for the author, the character, or the reader. Who would Alonso Quijano have been, after all, but a bored, lazy hidalgo if he had not split into Don Quixote, a persona inspired by the chivalric romance, made readily accessible by print media? Instead, he takes on armor, albeit rusty, and with it assumes a new masculinized image. We chuckle at the misadventures that occur when Don Quixote believes too completely that he is a sexually desirable and physically vigorous knight errant, presumably in the prime of his youth, rather than a bookish, single man in his fifties—think of his midnight tussle with Maritornes, whom he imagines to be the innkeeper's teenaged daughter. We also laugh at the arabesque humor of the conversation between Don Quixote and Sancho, for the master's continuous instructions to his servant about manners and self-control, as opposed to his servant's joyful disobedience, parody the very masculine conduct manuals described above (Martínez Góngora 108–110). The Law produces its own transgression; the arabesque spins out its contradictions.

Early reception of *Don Quixote* stems from the association of Cervantes

with arms *and* letters, and hinges on his use of Don Quixote as a weapon. The parodic split between the comical figure Don Quixote and the Spanish soldier *per se* erodes quickly—at least, in the novel’s reception outside of Spain. Already by 1625—only twenty years after the publication of Part I of *Don Quixote*—William Cross coined the phrase “Quixotes, Rodamantading braves,” which he further defined in a side note as “Vaine glorious braggarts,” to describe Diogo de Mendonça Furtado and his fifteen companions, who were captured by the Dutch on May 8, 1624, in Bahia, Brazil (Randall and Boswell 57). The comical Don Quixote merges with the soldiers defending the Hapsburg empire, stereotypically seen as arrogant braggarts; to wit, in accordance with the stock figure of the *commedia dell’arte* (Italian masked theater), the *capitane* (captain). The Byronic chestnut with which Cervantes smiled away Spain’s chivalry had roots in seventeenth-century European reception of *Don Quixote*, based as it is on the image of Cervantes as a satirical writer attacking his own countrymen. The French Jesuit René Rapin considered *Don Quixote* a satire of the Spanish nobility, who supposedly suffered from a disdain for intellectuals and an inordinate intoxication with chivalry, but his argument was based on the mistaken belief that Cervantes had served as the Duque de Alba’s secretary (Martínez Mata 499–500). Rapin’s ideas spread throughout Europe in another vehicle of print media authority, Louis Moreri’s *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique* (The Great Historical Dictionary). In this interpretive vein, Don Quixote is Cervantes’s weapon against Spanish nobility, by which Cervantes defends intellectual values while he deflates arrogant belief in an antiquated form of military practice. In other words, he is a military man of letters. In readings that insist strongly that *Don Quixote* is a parody of chivalric romances, Don Quixote serves as Cervantes’s weapon for literary cleansing. In the frontispiece to the 1738 Tonson edition, John Vanderbank and John Vandergucht depict Cervantes as a hyper-masculine Hercules Musagetes set to ascend Mount Parnassus to rid it of the monsters of the decadent genre of chivalric literature (Schmidt 1999, 51–55). Even here we see Cervantes, like Don Quixote, figured as a lettered, military man. In both cases, our author, be he a satirist or a parodist, appears as a muscular hero wielding the pen as a sword.

Even the more recent split between academic readers, dating since Juan Valera denounced Nicolás de Benjumea in 1861, stems from a shared image of Cervantes. Favoring a parodic literary reading, Valera argues against Benjumea’s interpretation by saying that Cervantes was heroic: “un soldado valiente, un hombre de mundo, y un aventurero corrido y experto” (167) (a valiant soldier, a man of the world, and an experienced adventurer and expert). Benjumea reads *Don Quixote* as a missive against Cervantes’s supposed enemies, such as the Spanish Inquisition and Juan Blanco de la Paz, because he “claimed that Cervantes’s intention was political reform as he called for a ‘new age of chivalry’” (Finello 61). Both see Cervantes as a soldier of letters,

thus merging the two sides of the ancient debate between arms and letters into the unified figure of the military author. This militaristic vision continues in the self-named Anglo-Saxon “hard” school of the second half of the twentieth century. The adjective “hard” is telling, for it claims an enclosed, rigid—dare I say, phallic—fortress of knowledge closed to readings that would allow the excesses of “soft” interpretations, which would include philosophical and historical ones. C&E make the point that the champions of the “hard” school fail to recognize Cervantes’s irony as in and of itself an “extraordinary contribution to the history of ideas” since it reveals how early modern selves, events, and objects, as well as authorial intent, were represented and signified in mediology (185). The questions remaining to be posed, then, are: how do we recognize the ironic ways in which Cervantes represented himself? How do we undo the mediology or mediologies that shape our vision of Cervantes, some of which he himself knowingly and ironically created, and others that have grown out of the mediatic and receptive processes that separate and shape us?

It is time to turn our attention toward other episodes of Cervantes’s life, ones that he chose not to represent in fiction, such as the years he spent collecting provisions for the Armada, his business activities, and his relations with the women in his household. The judicial proceeding into the duel that left Gaspar Ezpeleta dead—at the portal of the building where the Cervantes household lived—raises more questions than it answers, but it behooves us to linger with these questions. The accusations leveled against the Cervantes womenfolk as well as other testimony give sufficient cause to ask by what, if any, social measures our author could have been considered honorable? For example, Andrea de Cervantes, Miguel’s sister, deserves a second look. Andrea conceived Constanza out of wedlock with the noble Nicolás de Ovando, who had promised to marry her. Constanza, like her mother and her aunt Magdalena, was deceived by treacherous noblemen who would promise marriage, then enjoy a period of amorous relations, only to disappear. But Andrea was no fallen woman thrown into eternal disgrace. Instead, she led an engaged, active life, contributing her dowry to Miguel’s ransom from captivity, supporting her aging parents and her daughter by working as a seamstress, and winning legal guardianship of her daughter (230–231). Cervantes’s associates mentioned in the Ezpeleta affair, Simón Méndez (who had presented Miguel’s daughter Isabel with a *faldellín* [a short skirt worn under other longer skirts]) and Agustín Raggio, had legal difficulties related to their respective businesses (Canavaggio 42). Documents recently found show that Cervantes, in his role collecting provisions for the Armada, had daily contact both with rural poverty and with a powerful businesswoman. He had such a close working relationship with Magdalena Enríquez, the owner of the Seville factory holding an almost exclusive contract for producing hardtack for the imperial Armada and the American fleet, that she was authorized to receive his salary during

his absence from Seville in 1593 (Cabello Núñez 26). Another document from the same year testifies to the rural poverty Cervantes witnessed, for he could only collect 998 of the 5000 *fanegas* (bushels) of wheat requisitioned from the villages of Carmona, Utrera, Arahal, Morón de la Frontera, La Puebla de Cazalla, Marchena, Paradas, Osuna, Villamartín, and “otros lugares de Andalucía” (Cabello Núñez 31) (other places in Andalucía).⁸ Cristóbal de Barros commissions Cervantes for his trustworthiness and intelligence (“es necesario que haya persona ynteligente y de confianza” [Cabello Núñez 32–3] [it is necessary that there be [in this position] a trustworthy and intelligent person]) giving him the power to exempt from the tax those suffering hunger and poverty. These documents allow glimpses of a Cervantes, not a Saavedra, whose female relatives held jobs and entertained lovers, who had a close professional relationship with a very powerful businesswoman, who dealt first-hand with rural people suffering from poverty, and, as a businessman himself, met with influential men involved in questionable deals. And, he wrote ironic literature.

In the words of Todd W. Reeser, “As masculinity rules, so does the nation . . . The man who knows how to rule the house is like the man who knows how to rule the nation” (181). Up until now, the iconic image of Cervantes has been that of the masculinized ruler of the authorial word or the soldier wielding the satirical lance or plume. This is the ironic image Cervantes provided us. But have we taken the irony too seriously? How did Cervantes “rule” his house or his economic affairs? C&E, referring to the writings of Vattimo and Zabala, assert that “‘freedom’ is for the political reality of America what the theatrically propagated notion of ‘honor’ was meant to be for an early modern imperial power like Spain, a ‘condition of neutralization’ of true political alternatives” (14). Among the many parallels between early-modern Spain and contemporary America that C&E bring to our attention, we should add another: the reinforcement of masculine codes of behavior. Both the contemporary American construction of freedom and the early-modern Spanish construction of honor contain and confine models for normative and non-normative masculinity. Perhaps the actual relation of freedom to masculine honor in Cervantes’s Spain was a paradoxical one: the requirements of honor within the socio-historical realities of the time limited freedom understood as individual agency. Or, perhaps, the models of masculine honor and *verdadera nobleza* were more fictional than real. Perhaps something other than the construct of honor neutralized political alternatives. We need to ask this question about early-modern Spain, so we can, then, ask a similar question about the way masculinity is defined in today’s America vis-à-vis the ideology of freedom and the trope of blood. We need to ask how the mediatized language of masculinity maims and kills male and female bodies, both soldiers and civilians, on battlefields, divides and destroys societies through the phantom symbolism of blood, and creates a masculinity that allows for the proud and the powerful to prey, sexually and

otherwise, on the vulnerable, and then boast of it. And we also need to ask if we are trapped in the same mediology when we take the image of Saavedra, the hero, at face value.⁹

Notes

1. All translations unless otherwise noted are my own.
2. Upon returning to Spain Cervantes had to produce a defense of his behavior while captive in the *Información de Argel* (Information of Algiers), in which according to Goodman, “Cervantes emerges not a gentleman in the early-modern sense of the word ‘caballero,’ but a brave and virtuous old soldier, a ‘caballero’ of a type much closer to the model Don Quixote had in mind” (335).
3. *Arbitrista* is a term used to refer to individuals who offered economic and social reform plans.
4. In the dedication to Felipe II, López de Montoya states that his experience as an inquisitorial censor has shown him that Protestant heretical ideas infect the young. For this reason, he feels impelled to do his part in writing this book about educating noble children (sp).
5. In her interpretation of the image of Judith as the ideal woman in all her castrating power over the decapitated Holofernes, Georgina Dopico Black sees in Fray Luis’s own authorial stance a divided, androgynous self, caused by the feminization suffered as an effect of inquisitorial scrutiny (107).
6. C&E argue, following Žižek, for the need to become more conscious of our desire for ideological illusion (225). It would seem Cervantes preceded us here, too.
7. For detailed discussion of the theories of the novel mentioned in this paragraph, see Schmidt. It should be noted that, for Schlegel, both Don Quixote and Sancho could exhibit scholastic idiocy (*Narrheit*) and earthy stupidity (*Dummheit*) (Schmidt 2011).
8. One Castilian *fanega* was the equivalent of approximately 55.5 liters.
9. I would like to acknowledge the support of the Calgary Institute for the Humanities.

Works Cited

Acosta, Cristóbal de. *Tratado en contra y pro de la vida solitaria: con otros dos tratados, uno de la religión y religioso. Otro contra los hombres que mal viven*. Venice: Giacommo Cornetti, 1592. Print.

- Alvar Ezquerro, Alfredo. "La población española: siglos XVI al XVIII." *La sociedad española en la Edad Moderna*. Eds. Antonio Domínguez Ortiz and Alfredo Alvar Ezquerro. Madrid: Istmo, 2005: 17–81. Print.
- Ávila, Francisco de. *Diálogos en que se trata de quitar la presunción y brío al hombre*. Alcalá de Henares: Juan de Lequerica, 1576. Print.
- Cabello Nuñez, José. "Nuevos documentos para la biografía de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, un comisario real de abastos en los antiguos reinos de Jaén y Sevilla (1592–1593)." *Anales Cervantinos* 48 (2016): 13–51. Web.
- Canavaggio, Jean. "Aproximación al proceso Ezpeleta." *Cervantes: Bulletin of Cervantes Society of America* 17 (1997): 25–45. Web.
- Carrasco Martínez, Adolfo. "Las noblezas de los reinos hispánicos. Modos de integración y conflictos en la segunda mitad del siglo XVI." *Felipe II y el Mediterráneo*. Ed. Ernest Belenguer Cebriá. Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Conmemoración de los Centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, 1998: 17–60. Print.
- Castillo, David R., and William Egginton. *Medialogies: Reading Reality in the Age of Inflationary Media*. New York and London: Bloomsbury, 2017. Print.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. John Jay Allen. 2 vols. Madrid: Cátedra, 2004. Print.
- Dopico Black, Georgina. *Perfect Wives, Other Women. Adultery and Inquisition in Early Modern Spain*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001. Print.
- Finello, Dominick. "Notes on Nineteenth-Century *Quijote* Scholarship." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 7 (1987): 59–69. Web.
- Goodman, Robert T.C. "Origins of the Novel in Cervantes's *Información de Argel*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 83 (2006): 317–36. Web.
- Jiménez de Urrea, Jerónimo. *Diálogo de la verdadera honra militar*. Venice: Giovanni Griffio, 1566. Print.
- León, Fray Luis de. *A Bilingual Edition of Fray Luis de León's La perfecta casada*. Eds. and trans. John A. Jones and Javier San José Lera. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen P, 1999. Print.
- López de Montoya, Pedro. *Libro de la buena educación y enseñanza de los nobles; en que se dan muy importantes avisos a los padres, para criar y enseñar bien a sus hijos*. Madrid: Viuda de P. Madrigal, 1595. Print.
- Martínez Góngora, Mar. *El hombre atemperado. Autocontrol, disciplina y masculinidad en textos españoles de la temprana modernidad*. New York: Peter Lang, 2005. Print.
- Martínez Mata, Emilio. "La influencia del propósito anticaballeresco en la interpretación del *Quijote* (Siglos XVII y XVIII)." *Tus obras los rincones de la tierra descubren: Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de la Asociación de Cervantistas*. Eds. A. Dotras Bravo et al. Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2008. 495–502. Print.
- Perry, Mary Elizabeth. *Crime and Society in Early Modern Seville*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1980. Print.
- Randall, B.J. and Jackson C. Boswell. *Cervantes in Seventeenth-Century England. The Tapestry Turned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Print.

- Reeser, Todd W. *Masculinities in Theory: An Introduction*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. Print.
- Schmidt, Rachel. *Critical Images. The Canonization of Don Quijote through Illustrated Editions of the Eighteenth Century*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999. Print.
- _____. *Forms of Modernity. Don Quixote and Modern Theories of the Novel*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011. Print.
- Sliwa, Krzysztof. "Sobre Andrea de Cervantes." *Anales cervantinos* XXXVII (2005): 225–38. Print.
- Valera, Juan. *Sobre la estafeta de Urganda, o aviso de Cide Asam Ouzad Benengeli, sobre el desencanto del <<Quijote>>, escrito por Nicolás Díaz de Benjumea*. Londres: 1861. Madrid: Librería de A. Durán, 1861. Print.
- Vilches, Elvira. *New World Gold: Cultural Anxiety and Monetary Disorder in Early Modern Spain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010. Print.
- Žižek, Slavoj. *The Parallax View*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2006. Print.

Schmidt, Rachel. "Seeing Cervantes as More than a Soldier, or How to Reframe our Portrait of the Artist." *A Polemical Companion to Medialogies: Reading Reality in the Age of Inflationary Media*. Eds. Bradley J Nelson. *Hispanic Issues On Line Debates* 8 (2017): 111–122. Web.
