



Manipulation of Narrative Discourse: From Amadís De Gaula to "Don Quixote"

Author(s): Shannon M. Polchow

Source: *Hispania*, Vol. 88, No. 1 (Mar., 2005), pp. 72-81

Published by: [American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20063077>

Accessed: 27/06/2011 20:00

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aatsp>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Hispania*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Manipulation of Narrative Discourse: From *Amadís de Gaula* to *Don Quixote*

Shannon M. Polchow
University of California, Riverside

Abstract: There is no doubt that Miguel de Cervantes was heavily influenced by the romances of chivalry. While it is apparent that he found chivalric adventures and situations to parody in *Don Quixote*, he also found inspiration in their narratological structures. Current narratological studies of *Don Quixote* reveal that the text contains numerous narrative voices, including the extradiegetic voice of the supernarrator and the intradiegetic voices of the historian, translator, and Cide Hamete Benengeli. Looking specifically at *Amadís de Gaula*, one will see how these voices illustrate a common narratological link between *Don Quixote* and the chivalric tradition.

Key Words: *Amadís de Gaula*, Cervantes (Miguel de), Cide Hamete Benengeli, *Don Quixote*, historian, narrative voices, Rodríguez de Montalvo (Garci), supernarrator, translator

To say that Miguel de Cervantes and his fictitious creation Don Quixote were voracious consumers of the chivalric novel should surprise no one. Who could resist the world of chivalry with such entertaining characters as Tirant, Placerdemivida, Amadís, Arcaláus, and Urganda? Their exploits and predicaments kept consumers turning the pages and eager for the next adventure. While it is obvious that *Don Quixote* is a parody of the books of chivalry, it is not my intent to look at similarities in plot formation between the two, for that is a topic that has been discussed in some detail. My interest lies more with the similarities that exist in the narratological structure. Narratologically speaking, what did Cervantes appropriate from the *libros de caballerías*, specifically from *Amadís de Gaula*?

Before delving into the *Amadís*, it is pertinent to study *Don Quixote*'s narratological structure. In his groundbreaking article "The Narrator in *Don Quijote*: Maese Pedro's Puppet Show," George Haley expressed the following opinion about the complex narratological structure of Part I:

The characters in this corollary tale are all involved in the mechanics of telling and transmitting Don Quijote's story. Their adventures, not as violent as Don Quijote's but no less exciting for that, are the search for source materials in Manchegan archives, the creation of a continuous narrative from fragmentary and sometimes overlapping sources, the translation of the continuous narrative from Arabic to Castilian, the recasting of the translation and the publication of the revision, with intrusive commentary at every stage. (146)

As is evident in Haley's comment, there is a multitude of voices contained within the diegetic dimension, and, since his article, many have searched for some semblance of narratological order. Debates about who exactly is the narrator of *Don Quixote* have run the gamut, as we shall see. There appears to be a consensus that there exists a single narrative voice in the first eight chapters of the text. However, this accord abruptly dissipates when the reader reaches the following interruption:

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

desta apacible historia, el cual, siéndole el cielo favorable, le halló del modo que se contará en la segunda parte. (1.8; 63–64)

Who is speaking here? This question becomes even more complicated when the reader thinks of it in relation to the remainder of Part I. Is it somehow related to the new narrative voice that appears on the diegetic scene in chapter 9? How does it all fit together into the narrative plane? These questions have plagued a myriad of intellectuals, and the response to the question has been varied. Howard Mancing believes that it is best to apply Occam's razor and pare down the narrative choir to a narrative soloist, Cervantes himself. However, there are others who search to fine-tune Cervantes's polyphonic composition. For example, Haley asserts that this voice connects the first author's narrative fragment to the second author's tale. This voice steps in at the end of chapter 8, but disappears until the end of Part I when he materializes once again to impart concluding comments. Jesús G. Maestro contends that this is the voice of the *narrador-editor*, an extradiegetic, heterodiegetic narrator who will continue on as the second author, or the owner of that first-person narrative that commences in chapter 9. Alan Burch believes that this is the second author who announces his own entrance into the text prior to the commencement of his first-person narrative in chapter 9. The second author of Burch's diegetic scheme will also function as the extradiegetic narrator. Wayne C. Booth gives credence to the idea that this is a second narrative voice that filters the narration of Cide Hamete Benengeli.

While these are plausible explanations, James A. Parr has offered the most complete classification of the boisterous, sometimes cacophonous, narrative voices in my estimation, and his model will be the one utilized in this study. In his book *Don Quixote: An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse* and in numerous articles, he asserts that the first intradiegetic voice we hear is that of the researcher who appears in chapters one through eight. He explains that "This narrator is assigned the pose of an objective observer, but he is also given the liberty of first-person commentary [...] and it is he who initiates the quest for a reliable text, an adventure that frames Don Quixote's own benighted quest and a parallel and equally uncertain venture that we remain aware of throughout" (*Anatomy* 9). The historian searches through the Annals of La Mancha and other sources, then collates his findings in order to present the reader with what amounts to a critical edition of Don Quixote's story.

The intrusive voice that interrupts the narration at the end of chapter 8 to announce the entrance of a second author is dubbed the editorial voice or the supernarrator. Parr asserts that through careful examination of both Parts I and II of *Don Quixote*, this voice proves to be the extradiegetic narrator of the text. He explains that this voice "[...] plays the complementary role of principal narrator. [...] His is the critical voice, the editorial presence, so ubiquitous and outspoken throughout the two volumes. During those times when he is not commenting overtly on the other narrators, the characters, or the action, one assumes that he is silently going about his business of editing and ordering the text" (*Anatomy* 10). The supernarrator is responsible for the mundane editing procedures that are necessary for the text to take shape and he interrupts the text where he feels it is necessary. He does not write or translate, nor is he a character within the text. He is an anonymous figure who acts primarily as the editor of the text.

Besides the numerous metadiegetic narrators—Cardenio, Dorotea, and the Captive to name just a few—the other intradiegetic narrator of the text is the second author. He is the author introduced by the supernarrator at the end of chapter 8. He enters into the narratological scene in chapter 9 and explains how he found Cide Hamete Benengeli's manuscript and subsequently had it translated by an unknown *morisco*. His function is to find the continuation of the story and then bring it to center stage for other readers.

How does Cide Hamete Benengeli fit into the diegetic design? Cide Hamete is not a narrator; rather, he is a presence. Everything that he might state is filtered through the voice of the supernarrator by means of the "dice Cide Hamete" construction. Therefore, if he never explicitly says anything, he cannot be a narrator. If one desires to pigeonhole him, he would be labeled as the intra-intradiegetic narrator since his voice is twice embedded below the extradiegetic level (Parr,

“Cide Hamete” 103).

And yet, the list of voices does not stop there. There is a dramatized author of the prologue of 1605 who has his own voice. The interpolated story, “El curioso impertinente,” contains yet another. The reader hears the translator’s filtered utterances. Even the author’s writing utensil, his *pluma*, has its opportunity to join the polyphonic chorus at the end of Part II. With all of these narrative voices and presences at play, what exactly did Cervantes inherit from his chivalric predecessors? Given the impossibility of dealing with all of the chivalric romances in this short space, the present study will limit its scrutiny to *Amadis de Gaula*.

The Historian

In the *Quixote* of 1605, the historian is the voice that narrates the first eight chapters of the text. Within those chapters, he states the following: “Autores hay que dicen que la primera aventura que le avino fue la del Puerto Lápice; otros dicen que la de los molinos de viento; pero lo que yo he podido averiguar en este caso, y lo que he hallado escrito en los anales de la Mancha, es que [...]” (I.2; 26). Obviously other versions of Don Quixote’s tale exist. His is not the first rendition of the tale, nor will it be the last. While writing his depiction of the facts, the historian encounters a discrepancy within the stories that necessitates clarification; hence the need to consult the Annals of La Mancha. Through his perusal of the extant texts, he is able to describe accurately what he feels is Don Quixote’s first adventure.

This sort of historian is not an invention of Cervantes, but, rather, a feature that was utilized by preceding chivalric narrative. In the *libros de caballerías*, this particular type of historian has worked to conserve the text that we hold in our hands today. This historian figure appears in the prologue of *Amadis de Gaula*. As Edwin Williamson explains, “The narrative relations in the early *Amadis* books are [...] historical events once narrated by an ‘author’ and now being presented to us in a written version edited and updated by Montalvo” (52–53). *Amadis*’s tale, or at least the first three books, has already been preserved for posterity, and the historian has it before him. Regarding his role within this particular text, the narrator declares the following: “[...] deseando que de mí alguna sombra de memoria quedasse, no me atreviendo a poner el mi flaco ingenio en aquello que los más cuerdos sabios se ocuparon, quisele juntar con estos postrimeros que las cosas más livianas y de menor substancia escribieron, por ser a él según su flaqueza más conformes, corrigiendo estos tres libros de Amadís, que por falta de los malos escritores, o componedores, muy corruptos y viciosos se leían [...]” (I:223–24). It would seem that the contemporaneous editions that the historian has before him are in need of serious correction. It is his mission to create a more reliable version, one that is edited and emended, for the future.

The dramatized historian’s participation within the fourth and fifth books is more complicated. By “[...] trasladando enmendando el libro cuarto con las *Sergas de Esplandián* [...]” (I:224), not only does he act as a proofreader, he also translates and makes emendations to these particular sections of the text. In the case of the *Sergas de Esplandián*, which is the fifth book of Montalvo’s version, he has in front of him a text that has never before been accessible to the Spanish-speaking world. The narrative “[...] no es en memoria de ninguno ser visto, que por gran dicha pareció en una tumba de piedra, que debaxo de la tierra en una hermita, cerca de Constantinopla fue hallada, y traído por un úngaro mercadero a estas partes de España [...]” (I:224). If it were not for the work of the dramatized historian, the *Sergas de Esplandián* might still be untranslated and left to languish in oblivion.

The Translator

While the translator never addresses the reader directly in either part of *Don Quixote*, he is a presence within the text and what he is said to have said is sometimes paraphrased by the editorial voice. It is known that the current version of the text was written in Arabic and that the second author that appears briefly in chapter 9 of Part I has it translated into Spanish so he can read

the manuscript. The translator does appear in the text, but his comments are filtered through the supernarrator and, presumably, edited. For example, one reads in II.5 that: "Llegando a escribir el traductor desta historia este quinto capítulo, dice que le tiene por apócrifo, porque en él habla Sancho Panza con otro estilo del que se podía prometer de su corto ingenio, y dice cosas tan sutiles, que no tiene por posible que él las supiese; pero no quiso dejar de traducirlo, por cumplir con lo que a su oficio debía [...]" (485). This is not the only instance where this type of filtration occurs. Specific reference to the translator is made in II.24, when the editor notes: "Dice el que tradujo esta grande historia del original, de la que escribió su primer autor Cide Hamete Benengeli, que llegando al capítulo de la aventura de la cueva de Montesinos, en el margen dél estaban escritas de mano del mesmo Hamete estas mismas razones [...]" (604). Cide Hamete's marginal scribbles are announced and faithfully reproduced by the filtered voice of the translator.

Cervantes's predecessors utilize the translator and his narrative presence in various ways. It has been made abundantly clear that *libros de caballerias* display an elaborate genealogy of translation. The act of translation appears to give these narratives a more authoritative grounding since they were not just haphazardly written down, with creation as the principal purpose; rather, they were researched accounts, disseminated from one culture to another through translation and preserved for posterity by the almighty pen.

In *Amadís de Gaula*, the dramatized historian is not specific about the language of the original text. There is no mention in the first three books of whether they were originally translated into Spanish. However, an interesting scenario arises when it comes to the fourth and fifth books. The dramatized historian affirms that he was the one who translated both. While he is not specific about the details of the fourth book, he does give a detailed description of the discovery of the fifth, the *Sergas de Esplandián*. The original language of the first 98 chapters is not specified. All that is said is that this fifth book—which seems invariably to be published as a separate volume, since it is so long—is "[...] en letra y pargamino tan antiguo, que con mucho trabajo se pudo leer por aquellos que la lengua sabían [...]" (I:224–25). Thus, the dramatized historian functions as editor for the entire text and as translator for all but the last 85 chapters of the *Sergas*, which are rendered into Spanish from an original in Greek.

Cide Hamete Benengeli

If the first author of *Don Quixote* (I.1–8) speaks of various manuscripts of the knight's tale, this would mean that Cide Hamete Benengeli's text, discovered by the second author of I.9, is just one of many. As discussed earlier, Cide Hamete is not a narrator for he never speaks directly to a narratee. Each and every reference to the Moor is filtered through the voice of the supernarrator, the true narrator of the text. At one juncture, specifically II.24, the reader does hear the voice of Cide Hamete twice removed. One reads:

[...] llegando al capítulo de la aventura de la cueva de Montesinos, en el margen dél estaban escritas de mano de del mesmo Hamete estas mismas razones:

"No me puedo dar a entender, ni me puedo persuadir, que al valeroso don Quijote le pasase puntualmente todo lo que en el antecedente capítulo queda escrito: la razón es que todas las aventuras hasta aquí sucedidas han sido contingibles y verisímiles; pero ésta desta cueva no le hallo entrada alguna para tenerla por verdadera, por ir tan fuera de los términos razonables." (604)

While Cide Hamete's reservations continue beyond what is cited here, it is obvious that his remarks are filtered. His voice reaches us through that of the translator, which is in turn filtered by the supernarrator.

This filtration system connects Cide Hamete Benengeli to the *Amadís*, as has been postulated by Edwin Williamson. In chapter 9 of *Don Quixote* the narrator, Cervantes according to Williamson, but the second author according to Parr's typology, ceases to narrate his own text and introduces Cide Hamete Benengeli's text to the reader. After an elaborate explanation of how the manuscript was found and then subsequently translated, the second author introduces the actual

text with the following lead-in: "En fin, su segunda parte, siguiendo la traducción, comenzaba desta manera [...]" (I.9; 67). Passing narrating duties to a fictional character, Cervantes ceding his duties to Cide Hamete in Williamson's model, finds its precedent in the *Amadis* series.

In the *Sergas de Esplandián*, supposedly the fifth book of the *Amadis* series as Montalvo tells the reader in the prologue to his *refundición*, one reads of a similar situation where the narrator of the tale abdicates his duties and narration is handed over to a fictional character. Montalvo interrupts the narration of the *Sergas* in chapter 98 to relate the following:

Siendo ya mi ánimo y péndola cansados, y el juicio en gran flaqueza puesto, considerando el poco fruto que su trabajo alcançar puede en esta simple y mal ordenada obra por ellos emendada, temiendo que el yerro mayor no fuese de le poner fin, aviendo juntado dos tan leales amadores como la historia vos mostró, remitiéndola a aquellos que no solamente con sus sotiles y agudos ingenios podrian estos mis simples desvarios emmendar y corregir, mas aun siendo más dignos, con mucha mayor gracia y discreción proseguir en lo de adelante, si por ventura considerassen que sobre tan flaco cimientto como este alguna fermosa y perdurable obra levantarse podría [...]. (525)

Montalvo continues to relate the subsequent encounter he has with Urganda where she informs him that he is no longer allowed to work on Esplandián's tale until he has her express permission.

When Urganda grants Montalvo permission to commence writing once again, she also gives him access to a better manuscript from which he can work, that of Elisabad. This version is in Greek, a language the narrator apparently does not understand. Urganda explains that:

Este que aquí vees es aquel gran sabio, el maestro Helisabad, que escribió todos los grandes fechos del emperador Esplandián tan por entero como aquel que a los más dellos presente fue, como en este libro que vees se muestran. E porque aún tú no has visto ni podido alcançar el fin dello, sino solamente fasta que este Esplandián vido a su señora y se partió della en la fusta por la mar, assí como lo fallaron en la tumba de piedra en Constantinopla, por donde fue manifiesto, quiero agora, revocando el mandamiento tan premioso que te fize en que no procediesses más adelante en esta obra, que veas por este libro aquello que adelante sucede y de aquí lo llesves en memoria, para que poniéndolo por escrito sea divulgado por las gentes. Pues que gran sinrazón sería, sabiendo aquello que pasó fasta allí, como dixé, no gozassen de lo que no saben ni saber podrian si de aquí tú no lo llevasses. Y esto fago por te quitar del trabajo que passarías en lo componer de tu alvedrio, y aun porque no me fio de ti, ni estoy segura que tu juicio bastasse para tan grandes cosas contar. Y porque esto está en la letra griega, para ti es escusado leerla, pues que la no entenderías; lértelo ha en la tuya esta mi sobrina Julianda, que aquí viene. (548-49)

Julianda reads Elisabad's tale for Montalvo. He explains that after he left Julianda, "[...] me torné para mi casa, a la cual llegado, apartado de todos, tomando tinta y papel comencé a escrevir aquello que en la memoria traía, como agora oiréis" (550). From this point on, he relates the tale of the fictional character Elisabad, originally in Greek, just as the narrator relates the tale of the fictional character Cide Hamete Benengeli, originally in Arabic, in *Don Quixote*.

The Blossoming of a Supernarrator

The true narrator of the *Quixote*, following Parr's model, is what he has named the supernarrator. It is an editorial voice that appears on the diegetic plane at the end of I.8 when he explains that the first author, a.k.a. the historian, has left the scene and that a "segundo autor" will enter the picture and will find the remaining text. He was not satisfied with the cessation of the story with the swords of the two combatants left in mid-air. This supernarrator edits what has been previously written and gathered within this edition. He intrudes on the diegetic plane without notice, and his metaleptic moments range from commentaries on organizational structure to personal interjections.

There are various instances where the supernarrator interrupts the flow of narration in order to interject a commentary about the organizational structure of the story. Examples include: "Y así, le dejaremos ir su camino, hasta la vuelta, que fue breve" (I.25; 203); and "Pero dejémosle aquí, que no faltará quien le socorra; o si no, sufra y calle el que se atreve a más de lo que sus fuerzas le prometen, y volvámonos atrás cincuenta pasos, a ver qué fue lo que don Luis respondió al oidor, que le dejamos aparte, preguntándole la causa de su venida a pie y de tan vil traje vestido"

(I.44; 374). The editorial voice brings the narration to a sudden halt, leaving one character in mid-action while directing the reader's attention to other aspects of the story. In his book *Semiótica del Quijote*, José María Paz Gago explains that:

Las transiciones del objeto de la narración tienen lugar cuando se nos informa de las acciones paralelas de don Quijote y de otros personajes [...] fenómeno en el que se hace muy perceptible la acción del sujeto de la enunciación, especialmente en las formas verbales (*dejémosle, volvámonos*) en las que solidariza con los narratarios, esas proyecciones textuales de los receptores empíricos, que son invitados a dejar a un personaje y volver su mirada hacia otro. (104)

This is evident in the first example. The supernarrator allows Sancho to continue on his way to Toboso to find Dulcinea, and, while Sancho is traveling, he redirects the reader's attention to Don Quixote in the Sierra Morena. This technique will be more fully developed, almost to exhaustion, in Part II where the editor continuously interrupts narration to alternate between the simultaneous plot lines: Sancho on the island of Barataria and Don Quixote at the palace.

There are other first-person metaleptic moments where the supernarrator intrudes to offer his own personal interjections. The first order of interjections involves an outcry to God. Examples include: "¡Válame Dios, y quién será aquél que buenamente pueda contar ahora la rabia que entró en el corazón de nuestro manchego, viéndose parar de aquella manera!" (I.9; 68); "¡Válame Dios, y cuántas provincias dijo, cuántas naciones nombró, dándole a cada una, con maravillosa presteza, los atributos que le pertenecían, todo absorto y empapado en lo que había leído en sus libros mentirosos!" (I.18; 128); and "¡Oh, válame Dios, y cuán grande que fue el enojo que recibió don Quijote oyendo las descompuestas palabras de su escudero! Digo que fue tanto, que, con voz atropellada y tartamuda lengua, lanzando vivo fuego por los ojos dijo [...]" (I.46; 386). The first and third instances have been utilized by Parr and José Manuel Martín Morán to explain why the true extradiegetic narrator is the supernarrator (Parr) or second author (Martín Morán) and not Cide Hamete Benengeli. These are obviously Christian interjections and not the type of discourse that one would expect from a non-Christian historian.

A second order of personal interjections includes those comments made by the supernarrator to clarify the current situation. The supernarrator gives the reader his own personal evaluation of the situation, whether it is necessary or merely superfluous information. Examples of this type of metalepsis include: "Viole bajar y subir por el aire, con tanta gracia y presteza que si la cólera le dejara, tengo para mí que se riera" (I.17; 120); and "En esto, alzó los ojos y vio que su amo estaba parado, procurando con la punta del lanzón alzar no sé qué bulto que estaba caído en el suelo, por lo cual se dio prisa a llegar a ayudarle, si fuese menester [...]" (I.23; 173). Just as with the previous first-person metalepses, it appears that the supernarrator "[...] looms large behind the written text throughout, always ready to surprise us with an unanticipated intervention of one sort or another" (Parr, "Problems" 134).

The final set of interjections includes those where the supernarrator appears to reaffirm his position as the true narrator of the story. In contrast to the "dice Cide Hamete" and "cuenta Cide Hamete" interruptions, these metalepses incorporate a first-person narrative. Two examples include: "Digo que oyeron que daban unos golpes a compás, con cierto crujir de hierros y cadenas, que, acompañados del furioso estruendo del agua, pusieran pavor a cualquier otro corazón que no fuera el de don Quijote" (I.20; 139); and "Digo, pues, que como ya Cardenio estaba loco, y se oyó tratar de mentís y de bellaco, con otros denuestos semejantes, parecióle mal la burla, y alzó un guijarro que halló junto a sí, y dio con él en los pechos tal golpe a don Quijote, que le hizo caer de espalda" (I.24; 187-88). The utilization of the "digo" adds authority to the editor's voice. It reinforces the idea that what one reads in the text is being filtered through his perspective. Despite the insistence on "dice Cide Hamete," it is truly the supernarrator who has the final word.

This editorial voice begins to take shape within *Amadís de Gaula*. As with the *Quijote*, there are innumerable intrusions onto the diegetic plane. Voices irrupt from within the text at every turn. Before delving into the eye of the storm, it is imperative to start at the beginning by pointing to various intruding voices contained in the pages of this chivalric romance. After all voices have

been clearly defined, then an attempt will be made to determine who makes what utterance.

In *Amadis*, the historian / translator of the prologue takes on editorial tasks just as Cervantes's supernarrator does. He admits to correcting errors of a previous edition of the story along with translating and making emendations to the fourth book and to the *Sergas de Esplandián*. In the prologue, this historian / translator admits to the work that he has done with the *Amadis* through the use of the first person. However, right before the start of the tale, a voice breaks in and announces the following:

Aquí comienza el primero libro del esforçado y virtuoso cavallero Amadís [...], el cual fue corregido y enmendado por el honrado y virtuoso cavallero Garci-Rodríguez de Montalvo, regidor de la noble villa de Medina del Campo, y corregióle de los antiguos originales que estaban corruptos y mal compuestos en antiguo estilo, por falta de los diferentes y malos escriptores, quitando muchas palabras superfluas y poniendo otras de más polido y elegante estilo tocantes a la cavallería y actos della. (I:225)

Is this the same voice of the prologue, the voice of the historian / translator? If it is, the reference to himself in third person is uncharacteristic, since he just told us of his involvement with the text in first-person fashion. Perhaps referring to himself in third person is his way of giving more authority to his own text. Let us defer further speculation for the moment.

The vast majority of *Amadis de Gaula* is told in third person. However, there seems to be an interesting tension between the original author of the tale who tells the story in third person and an intruding voice that constantly interrupts the flow of narration with his first-person commentaries. The reader is forewarned at the onset that one Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo made additions and deletions to the original text. Could these intrusions belong to him? From the previous citation, it would seem as though he projects himself into the text as the editorial voice or supernarrator. It is announced at the very beginning that he will be intrusive, but exactly how intrusive is he and which intrusions belong to him?

The next voice to be examined calls specific attention to what is contained within the story and it highlights the technique of the author. Various simultaneous plot lines populate the tale. According to Williamson, "As the surface of the romance becomes densely peopled with secondary characters and profuse in adventures taking place over a vast geographical area, the author must intervene more directly in the narrative in order to give it shape and meaning" (48). An impersonal technique is used to transition from one thread of action to another. Impersonal transitions from one developing plot line to the next include: "El autor dexa de fablar desto y torna al [...]" (I:253); "El autor aquí torna a contar del [...]" (I:262) and "Aquí retrata el autor [...]" (I:359). A similar impersonal construction is utilized to refocus the action from one character to another. Instead of making reference to the author, there is reference made to the story and to the book itself. Some examples include: "Torna la istoria a contar [...]" (I:643); "esta grande istoria delante vos contará" (I:644); and "la historia vos lo mostrará adelante" (I:361). In the *Amadis*, it would appear that these citations, especially those referencing the author, are made by a voice other than that of the author. Why would the author of the text refer to himself in third person?

While this impersonal construction may not be an obvious presence of an editorial voice, since it could be merely a nuance of the writing style, there are many first-person metalepses in the text that would hint at more than one narrative voice involved in the telling of this tale. An intrusive voice seems to take the authoritative mantle away from the author of the story (who is constantly referred to) and instead establish himself as the authoritative figure. He interrupts narration to emphasize facts that he has personally relayed to the reader as opposed to the "autor." Phrases such as "como vos digo" (I:253) and "pero dígoos" (I:519) are interspersed throughout the story. This voice also intrudes to inform the reader when he wants something specifically known. He starts narrating a chapter by stating what he hopes to relay to the reader. It is written that: "Deste valiente y esforçado cavallero don Florestán quiero que sepáis cómo y en qué tierra fue engendrado y por quién" (I:625). When there is background information that needs to be divulged, this voice interrupts with this "quiero que sepáis" construction, as in the example: "Quiero que sepáis por cuál razón Amadís fizó este villancico por esta infanta Leonoreta" (I:768).

These first-person metalepses also occur when this voice wants to make his opinions known. Perhaps this is his way of accentuating his authority over the text. He will present situations, pose hypothetical questions, and then give his response to the question. When discussing how Amadís was victorious at the *Ínsula Firme*, the voice relates the following:

Pues si desto tal gloria y fama alcançó, júzguento aquellos que las grandes cosas con las armas trataron, vencedores y vencidos, los primeros sintiendo en sí lo que este cavallero Amadís sentir pudo, y los otros la victoria esperando, al contrario convertida, la desventura suya llorando; pues, de estos dos extremos, ¿cuál havremos el mejor?; por cierto, digo, qu'el primero, según la flaqueza humana, que medida no tiene, puede atraer con sobervia grandes pecados, y el segundo, gran desesperación. (I:675)

There are many other occasions where this voice will pose a question and then provide the supposedly correct answer for the reader. When Amadís enters into the *Peña Pobre*, the voice slips into a tangential train of thought. He rambles: “¿Pues era razón que de un cavallero tan vencido, tan sojuzgado, con causa tan liviana piedad se oviesse para de allí le sacar con dobladas vitorias que las passadas? Diría yo que no, si las cosas por él hechas en tan gran peligro suyo no se redundasen en tanto provecho de aquellos que, después de Dios, otro reparo si el suyo no tenían” (I:712). When an opinion is needed, this voice never seems to be at a loss for words. He is more than willing to let the reader know what he is thinking.

Not only does this voice incorporate his own thoughts into the text, there is also the imposition of a moralizing dimension, just as in *Don Quixote*. While the editorial voice of *Don Quixote* makes infrequent comments on contemporary social issues, it is really within the interpolated tale, “El curioso impertinente,” where the moral voice blossoms. In *Amadís*, it remains to be seen whether the previous voice and this moralizing voice are one and the same. It would appear that this voice is definitely the same as that contained within the prologue. The narrator of the prologue warns his reader about those histories that incorporate fabricated material into their tales but goes on to elucidate what good may come from them. He states:

Pues veamos agora si las afrentas de las armas que acaescen son semejantes a aquella que cuasi cada día vemos y passamos, y alun por la mayor parte desviadas de la virtud y buena conciencia, y aquellas que muy estrañas y graves nos parecen sepamos ser compuestas y fengidas, ¿qué tomaremos de las unas y otras, que algún fruto provechoso nos acarreen? Por cierto, a mi ver, otra cosa no salvo los buenos enxemplos y doctrinas que más a la salvación nuestra se allegaren, porque seyendo permitido de ser imprimida en nuestros coraçones la gracia del muy alto Señor para a ellas nos llegar, tomemos por alas con que nuestras ánimas suban a la alteza de la gloria para donde fueron criadas. (I:223)

It would seem that this voice follows his own advice. Whether his text is based solely on history or whether it incorporates embellished fictitious points, there are numerous situations where he will bring the narration to a sudden stop to give moral lessons to various populations of narratees. For example, he ceases describing the action in order to address powerful but covetous land barons. He explains:

Tomad enxemplo, codiciosos, aquellos que por Dios los grandes señoríos son dados en gobernación, que no solamente no tener en la memoria de le dar gracias por vos aver puesto en alteza tan crecida; mas contra sus mandamientos, perdiendo el temor a Él devido, no seyendo contentos con aquellos estados que vos dio, y de vuestros antecessores vos quedaron, con muertes, con fuegos y robos los agenos de los que en la ley de la verdad son, queréis usurpar y tomar, fuyendo y apartando los vuestros pensamientos de bolver vuestras sañas y codicias contra los infieles, donde todo muy bien empleado sería, no queriendo gozar de aquella gran gloria que los nuestros Católicos Reyes en este mundo y en el otro gozan y gozarán; porque sirviendo a Dios con muchos trabajos lo fizieron. Pues acuérdeseos que los grandes estados y riquezas no satisfazen los codiciosos y dañados apetitos, antes en muy mayor cantidad los encienden. (I:641–42)

No matter whom the voice is addressing, the message always remains the same: one must always search for a way to serve God, no matter what one's position in life may be.

In addition to first-person singular metalepses, a new metaleptic dimension is included in the *Amadís*: first-person plural metalepses. This construction is mostly used to move from one plot

line to another as well as to draw attention to the art of story-telling. While following two simultaneous plots lines, a voice will intrude to refocus the reader's attention from one character to the next. Examples include: "La donzella se fue su vía, y Agrajes, despedido del Rey y de Amadís, donde le dexaremos fasta su tiempo" (I:330); "Donde los dexaremos holgar y descansar, y contaremos que le avino a don Galaor en la demanda del Rey" (I:575); and "Mas dexemos agora esto y tornemos al Rey, qué hizo después que libre fue" (I:581). There are also numerous intrusions by this first-person plural voice such as "Mas agora os contaremos lo que a esta sazón aconteció al Rey [...]" (I:561), where the voice emphasizes the actual telling of the story at hand. These might be considered instances of the true "editorial we."

A final facet of this narrative dissonance is the voice that intrudes onto the text to inform the reader of future events that are unknown at that particular juncture. In the first book, it makes reference to events that will be told in the fourth. It is written that: "Ya tiempo fue que esta palabra que allí dixo aprovechó mucho a la dueña, así como en el cuarto libro desta istoria os será contado" (I:444). Unless the author already has his future books and their contents mapped out precisely, this comment appears to emanate from someone who has perhaps read through the entire collection beforehand and is making additions to the text. A more convincing example of this would be when the voice specifically mentions the *Sergas de Esplandián*. This voice states that: "Y así acaeció adelante como lo el Emperador dixo, hasta que fue tornado a la mano de aquella donde salió por aquel que passando tres años sin verla muchas cosas en armas fizo y muy grandes cuitas y passiones por su amor sufrió, así como en un ramo que desta historia sale se recuenta, que *Las Sergas de Esplandián* se llama, que quiere tanto dezir como las proezas de Esplandián" (II:1171).

Now that the voices contained within *Amadís de Gaula* have been delineated, it seems appropriate to seek some sense of order within the seeming chaos. Even though the majority of the text is told in third person, it appears that the "quiero" constructions and the first-person-singular metalepses are the voice of the original author of the text. This appears to be even more evident when one takes into consideration the first-person-plural metalepses along with the references made to "el autor." It is my contention that the use of the "nosotros" construction and this reference to the author of the story are techniques employed by the editorial voice, also known as the supernarrator of the text; that is, the projection of the voice of the historian / translator, Garcí Rodríguez de Montalvo. In a sense, he acts as a historian through his attempt to create a more perfect text of *Amadís de Gaula* and he is also a translator. The reader is specifically told that Montalvo has deleted and added information to the text, a role that an editor would assume. One can speculate about the "why" behind the use of "nosotros." I would contend that this is the editorial voice blending his voice with that of the original author. If the original author has laid claim to the "yo" construction, one way for the editorial voice to retain some authority over the text is to fuse his voice with that of the author. Granted, this could merely reflect inconsistency in the use of the "yo" and the "nosotros" forms. However, I would like to think that there is something more behind this phenomenon.

Some first-person-singular interjections are still difficult to attribute to one voice or the other, even if one follows the premise that the original author makes the first-person-singular statements. The moralizing metalepses could only have been made by the editorial voice. *Amadís's* tale is supposed to have taken place not many years after the Passion of Christ (I:227). If this is the case, then there is absolutely no way the original author could have made certain textual comments, such as those references made specifically to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabel. In addition, Montalvo informs the reader of the following: "[...] en los cuales cinco libros como quiera que hasta aquí más por patrañas que por crónicas eran tenidos, son con las tales enmiendas acompañados de tales enxemplos y doctrinas, que con justa causa se podrán comparar a los livianos y febles saleros de corcho, que con tiras de oro y de plata son encarcelados y guarnescidos, porque así los cavalleros mancebos como los más ancianos hallen en ellos lo que a cada uno conviene" (I:225). With this in mind, it appears evident that the moralizing metalepses belong to the editorial voice of the "second author," Montalvo, and not to the original author. By extension, those

hypothetical situations where the voice answers his own questions can also be attributed to the voice of this supernarrator since they each possess a moral flair.

The references to events that will be narrated in the future, specifically the mention of the *Sergas de Esplandián*, are another problematic area. Setting aside the extrafictional fact that Montalvo did indeed write the fifth book in the *Amadis* series, it is difficult to pinpoint who makes these utterances. If the original author of the tale did have a set plan and design for his *Amadis* series, then it is possible that he made them. However, there is always that lingering possibility that Montalvo made these utterances. I would like to say that Montalvo inserted these future references even though there is a nice story included as to how this text was hidden from the generation contemporaneous to Montalvo, but that would be depending on extratextual knowledge and not on what the text tells us. Therefore, I will let each individual draw her own conclusions. No matter how one decides on this particular instance, it is evident that, narratologically speaking, *Amadis de Gaula* is more complex than one might have expected at first glance. This narratological smorgasbord contains "[...] técnicas embrionarias de lo que posteriormente en manos cervantinas constituirán algunos de los ejes fundamentales sobre los que se articula la novela moderna" (Cacho Bleuca 102). In the work as a whole, there is definitely the presence of an editorial voice, or a supernarrator, contained within *Amadis de Gaula*, an entity that will be developed and refined in *Don Quixote*.

There is no doubt that Miguel de Cervantes was greatly influenced by the *libros de caballerías*. While he found chivalric adventures and situations to parody in *Don Quixote*, he went further than that by appropriating the narratological structure of various books of chivalry. While the use of historians and translators provides a common narratological link between *Don Quixote* and the *libros de caballerías*, the idea of the supernarrator is something that seems to be much more developed in Cervantes's text. The supernarrator, or editorial voice, is both a more dominant presence and more readily distinguishable from the author himself. While he is less assertive in Part I, he comes into his own in Part II. Although some may see these similarities as mere parody of the books of chivalry, they are much more than that. This style of narration is also prevalent in his other narrative works. Although Cervantes had little formal education, he obviously went to school in the books of chivalry for important dimensions of his narrative technique, specifically the use of a translator, of an editorial voice or supernarrator, and frequent recourse to metalepsis.

WORKS CITED

- Booth, Wayne C. "The Self-Conscious Narrator in Comic Fiction before *Tristram Shandy*." *PMLA* 67 (1952): 163-85.
- Burch, Alan. "Don Quixote and Narratology: The *Segundo Autor* as Extradiegetic Narrator." *Brave New Words*. Ed. Edward H. Friedman and Catherine Larson. New Orleans: UP of the South, 1996. 113-23.
- Cacho Bleuca, Juan Manuel. Introducción. *Amadis de Gaula*. By Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo. 2 vols. Madrid: Cátedra, 2001. I: 19-216.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. Salvador Fajardo and James A. Parr. Asheville, NC: Pegasus, 1998.
- Haley, George. "The Narrator in *Don Quijote*: Maese Pedro's Puppet Show." *MLN* 80 (1965): 145-65.
- Maestro, Jesús G. "El sistema narrativo del *Quijote*: la construcción del personaje Cide Hamete Benengeli." *Cervantes* 15 (1995): 111-41.
- Mancing, Howard. "Cervantes as Narrator of *Don Quijote*." *Cervantes* 23 (2003): 117-40.
- Martín Morán, José Manuel. *El Quijote en ciernes: los descuidos de Cervantes y las fases de elaboración textual*. Torino: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1990.
- Parr, James A. *Don Quixote: An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1988.
- . "The Role of Cide Hamete Benengeli: Between Renaissance Paradox and Baroque Emblematics." *Indiana Journal of Hispanic Literatures* 1 (1992): 101-14.
- . "Some Narratological Problems in *Don Quixote*: Five Instances." *Studies in Honor of Donald W. Bleznick*. Ed. Anita Stoll et al. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1995. 127-42.
- Paz Gago, José María. *Semiótica del Quijote*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995.
- Rodríguez de Montalvo, Garci. *Amadis de Gaula*. 2 vols. Ed. Juan Manuel Cacho Bleuca. Madrid: Cátedra, 2001.
- . *Sergas de Esplandián*. Ed. Carlos Sainz de la Maza. Madrid: Castalia, 2003.
- Williamson, Edwin. *The Half-way House of Fiction: Don Quixote and Arthurian Romance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.