

## “En blanco y sin figura”: Prologue, Portrait, and Signature in Cervantes’ *Novelas Ejemplares*

Javier Lorenzo  
*East Carolina University*

To assess the influence of *Don Quijote*, and of the Cervantine oeuvre in general, on Hispanic letters is certainly a daunting task. The legacy of creativeness and innovation that pervades the works of “el manco sano,” as he is admirably called in the prologue of the *Persiles*, is so diverse and staggering that one might feel tempted to conclude, with Alejo Carpentier, “que todo está ya en Cervantes” (qtd. in González Echevarría par. 1).<sup>1</sup> Indeed, most of the narrative strategies and defining attributes that we currently identify with modern and postmodern fiction are already established, or at least hinted at, in the pages of *Don Quijote*, the *Persiles*, and the *Novelas ejemplares*: the use of the self-conscious narrator; the juxtaposition of various levels of fictionality; the questioning of reality through the manipulation of point of view; the integration and combination of different genres and literary styles; the emergence of the autonomous character. These are some of the features that have secured Cervantes a place of honor in Hispanic and world literature and that have endeared him to countless generations of readers. The purpose of this essay is to explore another innovative aspect of the Cervantine heritage: the prologues. If the author of *Don Quijote* is commonly known as “el padre de la novela moderna,” he is also “uno de los escritores con los que el prólogo alcanza sus más altas cimas” (Martín 1) in the history of Hispanic letters. These “cimas” are often climbed in an experimental and playful mood that rejects the well-trodden path of tradition. A good example of this is the prologue of *Don Quijote* part one, in which Cervantes resorts to a dialogue between the prologuist and a resourceful friend to provide the substance of the preface and to mock the conventional nature of all prologues. Another example is the *Novelas ejemplares*, in which the prologue occupies the empty space left by a portrait of the author that a friend forgot to insert at the beginning of the book:

Quisiera yo, si fuera posible, lector amantísimo, excusarme de escribir este prólogo, porque no me fue tan bien con el que puse en mi *Don Quijote*, que quedase con gana de segundar con éste. Desto tiene la culpa algún amigo . . . el cual amigo bien pudiera, como es uso y costumbre, grabarme y esculpirme en la primera hoja deste libro, pues le diera mi retrato el famoso Juan de Jaúrigui . . . En fin, pues ya esta ocasión se pasó y yo he quedado en blanco y sin figura, será forzoso valerme por mi pico, que aunque tartamudo, no lo será para decir verdades, que dichas por señas, suelen ser entendidas. (50-51)<sup>2</sup>

The reference to *Don Quijote* is not accidental. It is a sign to let the reader know that this is also a subversive and non-conventional prologue; another exercise on literary experimentation like the one that the reader saw in the first part of the *Quijote*. What does Cervantes’ experiment consist of in the *Novelas*? For one thing, Cervantes alters the common topography of the Golden Age book, which divides the paratext into a series of discrete and well-defined units: “tasa,” “fe de erratas,” “privilegio,” “aprobación,”

“retrato,” “dedicatoria,” “prólogo” and “poemas laudatorios.”<sup>3</sup> Two of those units, portrait and prologue, are presented as coterminous and virtually interchangeable in Cervantes’ preface. More important than this, however, is the fact that the prologue of the *Novelas* calls into question, as I will argue in this essay, one of the ruling fictions that govern most prologues: the idea that the author is actually “present” in the preface and that he becomes readily available there to the reader through a moment of total transparency and disclosure.<sup>4</sup> Such an idea is constantly debunked in Cervantes’ work, not only in his prologues but also in his fiction, which at times seems to unveil, as Mary Gaylord Randel observes, “these most transparent figures” (93) of the author only to make them vanish in the fog of the text (think, for instance, of the reference to *La Galatea* and its author that the priest makes in the burning of Don Quijote’s library in I. 6, and his remarks regarding *La Numancia* and other praiseworthy *comedias* in his invective against modern playwrights in I. 48). This teasing game of appearance and disappearance takes center stage in the *Novelas* through the device of the portrait and the declaration of textual paternity that Cervantes makes in the second part of the prologue. These two moments represent, as I will suggest in these pages, moments of “signature,” that is, instances of authorial inscription that allow us to catch a glimpse of Cervantes “on deck” in the text. That glimpse, however, is deceitful and ambiguous, for it reveals both the presence and the absence of the author. The signatures that Cervantes appends to his text are therefore unreliable and contradictory. They erase the figure of the author at its moment of maximum visibility.

The first example of “signature” that I will examine in the *Novelas* is the self-portrait of the artist that Cervantes includes in the opening paragraph of the prologue. In order to understand the signatorial function of this portrait we need first to take a brief look at the relation between books and portraiture that began to develop in Europe from the middle of the sixteenth century onwards. This relationship was the result of the coming together of two powerful forces: printing and copper engraving. The combined use of these two brand new technologies had an immediate impact on the way books were received and on the standards of popularity enjoyed by Renaissance authors. The pattern portraits and detailed engravings that started to appear in the front pages of early modern books made the faces of writers more easily identifiable and brought them into the gaze of an immense audience limited only by its ability to buy and read the book. As Leo Braudy observes:

With the expansion of the book trade in the sixteenth century and especially with the increasing use of copper engraving (previously considered too expensive) after the middle of the century to supply portraits more detailed than the old woodblocks, printed portraiture becomes a widespread way to merchandise faces other than royal. (304)

If the interaction between printing and copper engraving made the faces of authors more popular and recognizable, it also disseminated in the sphere of books the notion of “contextual self-projection,” a technique of authorial representation that had been used in painting for decades. Contextual self-projection refers to “any representation of the author inserted into a work that he claims, one way or another, to have created” (Stoichita 200). The insertion of the authorial figure in the pictorial work

can be done in a variety of ways: the author may play the role of a character in the scene of the painting, as for example El Greco does by representing himself as a shepherd kneeling down in *The Adoration of the Shepherds* (fig. 1); he may appear in the painting as himself, without playing any roles or wearing any masks, as Velázquez does in *Las Meninas* (fig. 2); or he may enframe himself in the painting in the shape of a portrait, as in the case of Perugino in the murals that adorn the interior of the building of the *Cambio*



Fig. 1. El Greco, *Adoration of the Shepherds*, Museo del Prado, Madrid.



Fig. 2. Velázquez, *Las Meninas*, Museo del Prado, Madrid.

or stock-exchange in Perugia (figs. 3 and 4). This last modality seems particularly relevant for the study of the prologue of the *Novelas ejemplares*. What we read in Cervantes' preface looks very much like a written version of the



Fig. 3. Perugino, *Interior of the Audience Chamber*, Collegio del Cambio, Perugia.



Fig. 4. Perugino, *Self-Portrait*, Interior of the Audience Chamber, Collegio del Cambio, Perugia.

kind of authorial self-projection that we see in Perugino's murals in Perugia. Like Perugino, Cervantes depicts himself "as a portrait" and inserts his image into his work, which he then accompanies by a long *vita* or summary account of his life:

Este que véis aquí, de rostro aguileño, de cabello castaño, frente lisa y desembarazada, de alegres ojos y de nariz corva, aunque bien proporcionada; las barbas de plata, que no ha veinte años que fueron de oro, los bigotes grandes, la boca pequeña, los dientes ni menudos ni crecidos, porque no tiene sino seis, y esos mal acondicionados y peor puestos, porque no tienen correspondencia los unos con los otros; el cuerpo entre dos extremos, ni grande, ni pequeño, la color viva, antes blanca que morena; algo cargado de espaldas y no muy ligero de pies; éste digo que es el rostro del autor de *La Galatea* y de *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, y del que hizo el *Viaje del Parnaso*, a imitación del de César Caporal Perusino, y otras obras que andan por ahí descarriadas, y, quizá, sin el nombre de su dueño. Llámase comúnmente Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Fue soldado muchos años, y cinco y medio cautivo, donde aprendió a tener paciencia en las adversidades. Perdió en la batalla de Lepanto la mano izquierda de un arcabuzazo, herida que, aunque parece fea, él la tiene por hermosa, por haberla cobrado en la más memorable y alta ocasión que vieron los pasados siglos, ni esperan ver los venideros, militando debajo de las vencedoras banderas del hijo del rayo de la guerra, Carlo Quinto, de felice memoria. (51)

The combination of portrait and biographical account that Cervantes employs in his prologue evokes the Renaissance genre of "the lives of the artists." The most popular of these "lives," Vasari's *Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori et architettori* (1550), included in its second edition (1568) portraits of all the artists featured in the first edition along with their corresponding biographies. Vasari's decision to combine portrait and biography had a significant editorial impact, spawning a new genre of literature devoted to the dissemination of the deeds and images of modern humanist heroes, as for instance Jean Jacques Boissard and Theodor de Bry's four-volume *Icones virorum illustrium et praestantium* (Frankfurt 1597-99) and Francisco Pacheco's *Libro de descripción de verdaderos retratos, de ilustres y memorables varones* (Sevilla, 1599).<sup>5</sup> Cervantes' prologue reflects the impact of this kind of literature, but its contextual use of the portrait, that is, its insertion into a work that he claims to have written, has more in common with the pictorial practice of self-projection that we see in the paintings of Perugino, El Greco, and Velázquez. The purpose of this practice is, according to art critics, to create an alternative way of signing the painting: "any contextual authorial insertion fulfils one way or another the function of a 'signature'" (Stoichita 206).<sup>6</sup> This signature function becomes apparent in Perugino's self-portrait, where the artist's self-image is introduced into the painting along with a signature tablet (fig. 5), but also, I would argue, in Cervantes' prologue. By inserting his image "as portrait" into the preface, Cervantes is able to "sign" his *Novelas* and to assert, thereby, his authorship of the text. This includes not only his collection of novels or short stories, but also his prior works (even the untitled ones), for which he also claims creative responsibility:

Este que veis aquí . . . digo que es el rostro del autor de *La Galatea* y de *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, y del que hizo el *Viaje del Parnaso* a imitación de César

Caporal Perusino y de otras obras que andan por ahí descarriadas, y, quizá, sin el nombre de su dueño. (51)



Fig. 5. Perugino, *Self-Portrait* (detail), Interior of the Audience Chamber, Collegio del Cambio, Perugia.

If Cervantes' portrait works like a signature, as I think it does, then what we have here is a "supersignature"; a signature that pretends to be all-inclusive and sign the entire Cervantine oeuvre. This is hardly surprising, for the purpose of all signatures is, as David Bennington and Jacques Derrida explain, to "gather up all the moments of enunciation" of a text into a "single moment of metaenunciation which closes the already written book for the writer and opens it for the reader" (154). Cervantes' self-portrait gathers up all the moments of enunciation of his oeuvre (*La Galatea*, *Don Quijote* part one, *El Viaje del Parnaso*, and "otras obras descarriadas") and links them to a single, unified authorial source: "éste que . . . llámase comúnmente Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra" (51). The presence of this source in the prologue is problematized, however, by the doubts that Cervantes raises concerning the reliability and truth value of the portrait. After inserting his image into the preface, Cervantes poses the reader a disconcerting question: is this image trustworthy? Does it really portray Miguel de Cervantes, the historical author? Some critics, like Howard Mancing, are willing to accept this without reservations:

In the prologue to his *Novelas ejemplares*, Cervantes describes his physical appearance in some detail. I do not know anyone who does not take this to be an authentic self-portrait of the historical Cervantes. He even identifies himself by his full name, Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, in his text. (122)

The unproblematic relation that, according to Mancing, exists between Cervantes' self-portrait and its historical referent can be only sustained if we ignore what is explicitly stated in the prologue. The picture of Cervantes that the preface presents is the result of a complex operation of *mise-en-abîme* that deliberately problematizes its relation to its origin or referential basis and therefore calls into question the authenticity of the portrait itself. What we have is a verbal portrait written by an implied author who identifies himself as Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra that reproduces a hypothetical portrait-eulogy composed by an absent-minded friend which should have accompanied an allegedly real portrait painted, so we are told, by "el famoso don Juan de Jáurigui." This Jáurigui portrait is obviously the origin of the entire chain of portraits that we have in the preface, but its distance from the verbal portrait written by the implied author is so great that there is no reason to believe that they are actually the same portrait. This becomes apparent if we consider that the link that connects these two portraits, the portrait-eulogy of the forgetful friend, is, as John Weiger notes, nothing more than mere fiction, "a hypothetical imagined statement" representing "the poet's truth" (45) and bearing no direct or unmediated relationship to reality. Cervantes makes this very clear at the end of the first part of the preface, where he questions the truthfulness and reliability of his friend's portrait by comparing it to the two dozen fake and self-flattering testimonies that he could have used in its place:

Y cuando a la deste amigo, de quien me quejo, no ocurrieran otras cosas de las dichas que decir de mí, yo me levantara a mi mismo dos docenas de testimonios, y se los dijera en secreto, con que extendiera mi nombre y acreditara mi ingenio. Porque pensar que dicen puntualmente la verdad los tales elogios, es disparate, por no tener punto preciso ni determinado las alabanzas ni los vituperios. (51)

By stressing the fictional and unreliable nature of his friend's eulogy, Cervantes drives an insurmountable wedge between the image that supposedly appears in Jáurigui's portrait and the one that appears in the prologue. From the point of view of the reader, Jáurigui's portrait is totally unreachable and defiantly remote.<sup>7</sup> It belongs to an ontological dimension (the "real") that is well beyond the bounds of the prologue and is therefore just a shadow looming in the wall of the reader's cave. This, of course, has crucial implications for the signature function of the self-portrait that we discussed before. The validity of a signature depends, as Derrida explains, on its iterability, namely, its capacity to copy, reproduce or repeat a previous signature with which it must always coincide: "in order to function, that is, in order to be legible, a signature must have a repeatable, iterable, imitable form" ("Signature" 328). This means that every signature is, in reality, a "countersignature," a sign whose meaning and purpose depends on the absolute reproducibility of a preceding sign. Such an idea is clearly problematized in the prologue of the *Novelas ejemplares*. The portrait-signature that Cervantes presents to the reader reproduces a fictional, hypothetical portrait whose connection to the "real" has been severed and openly questioned. This breaks the chain of iterability that gives meaning to the signature and makes the portrait unable to sign, that is, unable to substantiate the presence of the author in the prologue. The function of the portrait in the prologue of the *Novelas* is, therefore, analogous to that of a mirage: it projects a vivid image of the author and, at the same time, dispels it.



The crisis of “presence” that the portrait-signature creates in the first part of the preface is reproduced in the second, “portraitless” part, in which Cervantes speaks in detail about the moral and entertainment value of his novels and the originality of his narrative project. The largest portion of this section is made up of a series of *topoi* and standardized analogies that underscore the social usefulness of the collection. Since the stories provide relaxation and “ejercicios honestos y agradables” (52), they are socially profitable, like games, gardens, and other forms of recreation.<sup>8</sup> Critics have traditionally viewed this segment as the ideological core of the prologue; the part that contains the critical judgment of the author and that explains, therefore, the reason why he wrote the preface. Yet, that reason may not be limited to declaring the moral and instructional value of the *Novelas* (a mere ploy, according to some critics, to keep the ecclesiastical censors happy), but may also comprise other objectives.<sup>9</sup> This becomes abundantly clear if we consider the blunt statement of authorship that Cervantes includes at the end of this section, which has an obvious signatorial or autographic purpose:

A esto se aplicó mi ingenio, por aquí me lleva mi inclinación, y más que me doy a entender, y es así, que yo soy el primero que he novelado en lengua castellana, que las muchas novelas que en ella andan impresas, todas son traducidas de lenguas extranjeras, y estas son mías propias, no imitadas ni hurtadas; mi ingenio las engendró, y las parió mi pluma, y van creciendo en los brazos de la estampa. Tras ellas, si la vida no me deja, te ofrezco los *Trabajos de Persiles*, libro que se atreve a competir con Heliodoro, si ya por atrevido no sale con las manos en la cabeza; y primero verás, y con brevedad dilatadas, las hazañas de *Don Quijote* y donaires de Sancho Panza, y luego las *Semanas del jardín*.

By linking the *Novelas* to the parental fountainhead of his “ingenio” and his “pluma,” Cervantes is able to “sign” them, for the aim of all signatures, as Derrida reminds us, is to guarantee “the presence of the ‘author’ as the ‘person who does the uttering,’ as the ‘origin,’ the source, in the production of a statement” (“Signature” 328).<sup>10</sup> The signature that Cervantes appends here to the text mirrors the one that he appended to the previous part of the prologue. If the latter was intended to sign the *Novelas* and all the works prior to them, this one will take care of the *Persiles* (1617), the second part of *Don Quijote* (1615), and *Las semanas del jardín*, a collection of short stories that Cervantes was never able to finish. What we are faced with, then, is another instance of “supersignature”: a single moment of autograph that pretends to be all-inclusive and transcend its own boundaries. The power to sign that Cervantes ascribes to this “supersignature” is seriously compromised, however, by the continuous references to death that pervade this part of the prologue. The appending of the author’s name to the *Persiles*, *Don Quijote* II, and *Las semanas del jardín* is preceded by a somber and destabilizing statement: “si la vida no me deja” (52). A similar statement appears toward the end of the prologue—“Mucho prometo, con fuerzas tan pocas como las mías” (53)—and also in the paragraph preceding the reference to Cervantes’ forthcoming works: “Mi edad no está ya para burlarse con la otra vida, que al cincuenta y cinco de los años gano por nueve más y por la mano” (52). By announcing the impending arrival of death, these statements assert the ability of writing to separate itself from its place of emission and establish the right of the text to exist and function independently from its source (as in the



case, for instance, of the “obras descarriadas” that Cervantes referred to in the previous part of the prologue). Such an idea goes explicitly against the intent and meaning of the signature, which is, as we just noted, to make the presence of the author “felt” as the producer or originator of the text. That presence disappears from the prologue as soon as it feels its own possibility. Cervantes asserts his mortality and in doing so he points at his own self-effacement as author. The signature, therefore, no longer signs, but marks the necessary absence of the signer-author. This affects not only the works that follow the *Novelas*, but also the *Novelas* themselves. The fact that Cervantes signs his short stories—“éstas son mías propias . . . mi ingenio las engendró y las parió mi pluma” (52)—in a context dominated by the presence of death turns his signature into an omen; an announcement of his own departure; the symptom of a vanishing that is already under way.

The role of the signature in the second part of the prologue is thus twofold and contradictory: on the one hand, it inscribes the presence of the author; on the other, it erases that presence from the text. The signature functions in this respect in a way similar to the portrait, to which I would like to return at the end of this essay. The end of portraiture is to celebrate and maintain presence; to erect a monument through which the living will continue to live long after death. “To preserve alive,” as Leonardo wrote in his *Treatise on Painting*, “the transient beauty of mortals and endow it with a permanence greater than the works of nature” (qtd. in Richter, 74). At the same time, however, portraiture was seen in the Renaissance as a posthumous art, an *ars moriendi*. The art of the portrait “was consciously directed,” as John Pope-Hennessy remarks, “to a future when the living would no longer be alive” (8).<sup>11</sup> This means that the idea of death, and therefore of the absence or disappearance of the subject, occupies a central place in the early modern view of the portrait.<sup>12</sup> Nowhere is this more apparent than in those paintings in which the sitter appears behind a “parapet” (fig. 5), next to a candle (fig. 6), or touching an hourglass (fig. 7) or a skull (fig. 8). The parapet, a stone ledge inspired in the funerary models of ancient tombstones (fig. 9), clearly signifies the inevitable demise of the sitter. The candle and the hourglass are visual synonyms of the parapet. They symbolize the transience and fragility of earthly things and have also a funerary meaning. The skull has pretty straightforward connotations and demands, obviously, no detailed explanation. The use of these objects in portraits reveals the ambivalent nature of the images that confront us in the paintings. Those images are as much an affirmation of presence as they are a representation of absence. This, I think, is also the value that Cervantes assigns to the signature in the prologue of the *Novelas ejemplares*. Whether



Fig. 5. Titian and Giorgione, *Portrait of a Venetian Man*, The National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C.



Fig. 6. Lorenzo Lotto, *Portrait of a Youth Against a White Curtain*, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.



Fig. 7. Moretto da Brescia, *Portrait of a Man*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.



Fig. 8. Frans Hals, *Young Man with a Skull*, National Gallery of Art, London.



Fig. 9. *Roman Tombstone*, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

that signature comes in the form of a self-portrait or as a declaration of textual paternity, its function is both to make present and to erase the figure of the author. This is in line with the view of authorship that Cervantes presents in most of his works. As Mary Gaylord Randel observes, “Cervantes chooses to dramatize the author’s relation to his text in figures which do not suggest authority, control, power, but rather contingency, limitation, even impotence” (101-02). The image of the author that we find in the prologue of the *Novelas* clearly conforms to this pattern. That image, as represented through the signature, fades before the eyes of the reader and leaves the text “en blanco y sin figura,” attached to the agency of an absent or vanishing author.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The quote is from Carpentier's unpublished speech at the Universidad Complutense in Alcalá de Henares on the occasion of his winning the Cervantes Prize of literature in 1977.

<sup>2</sup> All references to the *Novelas* are from Harry Sieber's edition in Cátedra.

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed description of the topography of the Golden Age book, see González de Amezúa 331-73.

<sup>4</sup> This is the type of fiction at work in the most popular type of preface (what Genette calls the "autographic-authentic" preface), in which the alleged author of the prologue is also the author of the text as confirmed by some other paratextual sign—usually the title and/or the dedication; for a comprehensive typology of the preface based on the category of the sender, see Genette 179-94.

<sup>5</sup> Pacheco's indebtedness to Vasari is very clear, as Pedro Piñero Ramírez and Rogelio Reyes Cano explain in the prologue to their edition of Pacheco's book: "Hay que contar también con la incidencia de un modulo literario estrechamente relacionado con aquélla. Nos referimos a las biografías de hombres modélicos, forma muy renacentista, de la que las *Vite* de artistas escritas por el italiano Vasari venían a ser el mejor paradigma. Pacheco conocía muy bien esa obra y hasta es posible . . . que estuviera preparando un libro de *elogios* diferente al de los retratos y centrado precisamente en biografías de artistas" (34).

<sup>6</sup> Renaissance artists could find a reference to the signatorial use of the self-portrait in Cicero's *Tusculunae disputationes*, where it is mentioned the example of Phidias' self-portrait on Minerva's shield: "opifices post mortem nobilitari volunt. Quid enim Phidias sui similibem speciem inclusit in clipeo Minervae, cum inscribere non licet?" (I. xv. 34) [Artists wish to become famous after death. Or why did Phidias insert his likeness on the shield of Minerva, though not allowed to inscribe his name on it? (40)].

<sup>7</sup> The same is true, ironically, for the art historian. As Enrique Lafuente Ferrari notes: "Llegamos, pues, a la desconsoladora conclusión de que nada nos autoriza, hoy por hoy, a creer que conocemos por vía fidedigna en documento visual alguno la apariencia física de Cervantes" (148).

<sup>8</sup> All these, as Riley notes (86-87), are *topoi* related to the ancient notion of *prodesse et delectare* (to teach and delight).

<sup>9</sup> According to Riley, the overmoralizing tone of this part of the prologue is just a mere strategy to satisfy the demands of the ecclesiastic authorities. He supports this judgment by noting that Cervantes "submitted the book to the ecclesiastical, before the civil, censor, although the latter alone was strictly necessary. And there are an unusual large number of *aprobaciones* (no less than four)" (102) in the book.

<sup>10</sup> The contrast with the prologue of the *Quijote*, in which Cervantes calls himself "padraastro," is apparent. So it is the use of the pregnancy and birthing *topos*, which does not, in my view, diminish the signatorial value of the statement. For other examples of this *topos* in Golden Age prologues, see McSpadden 10-11.

<sup>11</sup> This strange ambivalence between life and death, absence and presence, is perhaps best summarized by Leon Battista Alberti in *De pictura*: "Itaque vultus defunctorum per

picturam quammodo vitam praelongam degunt” [through painting, the faces of the dead go on living for a very long time] (II.25).

<sup>12</sup> Death plays also a key role in contemporary views of photographic portraiture, as for instance in Roland Barthes’ *Camera lucida*: “Ultimately, what I am seeking in the photograph taken of me . . . is Death: Death is the eidos of that Photograph” (15). Barthes explains the centrality of death in terms of “a perverse confusion” of temporal frames: “by attesting that the object has been real, the photograph surreptitiously induces belief that it is alive, because of that delusion which makes us attribute to Reality a superior, somehow eternal value; but by shifting this reality to the past (‘this-has-been’), the photograph suggests that it is already dead” (79).

## Works Cited

- Alberti, Leon Battista. *On Painting and On Sculpture: The Latin Texts of De Pictura and De Statua*. Ed. and trans. Cecil Grayson. London: Phaidon, 1972.
- Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc., 1981.
- Bennington, Geoffrey, and Jacques Derrida. *Jacques Derrida*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1993.
- Braudy, Leo. *The Frenzy of Renown: Fame and Its History*. New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Brescia, Moretto da. *Portrait of a Man*. 1520-25. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. 20 May 2005<[http://www.metmuseum.org/Works\\_of\\_Art/viewOne.asp?dep=11&viewMode=1&item=28%2E79](http://www.metmuseum.org/Works_of_Art/viewOne.asp?dep=11&viewMode=1&item=28%2E79)>.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Novelas ejemplares*. Ed. Harry Sieber. 8th ed. 2 vols. Madrid: Cátedra, 1997. Vol.1.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Tusculan Disputations*. Ed. and trans. J. E. King. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP; London: Heinemann, 1950.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Signature Event Context." *Margins of Philosophy*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1982. 309-30.
- El Greco. *Adoration of the Shepherds*. c. 1605. Museo del Prado, Madrid. 20 May 2005 <<http://www.abcgallery.com/E/elgreco/elgreco1.html>>.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- González de Amezúa y Mayo, Antonio. "Cómo se hacía un libro en nuestro Siglo de Oro." *Opúsculos histórico-literarios*. Vol.1 Madrid: CSIC, Instituto Miguel de Cervantes, 1957. 331-73.
- González Echevarría, Arturo. "Cervantes and the Modern Latin America Narrative." *Ciberletras: revista de crítica literaria y de cultura-Journal of Literary Criticism and Culture* 1 (1999): 28 pars. 30 June 2005<[http://www.lehman.cuny.edu/ciberletras/v1n1/crit\\_07.htm](http://www.lehman.cuny.edu/ciberletras/v1n1/crit_07.htm)>.

- Hals, Frans. *Young Man With a Skull*. 1626-28. National Gallery of Art, London. 20 May 2005<<http://www.abcgallery.com/H/hals/hals29.html>>.
- Lafuente Ferrari, Enrique. *La novela ejemplar de los retratos de Cervantes*. Madrid: Editorial Dossat, 1948.
- Lotto, Lorenzo. *Portrait of a Youth Against A White Curtain*. c. 1508. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. 20 May 2005<<http://www.abcgallery.com/L/lotto/lotto4.html>>.
- Mancing, Howard. "Cervantes as Narrator of *Don Quijote*." *Cervantes* 23.1 (2003): 117-40.
- Martín, Francisco J. "Los prólogos del *Quijote*: la consagración de un género." *Cervantes* 13.1 (1993): 77-87.
- McSpadden, George. *Don Quijote and the Spanish Prologues*. Potomac, MA: Porrúa, 1979.
- Perugino, Pietro. *Interior of the Audience Chamber*. 1500. Collegio del Cambio, Perugia. 20 May 2005<<http://www.abcgallery.com/P/perugino/perugino24.html>>.
- . Self-Portrait. *Interior of the Audience Chamber*, Collegio del Cambio, Perugia. 20 May 2005<[www.wga.hu/frames-e.html?/html/p/perugino](http://www.wga.hu/frames-e.html?/html/p/perugino)>.
- . Self-Portrait (detail). *Interior of the Audience Chamber*, Collegio del Cambio, Perugia. Stoichita 207.
- Piñero Ramírez, Pedro M., and Rogelio Reyes Cano. Introduction. *Libro de descripción de verdaderos retratos de ilustres y memorables varones*. Sevilla: Excma. Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, 1985. 15-49.
- Pope-Hennessy, John. *The Portrait in the Renaissance*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1966.
- Randel, Mary Gaylord. "Cervantes' Portrait of the Artist." *Cervantes* 3.2 (1983): 83-102.
- Richter, Irma A. Paragone: A Comparison of the Arts by Leonardo da Vinci. London: Oxford UP, 1949.
- Riley, E. C. *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Roman Tombstone. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. "The Portrait, the Courtier, and Death." By David Rosand. *Castiglione: The Ideal and the Real in Renaissance Culture*. Eds. David Rosand and Robert Hanning. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983. . 91-129.



Stoichita, Victor I. *The Self-Aware Image: An Insight into Early Modern Meta-Painting*. Trans. Anne-Marie Glasheen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Tiziano Vecellio, and Giorgione. *Portrait of a Venetian Man*. c. 1510. The National Gallery of Art, Washington D. C. 20 May 2005<<http://www.abcgallery.com/G/giorgione/giorgione.html>>.

Velázquez, Diego de. *Las Meninas*. 1656-57. Museo del Prado, Madrid. 20 May 2005<<http://www.abcgallery.com/V/velazquez/velazquez48.html>>.

Weiger, John G. *In the Margins of Cervantes*. Hanover and London: The U P of New England, 1988.