What eighteenth-century writers could not pick up—and here the age lives up to its clichéd reputation as an 'age of reason'—is Quijote's unshakeable faith in the power of enchantment. That there are enchanters, wizards who are capable of turning Dulcinea into the gawky country hoyden that the Don sees her to be, and who are responsible for many of the ignominious defeats and rebuffs suffered by him, is a cornerstone of the entire Quixotic edifice. Enchanters are both within and without Quijote's fiction: they are found in the fictions that have captured his belief, and they are the 'psychology' by which that captured belief is maintained. Eighteenth-century imitators of Quijote perceived that they would have to naturalize his madness and go a different way to work with the concept of magic. Where Quijote's form of madness often leads him to behave as if he were above the law—setting free prisoners, refusing to pay the reckoning at inns (because chivalric heroes never travel with money), even on occasion destroying the ceremonies of the Catholic church—eighteenth-century Quijote figures are on a quest for justice that involves trying to ensure that those responsible for putting the law into effect do so fairly. Smollett's *Sir Launcelot Greaves* (1760–1) is the clearest example. A pathology is supplied for Greaves' madness—the result of a nervous disorder following rejection in love—and his chivalry takes the form not of crazily attacking national institutions, but of redressing wrongs that are actually the result of a biased and unjust legal system that enjoys spurious legitimacy. Greaves' confrontation with the hideous Justice Gobble is the most salient case. The point is not to transcend the law but to return it to its proper functioning as a protector of the interests of ordinary citizens against the arbitrary cruelty of the powerful. Greaves distinguishes himself explicitly from the delusional aspects of Quixotic madness: 'I have not yet encountered a windmill for a giant; nor mistaken this public house for a magnificent castle.'[18] There is a decisive turn towards the social and the satirical.

What of the *Novelas ejemplares* in the eighteenth century? Readers of this revolutionary collection of stories often find that the contents fall into two distinct groups: one 'idealistic, romantic, sentimental, Italianate . . . ideologically conservative, generically romance narratives'; the other 'realistic, picaresque, satiric, original, progressive and essentially novelistic'.[19] We have seen that stories in the more idealistic camp were influential on theatre plots in the seventeenth century. Precise evidence that they were influential on eighteenth-century writing is difficult to find; authors lived too much in the shadow of *Don Quijote*. One or two of the stories, for example, the hard-hitting 'Rinconete and Cortadillo', had still not been translated into English by 1750. Nevertheless, it is difficult to imagine that Daniel Defoe, who knew his Cervantes, was unaware of a story such as 'The Deceitful Marriage', in which a woman pretends to be a lady of property in order to capture an ensign. Doña Estefania sets herself up in her friend's opulent house to woo

[18] Tobias Smollett, *The Life and Adventures of Sir Launcelot Greaves*, ed. Peter Wagner (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1988), 50.
[19] Mary Malcolm Gaylord, 'Cervantes' Other Fiction', in *Cambridge Companion to Cervantes*, 111.

her officer, and when the true owner unexpectedly returns, she persuades Campuzano that she is moving out so that Doña Clementa can play the same trick on another lover. Campuzano finds out that he has been tricked and has lost his trunk of valuables—except that they too were worthless flimflam. How could the author of *Moll Flanders*, which features a similarly elaborate double bluff between Moll and her Lancashire husband Jem, not have noticed such a grainy story?

In 'The Jealous Old Man from Extremadura', the only story to be separately translated and published, Felipo de Carrizales marries the youthful Leonora whom he keeps under lock and key and ensures that she cannot be seen from outside the house. All the precautions he takes are not proof against a musical young layabout called Loaysa who charms his way past the servants but who does not consummate the affair. Carrizales finds them entwined but suffers a stroke that results in a change of attitude: dying and penitent, he makes Leonora his heir and asks that she marries Loaysa. She, however, prefers the refuge of a convent. It is easy to conceive, though difficult to document, how attractive this January and May story would be to playwrights and novelists. Matthew Prior's poem 'The Padlock' is a version of the tale, as is Isaac Bickerstaff's fabulously successful three-act comedy of the same name performed in 1765, notable for the role played by the black servant Mungo, an elaboration on Cervantes' black eunuch Luis. Bickerstaff does not take on the Cervantic challenge of a bleakly open ending, preferring the theatrical satisfactions of marriage. The *Novelas ejemplares*, like *Don Quijote*, resist easy classification by pressing recognized genres into unexpectedly ironic and subversive service. They may have been one Cervantic challenge too many for most eighteenth-century writers.