on Cervantine criticism in general is performed in a Procrustean fashion: all Quixotic criticism is divided into three arbitrary categories, labelled *idealist*, *cautionary* and *perspectivist* (pp. 4-10). Then he proceeds to define his neologism *Dulcineism*, which turns out to be "the belief that human life is satisfactorily conducted only if it is lived out in close accord with prescribed ideals of the received culture" (p. 11), which seems to me to be a most effective way of saying that *the Dulcineated world* is no more and no less than the Judaeo-Christian tradition. By the end of this first chapter Mr. Efron outlines his new approach: "In plan, this study will attempt to do that [i.e., "to minimize distortion by means of selective focus"], beginning with an examination of the main character, then proceeding to the secondary character and the nature of his relationship with Don Quixote. We shall go on finally to treat the expansion of the novel's implications within the other members of the Dulcineated world, which, in turn, will mean dealing at least occasionally with implications for our own world, Dulcineated as it also is" (p. 21).

Obviously, what we have in front of us is an interpretation of *Don Quixote* as if it were a message from the earnest campus radical. Its pages are full of the contemporary cant: for example, Master Peter's puppet stage presents "ethnic prejudice" (p. 119), because Gaiferos and Melisendra are pitted against the Moors. Or, in the first part of the novel, Don Fernando accepts to marry Luscinda because of "group pressure" (p. 128). Inevitably, mention of the speech on Arms and Learning in the first part of *Don Quixote* leads Mr. Efron to mention McGeorge Bundy, Vietnam and Santo Domingo (p. 111), and this, just as inevitably, will lead him to discuss the figure of "the super-patriotic Captive" (p. 130), i.e., the Captive Captain Ruy Pérez de Viedma. The radical bias is obvious, but it is not this that makes the book practically unreadable, but rather the style, which is incredibly bad for someone who is identified in the dustjacket of his book as an Associate Professor of English at Buffalo.

JUAN BAUTISTA AVALLE-ARCE, *The University of North Carolina*

Margaret Church. *Don Quixote: The Knight of La Mancha*. New York: New York University Press, 1971. Pp. xxxvi, 179. \$7.95.

Professor Church has written a companion and study guide to *Don Quixote*. She identifies her intended readers as follows: "The companion is geared not for the publishing scholar in Spanish literature or the stylistic expert in the Spanish language but for the general reader and student of *Don Quixote* in translation" (p. vii). Her aim is to help such readers to understand Cervantes' complex masterpiece and to share her enthusiasm for it. To this end she offers her readers an overview of the novel, followed by chapter-by-chapter analyses of the material she considers "of particular thematic interest" (ibid.). There is much to recommend this book, including comments and comparisons (with Falstaff, King Lear, etc.) not so often found in the studies of professional Hispanists. On the other hand, the book reveals limitations likely to lead uninitiated readers of *Don Quixote* astray.

Professor Church calls on just over two dozen critics and scholars to support or amplify her own critical opinions. The list is small and, unfortunately, not as representative as it might be of the best of modern critical writing: Martín de Riquer, a worthy scholar but not a profound contributor to contemporary interpretations of *Don Quixote*, is by all odds

the scholar most often cited; Unamuno is presented as "the great critic" who epitomizes most Spanish criticism on *Don Quixote* (p. xiv); Américo Castro is nowhere even mentioned! Serious consequences flow from these bibliographical limitations. One example is the treatment of the picaresque in relation to Cervantes' work.

In her introduction Professor Church states: "Don Quixote is not a picaresque, nor is Cervantes' novel picaresque in any definitive sense" (p. xv). On page 68 she characterizes the 1605 *Quixote* like this: "The book itself can be judged a highly amusing yet thoughtful picaresque tale." A little later she concludes that Book II "shows the book in the final analysis to be the purest example of the tragic genre and not, as Book I would have us believe ... the purest of picaresque comedies permeated with a pathos felt mainly, I suspect, by those who, like Cervantes himself, are prey to a thwarted idealism" (pp. 68-69). Some earlier remarks label Ginés de Pasamonte a conventional picaresque and suggest that "he may represent the dark side of Cervantes" (p. 27). All this vacillation about how Cervantes' fiction stands in relation to the true picaresque genre suggests that Professor Church has not read the best Spanish discussions of the subject, which show the differences to be abysmal. She could have found orientation in Castro's well-known *El pensamiento de Cervantes* (Madrid, 1925, pp. 230-239) or in an excellent but uncited article in her own bibliography: Blanco Aguinaga's "Cervantes and the Picaresque Mode ..." in Lowry Nelson's *Cervantes* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969).

Space permits me to mention only two or three examples of one other kind of limitation, namely the tendency to make statements unsupported by the Cervantine text or even contradicted by it. We have already noted her speculation that Ginés de Pasamonte may represent the dark side of Cervantes. I can think of nothing in *Don Quixote* or in Cervantes' life to support such speculation. Among her comments on the adventure of the lions is the observation that "in previous episodes Don Quixote's luck was invariably bad" (p. 95). Not so; just three chapters earlier Cervantes made it clear that it was good luck that enabled Don Quixote to defeat the Knight of the Mirrors. As a matter of fact, both good and bad luck operate from time to time throughout both parts of the novel. In commenting on the adventure of the Parliament of Death, she expresses the opinion that Don Quixote's remark that "appearances are not always to be trusted" (p. 87) would be unthinkable from the Knight of 1605; yet it is the Don Quixote of 1605 who formulates the classic statement about the difficult problem of interpreting appearances: "So what seems to you to be a barber's basin appears to me to be Mambrino's helmet, and to another as something else" (*The Adventures of Don Quixote*, tr. J. M. Cohen, Baltimore, 1963, p. 204). A second edition of Professor Church's study would greatly benefit from closer adherence to Cervantes' text.

RICHARD L. PREDMORE, *Duke University*

Ruth Pike. *Aristocrats and Traders. Sevillian Society in the Sixteenth Century*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1972. Pp. xiii, 243. \$10.50.

According to the author, the principal theme of the book is to challenge "two of the most frequent assumptions about Spanish history in the sixteenth century: the Spaniards' lack