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 picaro, 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 picaro 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


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
of aptitude for trade and the total abandonment of commercial endeavors by ennobled merchants in favor of an aristocratic life based on land and rents" (viii). Together with the main title, this would seem to promise a discussion primarily concerned with trade and with the role of aristocracy, old and new, in the world of commerce in sixteenth-century Spain. While this intention, in effect, has been carried out, it accounts for only a portion of the subject matter; hence it does not accurately sum up the work as a whole. The historians' debate implied by the allusion to "frequent assumptions" remains outside the body of the discussion, and the author's "challenge," in fact, may be regarded as only one of several uses to which her discoveries may be put.

A clearer indication of the book's content is offered by the subtitle. Indeed, the nobleman shares his category of the "Elite" here with the clergy, lawyers, doctors, notaries and merchants. Taken together, they comprise about a half of the book. Most of the remaining discussion treats the working classes, the social outcasts and unassimilated classes: Moriscos, slaves and the underworld. In short, this is a comprehensive description of the social classes of Sevilla in the period of rapid change following the opening of the New World – a period, too, following upon the conclusion of the reconquest in the Peninsula, with its many difficult social problems continuing from the past. If the burgeoning commerce with America is one powerful source of change, another is the increasing social mobility of conversos and commoners.

To copious data drawn from archives in Sevilla, as well as from newly tapped sources in Madrid and London, has been added a substantial body of information from literary sources. This has not taken precedence over other kinds of evidence, but has served rather as a supplement where official documentation is scanty, as in the description of the Sevillian underworld. No serious criticism can be directed at the results of the process here, but such evidence is clearly of a different order. It would be injudicious to accept as reportage all of the naturalistic scenes of the picaresque genre. When they ring so true, however, as in the hands of Cervantes, who can know where to draw the line?

Since literary analogues are appealed to in speaking of the good-for-nothing sons of the elite (115), it might have been apposite to mention the most notorious Sevillian of them all: Don Juan Tenorio. All the more so in the light of claims that he was drawn from life. It could have been observed, too, that not only as a literary character, but as an historical personage, the scholarly and artistic career of the famous Juan Latino of Granada exemplified perfectly the eminence that a black freedman could attain in the sixteenth century in Spain. While the sampling from literature may be somewhat unsystematic, it is nevertheless entirely adequate for the purpose.

Not the least impressive feature of this competently prepared study – and one that inspires confidence – is the scrupulous respect accorded to the Spanish language.

EDWIN J. WEBBER, Northwestern University