

From: *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, 25.1 (2005 [2006]): 232-40.
 Copyright © 2006, The Cervantes Society of America.

David Quint. *Cervantes's Novel of Modern Times. A New Reading of Don Quijote*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003. 192 pp. ISBN: 0-691-11433-1.

Although it relies for textual authority on Starkie's English and Riquer's Juventud versions, the latter specifically proscribed by the editor of this journal, this important new book by David Quint, George M. Bodman Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Yale, offers multitudes of insights. The section on literary genre and socioeconomic evolution ("Social Mobility, Generic Mix," 76–85), focused on the discussion between the Cura and the Canónigo in I, 47, brilliantly illuminates the relationship between social hierarchies and literary genres. In Chapter 5 "Aristocrats," Quint offers the most straightforward, unflinchingly accurate analysis of the Duques since Ludovic Osterc. This chapter is right on target and brilliantly argued. I could not agree more with Quint's conclusion that "Cervantes's antiaristocratic bias cannot be clearer, and despite its comedy *Don Quijote* in this section becomes an angry book" (154). There is a nice insight on the meaning of the difference in narrative technique between Cardenio's fragmented narrative and the closed "Curioso impertinente": "Through these contrasted modes of narration, one straightforward, the other fragmentary and scrambled, Cervantes appears to dramatize the difference between the neatness of stories told by 'literature' and the confused and incomplete stories that human beings actually experience. ...Our own stories, Cervantes suggests, do not make sense to us, or we positively misunderstand them as we live them. This is why we turn to literature to grasp what is happening to us and to recognize why we act in the ways that we do" (27).

Quint argues two principal theses. First, he insists on "artistic integrity," as opposed to what he calls a "picaresque," more-or-less random succession of episodes, which is, he avers, how the novel has traditionally been read. This typical English Department reduction of "picaresque" to "episodic" and its consequent application to *Don Quijote* is annoying to the Hispanist, but not life-threatening once you realize that's all it means. "Cervantes's book evinces a carefully studied plan carried out in great, if not to the last, semantic detail. Its episodes connect with and comment upon other episodes, and they do so through a repetition of motifs, parallel actions, and direct verbal echoes. The meaning of the novel is thus created *relationally*, and a reading of any part of *Don Quijote* will be incomplete if it is not placed within this corresponding whole" (ix). Much of Quint's book is devoted to analysis of interlacing of episodes, with many quite ingenious examples. Quint is particularly at pains to demonstrate the necessary interaction of the interpolated stories and the main plot, as Ruth El Saffar on *La Galatea* (*Beyond Fiction*, 1984) and Ed-

ward Dudley ("Don Quixote as Magus: the Rhetoric of Interpolation," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 1972) among others have also done. Quint goes further than either, however, because he finds the book's "greatest stretches of writing lie in the interpolated stories of the 'Curioso impertinente' and the Captive's Tale" (xii).

Quint's second thesis, the source of his book's title, is that there is a direct relation of the text to economic history, and a similar relation of economic to literary history. "*Don Quijote* throughout tells and retells a master narrative of early-modern Europe: the movement from feudalism to the new order of capitalism that will become the realistic domain of the modern novel, the genre this book does so much to invent" (x). With respect to the more purely economic aspects of this thesis, there is considerable overlap with my *Cervantes and the Material World* (2000), so he'll get no argument from me on that. The second part of this thesis, namely that the progressive *embourgeoisement* observable in *Don Quijote* leads to the creation of both the characters and the readers of the modern novel, is a nice corrective to the gospel according to Ian Watt. I will detail some areas of disagreement later.

Quint's study is divided into two parts, which correspond to the two Parts of the novel. In *Don Quijote I* and within *Don Quijote* the character as well there is a clash between the old feudal order and a new protocapitalist order, which ends in an impasse (90). This clash is embodied in two fantasy women who compete for Don Quijote's allegiance: Dulcinea, who represents love within the Old Order (Petrarchan narcissism, Girardian mimetic desire and male jealousy), and Dorotea as the princess Micomicona, who represents the modern strategy of marrying for material advantage and upward social mobility. Quint then divides the love stories of *Don Quijote I* into a "Dulcinea" and a "Micomicona" series. The Dulcinea series predominates in the first half of *Don Quijote I*, and the Micomicona group in the second half, but the two series are interlaced throughout, so that, for example, the "Curioso impertinente," which belongs to the Dulcinea cycle, is interrupted by the Micomiconian episode of Don Quijote and the wineskins. The Dulcinea series includes the episodes of Marcela and Grisóstomo (I, 12 and 14), Don Quijote's description of Dulcinea to Vivaldo and company (I, 13), Cardenio's story (I, 23–24, 27), Don Quijote's description of Dulcinea to Sancho (I, 25) and his penance (I, 26), the "Curioso impertinente" (I, 33–36), the reunion of Cardenio-Luscinda and Dorotea-Don Fernando (I, 36), and Eugenio-Anselmo-Leandra (I, 51). The "Micomicona group comprises: Don Quijote and Maritornes (I, 16), Don Quijote's fantasy of the knight (himself) who marries the princess even without her father's blessing (I, 21), Dorotea's story (I, 28), Dorotea as Princess Micomicona (I, 29–30), Don Quijote and the wineskins (I, 35), the Captive's Tale (I, 37–41), the Judge (I, 42), Luis and Clara (I, 43–44), the Canon and Don Quijote on social mobility (I, 47, 50), and Leandra and

Vicente de la Rosa (*I*, 51). Quint insists on the relation between narrative trajectory and historical evolution, "from the idealized feudal past of Don Quijote's chivalric fantasies to the mentality and social arrangements of Cervantes's present-day Spain (19). This version of "interlace" is one of the undeniable strengths of Quint's book.

Quint first studies the interlace of the story of Don Quijote's love for Dulcinea and the interpolated stories of Grisóstomo, Cardenio and Don Fernando, Anselmo and Lotario. "Cervantes depicts a markedly old-fashioned love in the 'Dulcinea' complex of episodes and tales, the stories that mirror and comment upon Don Quijote's love for Dulcinea" (53). By "old-fashioned" he means "occurring within a feudal social structure" and "based on the model of Petrarchan love poetry." But while Petrarch offers only male subjectivism, Cervantes invites the reader to consider the same dynamic from the female point of view. Quint then amplifies the duality in Cervantes' text into a full-blown feminist analysis of the men's behavior. His discussion of male lovers who follow the Petrarchan model in terms of "monstrous egotism" is enlightening and somewhat embarrassing if the reader is a man or reads like one. Grisóstomo is "clearly guilty of making a Petrarchan, erotic idol of Marcela, of making her into a projection of his own ego" (47). Cardenio fails to step out from behind the curtain when Luscinda is marrying Don Fernando not because he is a coward, but because he wants to see her choose him over Don Fernando (30). Anselmo may be less interested in Camila's chastity than in seeing her prefer him over his purported rival (42). The interlacing of Cardenio-Luscinda-Don Fernando and Anselmo-Camila-Lotario is carefully worked out and I find it convincing. Since all these stories are supposed to mirror and comment upon Don Quijote's situation and behavior, I see the logic of including Don Quijote in this group, but there are other ways to account for his devotion to Dulcinea, and indeed Quint himself notes some significant differences between Don Quijote's attitudes and those of the other, more straightforwardly Petrarchan-narcissistic men (35).

Once the premise of this chapter has been accepted, the argument is nothing if not logical. But as Lacan said, all there is is never all there is. Don Quijote's expression of his love for Dulcinea in the old-style chivalric mode, which is what is visible on the surface of the discourse, can be seen as a result, not a cause. It is one of the symptoms of his psychosis, the etiology of which, as I have argued elsewhere, is bound up in his particular stage in the life cycle in tragic synchronicity with that of his niece. Dulcinea is a sublimated version of the niece, and the outdated chivalric rhetoric that surrounds her and appears to make Don Quijote the avatar that all the narcissistic lovers recreate is not the genuine expression of his psychic intimacy, but its opposite, a ready-made shield he uses to defend himself from his own truly unacceptable and thoroughly here-and-now desires.

Applying the same Lacanian insight to the relation between Anselmo and Lotario suggests that underneath what Quint calls the “unspoken competition and intersubjective struggle beneath the surface of this intimate friendship” (42), that is, underneath the underneath, lurks a forbidden ho-moerotic desire that finds its expression in a symbolic offer of the woman, standing in for the self, to the genuine but impossible love object, as Diana de Armas Wilson among others has argued. The result is the same that Quint observes—the woman becomes irrelevant—but the meaning of the episode is radically altered. Quint nonetheless gets a lot of mileage from his vision/version, which he summarizes as “a textbook case of Girard’s concept of mimetic desire that glosses in retrospect not only the conduct of the shepherd suitors of Marcela, but of Cardenio and Don Fernando, Anselmo and Lotario: jealous men more concerned about copying and competing with one another than about the woman whom they seek as the prize of the victory over their rivals, a woman who, otherwise, might as well be out of the picture” (48). Incidentally, this exactly describes the dynamic of *El burlador de Sevilla*. Quint comes close to this broader conclusion when he states: “the causes of a larger, cultural misogyny, *Don Quijote* repeatedly suggests, are to be found not in the behavior of women, but in the conduct of men” (49). As some of my female students concluded some years ago, “it’s a guy thing.” This formulation suggests that more than what men do, it is a question of how men are. I would therefore transfer the locus of interest from behavior to motivation.

In the Dulcinea cluster Cervantes “introduces the possibility of mercenary and social motives—only pointedly to discount them” (58). In the Micomicona cluster, he “has hit upon a staple plot of the new genre he is inventing in *Don Quijote*. It succeeds the Dulcinea story of idolatrous male jealousy, which his novel simultaneously portrays as its holdover from an earlier era, as the love story of modern fiction” (76). Early on *Don Quijote* had fantasized marrying a princess, becoming wealthy and inheriting a kingdom. Princess Micomicona offers *Don Quijote* the real possibility of upward social mobility and wealth through marriage. The emotional relationship of Ruy Pérez de Viedma and Zoraida is embedded in a material one. His brother the Oidor has done well by marrying up, and the Oidor’s daughter is on track to do even better. I found this section of Quint’s book more problematical than the preceding one. The thesis depends on the notion that marrying for material advantage and social mobility is a specifically modern, i.e., post-feudal behavior (17–21). My first impulse was to reject Quint’s thesis on historical grounds: interclass and intercaste marriages motivated by material advantage were common in the middle ages. Similarly, intraclass and intracaste marriage with the same motivation were, absent the economic (i.e., land-grabbing) potential of war, the only means of material advancement

available within the aristocracy itself. But, as Quint points out, marrying up for social-material advantage is one of the modern novel's most staple plots (and one of modern society's most typical behaviors). This brute fact, in combination with my own historical observations, leads me to wonder whether instead of denouncing Quint's thesis as anachronistic, we might do better to embrace it for the light it throws, perhaps *malgré lui*, on medieval-feudal society. Everybody has always craved material improvement, but until capitalism the only ways to get rich were to take wealth away from somebody else by force or to marry into it. Quint himself reduces these medieval practices to "disguised versions of the modern success story of worldly advancement" (60). That is, his point of reference remains the modern, capitalistic order, and the Micomicona cycle of episodes, instead of recalling traditional practices or mirroring contemporary ones, gestures toward modernity.

The second half of Quint's book deals with *Don Quijote II*. He begins by observing that in Part One Don Quijote himself is aggressive and violent: a sociopath. His embrace of the Old Order has negative results in the modern environment. In Part Two he evolves away from the Old Order and comes to embrace the new, money-based economy and the placid, bourgeois lifestyle that goes with it. The heroes who, again through the dynamic of interlace, move Don Quijote in this way are Don Diego de Miranda and Camacho el Rico. Interaction with them renders Don Quijote "gentler and wiser." Arguing this thesis requires footwork even fancier than that required to identify marrying up for wealth and status as a specifically modern practice. Here it is necessary to blur the distinctions, so crucial in Cervantes's society, between inherited and acquired wealth and status, and between land-based and money-based wealth, basic features of the Old and New Orders, respectively. Quint's tactic is to omit any reference to land and make wealth, sometimes in combination with money and sometimes alone, the measure of modernity. In this way Don Diego de Miranda, an *hidalgo de solar conocido* like Don Quijote, and Camacho el Rico, a peasant whose wealth is a function of land ownership, can become representatives of a socioeconomic order and members of a social class that at least anticipates and approaches the one we live in today. Well aware that the notion of a middle class is anachronistic, Quint refers to a "middling social class that is moneyed and peace-loving" (99), "a fluid middling class created by wealth" (106), "a new middling class" (107), "a new middling class" (114), "Don Diego's middling, moneyed class" (114), "a socially fluid class created by wealth" (118). "[Don Quijote] is an honorary member of the modern middle class" (127). At one point he states baldly that "both Don Quijote and his creator were joining the middle class" (107). Quint notes that "Cervantes does not depict the urban merchants and tradesmen who would create a new moneyed social class—we remember the third brother of the Captive, the merchant conspicuous by his absence in Part

One. His landed vision of this new class, somewhere in the middle between the high nobleman and the peasant, reflects the conservative limits of his novel's social vision" (108). This confession of the limits of his own thesis is drowned out by Quint's repeated comparison of this new "middling class created by wealth" to the contemporary middle class being squeezed out of existence by one right-wing government after another in this country. But I digress.

With respect to Don Diego, Quint's thesis requires that he be disengaged from his class's feudal past and repositioned at the beginning of the seventeenth century, as an example of the new, improved version of the minor aristocracy. The case comes to rest on his personification of the new, sixteenth-century lay piety preached by Erasmus and his followers. Even though his life lacks what Américo Castro used to call a "dimensión historiable," Don Diego's modern Christian piety not only distinguishes him from his feudal forebears; it tips the moral balance in his favor over the "aesthetic interest" offered by Don Quijote's far more narratable story (114). "Furthermore—and this is the point I wish to emphasize—if Cervantes builds the episode through the mirroring opposition of the two figures, the subsequent fiction of Part Two will show Don Quijote becoming more and more *like* Don Diego, as if the novel itself had absorbed the latter's moral example" (109).

As for Camacho el Rico, the strategy is to recreate the (only temporary) opposition between Don Quijote and Don Diego by assimilating Basilio to Don Quijote and Camacho to Don Diego. Basilio doesn't become an hidalgo like Don Quijote, but he "looks a bit like one" (115) because he can handle a sword. Because Quiteria is higher-born than he, Camacho becomes "a kind of New Man, whose liberal use of his wealth has allowed him to overcome his low birth" (116). "Through a bit of literary sleight of hand, then, the peasants Camacho and Basilio are made to stand in respectively for the moneyed parvenu and the old-style noble of the sword" (116). This bit of critical sleight of hand gets Basilio lined up with Don Quijote as versions of chivalry and Camacho with Don Diego as "two rich farmers," but as Quint rightly points out (117), there remains the crucial matter of *sangre*: Don Diego is an hidalgo. Quint draws up a list of qualities shared by both (liberality and peacefulness) and leaves Don Diego's good lineage and "discreción" as an acknowledged but unaccounted for residue (118). This fact of *hidalguía* is a nagging residue on Quint's whole thesis: Don Quijote, Don Diego, and the Duques are all *hidalgos*. Quint's problem becomes how to distinguish among them, in terms of good guys and bad guys, according to how closely each of them cleaves to the traditional feudal-chivalric ideology.

Don Diego is by implication dissociated from the higher nobility personified by the Duques, who are genuine bad guys, according to Quint (no argument from me). Quint concludes that the Duques really exercise "an oppres-

sive power over Spanish society" (100), but he misses the essential fact that the Duque is in hock to his own vassal. A new order has in fact come to exist, but invisibly. I would suggest that the real standard bearer of the new "middling class" on its way to displacing the aristocracy as the protagonist of history is the wealthy farmer whose son has seduced and abandoned Doña Rodríguez' daughter but who remains immune from punishment because the Duque is in debt to him. This unaristocratic landowner has somehow managed to accumulate a surplus of cash (i.e., a capital), which he invests by making loans, which in turn allows him to overturn the official, feudal socio-economic relations and exercise real control over his feudal lord. This man is the real wave of the future. Like his exact counterpart, the anonymous third Pérez de Viedma brother off in America making money and recalled in precisely this context by Quint (108), he is present in the text only by reference.

The complementary second half of Quint's thesis concerning *Don Quijote II* is that the character of Don Quijote himself has been radically changed. Don Quijote might disagree, as he does when he discovers that Avellaneda's Don Quijote has fallen out of love with Dulcinea (II, 59), but to bring that up would cramp Quint's style. "Cervantes radically changes the character of Don Quijote by associating him with the ethos and behavior of a middling social class that is moneyed and peace loving" (99). "The Don Quijote of Part Two is a changed man" (100). "One cannot insist too much upon the difference between the Don Quijotes of the two parts of the novel" (106). "The Don Quijote of Part Two is...more of a middle-class hero" (124). The "gentler, wiser Don Quijote of Part Two is already evolving into the Alonso Quijano the Good he will become in its last chapter" (105). Kudos, by the way, to Quint for recognizing that the identity of Alonso Quijano el Bueno is in fact a new one. Evidence of this evolution is that in *Don Quijote II* the wounds he inflicts are "pointedly unreal" (103); he hits puppets instead of Basques. Quint offers the combat that Sansón Carrasco "lured him into" (I, 14) as the only exception, leaving in silence the analogous combat (II, 64), in which Don Quijote failed to inflict any wounds at all because he was vanquished but where his combative spirit remained undiminished. And I suppose the lashes to be inflicted on Sancho don't count, because their source is the Duques and he is to administer them himself, even though Don Quijote is very enthusiastic about them. Neither does Quint mention Don Quijote's violent nocturnal attack on Sancho (II, 60), a marker of his frustration at the squire's unwillingness to beat himself. Don Quijote's definitive turn away from violence is the result of his relationship with Sancho, which reaches a crisis in II, 72, where Don Quijote has to choose between Dulcinea and Sancho, and chooses Sancho (which Quint concedes at the end of the last sentence of his discussion of this episode [160]). As far as I can see, this change in attitude has nothing

to do with Don Diego de Miranda or with Camacho el Rico, but grows out of the evolving relationship with Sancho.

Quint takes as more evidence of the radical change in character upon which his thesis depends the fact that "he no longer appears to hallucinate as he did in Part One" (105). I would ask why he no longer hallucinates, and I would answer that he no longer needs to. Early on in his career/project, he needed to create the environment necessary to allow him to practice knight-errantry, to be the person he wants to be. He mobilizes a frankly psychotic unconscious mechanism called distortion, which involves grossly reshaping external reality to make it conform to inner needs. Foucault said Don Quijote reads reality in order to make the books of chivalry true. Windmills become giants and inns castles. My idea is that by the beginning of *Don Quijote II*, Don Quijote has emerged as a person recognizable as Don Quijote as the result of the dialectic of his own desire/project and the world. He no longer needs to reshape reality in order to be who he wants to be. I think that many of the features Quint points to as evidence for the change he posits are the consequence of that process. In addition, the entire question has simply become passé. As early as I, 45 Cervantes had definitively subordinated the interpretation of reality to the matter of interpersonal relations and had begun to hint at the vast submerged continents of unspoken desire that underlie and account for such divergent labels as "basin" and "helmet." Part Two assumes this unspoken desire as its baseline, and explores different manifestations and consequences. It is not that Don Quijote requires his "fantasies of knighthood" to be "propped up" by others in order to be Don Quijote "even as his own powers of fantasy fail him" (106); the text explores the debilitating effect wrought on Don Quijote's "powers of fantasy" by the creation by others of a ready-made chivalric environment (the Duques), or by the imposition of a misinterpretation of reality from without (Sancho in II, 10). Again, what is at stake are the relationships between characters, not the interpretation of reality.

As part of his strategy to relate *Don Quijote II* specifically to a new, money-based economy, Quint observes that "Cervantes already has his heroes take money along with them on their quest in Part Two. This is the final detail that we learn at the end of Chapter 7" (124). But as it happens, the same prudent provision of cash is also present in Chapter 7 of Part One, as a consequence of Don Quijote's first clash with the modern world in the brief first sally.

I think Marx would agree with Quint's conclusion, which offers a synopsis of the subsequent evolution of the novel, from "tales of great captains and kings" to "the stories of middling people and of their quiet, imperfect heroism" (160), even though it avoids the familiar Marxist categories of aristocracy and bourgeoisie. I think Quint is correct in global terms, and has made a val-

uable contribution to the study of the evolution of the novel, but he is mistaken with respect to the specific properties of this text. I cannot agree with his identification of Don Quijote, or Camacho el Rico and Don Diego de Miranda, for that matter, as one of this new breed of middling hero. In fact, the text specifically associates Don Quijote's death with his realization that the only course open to him at the end of his travels is precisely to become like Don Diego. When she hears about his plan to trade a life of chivalric fiction for one based on the pastoral variety, the Ama counsels him: "estése en su casa, confiese a menudo, favorezca a los pobres, y sobre mi ánima si mal le fuere." It is exactly at this point that Don Quijote throws in the towel: "Callad, hijas, que yo sé bien lo que me cumple. Llevadme al lecho" (II, 73). It is undeniable that Cervantes' novel straddles the broad and shifting boundary between feudalism and modern capitalistic society, and that the novel and its readership will evolve in the direction of characters more like the comfortable Don Diego and the wealthy Camacho. And I agree with Quint that Cervantes himself had "made his peace with modernity" (127). What I cannot accept is the thesis that Don Quijote himself is similarly inclined. I believe that Cervantes presents a dialectic in which Sancho is consistently the spokesman for a modern, protocapitalistic mentality, and that Don Quijote comes to the fruitful compromise of II, 72 as a result of the invasion of the purely economic sphere by the intense personal relationship that has developed between the two men. It is that relationship that transcends the hierarchy of feudalism and maybe, maybe points toward a possible new kind of interclass (not classless, yet) society.

Carroll B. Johnson
Department of Spanish and Portuguese
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1532
johnson@humnet.ucla.edu