

Published in *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 7  
(1983 [1984]): 155-157.

Carroll B. Johnson. *Madness and Lust. A Psychoanalytical Approach to Don Quixote*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983. x + 230 pp. ISBN: 0-520-04752-4. \$22.50.

In this book Carroll Johnson studies Don Quixote's madness from a sexual point of view, treating him as though he were a real person and tracing his actions back to their unspoken motivations. His thesis is easily stated. Alonso Quixano's insanity is not caused by the reading of romances of chivalry, but by unresolved sexual tension and the pressures of middle age. A bachelor, with only women sharing his house, he is disturbed by the maturation of his niece, and takes refuge first in literature, then in a radical change of life and the deflection of this unacceptable desire to a new object, Dulzinea. (There is a weaker suggestion that Sancho is similarly disturbed by the maturation of his daughter Sanchica.) Dulzinea is developed in response to and defense from the real erotic possibilities he is offered: prostitutes, the innkeeper's daughter "Miss Palomeque," Doña Rodríguez. His relationship with Sancho is similarly a substitute for love for a woman; while their relationship is not sexual, it is loving.

I can see why Johnson is afraid, as he says in the introduction, that this book will not be well received by Hispanists, fractious lot that we are. Yet his goals are [p. 156] refreshingly modest ones; he is not trying to explain the whole book, merely to call attention to an element that has not been properly examined. This he does well. He shows that the concept of a "mid-life crisis," even though not called by that term, existed in the works of sixteenth-century medical writers that Cervantes might well have known. (However, the apparent cut-off date of 1980 has excluded the reconsideration of one such source, Huarte de San Juan by Malcolm K. Read, *Juan Huarte de San Juan* [Boston: Twayne, 1981], and Chester S. Halka, "Don Quijote in the Light of Huarte's *Examen de ingenios*: A Reexamination," *Acer*, 19 [1981], 3-13.) I would not have said that Don Quixote is an impotent virgin, but he himself confesses that he has never had sexual relations with a woman (II, 48), nor would I have said that he is in love with his

niece, but the book's emphasis on adolescent women is undeniable. Alonso Quixano's "mozo de campo y plaza," mentioned in I, 1, is immediately forgotten, and Sancho's daughter is mentioned much more often than in his son. The protagonist does reject every opportunity for legitimate sexual satisfaction, and thus is, in true neurotic fashion, "artifice de su desventura," rather than of his "ventura," as he claims (II, 66).

A test of a book's value is the thought it provokes. This book provokes quite a bit. One avenue Johnson does not explore, save to point out, with an air of disapproval, the priest's celibacy, is the religious. In thinking about other examples of mod-life crises of Cervantes' day or before, thus to be sure that it is not a uniquely American, or even Californian, phenomenon, it seems that there were a good many of them, but they were most often religious in the resolution. Alluded to only in a chapter title is the case of Dante; a Hispanic example is Lull. Yet a case with which Cervantes was surely acquainted, considering the popularity of his works in sixteenth-century Spain and the reflections of his ideas in Cervantes, is St. Augustine. All of these men tell us in their writings that, in their thirties, they suffered a crisis with considerable sexual content, and turned to God for relief. That don Quixote's erotic chivalry is quasi-religious in nature is stressed in the text. Would not a religious commitment have been an appropriate way for him to deal with his sexual tension and fears of death?

Another area that Johnson stays quite clear of, though he must have reflected on it, is the applicability of all of this to Cervantes. If Don Quixote was a *cincuentón*, as Johnson points out, Cervantes was too, and if Don Quixote lived in an exclusively female household, but without a wife, so did Cervantes (in Valladolid); though married, he never refers to his wife. Cervantes also had a mid-life career change. Why was *he* so fond of romances of chivalry, and why did he protest so strongly against them? Is *all* the sexual tension of *Don Quixote* to be attributed to the conscious creation of a fictional universe? When some must be subtly teased out of the text, this would seem unlikely. And what, if anything, are we to make of the Quixotic portrait of the author on the cover?

Two minor corrections. It is not Vivaldo, but Don Quixote who maintains that being in love is an essential part of being a knight-errant (p. 25). The recollections of Feliciano de Silva's works in I, 1 can not be from the *Segunda Celestina* (pp. 68, 111); such a

debt is mentioned by none of the modern editors of the work (Chamorro Fernández, Monk, and Criado de Val), and the phrase are traced to romances by Sydney Cravens, “Feliciano de Silva and His Romances of Chivalry in *Don Quijote*,” *Inti*, No. 7 (Spring, 1978), pp. 28-34. [p. 157]

There are a few minor emendations which could be made in the notes, which in truth, as Cervantes would say, contain much that is very helpful. Regarding Dorotea’s feet (I, 28), a relevant article is A. David Kossoff, “El pie desnudo: Cervantes y Lope,” *Homenaje a William L. Fichter* (Madrid: Castalia, 1971), pp. 381-86. The papers cited on p. 211, n. 10 and p. 216, n. 16 were published in 1981. Rodríguez Marín’s “Nueva edición crítica” of *Don Quixote* is confusingly cited as 1949 on p. 212, n. 17, and 1948 on p. 216, n. 14; it should be cited as 1947-49. Martín de Riquer is the author of *Caballeros andantes españoles* (p. 212, n. 17), a volume he himself called “divulgativo”; most of the same material is presented in a more up-to-date and scholarly form in his *Cavalleria fra realtà e letteratura nel quattrocento* (Bari: Adriatica, 1970). Finally, it is Pierre Alzieu, not Alzien (p. 217, n. 4), and Dominique Aubier, not Auber (p. 206, n. 3), yet is this latter typo prevents readers from locating Aubier’s book, so much the better.

The example of Aubier shows, by contrast, how well-grounded and stimulating this book really is. It is also well-written, easy to read, and has a good index. Welcome.

Daniel Eisenberg  
Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306 (USA)