

Character-Building in *Don Quijote*

EDWARD H. FRIEDMAN

AMIGOS CERVANTISTAS Y QUIJOTESCOS: A focus of my paper is characterization in *Don Quijote*, including the elements within the narrative that point the knight errant *toward* and *away from* what has come to be known as *realism*.¹ Cervantes's deviation from literary idealism points, on the one hand, to the Italian *novella* and the early Spanish picaresque, and, on the other, to the *entes de ficción* that, flouting the conventions of realism, inhabit the realm of metafiction. Rather than a hybrid or a liminal creature, Don Quijote is a study in contrasts rather than an amalgamation: often a ludicrous figure to be ridiculed or, at any rate, viewed with ironic detachment, yet on occasion a man worthy of sympathy, a character with whom the reader can identify.² I want to look at this dualism and its analytical implications. In the process of examining approaches to Don Quijote the character and *Don Quijote* the novel, I want to acknowledge and honor the work of one of my guides, colleagues, friends, and—not using the term lightly—heroes, Carroll B. Johnson, who taught us to look “inside” Alonso Quijano. I hope that my route will prove to be logical; it will not be *direct*, however.

One of the remarkable achievements of Guillermo del Toro's recent film *El laberinto del fauno* is the radical shift from levels of superrealism to high fantasy. The film pays homage to a number of predecessors, including Lewis Carroll and the brothers Grimm. This is potentially dangerous

¹ This paper is a slightly revised version of an invited lecture delivered at the Cervantes Society of America business meeting at the Modern Language Association convention in Chicago in December, 2007. I am most grateful to the CSA for the invitation.

² I have attempted to explore the realism-metafiction spectrum in *Cervantes in the Middle*.

ground, in the sense that the unforgiving politics of Franco's Spain might seem to have little connection to fairy-tale worlds, no matter how gruesome or monstrous they may be. There is nothing more serious than the struggle for existence and the cruelties of armed combat—guerrilla warfare five years into the dictatorship—and stylized images of imaginary or alternate spaces could run the risk of trivializing or detracting from the representation of a uniquely Spanish reality. Montxo Armendáriz's *Silencio roto*, of 2001, takes place in the same year—1944—and also centers on the role of the *maquis*, or resistance fighters, in the mountainous regions of the north, but the action is straightforward and the emotional thrust is uninterrupted, undiluted. Del Toro's realization is conspicuously different. Coincidentally, right before viewing *El laberinto del fauno*, I happened to see, in a hotel room, the 1999 film *Crazy in Alabama*, which marks Antonio Banderas's directorial debut. The movie has two plot lines, one involving a woman played by Melanie Griffith, who flees to California after decapitating her abusive husband—with the head in tow—to find fame and fortune in Hollywood, and the other involving intolerance and the resistance to integration in the small Alabama town where the murder took place. The two plots merge somewhat—and unsuccessfully—at the end, when Melanie stands trial in her hometown, but the fit is awkward, and ultimately impossible. Each part requires a particular tone, at odds with the other. The operative mode for the Melanie Griffith segments is wackiness mixed with black humor, while for the others (featuring the young actor Lucas Black) there is a poignancy and a delicacy, despite the eccentricities that surround the proceedings. *El laberinto del fauno* manages to walk this difficult tightrope and to fuse realism with allegory. And I believe that the juxtaposition is significant in a number of ways.

Visually, *El laberinto del fauno* is a marvel, extraordinarily creative and majestic in the fantasy sequences but also handled with the most subtle and solemn of palettes on the realistic plane. It is my feeling that del Toro, the writer of the screenplay as well as the director, emphasizes the fairy tales that intrigue the young protagonist Ofelia for a reason. The stories are not only the vehicles of her escape but her sacred books, her Bible (or, perhaps more correctly, her substitute for the Bible). James

Parr has signaled the “subversive discourse” of *Don Quijote*, its resistance to the authority, and authorities, of the past, and this does not exclude the Holy Scriptures. There seems to be in *El laberinto del fauno* a similar correlation between an authoritarian government that links Church and State and a highlighting of discourses of alterity. Del Toro may be advising the spectator to synthesize the diverse planes, to make sense of each of them, individually and collectively. Ofelia, the trapped child and the princess who reclaims her heritage, is emblematic of two Spains, one real, one imaginary, and both revised and refashioned by history. Books are at the heart of the matter. Books are shaping agents: of personality and of the “mirrors to nature” constructed in representational and, *a su manera*, in nonrepresentational art. In *Don Quijote*, Cervantes associates books with madness—with the imagination run amok—yet makes fictional texts inseparable from reality. Aided by the magical word *historia*, he defies the Aristotelian division of *history* and *poetry*, not so much through poeticized history, or historicized poetry, as by novel reconfigurations of each. Cervantes the bibliophile and Don Quixote the bibliophile revere books, but neither is an uncritical reader, and, in fact, the slogan “Everyone is a critic” may have originated—at least, in spirit—in 1605 and have found its maximum expression in 1615.

When I ponder literary characters who strike me as far removed from *hombres (y mujeres) de carne y hueso*, my thoughts immediately go to Don Alonso, Lope de Vega’s *caballero de Olmedo*, and to Augusto Pérez, the protagonist of Miguel de Unamuno’s *Niebla*. Don Alonso could be said to live and die poetry. The play records the transferal of his metaphorical musings, based most prominently on the courtly love tradition, to an “actualization” or “literalization” of dying for love. The audience foresees and awaits his demise, and the play’s dénouement addresses a tragic situation (which stems from a comic format) in which the hero seems more real when dead than alive, because the figurative language dies with him. In his attempt to counter nineteenth-century realism and naturalism, Unamuno fabricates the *nivola*, which depicts reality indirectly, periphrastically. Characters such as Augusto Pérez resemble ideological abstractions more than recognizable, physical types. Augusto is lost in thought, is thought personified, or dehumanized, as it were. His

death is ambiguous, but there appears to be little substantive to mourn. This is especially arresting because his inscription in a classic novel gives him—and, even more importantly, for Unamuno—his creator a glimpse, and an earthly simulacrum, of immortality. It may not be inadvertent that Unamuno's experiments with character portrayal following *Paz en la guerra* (1895) have what may be labeled a Freudian inflection; they are encoded images and certainly real, after the lexicon of reality has been rewritten. The line to Borges, Cortázar, and the writers of the *nueva narrativa hispanoamericana* is obvious. For me, the psychological insights of pre-Freudian writers—Mateo Alemán and María de Zayas come to mind, alongside Cervantes, of course—are, if anything, more fascinating, because there are no predetermined frames, no predetermined interpretations or symbols, beyond humoral theory and the early lessons of Juan Huarte de San Juan's *Examen de ingenios*, and no Freudian reading of madness as part of a comic vision. The dried-up brain of Alonso Quijano is, understandably, inconsistent, obsessive, delusional, and elusive. That brain and all that it connotes, and conjures, are, in a manner of speaking, the subject and the reigning metonym of *Don Quijote*. If Alonso Quijano is a fiction, Don Quijote is twice-removed from so-called reality, and yet he is no more or less real than those who coexist on the page with him, and, as Unamuno has suggested, no more or less real than Cervantes or the reader.

The very idea of metafiction can be compared to a marionette performance in which the strings are clearly and intentionally visible. In analogical terms, the "strings" are there in realism, but the objective is to conceal or disregard them. From several angles, Don Quijote is a *construct*, a counterpoint to real human beings. As he moves through the narrative—and as the narrative progresses—he becomes more and more a fictional entity, a literary, rhetorical, and cultural sign, a facet of Cervantes's textual and conceptual design. When reality threatens to intrude on the scheme, the author finds a means of escape. See, for example, the flight of the knight and his squire from the main road to the Sierra Morena in chapter 23 of Part I, in order to avoid pursuit by the agents of the Holy Brotherhood after the freeing of the galley slaves. Off the beaten path, they meet up with figures such as Cardenio and Dorotea who are sto-

rytellers and *dramatis personae*, more striking perhaps as generic models than as living, breathing souls. In Part 2, Don Quijote is the subject of a chronicle that has given him a dose of fame. He is known through his historical alter ego, which animates the plot of the 1615 volume but casts the formerly unpredictable knight into the metaplots of others, readers of Part 1. Much goes on in the first part beyond the chivalric adventures, but the adventures form the basis of the linear movement of the narrative. Part 2 depends much more heavily on reader-response. The metafiction becomes internally driven; the broad category of books is replaced by *the book*, or, more accurately, three books: Cide Hamete Benengeli's, Cervantes's, and, alas, Avellaneda's. Part 1 is about Don Quijote achieving success, if not indisputably, to the extent that his exploits have been etched into history. Part 2—and, arguably, the spurious sequel—is about the cost of that success, with respect to Don Quijote's identity and good name, and Cervantes's intellectual property. The character and the novel are consumed by—and into—the metafictional layers that comprise the second part.

The soon-to-be *cincuentón* Don Quijote is, at first, full of energy, visualizing an account of his accomplishments but, nonetheless, taking to the road and fighting the good—if not always the wise—fight. There comes a point, around midway in Part 1, when Don Quijote and Sancho take refuge in the mountains, in which the knight's romance-in-the-making is subordinated to the narratives of others, often presented diegetically rather than mimetically; stories are told or read aloud, varying from the invented fiction of Princess Micomicona to the (pseudo) autobiographical captive's tale. Juan Palomeque's inn is a locus for these adventures in storytelling, which culminate in a type of theatrical flourish in which lovers are paired and strangers identified, with the ominous presence of the Holy Brotherhood again marking a closure within the narrative sequence.

As soon as the *hidalgo* from La Mancha goes mad from reading and transforms himself into Don Quijote, the text becomes indistinguishable from the intertext. The romances of chivalry become a poetics and a prescription for action. From the start, Don Quijote simultaneously faces rivals and rival fictions (among them, pastoral romance as refashioned

in the Marcela-Grisóstomo episodes). The knight is eager to demonstrate his prowess on the field of battle, but his reflections on how history will remember him precede his first challenge. He is born of books and thinks of himself as preserved *in* and *for* history. He personifies *imitatio*. He is guided by a glorious past that is itself a product of idealization and thus of fiction. His love object is a pure abstraction, and a great portion of the scenarios in which he places himself stem from adaptations of his readings rather than from the “real” circumstances in which he finds himself. Out of touch with reality, he is immersed in chivalric fiction, and those around him are readily disposed to cater to his whims.

In Part 2, Don Quijote has difficulty freeing himself from the triumph shared rather indiscriminately by Cide Hamete Benengeli and Miguel de Cervantes, that is, from “the book” that has brought him into the world beyond fiction but that now has situated itself into the continuation. The authorial personas must face the critics, and the knight must face the quixotic others: one benevolent, one malicious (or maliciously spawned). Paradoxically, the “good” Quijote is more destructive, because he drains the spontaneity out of the knight, whereas the “evil” Quijote spurs him into full gear from chapter 59 onward, when his mission becomes the redemption of his name and of his book. Without that, the “disenchantment” of Dulcinea—derived from a stratagem of Sancho Panza—is his primary motivation. Action in Part 2 is predicated on the devices of readers of Part 1, notably Sansón Carrasco and the Duke and Duchess, and of Sancho, who has learned from experience. Avellaneda allows Cervantes to place another book into the equation, and he effects what would previously have seemed inconceivable: an alliance among Don Quijote, Cervantes, and Cide Hamete Benengeli, absurd but earnest soul brothers. That is one reason why the words of Cide Hamete’s pen at the end of the trajectory are so moving and so decisive, because Cervantes, anticipating Unamuno, suggests that immortality in the here and now can resist, or, at a minimum, forestall death. In the 1615 *Quijote*, criticism, theory, commentary, and, above all, one might contend, an internal system of intertextuality and self-referentiality draw the narrative threads to a conclusion. Don Quijote’s character may be more a question of semiotics and semantics than of human conduct. Verisimilitude (or

lack thereof) applies to literary points of reference. Behavioral norms (or transgressions) may seem to be relegated to the background, but to what degree is this the case?

On the basis of narrative complexity—and, specifically, the relation between a narrator or narrators and an implied author—the picaresque establishes a paradigm that will advance, almost indiscriminately, to realism and modernism and their aftermaths. *Pícaros* construct their stories, bare their souls, and, with the help of an overriding authorial presence, provide ironic counterarguments to their statements. They are subjects and objects, and this form of Renaissance self-fashioning both validates and contradicts the designation; every created voice is supplemented by a voice-over. Nonetheless, the voicing in itself—despite the narrative ventriloquism—amplifies the psychological foundations of narrative. Lázaro de Tormes's defensive explanation of his "case" becomes an autobiographical—and psychological—profile, a revelation of far more than the *pícaro* seems to reckon on, and, viewed from a distance, more than the anonymous author will have supposed. On one plane, Lázaro wants his narratee to understand his plight, to sympathize with him, and to agree that, given his inauspicious heredity and environment, he has made impressive strides. On a second, he appears to be operating under the premise that he is somehow upwardly mobile, but "his own words"—articulated by him, crafted by another—will deconstruct that misconception. On a third, which turns the irony back on itself, the voice is successful in conveying a mature Lázaro as the product of conditions exposed—consciously, unconsciously, subconsciously—in the narrative. There is amazing consistency in this cultural artifact and psychological document, and the same is true of Mateo Alemán's *Guzmán de Alfarache*, completed in 1604, and Francisco de Quevedo's *La vida del buscón*, published after *Don Quijote* but said to have circulated in manuscript in the first years of the seventeenth century. Alemán and Quevedo could hardly be more intrusive, yet the narrator/protagonists have their say.

In my opinion, Cervantes recognizes and personalizes the structure of picaresque narrative, taking certain elements, such as perspective, to new heights. I would differentiate between *structure* and *psychology*, because the motif of the individual in society plays out differently in each

context. In the picaresque, the shaping of the narrative mirrors the shaping of the subject. One senses that, for the authors, social protocol must be obeyed, so that parables about civil disobedience cannot have happy endings. The *pícaros* are trapped jointly, in society and in their discourse, but the traps are symbolic and finally transparent. Amid shifting centers, margins, and decentering, the key ingredient remains the individual, the subject, the subjective, the *self*, whether as an indictment against insubordination, as a pretext for didacticism or indoctrination, as an artistic exhibition, or as a forum for change. Although readers in different times and places, and of varying sensibilities, will not react in unison, it seems likely that most readers will observe ambiguities, mixed messages, and glaring gaps in the picaresque texts, an openness that allocates a space precisely for the reader and for multiple interpretations. Cervantes builds upon the narrative structure of the picaresque, but while he is obviously interested in commenting on human nature, his treatment of psychology per se tends to accentuate what might be called the cast of thousands, which includes, of course, the individual who becomes Don Quijote. One can trace a pathology of madness, but it is the *literariness*, not the *clinical side*, of the madness and the allegorical and metafictional aspects of the knight, not his medical charts or psychological test results, that predominate. Cervantes avails himself of the *constructedness* of the picaresque and turns it into a maximum display of the literary field, in its most comprehensive sense, and of the dialectics of life and art.

Don Quijote's madness affects his thinking, his speech, and his engagement with others. He misconstrues, or reorients, reality, to confirm his flights of fancy and to conform to the chivalric models to which he has dedicated himself. The big picture is not the illness or the trials of a madman, but the place of literature in society and the trials of authorship. Although he cedes the narrative territory to the Arab historian and to a host of surrogate writers and tellers of tales, Cervantes assumes the mediating position in *Don Quijote*, and he makes that position the crux of the story. *Don Quixote* is an allegory of writing, an allegory of reading, and an allegory of the representation of reality. Its anti-Aristotelian stance is a paean to art, a daring apologia for art as macrocosm. *Don Quijote* strays from the idealism that serves as its point of origin and

contributes to an emerging realism, but it is realism with a metafictional edge, with as many ties to modernism and postmodernism as to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century European realism and naturalism. In *The Rise of the Novel*, Ian Watt—infamously, for Hispanists—disregards early modern Spanish fiction—or considers it to be deficient—as he elaborates on the psychological development of characters as a criterion for the “modern novel.” A good number of scholars have begged to differ, but one may note (1) the coexistence of idealist, realist, and metafictional narrative over the centuries; (2) a convergence of sorts of the three in *Don Quijote*; and (3), although the sets are by no means mutually exclusive, one line that leads from the picaresque to later European realism and another that leads from *Don Quijote* to *Tristram Shandy* to modernism and postmodernism. Cervantes precociously stresses what would become a poststructuralist principle: the foregrounding of a mediating “other,” whereby similitude is always trumped by difference. Don Quixote needs the romances and Cervantes needs the recourses of literature in order to mediate reality, to render it artistically. If realism is *engaño*, metafiction is *desengaño*, a “warts and all,” unapologetic, and (via Roland Barthes) “writerly” approach to representation.³ This means, in part, that *Don Quijote* should not be read as flawed or incomplete realism, but as a dynamic blend of modes whose driving force is metaliterary.

The map of reading, or misreading, *Don Quixote* that I have outlined favors a self-referential frame.⁴ I am an advocate of flexibility in analysis, and I want my students to see how *Don Quijote* is the poster novel for diverse readings, for the limitless and mutable accumulation of what Jorge Luis Borges named “partial magic” (“Magias parciales”). On the topic of characterization, since I prefer to place the knight errant at the metafictional end of the personality spectrum, it behooves me to find an opposing point of view, and Carroll Johnson, in *Madness and Lust*:

3 In *S/Z*, Barthes employs the terms *lisible* (“readerly”) and *scriptible* (“writerly”) to differentiate between, respectively, those texts that make few demands on the reader and those that actively engage the reader. Through this dichotomy, Barthes stresses the status of the reader as consumer versus the reader as producer of texts.

4 The allusion is to Harold Bloom’s *A Map of Misreading*.

A Psychoanalytical Approach to Don Quixote and in the closing chapter of *Don Quixote: The Quest for Modern Fiction*, comes to my rescue. His commentary is premised on the belief that one may analyze a literary character as if he or she were “real.” Taking into account Don Quijote’s age, living conditions, domestic status, presumed sexual vigor and experience, and other factors, Johnson attributes the sallies to a mid-life crisis. He enters the character’s mind and seeks to explain his actions, his psychoses, and his madness as a source of happiness, of value. He makes much of the taboos that prohibit Don Quijote’s interaction with his niece and housekeeper and of his platonic friendship with Sancho Panza. He signals the crucial role of Don Diego de Miranda as a foil figure, an ultra-conservative citizen who takes no risks in a life that could be described as both successful and vacuous. Johnson forecasts in the introduction to *Madness and Lust*, which was published in 1983, that “I do not expect this book to be received with enthusiasm by most of my fellow Hispanists” (9), and he was not entirely wrong. This was his only book that did not receive consistently positive reviews, and the controversy that it provoked even made its way into his obituaries, together with tremendous praise for his brilliant scholarship and for his distinguished teaching career at UCLA.

Beginning in 1975, I reviewed four of Johnson’s books, an essay collection, and the manuscript of *Cervantes and the Material World*, and I loved having early access to his ideas. My review of *Madness and Lust* for the *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* was filled with admiration for the bold, heartfelt, and well-argued thesis, which I found compelling but also a bit, well, controversial. I expressed a greater comfort level with *Inside Guzmán de Alfarache*, of 1978, informed, as well, by Freud (and by Nietzsche, Marx, and Sartre), but geared, as its title attests, to the inner workings of the narrative, to a close reading of textual events, and to what Johnson calls the “human context” (9). Discourse analysis is united with such topics as unresolved Oedipal conflict, the “cash nexus” (the assertion that all tangible and intangible objects are for sale, and therefore only available to the rich), and “hierarchical interchangeability” (where sacred and secular authorities intersect and become transferable). For Johnson, psychoanalysis offers a method for bringing contradictions and

conflict into the interpretive process (v. *Inside* 215-29). *Cervantes and the Material World*, published in 2000, is a crowning achievement, a combination of detailed and subtle readings, and an exemplar of cultural studies. Johnson's breadth of knowledge is evident on every page. I would like to discuss what some might deem a more modest study, *Don Quixote: The Quest for Modern Fiction*, first published in 1990, as an analogue (or synecdoche) of his numerous publications.

I have used *The Quest for Modern Fiction* in many classes, most recently this past semester. The book functions as a general commentary on *Don Quijote*, but its clarity and succinctness do not dim its sophistication. In the acknowledgments, Johnson thanks his teachers, his "fellow *cervantistas* and Quixote freaks" (I cannot overstate my delight at being on the list), his students, his editors, his analyst, and his wife Leslie. Following a concise chronology of Cervantes's life and works, Johnson presents a simple but fundamental thesis in chapter 1: To appreciate *Don Quijote*, one should learn as much as possible about its historical context: Spain between 1500 and 1615. In eighteen pages, he traces the clash of the Old Learning with the New, scholasticism (formal logic) with humanism (philology). He speaks of Erasmus in Spain, calling attention to the *Manual of the Militant Christian*, its emphasis on interior devotion, and its appeal to New Christians. He briefly discusses the three religions—he was, after all, a student of Don Américo Castro—along with the obsession with blood purity, social and economic hierarchies, and the symbolism of Don Quijote's madness and "his estrangement from society's norms and expectations" (11).⁵ He then gives several textual examples that illustrate how a sense of context can enhance a reading of the novel. Chapter 2, on "The Importance of the Work," consists of three pages that encapsulate the uncanny ability of Cervantes to inscribe past and future theories and critical approaches into the text. In chapter 3, on the critical reception of *Don Quijote*, Johnson covers the "funny book" stance of the seventeenth century, the eighteenth-century reading as an "epic of reason," the nineteenth-century "Romantic" and "idealist" approaches, the

⁵ It is interesting to note that Ian Watt, in *Myths of Modern Individualism*, published some four decades after *The Rise of the Novel*, brings Américo Castro into his argument. See esp. 80-84.

rubric “Renaissance” versus “Baroque,” the “perspectivist” versus “cautionary” critics delineated by Arthur Efron, and so forth. Not surprisingly, Johnson mentions Salvador de Madariaga’s *Guía del lector del Quijote*, of 1926, translated into English as “*Don Quixote*”: *An Introductory Essay in Psychology*, which, he maintains, “has the merit of treating Don Quixote and the other characters as though they were real people whose behavior can be analyzed using the methods of modern psychology” (*Quest* 29), and which has led to other studies based on the tools afforded by psychology.

After summarizing Parts 1 and 2 of *Don Quijote*, Johnson includes a chapter on the metaliterary aspects of the novel, entitled “A Book about Books,” in which he underscores both Cervantes’s dialogue with the intertext—the theory and practice of literature—and the protagonist’s and other characters’ use of literature as “a model for living, a kind of script for life, a way of transforming life into art” (*Quest* 88). In the next chapter, “Readers and Reading,” he shows how *Don Quijote* aids (and abets) pedagogy by forcing readers *into* the text and by forcing instructors to teach critical analysis while avoiding either the *imposition* of their readings onto the student or a too-casual *dependence* on free-floating signifiers. And then comes chapter 8, “People, Real and Fictional,” in essence a seventeen-page summary of *Madness and Lust*. Johnson makes the case for contemplating Don Quixote as if he were a real person and for looking for verisimilitude through character motivation. He states, “My Don Quixote is a sexual being, whose identity, whose story, and whose interest for me as a reader ultimately depend on his sexuality. My Don Quixote is propelled backward into life by his flight from an unbearable environmental pressure personified in his niece and the threat of incest” (*Quest* 118). When I read this chapter, I am reminded of Borges’s “Pierre Menard, autor del *Quijote*,” which posits that even if a new author were able to rewrite the novel verbatim, differences in context would change its impact, its significance. Johnson’s thesis, when judged within the continuum of *The Quest for Modern Fiction*, concords beautifully with the vision of an open and multi-textured narrative and with the interdisciplinarity that has influenced research in the humanities. Perhaps more than *Madness and Lust*—in which the thesis seemed more isolated—

it has made me reflect on the analytical enterprise and on questions of characterization in *Don Quijote*.

It is a paradox but not a shock that Cervantes's break from idealism takes its lead from idealism and that its early modern realism resembles the late nineteenth-century *early* modernism of writers such as Unamuno. The dynamics of metafiction and realism is, I would submit, the *primum mobile* of *Don Quijote*. My reading would probably place the proportion as 65% to 35% in favor of metafiction, but each side constantly references and energizes the other. My feeling is that Carroll Johnson might have inverted these numbers (or scoffed politely at reducing a reading of *Don Quijote* to statistics). My numbers omit, of course, the middle ground between the two categories and the elasticity of a text that invites us to reconsider our analytical options with each rereading. The bottom line, for me, is communicated in the sentence "Aristotle believes art imitates life; Cervantes suggests life can imitate art," and these are the words of Carroll Johnson (*Quest* 88). The word/world dichotomy is the controlling mechanism of the narrative.

So, how real is *Don Quijote*? Do we want to put him on the couch? I think that one can find in Johnson's writings the raw material for a rhetoric of characterization that connects symbolism, realism (verisimilitude, motivation), and psychology, and that can function under the umbrella of *literariness*, of metafiction. When I ask myself what *Don Quijote* is about, I know that my answer would not contain the word *psychosis*, but I am grateful that Carroll's probably would, for his criticism of the novel and of Golden Age literature has educated, enlightened, and challenged me. His focus gives added dimension and depth to *Don Quijote* and to the critical act. Personally, I would give my fifty-minute hours not to *Don Quijote*, Guzmán de Alfarache, Segismundo, or Hamlet, but to Cervantes, Alemán, Calderón, and Shakespeare, or maybe to myself as reader, since theoretical *desdoblamientos* are not out of the question. When I teach *Don Quijote*, my overriding goal is to have students realize, as the course ends, that all future readings will be inflected by their contact with Cervantes and his knight errant. My own reading of the novel is permanently affected—and inflected—by the work of Carroll Johnson and by his devotion to a four-hundred-year-old novel. I miss

Carroll, whom I feel immensely privileged to have known, but he will always be in my library, in my classroom, and in my heart.

Department of Spanish and Portuguese
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee 37240
edward.h.friedman@vanderbilt.edu

Works Cited

- Alemán, Mateo. *Guzmán de Alfarache*. Ed. José María Micó. 2 vols. Madrid: Cátedra, 1998.
- Armendáriz, Montxo, dir. *Silencio roto*. By Montxo Armendáriz. Oria Films (Spain), 2001.
- Avellaneda, Alonso Fernández de [pseud.]. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha, que contiene su tercera salida y es la quinta parte de sus aventuras*. Ed. Fernando García Salinero. Madrid: Castalia, 1987.
- Banderas, Antonio, dir. *Crazy in Alabama*. By Mark Childress. Green Moon Productions (United States), 1999.
- Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. Trans. Richard Miller. Pref. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1974.
- Bloom, Harold. *A Map of Misreading*. New York: Oxford UP, 1975.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. "Magias parciales del Quijote." *Otras inquisiciones. Obras completas*. Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1960. 2: 46-47.
- . "Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote." *Prosas completas*. 2 vols. Barcelona: Bruguera, 1980. 1: 425-33.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. John J. Allen. 2 vols. Madrid: Cátedra, 2005.
- del Toro, Guillermo, dir. *El laberinto del fauno*. By Guillermo del Toro. Tequila Gang (Mexico, Spain, United States), 2006.
- Friedman, Edward H. Rev. of *Cervantes and His Postmodern Constituencies*. Ed. Anne J. Cruz and Carroll B. Johnson. *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies* 3 (1999): 290-91.
- . *Cervantes in the Middle: Realism and Reality in the Spanish Novel from Lazarillo de Tormes to Niebla*. Newark: DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 2006.
- . Rev. of *Don Quixote: The Quest for Modern Fiction* by Carroll B. Johnson. *Hispania* 74.3 (1991): 668-69.
- . Rev. of *Inside Guzmán de Alfarache* by Carroll B. Johnson. *Rocky Mountain Review* 33.2 (1979): 74.
- . Rev. of *Madness and Lust: A Psychoanalytical Approach to Don Quixote* by

- Carroll B. Johnson. *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 19.1 (1985): 143-44.
- . Rev. of *Matías de los Reyes and the Craft of Fiction* by Carroll B. Johnson. *MLN* 90.2 (1975): 314-15.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Huarte de San Juan, Juan. *Examen de ingenios para las ciencias*. Ed. Guillermo Serés. Madrid: Cátedra, 1989.
- Johnson, Carroll B. *Cervantes and the Material World*. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 2000.
- . *Don Quixote: The Quest for Modern Fiction*. Boston: Twayne, 1990. [Currently published by Waveland P.]
- . *Inside Guzmán de Alfarache*. U of California Publications in Modern Philology, III. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.
- . *Madness and Lust: A Psychoanalytical Approach to Don Quixote*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1983.
- Lazarillo de Tormes*. Ed. Francisco Rico. Madrid: Cátedra, 1987.
- Madariaga, Salvador de. *Don Quixote: An Introductory Essay in Psychology*. Rev. ed. London: Oxford UP, 1961.
- Parr, James A. *Don Quixote: An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse*. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1988.
- Quevedo, Francisco de. *La vida del Buscón llamado Don Pablos*. Ed. Domingo Ynduráin. Texto fijado por Fernando Lázaro Carreter. Madrid: Cátedra, 1980.
- Unamuno, Miguel de. *Niebla*. Ed. Mario J. Valdés. Madrid: Cátedra, 2000.
- . *Paz en la guerra*. Ed. Francisco Caudet. Madrid: Cátedra, 1999.
- Vega, Lope de. *El caballero de Olmedo*. Ed. Edward H. Friedman. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 2004.
- Watt, Ian P. *Myths of Modern Individualism: Faust, Don Quixote, Don Juan, Robinson Crusoe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- . *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1967.
- Zayas y Sotomayor, María de. *Desengaños amorosos*. Ed. Alicia Yllera. Madrid: Cátedra, 1993.
- . *Novelas amorosas y ejemplares*. Ed. Julián Olivares. Madrid: Cátedra, 2000.