WRITING AS CONQUEST AND ANXIETY OF INFLUENCE IN JUAN GOYTISOLO'S *REIVINDICACION DEL CONDE DON JULIAN*

Time and again critics have pointed to Juan Goytisolo's novel *Count Julian* as the first Spanish work that was influenced by Latin American narrative of the decade of the sixties.[1] They have praised its experimental quality, its linguistic innovations and "the very complex net of convergences" (Oviedo, 1976: 199) which define its textuality. A rhetoric of complexity marks, in my opinion, this novel manifesting itself in an overabundance of stylistic and narrative strategies which echo Spanish American literature. The text is also full of riddles which fascinate the readers and prompt them to search for a solution. The present essay investigates such rhetoric of complexity as the author's means of both thematizing and linguistically enacting the idea of writing and reading as conquest. I have chosen this novel in order to illustrate the impact of Spanish American literature and in order to show how the anxiety of influence[2] shapes the style of a modern author..

For the readers who might not be familiar with the novel, let me summarize the plot: it is the voyage of a Spanish Joycean and Ulysses-like narrator in search of his identity. It takes place in Tangier in the space of one day. The narrator is self-exiled from General Franco's Spain and like all exiles, is obsessed with the country he left. His obsession manifests itself in three ways: first, he criticizes the Spanish historiographic versions of the Spanish national identity which have negated the importance of Arabic culture. Second, he engages certain works and authors of the Spanish literary canon, authors he dislikes mainly since they are known to him through the readings performed by the members of the *1898 Generaration.* The

---

1. These critics are: Emir Rodríguez Monegal "Juan Goytisolo: destrucción de la España sagrada." *Mundo Nuevo* 12 (1967): 44-60. Julio Ortega "An Interview with Juan Goytisolo." *Review of Contemporary Fiction* 4 (1984): 4-19. Roberto González Echevarría *La ruta de Severo Sarduy.* Hanover: Ediciones del Norte, 1987, 153. José Miguel Oviedo "La escisión total de Juan Goytisolo: hacia un encuentro con lo hispanoamericano." *Revista Iberoamericana* 95 (1976): 190-200. Michael Ugarte "Juan Goytisolo's Mirrors: Intertextuality and Self Reflection in *"Reivindicación del Conde Don Julián,"* in *Modern Fiction Studies* 26 (1980): 613-24. Carlos Fuentes *La nueva novela hispanoamericana*, "Juan Goytisolo: la lengua común," 78-84. Severo Sarduy "La desterritorialización," *Plural* 8 (1975): 54-57. All these critics emphasize the "subversive" aspects of Juan Goytisolo's writing. Roberto González Echevarría is the only revisionist who says that "la narrativa del escritor español es experimental dentro de las convenciones de la narrativa moderna y forma parte de una ideología cuya cuestión básica es la identidad cultural" (153). This essay is in part indebted to his insight.
2. By anxiety of influence I mean to insist on the oedipal competition this text and its Latin American precursor. 3This aspect of Goytisolo's novel has already been studied in Michael Ugarte's book *Trilogy of Treason: Intertextual Study of Juan Goytisolo*. Columbia: Missouri UP, 1982.

narrator chooses the figure of Count Julian, who was perceived in Spanish medieval legends as propitiating the Arabic invasion of Spain, to launch a literary attack on certain writers and historians. Third, an internal conflict. The narrator pursues the enigmatic figure of a little Moroccan boy who reminds him of himself as a child in Spain. This pursuit of his own past identity in the maze of the Arab city of Tangier is the pretext that Goytisolo chooses in order to expose the literary conflation between novelistic self-reflexivity and self-reflection.[3] This third aspect, the solution of the labyrinthine identity of the narrator as a child is the focus of my paper.

It is not the Holy War that Goytisolo undertakes once again, from Tangier this time, against Spanish values that makes this work an unmistakable product of the literary period of the sixties. Readers are used to Goytisolo's political crusades and his claim for intellectuals of a role of denunciation of opression as if they were "new Franciscans" (de Miguel, 1980: 36). It is not even the radical, iconoclastic and massive destruction of Spanish history and literature that amazed readers like Carlos Fuentes (1969: 83). It is primarily the dialogue with literary theory included in Count Julian and (in a much lesser degree) in his previous work, *Signs of Identity,* that provoked both Spanish and Spanish American readers through its novelty. Goytisolo gave many interviews on the subject,[4] but it is primarily the discussion with Emir Rodríguez Monegal published in *Mundo Nuevo* which explicitly points to the impact of Spanish American novels upon his work. In this discussion, he refers to the use of now familiar narrative techniques such as the second person narrative subject, the discontinuity of the temporal coherence in his novel, as well as to his readings of Borges on self-reflexivity and of Bakhtine on the notion of intertextuality, while demonstrating how they all shaped what I call his Holy War against the literary style of the sixties in Spain (1967: 44-60). This is the *Social Novel* influenced by the *Realist Socialist* credo. It is no surprise that under the influence of "the missionary aims of literary criticism and the salutory powers of verbal analysis" as Edward Said recalls the sixties (1991: 139), Goytisolo's intertextual battle against the despised authors of the Spanish canon was to be seen favorably by his most noteworthy critics[5].

Up to now, Goytisolo's novel has been analyzed as the perfect example of a possible redemption of Spain through the literary messianic work of subversion. I would like to suggest another reading of Goytisolo's intertextual battle. I would like to show that this "subversive" piece of writing and its author are obsessed by

---

4. Goytisolo talked with Julio Ortega in "An Interview with Juan Goytisolo," *Review of Contemporary Fiction* 4 (1984): 4-19 and Emir Rodríguez Monegal "Destrucción de la España sagrada," *Mundo Nuevo* 12 (1967): 44-60.
5. The image of the "destructive creation" which characterizes the novel's intertextual relations I have borrowed from the work of Linda Gould Levine. Linda Gould Levine *Juan Goytisolo: La destrucción creadora.* México: Joaquín Mortiz, 1976 and Michael Ugarte *Trilogy of Treason: An Intertextual Study of Juan Goytisolo.* Columbia: Missouri UP, 1982 engage in an intertextual study of Juan Goytisolo's work. For Gould Levine, as the title of her book suggests, the creation lies in the destruction. For Michael Ugarte, the destruction is not a sufficient proof of the creation of by Goytisolo of a new order (104).

the notion of writing as a struggle between the one who controls and the one who is being controled. In addition, I would like to show that in this novel, Goytisolo wants to gain a specific authority: that of a master of Modern Letters in Spain. This search for narratorial authority does not entail a fruitful dialogue with one's own tradition, a "creative destruction," but rather the supression, incorporation and cannibalization of different "others." This notion of cannibalization implies a theoretical, political and ethical revision of the novel's Modernity, which also deconstructs Modernity's decentering claims. Here is a powerful example from the novel that sustains my thesis. One of the founding gestures of the novel occurs in the library in Tangier: the narrator chooses to insert dead flies in the pages of the anthologies of Spanish seventeenth century works in order to obscure and render unreadable these despised authors[6]. Moreover, this image implies that Goytisolo's novel is to be seen as the Master Text[7].

Using the same rhetoric of liberation, critics have praised the self-reflexive nature of the text that mirrors the narrator's contemplations about himself. Michael Ugarte reads in Goytisolo's work as well as in Borges, Fuentes and Cortázar *"an anxiety to lay bare* (my emphasis) the mechanisms which are otherwise hidden behind a language that pretends to grasp reality" (1980: 613). Even though I also read such a narcissism of the form in the choice of this device, I do not share Michael Ugarte's opinion. I don't think that Goytisolo is so eager to showcase or uncover the self-referential nature of the work. In my opinion, Goytisolo offers an obstinate resistance to the reading of self-reflexivity in his narrative, a resistance that becomes evident at the beginning of the novel in his refusal to show that the work is able to produce a mirror of its own narrative principles. If inside the parameters of Modern fiction self-reflexivity, as I will show, has become the emblem of the author who identifies with God and inscribes himself in the text as all knowing narrator, we can conclude that Goytisolo uses the above mentioned literary and psychological strategy (resistance) to show that he is, so to speak, up to the task and can therefore belong to the restricted circle of modern authors. Resistance could be seen as a means to gain authority.[8] Moreover, the difference between Goytisolo and Spanish-American writers becomes clear: while the latter welcome the complicitous relationship with the competent reader of the complex or self-reflexive text, Goytisolo privileges an opacity that keeps the competent reader at arms length.

In the novel's introductory passage, Goytisolo's narrator presents self-reflexivity and self-reflection as a riddle to be solved, a riddle that hides the cannibalistic gesture inherent in the writing and reading of a modern text:

---

6. I am quoting from the 1976 edition of *Reivindicación del conde don Julián*. Barcelona: Seix Barral (36-39).
7. I am indebted to Roberto González Echevarría for this insight.
8. In her essay "Resistent Texts/Incompetent Readers" (forthcoming *Poetics Today*) Doris Sommer analyzes resistance as the strategy of minority writers such as Rigoberta Menchú, Richard Rodríguez, Toni Morrison and others to keep competent and privileged readers at arm's length.

> abres un ojo: techo escamado por la humedad, paredes vacuas, el día que aguarda tras la cortina, caja de Pandora: maniatado bajo la guillotina: un minuto más, señor verdugo: un petit instant: inventar, componer, mentir, fabular: repetir la proeza de Sherezada durante sus mil y una noches escuetas, inexorables: érase una vez un precioso niño, el más exquisito que la mente humana pueda imaginar: Caperucito Rojo y el lobo feroz, nueva versión sicoanalítica con mutilaciones, fetichismo, sangre: (13)

There is no doubt that this introductory passage refers to the generations of Spanish American writers of the 1940's, the 1950's and the 1960's.[9] There are abundant references to these writers, references which not only experts but also readers who have a general knowledge of the field can detect/understand. I am also thinking of the broad public in Spain familiar with the literary prizes given to Spanish American authors of the sixties in Barcelona. It is useful to remember that Juan Goytisolo belonged to the editorial pool both in Paris and Barcelona which brought to fame writers such as Borges, Carpentier, Fuentes, Vargas Llosa, Cortázar and García Márquez[10]. The reference to Spanish American literature is transparent in the choice and the meaning of the second person narrative subject that Carlos Fuentes chose both in *The Death of Artemio Cruz* and *Aura*. Fuentes said that this device was a trial, condemnation and immolation of one's own identity (quoted in Jara: no date: 174). But the choice of Sherezada as narratorial model is in my opinion decisive to show the influence of Spanish American literature in this passage. In a famous essay, "Partial Enchantments of the *Quixote*," included in *Other Inquisitions*, the literary father of the *boom*, Jorge Luis Borges, chose Sherezada and *The One Thousand and One Nights* to explain the idea of self-reflexivity in the novelistic genre. Borges points to night DCII, "...Magic nights among the nights..." (45), in which Sherezada told their own story to the sultan, performing what the French critics would later call *a mise en abîme*. In "Borges and la Nouvelle Critique" Emir Rodríguez Monegal reminds us of the impact that Borges' essay on novelistic self-reflexivity had on French critics like Gérard Genette and Henri Michaud and over the Spanish American writers of the following generation (1972: 367-90). This particular night was no doubt interesting to the narratologist Gérard Genette be-

---

9. In this seemingly broad generalization, I'm refferring to Emir Rodríguez Monegal's classification of three generations of writers and readers in Latin America in the 40's, 50's and 60's. *See his Narradores de esta América*. Montevideo: Alfa, 1969.
10. The *Formentor Prize* and *The Prix International de Littérature* was given in 1961 by a jury of European and North American editors (Gallimard, Einaudi, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, Seix Barral, Grove Press and Rohwolt) to an obscure writer unknown even to elite readers in Europe and Latin America: Jorge Luis Borges. The *Prix International de Litterature* had the ambition to be a Nobel prize for writers who deserved the recognition that they did not have. The *Formentor Prize* was to be given to a first novel and edited and translated by the present editors. The 1961 prize given to Jesús Fernández Santos did not have the influence over this writer's career as it had over the winner of the 1962 prize: Mario Vargas Llosa for *La ciudad y los perros*. The *Formentor Prize* became The *Biblioteca Breve* prize and was given consistently to Spanish American writers in the sixties: in 1963 to Vicente Leñero, in 1964 to Guillermo Cabrera Infante, in 1967 to Carlos Fuentes, in 1968 to Adriano González León and in 1969 to José Donoso.

cause Sherezada who had been all along a heterodiegetic narrator, meaning that she was not included in the stories she told, suddenly becomes a homodiegetic narrator, the heroin of her own tale. Undoubtedly, Borges perceived in the abyss created by Sherezada (where she reigns as uncontested inventor of tales) the greediness of this mantis religiosa-like strategy. Adopting the perspective of the One Thousand and One Nights' narratee (the one who is merely passive and hears how he has been incorporated and devoured in the wondrous machine designed by Sherezada to reflect her own power), Borges reflects on the monstruous dimension of authority in the crafting of the *mise en abîme :* "He hears the beginning of the story, which embraces all the other stories, as well as, *monstruously,* (my emphasis) itself' (45). Borges meditates further:

> Why does it make us uneasy to know that the map is within the map and the one thousand and one nights are within the book of A *One Thousand and One Nights?* Why does it disquiet us to know that Don Quixote is a reader of the *Quixote,* and Hamlet is a spectator of Hamlet? Those inversions suggest that if the characters in a story can be readers or spectators, then we, their readers or spectators, can be fictitious. In 1833, Carlyle observed that universal history is an infinite sacred book that all men write or read and try to understand, and in which they too are written (46).

Even though Borges adopts the tranquil strength of proposing the definite statement on the *mise en abîme* as vehicle of absolute authority, he writes, as I said before, from the perspective of the one which is being written. His sympathy lies with the ones (like Sherezada's narratee) who are being irresistibly drawn and read by the infinite and circular ingression towards an abismal center where the power of the author as writer lies. This is, then, also a reflection on the monstruous insecurity of the one(s) who intends to secure their place as authors/readers of the tradition. Is there not in the relentless drive of certain (peripheral only?- I will address the issue later on) authors, in their need to incorporate the totality of the tradition, in their dream to reach the stability of totalization, something of the conqueror and the cannibal whose never ending pleasure lies in the absorption of their victims properties?

Is the place reserved for the reader/narratee[11] of *Count Julian* similar to the fate of Borges' narratee of *One Thousand and One Nights?* I don't think so. Borges, it seems is afraid of the power of the author as monstruous multiplicator of mirrors and fears for the total absorption of the reader. Goytisolo, on the other hand, is afraid of the power of the reader and intends to resist it. The strategy that he uses in order to keep him at arm's length is highly effective: he flatters the reader's vanity

---

11. Ross Chambers in *Room for Maneuver: Reading the Oppositional in Narrative*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1991 thinks that the reader can occupy the place left vacant in the narrative by a narratee's absence. The reader will be seduced by the narrator's narrative as act of seduction (33).

in making him think that he has become co-producer of the text. Has not the reader anticipated the solution to the riddle due to his modest expertise? (The heterodiegetic narrator, like Borges' Sherezada, will become a homodiegetic narrrator. The male Little Red Riding Hood as narrator will be eaten by the Wolf.) But the tantalizing and seductive gesture is immediately censored by a refusal to let us read the self reflexive nature of the text (or the narrator as object of his own art). This game of veiling and unveiling (a screen) is meant to resist the danger of reading as conquest. This game of veiling the final identity of the narrator as male Little Red Riding Hood while unveiling it at the same time, acts as a screen: it simultaneously reflects and hides. The narratorial authority refused to the reader is nonetheless exclusively designed for the author's sole control. In Goytisolo's game the reader will not become author because he threatens to cannibalize the latter's power. The author can become a reader meaning that he can become a cannibal: (he knows, among other things, how the narrator as male Little Red Riding Hood will be eaten by the Wolf.) The screen in its function of veiling/unveiling unveils the voracity of both author and reader in the act of devouring. It also demonstrates, ironically, that this devouring gesture is necessary for the survival of the text. The creation of a difficulty (that is, the resisting gap between the reading of the heterodiegetic narrator as homodiegetic narrator) precipitates the necessity of the devouring gesture. The trajectory of the text that pretends to the status of "difficult" and modern text betrays its vampirizing logic. The tone is set for the reading: the creation of a difficulty that points to the *writerly* nature of the text has to be overcome or integrated (desintegrated in the narrative) in order to allow for the readerbility of the labyrinth.

I would like to show in the analysis that follows the ambiguous nature of Goytisolo's relationship with the Orient, a vision of the Orient which as Said put it "is less a place than a topos, a set of references that seems to have its origin in a quotation, a fragment of a text" (1978: 216). I am not interested in pointing out for the mere sake of criticizing once again in *Count Julian* the ideal image that central cultures have of the Orient. Goytisolo is after all, another european writer like the Genet of the exordial quote ("Je songeais à Tanger dont la proximité me fascinait et le prestige de cette ville, plutôt repaire de traîtres.") fascinated by the: "ardientes noches del invierno africano, propicias a todos los éxtasis, a todos los olvidos: roncos maullidos de prodigiosa densidad erótica que, a menudo, en medio de tu sueño te desvelan"(18); "... una realidad porosa y caliza, ajena a las leyes de la lógica y del europeo sentido común" (70). For the critics of Orientalism, it is clear that in giving a manichean treatment to the Oriental myth, Goytisolo manages to consolidate the Orient like a text. His fascination with the most worn out literary stereotypes, the dialogue he engages in with the most reactionary visions of the West are the product of a reasoning that is not as simplistic as it seems at first. Intertextuality, as previously defined, is here, once again, the pretext to continue the battle with Spanish historiography and the then current *Realist Socialist* style of writing in Spain. Paradoxically, as I will show later, this renewed manifestation of

Goytisolo's Holy War is designed to affirm his superiority as "subversive" and committed reader and writer of the sixties. The stereotypical image of Arabic culture which emphasizes that which is "open," "complex," and "sensual" is opposed in Goytisolo's text and intellectual archive to the Christian and Spanish vision of that which is "closed," "rigid," and rational."[12] In this contrast and this privileging of the openness and complexity of Arabic culture (as it has been pointed out before) Goytisolo sides with the dissident Spanish historian Américo Castro against the majority of the historians and philologists of the nineteenth and twentieth century in Spain. Américo Castro vindicates the essential role of the Arabs in the formation of Spanish national identity (1962). This view has always been rejected by many intellectual and nationalistic figures such as Ortega y Gasset and Unamuno.

This type of discourse which negates the influence of six centuries of coexistence between Jews, Christians and Arabs culminates, according to Goytisolo in the publication of a (very Spanish) book titled: *The Arabs Never Invaded Spain* (See "Supervivencias tribales en el medio intelectual español") (142). Goytisolo's apropriation of Americo Castro's thought remains one of the enlightening characteristics of the novel.[13]

Count Julian's author's favorable insight into the openness and the complexity of Arabic culture translates itself in the text into the literal and literary image of the labyrinth. This image also transmits the narrator's appraisal of his own complexity ("... perdiendóte en dédalo de callejas de la Medina: trazando con tus pasos un enrevesado dibujo que nadie (ni siquiera tú mismo) podrá interpretar: y desdoblándote al fin por seguirte mejor, como si fueras otro: ángel de la guardia, amante celoso, detective particular: consciente que el laberinto está en ti: que tú eres el laberinto: minotauro voraz, mártir comestible: juntamente verdugo y víctima ..."(52). In its closure, its dimension of finite space where "signs in rotation" (Paz) play in search for an (absent) center, the labyrinth reminds us of Jacques Derrida's essay "La structure, le signe et le jeu dans le discours des sciences humaines" (1966: 409-428). (The movement of the game which allows for infinite substitutions mentioned by Derrida (423), is played by Goytisolo in a pastiche of Octavio Paz: "... adelante por el concertado caos ciudadano, ideograma alcoránico, sutil paradoja de líneas, a derecha/a izquierda? persiguiendo activamente los signos por la calleja

---

12. In this privileging of Arabic culture, Goytisolo sides with the historian Américo Castro who, in "Al-Andalus como una circunstancia de la vida española" included in *La realidad histórica de España,* says: "En la civilización musulmana el placer visual-adorno, colorido, espacios abiertos fue más solicitado que la complacencia en las estructuras cerradas... Toda manera de placer visual e imaginario importaba más que cualquier intento de estructurar la actividad vital en formas estables y cerradas. (Nótese la misma forma, predominantemente lineal y abierta de la escritura árabe")(188-189).
13. See Manuel Durán, "Américo Castro and the Contemporary Spanish Novel" (Conference given on the occasion of a symposium on the life and works of Américo Castro at the University of Madison, Wisconsin in 1988) (149-257) and Michael Ugarte, "Juan Goytisolo: Unruly Disciple of Américo Castro" in *Journal of Spanish Studies* 26 (1980): 613-624. And Goytisolo's essay; "Supervivencias tribales en el medio intelectual español" *Disidencias* Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1975 (137-149).

desierta ..." (83) seems taken from Paz's well known collection of essays *The Signs in Rotation:* The city, signs which have to be decoded in order to arrive to the pure poetic present, the choice of words like "caos," "ideograma," "sutil paradoja de líneas". The appropriation of Derrida's decentering virtues, the movement of supplementarity initiated by Goytisolo in his desire to emulate the French philosopher is interesting precisely because Goytisolo distorts and subverts the ideological imperatives of the seminal essay which offered Deconstruction to the world. Cannibalization, once again, as we will see, corresponds to an anxiety for (theoretical) trendiness that we had seen manifested earlier in Goytisolo's goal to emulate the "complexity" of Spanish American prose fiction. In view of the recent literature coming from voices that still consider themselves from the intellectual world that exists outside France (The "Periphery"), it seems clear that Derrida's essay still has wide repercussions in the way the periphery represents itself.[14] The source of contradictory feelings, of orphanage on the one hand and of exhilaration on the other, can be traced to the well known synthesis by Derrida of the critique of ethnocentrism operated during the fifties and the sixties by the discourse of human sciences (414). In an introduction to a collection of essays suggestively titled *Latin American Identity and Constructions of Difference* (1994: IX-XLVI), Amaryll Chanady reflects the current intellectual consensus (echoed also in Homi Bhabha's "DissemiNation: Time, Narrative and the Margins of the Modern Nation" (1990: 291-323) and George Yúdice's "Postmodernity and Transnational Capitalism in Latin America" (1992: 1-29) around the identity of the Nation as it is formulated by Post-Colonialist intellectuals: "At the same time that the nation is constructed, it is deconstructed by the successive and always complementary and substitutive, interpretations whose *incompleteness* (my emphasis) and constant succession and mutual contradictions demonstrate the inexistence of any originary center" (X). George Yúdice also emphasizes the incompleteness or "yet unattained status of the many different projects for cultural hegemony in the twenty-odd Latin American nations" (1992: 10). There is a singular sense of strength in Chanady and especially Yúdice's argument: this comes, maybe, from having mastered the discourse on identity pervasive in *dominant* western thinkers in their weakening and dismantling the notion of origin. Protected by Derrida's prophetism, they can finally uni-

---

14. See the collection of essays edited by Amaryll Chanady and titled *Latin American Identity and Constructions of Difference* Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1994. See especially her introduction "Latin American Imagined Communities and the Postmodern Challenge" (IX-XLIV) and Alberto Moreiras's afterword: "Pastiche Identity and Allegory of Allegory" (204-238). See Homi Bhabha's "DissemiNation: Time, Narrative and the Margins of the Modern Nation," in *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990 (291-322). George Yúdice's "Postmodernity and Transnational Capitalism in Latin America" in *On Edge: The Crisis of Contemporary Latin American Culture, Cultural Politics* 4 (1992) (1-28), Bernardo Subercaseaux"s "La apropiación cultural en el pensamiento y la cultura en América Latina," in *Estudios Públicos* 30 (1988): 125-135. Roberto Schwarz's "Brazilian Culture: Nationalism by Elimination," *New Left Review* 167 (1988): 77-90, and Haroldo de Campos' "Da razão antropofágica: a Europa sob o signo da devoracão" in *Coloquio/Letras* 62 (1981): 10-24.

versalize the debate on modernity's totalizing aspirations and trace the failures of the past projects that attempted to formulate a global Latin American pan-national culture such as: in the sixties, proponents of Dependence Theory and the ideologues of Development, the continuation of the utopian and liberal discourse of XIXth century Latin American Intellectuals by *boom* writers, and what Yúdice criticizes as the neo-conservative ecumenism of Octavio Paz (1992: 4-7). Even though this debate has allowed the emergence of new orientations for the socio-political emancipation of Latin America (this also the aim of Bernardo Subercaseaux's concept of "cultural appropriation" which he describes as a dialectic between exogenous cultural influences and the autochtonous social and cultural context) (1988:125-135) it has also contributed to discredit, according to Alberto Moreiras, "some sense of collective identity for social groups whose communal life has been exposed to serious rupture" (207). Cornel West also agrees that "without "totality" our politics become ematiated, our politics become dispersed, our politics become nothing but existential rebellion, [...] In other words, a measure of synecdochical thinking must be preserved, thinking that would still invoke relations of parts to the whole ..." (1988: 270). Such an invocation as petinent as it may it may seem, is not followed by the critics who condemn modernity's totalizing claims regarding the problems of collective identity: hence, the abuse and the appeal to cultural difference that Alberto Moreiras and Ella Shohat find pervasive in the discourse on identity (207). This dispersion can explain this new manifestation of orphanage, a *Labyrinth of Solitude* caused by a postmodern assessment of the problems of the Periphery. Derrida's essay also had an opposite effect in the sense that it unleashed a dangerous euphoria in the areas which felt liberated from the hegemony of the center. Goytisolo's infinite free play of signs in the closure of the labyrinth reflects such a peripheral euphoria: it is also well known that Roland Barthes's essay on "The Writerly" (in English, 1974: 3-6) had the properties we have already detected in Derrida. Barthes conceives the *Writerly* as a state of "textual resistance" to the *Readerly* which is, according to Barbara Johnson[15] "the site of dominant ideology" (1987: 26). The Writerly, which was to free the signifier from its dependence on the solidity of the signified, was an "insistance on the work and the discourse of the other" (27). Johnson says that

> The *Writerly* was the embodiment of the rhetoric of liberation in the Marxist phase of the *Tel Quel* group ... A parallel was then being drawn between the materiality of the signifier and historical materialism. It soon became apparent however that the analogy between linguistic materiality and historical materialism was not enough to guarantee that to concentrate on the play of the signifier was to do anything radical at all (27).

---

15. I use Barbara Johnson's analysis of the opposition between the *Readerly* and the *Writerly* in her article "Is Writerliness Conservative?" included in *A World of Difference* Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1987 (24-30) because Barthes himself is elliptical and schematic enough to discourage readers of good will. Barthes limits himself to pointing out that "the Readerly text is a classic text" (4).

Goytisolo's free play of signs in a labyrinth that can just represent the closure of Spanish literary and cultural history, functions under the delusion criticized by Johnson's analysis. Criticism around Goytisolo's works has expressed doubts about the kind of redemption that the modernity of *Count Julian* was bringing to Spain[16]. I would like to bring a tentative answer based on a critique of the peripheral euphoria or the slogan "vindication of the peripheral" (Oviedo, 1976: 200) which contaminated both Spanish (in the person and persona of Juan Goytisolo) and Spanish American narrative of the sixties. It is a well established fact that Spain and Latin America are considered by their intellectuals to be culturally constituted as a lack. For Goytisolo, this lack makes its appearance six centuries ago when Spanish national identity substracts from its sphere the Jewish and Arab presence. The theme of Spain as dependent culture is dominant in Goytisolo's essays. Octavio Paz's image which caracterizes the XVIIth century Spanish autarchy and self-anthropofagism ("Los españoles se comieron a sí mismos. O como dice Sor Juana: hicieron de "su estrago un monumento") (1974: 123) can be extended further in time, if I interpret correctly Goytisolo's contradictory statements during the sixties: on the one hand, in a debate on the necessity of the Europeization of Spain that opposes him to Jesús Fernández Santos, Goytisolo argues that Spain has to "Africanize" itself (quoted in Díaz, 1974: 199)[17]. On the other, the author of *Count Julian* criticizes certain Spanish intellectuals for "creating a cosmopolitan culture foreign to our reality of underdeveloped country" (quoted in de Miguel, 1980: 64). These two statements in their contradiction nonetheless reflect the representation of Spain as a lack that has to be sated by a utopian Africanization which, as we will see, is completely out of tune with Goytisolo's own lack of commitment with the history of the Mahgreb in Count Julian. The critique of cosmopolitan culture in Spain during Franco's "cultural desert of the 50's"[18] is also consistent with this vision of Spain as an open and hungry mouth that has to be fed by benevolent and enlightened nations.

The theme of Latin America as boa-cannibal(izer) encompasses the whole of Latin American history since the conquest, as Roberto Fernández Retamar's totalizing essay "Caliban" and the critical duo Haroldo de Campos/Emir Rodríguez Monegal have shown. The vanguardist irreverence of Oswald de Andrade's *anthropofagous* movement seems naive when one considers a similar undertaking

---

16. Michael Ugarte in *Trilogy of Treason: An Intertextual Study of Juan Goytisolo*, in particular wonders about "the new order" that Goytisolo (as a product of the textual battle which marks the subversiveness of *Count Julian*) is seeking (104).
17. Here is Goytisolo's whole quote: "Hoy nuestras miradas deben volverse hacia Cuba y los pueblos de América, Asia y Africa que combaten por su independencia y su libertad. Europa simboliza ya, históricamente el pasado, el inmovilismo. Hora es quizás de africanizarse, como diría Unamuno, y convertir en bandera reivindicativa la ironía trasnochada de lo de Africa empieza en los Pirineos."
18. The expression is from José María Castellet and quoted in Amando de Miguel's book *Los intelectuales bonitos* (Barcelona: Planeta, 1980) (94).

of cultural foundation by *boom* authors in the sixties: the "original" myth of the *boom* founded (among others) by Carlos Fuentes in his *La nueva novela hispanoamericana* where he made tabula rasa of Latin American literary history in order to inscribe the modernity of the sixties that himself, Cortázar, García Márquez, Donoso, Vargas Llosa and Goytisolo are writing; adding to a lack, substituting the lack. From the margins from which they believe they're coming from, Goytisolo as member of the *boom* asserts himself as another presence that indeed wants to assure the myth of an "original" modernity in Spain. *The peripheral,* when it is to be understood as José Miguel Oviedo seems to do (1976: 200) as the Spanish and Spanish American response to a lack or tabula rasa is transparent: I find that Goytisolo (in this form of narcissism that is the choice of a rhetoric of liberation through the "complex" and culturally trendy) is guilty of what Yúdice (1992: 11) called the "autotelism" of *boom* writers. Autotelism is to be taken (in a different meaning than the one given by Yúdice) in its strictest sense as the affirmation of faith in one self and one's language as capable to found literary modernity for Spain and Latin America. It is hard to imagine Goytisolo's margins (or Fuentes and Cortázar) as other than the place to develop a cult of the self as committed reader and writer of literary theory of the sixties. In other words, Goytisolo's peripheral utopia is not as Severo Sarduy thought "potencia de un discurso ex-céntrico" (1975: 4) but the site in which to inscribe and cannibalize the intellectual Parisian center. This is why, in my opinion, Goytisolo fits Julia Kristeva's description of the intellectual as dissident and her formulation of a possible ethics of writing:

> Ethics should be understood here to mean the negativizing of narcissism within a practice: in other words, a practice is ethical when it dissolves those narcissistic fixations (ones that are narrowly confined to the subject) to which the signifying procees succumbs in its socio symbolic realization.

In this passage, the narrator humiliates a little Moroccan boy who serves as guide in the labyrinth of Tangier:

> ... sacudiéndose tal vez como un perro de lanas: humillada sí, pero digna: interceptando bruscamente tu torrencial desahogo: el tiempo de ocultar tu culpabilidad atónita y devolverla a su tibia, perezosa guarida (60).

The humiliation of the little Moroccan boy in the scene of the (urinoir)[19] and the abusing of the master's privilege by the narrator, recall Goytisolo's own tor-

19. Brad Epps reminded me of Freud's analysis of the fantansy "A Child is Being Beaten" in his book *Sexuality and the Psychology of Love* (New York: Collier, 1963), 107-132. Freud says that "the first phantasies were entertained very early in life: certainly before school age ...and were invariably charged with a high degree of pleasure and had its issue in an act of pleasure and had its issue in an act of pleasurable, auto-erotic gratification" (107-108).

tured vision of sex and desire as the one who controls and the one who is controled in *Forbidden Territory* (1989: 194-95). It also recalls Goytisolo's vision of writing and reading: in the labyrinth, there is no way out of the binary trap that the narrator sets for himself: the conqueror, the one who penetrates and humiliates, needs the conquered (as he needed Spanish American literature and the theoreticians of the "complex") in order to discover the sadistic or sadian *jouissance* of writing. Writing as the obsession of conquest (and the restlessness of the warrior after the victory in the war waged against totality) may very well in fact be this sadian crime of the epigraph by Sade at the beginning of *Count Julian:*

> Je voudrais trouver un crime dont l'effet perpetuel agît même quand je n'agirais plus, en sorte qu'il ny eut pas un seul instant de ma vie, oú même en dormant, je ne fusse cause d'un désordre quelconque, et que ce désordre put s'étendre au point qu'il entraînât une corruption générale ou un dérangement si formel qu'au delá même de ma vie l'effet s'en prolongeât encore.

"The *dérangement* so formal" as the product of the sadian crime is the rigorous and symmetric arrangement of Goytisolo's maze of mirrors that will disrupt forever the form of Spanish writing. In the reflection of the lines on the page as they feed and tirelessly comment on each other, can be felt the monstruous work of assimilation which is in the nature of writing. But what seems monstruous is only banal for the one who writes this text. He is oblivious as he is to the dialectic of master and slave and is pressed to prove that "le discours du plus fort est toujours le meilleur" (Lafontaine): the one who is able to make confess that sex is guilty (the Spanish priest and the humiliating performance of his spider's web-like sermon which feeds the self-reflexive structure) (102-108), the one who is able to create the self reflexive structure (the narrator) and the one who is able to eat the Little Red Riding Hood. The fact that the sadian (self-reflexive) job on the little Arab boy should in the end be masochistic (it interferes with the narrator's own past self as the Victorians talked about intimate pleasures) matters in my reading of the text as the narrator's will and dream of power: the mimetic repetition by the little Arab boy of textual fragments where the narrator takes part actively or passively in acts of humiliation serves two purposes. First, it establishes a complicity in suffering with this little boy who is made to reproduce (as narrating figure "you") with rigorous sadism the narrator's plight (the permutation of identities in the sadian figures does not limit their monotonous and repetitive sameness). Second: it allows for the construction of the self-reflexive labyrinth based on the work which quotes itself in a tedious and intolerable symmetry. This, in turn, gives away the solution to the riddle as labyrinthine identity of the narrator: ("... consciente de que el laberinto está en ti; que tú eres el laberinto: minotauro voraz, mártir comestible: juntamente verdugo y víctima..." (52). He as absolute hero of his own fabula: executioner, victim, traitor, betrayed, voracious minotaur, edible martyr, wolf and Little Red Riding Hood. In a magistral *mise en scéne* where all the signs in rotation ("a

galaxy of signifiers" as Barthes put it) manage to form a coherent pattern, the narrator condemns himself to carry out the sacrifice of the odious ego of his Spanish childhood. In this sadomasochistic scene where the enigmatic little boy ("... el niño?: qué niño?: tú mismo un cuarto de siglo atrás, alumno aplicado y devoto, idolatrado e idólatra de su madre, querido y admirado de profesores y condiscípulos: muchacho delgado y frágil, vastos ojos, piel blanca: el bozo no asombra aún, ni profana, la mórbida calidad de las mejillas...") (215) is finally the "you" persecuted in the labyrinth and caught by the You/Julian. We read the mortal game of a perfeccionist of destruction and suicide who enjoys his masks of executioner and victim. In *Count Julian*, the recreation and sacrifice of the Ego is a manifestation of the will to power of the *boom* narrator: he constructed his work as a labyrinth of mirrors whose aim is to reflect his own identity. The *mise en abîme* of Sherezada's story is a mise à mort of the narrator: having announced in such an ostentatious way that the work was able to produce a mirror of its own narrative principles, *Count Julian* becomes another bazaar of the novelistic self-reflexivity of the *boom*.

I wanted to show in this essay the ideological limits of the *boom's* faith in language as all powerful founder of a new de-centered identity. This faith, as we know, has also contaminated the reader in the myth that the rhetoric of complexity is also the rhetoric of complicity.[20] It has made us all —authors and readers and readers as authors, avid devourers of these museums of Modernist techniques that *boom* novels are— enjoy the feeling of possessing and unlimited ability to decodify what seem like hermetic and unnegotiable labyrinths. But, as Roberto González Echevarría has shown in his book on Sarduy, this myth of complexity only hides the conventionality (inside the parameters of modern fiction) of *boom* novels (1987: 98-99). Goytisolo's *Count Julian*, produced in the midst of the European (meaning Parisian and Barcelonés) reverence for the expansion of the Spanish American narrative of the sixties and the diktats of post structuralism, seemed particularly sensitive to this issue.

A few words on the conflation between the rhetoric of complexity as rhetoric of complicity seem necessary to differentiate Goytisolo's novel from other boom novels. I don't think as I have shown (and unlike other *boom* novels) that Goytisolo is eager to lay bare and share with the reader at the beginning of the text the "complexity" of his own creation. The resistance to such a reading in crucial parts of the book make Count Julian a fascinating and excruciatingly painful case of *narrativa interrupta*. Thus Goytisolo achieves his aim. The opacity created by the resistance in the structural gallery of mirrors seems a challenge for the readers used to the complicity between author and co-producer of the text. Why is Goytisolo's text reluctant to open up the rigid boundaries evident in the structure. The title of such

---

20. As their commong Latin root (cumplicare) indicates, it is in the act of folding upon themselves or of combining with each other that things become complex as well as complicitous.

autobiographical works as *Forbidden Territory* and *Realms of Strife* seemed like the beginning of an answer. In these works, Goytisolo suggests through the title his desire for protection in the limits of his own personal territory. (On the subject, Brad Epps reads correctly and beautifully Goytisolo's territoriality "as a way to protect the space of an authentic and authorized (my emphasis) "I" (1992: 165). In *Count Julian,* the destruction of a fictitious version of his "I", prolongates the obsessive, claustrophobic dialogue that Goytisolo has with himself. It was legitimate to wonder if Goytisolo needed the complicity of a reader: it could be that the fortified constructions meant for the protection of a fragile and problematic Ego (as Lacan evokes them in "The Mirror Stage" (1966: 94) were destined solely for the self-reading of the perfeccionist of self destruction of *Count Julian.* I think that the pact with the reader is inscribed explicitly in the formal structure of the work: in the uncovering of the desire to cover (and not "to lay bare" as Michael Ugarte thinks). This pact is not a pact of complicity. Goytisolo privileges a communicative function (between narrator and narratee/reader) of a different kind, where the reader is made aware of the act of exclusion. His participation as *Tertius Exclusus* (and not as Michel Serres's *Tertius Gaudens*)[21] rejected from the banquet of interpretation is required in order to give resonance to Goytisolo's narrative and narcissistic *tour de force*. The impenetrability of the structural difficulties (the beginning of the text, the mystery of the narrator's identity) intensifies these difficulties, give them a weight, a specificity and a resonance. This resonance would be lacking in Count Julian had the author subscribed to the transparence, and the fluidity of the dialogue between complicity and complexity of the *boom* reflexive texts. I suggested that the impenetrability could be an exfoliation of the anxiety of the "difficult" text's model. I also suggested that the emphatic resistance indicated an urge to equal and transcend the model of the Modern texts. As author of a fundational novel, Goytisolo knew about the notion of writing as the struggle between the one who controls and the one who is controled.

I want to end this argument on the resistance to the dialogue between author and reader by saying that this seems amazing coming from Goytisolo. It is astonishing, I think, that this author should be so refractotry to the interlocutory dimension of this text. The school of *Reader Response* claims with the eloquence of Vincent Kaufman that "chaque texte démontre une relation particulière à l'Autre dans laquelle se constitue l'identité du lecteur visé" (1986: 10). The author of *Disidencias* is, after all, very sensitive to the intertextual relations that shape the history of *Count Julian* inside the Spanish literary history. He has always engaged in a dialogue about his works with the reader. The novel presents itself as a *lectura cómplice* of

---

21. In his book *Room for Maneuver; Reading the Oppositional in Narrative,* Ross chambers borrows these two images from Michel Serres. In the context of Chambers's essay, the reader as narratee alternates between the roles of seducer (tertius gaudens) because he's able to identify with the narrator's seduction, and of pure witness (Tertius Exclusus) of the relationship between the seducer and the seduced (the narratee) (31-32).

certain rejected authors of the Spanish literary canon. (See *The Notice* where Goytisolo says that "la presente obra ha sido realizada con la participación póstuma o involuntaria de ...") However, as Brad Epps has brilliantly shown, the text and his author keep at a distance certain "others" (such as women) that should have been included in the reformed canon Goytisolo intended to create (1992: 274-297). Goytisolo, in strenghtening the stereotypical image of the woman and the homosexual performs an act of exclusion that bears resemblance to the one we have been examining in this essay. A self-proclaimed reader of the excluded, Goytisolo should have extended the conditions of the reading pact to the implicit reader: you, I, Us, ideal reader modeled on the ideals and the ethnocentric guilt of the sixties. This friendship, at least in the complicitous guilt, was rejected and replaced by a quite perverse, antagonistic and competitive link which is only another symptom of the need to conquer.

Mayder Dravasa
Universidad de Tufts