

**The Character or The Author?***The battle of Don Quixote, Schweik and....  
Shakespeare to the reader***Literature****Keywords:** Don Quixote, Schweik, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Hashek, characters, readers, the author, etc.**Agim Baçi****The Academy of Albanological Studies. Institute of Linguistics and Literature – Tirana, Albania****Abstract**

The character or the author is a debate that sometimes leans on the power of the reader and sometimes on the power of the author to describe the power of a work. But what distinguishes a work represented by the character, and what can distinguish another work represented by the author? When we say that the work is represented by the character, it is not about the idea thrown by Roland Barthes in his essay ‘the death of the author’, nor from Foucault’s question ‘who cares who speaks’, but about the case when the character manages to ‘walk on its own’, thus transforming him into an explanatory dictionary for phenomena. And, in the case of Don Quixote and Schweik, it all has to do with their ‘ability’ to be judged by the reader without the ‘presence’ of the author. Meanwhile Shakespeare’s characters, often extremely significant to some of the most disturbing phenomena in human life, such as betrayal, the desire for power or the desire for wealth, cannot be separated from the author by the reader. Why? According to the author of this work, this difference between Don Quixote, Schweik and Shakespeare is not due to the small number of characters of Cervantes and Hashek and the large number of those of Shakespeare. But Don Quixote and Schweik’s naive portrayal causes readers to dare to judge these characters by themselves. That is why the biggest misunderstandings happen with Schweik and Don Quixote, whereas Shakespeare is the painter of ‘betrayal’, ‘power’ and ‘wealth’ - three things we owe to the ability of thinking. Therefore, Shakespeare’s ‘wisdom of the characters’ needs someone to introduce them. And the reader needs the author in order to believe this ‘character wisdom’.

Usually, when we try to talk about literature, about different books, sometimes we use the name of the author, but in some cases we use the name of the character. In both cases, the use of these names is imposed spontaneously but often also constitutes a way of understanding.

But is there a battle between the author and the character? Is there a challenge between them? Let us dwell for example on three books that I think have had the most readers in the world. Thus, we say Don Quixote, Schweik, and Shakespeare. The first two are characters, the third is an author. Why these change as we refer to it? What makes Shakespeare continue to be the master of all his characters? Why Cervantes looks pale in front of Don Quixote's name. What about Hashek, why can't he be more powerful than Schweik?

When we say Don Quixote, no one is trying to identify the hero by the author’s name. Cervantes can no longer represent it. History has given the ‘creature’ the right to keep all the power of the work. Meanwhile, the same story appears between Hashek and Schweik. Hashek remains quite distant, almost negligible in the face of the power that Schweik’s name exhibits. In both cases, the character’s name is more popular than the authors, and there may even be many people in the world who know about Don Quixote but know nothing about Cervantes, who know a lot about Schweik and who do not know Hashek at all.

As for the irony of fate, these two works remain the only famous ones of these two authors, as the others have not matched their value. Quite the opposite happens with Shakespeare - to continue to think mostly as an author. Although Hamlet, King Lear, Macbeth, Othello, Ophelia, are characters who have put to work hundreds of scenes, hundreds of Academy of Arts, hundreds of critics, still no one has thought to represent Shakespeare with any of his characters.

Then, why in this communication with these books, we continue to think of Shakespeare as an author, while the characters 'decide' for Cervantes and Hashek? Can something separate you; is there an essential factor that makes the difference?

There may be several reasons, but I would like to list just one of the logics that I believe may have been decisive in this way of acceptance given to these works.

Don Quixote is natural. It is an internal part. It is the desire to triumph in love. It is a test in itself.

Schweik is the irony, it is the floor of the truth, and at the same time the way the truth is seen.

Coming to the limits of naivety, without complications, without scenes, about Don Quixote and Schweik it seems easy for anyone to think. They are so natural that there seems to be no limiting on controlling them. The authors seem to have delivered them to every reader. Just need to recall how many names, comparisons, misunderstandings there are with these two characters, to understand the courage that thousands of readers have taken to discuss, debate, judge, and then even experience more than the authors.

Quite different it seems to happen with Shakespeare. He is the painter of power, money and betrayal. No pen like him has painted these three 'powers' that spin millions of human lives. But all three of these traits are mostly the offspring of the mind. As a result Shakespeare's characters seem more like a product of wisdom. Life has proved and continues to prove his words - no one dares to control his 'creatures', but only to think about them.

With the first two, Don Quixote and Schweik, we label hundreds, thousands of people. Even a good portion of those who have not read it as a book, have the opportunity to know the meaning of labeling due to its occasional use in everyday life. While with Shakespeare everything happens differently. He belong to the solutions of the mind, solutions which to us, though constituting signs to define a phenomenon, remain within the wise solutions, or solutions that can be achieved or avoided through wisdom.

Don Quixote is a dream – but the dream can not be a general term, as the dream belongs to the essence of our intimacy. Therefore, the misunderstanding with Don Quixote has come to a

flow that seems normal, where usually ‘Don Quixote’ we describe someone who is taking in vain, who dreams in vain. But can someone in love dream vainly? This seems impossible, as we almost all loved a person even without telling them.

Schweik is the ‘truth without a label’ – but we are used to telling the truth in the softest possible form, clad in damping sentences. Therefore, with Schweik we usually label those who behave as naive, because the righteous, those who tell the truth, we see them as naive, or even almost, as fools.

Shakespeare, meanwhile, is the solution of the mind. Betrayal, power and money we label them almost equally. Since they belong to mind-based agreements and not soul-based ones, humanity in general has not misunderstood Shakespeare’s characters. This makes us have no question marks when labeling with the names of his characters: Thus, with Brutus we look at the traitor, With Romeo and Juliet we look at love.

Every reader has the ‘right’ to judge Don Quixote and Schweik, because they are heading for a lost world, far from the ‘wise’. Therefore, since every reader can ‘judge’ them, then the author is not decisive in what the reader needs to think. Whereas in Shakespeare, direct wisdom or fable, is in every letter. Since they are characters in the book, readers often need support to believe that lightning-fast, philosophical, striking, creepy thought. And, in the meantime, we look at Macbeth, Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, as characters, with different actors. While Shakespeare is a human name, that is, a man - so it seems easier for him to carry the burden of wisdom for all of them. Only he can sum up those thoughts.

## References

Ortega Y Gasset Jose: *Meditations on Quixote*, W. W. Norton & Company, published June 1983.  
Bloom, Harold: *Shakespeare - Invention of The Human*, London: Fourth Estate LTD, March 1999.  
Sontag, Susan: *Against Interpretation*, New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1966.