

**EXOTICISM AND FAMILIARIZATION:
STUDIES IN HISPANO-RUSSIAN LITERARY RELATIONS**

by

MARGARET HELEN TEJERIZO

Thesis presented for the degree of Ph.D.

in the Departments of Slavonic Languages and Literatures

and Hispanic Studies of the University of Glasgow

©Margaret H. Tejerizo, 1993

April, 1993

ProQuest Number: 11007926

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 11007926

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Thesis
9623
copy 1

GLASGOW
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

ABSTRACT

The reception, familiarization and influence of Russian writers in late 19th-century/early 20th-century Spain has been a long-neglected area of investigation, and is overdue for reassessment now. This thesis studies certain characteristic moments of that process, beginning with the situation typical of much of the 19th century, in which a major Russian author like Pushkin was at least a presence, though still decisively an exotic one, on the Hispanic literary horizon. A not dissimilar status attended those figures in the Hispanic literatures who were known to readers in Russia. (The case of Brazilian literature is taken as a particular example.)

There followed, as far as Russian literature in Spain was concerned, a phase of intelligent, if still largely second-hand reporting by individuals enjoying some special advantage for that purpose (Valera, Ganivet) and of enthusiastic and discriminating critical advocacy (still through intermediaries) by serious readers (Pardo Bazán, Leopoldo Alas). The former, in particular, emerges as a figure of crucial importance, and her role in the familiarization (of Spaniards with Russian literary culture), must be seen as an essential part of her own literary vocation.

Already in this generation, the impact of Russian writing as a creative influence begins to be apparent, and its importance as such in the years around and after 1900 is typified in the examples of Unamuno and Pío Baroja. Once the availability of major Russian texts had been established, the way was open for this influence to extend more widely than acknowledged examples reveal, and a formalist analysis of plays by Chekhov and Lorca is used to suggest how this possibility operates. Here, a further decisive element in the process of familiarization comes into play: the social and institutional similarities between Spain and Russia – not least with regard to the “woman question” in the years under review.

Finally, after a period when political factors achieved what was virtually a “freeze” in cultural contacts, the renewed sense of European belonging affecting both post-Franco Spain and post-Brezhnev Russia has facilitated a new surge of interest in Russia in the Spanish cultural and popular media – again, interestingly, with a publication for women – the magazine *Telva* – notably to the fore.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	2
CONTENTS	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	7
DECLARATION	8
PREFACE	9
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
(1) Spain and Russia: “Dos tierras de desmesura y sinrazón”	20
(2) Russia and Spain: Some early contacts	29
(3) “Embajadores en el infierno”	35
(4) The earliest Spanish translations of Russian literature	37
A brief survey	
(5) A.S. Pushkin as translator. Some early Russo-Latin	48
American contacts	
CHAPTER 2: JUAN VALERA AND EMILIA PARDO BAZAN	
(1) The distortion of Gogol’ in 19th-century Spain	71
(2) A Spanish diplomat in St. Petersburg: Juan Valera	76
and his letters from Russia	

(3)	The ‘descubridora’ of Russian literature: Countess Emilia Pardo Bazán	
(a)	The critical reception of Russian literature in 19th-century Spain	94
(b)	<i>La Revolución y la novela en Rusia:</i> Contents and critics	105
(c)	Emilia Pardo Bazán’s later studies of Russian literature	123
(d)	The presence of Russian literature in the fictional world of Pardo Bazán: A brief summary	135

CHAPTER 3(A): PIO BAROJA AND RUSSIAN LITERATURE

(1)	Introduction	153
(2)	Early criticism	164
(3)	The fragmentation of Dostoevsky in Spain A brief synopsis	171
(4)	Influences	175
(5)	Mature criticism	183
(6)	Mistaken identity: Baroja and Gor’ky	192
(7)	Dostoevsky and the novelistic world of Pío Baroja Some themes and ideas	199

CHAPTER 3(B) TURGENEV AND GALDÓS The Generation Conflict

210

**CHAPTER 4: “CLARIN”, UNAMUNO, GANIVET
AND RUSSIA**

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| (1) | The woman question: An introduction | 232 |
| (2) | The popularity of Tolstoy in 19th-century Spain:
A summary | 236 |
| (3) | “Clarín” and Tolstoy: <i>La Regenta</i> and <i>Anna Karenina</i> .
Two novels which “exaltan lo vital” | 240 |
| (4) | <i>Master and Man</i> and <i>The Kreutzer Sonata</i> | 253 |
| (5) | Unamuno and Russian literature | 260 |
| (6) | Angel Ganivet in Russia | 274 |

**CHAPTER 5: THE STORM, THREE SISTERS AND
LA CASA DE BERNARDA ALBA**

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| (1) | “Mulier in silentio discat” | 291 |
| (2) | “Suffer and be still”: <i>Three Sisters</i> and
<i>La casa de Bernarda Alba</i> | 296 |
| (3) | “Meekly take thy place assigned”:
<i>The Storm</i> and <i>La casa de Bernarda Alba</i> | 358 |

CONCLUSION 372

BIBLIOGRAPHY 383

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisors, Mr. M. Dewhirst (Department of Slavonic Languages and Literatures) and Professor N. Round (Hispanic Studies) for their help and encouragement; Dr. J.A. Dunn (Department of Slavonic Languages and Literatures) for support; Louise Boyle and Margaret Hector (Department of Slavonic Languages and Literatures) for their sterling work; and Mr. V. Bagno and the late Montserrat Roig for their valuable advice.

Margaret H. Tejerizo, 1993

DECLARATION

The content of Chapter 4, section (5) is partly based on a research paper presented to the Colloquium on Unamuno held at Glasgow University in 1986. This paper was subsequently published in Round, N.G. (ed.) *Re-reading Unamuno* (Glasgow, 1989).

PREFACE

PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

(1) DEFINITIONS

Exoticism: "... tendency to adopt what is foreign."

Familiarization: "... the act of making ... well-known".¹

In the first part of this thesis I will concentrate on certain important episodes within the vast (but little-researched) area of Hispano–Russian literary relations. Working with the two definitions given above clearly in mind, I will examine the ways in which certain Spanish authors of the late 19th/early 20th-centuries “adopted” Russian literature and endeavoured to make it well-known in their own country. These writers will be referred to as cultural *mediators* or *intermediaries*. A *mediator* has been defined as “... a go-between; a messenger or agent”, while the term *intermediary* may describe “[o]ne who acts between ... persons or things.”² I will investigate in considerable detail what these “agents” actually wrote about Russian literature and in doing so I will present, for the first time in English, an organized evaluation of the “message” which they communicated to their fellow Spaniards concerning this foreign culture. *Exoticism* may also suggest “that which ... is outlandish ... strange.”³ The popular image of Russia current in 19th-century Spain was often “a falsified and stereotyped one.”⁴ Indeed, Spaniards frequently thought of this remote land as being

... snow-covered, whipped by the winds, and
inhabited by fierce warriors, miserable peasants, mysterious

rebels, and women as passionate as they were devoted ...
 [with] ... prisons, sleighs, Siberia, and Cossacks.⁵

(It comes, then, as no surprise to learn that virtually the first Spanish translation of a Russian literary work was that of Pushkin's *Метель* [*The Snowstorm*], a tale which echoed and reinforced at least some of the expectations enumerated above.)⁶

The attraction of exotic and far-off lands was not, of course, confined to Spanish sensibilities. In 19th-century Russia the literatures of Hispanic countries were also becoming increasingly well-known and it will be in order to examine one outstanding example of the familiarization process of these cultures there. If Pushkin was the first major Russian writer to appear in Spanish translation, he was, additionally, one of the first "translators" of Brazilian literature into Russian. This will be the only example of Russo-Latin-American literary relations to be dealt with in this thesis.⁷

One of the crucial means, then, by which the "exotic" could (and gradually did) become "familiar" was through the medium of *translation*. *To translate* has been defined in the following terms:

... (to) put over, *traducere navem*. Whoever is about to set sail, to man a ship and to take her under full sail across to unknown shores, should not be surprised to arrive in another land where another wind blows.⁸

The first translations of major Russian writers to reach 19th-century Spain had, in a number of cases, been buffeted about by many winds. The majority of these works did not even arrive by a direct route, but made circuitous detours, mostly via France. Brief examination will be made of certain of these versions and the greater ease with which translations made their way into Spain in the later years of the 19th century will also be mentioned.

The *reception* of an author within another culture has been defined as “... the fluctuations of ... [his/her] ... reputation and literary fortunes”⁹ in a different land. Throughout this thesis a synopsis will be provided of “literary fortunes” of certain selected 19th-century Russian writers in Spain.¹⁰

One of the areas of my investigation will be that of *influence*, a term which is explained as follows:

... a conflux of impulses from various literatures, which join the traditions [the writer] finds in his native country and stimulate the talent he was born with.¹¹

(2) CULTURAL INTERMEDIARIES

As Russian literature gradually made its way into 19th-century Spain, many writers and intellectuals were attracted to this new “exotic” culture. Indeed, it occasioned frequent (and varied) responses. Many Spanish writers could be defined as “cultural intermediaries” but I set rigorous standards for inclusion into this category. I have made a further subdivision of *major intermediaries* and *minor intermediaries*.

(a) MAJOR INTERMEDIARIES

A major intermediary will have provided continuous, accurate and original information about Russian writers in the years being reviewed here. Additionally, he or she will have communicated this “message” in a well-organized and effective way. Further, Russian literature should have made an impact within the creative work of the intermediary.¹² My research clearly showed that *FOUR* Spanish

writers (within the time-span being investigated here) could be included in this category: (1) EMILIA PARDO BAZAN, (2) PIO BAROJA, (3) LEOPOLDO ALAS “CLARIN” and (4) MIGUEL DE UNAMUNO. I have classed these in order of their importance in this familiarization process. *Pardo Bazán* was the central figure around whom the other three, in my opinion, were variously situated. Doña Emilia, must, I believe, be credited with a vigorous, organized approach to her subject which produced not only the first lengthy critical appraisal of Russian literature to reach Spain in those years, but many other illuminating studies and essays as well. A reassessment of her work in this field is long overdue.

The other three major intermediaries were serious critics of this new and exotic literature, Baroja and Alas being drawn to the works of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy respectively. Unamuno’s responses to Russian writers were, in many cases, spiritual ones. (Sadly, a full investigation along such lines falls outwith the purposes of this thesis, but much could have been said, for example, about his work “La agonía del cristianismo” within this context.¹³) One might have argued for the possible inclusion of Antonio Machado in this category; his essays “Sobre literatura rusa” (1922) and “Sobre La Rusia actual” (1937), together with his other writings on Russia, were certainly stimulating and informative. However, taken overall, he does not adequately fulfil my criteria during the time-span under review in this thesis.

(b) MINOR INTERMEDIARIES

Into this category I will place those Spanish writers who provided a more limited amount of information about Russian culture but who, because of a special advantage which they enjoyed – namely they had visited Russia – deserve to engage our attention here. *Two* writers emerge as having fulfilled these requisites adequately: *JUAN VALERA* and *ANGEL GANIVET*.

A continuous spate of travel literature had appeared in Western Europe during the 19th century (and earlier too) which offered readers impressions of that distant land, Russia. In Forstetter's *Voyageurs en Russie*, for example, there is a compilation of travellers' accounts of that "grande plaine recouverte de neige où les brigands mènent leur jeu".¹⁴ (This anthology includes too the short testimony of a Chilean sailor, Pedro del Río, who had visited Moscow in 1883.¹⁵) It surprises, then, that Valera's witty and informative *Cartas desde Rusia*, which document his stay in Russia (1856–1857) should have received such scant critical attention.¹⁶ A reevaluation of their content is now in order. In his illuminating study *Russia under Western Eyes* Anthony Cross includes accounts which in many cases, do not have the freshness and vivacity of Valera's Letters.¹⁷ *Cartas desde Rusia* prepared the way, I believe, for the later work in this familiarization process which was achieved by Pardo Bazán and the other three major intermediaries to be examined here.

Angel Ganivet committed suicide in Riga in 1898. The reports which he did, however, provide about Russia, although few in number, nevertheless had a special ring of authenticity and offered practical advice concerning the learning of Russian, for example. Regrettably his contributions to this process – which might well, in my view have been outstanding – were tragically cut short. Nevertheless, I believe that his achievements as a mediator do not deserve total dismissal.

The inclusion of Jacinto Benavente into this category might well have been posited. However, I consider that his visit to Russia in 1929 and his responses to this, together with his play *Santa Rusia* of 1932 situate him outwith the main temporal focus of this study.¹⁸

(3) "THE WOMAN QUESTION"

It has been a widely-held critical view that "the greatest achievements of the writer is his creation of women."¹⁹ In the second part of this thesis I will trace the

trajectory of “the woman question” as this emerges in certain Russian and Spanish literary works. This issue was one of the most topical matters of the late 19th century: Pardo Bazán, for example, had provided a Prologue for the first Spanish translations of Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women*.²⁰ Many other relevant instances could have been cited. In my exploration of this theme I will keep clearly in mind two definitions. Although my study is not being approached from a feminist point of view, I will recall Simone de Beauvoir's definition of feminists as “those women or even men who fight to change the position of women...” and Toril Moi's response, namely that

... men can be feminists – but they can't be women
 ... Under patriarchy men will always speak from a different
position than women...²¹

As the first of my examples here I will explore the connections between “Clarín's” novel *La Regenta* and Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* looking to see how the Spanish author may have absorbed, now at a deeper and more creative level, ideas and themes from the Russian. Tolstoy's work *The Kreutzer Sonata* will also be mentioned here.

(4) ‘A DOLL’S HOUSE’

It has been aptly noted that:

Cuando Nora, en *Casa de muñecas* de Ibsen, cerró de golpe la puerta de su casa al final del drama y se marchó deliberadamente hacia su propio futuro ... el golpe reverberó por toda Europa.²²

Still considering aspects of the “woman question” in the closing sections of this thesis, it will be seen how, in fact, Ostrovsky, Chekhov and Lorca firmly “slammed that door shut” on groups of women in certain of their dramatic works. In the plays which I will examine, the motif of the house acquires great prominence, as does the theme of the entrapment of dependent women. While Lorca cannot be classed as an intermediary within the categories defined above, we have, I believe, an important example here of influence absorbed at a much deeper and more creative level. By means of an analysis based on the methods of the Russian Formalists, I will argue that *Tri sestry* (*Three Sisters*) may have exerted an important creative influence on *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. A shorter discussion of the creative input which Ostrovsky’s play *Гроза* (*The Storm*) may have supplied for the same Spanish work will also be in order.²³

(5) ¡QUE VIENEN LOS RUSOS!²⁴

The exclamation cited above was not, in fact, a cry of alarm. It was the title of an article which discussed the first production in Spain in April 1993 of “la versión teatral de *La guardia blanca*” by M.A. Bulgakov.²⁵ In this same piece the new collaboration between Spanish and Russian theatres was also noted:

El Mossoviet y el Centre Dramàtic, que dirige Domènech Reixach, firmaron hace dos años el primer acuerdo entre un teatro ruso y otro español. Como consecuencia, el catalán Ramón Sinó montó, con actores del Mossoviet, *Restauración* una obra ... que está siendo un éxito que permanece en cartel en Moscú desde enero de 1992. Ahora, en Barcelona mueven los rusos, cuya compañía joven ya sorprendió el pasado año en el Teatre La

Cuina con una original versión de *La señorita Julia*, dirigida por Khomski.²⁶

In the conclusion of this thesis some recent responses to Russia's literature and culture will be presented (a selection of those which have appeared in the Spanish press over the past 4 years). I will show that, after the virtual "freeze" of relations between the two countries (for political reasons), both are now experiencing a renewed sense of European belonging. After the active period of familiarization initiated largely by Pardo Bazán, I believe it is now in order to speak of "New Beginnings" between these two cultures.

In this concluding section it will emerge that another woman, the late Montserrat Roig, was a prominent figure in this new process, as was (and is) the magazine for women *Telva*.

The cultural heritage of Russia ("(e)l pueblo más sufrido, amargo, bello y romántico de Europa" provoked, as will be demonstrated, many critical responses in Spain.²⁷ In the course of this thesis I have chosen to highlight some of the most original and notable of these. My study will show that Spain occupies an important place of her own in this process of familiarization and, indeed, this much neglected area of investigation is overdue for reassessment now.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

There has been no substantial research in English on this subject. The findings of certain Russian Hispanists, notably, V.E. Bagno, will be presented here for the first time in English. Indeed, Schanzer's excellent study *Russian Literature in the Hispanic World: a bibliography* is now due to be updated since it does not take into account the new wave of translations of Russian literature which have appeared in Spain since the death of Franco.²⁸

NOTES FOR PREFACE

- 1 *Oxford English Dictionary* V (1989), pp.551-552 and p.706.
- 2 *The Shorter Oxford Dictionary* II (1978), p.1300 and p.1096.
- 3 *Oxford English Dictionary*, p.704.
- 4 George Schanzer, *Russian Literature in the Hispanic World: a bibliography* (Toronto, 1972), p.xxi.
- 5 Idem.
- 6 This translation will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 1.
- 7 This episode is introduced by way of example and because Pushkin was involved in an indirect way.
- 8 Jacob Grimm in Albrecht Neubert, *Text and Translation, Übersetzungswissenschaftliche*, 8 (Leipzig, 1985), p.154.
- 9 S.S. Prawer, *Comparative Literary Studies* (London, 1973), p.33.
- 10 A comprehensive bibliographical study of Russian writers in Spain has already been carried out by Schanzer, op. cit. I have chosen to concentrate on Pushkin, Gogol', Tolstoy Dostoevsky and Turgenev, all major 19th-century writers and each, in his own way, a contributor to "Russian Realism".
- 11 Prawer, p.62.
- 12 I give a fuller definition of these requisites in chapter 1.
- 13 Miguel de Unamuno, *Obras Completas*, VII (Madrid, 1966), pp.305-364. On p.340, for example, he notes: "Y, sin embargo, el verdadero padre del sentimiento nihilista ruso es Dostoyevski, un cristiano desesperado, un cristiano en agonía".

- 14 M. Forstetter, *Voyageurs en Russie* (Vevey, 1947), p.ix.
- 15 Ibid., pp.197-200.
- 16 These *Cartas* are dealt with in chapter 2.
- 17 Anthony Cross, *Russia under Western Eyes* (London, 1971). This excellent book deals with impressions of Russia from 1517-1825. Should Professor Cross plan to extend the time-span of this book, it is sincerely hoped that he might include at least a reference to Valera
- 18 See, for example, Jacinto Benavente, *Santa Rusia, Obras Completas V* (Madrid, 1962), pp.877-939.
- 19 G. Martínez Sierra, *Motivos* (Madrid, 1920), p.39.
- 20 J. Stuart Mill, *La esclavitud femenina* (Madrid, 1892).
- 21 Quoted in Lisa Condé, *A Feminist Consciousness in Galdós* (Toronto, 1990), pp.2-3.
- 22 Quoted in Lisa Condé, *Women in the Theatre of Galdós* (Toronto, 1990), p.23.
- 23 In the course of my examinations of these plays I will, of course, be dealing with the powerful matriarchs represented therein. Doña Perfecta might well have been included in such a list. Galdós himself does not qualify for inclusion into the categories of cultural mediators mentioned here. However, given his immense importance within Spanish literature one episode will be briefly discussed – namely the possible relationship between his novel *Doña Perfecta* and Turgenev's *Отцы и дети* (*Fathers and Children*).
- 24 Title of article in Spanish *Vogue*, April 1993, p.38. This, despite the nature of the publication, was an excellent article, written by Javier Vallejo.
- 25 Idem.

- 26 Idem.
- 27 Alfonso Ussia, *Epoca*, 5 April, 1993, 38.
- 28 Such a study falls outwith the parameters of this thesis. Information about some of these new translations does appear in magazines such as *Epoca*, *Tiempo* and, of course, *Telva*.

CHAPTER 1

(1) INTRODUCTION

SPAIN AND RUSSIA:

"DOS TIERRAS DE DESMESURA Y SINRAZON"

“...everywhere there is connection, everywhere there is illustration: no single event, no single literature, is adequately comprehended except in relation to other events, to other literatures.

Matthew Arnold¹

“Comparative literature...is [the] study of literary relations and communications between two or more groups that speak different languages.”

René Wellek²

As S.S. Praver so aptly observed, comparative studies of the reception, diffusion and influence of literatures make up “a house with many mansions”; in the course of this thesis, however, it is not my intention to “[peer] into every nook and cranny” of this vast abode.³ For the most part I shall be engaged in an examination and reassessment of the work of the principal promoters of Russian literature in late 19th-century Spain. In their function as mediators between the literary traditions of

Spain and Russia these cultural intermediaries were operating across linguistic and national frontiers which had rarely, if ever, been crossed before, as we shall see.

Within the time-span to be investigated in this thesis, some attention will be paid to the translations of Russian literature which gradually made their way into Spain in the 19th century. Translation is, of course, one of the main channels through which the major influence of another literature may travel; the flow of translations of Russian writers into Spain did not, in many cases, run smoothly. The channel frequently became blocked and even, on occasions, diverted from its proper course, as will be observed.⁴

In his major bibliographical study *Russian Literature in the Hispanic World* (1972) George Schanzer states conclusively that “[m]any noted [Spanish] writers participated in [the] dissemination process [of Russian literature in Spain].”⁵ Sadly he does not develop this further. A major area of investigation of this thesis will be to take up this matter from where Schanzer leaves off. In their work, as I will argue, these writers were most effective communicators, notwithstanding the many linguistic, social and historical factors which often barred their paths.

It has been suggested that one of the most fruitful thematic areas for comparative literary studies is the investigation of “[r]ecurrent situations and their treatment by different writers”.⁶ In the second part of this thesis I propose to address certain aspects of the “woman question” (“zhenskii vopros”), (one of the most topical issues in Europe in the 19th century – and later, too, of course) as these emerge in the writings of certain Spanish and Russian authors. A “thematic” study of this nature will demand that “the spirit of [these two] societies and epochs as well as those of individual talents” be examined and contrasted.⁷

This thesis, then, has three main objectives. The first, and the most important of these, will be my attempt to evaluate and to reassess Spain’s contributions to the reception and the spread of the influence of Russian literature at

the end of the 19th century and into the early years of the 20th century. Spain's participation in this process has largely been ignored or undervalued; unjustly so, I believe, given the quality of some of the critical responses made by Spanish writers to certain Russian authors. I shall examine the contributions which were made by seven Spanish authors to this process; other Spanish writers could have been mentioned too, but the ones on whom I have chosen to concentrate here all fulfil specific and well-defined purposes in the above-mentioned process. Four of these writers, Emilia Pardo Bazán (1852–1921), Pío Baroja (1872–1956), Leopoldo Alas, “Clarín” (1852–1901) and Miguel de Unamuno (1864–1936), I have defined as “major intermediaries”. These four writers are studied not in their chronological order, but in the order of what I believe to have been the significance of their achievements in the introduction to and the familiarization of Russian writers in Spain. My definition of the term “major intermediary” demands that three functions be fulfilled. In the first instance, correct, stimulating and ongoing information about Russian literature must have been provided; secondly, original work, or works, must have been written on Russian literature; and, finally, Russian writers should have been a source of inspiration in the intermediary’s own creative work. At this juncture I shall endeavour to discover to what extent these Spanish authors were ready to “make direct contact” with the work of the Russian writers and to allow this encounter

to affect [their] own literary creations. [This] must depend on a feeling of kinship, or fascinated hostility – feelings which also play their part in determining the reception of a given author’s work in a country other than his own.⁸

The four Spanish writers referred to above met all three conditions in their work as major cultural intermediaries, as will be seen. The achievements of all four (in particular those of Pardo Bazán), were quite extraordinary, given the vastness of the subject which they were attempting to comprehend and study, and given the two great handicaps with which they embarked upon this venture into the unknown. Not one of them had ever visited Russia and not one of the four possessed even a reading knowledge of Russian. Consequently, they had to rely on the often imperfect translations of that era for at least part of their own information about Russian writers, and even for their actual acquaintance with them. Yet despite these handicaps (the latter of which might even seem to be an insurmountable one) they all provided accurate, stimulating and original material on Russian writers – much of which is still largely unregarded within the wider field of Russian studies. As my first aim, then, I shall seek to redress this injustice and to show that Spain possessed valuable, energetic and well-informed critics who both introduced Russian literature to their compatriots and kept up their commitment to studying Russian writers and culture throughout the course of their lives. Most histories of the influence and the spread of Russian culture have tended to ignore or to belittle Spain's place in this process altogether. The contributions made by these four prove conclusively that the part played by Spain had a significance of its own.

The contributions of two “minor” cultural intermediaries Juan Valera (1824–1905) and Angel Ganivet (1865–1898), will also be examined. Valera and Ganivet, unlike the four major intermediaries mentioned above, had both visited Russia; Valera spent one year there (1856-57) as part of a Spanish diplomatic mission to St. Petersburg, and his *Cartas desde Rusia* enjoyed tremendous popularity in Spain. However, Valera was accused by certain of his contemporaries of having wasted his time in Russia. He did not know the language and, although on his return to Spain he expressed his firm intention to study both

the Russian language and many Russian literary works in the original, he never did so. I do not agree, however, with the often harsh criticisms of what Valera actually did achieve through his letters from Russia. These, in fact, provided a fascinating first-hand account of many aspects of Russian life and additionally served, as I shall argue, to prepare the ground for the major impact of Russian literature in Spain some years later. Valera also made some very important literary contacts while in Russia, a fact which has been overlooked or ignored by his detractors.

Angel Ganivet, who committed suicide in Riga in 1898, while serving as the Spanish consul in that city, could have been, in my opinion, the outstanding cultural mediator in Russo-Spanish literary relations. He was a keen linguist, having commenced a serious study of Russian some time before his death. His interest in foreign literatures, evident from his other writings, together with his intention to produce a short study of Russian writers, make his untimely death at the age of thirty-three a great loss to the further development of possible future literary relations between the two countries. We may only speculate about what his contributions might have been in this field, had he not thrown himself into the Dvina a second time, having been rescued after his first suicide attempt. Although the achievements of Valera and Ganivet are of lesser importance than those of the four above-mentioned major intermediaries, they are still significant for the reception of Russian culture and its popularization within Spain as a whole.

My second aim in this thesis is to highlight and to examine one major shared theme which, in my view, is powerfully represented in both literatures during the major time-span to be examined here. In that era, as we have noted, one of the most widely discussed issues in Europe was the so-called “woman question”. Many writers addressed the changing role of “those who wait behind the window”, dealing in their works with such matters as adultery, mother-daughter relations and many other questions directly involving attitudes to women in society.⁹ As the first

of my examples, I shall examine and compare two novels which deal with this topic, Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* and "Clarín"'s *La Regenta*.

The last Spanish author to be included in this thesis is Federico García Lorca (1898-1936). His play *La casa de Bernarda Alba* will be compared to *Three Sisters* by Chekhov. The striking similarities between these plays with regard to the "woman question" will be demonstrated using an analysis based on the theories of the Russian Formalists. I shall also mention Ostrovsky's play *The Storm* as another possible creative source for *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.

The third aim of this thesis is to bring to the forefront, wherever relevant, some of the research in the area of Russo-Spanish relations which has been carried out by Russian Hispanists, in particular the work of the late M.P. Alekseev and that of his former student, V.E. Bagno. In this first chapter brief reference will also be made to the contributions which have been made by L.A. Shur to the study of the early cultural relationship between Russia and Latin America. Very little of the work of the above-mentioned Russian Hispanists has been translated into either English or Spanish. For this reason, attention will be drawn from time to time to certain of their findings and conclusions, hitherto unavailable in English.

Because of the complex and rapidly changing situation within the former Soviet Union at present, the term "Russian" will be used throughout, replacing the term "Soviet" unless it is clearly inappropriate to do so. Unless otherwise stated, translations from Russian texts will be my own, and the Library of Congress system will be employed for transliteration purposes. The transliteration of names of well-known authors reflects customary usage.

A detailed textual study of the earliest translations of Russian literature to reach Spain falls outwith the purposes of this thesis. However, the first Spanish versions of works by Pushkin and Gogol' will be discussed. Information will also be given about the reception of Turgenev and Tolstoy in Spain. As the major

impact of Dostoevsky's writings in the Hispanic world did not occur until the 20th century, the availability of translations of his writings (and critical reactions to it) in 19th-century Spain will be mentioned only briefly.

The thesis is divided into five chapters and a conclusion. In the first chapter I shall briefly set the scene for the major episode in the reception of Russian writers in Spain. This occurred, in my opinion, in 1887 when Emilia Pardo Bazán published her lectures *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* in essay form. In this chapter some earlier cultural contacts between the two countries will be mentioned and the earliest translations of Russian literature into Spanish will be discussed. This part of the thesis will make reference to George Schanzer's major bibliographical study entitled *Russian Literature in the Hispanic World* (1972).

I shall also examine briefly the role of A.S. Pushkin in the early cross-cultural contact between Spain and Russia. By way of example only, since Pushkin himself was indirectly involved in the process, reference will be made to some of the early information which Russia received about Latin America. The parameters of this thesis have already been defined above and further references to the cultural relationship between Russia and Latin America cannot be included here; this area is, however, a rich field for research and one which remains and deserves to be studied in detail.

In the second chapter the earliest Spanish translation of Gogol' will be discussed, together with his reception in 19th-century Spain. I shall then examine the achievements of Valera and Pardo Bazán in the introduction of Russian culture and literature into Spain. Pardo Bazán's essays *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* will be considered, as will her later essays on Russian literature. The possible influence which Russian writers had within her own fictional world will also be posited.

In the third chapter the work of the second major intermediary, Pío Baroja, will be examined and a short study will be made of his essay on Dostoevsky; the presence of the latter within Baroja's own fiction will also be analysed. In this chapter too a brief account of the reception of Dostoevsky and Turgenev in 19th-century Spain will be presented: mention will be made of the possible influence of the latter's *Fathers and Children* on Benito Pérez Galdós's *Doña Perfecta*. Galdós is in no sense an "intermediary", and a detailed study of the influence of Russian literature on his work would fall outwith the purposes of this thesis. Yet, given his great significance for 19th-century Spanish literature, brief reference to this example would seem to be in order. Bagno's conclusions with regard to this possible relationship will also be noted.

In the fourth chapter the reception of the writings of Tolstoy in 19th-century Spain will be discussed briefly. Then the work of the third major intermediary, Leopoldo Alas, "Clarín", will be examined. His article on Tolstoy's story *Master and Man* will be mentioned. In this chapter too the "woman question" will be introduced more fully, through a comparison of *Anna Karenina* and *La Regenta*. The contributions of Miguel de Unamuno, the last major intermediary, will also be included here; an assessment of the role of Angel Ganivet as a minor cultural link between Spain and Russia will conclude this chapter.

The fifth chapter briefly discusses Federico García Lorca's interest in Russian culture. His play *La casa de Bernarda Alba* (1936) will be compared in some detail with Chekhov's *Three Sisters* (1901). The results of this analysis will demonstrate a very close affinity between the two authors with regard to the "woman question". Ostrovsky's *The Storm* (1859) will also be considered as a possible source for Lorca's play.¹⁰

In my conclusion some recent trends in the revival of a cultural relationship between Spain and the former USSR will be briefly reported. I have examined a

range of Spanish periodicals over a four-year period, and reference will be made to various articles and interviews which point to new cross-cultural perceptions and understandings between the two countries. Since the death of General Franco in 1975 and the advent of glasnost' (apertura) within the former Soviet Union some years later, there have been, of course, new opportunities for the rebuilding of cultural relations between the two countries, as they pursue their sharply-contrasted processes of "democratization".

Above all, however, I hope to prove conclusively in this thesis that Spain participated fully in the Western awareness of the importance of Russian writers and that Spanish contributions to the field of Russian studies deserve to be more widely known and to be held in much greater esteem. An evaluation of these findings is being presented here for the first time in English. The last decades of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th represent the richest period in the development of a cultural relationship between the two countries, a relationship which was, of course, complicated (and latterly virtually terminated) as a result of political events: the 1917 October Revolution in Russia and the Civil War in Spain (1936-39). It remains to be seen whether, as a direct result of the greater "transparencia" within these countries (and despite the economic and other problems which beset the former Soviet Union), the final decade of this century will witness a restoration of the important cultural link between them. If so, the work of Emilia Pardo Bazán and the other writers studied here will, after all, have been vindicated.

(2) RUSSIA AND SPAIN:

SOME EARLY CONTACTS

“In the same way as Russia’s path into Europe was barred by the... Mongolian hordes, so too in Spain the Arab Caliphate became a barrier to her path to development”.¹¹

Because of the vast geographical distances which separated Spain and Russia, (they have been described as countries which are situated “at opposite ends of Europe”), the language barriers, the immense difficulties of travel and the two countries’ historical vicissitudes, it has become customary to regard Spain and Russia as having little, if anything, in common.¹² It remains an undisputable fact too that one of the most neglected areas in the study of comparative literature, literary influences and cultural interactions has been the relationship between Russia and Spain. Of this rich field for research, which is still in many ways underdeveloped, Alekseev observed that “...many important episodes within this relationship have not been discussed at all up to the present time”.¹³ However, as regards the early history of Russia and Spain, Alekseev indicated one vital similarity in the development of these two countries which would appear to have been largely overlooked by researchers in the area of comparative literature or cultural studies, namely that the Moorish influences on Spain can aptly be compared to the Mongolian influences on Russia. As a result of these influences both countries were, among other things, cut off from the mainstream of events in the rest of Europe for many years. The subsequent duality of both Spanish and Russian culture “played a vital role...in the cultural processes...of both

countries”.¹⁴ Looking at this same question from a different perspective, Ernesto Sábato points to other significant similarities between the two countries. He notes as follows:

Perteneiente Rusia a la periferia de Europa, con rasgos de sociedad y mentalidad feudales, siempre mostró cierta similitud con España (país que tampoco tuvo en forma cabal el fenómeno renacentista). No es simple casualidad que el mejor *Quijote* se haya filmado en Rusia, y que tradicionalmente el personaje de Cervantes haya suscitado tanto interés y haya sido tan profundamente comprendido en aquella otra tierra de desmesura y sinrazón.¹⁵

According to Alekseev, another essential common bond between Russia and Spain may be found in the fact that both religion and religious oppression played dominant roles in the two countries over many centuries. He notes:

In Catholic Spain and Orthodox Russia... the struggle against both social and ecclesiastical oppression began almost simultaneously; in both countries church and state were closely connected in medieval times and their early literatures were ecclesiastically orientated.¹⁶

Religious oppression was to be another major factor in the increasing historical isolation in which both Spain and Russia found themselves. Spain became more and more cut off in her staunch upholding of Roman Catholicism against the new Protestant faiths of post-Reformation Europe. It was, in fact, not until 1843 (the year of Galdós’s birth) that the decree which had been established by Philip II in 1559, forbidding Spaniards to study abroad – except in the “safe”

cities of Bologna, Rome, Naples and Coimbra – was repealed. This, of course, had been an attempt by Philip to maintain religious “purity” within the country and to avoid contact with the heresies which abounded, in his opinion, in practically all the rest of Europe. In a similar way, after the fall of Byzantium, “Russia regarded herself as the main upholder and defender of Orthodoxy in opposition to the ‘Latin faith’”.¹⁷ (The Mongol Tartars had, of course, cut short the spiritual legacy of Byzantium with the sack of Kiev in 1237; the rule of the former had lasted in Russia until 1480. Just over a decade later the Moors were finally expelled from Spain.)

There are many other similarities in the historical development of the two countries which could be mentioned; for example, the role which autocracy, imperial expansion and revolutionary activity played in both, finally issuing in “the phenomena of the 20th century – Francoism and Bolshevism”.¹⁸ (This will be discussed briefly later in this chapter.)

France had exerted a great influence on the cultures of both Spain and Russia over a span of many years. The rejection of the powerful spread of this French cultural domination marks yet another important point of similarity between the two countries; ironically, however, the French language was to be in great measure the means through which Spain and Russia received initial information about one another’s literature and culture. The importance of certain French journals for providing Spain with early information about Russian culture will be mentioned briefly later. In both Spain and Russia the so-called “intelligentsia” in many cases received a French education. Spain and Russia were, of course, also united against the common enemy, Napoleon, a situation which was to have important repercussions for the relations between them. M.A. Dodolev has shown that historical events in Spain at the beginning of the 19th century made a significant

impression in Russia: “Spain’s War of Independence...was of great significance internationally...and Russia was also fully aware of these events”.¹⁹

Spanish literature, together with an awareness of and interest in Spanish culture, reached Russia considerably earlier than Russian literature became widely known and popular in Spain. Spanish literary works first reached Russia predominantly in French, but occasionally in English or German translations. In contrast, the initial information which reached Spain regarding the culture of Russia came mostly through Latin, Polish and French sources; a study of these very early materials does not, however, fall within the parameters of this present study. In the initial cultural and literary interchange, the Spanish language was more widely known and accessible to Russian readers than was, or indeed is, the Russian language in the Hispanic World (although this situation is changing rapidly in present-day Spain).²⁰

Regular diplomatic relations between Spain and Russia began in the early 18th century; on September 20th, 1719, Peter I sent a missive with his envoy to the Hague instructing the latter “to seek out an alliance with the Spaniards”, and in this same letter Peter indicated that a Russian presence might be established in Madrid in exchange for a similar Spanish one in St. Petersburg.²¹ However, the trading and diplomatic relations between Spain and Russia, which had been instigated by Peter I, soon fell into decline. From the beginning of the 18th century until 1740, various trade treaties were agreed with Spain but these proved to be of no great advantage to either party. In 1740 strong disagreements arose between the two sides regarding a new framework for diplomatic and trading exchanges, and further attempts to forge links of this nature proved fruitless for some years to come.

During this early period there are few traces of any literary relations between Spain and Russia. On the Russian side, a play which enjoyed considerable popularity in St. Petersburg at that time was *Don Juan and Don Pedro*. Although a

variation of the Don Juan theme, which had, apparently, made its way to Russia through German, Italian or French sources, this bore little resemblance to the Spanish dramatic treatment of the character. Yet it doubtless served to create a certain Spanish “stereotype” or “myth”.²² Only in late 18th or early 19th century, with amongst other things, the opening–up of more and better travel routes, did cultural relations between Spain and Russia begin to develop more fully. By that time the major dramatic works of Calderón de la Barca and Lope de Vega and the prose writings of Quevedo and Cervantes (especially *Don Quijote*) and the picaresque novel *Lazarillo de Tormes* were known in Russia, largely through French translations.²³ (The significance of *Don Quijote* for many Russian writers will be briefly mentioned in the course of this thesis.)

It has generally been accepted that prior to Emilia Pardo Bazán’s lectures in the “Ateneo” (which she later published in essay form – *La revolución y la novela en Rusia*, 1887) relatively little interest was evident in Spain regarding Russian life and culture. However, I have discovered, for example, a considerable number of references to the social engagements of the Russian Ambassadors in Madrid during the 1860s and the 1870s; this would indicate that there was at least a level of awareness of that country and its customs among certain sectors of the Spanish public.²⁴ Two years before Pardo Bazán’s lectures “el distinguido políglota Mr. Bark” had given a lecture on Russian literature to the “Círculo filológico matritense”; this speaker also offered Russian language classes “todos los martes”, the earliest reference I have found to such activities in Spain.²⁵ Pardo Bazán’s contribution to the furthering of Spanish-Russian literary relations was, of course, of vital importance, though this was sadly undervalued and even criticized by some of her male literary “rivals”. I shall argue that such “criticism” may on occasions have arisen from envy of her literary successes. (Relevant to this conclusion it is noted that on April 27th and May 4th 1881 the “Ateneo del estudio” had devoted a

short series of lectures to the topic *¿Es necesaria y útil la enseñanza de la mujer?*²⁶ This will be mentioned later when the “woman question” is discussed more fully. Pardo Bazán was not, of course, granted admittance to the Spanish Academy despite her outstanding literary achievements both in Spain and Latin America.) Her work on Russian literature had such far-reaching consequences that it marks a watershed in the whole history of Russo-Spanish relations. It heralds, in fact, the beginning of a new era of growing understanding and familiarization between the two countries, especially, of course, from the Spanish side.

Yet, in other ways too the ground was already being prepared for the advent of her material on Russian literature. For at least ten years prior to the publication of her work, *Ilustración española y americana*, *La Revista europea*, *La Ciencia cristiana*, *La revista contemporánea*, *La Revista de España* and *La Revista hispanoamericana* all had published articles and other materials concerning the political and cultural life of Russia; we have, consequently, additional proof that there was in Spain during these years a “certain level of awareness about and interest in Russia”.²⁷

(3) "EMBAJADORES EN EL INFIERNO"²⁸

"Wise master, Marxist gardener!

Thou art tending the vine of communism.

Thou art cultivating it to perfection.

After Lenin, leader of Leninists!"

To the Leader, to Comrade Stalin²⁹

"...[Ya] se habla... del telón de acero y de defender la civilización de la Europa occidental contra la amenaza... [del comunismo]. [Y] en ese camino España está llamada a ser el más luminoso de los faros."

General Franco³⁰

For the obvious political reasons which we have already briefly outlined, the period of growing Spanish cultural and literary interest in Russia, in great part initiated by Pardo Bazán, ended (at least officially) in 1939. During the Franco years, interest in Spanish literary works (in particular the classics of Spanish Golden Age literature), was maintained in the USSR but in the course of that era Russian attention tended to shift towards the works of Latin American writers.³¹

While the "Caudillo" was in power the "official" attitude in Spain towards the former USSR was characterized by its fanaticism and lack of tolerance. Franco, firmly convinced of his God-given role as champion of "lo espiritual" in the bitter "Cruzada" against the "heresies" of Communism, made frequent references in his speeches and interviews to the threats which, in his view, were posed by the former USSR.³² By way of one brief example, here is how Franco addressed the Spanish

people on December 31st 1956 (a year which had, of course, witnessed momentous changes in Russia) exhorting them to be ever vigilant with regard to the “enemy”:

Españoles:...Constituiría... un grave error... suponer que el dispositivo soviético está en descomposición y que la amenaza soviética pueda ahora preocuparnos menos. Que algo grave está pasando en el mundo de los soviets es evidente... La desestalinización y las gravísimas acusaciones públicas contra la obra de tantos años del régimen soviético, no es un capricho, sino una necesidad histórica e imperiosa, todavía poco conocida... Mientras el sistema soviético de terror implacable y de eficacia probada tenga capacidad para resolver las situaciones... no puede decirse que esté en crisis, ya que su amenaza y peligrosidad permanecen.³³

An examination of literary relations between Franco’s Spain and the former USSR falls outwith the purpose of this thesis, however fascinating such an investigation might prove.³⁴ We will, nevertheless, briefly draw attention to certain present-day trends in Spanish-Russian cultural relations as these can be observed in a selection of Spanish periodicals monitored for this purpose over the last four years.³⁵ A definite resurgence of interest can be detected in this area and it is hoped that this revival heralds a new era in the literary and cultural relations between the two countries.

(4) THE EARLIEST SPANISH TRANSLATIONS

OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE

A BRIEF SURVEY

“I have read neither Calderón nor Vega;... I do not know any Spanish.”

A.S. Pushkin³⁶

By the middle of the 19th century one of the dominant literary genres in Spain was “costumbrismo”; Larra had written many “costumbrista” articles describing daily life in Madrid, while Estébanez Calderón’s *Escenas Andaluzas* (1832) vividly depicted customs in the south. “Costumbrismo” was of considerable importance for the subsequent development of 19th-century Spanish prose in that it established “the main lines that the novel was to follow” and it further represented a deviation from possible excesses of Romanticism.³⁷ The first 19th-century Spanish novel (which owed a considerable amount to “costumbrismo”) is generally considered to be *La Gaviota* (1849), the work of authoress Cecilia Böhl de Faber (1796-1877), who wrote under the name of Fernán Caballero; it has been described as “the first work of Spanish life”.³⁸ In Russia a similar achievement can be ascribed to A.S. Pushkin; with the publication of *The Tales of Belkin* (1830), his first completed work in prose, Pushkin virtually single-handed laid the foundations for the great tradition of 19th-century Russian prose fiction. Throughout these tales Pushkin emphasizes the importance and the

pleasures of “byt”, ordinary daily life, and parodies on many occasions the traditions and expectations of Sentimentalism and Romanticism.³⁹ Pushkin was, in fact, the first major Russian writer to be translated into Spanish; one of the above-mentioned tales, *The Snowstorm*, was translated into Spanish in 1847. In this section I will present, in addition to certain details of this early translation, a short summary of Pushkin’s fate within Spain and brief mention will be made of the first translations of his work in two Spanish American countries.

Undoubtedly, the absence of close political, economic and historical links between Russia and Spain represented a significant factor in the relative lateness of the major diffusion of Russian literature in the Hispanic world. (This point will be discussed again, in the following chapter.) The major impact of the Russian writers who played a significant role in the development of 19th-century prose fiction – Pushkin, Gogol’, Turgenev, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky – did not reach Spain until the late 1880s, by which time, as V.V. Rakhmanov observed, “... the wave of interest in Russian literature had swept through Europe”.⁴⁰

However, as has been briefly outlined already, a certain mutual cultural interest had existed between Russia and Spain prior to those years; this had been further strengthened by political events of the first two decades of the century. Even as early as 1805 an ever-increasing curiosity regarding the political situation in several Latin American countries manifests itself in Russia; Baldran notes:

Cette nouvelle curiosité pour tout ce qui concernait l’Amérique latine fut bientôt renforcée par les circonstances historiques: l’indépendance des colonies américaines passionna les jeunes romantiques russes et les Décembristes y trouvèrent une justification de leur idéologie.⁴¹

Without doubt Emilia Pardo Bazán's work *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* clearly marked a new era of literary and cultural interest in Russia. But George Portnoff's assertion that prior to 1887 there were no articles at all in Spain dedicated to Russian cultural and literary movements is both incorrect and misleading, as we have already seen. Portnoff's dating of the entrance of the first translations of Russian literature into Spain is also incorrect; quoting Díez-Canedo, he comments:

La fecha de la entrada (de 1880) que da el señor Díez-Canedo nos parece inexacta. Es muy posible que por esa fecha haya entrado algún cuento o novela corta, como *La sota de bastos* de A. Pushkin, que se publicó en un folletín hacia 1884; pero esta clase de literatura pasó inadvertida. Según todos los indicios, las obras más importantes no entraron en España sino hacia 1888. Hasta esta fecha no se encuentra nada de ruso en las revistas literarias de España de aquella época, como *La Lectura* y *La España Moderna*.⁴²

Although Portnoff's information has been proved wrong, he is correct in naming Pushkin as among the first Russian authors to be translated into Spanish. One of the stories from *The Tales of Belkin – The Snowstorm – El turbión de nieve* – was translated into Spanish (via French) in 1847.⁴³ However, G.R. Derzhavin's (1743–1816) ode *God – Oda al Ser Supremo* – precedes this by almost ten years and thus confers upon Derzhavin the honour of being the first Russian writer to be translated into Spanish, albeit through French. His eleven stanza poem, published in 1784, has been described as an ode in the tradition of the “Russian Pindar”, Lomonosov. In it Derzhavin gave “a poetic depiction of the idea of the Great Chain of Being, one common to all of religious and philosophical thought in the

eighteenth century”.⁴⁴ This poem entered Spain in 1838, being published in Barcelona, in a “religious journal”.⁴⁵ (Additionally Derzhavin was the first poet to recognize the young Pushkin’s great talent.)

Further individual stories from Pushkin’s *The Tales of Belkin* appeared in Spanish translation during the years 1875–1880; some of these will now be listed, given the supreme importance of this work within the history of Russian literature. A new version of *the Snowstorm*, now entitled *La nevada*, was published by *Revista Europea* in 1877; *The Undertaker* (*El constructor de ataúdes*) also appeared in that same year.⁴⁶ Pushkin’s later prose work, *The Captain’s Daughter* (*La hija del capitán*) received its first Spanish rendering in 1879, although Portnoff refers in his bibliography to his own translation of this work, done in 1919, as being the first and only Spanish version available.⁴⁷ The existence of the above-mentioned translations of Pushkin, (most of which had appeared in the journal *Revista Europea*), reveals the shortcomings of Portnoff’s claims. Furthermore, both his somewhat scathing reference to Pushkin’s short prose works as “esta clase de literatura” and his seeming failure to class them amongst his list of “obras importantes” must cast a certain doubt on his literary judgement.⁴⁸ Moreover, it seemed to have escaped Portnoff’s attention that before 1880 Pushkin had also appeared in Spanish translation in Chile. *The Snowstorm* (*El turbi3n de nieve*) was published in *Revista de Santiago* in 1850, *The Prisoner of the Caucasus* (*El prisionero del Caúcaso*) in *El Santa Lucía* (1874), *The Snowstorm*, *The Shot* and *The Undertaker* in *La Estrella de Chile* in 1875 and *The Shot* in Valparaíso in 1877.⁴⁹

The source used by the first Hispanic translator (or translators) of *The Snowstorm* (Spain 1847, Chile 1850) was, without doubt, the French translation of the original, *Le tourbillon de neige*, printed in the journal *L’illustration*, (Paris, 1843).⁵⁰ Indeed it seems probable that the Spanish version, which first appeared in

Valencia, was the same one which appeared three years later in Chile, since both versions are almost identical: in neither, however, is the name of the translator (or translators) revealed.

The 1843 French translation of *The Snowstorm* differs considerably in places from the Russian original; where Pushkin parodies Romanticism, his “literary pranks” have been grossly misinterpreted in the French rendering, where Romantic elements have actually been stressed. There are also other significant “additions, inaccuracies [and] oversights”.⁵¹ Of course, since early Spanish translators depended for the most part on such French intermediaries, any shift in emphasis or inaccuracies within the French text would remain or could even be subject to further mutilation in the derivative Spanish versions. We can also observe a strange tendency in the work of these early translators of Pushkin’s prose; paradoxically they often attempted to obfuscate the vitally important “prosaic” elements of *The Tales of Belkin* – ordinary life or “byt”, historical time, local detail – and to concentrate above all on what they interpreted as the “sentimentality” of the plot.⁵² Also the vitally important element of parody in the original was totally lacking in both the French and Spanish versions. And, of course, as these early translations of individual tales appeared in isolation from the rest of the cycle, the important relation among the tales themselves and to the *Editor’s Foreword* was completely absent. However, despite the above-mentioned flaws and inaccuracies, and given too that the Spanish and the Chilean versions were “translations of translations”, they nevertheless did retain certain features of “...Pushkin’s style and the Russian national flavour”: moreover for Chilean readers this 1850 translation of *The Snowstorm* would have been especially important in that it was representative of a European tradition outwith Spain.⁵³ This Chilean version of *The Snowstorm* marks the very first state in Russo-Chilean literary relations.⁵⁴ The progressive Chilean journal *El Santa Lucía* also published a

translation of *The Prisoner of the Caucasus* in 1874; it is interesting that no separate “Spanish” version of this work can be traced either before or indeed after this date. (No subsequent translation of this work, in fact, appeared in the Hispanic World until the 1946 Mexican edition.)⁵⁵ On this occasion it would seem that the translator must have been Chilean; again, he or she worked not from the Russian original, but from the 1847 French version by H. Dupont.⁵⁶ The existence of this early Latin American translation, which seems to have bypassed Spain altogether, anticipates by several decades the evidence advanced by Schanzer in support of his contention that many works of Russian literature appeared first in Latin America and only later in Spain.⁵⁷ (One possible explanation for the choice of *The Prisoner of the Caucasus* by its anonymous Chilean translator and/or the editor of *El Santa Lucía* may lie in the exotic qualities of the original work. These, doubtless, would have had great appeal to the Romantic tastes prevalent in Chile in that period.)⁵⁸ This Chilean translator did, however, take considerable liberties with the French source; several parts of the French version were omitted – for example, the epilogue – but the translator did retain all references to “elements of folklore”.⁵⁹

Other early Spanish translations of Pushkin are all of his prose works – in particular, several of *The Tales of Belkin*, published as individual works. It is instructive, then, to note that this significant work of 19th-century Russian literature has not yet been translated fully and accurately into Spanish. In 1945 an Argentinian version appeared which was entitled *Los cuentos del difunto Ivan Petróvich Bielkin redactados por A.P. – Nota del redactor*; in this edition the order in which the tales are presented is random and haphazard – beginning with *El fabricante de ataúdes* and ending with *La nevasca*. This order bears no resemblance either to the original order or to the “secret” order of the tales which, according to the fairly recent research of A. Kodjak and others, may be found in the second footnote “From the Editor” and which is of great importance for a correct

understanding of these stories.⁶⁰ Consequently, even today the Hispanic reader of Pushkin who has to rely on Spanish translations of *The Tales of Belkin*, has still not had an adequate opportunity of appreciating this vitally important work in a full and accurate rendering.

Of Pushkin's translated prose works the most popular in Spain were *El bandido Dubrovsky*, *La hija del Capitán* and individual stories from *The Tales of Belkin*. *The Queen of Spades* also enjoyed considerable success and popularity; it had, in fact, at least six different titles in Spanish, among them, *La dama de espadas*, *La dame de pique*, *La Reina de espadas* and *El secreto de la comtessa* [sic]. This phenomenon, which also occurred frequently with early Spanish translations of the shorter works of Dostoevsky, often caused great confusion both for reader and bibliographer.⁶¹ As might be expected, there are many Spanish versions of Pushkin's own contribution to the Don Juan legend. But there are astonishingly few Spanish translations of what is often regarded as his greatest achievement, the "novel in verse", *Evgenii Onegin*; an early Spanish translation of this work appeared with the subtitle *Un amor trágico*, a liberty, of course, on the part of the translator or translators.⁶²

Pushkin, then, one of Russia's finest poets, had a rather curious fate when translations of his writings began to circulate in the Hispanic World. For many years Spanish readers, who had to rely on their native language to make his acquaintance, must necessarily have regarded him as a writer of short prose fiction and tales of mystery and adventure. In Spain too, of course, as Pushkin himself had observed in *Evgenii Onegin* in a Russian context, "...the years were demanding prose". The difficulties of translating poetry in a satisfactory manner may also account in some way for this unusual phenomenon. Pushkin's verse did not, then, whatever the reasons, appear in Spanish translation until much later than his prose. It was only in 1930 that the Barcelona series *Las mejores poesías líricas de los*

mejores poetas published a volume of his poetry. By this time, of course, the standard, the accuracy and the overall quality of translations had greatly improved, since the majority of the translators were now working directly from the Russian originals.

To cite a further brief example from Latin America, Mexico, like Chile, differs from the pattern which was established in Spain as regards translations of Pushkin. In Mexico the first of his works to be translated was *Mozart y Salieri: (Poema dramático)*, which appeared in *Eco de Ambos Mundos* (1876), translated from the French. It must be assumed that the dramatic intensity of Pushkin's short work had a special appeal for his Mexican readers.

Given the often inaccurate, and in many ways incomplete, early translations of his oeuvre and despite the absence of versions of his poetry and dramatic works, the Spanish reading public would, nonetheless, have been able to learn of Pushkin's reputation as a poet. They could have done so in particular from Valera's *Cartas desde Rusia* (1856), from Castelar's *La Rusia contemporánea* (1881) and, naturally, from Emilia Pardo Bazán's lectures and essays on Russian literature and culture. (Valera and Pardo Bazán will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter). In addition, *La España Moderna* had published a special tribute to Pushkin, written by Araujo.⁶³ During the year which Valera spent in Russia (1856-57) he had read Pushkin in German translation, and on his return to Spain he did make some attempt to make Pushkin better known there. Campoamor is also known to have been interested in Pushkin's works, as Valera observed in one of his letters:

Leo, sin embargo, algunos autores rusos traducidos
en alemán, y un día de éstos le escribiré a Campoamor una
larga carta que me pide con noticias de aquí, dándoselas muy

circunstanciadas del príncipe de los poetas moscovitas y de sus obras: de Pushkin, que apenas se conoce en Francia.⁶⁴

Moreover, Nemirovich-Danchenko's anecdotal account of his visit to Núñez de Arce where he noted both the Spaniard's collection of Russian poetry (though Núñez de Arce neither spoke nor understood Russian) and his great admiration for Pushkin helps to redress the balance somewhat. It bears witness to the fact that at least some Spanish writers and intellectuals of the nineteenth century had access to versions of Pushkin's poetry, albeit not in Spanish. As a result of this they would have learned of Pushkin's reputation as one of Russia's most outstanding poets.

It must also be noted that many later Hispanic versions of Pushkin's works carried prefaces or prologues written by eminent literary figures. The 1914 Bogotá translation of *La reina de espadas* had a "Noticia biográfica y literaria" which had been composed by Pardo Bazán herself; Eduardo Mallea was associated with the 1944 Buenos Aires version of *La dama de espadas*, which also claimed to be "una versión especial del ruso por Olga de Wolkonsky"; Nabokov wrote the prologue for the 1954 Chilean rendering of *Dubrovski, el bandido*, and some years earlier Antonio Machado had prefaced the 1939 Cuban *Festín durante la peste. El convidado de piedra*.⁶⁵ Significant too are the publication of the biography *Alexandre Puixkin*, and the special exhibition which was organized in Barcelona to coincide with the anniversary of the poet's death.⁶⁶ Navarro Tomás was associated with this event, as was Lorca's contemporary Manuel Altolaguirre.

Apart, then, from Derzhavin's *God*, selected works of Pushkin were the first to be translated into Spanish, certain of these being available even within the first half of the 19th century. Paradoxically, these were for the most part translations of his short prose works. With the advent of more proficient translators who worked directly from the Russian originals, Spanish readers in the

first decades of the 20th century had real opportunities of acquainting themselves with some of Pushkin's poetry and with his dramatic works. Such translations were often the result of direct Spanish/Russian collaboration. For example, the 1938 version of Pushkin's *Festín durante la peste. El convidado de piedra* was the joint work of O.G. Savich and Manuel Altolaguirre. In Alekseev's archives there is a Spanish verse translation of *Tale of Tsar Saltan*, the work of L.I. Averyanov, completed in 1917.⁶⁷

Writing in 1937 Antonio Machado referred to Pushkin as "Nuestro Puchkin" and there is now a monument to him (unveiled in 1981) in a central Madrid park; in *La aguja dorada* (1986) the late Montserrat Roig dedicated a chapter to Pushkin and reproduced the Spanish translation of Pushkin's poem *Ia vas liubil – I loved you once*.⁶⁸ According to Montserrat Roig there is, in fact, "una aproximación mística" between Pushkin and his Spanish readers, which both transcends and defies the language barrier and the problems of translation. She observes:

Es una lástima que la poesía de Pushkin haya sido traducido tan poco y a menudo tan mal. Los especialistas dicen que es casi imposible. Pero su preocupación por la lengua viva no sujeta al encorsetamiento normativo, lo acerca a nosotros... Creía que la lengua hablada por el pueblo era digna de una profunda investigación... Hay, todavía, otro punto que lo aproxima a nosotros: su conciencia de escritor profesional, su voluntad de vivir de la escritura... Un grupo de escritores creían que nuestra lengua y nuestra literatura se ensuciaban si, además, pretendíamos cobrar. Era la teoría de la salvación mesiánica – que no conduce a nada, sino a la flojedad de intenciones – contra las ganas de sobrevivir por

medio de tu propio oficio... [Pushkin] vendía sus poemas
con el mismo provecho que un zapatero considera un par de
botas suyas.⁶⁹

This is a fitting and positive note on which to end this account of a major
Russian writer's first tentative entry into Spanish awareness.

(5) A.S. PUSHKIN AS TRANSLATOR

SOME EARLY RUSSO-LATINAMERICAN CONTACTS

“The Decembrists followed the liberation process of the peoples of South America with great interest.”

L.A. Shur⁷⁰

“Pushkin is a writer who invites the comparative approach almost more than any other. Few authors have so consciously made themselves an intermediary between their own time and country and the literatures of other times and climes... In the fact of every literary achievement he seems to have asked himself: could that be done in Russian?”

S.S. Praver⁷¹

Russian interest in and information about the 19th-century liberation of Latin American countries from Spain and Portugal has been well documented and researched. Much of this valuable material, however, remains largely unknown to scholars in the West. As L.A. Shur has observed, events in Latin America in the early years of the 19th century held a special interest for the Decembrists. Shortly before the Decembrist Uprising, for example, a short article “Recent Events in Latin America” had appeared in the journal *Son of the Fatherland*, dedicated to Paraguay’s struggle for independence.⁷² Many other such examples could be cited.

One of the first intermediaries responsible for acquainting early 19th-century Russian readers with both the Spanish language and the cultures of Latin America

was V.M. Golovnin, "...a famous sailor...who was close to the Decembrists in his ideas and outlook".⁷³ Golovnin's travel writings were extremely popular in Russia, and included in them were frequent descriptions of Latin American countries, their customs, geography and history. The account given by Golovnin of his journeys aboard the "Kamchatka" (1817-1819) contained valuable, first-hand information about political events in many Latin American countries, and extracts from the book were published in 1818 in *The Son of the Fatherland*.⁷⁴

Golovnin's interests were not confined to the customs of those Latin American countries which he visited. In 1824, after two separate voyages to South America he published a Spanish grammar book. The first Spanish grammar for Russians, had, in fact, appeared in 1811, the work of Jacob Langen, and in Russian journals of that same period "references were often made to Spanish dictionaries and grammar books published in France and Germany".⁷⁵ It was, of course, no accident that precisely at that time interest in the Spanish language was increasing in Russia; political events both in Latin America and in Spain had captured the attention and the imagination of many Russians of that era.⁷⁶ The grammar book which had been compiled by Golovnin was intended to be put to practical use; he had written it primarily for Russian sailors who might visit Spain or Spanish-speaking lands. If in the prologue to this grammar book Golovnin admitted that "...the Spanish language is almost unknown in Russia", nevertheless his own knowledge ranged widely beyond a purely linguistic set of interests.⁷⁷ Apart from his Spanish grammar book, there exists, in manuscript form, his Spanish-Russian dictionary; the final chapter of his *Grammar* lists many books on Spanish American history which he had consulted, and in the catalogue of his books, which has been preserved, there appear many Spanish books and books about Spain and Latin America in various other languages, together with Spanish grammar books and dictionaries.⁷⁸

If Pushkin, as has been shown, was the first major Russian writer to be translated into Spanish, he was himself, by a strange irony of fate, one of the first “translators” of Latin American literature into Russian. In 1825 he “translated” eleven stanzas from a work by the Brazilian poet Tomás Antônio Gonzaga, *Marília de Dirceu*, into Russian.⁷⁹ These verses, which were not published in Pushkin’s own lifetime, were entitled simply *From the Portuguese*, and no reference is made by Pushkin either to Gonzaga himself or to the original work.⁸⁰ Pushkin was not, of course, translating directly from Gonzaga’s Portuguese text, but from the 1825 French edition of the Brazilian poet.⁸¹

The life of Gonzaga (1744-1810) doubtless held a certain attraction for Pushkin and his contemporaries. Gonzaga’s imprisonment in 1789, after being accused of taking part in “a Inconfidência” (Part II of *Marília* was actually written in prison in Ilha das Cobras), and his subsequent exile in 1792 to Mozambique would have been known to Pushkin from the French translator’s introduction.⁸²

Marília de Dirceu is a series of love poems dedicated to Maria Dorotéia Joaquina de Seixas – the “Marília” of the title. It is divided into two parts; a third part exists, but is considered to be apocryphal. Part I reflects the joy of the poet’s love for Marília, descriptions of her and thoughts of their future happiness; here, Gonzaga “reflete tôdas as felicidades do namôro e do noivado”.⁸³ In Part II a change has taken place and the mood of the *Liras*

reflete os sofrimentos morais e físicos do cárcere e versa preferentemente os seguintes temas: reflexões sôbre a Justiça, sôbre a Sôrte, sôbre a Glória; desalentos, e consolação no amor de Marília....⁸⁴

Many of these preoccupations would, of course, have been of great interest to Pushkin and to several of his Russian contemporaries.

A certain confusion, however, seems to have arisen regarding this poem *From the Portuguese*. It has been suggested that these eleven stanzas are “a free translation of the poem ‘Memoirs’”, yet none of the 75 *Liras*, which make up the work *Marília*, bears this or any other title.⁸⁵ It is further asserted that “Pushkin translated this from the French, altered it somewhat and changed the end”, and this does nothing to resolve the matter either.⁸⁶ It has also been suggested that *From the Portuguese* belongs amongst Pushkin’s “‘mixed’ translations”, and that Pushkin’s aim with this (and with other translations belonging to the same category) was twofold – namely to capture the essence and the spirit of the original work and to introduce hitherto largely unknown authors and their works to the Russian reading public.⁸⁷ Though Pushkin succeeded as regards the first of these intentions, it must be observed that Gonzaga’s name and all references to Brazil are absent from Pushkin’s poem, as, indeed, are any direct references to “Marília” herself. She is merely alluded to in such terms as “she”, “my beautiful woman”, “maiden”, whereas in Gonzaga’s original work her name is virtually omnipresent – “Marília bela”, “a minha Marília”, – the majority of the poems being, in fact, addressed directly to her. The claim that “by suppressing references to Marília, Pushkin gave his verses greater freedom” seems rather far-fetched.⁸⁸ As Pushkin was working from a translation of a translation, he cannot, of course, be held responsible for the French translator’s errors or omissions. What does emerge from Pushkin’s poem, then, seems not to be a direct translation of any of Gonzaga’s *Liras*. Yet it does constitute a faithful rendering of certain aspects of Gonzaga’s work. Of the poems of *Marília* Antônio Soares Amora has said

...são...das obras-primas da lírica em língua
portuguêsa; não têm unidade narrativa, mas de qualquer
modo documentam a história do grande, sincero a puro amor
do Poeta....⁸⁹

Pushkin's "translation" captures the crucial elements: the idealized, pastoral setting, the poet's evocation of his beloved and, finally, his desolation in her absence. The Russian poem, in my opinion, comes closest to being a "translation" of *Marília*, Part II, Lira XI, though this has seventeen stanzas rather than eleven, and the order of the stanzas has been altered.⁹⁰ Certain of Gonzaga's images too have been omitted, while others have been slightly changed. Even so, Gonzaga's stanzas two and three:

A porta abria
 Inda esfregando
 Os olhos belos,
 Sem flor, nem fita,
 Nos seus cabelos

Ah! que assim mesmo
 Sem compostura
 É mais formosa,
 Que a estrêla d'alva,
 Que a fresca rosa.

may be compared to Pushkin's stanzas two and three:

На постеле пуховой,
 Дева сонною рукой
 Отирала сонны очи,
 Удаляя грезы ночи.

И являлася она
 У дверей иль у окна

Ранней звездочки светлее,
Розы утренней свежее.

bearing in mind, of course, that the latter is not a literal translation of the former.⁹¹

Again, Gonzaga's stanzas 14 and 15 *Não há Pastôra*,

Que chegar possa
À minha Bela,
Nem quem me iguale
Também na estrêla;

Se amor concede
Que eu me recline
No branco peito,
Eu não invejo
De Jove o feito:

can be juxtaposed with Pushkin's stanzas 8 and 9:

Девы, радости моей,
Нет! на свете нет милей!
Кто посмеет под луною
Спорить в счастья со мною?

Не завидую царям,
Не завидую богам,
Как увижу очи томны,
Тонкий стан и косы темны.

In both cases these stanzas represent the poet's song of praise and delight in the beauty of his beloved.⁹² Both poems close on a somewhat abrupt note of desolation; Gonzaga's final stanza Assim vivia:

Hoje em suspiros
 O canto mudo:
 Assim, Marília,
 Se acaba tudo.

reflects past joys and present sadness and solitude, as do the last line of Pushkin's stanza 10 and his final stanza:

Но блаженство миновалось.

 Где ж красавица моя!
 Одинокий плачу я —
 Заменяли песни нежны
 Стон и слезы безнадежны.

In both cases the song of the poet has ceased, and is replaced by sighs and a sense of desolation.

Another reference – albeit a very brief and a superficial one – to a Brazilian theme is to be found elsewhere in Pushkin's works. In a variant version of the poem *The Little House in Kolomna* there is a direct allusion to the immensely popular French melodrama, written by Rochefort and Gabriel, *Jocko ou le singe brésilien* (1819).⁹³ This play had been translated almost immediately into Russian and it enjoyed great success in Russia for many years. It was not, of course, by chance that Pushkin had translated Gonzaga and had included too the very topical reference to *Jocko* in his poem mentioned above. Some of the first material about

the culture, history and political events of a Latin American country to be reported in great detail in the Russian press was about Brazil. Brazil's independence from Portugal in 1822 had caused great interest in Russia, and the beginnings of an interest in Brazilian literature can be discerned around that date too.

Finally, a similarly brief and casual example of some sort of awareness of Latin America can be found in the reference in chapter 1, XV of *Evgenii Onegin* to a "Bolivar-style" hat.⁹⁴ This reveals that the name of Simón Bolívar would be known not only by Pushkin, but by at least a section of the Russian reading public of that time too.

In 1829 *The Son of the Fatherland* published an anonymous translation of extracts from the Brazilian epic poem *Caramuru* (1781) written by Frei José de Santa Rita Durão (1722?-84).⁹⁵ This epic, which is considered to have been written as a direct imitation of *Os Lusíadas*, consists of 10 cantos which tell of the adventures, historical and legendary, of Diogo Álvares Correia, or Caramuru. The narrative is diversified by descriptions of the Brazilian countryside, by references to the native inhabitants and their traditions, and by the appearance of both native and Portuguese historical figures. Santa Rita Durão, born in Brazil but, from an early age, domiciled in Portugal, describes himself as being moved to write this poem by his "amor da pátria".⁹⁶ The version of his work which reached the Russian press in 1829 derived from a French translation of the original, this translation being of somewhat inferior quality. Of particular interest to the French translators and, subsequently to the sector of the Russian reading public which became acquainted with the poem, must have been, for example, Canto VII, verse XXII where Caramuru and his wife Paraguaçu visit the French King and Queen and describe the marvels of the Brazilian landscape to them:

Mandas-me, Rei Augusto, que te exponha,
(Diz cheio de respeito o Herói prudente)

E aos olhos teus em um compêndio ponha

A História natural da oculata gente:⁹⁷

Despite all the flaws and difficulties inherent in “double” translation, Russian readers would have received from this version of *Caramuru* a reasonably direct impression of both the historical past and the native customs of Brazil, as well as vivid descriptions of this exotic country itself.

Until fairly recently it was believed that the first article to appear in the Russian press about Brazilian literature had been Belinsky's essay “Literature, Science and Fine Art in Brazil”, which appeared in the journal *Telescope* in 1834.⁹⁸ This material had been translated by Belinsky from French sources and purported to be a summary of Brazilian literature from the 16th century to the beginning of the 19th century.⁹⁹ However, an anonymous article, entitled “Brazilian Literature”, published in 1831 in *Cynthia*, has been discovered by L.A. Shur. Sadly, Shur's research on this topic is virtually unknown to Western scholars.¹⁰⁰ This earlier article was, in fact, once more a translation from a French original, this time being an abridged version of the first chapter of the *Resumé de l'histoire littéraire de Brésil* by Ferdinand Denis. Ferdinand Denis (1798–1890), “l'homme qui à Paris connaît le mieux le Brésil”, had lived in Brazil from 1816–1819. On returning home he published several works intended to popularize in France both Portuguese and Brazilian culture.¹⁰¹ Among these studies one of the best known and acclaimed was his *Scènes de la Nature sous le Tropiques* (1824). Denis is not only important in his role as intermediary between Brazil and France (later, Brazil and Russia); he is considered in Brazil to be one of the forerunners of the Brazilian Romantic Movement, and is mentioned as such in many Brazilian literary histories and studies.

No Brasil, contamos inicialmente com vagos pronunciamentos pré-românticos e sugestões renovadoras de José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva, de Almeida Garret e Ferdinand Denis,

observe Candido and Aderaldo Castello.¹⁰²

Shur, in turn, believes that articles such as the translation of the chapter “Considerations générales sur le caractère que la poésie doit prendre dans le Nouveau-Monde” from Denis’s literary history of Brazil, – the piece which appeared in *Cynthia* in 1831 – “played a vital role in the development of Russian Romanticism”.¹⁰³

Two further translations of Denis had appeared in the Russian press of those years; on April 26th, 1831 *Literaturnaia gazeta* had published an extract from his *Sur la découverte du Nouveau-Monde. Christophe Colomb devant l’assemblée des docteurs de Salamanque*, and in 1833 *Telescope* carried the translation by Belinsky of another article by Denis “Sur la poésie des voyages de l’Antiquité au 16ème siècle”.¹⁰⁴ The polemic which surrounded the first article and which led to heated literary discussions, has been fully documented by Shur.¹⁰⁵ Nevertheless, this anonymous Russian translation of Denis would have confronted Russian readers with the following, which in certain Russian circles was interpreted as being a dangerous “manifestation de l’avant-garde romantique”:

America... must be as free as its literature....¹⁰⁶

As these few examples from the Russian journals of the 1830s show, the role of the intermediary played by France in the dissemination in Russia of information about Brazil, her culture and her literature cannot be ignored. This role was evident also in the case of certain other Brazilian works which appeared in

Russia in the first decades of the 19th century, all these translated from French. As J. Baldran observes:

Les articles parus dans la presse russe du premier tiers du 19ème siècle témoignent à l'évidence du rôle d'intermédiaire que joua la France entre ces deux pays, et aussi du très vif intérêt porté par les intellectuels russes à tout ce qui concernait le Brésil: les matériaux fournis par les journaux préparèrent le développement du romantisme russe.¹⁰⁷

The importance of an individual intermediary like Ferdinand Denis cannot be overlooked either, though Denis himself appeared to have been unaware of the significance of his work in Russia. But there were also reasons for the new interest which owed nothing to France. Political events in Brazil and the first manifestations of Brazilian literature to reach Russia caught the imagination of certain Russian intellectuals. The new Brazilian nationalism after achieving independence from Portugal and the often exotic descriptions of nature to be found in the works of late 18th-century and early 19th-century Brazilian authors “coïncidaient avec l'esthétique révolutionnaire des Décembristes”.¹⁰⁸ There had also been Russian expeditions to Brazil, 35 between the years 1800-1850, and articles describing the customs, geography and language of Brazil (for example, by the German naturalist Dr. Langsdorff, who had entered the Russian diplomatic service in 1801), had appeared in the Russian press.¹⁰⁹ The language barriers, however, remained largely unresolved during these years, hence “[c]’est donc à travers le prisme de la langue française que la littérature brésilienne fut reçue en Russie”.¹¹⁰

From the article which appeared in the journal *Telescope* in 1834, Russian readers would have been able to acquaint themselves with some of the most

important names in Brazilian literature from the 16th century to the beginning of the 19th. This article had first appeared earlier in 1834 in the French *Revue Britannique*, from which it had been taken and translated into Russian by Belinsky.¹¹¹ In fact, although the original article was anonymous, it was accompanied by an indication that the material therein was based on information printed in *Le Journal de l'Institut Historique*. The source is the 1st August 1834 number of this journal, which contains the article “Résumé de l’Histoire de la littérature, des sciences et des beaux-arts au Brésil”. This presents the lectures given to the Institute by three Brazilian writers, Domingos José Gonçalves de Magalhães, Araujo Pôrto Alegre and Francisco de Salles Tôrres Homem. The *Revue Britannique* reproduced this material with only a few omissions in its own article. Two years later, these same three Brazilian writers were to be found in the French journal *Niterói*, and they had as their aim “divulgar, no Brasil, os ideais românticos, sobretudo em indicar ao Brasil a trajetória para uma autêntica literatura nacional”.¹¹² The speech given by Magalhães to the ‘Institut Historique’ was, in fact, to be reproduced in *Niterói* as the article “Ensaio sôbre a literatura do Brasil”. Hence as early as 1834, thanks to Belinsky’s translation in *Telescope*, Russian readers had the opportunity of reading, albeit anonymously, the literary ideas of Magalhães, considered to be the greatest pioneer of Romanticism in Brazil. From this same article too Russian readers would have learned of José Basílio de Gama (1740-1795), author of the epic poem *O Uruguai*, a milestone in the regeneration of Brazilian literature.¹¹³

Information about other Latin American literatures and cultures also began to appear more fully in the Russian press in the 1830s and the 1840s. Brazil, being the first, presents, for the purposes of this present work, an example of special interest. The emergence of a national literature in Brazil, free from the influence of Portugal, the exotic qualities of Brazil’s countryside, and the stirrings of

Romanticism to be found in Brazilian authors doubtless help to explain the popularity of translations of Brazilian literature and the presence of pseudo-Brazilian works and the articles about Brazilian culture in Russia in the early 1830s.

It is not the purpose of this study to examine in detail the reception of Hispanic literatures in Russia. The foregoing section, however, was included in an attempt to give a slightly fuller impression of relations between these two cultures prior to 1887. And it must be apparent, even from the few examples cited, that this early period of contact between Russia and the Hispanic world was by no means a sterile one. But the overall purpose of this chapter has been to set the scene for the work done by the major Spanish intermediaries. And here it emerges that prior to 1887, the year of Pardo Bazán's major contribution to Russo-Spanish literary relations, Russian writers had already appeared in Spain, even if only in a minor way, and mostly in French translation or in translations done from French versions. This dependence on translations which were often poor and sometimes distorted brought serious problems, but a presence was certainly established. On the Russian side, Hispanic literature had already begun to make a considerable impact from early in the century, and from its later decades onwards the situation in both countries was to improve. One factor in this was the work of the intermediaries whom we are about to consider. Another was quite simply the advent of more skilled translators.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER 1

- 1 S.S. Praver, *Comparative Literary Studies: an introduction*, (London, 1973), p.12. A list of books and articles on comparative literary studies is given in the final bibliography.
- 2 Ibid., p.8.
- 3 Ibid., p.166.
- 4 Praver notes on p. 82 that “[t]he trouble with translations, it has often been said, is that they can be properly judged only by those who have no need of them.” Wherever appropriate I shall consider and juxtapose certain translated extracts. However, it is not the main purpose of this thesis to carry out analyses of this kind – however rewarding and illuminating such an undertaking might prove to be.
5. George Schanzer, *Russian Literature in the Hispanic World: a bibliography*, (Toronto, 1972), xxii.
- 6 Praver, p.98.
- 7 Ibid., p.102.
- 8 Ibid, p.31.
- 9 This quotation is discussed fully in chapter four of this thesis.
- 10 See Praver, p.99, where he discusses “[h]emes and prefigurations”.
- 11 Mikhail Litov, “Russia, Spain, Christianity”, *Strani i mir*, March, 1992, p.127. This article was kindly supplied by Mr M. Dewhirst, Department of Slavonic Languages, University of Glasgow.
- 12 Idem.

- 13 M.P. Alekseev, *An Outline of Spanish-Russian Literary Relations from the 16th to the early 19th Centuries*, (Leningrad, 1964), p.4. As this work has not been translated to date into either English or Spanish, Alekseev's valuable research in this field remains virtually unknown to Western Hispanists. For this reason the title is given here in English translation. In the footnotes for the individual chapters the titles of significant works of Russian Hispanists will also be given in English translation. In the final bibliography they will be given in Russian.
- 14 Ibid., p.5.
- 15 Ernesto Sábato, *Obras Completas* 11 (Buenos Aires, 1960), p.139. His observations about the absence of a true Renaissance in Spain and Russia are particularly relevant.
- 16 Alekseev, p.4.
- 17 Litov, p.127.
- 18 Idem.
- 19 M.A. Dodolev, *Russia and Spain: 1808–1823* (Moscow, 1984), p.4.
- 20 Russian can now be studied in several Spanish universities. There are well-established Departments, for example, in Barcelona University and in the Universidad Complutense, Madrid.
- 21 Alekseev, p.32.
- 22 Ibid., p.34.
- 23 This will be discussed in later sections of this thesis.

- 24 Many examples could be cited from the Spanish press of those times. See, however, *Madrid in sus diarios*, 111, (1860–1875), (Madrid, 1969), p.270 where *La Iberia*, January 29th 1864, had noted as follows:
- Los embajadores de Rusia en esta corte, dieron anteanoche una fiesta de baile para su servidumbre. Somos partidarios que todos disfruten y bailen y se divierten y bajo este punto de vista, nos merece aplauso la conducta del príncipe ruso.
- 25 *El Imparcial*, 11th March 1885 had remarked on this. I have not been able to discover any further information about Mr. Bark. Although many language classes were publicized in the press of those times, this is the first reference I can find to a Russian course. See *Madrid en sus diarios*, IV, p.415.
- 26 These talks were reported on the dates mentioned in *El Imparcial*. See *Madrid en sus diarios*, IV, p.405.
- 27 V.E. Bagno, *Emilia Pardo Bazán and Russian Literature in Spain* (Leningrad, 1982), pp.13–15. This work is Bagno's major contribution to Russo–Spanish relations. I have corresponded with Mr. Bagno since 1986 and during this time he has kindly sent me all his publications in the field of Russo–Hispanic relations. He was invited to participate in the Glasgow University Colloquium on Antonio Machado in 1989. Unfortunately he was unable to attend; Bagno does, however, have a link with Hispanic Studies in Glasgow. He has expressed to me on many occasions his great admiration for the work of Dr. Ivy McLelland, sometime Reader and now Senior Research Fellow in the Glasgow Department; he had hoped to meet her at the Machado Conference. I am grateful to Dr. J.A. Dunn, Department of Slavonic Languages, University of Glasgow, who provided me with my initial information about Bagno.
- 28 This was the title of a very popular novel (and film) during the 1950s in Spain. The author, Torcuato Luca de Tena, b. 1923, was recently interviewed in *Epoca*, (1 March, 1993), 100-101, where he described his novel in the following terms: "...recoge la odisea de los militares españoles en los campos de prisioneros rusos."

- 29 These lines are taken from the poem to Stalin by the Iranian A.A. Lakhuti who emigrated to the former USSR. His work was translated from Persian into Russian in 1932. Quoted by Rosalind Marsh, *Images of Dictatorship – Portraits of Stalin in Literature*, (London, 1989), p.27. This excellent book invites similar treatment of General Franco in recent Spanish literature; this would be a most rewarding undertaking but one which lies outwith the purposes of this thesis.
- 30 F. Franco, *Discursos y mensajes*, (1955-1959), (Madrid, 1960), p.745 and p.752.
- 31 Interest shifted during those years to the “new” writers of Spanish America, in particular to Mexico.
- 32 See, for example, F. Franco, p.752.
- 33 Ibid., pp.276–277.
- 34 Many new works have appeared in recent years which reassess the Franco era. Certain of these discuss “relations” with the former USSR. Since January of this year *Epoca* has been presenting on a weekly basis “Un estudio monográfico...sobre las relaciones entre Franco y Don Juan de Borbón”, written by Ricardo de la Cierva. This series has included extraordinary revelations and hitherto unpublished photographs of the Franco era. In the issue for 1st March 1993, for example, there is a reproduction of a poster entitled “Lo que hay... detrás del comunismo”, which depicts various aspects of “Soviet” life (in most horrific terms). *Epoca*, 1st March 1993, 389.
- 35 These are detailed in the conclusion of this thesis.
- 36 Bagno in his article “Pushkin in Spain. (New Materials)”, in *Vremmenik Pushkinskoi komissii* (Leningrad, 1983), p.164, quotes this. This short article was written to commemorate the unveiling of the statue to Pushkin on

January 27th, 1981, in Madrid's Fuente del Berro park. An article about this statue also appeared in *Semana*, 15th June, 1986, 12-15.

- 37 For a discussion of "costumbrismo" see Gerald Brenan, *The Literature of the Spanish People* (London, 1961), pp.340-342. For a wider discussion of literary genre see, for example, Prawer, pp.114-128.
- 38 Brenan, p.342.
- 39 Literary parody is one of the key elements of this work. We note, for example, the depiction of the heroine of *The Snowstorm*, who was pale, read French novels and, consequently, was in love. From the fragments of both the French and the Spanish versions of this story which I have read the translator appears to take all of this at face value.
- 40 V.V. Rachmanov, "Russian Literature in Spain", in *Language and Literature*, V, (Leningrad, 1930), p.329.
- 41 J. Baldran, "Entre la Russie et la Brésil...La France" in *Bulletin des Etudes Portugaises*, XXXVII, (1976), 145.
- 42 George Portnoff, *La Literatura rusa en España* (New York, 1932), p.60.
- 43 Schanzer, p.139.
- 44 G.R. Derzhavin, *Stikhotvoreniia* (Moscow, 1958), pp.32-34. Also, *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, ed. Charles Moser (Cambridge, 1922), p.88. For an excellent account of Derzhavin's poetic art see too Pierre Hart, *G.R. Derzhavin: A Poet's Progress* (Ohio, 1978).
- 45 This translation of Derzhavin was connected with Balmes. See Schanzer, op. cit., p.xiii. There is also a short article entitled "Early Spanish Translations of Pushkin" in *Hispanic Review*, VI, (1938), 348-349.
- 46 Schanzer, pp.133-140.

- 47 Ibid., pp.136–137 shows that this is not true.
- 48 The importance of Pushkin’s prose, both within his own work and for the subsequent development of 19th-century Russian prose fiction, cannot be overestimated.
- 49 M.–C. Duarte, “The First Translations of Pushkin in Chile”, in *Russo-European Literary Relations* (Leningrad, 1966), pp.192-197.
- 50 Idem.
- 51 The important notion of the literary prank is discussed by David Budgen in the excellent introduction to his translation (with Gillon Aitken) of the *Tales of Belkin* (London, 1983), pp.7-26.
- 52 Pushkin’s own words regarding the prime qualities of prose, namely “brevity and accuracy”, might relevantly be recalled at this point.
- 53 Duarte, p.196.
- 54 Ibid
- 55 Ibid., p.195.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Schanzer, pp.xxi–xxii.
- 58 Duarte, discusses this.
- 59 Ibid., p.197.
- 60 A. Kodjak, *the Tales of Belkin* (The Hague, 1987) discusses this, for example. The politically sensitive tale, *The Postmaster*, may have been shuffled to a less obvious position. In the “secret” order of *The Tales* it is given first.

- 61 Schanzer, pp.xvi-xvii, discusses this.
- 62 Again the unusual form of this work may have posed problems for translators.
- 63 Schanzer, p.140.
- 64 Juan Valera, *Obras Completas*, III (Madrid, 1958), p.109.
- 65 Schanzer, p.140.
- 66 Idem.
- 67 Bagno, "Pushkin in Spain", pp.167-168.
- 68 Antonio Machado, *Poesía y prosa* (Madrid, 1989), p.2359. Montserrat Roig, *La aguja dorada* (Barcelona, 1987), p.56.
- 69 Montserrat Roig, p.28.
- 70 L.A. Shur, "Articles about Brazilian Literature in the Almanac *Cynthia*", in *Russo-European Literary Contacts* (Moscow, 1966), p.149.
- 71 Praver, p.25.
- 72 Shur, p.150.
- 73 Alekseev, p.34.
- 74 Ibid.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Ibid.

- 77 Ibid.
- 78 Ibid.
- 79 Alekseev, "Pushkin and a Brazilian Poet", *Nauchyi biul.* (LGU, 1947), Nos 14-15, 54-61, discusses this. Tomás Antônio Gonzaga, *Marília de Dirceu* (Sao Paulo, 1964).
- 80 A.S. Pushkin, *S portugal'skogo*, in *Poln. sobr. soch.*, 2, (Leningrad, 1977), pp.266-267.
- 81 Alekseev, p.54.
- 82 Idem.
- 83 Antônio Soares Amora, *História da Literatura Brasileira* (Sao Paulo, 1967), p.32.
- 84 Idem.
- 85 Alekseev, p.56.
- 86 Ibid.
- 87 Ibid.
- 88 Ibid.
- 89 Soares Amora, p.32.
- 90 Gonzaga, p.103.
- 91 Gonzaga, p. 103 and Pushkin, p.266.
- 92 Ibid.

- 93 See Baldran, p.152.
- 94 A.S. Pushkin, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, 5, (Leningrad, 1977).
- 95 Baldran, p.146. See, for example, A. Candido and J. Aderaldo Castello, *Presença da Literatura Brasileira* (São Paulo, 1973), p.158.
- 96 Soares Amora, p.34.
- 97 Ibid., p.168.
- 98 Baldran, p.147.
- 99 Idem.
- 100 Shur, p. 150.
- 101 Baldran, p.147.
- 102 Candido and Aderaldo Castello, p.252.
- 103 Shur, p.156.
- 104 Ibid., p.152, notes 7 and 8.
- 105 Idem.
- 106 Idem.
- 107 Baldran, pp.151-152.
- 108 Ibid., p.146.
- 109 Shur discusses this on p. 156.
- 110 Baldran, p.146.

111 Ibid., p.149.

112 Soares Amora, p.44.

113 See note 109.

CHAPTER 2

JUAN VALERA AND EMILIA PARDO BAZAN

(1) THE DISTORTION OF GOGOL'

IN 19TH-CENTURY SPAIN

A BRIEF SUMMARY

“...[Pushkin] suggested the example of Cervantes to me. Although the latter had written many remarkable and excellent tales, had he not produced *Don Quixote*, he would never have occupied his present place in literature. [Cervantes]...gave me...the plot for *Dead Souls*.”

N.V.Gogol¹

“The four stories of *Mirgorod* are set in different periods of historical (and non-historical) time, and may be seen as four distinct and contrasting genres: idyll, epic, fairy story, comic tale. Although each one may stand independently, it nevertheless gains from being read in the context of the others; for there is a mutual interpenetration of themes which gives greater unity to the collection than may at first be apparent.”

R. Peace²

Like the works of Dostoevsky, the full impact of Gogol's writings was not felt until the early years of the 20th century; one of the main reasons for this, I believe, can be found in the linguistic complexities which his oeuvre would have presented for even the most experienced and talented translators.³ However, one of the most bizarre incidents in the entire history of the early translations of Russian writers to reach Spain in the late 19th century must be that of the first Spanish version of *Taras Bul'ba*, published in Madrid in 1880.⁴ This story, belonging to the collection *Mirgorod*, had been substantially revised by Gogol' before the publication of the second edition in 1842.⁵ Gogol' had extended his original version of *Taras Bul'ba* by three chapters; the first Spanish translator (or translators), on the other hand, in keeping with the French version, saw fit to reduce it by one.⁶ Consequently, the first Spanish rendering of *Taras Bul'ba* ends somewhat abruptly after section XI – "...But Taras was no longer beside him: all trace of him had vanished."⁷ Schanzer offers the somewhat uneasy comment in his study that the work "parece incompleto", but does not comment or attempt to explain further.⁸ Bagno ventures the tentative suggestion that this cut may have been effected for "diplomatic" reasons; in the final chapter there are, after all, descriptions of atrocities carried out by Taras "against Catholics".⁹ However, I cannot fully agree with Bagno here. There are many other occasions throughout the story (retained in both the French and Spanish translations) where less than flattering descriptions of Catholics occur; for example, in chapter four we encounter the following: "Polish priests harnessing orthodox Christians in the shafts! What! Allow such tortures in Russia at the hands of the cursed infidels!"¹⁰

It may simply have been that the dramatic ending of chapter eleven – the death of Ostap and his father's cry "I hear!" – seemed a more appropriate point at which to end the story. Whatever the real reasons might have been for this truncated finale, they are likely to remain a mystery.¹¹ Additionally, of course, Spanish readers did not have the opportunity at this stage of becoming acquainted with *Mirgorod* in its entirety.¹² The first complete Spanish translation did not

appear, in fact, until, 1951, although there were many other separate (and complete) versions of *Taras Bul'ba* prior to that date.¹³ (We recall too that a similar pattern had occurred with *The Tales of Belkin* some years before.)

The first Spanish translation of *Taras Bul'ba*, in keeping with the majority of 19th-century Spanish versions of Russian literature, was based on a French rendering. The French version in question is, however, of special interest in that it was the collaborative work of Turgenev and Louis Viardot, (a detail which was omitted or overlooked by Schanzer), published in Paris in 1845.¹⁴ *Taras Bul'ba* had been selected by Viardot because of its universal appeal and due to the fact that it presented, in his view, fewest difficulties for the translator, given, as we have noted, the complex nature of Gogol's fictional world.¹⁵ The initial rendering into French was done by Turgenev, assisted by S.A. Gedeonov; Viardot then made various stylistic amendments and improvements.¹⁶ Belinsky had praised the high standard of this translation, although it contained a substantial number of major errors: "...the inability to find adequate French equivalents for certain of the Russian idioms...arbitrary reductions of the text etc" – none quite so arbitrary, surely, as the removal of the entire final chapter.¹⁷ Apart from this major deletion, there were other strange and inexplicable cuts; for example, in chapter nine, when Andrii suddenly catches sight of his father, Gogol's subsequent digression, (where he compares Andrii at considerable length to a recalcitrant schoolboy)

Оглянулся Андрий: пред ним Тарас!
Затрясся он всем телом и вдруг стал бледен...

Так школьник, неосторожно задравши своего товарища и получивши за то от него удар линейкою по лбу, вспыхивает, как огонь, бешеный выскакивает из лавки и гонится за испуганным товарищем своим, готовый разорвать его на части; и вдруг наталкивается на входящего в класс учителя: вмиг притихает бешеный порыв и падает бессильная

ярость. Подобно ему, в один миг пропал, как бы не бывал вовсе, гнев Андрия. И видел он перед собою одного только страшного отца.

is drastically truncated in the Spanish rendering, via the French, to the lifeless and flat: “El joven se estremeció como un estudiante sorprendido en falta por su maestro.”¹⁸ Bagno believes that Turgenev and Viardot were led to make cuts of this nature in their desire to avoid “any discord for the foreign reader”; this explanation is not, however, a convincing one nor does it justify such a considerable reduction of the original text.¹⁹ In fact, the role of the digression as an important artistic device throughout Gogol’s oeuvre has been noted on many occasions by critics, forming as it does a significant element in “the idiosyncrasies of [his] writings”.²⁰ As Freeborn observes:

Gogol as narrator is ubiquitous, but he is dressed up in a clownish costume of coyness, feigned astonishment, throwaway remonstrances and arch patter in order to play the role.²¹

Once more the reasons for this cut are puzzling and are likely to remain a mystery.

The preface to this first Spanish version of *Taras Bul’ba* provided information about Gogol’s life and certain critical observations about his works (based for the most part on Mérimée); it contained in addition an interesting “variation” on the title of *Dead Souls*, this being rendered simply as *Los muertos*.²² Pardo Bazán supplied fuller and more accurate Spanish translations of certain episodes from *Taras Bul’ba* in her lectures and essays; these will be noted in a later section of this chapter. She also provided Spanish readers with a stimulating and accurate critical introduction to Gogol’, incorporating certain comparisons of her own, as will be seen. The first Spanish translations of Gogol’s later works, for example, *The Government Inspector* and *Dead Souls*, did not reach Spain until the

early years of the 20th century.²³ Apart from Pardo Bazán's presentation of him in 1887, Juderías published a series of articles entitled "Nicolás Wassilievitch Gogol" in *La lectura*, 1902–1903.²⁴ The possible influence of Gogol' on Valle-Inclán has been posited, in particular as regards the latter's *Esperpentos*; his impact on the intermediaries to be examined in this thesis will be discussed more fully later.²⁵

This short episode once more draws our attention to the precarious way in which major Russian writers made their way, through the medium of distorted translations, into the sensibilities of the Spanish reading public of the later years of the 19th century.

(2) A SPANISH DIPLOMAT IN ST. PETERSBURG:

JUAN VALERA AND HIS LETTERS FROM RUSSIA

“Si yo supiera el ruso, ya sería otra cosa. La literatura de esta nación apenas es conocida en parte alguna, y la lengua, aunque empieza a estudiarse, se sabe poco. Difícil me será, por tanto, conocer algo del estado social de esta nación por su literatura, que dicen ser un transunto fiel de dicho estado social. En Francia no creo que se conozcan más que algunas novelitas de Puschkin y de Gogol, que Mérimée y Viardot han traducido, y varios extractos y juicios críticos de otras pocas publicados en *La Revista de Ambos Mundos*. En Alemania se ha traducido algo más, y, sirviéndome de la lengua alemana, que entiendo medianamente, pienso leer los poetas”.

Valera, St. Petersburg, 1857²⁶

“Juan Valera es, sin lugar a dudas, una de las figuras más representativas de [la segunda mitad del siglo XIX] no sólo desde el punto de vista literario o crítico sino también desde una perspectiva humana poco común, conocida hoy en día con precisión gracias a la publicación de sus cartas”.

E. Cremades²⁷

The contributions made by two mediators who were both actively involved in the introduction and the familiarization process of Russian literature to 19th-century Spain will now be examined. One of these, Juan Valera, I have already

defined as a “minor” intermediary, while the other, Emilia Pardo Bazán, was, in my opinion, the most outstanding figure in this field. Between them they were largely – though, as we have seen, not quite wholly – responsible for the introduction of Russian literature to Spain and to the Spanish-speaking world in the second half of the 19th century; Pardo Bazán continued and developed her critical endeavours in this field throughout the rest of her life.

In the case of Juan Valera it has unjustly been the norm to underestimate his work in this area. In the case of Emilia Pardo Bazán, some critics, for example, Bagnó, have singled out her *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* as the major Spanish work of the whole 19th century in this field. But others have dismissed these essays as plagiarism and have tended to undervalue her contributions to the topic in general. In my study of Pardo Bazán’s work, I shall emphasize both the vitality and the sheer vastness of doña Emilia’s undertaking – aspects of her first major study on Russian literature which have, in my opinion, been undervalued or even overlooked. I shall also examine Pardo Bazán’s later critical writings on Russian literature. These, while mentioned in passing by Bagnó, have on the whole, been sadly neglected. Particularly worthy of fresh attention are doña Emilia’s essay on Tolstoy’s *The Kreutzer Sonata* and the article on his life and work which she wrote shortly after his death. These later studies by doña Emilia are vital, personal and perceptive, and their role in spreading greater knowledge about Russian literature in the Hispanic World deserves to be more strongly emphasized.

In order to assess the impact which their views would have had on Spanish audiences and readers, it will be necessary to return the focus of attention to what Valera and Pardo Bazán actually said and wrote. Certain critics were very quick to point out the shortcomings of both, without necessarily paying due regard to this. I believe that, rather than stressing what Valera did not achieve in his *Cartas*, it is worth dwelling upon the fact that he actually spent more than a year in Russia – and at a time of great cultural development within the country – and that he established

important literary friendships there. These things add authority to the information which he did offer to his Spanish readers, and it is to this that our attention should be directed. In the case of Pardo Bazán, most of her detractors assessed *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* by comparing and contrasting it with Vogüé's *Le Roman russe*. However, not all of doña Emilia's listeners that April day in 1887 would have had a profound knowledge of Vogüé's work. I propose, therefore, to concentrate on what she actually said, and later wrote, and thus to consider the impact that her words must actually have had, at first for her audience in the Madrid "Ateneo", and later for the readers of her essays in Russian literature.

The novelist Juan Valera (1824-1905) spent over a year in Russia (1856-57) as part of an "embajada extraordinaria" sent from Madrid to St. Petersburg. At its head was the Grand Duke of Osuna, whose extravagant and eccentric behaviour, both during the journey to Russia ("este viaje principesco a través de Europa") and for the duration of the Spanish Mission in St. Petersburg, led to serious diplomatic difficulties and to clashes of personality within the Mission itself. All of this as might be expected, is well documented by Valera in the course of his letters.²⁸

At the time when Valera was in Russia, the "zenith" of Russian realistic prose had already begun (1855 is the year normally associated with its beginning). As Freeborn observes:

Literatures are prone to undergo periods of explosive growth and Russian nineteenth-century literature underwent such an explosion in the period between the first appearance of *Eugene Onegin* and the completion of *War and Peace*. In these forty years Russian literature experienced processes of change and maturation which were particularly marked in the novel. It grew from a virtually experimental form into a genre of such prominence that by the end of the 1860s it not only exerted a dominant influence in Russian literature but had begun to acquire that international reputation which has

given it a leading place in any history of the nineteenth-century European novel.²⁹

Valera's *Cartas* represent, in fact, an initial stage in the establishing of this reputation in Spain.

A short synopsis of some of the important literary events in Russia during the years around 1856–57 will provide an additional background to Valera's stay in St. Petersburg. For example, the literary careers of writers such as Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Turgenev and Goncharov reached their peak during the period 1855–1880.³⁰ Alexander II ruled at that time, and the years 1856–66 are known as the "Epoch of Great Reforms". Although the Russian people "had no effective political voice", this era is also characterized by the influence of the "raznochintsy", members of a younger generation who had received this title "because they were the offspring of minor public servants... and of the clergy".³¹ During this epoch too the so-called "thick journals", such as *The Contemporary* played a particularly prominent and influential role. From 1855 onwards Chernyshevsky was a member of *The Contemporary's* editorial board and in 1856 Dobrolyubov joined him there. *Russian Word* and *Notes of the Fatherland*, also played an important part in Russian literary and intellectual life. The poetry of Fet and Tyutchev was published then too, as was N. Nekrasov's poetic dialogue *Poet and Citizen*.. M. Saltykov-Shchedrin wrote his satirical comedy *The Death of Pazukhin* in 1857. Ostrovsky had already established his reputation as a dramatist, although his masterpiece *The Storm* was not published until 1859. In 1856 *The Contemporary* published Turgenev's first novel, *Rudin*; Tolstoy had published a "quasi-autobiographical" work in 1856 entitled *A Landowner's Morning* – a work which reveals his great dislike of serfdom; in 1857 Tolstoy travelled abroad for the first time. Another of the latter's stories, also written in 1856, *Two Hussars*, deals with the "materialism... and the hypocrisy" which he had observed within Russian society.³² Dostoevsky was released from penal servitude in 1854, though his *The*

House of the Dead (which so impressed Pardo Bazán) was not published until 1860-2. It was into this stimulating cultural atmosphere that Valera arrived, and in his letters to Spain he captured for his readers his own impressions of what he witnessed. His letters not only have the freshness of first-hand and personal experiences – Valera manages to impart a great deal of information about very many aspects of Russian life and customs – they are also, on many occasions, extremely entertaining and witty.

As far as existing literary relations between Spain and Russia are concerned, however, it is clear from the passage cited at the beginning of this chapter that Valera did not know that Pushkin (about whom he would hear and learn much during his stay), had already been translated into Spanish ten years previously. Valera was correct, however, regarding his assumptions about Gogol', since, as we have already noted, the first Spanish version of any of Gogol''s writings did not appear until 1880.

Valera wrote 45 letters to Spain from St. Petersburg, only a few of these to his family and the remainder to his friend Leopoldo Augusto de Cueto. At first Valera seems to have been completely unaware of the fact that most of his letters to Cueto were being published at home, where they enjoyed tremendous success. Only five of them, in fact, remained unpublished until fairly recent times. It is disappointing, then, that the latest critical study of Valera, which includes articles entitled "Valera en Washington" and "Valera en Portugal", refers only briefly and superficially to his stay in Russia and only passing mention is made of his *Cartas*.³³

It was in a letter to his mother that Valera described his first impressions of Russia and of its customs; he also recounted to her some of his early adventures there. In another early letter, to his brother, he tells of his astonishment regarding the lack of knowledge about Spain which he had discovered in Russia on arrival there. He found this all the more surprising, he remarks, since he had already observed certain striking similarities between the two countries:

Entre España y Rusia hay, con todo, algunos puntos de contacto. Por ejemplo, el predominio militar. Aquí todo se gobierna militarmente, hasta los teatros. Hay el General de los teatros, como pudiera decirse el General de tal o cual división.³⁴

Valera's sharp wit and irony, together with the considerable amount of new information about this exotic and distant land which he was providing, made his letters very popular reading among Spaniards: it is known, for example, that they were read by the politician Narváez, who subsequently "...se previene contra la afilada pluma de Valera".³⁵ Valera's sister, writing to him in St. Petersburg, revealed that his letters from Russia "...han hecho una revolución...Lo cierto es que tus cartas las copian todos los periódicos...".³⁶ Bagno believes that these letters did much to establish Valera's reputation as a writer in Spain; it is known too that they were read and admired by the Spanish Queen.³⁷ Incidentally, there also exists an interesting counterpart to Valera's letters from St. Petersburg; in 1859 a young Russian, Aleksander Nikolaevich Veselovsky (1838–1906), had spent two years in Spain, an account of which he gives in his *Diario Español* (1859–1860).³⁸

As regards Valera's letters, however, he was later to be accused by some of his contemporaries and fellow writers of having misspent his time and of presenting a superficial account both of Russian customs and of literary events there. Certainly Valera did write, and often at considerable length, about the diversions and lavish entertainments of St. Petersburg society, in which he himself had participated very willingly. These letters are characterized by vivid touches of humour; for example, Valera notes his linguistic "progress" when he has to purchase shirts for himself in St. Petersburg:

...hay días que no tengo que ponerme y acudo al 'Magasin Engliski' a comprar todo esto a un precio 'disparatadiski' y 'arruinatiski'. Y casi hablo el ruso.³⁹

However, a more careful reading establishes that he did offer his readers a valuable introduction to Russian literature, both through his presentation of the names of some of the most outstanding Russian authors of that era (and earlier) and through his comments on their work. He also provided for his readers fascinating observations about many other aspects of Russian life. In addition, once Valera realized that the letters which he had written to Cueto from Berlin and Warsaw, while on his way to Russia, had been published,

... disminuyen los comentarios privados...(y) ... el tono es más didáctico, de modo que la correspondencia se convierte en algo así como en un Baedeker, en un guía de Rusia. Prolijas descripciones de los museos rusos, sin omitir una sala ni un cuadro y estadísticas pesadas y enumeración de sus tesoros.⁴⁰

One important personal adventure (and one which may have had an influence on Valera's later writings) which occurred during his stay in Russia, was his relationship, "este baño ruso de amor", with the popular actress Magdalena Brohan. This relationship was documented by Valera in considerable detail in a letter of April 6th, 1857, sent to Leopoldo Augusto de Cueto. Valera, of course, did not wish this letter to be included amongst his now semi-official letters from Russia, and, indeed, other letters describing the vicissitudes of the relationship with Magdalena Brohan were sent to Cueto, but were likewise not intended for general publication. In one of these, describing the anguish which the relationship had caused him, Valera notes: "No tengo más remedio que hacer de esto una novela".⁴¹ In fact, no novel was written about it; instead Valera depicted aspects of the relationship in a poem entitled "Saudades de Elisena", which he composed in St. Petersburg in 1857. The poem bears witness, among other things, to the "voluble conducta femenina". Some of Valera's biographers and critics believe, in fact, that "la aventura rusa dará que pensar a Valera durante años" and even claim to see

reflections of it within Valera's own fictional world, in particular in the descriptions given of Pepita Jiménez.⁴²

With regard to knowledge of Spanish literature within the St. Petersburg society which he frequented, Valera records that the majority of Russians he encountered “singularmente las damas, imaginan que no hay en castellano libros que leer, fuera del *Quijote*, que está traducido al ruso”.⁴³ However, he did make the acquaintance of a certain General “Kraschnakousky” who “habla regularmente nuestra lengua y conoce algo nuestra literatura”. This same General had asked Valera to inform him of “las obras más notables en prosa que han aparecido últimamente en España, para ver si hay alguna que le convenga traducir...”. He also assured Valera that he had translated into Russian and had later published “un opúsculo de Martínez de la Rosa sobre la guerra de las comunidades de Castilla y algunos articulitos de Larra”.⁴⁴ Since Valera himself knew no Russian at all, he had to make the acquaintance of the salient figures of Russian literature – Pushkin, Gogol', Lermontov and later Tolstoy, for example – mainly through French or German translations. (The precarious availability of Pushkin was discussed in the previous chapter and we have also mentioned the mutilated rendering of Gogol's *Taras Bul'ba* of 1880.) Lermontov became available in Spanish translation in 1867, when a version of his complex psychological novel *A Hero of our Time* was published in Madrid, as might be expected, “traducida de una traducción francesa”.⁴⁵ Valera's Russian acquaintances were, however, in a marginally better position. After the tentative early contacts with Spanish literature in the 18th and early 19th century a number of translations of major writers had been made. By 1857 works by Calderón, Cervantes, including *El Quijote*, and three plays by Lope had already been published.⁴⁶

On February 5th, 1857, Valera wrote to Cueto from St. Petersburg, stating that “cada día... siento mayor deseo de volver a la patria, y cada día hallo más difícil salir de aquí”; yet it is in this same letter that he writes at greatest length about Russian literature. Regretting his ignorance of the Russian language, “...cuando

llegue yo a aprender el ruso, porque he hecho propósito de aprenderlo, ya no estaré en Rusia, ni acaso tendré probabilidad de volver a Rusia en mi vida”, Valera assures his friend that

mis nuevos conocimientos filológicos me servirían, sin embargo, para estudiar una literatura que, aunque casi ignorada en toda la Europa occidental, no por eso deja de ser rica y promete ser grande con el tiempo.⁴⁷

(Valera’s last statement, of course, proved to be very true; his earlier declarations did not, in fact, since he never managed to acquire even a reading knowledge of Russian.) He goes on to inform Cueto about the various literary activities which he had noted in St. Petersburg. Such a description could not fail to be of interest to Spanish writers and intellectuals of that era:

Aquí se nota en el día cierto movimiento literario. Se publican varias revistas ... y otras obras periódicas literarias y científicas, cuyo número se eleva a ochenta ... Hasta en Georgia se publican dos periódicos literarios en la lengua del país.⁴⁸

As to his own studies of Russian literature, Valera writes:

En ruso ... hay libros en abundancia; mas para mí están sellados con siete sellos. Sólo puedo conocer los nombres de los autores y de sus obras, y formar de ellas una ligera idea, por un compendioso diccionario de los escritores rusos, que ha compuesto en alemán el doctor Federico Otto, y que contiene más de seiscientos artículos sobre otros tantos autores. Otro alemán llamado Koenig ha escrito también una obra muy apreciada sobre la literatura rusa; mas no he podido dar con ella. Dicen que aquí está prohibida.⁴⁹

Valera continues by giving a brief history of early Russian literature, which must be the very first such appraisal to appear in the Spanish language. By this stage in the publication history of his letters he was offering such information – however superficial it might be – to a wide readership:

Por lo general, se cree que la literatura rusa comienza ahora; pero si este asunto se considera con mas detención, se ve que cuenta siglos de antigüedad y obras notables escritas en los tiempos en que muchas otras literaturas de Europa no habían nacido aun y ni siquiera tenían lengua propia formada en que manifestarse...⁵⁰

Valera was, of course, correct to refer to these important “beginnings” of Russian literature in the 19th century, as we have noted. The supreme importance of *The Tales of Belkin* (1830) and other prose writings of Pushkin, which heralded the “Golden Age” of Russian prose in the later decades of that same century, have also been stressed. The 1840s have been further described as that “marvellous decade” representative of “great philosophical, cultural, and literary beginnings” in Russia.⁵¹ Valera concludes the literary section of this letter by remarking:

De los demás autores rusos, antiguos y modernos, y de las canciones o baladas populares que hay aquí, y que corresponden a nuestros romances, espero saber el ruso para hablar con conciencia.⁵²

He admits that, once again, due to his own lack of knowledge of Russian “...por ahora sólo puedo hablar sin escrúpulo de Puschkin y de Liermontov. Bondenstedt los ha traducido tan bien en verso alemán, que vale tanto como leerlos en ruso”.⁵³

In a letter written in April of that same year, Valera attempted to explain to Cueto something of the Russian Orthodox religion, a subject which would have been of great interest to his other Spanish readers. In so doing Valera briefly touched on the topic of Polish/Russian relations and he also mentioned the attitude of the Russians to the Jesuits. Given the fact that this religious order had been founded in Spain and had experienced periods of oppression and expulsion there too, this must have been a fascinating reference for his native readership:

La dominación de los polacos en Rusia ha engendrado un odio inmenso inextinguible contra los polacos. Ahora la están pagando los pobres. Para un buen ruso o para una buena rusa no hay caballero polaco que no sea falso, traidor, tramposo, etc, ni dama polaca que no sea deshonesto y liviana... Los jesuitas, que durante la dominación polaca trataron de civilizar y hacer católicos a los rusos, son aun más aborrecidos.⁵⁴

In the same letter, Valera discussed the fees paid to Russian authors of the times:

La literatura prospera, si hemos de creer[lo]. Cinco rublos [ochenta reales de nuestra moneda] es el precio ordinario que recibe un literato por cada página de impresión de una revista, y en Rusia se publican muchas revistas.⁵⁵

He also gives information about books being published there in April 1857. Such topical details must have caught the attention of many of his Spanish readers:

Libros se escriben también en abundancia, pero poco notables. De las novelas de Turgueniev es de lo que más se habla, y ya la *Revue des Deux Mondes* ha dado en francés algunas traducciones de ellas.⁵⁶

As has already been noted, *Rudin* had been published in 1856, although Turgenev did not add the final epilogue until 1860. The reception of Turgenev in Spain and his possible influence on Galdós will be discussed briefly in a later chapter, but this mention of his name by Valera is likely to have sparked off at least some interest among serious literary scholars and writers. Bagno believes that Valera's reference to Turgenev "... must be one of the first ... to be published in Spain".⁵⁷

Valera then remarked with some irony (as Pushkin had done in *The Queen of Spades*):

He notado que las personas cultas de por aquí, esto es, los príncipes y boyardos, porque la burguesía no la conozco, no se fían mucho de los autores rusos, y no los leen sino después de haber pasado por el crisol de la crítica francesa, y cuando los franceses han dicho que son buenos 'et vidit Deus quot esse bonum'.⁵⁸

With evident amusement Valera went on:

Mas esto no impide que todo ruso trate de probarle a usted que sus autores son intraducibles y que sus hermosuras y primores son incomunicables y divinos, como la lengua en que se escribieron. Por donde Pushkin y Liermontov, que yo he leído en alemán y algo de Gogol, que he leído en francés, debo tener por cierto, si quiero estar bien con estos señores, que valen mil veces más en la lengua propia, y que en otra lengua sólo queda un glóbulo homeopático de la bondad de ellos...⁵⁹

On March 10th 1857, thanks to an introductory letter from Prosper Mérimée, Valera made the acquaintance of S.A. Sobolevsky (1803-1870), who

would help him to increase his knowledge of Russian literature. Mérimée had presented Valera to Sobolevsky as a man of outstanding intellect and had asked the Russian to tell him “about everything” during his short stay in Russia. Valera was quick to respond positively to this new-found acquaintance:

Hasta ahora el hombre de más talento que he conocido en Rusia, traducido también, puesto que tiene que hablarme francés para entenderse conmigo, es el señor don Sergio Sobolevski, poeta faceto, gran bibliófilo y amigo de Mérimée, Serafín Estebáñez Calderón y Gayangos...⁶⁰

Sobolevsky had read the works of the Duque de Rivas given to him by Valera, but found them, as Valera remarks, “algo palabreras: defecto común de toda o de casi toda nuestra literatura y quizá de la lengua”; Sobolevsky possessed an extensive personal collection of Spanish literature which contained many works by Cervantes and a selection of Valera’s own poems. He had sustained friendly relations with Pushkin, Griboedov and Del’vig (and with many other important literary figures too); we may take it, then, that any information imparted by him to Valera about Russian literature would be drawn from his own accurate first-hand knowledge and personal experience.⁶¹ Sobolevsky himself was well-known in Russia for his epigrams; his vast library of both Russian and foreign books was famous too. He was, furthermore, according to Valera, “grande aficionado de los españoles ... pronuncia muy bien la jota y canta la aragonesa y las playeras”.⁶² In addition, Valera himself noted that he owned “una biblioteca española de los más raros ... y no ha quedado biblioteca, ni monumento, ni figón que no ha visitado en nuestras tierras”.⁶³ Valera clearly believed too that Sobolevsky might be a potentially significant figure for the development of possible future Russo-Spanish relations:

Sobolevski piensa volver por ahí y copiar en Simancas cuanto atañe a las relaciones entre España y Rusia,

que comenzaron a fines del siglo XVII, según él dice, por un embajador ruso que fue a Madrid en tiempo de Carlos II.⁶⁴

Further, in the Central State Archive of Literature and Art of the former Soviet Union there is information concerning a brief correspondence between Valera and Sobolevsky; this bears additional witness to the friendship and understanding between the two men. Sobolevsky had asked Valera to send him some of his own poems, which the Spaniard promptly dispatched to Russia. He added certain explanatory details for Sobolevsky's benefit:

Glaflra es la Duquesita de Alba; digo, si no me equivoco: porque los versos y el corazón que le di, y las coqueterías que hizo conmigo, fueron en los bailes de máscaras.⁶⁵

Valera had also made two other important Russian friends, M.A. Korf and V.P. Botkin, who, as Bagno believes, did much to increase his knowledge about culture and literature in Russia; in turn, Valera informed the two Russians about the latest literary events in Spain. In a letter, written in French, which is preserved in the former Lenin Library, Moscow, he promises to send Korf a Spanish Bible, and proposes that an exchange be set up between the principal libraries in Spain and those in Russia.⁶⁶

It must be assumed that without the language barrier Valera's stay would have been more productive in terms of literary appreciation. Yet despite the shortcomings of his work, it did have an important role to play in the formation of other, later intermediaries of Russo-Spanish literary contacts. The young Pío Baroja, for example, used Valera's letters when composing his own series of articles, *La literatura rusa*. However, a more mature Baroja, who was a life-long admirer of Russian literature and in particular of Dostoevsky, accused Valera of having wasted his year in Russia and of not utilizing the literary experiences gained

in St. Petersburg to better advantage, despite the language problems. Baroja comments:

Don Juan Valera tenía gracia y malicia, pero era un fabricante de 'bibelots' y no quería salir de ahí. El mismo Mérimée, un poco maestro suyo, a quien don Juan conoció, pasó su curiosidad por el mundo y escribió novelas y cuentos cuya acción sucede en España, en Italia, en Córcega, en Iliria, y se ocupó de los escritores rusos... Valera no quiso salir de sus asuntos de novela de España, y sobre todo de Andalucía y de los alrededores de Cabra.⁶⁷

Baroja further states:

No comprendo como un hombre que pasó años en la corte de Viena y en la de San Petersburgo, en una situación elevada en donde ... y habría oído seguramente contar cosas interesantes, tuviese que referirse siempre en sus libros a doña Mencía y otro pueblo próximo y hablar de pestiños y de otros postres de sartén como algo trascendental.⁶⁸

(Baroja here appears to be taking exception to Valera's practice as a novelist, rather than as a critic of Russian literature. Even so, it is hard to separate the two aspects altogether.)

Valera's interest in Russian literature was, of course, shared to a much greater extent by Emilia Pardo Bazán. It was, however, a subject on which Valera and Pardo Bazán did not agree. Valera had already criticized doña Emilia's literary theories in general in his *Nuevo arte de escribir novelas*.⁶⁹ In his reply to Pardo Bazán's *La revolución y la novela en Rusia*, Valera addressed an article to doña Emilia "con motivo de las novelas rusas".⁷⁰ In this essay, written in the form of a letter to Pardo Bazán, Valera criticizes her for praising Russian writers so highly,

this praise being, in his opinion, merely her civilized curiosity “por lo bárbaro”.⁷¹ Unfortunately, at the time of writing this letter, Valera’s own knowledge of Russian literature was still very limited. He admitted as much privately in a letter to Menéndez y Pelayo and he undertook to write a second “reply” to doña Emilia when he had remedied his own lack of first-hand knowledge of Russian authors:

Para escribir yo, y no desisto de ello, otra carta a doña Emilia Pardo Bazán acerca de la novela rusa, estoy leyendo algo de Turgueneff y de Tolstoi. Casi todo lo ruso de algún valor está bien traducido en alemán.⁷²

This second letter was, however, never written.

Two recent critics have renewed Baroja’s charge that Valera displays an almost total – not to say culpable – ignorance of Russian literature. Manuel Bermejo Marcos states that “Valera había estado en Rusia cerca de dos años y nada de aquella literatura, ni entonces ni más tarde, había llamado su atención”.⁷³ Nelly Clémessy claims that:

Lorsqu’il était en mission diplomatique en Russie, don Juan y avait fréquenté les milieux aristocratiques, et s’était laissé entraîner dans les plaisirs mondains sans même soupçonner l’existence d’une littérature nationale contemporaine.⁷⁴

Neither of these assertions can be fully sustained in the light of what Valera’s *Letters* actually say, though the limits of his awareness are also patent enough. Factors of personal temperament, as well as linguistic deficiencies may well have played their part. It is likely, for example, that the critical position which Valera adopts in his letter to Pardo Bazán springs largely from what Bermejo Marcos describes in the following way:

Nos parece que el amor propio de Valera le hizo tomar una postura errónea para justificarse a sí mismo.⁷⁵

Valera certainly did miss opportunities during his stay in Russia of acquainting himself more fully with the literary and intellectual atmosphere of the country. If doña Emilia was writing of and praising highly “obras de suma importancia que él había ignorado por completo”, it is not surprising that “una prueba de ‘miopía’ de tal envergadura hería el orgullo del crítico”.⁷⁶ To save face Valera chose to “restar importancia a las novelas que la condesa alababa y él no había siquiera entrevisto”.⁷⁷ Valera’s arguments in this matter lack weight, and as Bermejo Marcos sums up:

... pretender enfrentar la obra de Puschkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Turgueniev, Dostoyewsky y Tolstoy a los nombres portugueses, españoles y americanos que don Juan cita resulta de todo punto infantil.⁷⁸

Nevertheless by these letters to Spain from the St. Petersburg of 1857 a link was established between the literatures and literary life of the 19th century. It must also be stressed that of the Spanish intermediaries in this field in the later decades of the 19th century (with the exception of Angel Ganivet), Valera was the only one who had actually set foot on Russian soil. He had made the long journey overland from Spain to Russia, he had been resident in St. Petersburg for over a year; he had also visited Moscow. He alone then could convey to his Spanish readers the freshness of first-hand impressions and the colour of local customs and traditions – and all of this, I believe, he succeeded in doing very well. Through his friendship with Sobolevsky and Korf, Valera had the advantage of discovering for himself some of the salient figures in Russian literary life of those years. His letters also contain information about trade between Spain and Russia, comparisons between the Catholic Church in Spain and the Orthodox Church in Russia, and points of

“costumbrismo” which he had noted in Russian habits and in the way of life there. These facts cannot and should not be overlooked and, consequently, Valera’s letters deserve something better than total dismissal. It is regrettable, of course, that he was unable to impart fuller and more detailed information about Russian literature and cultural life to his readers. But the literary information which he does, in fact, impart, together with the underlying basis of personal experience and – not least – the tremendous popularity which the *Cartas desde Rusia* enjoyed – all of these points must, I believe, make this a significant text in the development of Russo-Spanish literary relations. In future, one hopes, the balance may be redressed somewhat in Valera’s favour. His *Cartas desde Rusia* did much to generate interest among Spanish readers regarding the culture and customs of Russia. The person who must, however, be regarded as the major intermediary between Russian literature and Spanish readers of that era was not Valera, but his sometime literary rival, whom he called with irony “la excelente escritora” – Emilia Pardo Bazán.

**(3) THE ‘DESCUBRIDORA’ OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE:
COUNTESS EMILIA PARDO BAZAN**

**(a) THE CRITICAL RECEPTION OF
RUSSIAN LITERATURE
IN 19TH-CENTURY SPAIN**

“En lo que he caminado de sorpresa en sorpresa y de gusto en gusto es en lo ruso: aún no he terminado mi estudio pero me divierte infinito.”

Emilia Pardo Bazán⁷⁹

“While the catalogues, the library shelves, the bookshops, the reviews, the courses of study, all help to suggest that women are without a literary tradition, the belief in female inferiority is surely sustained. And it erodes women’s confidence; it undermines the woman writer; it produces doubts.”

Dale Spender⁸⁰

Although Spain has always been regarded as having been late in receiving information about Russian literature in the 19th century, it should be noted that Constance Garnett did not start to publish her well-known translations of Russian literature into English until 1894, and that in the United States Isabel Hapgood’s translations had only appeared in 1886. Only one year later, and seven years before Garnett began her work, Emilia Pardo Bazán gave Spain (and subsequently Latin America) an accurate, well-organised and stimulating presentation of the culture and the literature of Russia. Disappointingly few Western critics have been willing to

give Emilia Pardo Bazán her rightful place as the person who, virtually overnight, managed to introduce Russian writers to Spain in a detailed, energetic and efficient way. It was a huge undertaking and one which she accomplished with a success which Western critics have, on the whole seen fit to obscure or to diminish. Russian critics, on the other hand, have had a much clearer picture of the immense importance of her introduction of Russian literature and culture to Spain and the Spanish-speaking world. Although Charlotte Rosenthal notes that in Russia..“the ‘Silver Age’ was definitely a period of transition during which women became professionals in all areas of literary activity”, there was no Russian woman writer during that era, in my opinion, whose literary and critical achievements could surpass or, indeed, match, those of Pardo Bazán.⁸¹

One of the stated aims of the present study is to make available some of the findings about literary relationships between Spain and Russia which appear in the hitherto untranslated writings of Russian Hispanists.⁸² My own overall aim here will be to provide a reassessment convincing to non-Russianists, of Pardo Bazán's pioneering achievement. Not only was she the first major critic of Russian literature writing in the Spanish language; she also provided in *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* the first important literary study in Spanish to deal with the novels of Dostoevksy – and that within six years of the novelist's death – while her studies, then and subsequently, of Tolstoy were also of immense importance in introducing his life and works to Spanish readers.⁸⁴

Russian scholars have recognised the unique importance in this respect of Pardo Bazán's work; Bagno, for example, talks of “...the significance of the work of Emilia Pardo Bazán in bringing the traditions of Russian classical prose-writing to Spanish literature”.⁸⁵ Thanks to Pardo Bazán's study, Bagno believes too that writers including Galdós, “Clarín” and Pío Baroja came to know and be influenced by the writings of both Tolstoy and Dostoevsky.

It was during a visit to Paris in 1885 that doña Emilia first became acquainted with Russian literature. The first Russian novel she ever read was, in fact,

Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* in the French translation of V. Derély, which had been published in Paris in 1884.⁸⁶ Doña Emilia herself relates:

Recuerdo que fue en marzo del 1885 cuando cayó en mis manos una novela rusa que me produjo impresión muy honda: *Crimen y castigo*, de Dostoyevskii...⁸⁷

During this stay in Paris doña Emilia not only met writers such as Zola and Daudet, but she also established friendships with several Russian exiles living in Paris at that time, for example, the writer Tikhomirov and the translator Pavlovsky. The latter was a friend of Turgenev and of Pauline Viardot, and had met Pardo Bazán in 1885. Bagno believes that their friendship provided doña Emilia with very valuable information about Russian life and literature.⁸⁸ Thus she was able to acquaint herself directly and in an entirely authentic way with political, social and cultural events which were taking place in Russia, even though, unlike Valera, she had never visited the country. Like Valera, however, she too knew no Russian at all. Yet the Catalan writer Narcís Oller (well-known as a translator of Russian literature into Catalan, having one play by Ostrovsky, two stories by Tolstoy and three stories by Turgenev to his credit) had no hesitation in asserting that her direct contact and personal friendships with exiled Russian intellectuals enabled doña Emilia to familiarize herself with various aspects of Russian cultural traditions.⁸⁹ Besides, as Clémessy declares, in Paris

...la mode russe régnait, précisément durant l'hiver 1885-1886. On pouvait lire en français les principales oeuvres de Pouchkine, de Lermontov, de Gogol et plusieurs de Gontcharov, de Tolstoï et de Dostoïevski.⁹⁰

In the prologue to the fourth edition of *La cuestión palpitante* (1883) doña Emilia reveals that prior to 1885 she knew of Russian authors only by hearsay. However, in the last chapter of this same work, she claims a certain degree of

knowledge of “las obras de ... Turgueneff”, but further states that of these works “apenas me formo clara idea....”⁹¹

It remains for further study to determine to what extent Pardo Bazán did, in fact, know Turgenev’s writings at the time when she was working on *La cuestión palpitante*, but the firm assertion made by Clémessy, namely that “il est certain, en tout cas, qu’elle n’eut vraiment la révélation du roman russe qu’en 1885 avec la lecture de *Crime et Châtiment* de Dostoïevski en français”, is probably correct. Bagnò, however, while also referring to the passage from *La cuestión palpitante*, believes that in the course of her many literary conversations with Pavlovsky, for example, Pardo Bazán could, in fact, have acquired a considerable amount of detail about Turgenev’s works.⁹²

During her visit to Paris in 1885 Pardo Bazán decided to write a critical work on the Russian authors and literature she had so recently discovered::

La idea de escribir algo acerca de Rusia, su novela y su estado social, cosas que guardan íntima relación, me ocurrió durante mis internadas en París, al notar la forma y el éxito que logran en la capital del mundo latino los autores y especialmente los novelistas rusos....⁹³

She was not able to set to work on this project at once, however, as she notes:

Mas habiendo de regresar a España, no exploté por entonces el filón que incitaba mi literaria codicia. Al invierno siguiente no tuve labor de más prisas que internarme en la región nueva.⁹⁴

As preparation for this critical work, doña Emilia read extensively in Russian literature during the years 1885 to 1887. From the list of “libros consultados” which serves as a bibliography to her essays, it is noted, for example, that she had

read four works by Dostoevsky by 1887: Humbert's translation *Humiliés et offensés*, published in 1884, Neyroud's version *Souvenirs de la Maison des Morts*, published in 1886, *Krotkaia*, the translator and date of publication of which remain unknown, and the above-mentioned translation of *Crime and Punishment*; she had also read many works by Pushkin and Lermontov, Griboedov's *Woe from Wit*, several works by Gogol' (including the complete French translation of *Taras Bul'ba*) and a large selection of the works of Turgenev and of Tolstoy – all of these in French translation.⁹⁵ She had also read and studied, of course, Vogüé's *Le Roman russe*, which had been published in Paris in 1886, this work being the most important and widely known critical study of the Russian novel to appear in the West at that time: its importance as a "source-book" for Pardo Bazán is also stressed by Bagno.⁹⁶ Vogüé had two great advantages over doña Emilia; like Valera, he had visited Russia, and he had (unlike either Pardo Bazán or her predecessor) an excellent knowledge of Russian. Consequently he was able to read literary works without having to rely upon translations. Vogüé wrote several literary studies on Russia, – among them what Clémessy describes as, "un remarquable préface à la traduction de *L'Idiot*, Paris, 1887".⁹⁷

In April 1887, Emilia Pardo Bazán presented her study of Russian literature as three lectures, given in the centre of intellectual life in Madrid, "El Ateneo". She made it quite clear in her introduction that she was fully aware of the complexity of the task that she was about to undertake. In fact, she even describes her feelings at the outset of these lectures in the following terms:

Aunque yo no lo dijese, nadie dudaría que este momento ha de ser de gran turbación interior para mí...[D]oblemente desautorizada por mi insuficiencia y por mi sexo, me arrojo a tratar y exponer un asunto nuevo en España, y, a más de nuevo, exótico, arduo y vastísimo...No sólo aquí tengo que implorar indulgencia. Allá en los confines de Europa, donde se extiende el más vasto imperio

del orbe, tal vez por azar o por curiosidad erudita, encuentre algún lector estas páginas. Sea quienquiera el escritor o pensador ruso que ponga en ellas los ojos, le ruego me tome en cuenta la iniciativa y no me acuse si tropiezo en la desconocida senda.⁹⁸

It is noted how Pardo Bazán offers an apology to her audience since she was, after all, a *woman* writer and critic. Her words also express certain important qualities present, not only in these lectures, but in Pardo Bazán's later studies of Russian literature too. Doña Emilia manages to convey a freshness and an enthusiasm which must surely have captivated her listeners on April 13th, 1887. Certainly Galdós, with whom doña Emilia sustained a great literary (and personal) friendship, as the fairly recent publication of some of their letters reveals, noted that the first of these lectures was highly successful.⁹⁹ Literary circles in Madrid eagerly awaited her second lecture, given on April 20th, and Galdós further describes how the whole series represented "el acontecimiento literario del día", winning for themselves an "alto puesto ...en las letras españolas".¹⁰⁰ Another impression to be gleaned from Pardo Bazán's introductory remarks is that she was well aware of the enormity of the task on which she was so enthusiastically engaged, and no less aware of her own limitations in this area. It is certainly true that in her subsequent studies of Russian literature a greater self-assurance is apparent; nevertheless, neither the impact nor the achievement of this early presentation should be underestimated. Some of her own contemporaries, regrettably, were all too eager to do so.

Later in 1887 Pardo Bazán published her lectures under the title *La revolución y la novela en Rusia*, the very first lengthy and organized critical appraisal of Russian writers to appear in print in the Spanish-speaking world.¹⁰¹ From a historical point of view Pardo Bazán's work appeared at a most opportune moment, since a much greater interest was beginning to be awakened in Spain with regard to

“this vast, distant empire, Russia”, and the names of great Russian historical figures were becoming more and more familiar to the Spanish people.¹⁰²

Two critics offer further testimony of the importance of doña Emilia’s work: Clémessy maintains that “*La revolución y la novela en Rusia* revêt une importance particulière dans l’histoire des lettres espagnoles de la fin du XIXe siècle”, while Juan Ventura Agudiez claims that “las primeras noticias organizadas sobre la novelística rusa vienen a España merced al estudio *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* de Pardo Bazán”.¹⁰³ Pardo Bazán’s contemporary and sometime literary rival Leopoldo Alas, also reports on the success which this work by doña Emilia enjoyed. As evidence of its popularity and wide circulation he recalls seeing “los tres tomos de esta obra en el bufete de un abogado, y sobre el mostrador de un comerciante”.¹⁰⁴ The key to this success is perhaps best defined in George Portnoff’s summary of Pardo Bazan’s achievement:

que ha escrito [la condesa] un libro bien documentado en el arte ruso ... Habla de la vida de los más salientes autores rusos, como Herzen, Gogol, Goncharoff, Puchkin, Lermontoff, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy y otros. Analiza detalladamente el carácter y el espíritu de los personajes y el valor artístico en general.¹⁰⁵

The Russian scholar K.N. Derzhavin, writing in 1947, agrees with Portnoff as to the great value of her work.¹⁰⁶

By the 1880s, as we have seen, there already existed a certain amount of Russian literature in Spanish translation. Typically, these texts had been translated into Spanish via French, and E. Díez Canedo notes that it was precisely around this time that French translations became more readily available in Spain:

Desde que, hacia 1880, tradujeron al francés las novelas de León Tolstoy, no ha dejado España de tener, con

relativa prontitud, versiones de los libros rusos que iban pasando a la lengua de la nación vecina.¹⁰⁷

However, it is likely that, prior to 1887, the Spanish versions and indeed the French versions of Russian writings would have been known only to a minority. As Clémessy observes, these works were not in the possession of the Spanish reading public in general, “mais seulement d’une élite intellectuelle.”¹⁰⁸ “Clarín”, for example, writing to Galdós on April 1st, 1887, says: “Ahora vivo en Rusia enamorado de Gogol y de Tolstoï; ¡qué *Guerra y Paz!*”¹⁰⁹ At the beginning of that same year the same author had commented in an article that “La moda de la novela rusa ... es hoy una obsesión”.¹¹⁰ And this may well have been true of “Clarín”’s immediate circle of active literary creators. From correspondence of the Catalan writer and translator Narcís Oller it is known that Galdós owned a copy of the French translation of *War and Peace* as early as 1884. He also had translations of other Russian novels in his library before 1887.¹¹¹ It was not, however, until the year of doña Emilia’s lectures that Spanish translations of Russian authors became more widely known and available; as Portnoff says, “el gran público en España llegó a conocer a los maestros rusos por los años 1887 y 1888...”.¹¹²

La revolución y la novela en Rusia was, thus, the principal means by which literary circles in general, as well as a wider reading public in late 19th-century Spain became acquainted with Russian literature. Recent research has, indeed, shown that in the years immediately prior to 1887 various articles and studies on Russia, notably in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, were available to Spanish intellectuals.¹¹³ The existence of such works must detract somewhat from Pardo Bazán’s claim that before the appearance of her essays even the names of Russian authors were largely unknown to her fellow Spaniards. Yet, in actual fact, most of these short studies and articles deal only with historical and political aspects of Russia. Only two refer in any detail to Russian authors. One of these in *El Imparcial*, 1882, is an account by José García Gómez of “las novelas nihilistas”,

and the other, entitled “Literatura rusa, Miguel Lermontoff” by Ignacio de Genover appeared in the same journal in 1883.¹¹⁴ Other short articles written around this time mention Pushkin and Gogol’, while only a few months before doña Emilia’s lectures the name of Dostoevsky appears for the first time in a Spanish critical work, albeit under the disguise of “Doitöieski”, this being in *Cartas críticas* by J.B. Pastor Aicart.¹¹⁵

In sum, the scattering of the articles and translations of Russian interest (mainly French in their immediate origin) available in Spain before 1887, enabled the Spanish reader of the latter half of the 19th century to receive certain information about events both social and political in Russia, and to know at least the names of some major Russian writers. Valera’s *Cartas* were clearly important in supplying information at this sort of level. However, it is unlikely that Dostoevsky and Tolstoy would have been widely known to the Spanish public in general until the publication of Pardo Bazán’s lectures. R.E. Osborne firmly believes that before this work appeared “...los novelistas rusos eran casi completamente desconocidos en España”.¹¹⁶ Quite apart from its critical influence, then, her work could claim a certain historical priority in terms simply of the information which it made available. This view is, to some extent, corroborated by the first Russian/Soviet study dealing with the reception of Russian literature in Spain – the article which V.V. Rachmanov published in a Leningrad journal in 1930.¹¹⁷ The main purpose of this study was, as Bagno emphasizes, a restricted one:

The question of influences of Russian writers on Spanish authors and an examination of Spanish critical articles on Russian literature did not enter within the scope of his study. He was interested in a more concrete question, namely to discover which Russian writers were actually available to Spanish readers.¹¹⁸

Rachmanov asserts that Dostoevsky was the most popular Russian author in Spain right into the 1920s and the 1930s. And about Dostoevsky we may be

reasonably certain that virtually nothing was known in Spain before Pardo Bazán's study. The interest in Tolstoy, which Rachmanov identifies among certain Spanish writers and readers during the same period must, again, owe much to her.¹¹⁹ Rachmanov's conclusions, indeed, are not immune to challenge in the light of later research. But even Bagno's own work, with its broader critical focus, fully bears out the view of doña Emilia's achievement voiced by one of her most admiring Western critics, Nelly Clémessy:

... dans la divulgation de la littérature russe en Espagne, le rôle capital doit être attribué à *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* ... et ... l'exposé critique de doña Emilia, par son opportunité et sa qualité, connut un vif succès et une rapide diffusion.¹²⁰

Despite this coincidence of view between both Russian and non-Russian critical sources, certain contemporaries of Pardo Bazán, as well as some later critics of her work, have done scant justice to either its scope or its quality. They have been all too quick to emphasize the fact that she "borrowed" much of her material from Vogüé's *Le Roman russe*. Certainly she knew this work well; indeed, she openly admitted to having used it as a source book and a point of reference for her own study. Nevertheless, wherever possible, she tried to make this new material particularly relevant for her Spanish readers by giving them frequent points of comparison between Russian and Spanish literatures and cultures. This must surely have stimulated both the imagination and the interest of her public and given them valuable references for their own future reading and study of this largely unknown literature.

Some of the issues will emerge more clearly from a brief examination of the content of two sections of her work, and of the critical claims regarding them which have been put forward by Bagno and others. This account will also serve to

highlight the ambition, vitality and enthusiasm of Pardo Bazán's whole undertaking.

(b) LA REVOLUCION Y LA NOVELA EN RUSIA:**CONTENTS AND CRITICS**

“Con [Dostoevsky] entramos en una estética nueva, donde lo horrible es bello, lo desesperado consuela, lo innoble raya en sublime.”

“Era el estado de la mujer en Rusia más amargo y humillante que en el resto de Europa: cubría el velo oriental su rostro, hasta que una emperatriz se atrevió a alzarlo, no sin grave escándalo de la corte; el palo y el encierro la hicieron bestia de labor entre los campesinos, odalisca entre los nobles; en las clases sociales más elevadas, el marido ruso tenía colgado a la cabecera de la cama el látigo, emblema de su autoridad. La ley no reducía a la mujer a minoría perpetua, como entre nosotros, y le consentía administrar libremente su fortuna... Todo lo ha cambiado las ideas nuevas, y hoy es la mujer rusa la más igual en condición al hombre, la más libre, la más inteligente, la más respetada de Europa”.

Emilia Pardo Bazán¹²¹

To attempt to present single-handed what amounted to a cultural and literary history of Russia for the Spanish public of 1887 was an enormous undertaking – the more so because Pardo Bazán had neither visited Russia nor possessed even a reading knowledge of the language. To stress the “second-hand” character of much of her material is beside the point. Doña Emilia was not setting out to be original in

that sense, as she had admitted with a certain humility in the introduction of her lectures. It was her aim to provide such information as she could herself acquire, given her limited access to primary evidences about a relatively unknown country and culture. In particular, she sought to introduce her Spanish audiences to what was presumably, for the majority of them, a new literature. She managed very well to compensate for her initial handicaps by the sheer vitality and delighted enthusiasm which her lectures and later essays clearly reveal. For the listener or the reader who had never heard of Dostoevsky, for example (nor, for that matter, of *Le Roman russe* either), it would be of no importance whatsoever if part of the information about him had been translated from some other external source, (although these translations were, for the most part, acknowledged by Pardo Bazán). The information had been given, a possible link had been established, and that was, at the end of the day, the most important thing of all. Doña Emilia's clearly stated aim was to inform her audience as accurately and reliably as she could, given her admitted limitations, about this new culture and literature. There is little or no attempt on her part to claim credit for any originality; yet it is possible to show that the work does have its own originality, as do her later essays on Russian literature.

Pardo Bazán's own position within Spanish literature, her "place" as an outstanding woman writer and critic and her great influence in both Spain and Spanish-America have been summed up as follows:

Raras veces en la literatura aparecen mujeres de la eminencia de Doña Emilia Pardo Bazán, quien se distinguió brillantemente en las letras españolas durante los últimos veinticinco años del siglo XIX y las dos primeras décadas del XX... Por los años 1880-1910, que caracterizan el auge de su producción, y hasta su muerte en 1921, apenas pasó una semana en que no contribuyera con un artículo o un cuento en las revistas y periódicos mas prestigiosos de

España y Hispanoamérica. El éxito y la popularidad que Doña Emilia gozó se debieron no sólo a su inteligencia extraordinaria y a su habilidad, sino también a la diligencia y al vigor con que llevó a cabo su profesión de novelista y periodista.¹²²

Married before she was seventeen, she had travelled widely in many European countries (though not in Russia) and she had a good knowledge of several languages other than Spanish (though, again, not of Russian). During a stay in Vienna, for example, she had translated Heine into Spanish, and she had also visited London, where she began a serious study of Shakespeare. However, despite her social position – the title of Countess was inherited from her father – she was not a woman of great wealth, and the publication of her stories and articles provided her with an important source of income. She was also very astute as far as her own creative output was concerned, and proved very shrewd in identifying the successful literary genres of the times. Like Pushkin (whom she greatly admired), in his own transition from poetry to prose, she was able to come to terms with – yet not pander to – public taste. She realized, for example, that readers of her time were “demanding” short prose works rather than novels. The immense popularity which her own short articles and stories enjoyed confirmed her in this view.¹²³ Towards 1890, Pardo Bazán “cambió el rumbo de su orientación artística” in another sense, and began to introduce a new religious and ideological vein into her works – this, again, chimed shrewdly with a change in literary fashion but it also owes much, in my view, to her great admiration for the writings of Tolstoy.¹²⁴ And it is this relationship with her public which is manifested in her presentation of Russian literature. *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* is, unashamedly and unexceptionally, a work of popularization. But it is also a work of exceptional quality: doña Emilia would not have permitted herself to get away with anything less.

La revolución y la novela en Rusia is divided into three main parts. The first deals with the social and political history of Russia, the second begins with a study of nihilism and its origins and concludes with an introduction to the country's literature; and the third part is dedicated to four major Russian writers, Turgenev, Goncharov, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. Here only the second and the third parts of her work, dealing primarily with Russian literature, will be examined in detail. In the first part of *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* doña Emilia openly admits to the difficulties which had faced her, and reveals with some amusement how she set about solving them. She also explains how the title of her work arose, embodying as it did the important relationship between the novel and society in Russia. Quite rightly, Bagno has particular praise for the perceptive quality of such comments as these:

Ciñéndome a Rusia, no niego que a mi curiosidad se unían algunas dudas sobre el valor de su tesoro literario. Al dilatar mis investigaciones descubrí que, aparte del mérito intrínseco de sus autores famosos, la literatura rusa merece fijar la atención por relacionarse íntimamente con graves problemas sociales, políticos e históricos de los que preocupan a Europa entera... Aquí es ocasión de confesar paladinamente que me falta algo indispensable tal vez para mi empresa: la posesión del idioma ruso...He procurado suplir lo que me falta. No solamente he leído cuanto hay escrito sobre Rusia en lengua inteligible para mí, sino que he procurado relacionarme con escritores y artistas rusos...¹²⁵

At the beginning of part two Pardo Bazán once more refers to the enormity of her task: "Nunca he percibido como ahora los escollos y dificultades del asunto que trato. Hablar de nihilismo es un gran atrevimiento..."¹²⁶ It was this awareness, no doubt, which explained (and for her, justified) her reliance on

Vogüé. But rather than detailing the effects of this dependence on *Le Roman russe*, it will be of more value to attempt to assess positively what Pardo Bazán actually did achieve in presenting Russian literature and how she was able to do so. Very evidently, Vogüé was only one of the resources available to her. On many occasions in the course of these two sections of her work she makes direct comparisons between Russian and Spanish literatures. She also refers to information which she had received directly from her Russian friends about topical events in their country. Early in section two, for example, after having explained the origins of “nihilismo”, she goes on to discuss its relation to and application in Turgenev’s novel *Fathers and Children*. Adding further details about the historical background of Russia, she relates how:

Persona que ha visto de cerca al zar de hierro me lo describió alto, derecho, rígido, siempre incrustado en su uniforme, esclavo de sus deberes de soberano, personificación viviente de la autocracia, no sin razón llamado el Quijote del absolutismo...¹²⁷

In this same section, still explaining her topic of “nihilismo”, she refers again to Turgenev, and writes at considerable length about “un tal Bazarof, muy díscolo, mal criado y inaguantable...”.¹²⁸ This long section on Bazarov must surely be his first major presentation to Spanish audiences.

A long section then follows which deals with the role of women in Russia, past and present. This section was doubtless fascinating to many of her listeners. Certainly the research for this section would have been most enjoyable for doña Emilia herself, to judge from both the wit and the ironic tone by which it is marked. Here too Pardo Bazán used information which had been related to her by Russian friends: from Tikhomirov she had learned much. She tells us about the “constitución de la familia revolucionaria” and about other matters to do with family life in Russia.¹²⁹

After an account of “la novela de Chernichevski...¿*Qué hacer?*” and other historical details, doña Emilia begins her study of Russian literature in earnest. She states that before proceeding to a study of the Russian novel, “me es indispensable volver la vista atrás y recordar...los orígenes...de las letras rusas”: she discusses “las bilinas”, which, she explains to her Spanish audience, are “cantos de gestas o romances, pues según la etimología rusa, bilinas quiere decir canciones del pasado”.¹³⁰ She mentions the famous *Canto de la hueste de Igor*; she gives a brief explanation of *Domostroí*, which again must have captured the attention of her listeners; and she goes on to compare “el...zar Iván el Terrible” to “nuestro Pedro de Castilla”, since both, in her opinion, were able to “enfrentar a la nobleza”.¹³¹ Karamzin and his achievements are mentioned, and she also keeps her listeners well-informed as to the progress of literary history in Russia. At the beginning of the 19th century, she observes, “el clasicismo decaía: la orientación de Rusia había variado, y cambió totalmente después de 1812”.¹³² This reference brings her directly to a short exposition of the life and works of Pushkin, “el semidiós del verso ruso”, as she introduces him. Later in this same section too she compares him to Espronceda and assures her audience that Pushkin belongs “a las grandes corrientes generales de la literatura europea”.¹³³ However, by far the longest and most detailed literary section of this second part of *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* is dedicated to the life and works of Gogol’. It is here too that the greatest number of points of comparison are drawn with Spanish literature. Pardo Bazán confesses that she would rate Gogol’ almost as highly as Cervantes and she wonders if the former had, by chance, known

¿el *Romancero del Cid* y los romances españoles en general? Creo que no será temerario afirmar que sí, tratándose de un autor que profesaba culto acendrado al *Quijote* y se inspiró en él para su obra capital.¹³⁴

We noted earlier in this chapter the mutilations present in the first Spanish rendering of *Taras Bul'ba*; Bagno notes that the fragments from this story which Pardo Bazán herself “translated” reveal that she had prepared herself very well for such an undertaking.

Although she did not know any Russian, she must have...asked the advice of one of her Russian acquaintances in Paris. Even the very title of the work (the name of the main protagonist is translated by her perfectly – Taras Bulba – while the Spanish translator of the 1880 version...was forced to keep to the erroneous French transcription – Tarass Boulba... In general in Pardo Bazán's translations, in comparison with the French text, one can find a greater poetic quality. The translation of Turgenev and Viardot... had considerably impoverished Gogol's original.¹³⁵

Bagno considers to be of particular note (and greatly superior to Viardot's translation, as we shall see) the following sentence from chapter IX of *Taras Bul'ba*:

Остановился старый Тарас и глядел на то, как он чистил перед собою дорогу, разгонял, рубил и сыпал удары направо и налево.

Viardot's version had been:

Le vieux Tarass s'arrête: il regarde comment Andry s'ouvrait passage, frappant à droit et à gauche, et chassant les Cosaques devant lui.¹³⁶

The 1880 Spanish translation (based on the above) was:

Tarass se detuvo y viendo como Andrés se abrió camino á derecha é izquierda por entre las filas de sus antiguos companeros, perdió la paciencia y le dijo.¹³⁷

Pardo Bazán's version, finally is

Detiéndose el viejo Taras, mirando cómo se abre paso Andry descargando tajos y mandobles á derecha é izquierda y arrojando á los cosacos.¹³⁸

This, in my opinion, provides an outstanding example of the zeal and diligence with which Pardo Bazán set about her work as literary mediator.

Later, when discussing Gogol's play *El inspector* she notes:

Sincera confesión del humorista, cuya risa encubre las lágrimas y brota del hígado enfermo, de la bilis derramada que infiltra el organismo. Podía aplicarse a Gogol lo que una musa ilustre dijo de Quevedo: "arranque de dolor, de ese profundo dolor que se concentra en el misterio..."¹³⁹

Doña Emilia informs us too that she had studied *Dead Souls* before reading Vogüé and that her impression of Gogol's work had coincided almost exactly with his. She also confesses that *Dead Souls* in her view, came closest to *Don Quijote*

de cuantos [libros] he visto en mi vida...Y el propósito de tomar el *Quijote* por modelo es evidente, aunque sea inexacto, según afirman compatriotas de Gogol, que éste haya pisado nunca el suelo de España.¹⁴⁰

She notes, however, that in *Dead Souls*, "el estado social de Rusia" seemed to her to have been "más feo y triste que él de la España de Cervantes". Many other

relevant points are made too to provide links between the two works.¹⁴¹ She ends this second section by referring to Gogol' as "el Cervantes ruso" and she sees in him the true founder of the great traditions of the Russian novel.¹⁴²

In the third and final section of *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* Emilia Pardo Bazán examines the works of Turgenev in somewhat greater detail, giving a further analysis of *Fathers and Children*. She notes Turgenev's plans to translate *Don Quijote* into Russian and she refers to and quotes from conversations which Turgenev had with her own friend Pavlovsky. In this section doña Emilia freely admits that she is quoting directly from *Le Roman russe* in order, as she reveals, to give her Spanish audience the benefit of de Vogüé's descriptions of Turgenev's works. But she then proceeds to give her own personal impressions too.

With regard to *Oblomov*, she confesses that she had only read part of Goncharov's novel, and this she describes as having "un encanto indecible, una intensidad psíquica...".¹⁴³ There remain just two more Russian novelists to be discussed, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. Dealing with the former, she makes the important connection between Gogol's story *The Overcoat* and "la obra de Dostoyevski".¹⁴⁴ With Dostoevsky, she tells her audience, we enter "la ciudad doliente, en el eterno dolor, entre gentes perdidas y condenadas...". From *La casa muerta* she reveals that she cannot even quote a single line, such is the powerful intensity of this work, and she urges her audience to read it – "y con paciencia", she warns, "pues no es corta ni amena, ni suelen serlo los libros rusos".¹⁴⁵ The longest part of this final section of her work is devoted to Tolstoy. In this, the earliest of her critical studies of Tolstoy, she presents only the salient features of his life and works to her audience. She highlights the dramatic intensity of *Anna Karenina*; she devotes some attention to Tolstoy's later *Mi religión* and his *Comentario sobre el Evangelio* and she refers to his "pesimismo", comparing it with the "misticismo" of Dostoevsky and the "occidentalismo" of Turgenev.

Her conclusion offers a number of comments on the state and function of the novel in Europe, and here she is not at all inhibited about expressing

disagreement with Vogüé. She sees both Spain and Russia as examples of “un pueblo antiguo y a la vez joven, que aún ignora adonde le empujará el porvenir”. She complains of the lack of new and intellectually stimulating books in the Spain of her time, making the comparison between the quality and the quantity of available literature at “la estación francesa de Hendaya” and what was on offer “en Irún, a dos pasos como quien dice...”.¹⁴⁶ She admits in her concluding lines that, despite her study and her love of this new literature, for her Russia remains “ante todo, un enigma; otros lo resuelvan si a tanto alcanzan; yo no pude”. She had, as she tells us, heard the call of “la esfinge; puse mis ojos en los suyos, hondos como el abismo...”.¹⁴⁷

From this very brief examination of the content of *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* there will have emerged something of the originality of what Pardo Bazán was doing and saying – and something, too, of her honesty in admitting to her own limitations. The vivacity of her writing ought also to be apparent, as should its organized and scholarly approach. Her attempts in this work to draw stimulating and thought-provoking parallels between this new literature and the literature and culture of Spain must have been of special interest to her Spanish audience.

As has already been stated, Pardo Bazán appends to the text of *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* a list of the books studied and used by her in the course of its composition. Vogüé’s *Le Roman russe* is given due prominence among those. Vogüé’s work, certainly, has an importance of its own as one of the channels by which information about Russian literature reached the Hispanic world.¹⁴⁸ And its prominence among doña Emilia’s sources is unmistakable. But Portnoff’s comment remains relevant:

No importa a nuestro objeto que la condesa de Pardo Bazán haya sacado el material para esta obra de *Le Roman russe*, de Vogüé, o de sus lecturas de autores rusos o de otras fuentes ... No cabe duda que la condesa ha leído las obras capitales de los maestros rusos como Puchkin,

Lermontoff, Gogol, Herzen, Goncharoff, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy y otros, como lo prueba el detallado análisis que encontramos de ciertas obras.¹⁴⁹

Pattison's statement that she "...lifts long passages directly from the French author without acknowledgement" besides being both harsh and, for the most part, demonstrably false, is quite beside the point.¹⁵⁰ Sainz de Robles, by contrast, shows greater perception, when he maintains that her work "contiene muchas sutilezas propias y excede al de Vogüé en cuanto a lo literario".¹⁵¹

Given her restricted linguistic and geographical horizons, Pardo Bazán was bound to rely on many secondary sources for the first two sections of her work – histories, travel books, political studies, and so forth. It is, of course, in the third section, where she is dealing with Russian literature, that she draws most heavily on Vogüé.¹⁵² Clémessy's assertion that "il n'est pas douteux qu'en composant son propre exposé doña Emilia avait sous les yeux un exemplaire du *Roman russe*" is, of course, undeniable.¹⁵³ But it is surprising that Clémessy should regard the comparisons which Pardo Bazán introduced between Russian and Spanish literature as superficial and of little importance. These comparisons are often made with lively humour and are always strikingly apt; they constitute a real incitement to her Spanish audience to sample this new literature for themselves. On many occasions they reveal that Pardo Bazán had given careful thought to the works of Russian authors, either as a result of her own reading of them, or by way of reflection on her various secondary sources.

Dostoevsky made his appearance to the Spanish public of the late 19th century described by Pardo Bazán as "el psicólogo y alucinado".¹⁵⁴ Her treatment of him clearly derives in part from Chapter V of *Le Roman russe*, (entitled "La religion de la souffrance, Dostoievski"). Nevertheless Pardo Bazán's study does contain certain points of originality; even Clémessy admits as much: "l'étude de l'oeuvre et de la personnalité artistique de l'écrivain est beaucoup plus originale".¹⁵⁵

It is likely that doña Emilia derived most of her information about *The Idiot* from Vogüé, since this work had not been translated into French at the time when she was writing; but she develops an apt enough comparison with *Don Quijote*: “...*El Idiota* tipo imitado del *Quijote*, enderezador de entuertos, loco, o mejor dicho, simple sublime”.¹⁵⁶ When discussing *Crimen y castigo* and *La casa muerta*, which she did know, she expresses a convincing and much more personal view. She considers *Crimen y castigo* to be “febril”, and its author as resembling “un demente cuyos intervalos lúcidos se deben a las tribulaciones y al martirio”.¹⁵⁷ Doña Emilia questions the ultimate “belleza” of Dostoevsky’s novels, and by way of reply she comments:

Todo cuanto ha escrito Dostoyevski tiene el mismo carácter: araña el alma, pervierte la imaginación y subvierte las nociones del bien y del mal hasta un grado increíble....¹⁵⁸

As Vogüé had done before her, doña Emilia refers to the similarities between Dostoevsky and Edgar Allen Poe. But she is of the opinion that Poe could never attain even a single one of the “tremendos análisis psicológicos” of *Crime and Punishment*.¹⁵⁹ In Pardo Bazán’s opinion, Turgenev is “el occidental, célebre y dichoso”, whilst Dostoevsky is a “psicólogo rabioso, casi enemigo de la naturaleza y del mundo sensible...”. In this comparison of Dostoevsky and Turgenev, doña Emilia further sees Dostoevsky as “el bárbaro, juguete del destino, obligado a lidiar con la pobreza cuerpo a cuerpo”.¹⁶⁰ Overall, the account of Dostoevsky does reveal a certain understanding of him and clearly shows that Pardo Bazán knew at least two of his works well. In this regard, it will certainly bear comparison with Vogüé. Clémessy even suggests that Pardo Bazán’s study shows itself to be “plus complète et plus claire que celle du critique français”, a judgement with which I would fully agree.¹⁶¹

In the light of Pardo Bazán's largely successful aim of making Dostoevsky and other Russian writers better known, Pedro Albuin's comment that Pardo Bazán did not understand Dostoevsky's "realism" seems somewhat beside the point.¹⁶² Doña Emilia could hardly be expected to capture the complexities and depth of Dostoevsky in a few pages. Besides, Dostoevsky's later novels were not yet available to her either in French or in Spanish translation. It was to be the task of a later Spanish writer to explore the works of Dostoevsky more fully. As Clémessy notes, in 1887, with only two or three of Dostoevsky's works available to her, "la nouveauté du monde analysé par Dostoievski, le caractère insolite de son oeuvre, ne pouvaient guère laisser espérer une compréhension totale".¹⁶³

Yet the information about this new literature which doña Emilia had provided for her fellow Spaniards so willingly and as a result of so much research and personal effort was not always fully appreciated. Her work on Russian literature encountered several important opponents:

Yo no me opongo a que usted profetice ... No me opongo tampoco, antes me junto con usted, si me acepta, para pronosticar a los rusos un brillante porvenir literario. A lo que me opongo, lo que no quiero es que este porvenir sea a costa nuestra....,

writes Juan Valera to doña Emilia – perhaps a rather disappointing comment from one who had lived for a year in Russia and had experienced its culture at first-hand.¹⁶⁴ Menéndez y Pelayo too seems to have been somewhat irritated by Pardo Bazán's work on Russian literature and her predilection for Russian novelists, as is evident from his own correspondence with Valera.¹⁶⁵

From Valera's well-known letter to Pardo Bazán taking issue with her work on Russian literature it is apparent that *La revolución y la novela* was highly regarded in many quarters. Even Valera allows himself to praise the manner of her presentation:

Cuanto usted nos cuenta de Rusia está contado con claridad, orden y elocuencia, y en los elogios que los periódicos tributan a usted me atrevo a decir que para nada he tenido que tomar parte la galantería.¹⁶⁶

He goes on, however, to build up his argument against doña Emilia's treatment of the topic:

Así es que, sin dejar de sostener, como el más devoto admirador de usted, que su libro sobre Rusia es interesante y amenísimo, he de poner algunos reparos y he de contradecir algo de lo que en él se afirma.¹⁶⁷

The "algo" was to be a rather lengthy diatribe. According to Valera:

Casi nos pinta usted a las naciones europeas intelectualmente decaídas. Yo creo lo contrario: nunca gozaron de más brillante florecimiento intelectual. En Rusia empieza también ahora una época fecunda. Quizá en el porvenir, Rusia eclipse y supere a los pueblos occidentales de nuestro continente; pero este porvenir está aún muy remoto.¹⁶⁸

Valera sees the great popularity which Russian literature had enjoyed during these years in Paris as being due to four major reasons: first,

La gratitud por la admiración que produce en Rusia todo lo francés. Antes que Balzac y Zola fuesen tan admirados en Francia, lo fueron en Rusia.¹⁶⁹

(Certainly Dostoevsky greatly admired Balzac and looked to him, to a certain extent, for guidance in the art of novel-writing.)¹⁷⁰

The second reason which Valera finds is “la grandeza y el poder de aquel Imperio colosal”; third, “la vanidad patriótica de los franceses, quienes ven en casi todo literato ruso a modo de un hijo adoptivo...”; and fourth, “Cierta presentimiento instintivo o calculado de que, en el caso de nueva guerra entre Francia y Alemania, Rusia sería la natural aliada de Francia”.¹⁷¹ Whatever grain of truth there may be in these statements, in his next line of argument Valera is much less convincing – and it must be remembered that, by his own confession to Menéndez y Pelayo, he had read neither Dostoevsky nor Tolstoy:

Al exponer yo todo esto, no quiero menoscabar en nada la merecida reputación de los autores rusos que usted nos hace conocer. Yo acepto, y aun encarezco en absoluto y sin comparaciones, cuantas alabanzas da usted a los dos poetas y a los cuatro novelistas principales. Puschkin, Liermontov, Gogol, Turgueniev, Dostoyevski y Tolstoi son seis ‘genios’; pero ¿no habría seis ‘genios’ del mismo calibre en cualquiera otra tierra de la Europea occidental menos extensa y en cualquiera otra nación menos populosa?¹⁷²

Not only does Valera want to defend the greatness of Spanish and Portuguese literature and to equate it to that of the Russian; in the cause of detracting from Russian writers he also turns himself, paradoxically, into an apologist of Polish literature. It is impossible to evade the notion that Valera was defending opinions on topics of which he knew little in terms of other topics of which he knew still less. The second, better-informed attack on Pardo Bazán’s work for which he was allegedly preparing himself by reading the works of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky never, in fact, appeared.

“Clarín” also criticized Pardo Bazán’s work – but mainly for what he saw as her dependence on Vogüé (he cannot resist referring to her as doña Emilia Pardo-Vogüé). However, he did acknowledge the success of her presentation of Russian

writers to the Spanish public at large. Indeed, as Sergio Beser points out, his own “gran interés por Tolstoy, Gogol, Turguenev, Dostoievski y Pushkin” was largely due to Pardo Bazán.¹⁷³ It seems that it was Tolstoy, not Dostoevsky, who captured “Clarín”’s attention most of all, for Alas “en los dos últimos años de su vida muestra una gran atracción por las novelas de Tolstoy, prueba de ello es el prólogo a *Resurrección*, firmado en abril de 1900”.¹⁷⁴ In addition, in one of his very last works, “Clarín” offers a direct avowal of his great admiration for Tolstoy:

Tolstoy, espíritu más profundo no es tan fuerte ni tan variado y abundante como Zola, con serlo mucho. Mi alma está más cerca de Tolstoy que de Zola, sin embargo.¹⁷⁵

Another critic of Pardo Bazán’s work was Francisco de Asís de Icaza, who openly accused doña Emilia of plagiarism, especially in the third part of her work where she deals with Russian literature.¹⁷⁶

One suspects, however, that there may have been a considerable degree of envy of Pardo Bazán’s achievements in this area on the part of some of her male colleagues. After all she was the one who actually managed to present this new literature to Spain. Even in the matter of “Clarín”’s comparison of Zola with Tolstoy, we might note that it was Pardo Bazán who actually essayed a full-scale comparison of the two novelists.

Galdós, on the other hand, admired Pardo Bazán’s work from the very outset. He had also owned works by Tolstoy from as early as 1884; Portnoff believes that he was influenced by *Anna Karenina* in his *Realidad* and, indeed, the role of Russian writers within the works of Galdós is a subject which still remains to be researched in detail. A full appraisal of the presence of Russian literature in his fiction would carry us beyond the bounds of the present study.¹⁷⁷ Some relevant details will be given in the following chapter.

Pío Baroja, who was to follow in doña Emilia’s footsteps as far as interest in the Russian novel was concerned, sees in her “una escritora universal”. For

Baroja, her interest in Russian literature removed her from the “provincialismo” which he so disliked in the works of certain other Spanish authors such as Pereda.¹⁷⁸

To conclude, it is obvious that in and after 1887 Spanish writers such as “Clarín”, Galdós and Baroja were becoming increasingly interested in the “newly discovered” Russian literature. This interest must at least in part be attributed to Pardo Bazán. The importance of her study of Russian authors, in particular of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, was not that she followed the French fashion, but precisely “qu’elle ait lancé la mode russe en Espagne”.¹⁷⁹ The reputation of Dostoevsky may well have remained, in Clémessy’s words, that of “en effet le romancier russe le moins populaire en Espagne; il faudra attendre la deuxième décennie du XXe siècle avant de le voir mis à l’honneur et vraiment compris”.¹⁸⁰ The researches carried out by Schanzer certainly suggest that this is closer to the truth than the conclusion presented by Rachmanov – namely that Dostoevsky was the most popular Russian novelist in Spain at the end of the 19th century.¹⁸¹ In fact, it was Tolstoy who enjoyed that position – or so the evidence strongly suggests.¹⁸²

Pardo Bazán’s own understanding of Dostoevsky was, of necessity, limited. But her study of him at least allowed Pío Baroja to apply the lessons both in his own fictional practice and in his critical judgements. Doña Emilia bequeathed to future generations above all the spirit and essence of the writers she examines. Especially influential, I believe, was her conviction that there were “affinités profondes existant entre le peuple russe et le peuple espagnol”.¹⁸³ As one example of the latter, she notes that “en mi propensión a sorprender semejanzas entre Rusia y el país gallego, me parece ver rastros de ese poder familiar en los petrucios o mayores de Galicia”.¹⁸⁴ It is a preoccupation which links Pardo Bazán – as do other aspects of her writing – with the slightly younger group of writers who have come to be known as the “Generation of 1898”:

While Pardo Bazán is not classified as a member of the Generation of '98, there is no other writer who gives us so sharp a picture of the mood of Spain in the decades from 1880-1910 and she may therefore be studied as the best expression of the spirit of '98.¹⁸⁵

Pardo Bazán's important place in the literary history of Spain owes most, of course, to her novels and stories but it also owes something to her extremely valuable work as a critic – not least of Russian literature. Nor was her influence in this field confined to Spain alone. Bagnó, for one, believes that *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* also played an important role in Latin American countries.¹⁸⁶

Pardo Bazán's later writings on Russian literature, to which we now turn, are characterized by the same enthusiasm and energy as her early lectures. But they demonstrate a greater sureness of touch and a greater confidence as regards their subject matter. By the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th, when these later studies were written, Pardo Bazán had been able to read much more extensively in the area of Russian literature. Her love for it had increased over the years, and with the advent of better translations it may be assumed that the quality of what she was reading was higher. As has been stated, these later studies demonstrate the same vigour and passionate interest in her subject-matter as did *La revolución y la novela en Rusia*. They also resemble that work in their efforts to provide apt and stimulating points of comparison between Spanish and Russian literatures.

(c) EMILIA PARDO BAZAN'S LATER STUDIES

OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE

“Cuando hace catorce años hablé en el Ateneo de Madrid de la literatura rusa... dije que el crédito que en Francia obtenía esta literatura no era uno de tantos caprichos de la exhausta imaginación parisiense, sino un acto de justicia internacional, debido a méritos de algunos de los escritores más originales que este siglo produjo. Hoy nadie lo duda. Bastaría el nombre de Tolstoi para que nadie lo dudase.”

Emilia Pardo Bazán¹⁸⁷

Not only was doña Emilia responsible, as has been seen, for the major 19th-century Spanish critical work on Russian literature; the value of her later essays on the subject is itself long overdue for a reassessment, given the habitual neglect of them by critics and biographers.¹⁸⁸ In 1891 she attempted a short comparative study of Tolstoy's *The Kreutzer Sonata* and Zola's *L'argent*.¹⁸⁹ She had read the former in an 1890 French translation, and refers to it in her essay as *La sonata a Kreutzer*. She justifies the study by claiming that, although these two works are “profundamente distintas entre sí”, they both contain

la analogía de llevar en su seno gérmenes y predicciones de una sociedad nueva, muy diversa de la actual, y cuyo advenimiento solicitan o sueñan los autores con (valga la frase) esperanzado pesimismo.¹⁹⁰

The first part of this short study is devoted to Zola's novel; doña Emilia makes the transition to Tolstoy in the following terms:

En *La sonata a Kreutzer* no se trata del DINERO, sino del MATRIMONIO, que en opinión del novelista-vidente, está muy mal arreglado...Para hablar con más exactitud, el alegato de Tolstoi no va solamente contra el matrimonio, sino contra casi todas las formas de la relación sexual, entre ellas el AMOR, sentimiento que el novelista niega en redondo por boca del protagonista, representante de las opiniones del autor durante toda la novela.¹⁹¹

This short comparative study offers a sufficient reply to those who were only too anxious to accuse Pardo Bazán of plagiarism in her earlier presentation of Russian literature. It stands out as an original and perceptive analysis – though it is also, regrettably a neglected one. In all justice this essay ought to be considered as a valuable and illuminating piece of Tolstoy criticism in its own right. Bagno points to the change which doña Emilia's views of *The Kreutzer Sonata* had undergone, but his only other comment about this later study is to the effect that Pardo Bazán regards Tolstoy's novella as the most outstanding prose work of the entire 19th century.

First Pardo Bazán gives her readers a brief outline of Tolstoy's plot. In the course of this she cannot resist a comparison between "Podsnichev" (she also tells us in an aside that "los nombres, en la novela rusa, siempre me estorban un poco") and a Spanish literary figure, referring to the former as "un 'médico de su honra'". She also detects that in *The Kreutzer Sonata* there is a dramatic conflict between Tolstoy "el artista" and Tolstoy "el apóstol". This understanding is, she believes, a necessary condition for any correct interpretation of this "extraño libro de Tolstoi" or, as she refers to it later, "la novela más profunda y genial de la temporada de 90 a 91".¹⁹² There are long quotations too (in Spanish) from Tolstoy's work; in these

Pardo Bazán has somehow managed surprisingly well to preserve both the style and the dramatic tone of the original. She was, of course, translating from a translation – but by this date admittedly, of a much higher standard. Yet there can be no doubt that the short translated passages which she chose to include would have given her readers a very authentic sense of Tolstoy's original work.¹⁹³ Given, of course, that, at the time when Pardo Bazán composed this short essay, both the sanctity and the inviolability of the marriage bond were rigidly upheld within Roman Catholic Spain, doña Emilia's own comments on the story would surely have caught the attention of her readers:

¡Cuántos y cuántos matrimonios han ascendido por este calvario! ¡Qué bien estudiados los síntomas del mal, y cuán fáciles de observar a nuestro alrededor!

Indeed, it is rather surprising to learn that this story was one of the most popular of all Tolstoy's works in Spain. Part of the explanation could be that, as Pardo Bazán herself had noted, shorter prose works were much more in demand at that time.¹⁹⁴ Doña Emilia underlines the popularity of *The Kreutzer Sonata* for her readers when she declares that:

Ni *Ana Karenina*, ni ciertas partes de *Guerra y Paz*, ni los *Cuadros del sitio de Sebastopol*, ni la *Novela de un caballo*, revelan las soberanas facultades de novelista que posee Tolstoi más espléndidamente que *La sonata*.¹⁹⁵

It may be too that the dramatic intensity of this work had a special appeal for Spanish readers, or it may have been the stark analysis of marriage which, in the relatively closed Spanish society of those years, contributed to its rather unexpected popularity in late 19th-century Spain. These points will be mentioned again in a later chapter of this thesis. Doña Emilia, however, does disagree with Tolstoy on the following point,

Eso de que a un hombre honrado no le sea lícito derretirse ...con su propia mujer sin cometer adulterio y descender al nivel de los marranos y los simios, a la verdad me parece duro.¹⁹⁶

Here she cannot resist a comparative judgement on Tolstoy: “Tolstoi no es sino exageración o nota aguda del desprecio místico de San Francisco de Sales.”¹⁹⁷

Although Pardo Bazán does not tell her Spanish readers the origins of the title of this short work – perhaps this is one of the few real faults of this brief critical study – what she does, without any doubt, provide is a personal appreciation of *The Kreutzer Sonata*. In an interesting and illuminating way she highlights the salient points of Tolstoy’s work.

Pardo Bazán was to refer again to the *The Kreutzer Sonata* in a short work of 1908 dedicated to “El padre Luis Coloma”. There are many other references to Russian literature in the course of this study, but it is the conclusion which is of special interest.¹⁹⁸ She compares certain writings and ideas of Luis Coloma and of Tolstoy in the following terms:

¡Qué analogías tan singulares noto que existen... entre las ideas del padre Coloma y las de Tolstoi, que condena por sensual el excesivo cariño a los hijos en *La sonata a Kreutzer*!¹⁹⁹

The comparison with Zola was not to be Pardo Bazán’s last attempt at a critical analysis of Tolstoy. In 1900 she wrote a brief appreciation of his *Resurrection*, which appeared in *El Imparcial* on March 5th.²⁰⁰ Once again, doña Emilia offers an original and valuable short piece of Tolstoy criticism, and it is clear how she attempts to situate him for her readers within a Spanish cultural context:

Este admirable escritor, el más OBJETIVO (como en otros tiempos se decía) de los artistas contemporáneos, el

más sereno y sagaz para describir, el que ve la verdad a lo Velázquez...²⁰¹

On several other occasions too Pardo Bazán returns to this link between the art of Tolstoy and that of Velázquez. In this study she attempts to understand the reasons for Tolstoy's immense popularity in Spain and in other "Latin" countries. Using *Resurrection* as her point of comparison, she notes:

Las impresiones de la última novela de Tolstoi, y en general de su arte, ya tan perfecto, no son únicamente de índole estética y literaria; engendran eso que se llama UNCIÓN. Por latinos que seamos, por individualistas que nos reconozcamos, la lectura de *Resurrección* hace vibrar en nosotros cuerdas al parecer insensibles.²⁰²

In this study Pardo Bazán gives her readers an outline of the plot of Tolstoy's novel and intersperses this with her own comments, conclusions and comparisons, this time including Victor Hugo and Sue. This essay once more reveals her admiration for Tolstoy and an enhanced understanding of him, which was due in part, presumably, to her further reading and study of his works, as well as to the availability of better translations. Had Pardo Bazán been content merely to "plagiarize" Vogüé it is doubtful whether she would have embarked upon these further studies which clearly show a deep personal commitment to Russian literature and a desire to increase her knowledge in this area by whatever legitimate means she could.

In 1901 Pardo Bazán turned her attention away from Tolstoy, to focus it upon "Dos tendencias nuevas en la literatura rusa", namely "El hampa y la bohemia (Máximo Gorki)" and "La conciliación pagano-cristiana (Demetrio Merejkovski)"; this essay was published in *La Lectura* in April and May of that same year.²⁰³ Doña Emilia begins this study by recalling her earlier lectures in Madrid on Russian

literature, at a time when this was, she states “completamente desconocida en España”.²⁰⁴ She mentions in passing the recent excommunication of Tolstoy from the Orthodox Church and then takes up the main subject of her essay. She believes that, on the one hand, very little, if anything, is known about Gor’ky in Spain but

al segundo, Demetrio Merejkovski, por el contrario, acaban de hacerle popular aquí varias traducciones, creo que cuatro, publicadas casi a un tiempo, de su novela *La muerte de los dioses*.²⁰⁵

Gor’ky’s main achievement, she tells her readers, is “haber traído al campo de la novela rusa personajes desconocidos, capas sociales diferentes de las estudiadas hasta hoy...”. However, Pardo Bazán feels that her Spanish readers could relate very well to these types and recognize them without any difficulty, since they were very well known in Spanish literature and art. She makes her point in characteristically apt and witty terms:

Novedad será en Rusia la pintura del hampa y de la bohemia; en los países latinos, en España sobre todo, esa pintura corresponde a las escuelas clásicas del siglo XVII...En literatura y arte, los golfos y los filósofos bohemios de España, los Menipos de Velázquez, los Lazarillos de Hurtado, los pilluelos de Murillo, han puesto la infranqueable raya. ¿Qué nos vendrá a contar, a los compatriotas del señor Monipodio, el señor Arístides Fomitch, principal personaje de *Los ex hombres*, de Gorki? De ‘ex hombres’ estamos aquí hasta la gola. Los encontramos al paso, hoy como ayer, calentándose al sol, esperando el santo advenimiento de la peseta. Las pesquerías de Gorki son flor para nuestras almadrabas.²⁰⁶

Pardo Bazán gives a brief biography of Gor'ky and a short outline and analysis of some of his works. She mentions that her own favourite

entre las narraciones de Gorki que conozco... es
Malva...las más clara, las más artística, la más perfecta

and that only “nuestro Pereda ha trazado marinas como las dos admirables de Gorki en esta novelita...”.²⁰⁷ Velázquez, she announces, could have painted a magnificent portrait of “Konovalof... para retratar su torso hercúleo, su rutilante melena...”.²⁰⁸ She ends her synopsis of the work of Gor'ky with yet another extraordinarily apt and entertaining comparison between certain of Gor'ky's characters and the “pícaro español”:

Hay además, en los hampones eslavos, algo de delicado que no tiene jamás el pícaro latino. Contadle a Ginesillo de Pasamonte cómo un vago eslavo, muerto de hambre, devuelve un caballo que ha robado para comer por lástima del aldeano a quien el jaco pertenecía, y veréis como se ríe el truhán español.²⁰⁹

Before going on to study the second of the authors to whom this essay is devoted, Pardo Bazán makes a couple of “confessions” to her readers, first observing that:

La muerte de los dioses...más bien que de un ruso caritativo, místico, supersticioso, pesimista, nihilista, parece obra de un latino cultísimo, penetrado del ideal de la belleza según la conciben los pueblos agrupados a las orillas del Mediterráneo... Lo que nos admira es leer en la cubierta el erizado y difícil apellido de Merejkovski.²¹⁰

Her second “confession” is that she

ignoraba hasta la existencia de este autor que se nos revela con un libro hercúleo. Debo decir, en excusa de mi ignorancia, que si la novela ha abierto surco, del autor poquísimos han hablado, por ahora, nuestras habituales informadoras las revistas extranjeras.²¹¹

She then proceeds to give details of the author's life and works, and her final comment is that, even after a careful reading of *La muerte de los dioses*

insisto en admirarme de que sea ruso el autor. No concibo nada más diferente de Tolstoi, de los rusos en general, que Merejkovski...²¹²

In her final study of Russian literature Pardo Bazán once again returned to Tolstoy: in December 1910 and January 1911 *La Lectura* published her study "El conde Tolstoi".²¹³ This work is divided into two sections, the first entitled "El escritor" and the second "El redentor", these being, according to doña Emilia, the two essential aspects of Tolstoy. She begins by looking back to her own work of 1887 and remarks that:

Observo que no ha variado en lo esencial mi criterio respecto al asunto, no porque guste de encerrarme en lo ya dicho y pensado como en una cárcel, sino porque el desarrollo de aquel movimiento literario y de la personalidad de Tolstoi ha sido el que podía preverse, y hasta su muerte fue cual pudiera él soñarla.²¹⁴

She tells us too that since the year of her lectures and their subsequent publication:

Tolstoi se ha abierto camino en España y corren traducciones suyas en gran número...mas para descubrir el

rastró de sus doctrinas sociales y religiosas en el alma española, habría que aplicar muy despacio la lente. Hoy nuestra alma es como el corcho: ligera, seca, elástica, flotante.²¹⁵

In the first section of this essay Pardo Bazán describes certain of Tolstoy's works and gives her views regarding them. It is worth noting that she both mentions and discusses briefly *La muerte de Ivan Ilitch*, a work with which she is dealing here for the first time.²¹⁶ In passing, a reference is made to Pushkin; on this particular occasion Pardo Bazán compares him to Zorrilla. She laments her own lack of knowledge of Russian with great frankness and honesty:

Confieso y reconozco esta deficiencia: no saber el ruso, la lengua más rica, armoniosa, flexible y fértil de todas las europeas... No me consuela la certidumbre de que tampoco lo saben los demás, y quisiera ser la excepción, poseyendo la clave de una literatura como la rusa. Mi juicio, basado en traducciones, no puede ser acertado del todo.²¹⁷

In this essay Pardo Bazán finds many occasions to renew and develop the comparison between Tolstoy and Velázquez. To give but one example, she observes that Tolstoy, like the Spanish painter, was able to see “mas allá del arte, llegando a identificarse con las secretas fuerzas de la naturaleza...”²¹⁸ She reveals that she had carried out her own comparative study of *Anna Karenina* and *Madame Bovary*. She finds the former far superior to the latter and even goes as far as to suggest that there are places in *Anna Karenina* – “verbigracia, la entrevista de la madre con su hijo, el niño Sergio... en la que la emoción producida en el lector iguala a la que es capaz de producir a veces Shakespeare”.²¹⁹

While describing briefly some of Tolstoy's later *Tales* she recounts how “hablando de [*Los tres staretsi*] de Tolstoi, Alejandro Pidal me refirió una tradición

asturiana que es exactamente igual a la rusa...”; while discussing Tolstoy's *Kholstomer* she also alludes to *Rocinante*, again a well-found and thoughtful comparison.²²⁰

In the second section of this work, she tells how she had sought details about Tolstoy's life and family history “de otro amigo mío, el príncipe Gortchakof, que fue embajador de Rusia en Madrid”: the latter had informed her, however, that the Tolstoy family “no figuraba en primera línea, como, por ejemplo, en España la de Medinaceli”.²²¹ We are also told of the study of Tolstoy's life by Julián Juderías which had featured in *La Lectura* in December 1910, a study which Pardo Bazán had admired greatly.

She had known already of Tolstoy's spiritual crisis of the 1870s and of his subsequent “conversion”. This leads her to propose a very striking comparison between Tolstoy and a well-known figure from Spanish literature, imagining the moment when both Tolstoy and Don Juan Tenorio “received” intimations of their own mortality in the following way:

... me ocurre notar que, ni mas ni menos que estos burladores meridionales, bañados por el sol, el conde Tolstoi, entre sus hielos, rodeado de cosacos, baskires y mujicks, es otro que se convierte porque ante sus ojos pasa su propio cortejo fúnebre.²²²

She also sees a comparison between the life of Tolstoy after this “conversion” and that of St. Francis of Assisi and refers to

un cuadro de Murillo... que representa a San Francisco abrazando a Cristo, el cual, desde su cruz, desclava un brazo para corresponder a la caricia. El pie del Santo, al mismo tiempo, se apoya, rechazándola y pisoteándola, en una bola que es emblema del mundo... Comparemos el lienzo de Murillo con el famoso retrato de

Tolstoi arando, descalzo... y podremos decir que los pies desnudos del conde no pisotean al mundo; no hacen mas que apoyarse en la tierra.²²³

In the final lines of this essay doña Emilia finds another Spanish painting which, she feels, reflects something of Tolstoy's greatness, his convictions and the way of life which he had adopted shortly before his death. This time she mentions the "bello cuadro del Greco, que representa el martirio de San Mauricio y su legión".²²⁴

In her conclusion Pardo Bazán remarks that, sadly, the teachings of Tolstoy "no han encontrado eco". She describes for her readers details of Tolstoy's death, which she had felt to be "tan teatral y artísticamente hecha como el final de un drama de Ibsen...".²²⁵

The examples given in the course of this chapter illustrate something of the vastness of Pardo Bazán's undertaking and the immense scope of what she actually achieved in this field. In late 19th-century Spain and, indeed, in 20th-century Spain too, no-one could compete with her as a popularizing interpreter of Russian literature. Not only did she set herself the daunting task of presenting to her compatriots what amounted to a cultural and literary history of Russia, but, wherever possible, she endeavoured to make this as relevant as she could through comparisons between Russian and Spanish culture. Her studies were always thought-provoking, enthusiastic and well-organized; occasionally witty. She was well aware of her own shortcomings, her lack of knowledge of Russian being the greatest one, and she never tried to conceal the fact that she used other works to perfect or improve her own knowledge of this vast subject. Unlike Valera, she cannot convey the freshness of first-hand experiences. But what she does convey is an immense enthusiasm and a great love for Russian literature. The balance of evaluation, then, must fall decisively in her favour: more than anyone else, it was

Emilia Pardo Bazán who “brought” Russian literature to Spain in the last decades of the 19th century.

(d) THE PRESENCE OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE
 IN THE FICTIONAL WORLD OF PARDO BAZAN:
 A BRIEF SUMMARY

“The Russian novel was very close... to the realism
 of [Pardo Bazán], the great Spanish writer.”

V.E. Bagno²²⁶

Set against the epochal importance of her critical work on Russian literature, the possible impact of that literature within Pardo Bazán’s own fictional world remains a relatively minor theme. As has been noted, Pardo Bazán introduced new philosophical and religious tendencies into her fiction after 1890; and it may fairly be assumed that the influence of Tolstoy was a major one in this process.²²⁷ Indeed, certain of her later stories recall both in form and in content some of Tolstoy’s shorter works which had a clearly defined didactic aim. Tolstoy himself is the protagonist of two of these short prose works, *El conde llora* (1911) and *El conde sueña* (1911). In the first of these she imagines Tolstoy in a situation where he gives only “de su caridad burguesa” to a small boy who has asked him for “un potrito negro”.²²⁸ This is a very vivid and moving story, written from a clear moral standpoint. Here again, as she had done in her essays on Russian literature, she relates the Russian setting (the story takes place on Tolstoy’s estate) to a Spanish context – for example, in the following description of the child:

Si el conde hubiese sido ^{de} una naturaleza estética, el
 chiquillo, lejos de atraer su mirada, la rechazaría. Para los
 que conocen un cuadro célebre de Murillo, ‘Santa Isabel’, es

ocioso describir al muchacho que el conde contemplaba,
fascinado de compasión.²²⁹

In the second of these stories she imagines how “el místico ateo”, as she refers to Tolstoy, comes to a realization through a dream that “no basta dar pedazos de su carne, ni sangre de su corazón, cuando se ha concebido la idea redentora; hay que darse entero, o no aspirar a redimir...”.²³⁰ In the final lines, Pardo Bazán visualizes Tolstoy’s awakening from this dream and how “tuvo vergüenza de sí mismo...en su lecho, que prepararon manos amantes”.²³¹ Once again this is a powerful short prose work, without doubt written not only with Tolstoy present in the story itself, but with his ideas as part of the inspiration behind it. *El cerdo-hombre*, (1911) is another of her short stories which is set in Russia. It has been described how, as a direct result of his religious crisis,

Tolstoy ...wrote a number of short instructional works derived from popular legends and early Christian stories...frequently ending with aphoristic sayings or scripture quotations....²³²

I believe that similar words could also be used to describe many of Pardo Bazán’s later short prose works and that a more detailed study of many of those would reveal a marked influence of Tolstoy.

Bagno gives few details of a possible influence of Russian writers on Pardo Bazán’s fictional world, except for the reference mentioned earlier to *La cuestión palpitante* and a brief mention of Tolstoy’s presence within her writings, which he believes can be detected in two of her later works, *La quimera* and *La sirena negra*.²³³

On aggregate there was really no other intermediary who achieved as much as she did; it has to be remembered too, as we noted, that the 19th-century literary climate was marked by a considerable amount of prejudice against women writers.

Some, at least, of the criticism which her studies of Russian literature received from her male counterparts may, in fact, have been occasioned by their professional jealousy. Kirby comments:

Sin lugar a duda, la independencia de Emilia Pardo
Bazán...y su triunfo notable en un campo regido
tradicionalmente por el hombre irritaban a los críticos.²³⁴

In Russia at that time there was no woman writer or critic who could equal Pardo Bazán, as we have observed.²³⁵ Several women writers had published “society tales” in the earlier years of the 19th century, – for example, Countess Yevdokiia Rostopchina, – and Karolina Pavlova’s poetry was greatly appreciated later by the Symbolists.²³⁶ Doña Emilia’s role as Spain’s first female intellectual is a good deal more remarkable than any of these. Her exercise of that role in the domain of Russian literature was one of her most successful ventures.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER 2

- 1 Bagno quotes the extract from this famous letter in *Gogol' and World Literature*, ed. Khrapchenko (Moscow, 1988), p.181. S. Karlinsky, *The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol* (Chicago, 1992), p.119 notes too that Gogol' "got the idea [for *Diary of a Madman*] from Cervantes."
- 2 R. Peace, *The Enigma of Gogol'* (Cambridge, 1981), p.89.
- 3 See short list of critical works on Gogol' in the final bibliography of this thesis.
- 4 Bagno discusses this on p.198. Most of his information comes from Schanzer.
- 5 See, for example, Peace, p.29 for a fuller discussion of these revisions.
- 6 Bagno mentions this on pp.199–200.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 See Schanzer, p.85. As we note in the text, Schanzer makes no mention of details of these significant cuts.
- 9 Bagno, p.200.
- 10 Many other such examples could be cited.
- 11 Bagno does not offer any convincing explanation.
- 12 Schanzer, pp.84–85 notes first editions.
- 13 According to Schanzer's findings *Taras Bul'ba* had twenty different renderings from 1880 up till 1953. Schanzer, p..85–86.
- 14 Bagno discusses ^{this} on pp.202–203.

- 15 Karlinsky, p.77, suggests that this story “is probably [Gogol’s] best-known work. Almost everybody seems to like it.”
- 16 Bagno, p.204, discusses this.
- 17 Idem.
- 18 Idem.
- 19 Once again Bagno’s explanation is not totally convincing.
- 20 Peace, p.270.
- 21 R. Freeborn, *The Rise of the Russian Novel* (Cambridge, 1978), p.91. He also discusses further the function of the digression on pp.92–93.
- 22 Bagno, p.206.
- 23 See Schanzer, pp.82–87.
- 24 Ibid., p.87.
- 25 See brief selection of critical works on Valle-Inclán in final bibliography of this thesis. I believe that a most profitable comparative study could be carried out on this subject.
- 26 Juan Valera: *Obras Completas*, III (Madrid, 1958), pp.90–91. This will be further referred to as O.C. In this letter, sent to his friend don Leopoldo Augusto de Cueto, Valera realizes that two of his previous letters to him, one from Berlin, another from Warsaw, had been published in Spain. Having found this out, Valera assures his friend that in future letters he will try to amuse his readers, since his correspondence is to be published. It is justifiable therefore to refer to Valera’s ”readers” in the context of these letters.
- 27 Enrique Cremades, ed., *Juan Valera* (Madrid, 1990), p.11.
- 28 Valera’s letters are contained in O.C., 111, pp.76–206.

- 29 Freeborn, p.1.
- 30 For a background study of this period see, for example, *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, ed. C. Moser (Cambridge, 1992), chapter V.
- 31 Ibid., p.251.
- 32 Ibid., p.298.
- 33 E. Cremades recent collection of articles (see note 27), does not contain any material dealing either with Valera's stay in Russia or with his letters.
- 34 This letter is quoted by Carmen Bravo-Villasante, *Vida de Juan Valera* (Madrid, 1974). She deals with his stay in Russia on pp.114–117.
- 35 Ibid., p.16.
- 36 Carmen Bravo-Villasante gives further details and quotes unpublished materials (prior to 1974) on pp.114–117.
- 37 Bagno, *Emilia Pardo Bazán and Russian Literature in Spain*, discusses this in chapter one.
- 38 Details of this interesting episode are given in *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, 250–252, (1971–72), 737–755.
- 39 Valera, O.C. 111, p.143.
- 40 Carmen Bravo-Villasante, p.114.
- 41 Juan Valera, O.C. 111, pp.161–162, describes the beginnings of this relationship. The description which Valera gives of Magdalena Brohan on p.163, bears a certain similarity to his descriptions of the fictional Pepita Jiménez in the novel of that name.
- 42 Carmen Bravo-Villasante discusses this on pp.116–117.

- 43 Valera, O.C. 111, p.91 Russian interest in *Don Quijote* has always been great. See, for example, N.I. Balashov et al., eds., *Cervantes and World Literature* (Moscow, 1969). The earliest Russian translation of Cervantes's novel was a version made from the French translation of Fillean de St. Martin and it appeared in 1768.
- 44 Juan Valera, O.C. 111, p.91.
- 45 Schanzer, p.120.
- 46 A detailed study of the reception of Spanish literature in Russia does not come within the parameters of this thesis.
- 47 Valera, O.C. 111, p.122.
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Ibid., p.123.
- 50 Ibid.
- 51 *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, p.136.
- 52 Valera, O.C.111, pp.123–124.
- 53 Ibid., p.124.
- 54 Ibid., p.173.
- 55 Ibid., p.175.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Bagno, p.14.
- 58 Valera, O.C. 111, p.175.
- 59 Ibid.

- 60 Ibid.
- 61 Bagno discusses this too on p.14.
- 62 Valera, O.C. 111, p.175.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Ibid.
- 65 O.K. Vasil'eva–Shvede, “Juan Valera’s Letter in the Archives of S.A. Sobolevskii”, in *Russo-European Literary Relations* (Moscow, 1966), pp.371–373.
- 66 Bagno reproduces this letter in full on pp.12–13.
- 67 Pío Baroja, *Obras Completas*, III, p.832. Ibid., p.709.
- 68 Ibid.
- 69 Juan Valera, *Epistolario de Valera a Menéndez y Pelayo* (Santander, 1946), p.399.
- 70 Ibid.
- 71 Ibid.
- 72 Ibid.
- 73 Manuel Bermejo Marcos, *Don Juan Valera, crítico literario* (Madrid, 1968), p.197.
- 74 Nelly Clémessy, *Emilia Pardo Bazán*, I (Paris, 1973), p.811.
- 75 Bermejo Marcos, p.197.
- 76 Ibid.

- 77 Ibid.
- 78 Ibid.
- 79 Emilia Pardo Bazán, *Obras Completas*, III (Madrid, 1973), p.760. This will be referred to further as O.C. 111.
- 80 L. Edmondson, ed., *Women and Society in Russian and the Soviet Union* (Cambridge, 1990). This is quoted by Charlotte Rosenthal, p.34.
- 81 Ibid., p.32.
- 82 A selected list of these works will be given in the final bibliography of this thesis.
- 83 V.E. Bagno, *Emilia Pardo Bazán and Russian Literature in Spain* (Leningrad, 1982).
- 84 This essay will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.
- 85 Bagno, p.12.
- 86 Pardo Bazán, O.C. III, p.760.
- 87 Ibid.
- 88 Tikhomirov, in conjunction with another Russian exile, had published *La Russie politique et social* in 1886 in Paris. Louis Viardot, husband of the opera singer Pauline and friend of Turgenev, had also translated *Don Quijote* into French. It is possible that Pardo Bazán met Pauline García Viardot through their mutual friend Pavlovsky, but Pardo Bazán never refers to her. Bagno briefly discusses Pardo Bazán's friendship with Pavlovsky.
- 89 See note 88.
- 90 Clémessy, vol.1, p.112.

- 91 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C.III, p.645.
- 92 See note 58, above.
- 93 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C.III, p.760.
- 94 Ibid.
- 95 Ibid., pp.879-880.
- 96 Vicomte Melchior de Vogüé, *Le Roman russe* (Paris, 1886).
- 97 Clémessy, vol.I, p.112. She also gives a list of his other works on Russian literature.
- 98 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C.III, p.760.
- 99 Benito Pérez Galdós, *La revolución en Rusia: Conferencias de Emilia Pardo Bazán* (Madrid, 1932), p.203. See too Carmen Bravo-Villasante's account of this relationship in *Emilia Pardo Bazán - Cartas a Galdós* (Madrid, 1975).
- 100 Galdós, p.230.
- 101 Bagnò, chapter I, discusses this.
- 102 Ibid., p.11.
- 103 Clémessy, vol.I, p.113 and Juan Ventura Agudiez, *La Cruz* (Oviedo, 1970), p.140.
- 104 See W. Pattison, *El naturalismo español* (Madrid, 1965), p.133.
- 105 Portnoff, p.36.

- 106 K.N. Derzhavin, "Russian Literature in Spain", *Nauch. biul.*, 14–15 (1947), 42-45. It has to be stated, however, that Derzhavin follows Portnoff in most matters.
- 107 Enrique Díez Canedo, *Conversaciones literarias* (Madrid, 1932), p.235.
- 108 Clémessy, vol.I, pp.116-118, discusses this.
- 109 "Clarín", *Cartas a Galdós*, in "Revista de Occidente" (Madrid, 1964), p.240.
- 110 Ibid.
- 111 Carmen Bravo–Villasante discusses this in *Emilia Pardo Bazán – Cartas a Galdós*, p.125.
- 112 Portnoff, pp.38–39.
- 113 Bagnò discusses this in chapter one.
- 114 Ibid.
- 115 J.B. Pastor Aicart, *Cartas críticas* (Madrid, 1986), p.235.
- 116 R.E. Osborne, *Emilia Pardo Bazán: su vida y sus obras* (Mexico, 1964), p.83.
- 117 V.V. Rachmanov, "Russian Literature in Spain", *Iazyk i lit.*, V, (1930), pp.329–349.
- 118 Bagnò, p.14
- 119 Rachmanov, p.329.
- 120 Clémessy, vol.I, p.119.
- 121 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C.III. The first quotation is taken from p.855 and the second one from p.805.

- 122 Ibid., p.xiii.
- 123 Ibid., p.5
- 124 Idem. A full study of the impact of Tolstoy on Pardo Bazán's later works would be very profitable.
- 125 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C.III, pp.762–763.
- 126 Ibid., p.801
- 127 Ibid., p.802.
- 128 Ibid., p.804.
- 129 Ibid., p.807.
- 130 Ibid., p.821.
- 131 Ibid., p.823.
- 132 Ibid., p.825.
- 133 Ibid.
- 134 Ibid., p.832.
- 135 Bagno mentions this on p. 204.
- 136 Idem.
- 137 Idem.
- 138 Pardo Bazán even has the correct spelling of Taras's son's name.
- 139 Pardo Bazán, O.C. 111, p.835.

- 140 Ibid., p.837. Pardo Bazán also comments on the differences, as she saw them, between Chichikov and Don Quijote. At this point she presents a fairly lengthy comparative study of the two novels, using her own personal observations.
- 141 Ibid..
- 142 Ibid., p.842.
- 143 Ibid., p.854.
- 144 Ibid., p.857.
- 145 Ibid., p.859.
- 146 Ibid., p.879.
- 147 Ibid.
- 148 Bagno discusses this in chapter one.
- 149 Portnoff, p.44
- 150 W. Pattison, *Emilia Pardo Bazán* (New York, 1971), p.50.
- 151 Sainz Robles in *Emilia Pardo Bazán*, O.C. 1, p.59.
- 152 As stated in the text, I feel that she acknowledges her use of Vogüé openly and frequently.
- 153 Clémessy, vol. 1, p.125.
- 154 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C. 111, p.855.
- 155 Clémessy, vol. 1, p.125.
- 156 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C. 111, p.863.

- 157 Ibid., p.862.
- 158 Ibid., p.862.
- 159 Ibid., p.861. In her section on Dostoevsky she frequently acknowledges her debt to Vogüé.
- 160 Ibid.
- 161 Clémessy, vol. 1 , p.129.
- 162 Pedro Albuin, *Presencia de Curros y doña Emilia* (Vigo, 1951), pp.53-54.
- 163 Clémessy, vol. 1 , p.129.
- 164 Juan Valera, O.C. II, p.707.
- 165 *Epistolario de Valera a Menéndez y Pelayo*, p.399.
- 166 Valera, O.C.II, p.708.
- 167 Ibid., p.709.
- 168 Ibid.
- 169 Ibid., p.710.
- 170 See, for example, L. Grossman, *Balzac and Dostoevsky* (Ann Arbor, 1973).
- 171 Valera, O.C.II, p.709.
- 172 Ibid., p.712.
- 173 Sergio Beser, *Leopoldo Alas: Crítico literario* (Madrid, 1968), p.336.
- 174 This will be discussed in chapter four of this thesis.

- 175 Beser, p.337.
- 176 Francisco de Asís de Icaza, *Examen de críticos* (Madrid, 1894), pp.109–126.
- 177 Details of this will be discussed in the next chapter of this thesis. Biographical references will be given there too.
- 178 Pío Baroja, *Obras Completas*, vol.III, p.832.
- 179 Clémessy, vol.I, p.145.
- 180 Ibid.
- 181 Schanzer's conclusions regarding the popularity of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky are given in the next chapter of this thesis.
- 182 See note 181 above.
- 183 Clémessy, vol. 1, p.145.
- 184 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C. 111, p.786.
- 185 Pattison, p.56.
- 186 Bagno discusses this in his final chapter.
- 187 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C.III, p.1236.
- 188 Very little mention has been made of these later essays despite the fact that they are, in my opinion, both original and, in places, very perceptive.
- 189 Details of the significance of *The Kreutzer Sonata* and its possible influence on "Clarín"'s novel *Su único hijo* will be mentioned in the fourth chapter of this thesis.
- 190 Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C. 111, pp.984-985.

- 191 Ibid., p.990.
- 192 Ibid., p.991.
- 193 Ibid., pp.992-993.
- 194 Ibid., p.992.
- 195 Ibid., p.994.
- 196 Ibid., p.993.
- 197 Ibid.
- 198 Ibid., pp.1436–1457.
- 199 Ibid., p.1437.
- 200 Ibid., pp.1218–1221.
- 201 Ibid., p.1219.
- 202 Ibid.
- 203 Ibid., p.1236–1248.
- 204 Ibid., p.1236.
- 205 Ibid.
- 206 Ibid., p.1237.
- 207 Ibid., p.1241.
- 208 Ibid.
- 209 Ibid., p.1242.

- 210 Ibid.
- 211 Ibid.
- 212 Ibid., p.1247.
- 213 Ibid., pp.1497–1519.
- 214 Ibid., p.1497.
- 215 Ibid.
- 216 Ibid., p.1498.
- 217 Ibid., p.1502.
- 218 Ibid., p.1503.
- 219 Ibid.
- 220 Ibid., p.1507.
- 221 Ibid., p.1509.
- 222 Ibid., p.1510.
- 223 Ibid., p.1511–1512.
- 224 Ibid., p.1518.
- 225 Ibid., p.1519.
- 226 Bagnò, p.14.
- 227 A most profitable detailed study could be carried out, as has been noted, regarding the influence of Tolstoy on her later short prose works. Such a study does not come within the parameters of this thesis.

- 228 Both of these short stories are contained in Pardo Bazán, O.C. III – *El Conde llora*, pp.392–395, and *El conde sueña* pp.395–398.
- 229 Ibid., p.393.
- 230 Ibid., p.397.
- 231 Ibid.
- 232 Julian Connolly, in *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, p.340.
- 233 Bagno, “Lev Tolstoy and 19th-Century Spanish Writers”, in *Russkaia literatura*, 3, (1978), 85. *La quimera* is contained in Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C.I, pp.705–899, and *La sirena negra* is in O.C.II, pp.871-929.
- 234 Kirby, introduction to Emilia Pardo Bazán, O.C.III, p.xv.
- 235 See, for example, Richard Peace, in *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, p.235, for a discussion on Pavlova and also Charlotte Rosenthal, “The Silver Age: highpoint for women?” in ed. Linda Edmondson, ^{*Women and Society*} pp.40–42. Rosenthal notes, for example, on p. 41 that “Pavlova appealed to women poets of the early twentieth century. After all, she was an outstanding example of a singular dedication to a poetic calling.” Her achievements cannot, however, be compared in any way with those of Pardo Bazán.
- 236 Women writers in Russia will be discussed more fully in chapter four.

CHAPTER 3

(A) PIO BAROJA AND RUSSIAN LITERATURE

(1) INTRODUCTION

“La mayoría de la gente es gente sin olfato. Hay personas que tienen inteligencia, pero no tienen olfato; es decir, no tienen intuición. Los escritores franceses no vieron en su tiempo, al aparecer las obras de Dostoyevski en traducciones, el carácter único y extraño de este autor.”

Pío Baroja¹

“Where Shakespeare had spoken of holding the mirror up to nature, Stendhal undertook to put it on wheels and send it traveling down the highway... Though Kafka seems both more and less than a realist, he may be finally what Dostoevsky considered himself ‘a realist in the higher sense’, portraying ‘all the depth of the human soul’. Neither the grim fantasies of Kafka nor the psychological inquests of Dostoevsky would be convincing to us, if they were not presented so realistically”.

H. Levin²

In acknowledging 19th-century Russian literature’s great debt to the works of Gogol’, Dostoevsky’s alleged remark that “we all came out from under Gogol”’s *Overcoat* has been endlessly quoted and may indeed “have its own truth”.³ Many important Spanish writers at the end of the 19th century and in the early years of the

20th century owe a similar debt to Emilia Pardo Bazán for her accurate and vigorous presentation of Russian literature to them. It has already been seen that as a direct result of her pioneering work in this field both Galdós and “Clarín” came to be great admirers of Russian literature. The full force and attraction of its example, however, can most clearly be felt in the work of a writer somewhat later in date – Pío Baroja.

Baroja (1872-1956) was a lifelong admirer and critic of Russian literature, in particular of Dostoevsky. Through his essays and autobiographical writings and in his fictional world, Baroja followed the lead given by Pardo Bazán in establishing important links between Spanish and Russian culture. Through the course of his long life he consolidated certain of these links. Baroja lived through many important political and historical events affecting Spain and Russia; for example, as a young man he experienced the crisis of Spain’s decline in 1898. He would, of course, have known of the Russian Revolution of 1917, and the subsequent Civil War there; he not only lived through Spain’s Civil War, but experienced two World Wars as well. During the whole extended span of a life lived against this momentous background, he displayed an unflagging interest in Russian literature. His first critical articles on the subject appeared when he was barely twenty; as an old man, he produced a perceptive and original article on Dostoevsky, written at a time of political “hostility” between Spain and Russia. In the autobiographical and other essays of the intervening years, the name of Dostoevsky constantly recurs with repeated testimonies of Baroja’s respect for his greatness as a writer. Inevitably Dostoevsky influenced Baroja’s own novelistic world in terms of ideas; we shall examine certain of these responses in a later section of this chapter. If Pardo Bazán’s great achievement as a cultural intermediary had been to present an overall, well-organized picture of Russian literature – then Baroja’s outstanding feat in this same area must surely be that over the course of many years he gave his readers a much greater insight into works of Dostoevsky. His interest in Dostoevsky and the Russian’s influence on his practice

as a writer are important historically in two contexts. First, there is the fact that Baroja belongs to the “98 Generation” (though his own views on the existence of this “Generation” are ambivalent, to say the least). Secondly, Baroja’s works in their turn have been particularly influential on subsequent generations of writers in Spain and Latin America. Thanks to his efforts, readers throughout the Hispanic World came to know and to understand Dostoevsky at a much deeper level. It follows that, next to Pardo Bazán, Baroja should, in my opinion, be regarded as the second major intermediary between the Spanish and Russian cultures.

Looking back on writers and novelists who had formed his literary background, Baroja readily acknowledges:

Dostoevski siempre conserva interés y curiosidad para mí, siempre encuentro en él extrañas sorpresas. Es un autor que llevo leyendo ya hace más de cuarenta y cinco años, del que escribí un pequeño artículo a los veinte, y del cual voy teniendo un concepto que va cambiando con el tiempo.⁴

José Alberich, assisted by Baroja’s nephew Julio Caro Baroja, has compiled a list of the books found in Baroja’s library at “Itzea”. A significant part of the literature section was devoted to the Russian classics and other Russian works.⁵ In what Alberich classes as “novela moderna” there are some eighty Russian titles listed, and these form an extremely original selection for a Spaniard of those times:

... nos limitamos a reproducir una lista de los novelistas rusos representados en “Itzea”, con el único propósito de mostrar que son más de los ordinariamente conocidos en España. La mayoría en traducciones francesas: Tolstoi, Dostoiewski, Turgeniev, Gogol, Pushkin, Lermontoff, León Chestov, Vasilií Vereschagin, Korolenko,

Gorki, Tchékov, Iván Gontcharov, Constantin Fedin, Leónidas Andreiev, Artzibachev, Alejo Kuprin, Fedor Sologub, Iván Chmélov, Iván Bunin, Iván Byarne, Dimitri Merejkowski.⁶

Like Valera and Pardo Bazán, Baroja had no knowledge of Russian and, although on many occasions he was invited to visit Russia, he never did so because of his dislike and disapproval of the Soviet political system. It is clear that his great interest in matters Russian was not confined solely to Dostoevsky. The library list alone is evidence of that. In his essays, too, he mentions many Russian writers and their works. The fact that, like his Spanish forerunners, he had to rely on French translations might have deterred him, but did not.⁷ This outcome had, in his case, a special significance, well observed by Alberich:

Otra cosa que me chocó fue que Baroja, a pesar de su galofobia en política y literatura, hubiese leído más libros en francés que en ninguna otra lengua, incluyendo la suya. La inmensa mayoría de sus libros de historia, filosofía, crítica literaria, novela, poesía y teatro, son franceses o están traducidos al francés, Sus novelistas predilectos, ingleses y rusos, los tuve que leer en traducciones francesas...⁸

After training as a doctor, Baroja presented a thesis entitled *El dolor: Estudio de psico-física*.⁹ Although he only practised medicine for a short time, he retained a lifelong interest in psychology and in the fast developing area of psychiatry. Again, given the number of books in his library which deal with this subject, it is clear that Baroja was especially interested in studying the workings of the criminal and of the abnormal mind. Alberich makes the following observations:

Muy de esperar, conociendo la preocupación del novelista por las razas humanas y otros temas

antropológicos, era la presencia de esta clase de obras en su biblioteca, entre las cuales ocupan lugar importante las dedicadas a un tema tan típicamente finisecular como el de la “patología del genio”. Allí están los más conocidos libros de este género, *Les grands hommes* de W. Ostwald...*Las enfermedades de la personalidad*, de Th. Ribot, y *L’homme criminel* y *L’homme de génie* de Lombroso...Las obras de...psicología abundan con Freud, Marañón...¹⁰

Baroja recognized Claude Bernard’s *Introduction à l’étude de la médecine expérimentale* as being one of his “guías espirituales” and Ciplijauskaitė believes that from this work Baroja had even learned

a entender el procedimiento...de novelista. Insiste Bernard en que la observación sola no es suficiente: es sólo el primer paso, y se puede considerar casi como una fase pasiva. Sobre los hechos observados hay que añadir razonamiento, puesto que “l’observation montre et l’expérience instruit”.¹¹

Another discovery in Baroja’s library which surprised Alberich, given Baroja’s well-known aversion to most manifestations of religion, was his collection of religious books; Alberich discusses this and mentions too the comments of Julio Caro Baroja:

Una de las cosas que más nos sorprendió en nuestra visita fue encontrar una pequeña colección de libros religiosos, casi todos antiguos, y que Baroja tenía en gran respeto, según nos comunicó Julio Caro...Caro me obsequió, además, con una revelación muy interesante: durante su estancia en París a raíz de la guerra civil española,

don Pío solía leer un Nuevo Testamento, que se conserva profundamente subrayado por él.¹²

The presence of the above material in Baroja's library suggests that at least two major aspects of Dostoevsky's writing would have held a special interest for him. Taking into account his medical training and his interest in psychology, Dostoevsky's analysis and presentation of what Freud described as "abnormal psychology" must surely have fascinated Baroja and possibly even influenced (or, at least, coincided with) his own thinking in this field. Less expectedly – and perhaps in less obvious ways – Dostoevsky's constant search for religious truths may be seen as evoking its own kind of response from Baroja.¹³

Before turning to examine Baroja's stated views on Dostoevsky, it is appropriate to consider briefly Baroja's position in relation to the so-called "generación del 98". He states:

Yo siempre he afirmado que no creía que existiera una generación del 98 ... Una generación que no tiene puntos de vista comunes, ni aspiraciones iguales, ni solidaridad espiritual, ni siquiera el nexo de la edad, no es una generación.¹⁴

He even denies that the date was an authentic one, and to his own question: "¿Había algo de común en la generación del 98?", his reply is quite definitive: "Yo creo que nada."¹⁵ He does, nevertheless, allow that the writers usually associated with this literary group (Azorín, Unamuno, Ganivet), maintained a certain common ideal, namely that

...todos aspirábamos a hacer algo que estuviera bien, dentro de nuestras posibilidades. Este ideal no sólo no es político, sino casi antipolítico, y es de todos los países y de todos los tiempos, principalmente de la gente joven.¹⁶

Baroja firmly believed that the main literary mentors of the young Spanish writers of that period were not native but foreign. He lists Shakespeare, Carlyle, Flaubert and Dostoevsky as those who provided the main sources of inspiration for those aspiring Spanish thinkers and writers.¹⁷ But to those who would wish to search for and produce a scheme of the main ideas of the “Generation”, Baroja answers with a half-humorous reference to Hegel:

Ni del horno hegeliano, en donde se fundían las tesis y las antítesis, hubiera podido salir una síntesis con los componentes heterogéneos de nuestra famosa generación.¹⁸

To clinch his arguments against the existence of this literary generation, Baroja turns to a series of examples in which the name of Dostoevsky is again prominent:

Si hay algo nuevo y característico en esta supuesta generación del 98, que yo creo que no lo hay, no es más que un último aliento que viene de fuera, de romanticismo y de individualismo.

Nietzsche, Ibsen, Dostoyevski, etc., no representan más que eso. Ni ellos, dentro de su carácter grande y desmesurado, aunque hubieran vivido cerca, hubiesen podido formar un grupo político, ni nosotros, con unas proporciones reducidas, tampoco.¹⁹

Here, in fact, Baroja almost coincides with the critic Fernández Almagro who, in arguing precisely the opposite case – that is to say, the real existence of an “1898 generation” – stresses the enormous importance of “los novelistas rusos recién descubiertos” on its members.²⁰

What is striking about the passage just quoted is Baroja's choice of two terms in particular to be associated with the literary achievements of Dostoevsky: "romanticismo" and "individualismo". The young Dostoevsky had ample contact with Romanticism – Schiller, for example, had been a very important influence on him – but Dostoevsky stands at a cultural watershed. If Romanticism had represented an important factor in Dostoevsky's formation as a writer, nevertheless, as Alex de Jonge points out, Dostoevsky later "freed himself from the rhetoric of Romanticism, if not from its essential concerns; his mature work points forward rather than back and is closer in feel to our own age".²¹ Critics of Baroja's own work have on many occasions said very similar things.²² With reference to the term "individualismo" as Baroja applies it to Dostoevsky, what he had, in fact, perceived was, surely, the latter's preoccupation with the ultimate alienation of the individual in the post-Romantic era, "in a world which could only satisfy the appetites and...could not meet spiritual needs".²³

Referring to Dostoevsky's position at the point of transition between two eras, de Jonge makes the following claim:

Dostoevsky develops the themes of Romantic literature and goes on to record a particular state of culture – the moment before it comes apart. He is, above all, concerned with offering a study in depth of the Gadarene swine, as they break from a trot into a canter. He describes the divided society in which every man is out for himself...²⁴

(These last words point to a theme given one of its most characteristic 19th-century expressions in the title of Baroja's trilogy *La lucha por la vida*.)²⁵

Like Dostoevsky, Baroja developed certain themes of Romantic literature, his legacy from preceding generations of Spanish writers, but as Dostoevsky had

done in Russia, Baroja also helped to bring Spanish literature into a new modern era.

To conclude this introductory section, Baroja would have found in the works of Dostoevsky themes and ideas to stimulate his own artistic creation. On a discursive level, too, he responded at length, in articles, essays and literary reminiscences, to the enormous source of interest which Dostoevsky provided. Dostoevsky's acute penetration into and understanding of the abnormal states of mind into which people are often driven and his sometimes well-nigh clinical examination of these conditions, gripped both the critical attention and the creative imagination of Baroja. He later acknowledged this debt in the essay "El desdoblamiento psicológico de Dostoyevski", a critical study which must have led many readers to look more closely at Dostoevsky or to reassess their judgment of him.²⁶ Another feature of Dostoevsky's work which would have been of great interest to Baroja (as, later, to Unamuno) was the "dichotomy between faith and reason."²⁷ To quote but one example from Baroja's own work, this very subject plays a central role in *El cura de Monleón*.²⁸ With regard to this novel, Francisco Pérez notes:

Baroja no supo resolver la "contradictio oppositorum" que para él presentaban la razón y la fe, y cuando intentó acercarse con mayor detenimiento e información, y sospecho que no sin cierta inquietud, a una intimidad sacerdotal, no pudo por menos de hacer derivar a su personaje, *El cura de Monleón* hacia el escepticismo y el acabamiento.²⁹

Similar claims made by Boyce-Gibson concerning Dostoevsky's own struggle to reconcile the concepts of faith and reason, as presented in his later novels, could, to some extent, be applied to Baroja's own problematics in this particular area:

[Dostoevsky] grew up at a time and in a country where there was both “faith” (among the people) and “reason” (among rootless intellectuals), and no facilities for interchange or compromise. “Reason” was presented to him as antithetical to “faith” as something which could flourish without or even against “reason”. Again and again he tried to formulate their incommensurability; in novel after novel he tested his “prose” advances towards God and relentlessly found them wanting.³⁰

Baroja had highlighted Romanticism as forming an important part of Dostoevsky’s novelistic world, but he had also been attracted by the latter’s portrayal of characters who belong to the post-Romantic era. These individuals are at odds with and essentially alienated from their environment in a much more tragic way than their Romantic counterparts had been. Baroja, like Dostoevsky, stands at a similar cultural watershed in this respect too, as Matus comments:

Este encabalgamiento en dos siglos, en dos épocas literarias tan diferentes, que afecta a la obra de Baroja, determina y explica también algunos aspectos de su técnica novelesca. Al siglo XIX debe Baroja el interés por lo anecdótico, la variedad de elementos, el carácter pintoresco, claroscuro, sentimental... también la concepción del mundo de la aventura, la afición por lo rememorativo y ensoñador, el gusto por lo antiguo ... Al siglo XX debe Baroja la angustia vital existencialista...³¹

Finally there were ethical questions posed by Dostoevsky to which Baroja responded; in *Galería de tipos de la época*, for example, he points out:

Además, hay que reconocer que, modernamente, la gran literatura europea ha sido moralista: Dickens, Tolstoi, Dostoyevski, Ibsen, se han distinguido por su sentido ético, y no se pueden comparar estos hombres con los que han tenido la tendencia contraria como ... Oscar Wilde, Jean Lorrain... y otros por el estilo.³²

Ciplijauskaité comments as follows with regard to the presence of ethics and justice within Baroja's own fictional world: "la justicia – o más bien la falta de ella – preocupa hondamente a Pío Baroja, y en su obra palpita una desilusión constante al ver lo que los hombres hacen con ella."³³ Baroja's treatment of the topic, however, is much closer to that of Dostoevsky than to other 19th-century writers, such as Gogol', Dickens and Dumas, all of whom Baroja held in great esteem. In their works he had observed that "la distancia entre los 'buenos' y los 'malos' es demasiado evidente, el castigo final demasiado arbitrario".³⁴ In the later works of Dostoevsky the concept of justice is seen as an ethical value in its own right and often as a matter of choice for the individual. Within these very similar views of justice, then, are to be found,

las angustias personales que en el siglo XX cuajarán en la responsabilidad de elección individual abogada por los existencialistas. Baroja se halla más cerca de éstos que sus autores predilectos del siglo XIX.³⁵

The sources of inspiration which Baroja was able to find in Dostoevsky should be clear enough from the foregoing. Before examining how this inspiration translated itself into Baroja's own fictional world, it will be instructive to look at Baroja's critical responses to Dostoevsky, from his very early articles to the mature and polished essay "El desdoblamiento psicológico de Dostoyevski."

(2) EARLY CRITICISM

“Cuando yo estudiaba el cuarto año de Medicina se me ocurrió enviar algunos artículos, uno de ellos sobre Dostoiewski, a *La Unión Liberal*, de San Sebastián, donde me los publicaron.”

Pío Baroja³⁶

Unlike Pardo Bazán, whose interest in Russian literature came to fruition when she had already established a reputation for herself as a writer, Baroja became intensely interested in that country's literature while still a medical student.³⁷ He knew and greatly admired Pardo Bazán's work on Russian literature; he had studied Valera's *Cartas desde Rusia*.³⁸ He also knew the works on Russian literature of St. René Taillandier, Xavier Marmier, Vogüé and Mackenzie Wallace, all of which had been translated into Spanish.³⁹ The thirteen short articles which Baroja published in *La Unión Liberal* in 1890, under the title of *La literatura rusa* seem, in fact, to have been largely forgotten by him later in life; in his *Memorias*, for example, he refers briefly to only one article which he had written on Dostoevsky.⁴⁰

However, a slightly closer look at these early pieces by Baroja will provide certain interesting insights; they reveal, apart from Baroja's own youthful enthusiasm for certain Russian authors, the birth of his great talent as a literary critic; they document the earliest phase of what was to be a lifelong passion for Russian literature, and in particular for Dostoevsky. Among the Russian writers who feature in these early articles are Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. At this stage, there is no article dedicated to the works of Maksim Gor'ky; Baroja was not to discover Gor'ky until much later, when he was in Paris.⁴¹ In

these early articles Baroja also includes, as Pardo Bazán had done, a study of nihilism.⁴²

The collection of articles begins with a brief account of Russia's *Cuentos populares*, and Baroja notes, with what have been described as “un par de frases dignas del gran intuitivo que fue Baroja”,

Hoy la literatura rusa está llamada a producir una revolución política y una revolución literaria. Revolución política porque está haciendo grandes brechas en la tiranía, y revolución literaria porque el moderno naturalismo ruso es la expresión más completa de la novela naturalista.⁴³

It is interesting that like Pardo Bazán before him, Baroja also chooses at the very beginning of his study to mention the link between “revolución” and “novela”.⁴⁴ In this introductory section too Baroja explains some of the words used in Russian folk-lore – “gore”, he tells his readers, means “desgracia”, and “beda” is “miseria”.

In the first three articles Baroja deals with early Russian literature. Here, as Salaverri rightly concludes, “se nota el carácter libresco de los conocimientos del joven redactor, que copia y transmite datos sobre autores que no ha leído, según libros de crítica que ha compulsado”.⁴⁵ Yet, in a similar way to Pardo Bazán, Baroja does include certain of his own stimulating observations. For example, in his first article he considers the “encarnaciones del mal” as they appear in early Russian folk-lore.⁴⁶ In the second article, entitled “Desde su origen hasta fines del siglo XVIII”, Baroja begins by considering the influences of Catholicism and Orthodoxy on their respective countries and makes the following perceptive comment:

Así como la religión católica, con su poético misticismo, ha contribuido en mucho a la grandeza de la literatura de la raza latina, así también la griega cismática,

fría, seca y poca imaginativa, influye grandemente en la eslava.⁴⁷

It is apparent too from this second article that Baroja was much impressed by both the scientific and the literary achievements of Lomonosov, whose biography he briefly supplies. In this third short article, —"El clasicismo", Baroja rightly stresses the importance of Karamzin, mentioning not only his literary works, amongst them *La pobre Lisa*, but also his historical studies and, noting that: "Como historiador es el más notable de Rusia".⁴⁸

However, from his fourth article onwards, a much more personal note can be detected; as Salaverri comments, there are "elementos de apreciación que se nos antoja proceden de una lectura de los textos y autores citados".⁴⁹ In the fourth and fifth articles Baroja examines "El romanticismo", and in the course of these two short essays he deals with Pushkin - "el gran poeta" - and Lermontov - "el Byron ruso"; these studies reveal a certain familiarity on Baroja's part with at least some works by these authors.⁵⁰ He begins his appraisal of Russian Romanticism by attempting to define its salient features and he observes correctly that it was not

tan autoritario y despótico como el romanticismo francés...[y]...no hubo en Rusia partidarios acérrimos ni enemigos furibundos; su aparición fue el tránsito de una literatura decadente a otra que nacía vigorosa...⁵¹

Of Pushkin's works, Baroja valued most highly "la tragedia *Boris Godunoff*, magnífica obra...que fue escrita por su autor después de un estudio profundo de las obras de Shakespeare..." But, curiously, he does not even mention Pushkin's vitally important first completed prose work *The Tales of Belkin* or his *Queen of Spades*. As for Pushkin's great "novel in verse" this is what he has to say about it:

Entre sus novelas, *Eugenio Onegin* es la más conocida. Contiene bellísimas descripciones de la vida frívola de San Petersburgo.⁵²

However, in the following article, which concludes his short presentation of the major features of Russian Romanticism (as he saw them), Baroja does partially redress the balance in Pushkin's favour by affirming that:

A fines del primer tercio del siglo XIX, multitud de escritores siguieron las huellas de Pouschkine, unos en la poesía lírica y en el drama, y otros en la novela y en el cuento.⁵³

According to Baroja, Lermontov “[se] propuso ser el Don Juan de la sociedad rusa...”, but he notes too, rather unkindly perhaps, that in this regard “no le acompañaba mucho su figura, pues era bajo, contrahecho y de una fealdad supina...”⁵⁴ Whereas Pardo Bazán had highlighted a comparison between the poetry of Pushkin and that of Espronceda, Baroja sees the true comparison as existing between Espronceda and Lermontov. For Baroja, Lermontov's poetry in general had a “gran fuerza poética”. But in dealing with what he calls “la novela, *El héroe de nuestro tiempo*”, he refers to the enigmatic and fascinating Pechorin merely as “un personaje repulsivo y antipático.”⁵⁵ It is to be wondered if a more mature Baroja might have revised this judgement somewhat; Pardo Bazán, for example, had held Pechorin in very high esteem.⁵⁶ At the very least Pechorin offered an admirable opportunity for an extended comparison with Don Juan.

In the five following articles Baroja attempts to explain to his readers some features of what he describes as “el Naturalismo ruso”.⁵⁷ Explanations were in order; it has to be remembered that the newspaper in which these articles appeared, while certainly “liberal” was also a provincial publication. Much of the sixth and seventh articles is, in fact, devoted to Gogol', whom Baroja describes as “el Balzac

ruso”; one recalls that Pardo Bazán had referred to him a few years before as “el Cervantes ruso”.⁵⁸ In his presentation of Gogol’ Baroja was clearly speaking from a personal knowledge of the former’s works, and it is obvious that he had shaken off a great deal of his former dependence on histories of literature.⁵⁹ Baroja attempts to give both a brief summary of the content of certain of Gogol’’s works and some critical judgements of his own. Gogol’’s short story *The Overcoat*, a story which has occasioned a great diversity of critical opinion, is, according to Baroja, his “primera sátira, triste y amarga”. The play *The Government Inspector* is “otra sátira social, aún más cruel que la primera; su argumento es más que de comedia, de sainete, de enredo”.⁶⁰ Baroja with great perception, given his youth, his lack of critical experience and his necessarily limited reading of Russian literature, notes that Gogol’’s characters are

dibujados de una manera admirable... son de carne, andan, viven, y nos enseñan de tal manera sus rarezas y hasta sus menores gestos que creemos conocerlos, haberlos hablado, haberlos visto.

Such description could even be said to have a certain relevance for Baroja’s own portrayal of character.⁶¹ Baroja also believed that Gogol’’s works show “un diálogo vivo y animado y sin ningún artificio dramático”. And, as Pardo Bazán had done so often and so well, Baroja tries to find for his readers some relevant link with Spanish culture. He observes that the Russian is “un pintor de costumbres [que] tiene algo de Teniers en el colorido y algo de Velázquez en el dibujo”.⁶²

When he presents a brief study of the life and works of Turgenev, the young Baroja informs his readers that if they wish to arrive at a full understanding of the latter, “hay que leer todas sus obras”. Whether or not he had done so himself, his subsequent brief analysis of some of Turgenev’s works (*A la víspera*, *Padres e hijos* for example), contains judgments which could well apply to certain of his own later novels.⁶³ Baroja points out that

estas [novelas] no tienen más que argumentos sencillos sacados de la vida ordinaria; en sus obras no se encuentran ni grandes acciones ni grandes crímenes; deja languidecer, como Gogol, las escenas interesantes con minuciosas observaciones; y es como aquél, profundo conocedor del corazón humano, sus personajes están tomados del natural y los presenta de tal manera que creemos ver retratos y no cuadros de fantasía.⁶⁴

Baroja also greatly admired Turgenev's female characters, seeing in them both a strength and a will which their male counterparts lack. Turgenev's possible presence in the works of Baroja is a subject which remains to be studied in detail. Salaverri (correctly, in my view) believed that Baroja learned from Turgenev as far as the technique of novel-writing was concerned and that certain aspects of the Russian's style "le servirán a Baroja para su formación de escritor".⁶⁵

Baroja's first critical article on Dostoevsky, "El naturalismo: Dostoevsky", was published on March 17th, 1890. Given Baroja's later and lifelong admiration for him, this first article is somewhat surprising. The young Baroja appears to find Dostoevsky "a veces pesado, su genio inquieto, es el sacerdote del sufrimiento" (very similar words to those of Vogüé). He continues by contrasting Turgenev, who "representa la simpatía" with Dostoevsky, who

representa la piedad, pero la piedad exagerada por los débiles y los humildes, y parece decir como Raskolnikof a Sonia: "Me arrodillo delante del sufrimiento de la humanidad".⁶⁶

In this piece Baroja mentions a wide selection of Dostoevsky's works, for example *La mujer de otro*, *Pobres gentes* and *Crimen y castigo*, but discusses only the latter two works in any detail.⁶⁷ Only a brief mention is made of *El idiota*, *Los*

poseídos and *Los hermanos Karamazof*. It may be, of course, that at the time of writing Baroja did not fully appreciate Dostoevsky in his role as “el sacerdote del sufrimiento”. At this stage, his brother Darío was still alive and “no ha pasado don Pío por la terrible prueba de la muerte de su hermano y no le preocupa aún tanto ‘el dolor’”.⁶⁸ Baroja does admit, however, that Dostoevsky’s genius in *Crime and Punishment* as revealed in his penetrating “análisis de las sensaciones y pasiones de los personajes” surpasses that of both Poe and Baudelaire.⁶⁹

In the last of these early articles devoted to Russian literature, published on March 24th 1890, Baroja turns to Tolstoy. Tolstoy, he declares, is the true heir of Turgenev, or at least he had been, until “ha abandonado la literatura...cuando la gloria le sonreía, y estima más la fama de un buen agricultor que la que le dan sus triunfos literarios”.⁷¹ Baroja himself was, of course, to write many autobiographical works at a later stage in his own literary career. He mentions that *War and Peace* had been translated into Spanish only months before his article was written. He also refers to the recent translation of *Anna Karenina* as he observes the fine juxtaposition by Tolstoy of “el amor adúltero de Ana y de Vronsky a la par que el puro de Kitty y Constantino Levine”.⁷² As his final comment on Russian literature in these early articles, Baroja observes:

Si Turguenieff es el más poético, si Dostoievsky es el más trágico, Tolstoi es, en cambio, el más majestuoso de todos los escritores rusos.”⁷³

In these thirteen brief and early articles, Baroja’s great love of Russian literature and culture is unmistakable, and it seems inevitable that this would have had its effect, sooner or later, on his own creative practice. What is not clear at all at this stage is that the decisive influence on that level would not be Turgenev, but Dostoevsky.

(3) THE FRAGMENTATION OF DOSTOEVSKY IN SPAIN

A BRIEF SUMMARY

“The fantastical atmosphere of [Dostoevsky’s]... works is akin to that of...Franz Kafka... In fantastic realism characters face conditions in which they must inescapably reveal their innermost ‘self’, the quintessence of their nature. The fantasy of the novels of Nikolai Gogol, deriving from folk superstitions, or the life-rooted realism of Leo Tolstoy, are artistic frameworks of an entirely different kind. They are more balanced and earthbound. It is understandable that Tolstoy was annoyed at the literary reception accorded Dostoevsky. Tolstoy wrote in his diary about the artificiality and the unnatural behaviour of Dostoevsky’s protagonists, and noted ironically that when encountering a tiger anyone would pale and run, but in Dostoevsky’s world he just blushes and stands rooted to the ground”.⁷⁴

As we have already commented, the full impact of the works of Dostoevsky was not felt in the Hispanic World until the twentieth century, “... after World War 1”; it is in subsequent years that the rapid flow of Spanish translations of his works truly commences both in Spain and in Spanish America.⁷⁵ Dostoevsky’s highly complex and “modern” novelistic world provided a challenge for later translators and critics. However, it will be instructive at this stage to make brief mention of the few Spanish renderings of his works which were available in the final years of the 19th century and in the first years of the 20th century.

The compilation of Spanish translations of Dostoevsky's works has been greatly complicated by the fact that

variations in titles of individual works are so numerous that they have made it impossible to prepare a useful title index... Dostoevskii's *Zapiski iz mertvogo doma* (*Memoirs from the House of the Dead*) was distributed not only under the title of *La casa de los muertos*, but also as *Cuadros carcelarios*, *Memorias de la casa muerta*, *La novela del presidio*, *Los presidios de Siberia*, *Recuerdos de la casa de los muertos*, and *El sepulcro de los vivos*... Much more serious are the cases covering works that represented shortened or mutilated versions of a Russian original. Special mention must be made of the process of fragmentation, which created two or more books from one known work. For example *Barbas de estopa*... and *Los muchachos*... are taken from *The Brothers Karamazov*, as is *El pobrecito Ilucha*... The title *Sonia*... disguises the second part of *Crime and Punishment*...⁷⁶

We have noted already the "overall Hispanic emphasis on the short narrative" which was predominant during the era being examined in this thesis. The problems cited above demonstrate for us yet again the tortuous path along which Russian writers made their tentative way into Spain at the end of the 19th century and even into the first decades of the 20th.⁷⁷

The earliest translation of a complete work by Dostoevsky to appear in Spain was *La casa de los muertos*.⁷⁸ This was published in *La España Moderna* in 1892, and it contained a preliminary study written by Pardo Bazán.⁷⁹ Francisco Villegas translated the first Spanish version of *Crime and Punishment* in 1901; one year earlier he had produced a rendering of *Notes from the Underground*.⁸⁰

However, if Dostoevsky's original opens with the provocative and challenging statement

Я человек больной... Я злой человек.
Непривлекательный я человек. Я думаю, что у
меня болит печень. Впрочем, я ни шиша не смыслю
в моей болезни и не знаю наверно, что у меня
болит.

Villegas's commences on a somewhat different note, with the matter-of-fact announcement that

Al fin y a la noche Ordinov se decidió a cambiar de
casa.⁸¹

The Brothers Karamazov did not appear in Spanish until 1918, translated by Francisco Canadas; *El Idiota* was first published in 1926, the work of Carmen Abreu.⁸² The main "wave" of translations of Dostoevsky's works did not become evident in Spain until the early years of the twentieth century, as we have already stressed.⁸³ Although a detailed study of these falls outwith the parameters of this thesis, it will, nevertheless, be of interest to note certain "curiosities" which accompanied some of these Hispanic renderings. For example, the 1960 Barcelona translation of *Noches blancas* did not mention Dostoevsky's name on the cover. Instead there was an advertisement for "... supositorios, exámenes Rorschach y tranquilizadoras", essential items, one supposes, to accompany the work.⁸⁴ A 1959 version of *Los hermanos Karamazov* (Schanzer notes nervously that it contained "algunos cortes") featured Yul Brynner on its cover.⁸⁵ A 1965 anonymous translation of *Crime and Punishment* displays a lurid and totally irrelevant cover; Raskolnikov is depicted stabbing the money lender as she attempts to rise from a lace covered four-poster bed.⁸⁶ Such inauspicious beginnings conceal, however, a reasonably accurate translation. I commend in particular the

vitally important opening of the novel, where the Spanish translator has captured adequately the atmosphere of “heat... rootlessness and indecision”.⁸⁷

В начале июля, в чрезвычайно жаркое время, под вечер один молодой человек вышел из своей каморки, которую нанимал от жильцов в С - м переулке, на улицу и медленно, как бы в нерешимости, отправился к К - ну мосту...⁸⁸

En la calurosa tarde de principios de julio, un joven salió del cuchitril que había realquilado en la callejuela de S. y se encaminó lentamente, como indeciso, hacia el puente de X.⁸⁹

In 1922 André Gide discussed the many ways in which a writer may seek inspiration in the works and ideas of another. He made the following penetrating observation:

It is not fear of being wrong, it is a need of sympathy that makes me seek with passionate anxiety that stimulus or the recall of my thought in others; that made me ... translate Blake and present my own ethic under cover of Dostoevsky's ...⁹⁰

We shall now consider some of the ways in which Baroja may have presented his “own ethic” in a similar way.

(4) INFLUENCES

“Mirando hacia el lado opuesto, se yerguen en bloque las figuras gigantescas de los novelistas rusos del siglo XIX. Para Baroja, son sobre todo Dostoyevski y Tolstoi que merecen más elogios... En general, se han comentado poco las relaciones que pueda haber entre Baroja y Gogol, aunque este nombre aparece frecuentemente en la lista de sus autores predilectos.”

Biruté Ciplijauskaitė⁹¹

“Writers do learn from each other, even across linguistic frontiers, and few questions interest the literary historian more than what they learn, and how they apply the lesson.”

S. S. Praver⁹²

Baroja's fascination with Russia also makes itself obvious in his fiction. On a purely personal level,

su gran amor lo vivió siendo ya cuarentón [con] una dama rusa... predispuesta siempre al aburrimiento pero encantadora, poseía “le charme slave”, según el autor.

Baroja and “la dama rusa”, Anna, discussed Dostoevsky on many occasions, and their relationship (which ended with Anna's return to Russia) is reflected in Baroja's novel *La sensualidad pervertida*:

A mí me llenó la cabeza de melancolía el pensar que podía haber encontrado a aquella mujer rusa cuando yo era más joven y ella estaba libre.⁹³

Baroja at eighteen had already known and admired some of Gogol's writings. Many of the latter's works are to be found in Baroja's library in "Itzea", among these a copy of *Taras Bul'ba* underlined in many places by its owner.⁹⁴ What had captured Baroja's attention in this work, apparently, had been the striking manner in which Gogol' suddenly switches from "descripciones de batalla... de una crueldad muy pronunciada [a] interrupciones con descripciones del personaje totalmente líricas, en un estilo romántico..."⁹⁵ Certain critics have pointed to similar features in Baroja's own writings. In particular the union of "la acción, el diálogo escueto, el movimiento rápido, aspectos costumbristas y luego las digresiones líricas..." follows very much the pattern which has just been described; it could also be maintained that in Gogol', as in Baroja's own writings "la ironía no impide un fondo sentimental ni la percepción de la belleza natural."⁹⁶ However, one very important difference exists between the two, in my opinion. While both desire to expose faults in the society around them, Baroja merely reveals these vices. The latter's work does not display the labyrinths of complexities and contradictions which are manifest in Gogol's social satire. As Peace convincingly argues

England in the nineteenth century was by and large a stable society, self-confident, sure of rightness of things. The heroes of its literature largely reflect such values... By contrast, Russia in the nineteenth century was caught between the old rigid values of a medieval consciousness and a newly awakened awareness of the individual. It was a divided society... It was a sprawling empire searching for an identity between East and West. The soul-searching, the

neurosis, both private and national, the theme of alienation itself were scarcely understood by contemporary readers in Western Europe. It took the twentieth century to discover the “modern literature” that had been produced in Russia a century before... Gogol left a legacy; for alongside the preoccupation with the individual, Russian literature would also be concerned with the fate of Russia: the marrying of these two themes is one of the hallmarks of the great nineteenth-century tradition.⁹⁷

The above citation admirably presents the main reasons, in my view, for the later impact which both Gogol’ and Dostoevsky made in the Hispanic World.

Baroja had been greatly impressed by Gogol’s humour, and in his short essay “La procesión de los humoristas” he has the following to say by way of linking the humour of Dostoevsky to that of Gogol’:

...ahí está Gogol, con sus propietarios de fincas enormes y mal administradas, sus generales ignorantes y sus mujiks sentimentales y llorones...; ahí aparece Dostoyevski con su galería de tipos cómicos, doloridos y absurdos, hombres llagados que se contradicen, van y vienen inconscientemente agitados por el espíritu subterráneo.⁹⁸

Of course Baroja was in no way mistaken in his critical perceptions when he linked Gogol’ and Dostoevsky in this way. The most important literary relationship between these two writers and the great debt which Dostoevsky owed to Gogol’ have been extensively discussed by both Western and Russian critics, Dostoevsky being “the first to realise Gogol’s latent psychologism and to bring it into the open”; additionally Gogol’ was, of course

the first to have explored the neurotic personality. Yet although he did this obliquely, he opened the way for the intense interest in psychology so characteristic of the Russian novel.⁹⁹

Another reason for Baroja's attraction to the works of Gogol' may be found in the way in which the latter "excels in the use of the dream and the double, and he anticipates Dostoevskii's use of the subconscious in these most important areas".¹⁰⁰ It is apparent too, even from his very early article on Gogol' that Baroja had greatly admired *Dead Souls*. In a later text, he describes "un señor pintoresco...en un pueblo de Levante" as having "un despacho que parecía de uno de los propietarios pintados por Gogol en sus *Almas muertas*."¹⁰¹

From time to time it is possible to glimpse aspects of Gogol's influence on Baroja's own writings. For example, Baroja had obviously been intrigued by the character of Akakii Akakievich (in *The Overcoat*), who has been identified as an early instance of the literary type known as the "little man"; if Gogol' himself did not invent this type then, at least, "he decisively influenced the theme's future development".¹⁰² At a purely superficial level, a manifestation of this type can be recognized in Baroja's own works, for example, Antonio Latorre in *Locuras de carnaval*. If Akakii Akakievich's greatest satisfaction and his life's work, prior to the acquisition of his new overcoat, had been the copying out of the writing of others, then the world of Baroja's character is similarly centred around his proof-reading tasks.

One important theme which can be identified in Gogol's later works in particular is his preoccupation with "poshlost" or "trite vulgarity" as this was revealed in the various levels of Russian society. This theme was taken up and developed further by Chekhov; the latter had declared Gogol' to be the greatest Russian writer and the "major influence on [Chekhov's] early writing was undoubtedly Gogol."¹⁰³ In many of his short stories and in his plays, Chekhov

(1860-1904) attempted to show the atrophy and backwardness of Russian provincial life. Though Baroja rarely refers to Chekhov, there are still occasions in the former's work where possible similarities between the two may be noted.¹⁰⁴

It is instructive to remark that in the Spain of those years, a country which had such a long and rich dramatic tradition of its own, only scant reference can be found overall in Spanish criticism to Chekhov's plays. His earlier prose works had not been mentioned at all by Pardo Bazán either in her lectures of 1887 (which was arguably too early in any case), or in later studies which might well have taken some cognizance of Chekhov's writings of the 1890s. In fact the earliest critical article on Chekhov published in Spain was the short work by Juderías "Tchejoff", which appeared in *La Lectura* (Madrid), 1902!¹⁰⁵ The early Sempere and Maucci versions of Chekhov's stories were not available in Spain until 1904. It appears, however, that a much greater interest in his writings had already been apparent in three Latin American countries: Uruguay, Venezuela and Bolivia.¹⁰⁶ (The demand for Chekhov's works had been so great in Uruguay in particular that a special article had appeared in Moscow entitled "*The Cherry Orchard* in Montevideo").¹⁰⁷ Baroja's meagre references to Chekhov suggest no very close acquaintance. There is one amusing episode indeed, where he describes how, when dining out in Paris, he was asked "¿Sabe usted que está aquí Tchekoff, el escritor ruso?" On learning this, Baroja expressed his unwillingness to meet Chekhov since, as he remarked, "Yo he leído poco de él. No le podría hablar de sus libros". However, this had all been "alguna confusión", and the "presunto Tchekoff o Chejoff" turned out to be "León Chestoff, un escritor ruso, al parecer filósofo."¹⁰⁸ In a sense, despite the biographical parallels between them, the two men were not even contemporaries. Chekhov was born some twelve years before Baroja and was outlived by him by many decades. Nevertheless the two authors share common themes and attitudes to both life and literature. (Both had, of course, trained as doctors.) Baroja and Chekhov, it might be observed, present women characters in a very similar way, tending to divide their female protagonists into types, the predatory sensual female

on the one hand, such as Laura in *Camino de perfección* and Natasha in *Three Sisters*, and the almost idealized female characters on the other hand, such as Dolores in *Camino de perfección* and Anna in *The Lady with the Little Dog*.¹⁰⁹

To cite further brief examples, Fernando Ossorio's thoughts on finding the Bishop's tomb seem to run parallel with sentiments expressed in one of Chekhov's last stories, *The Bishop*, written in 1902.¹¹⁰ The conclusion expressed about the ultimate meaning of life in *César o nada*, – "la vida es un laberinto que no tiene más hilo de Ariadna que uno: la acción" – may be compared to Sonya's famous last speech at the end of Chekhov's play *Uncle Vanya*.¹¹¹ Andrés Hurtado, protagonist of *El árbol de la ciencia*, gives his view that

uno tiene la angustia, la desesperación de no saber
qué hacer con la vida, de no tener un plan, de encontrarse
perdido, sin brújula, sin luz adelante adonde dirigirse. ¿Qué
dirección se la da?

Such a dilemma can also be found in Ol'ga's speech which closes *Three Sisters*.¹¹²

This play will be discussed in much greater detail and from quite a different standpoint in a later chapter of this thesis.

From Baroja's early articles on Russian literature and from references made in his later writings it is apparent that he greatly admired Tolstoy – if not Tolstoy the essayist on religious and moral topics, then most certainly Tolstoy the novelist. As has been noted, he had much admiration for Tolstoy's autobiographical writings too. Baroja rarely offers any detailed analyses of Tolstoy's works, but frequently refers to him as one of the Russian novelists whom he most admired.¹¹³ Ciplijauskaitė, for example, believes that Baroja's way of observing the Spanish society of his times

puede haber sido influido hasta cierto punto por *La guerra y la paz*. Sólo que, mirando con ojos de un autor del

siglo XX, que además es escéptico, presenta una visión más desilusionada. Tampoco logra crear los ambientes de familia tan típicos en Tolstoi.¹¹⁴

Ciplijauskaitė also points to a certain similarity between Baroja's María Aracil in the epilogue to *La ciudad de la niebla* and Natasha in *War and Peace*, a judgement with which I would agree.¹¹⁵

With regard to Gogol' and Tolstoy I would fully agree too with Ciplijauskaitė's overall comment:

...habrá tomado de ellos - si algo tomó – el concepto general; la amplitud de visión, los horizontes abiertos. Como en tantos otros se habrá identificado con la humanidad latente en sus [obras] ...¹⁶⁶

One may speculate too that Baroja would surely have found Bulgakov's novel *The Master and Margarita* and other great works of the Soviet period to be of enormous interest also; Julio Caro, however, noted his uncle's intense dislike of works of Socialist Realism and all "literatura programada".¹¹⁷

None of these affinities which we have briefly suggested, however, goes as deep as that which linked the more mature Baroja with Dostoevsky – above all, in their shared concept of suffering. Baroja was attracted not only by "el mundo patológico" in Dostoevsky, but also by his "fondo moral" and by the "análisis del hombre interior", present in all his writings. In his work *La intuición y el estilo* Baroja himself tells his reader precisely what Dostoevsky was to come to mean to him:

El valor de Dostoyevski... está en su mezcla de sensibilidad exquisita, de brutalidad y de sadismo, en su fantasía enferma, y al mismo tiempo poderosa, en que toda la vida que representa en sus novelas es integramente

patológica por primera vez en la literatura, y que esta vida se halla alumbrada por una luz fuerte de alucinación, de epiléptico y de místico. Dostoyevski echa la sonda en el espíritu de hombres mal conocidos por sus antecesores literarios.¹¹⁸

(5) MATURE CRITICISM

“Four facets may be distinguished in the rich personality of Dostoevsky: the creative artist, the neurotic, the moralist and the sinner. How is one to find one’s way in this bewildering complexity?”

Sigmund Freud¹¹⁹

In his essays and autobiographical writings Baroja displays such a vast knowledge of both classical and contemporary authors that “debería haber escrito una historia de la literatura”. Vaz de Soto, who offers this judgement, believes that Baroja is one of the most important critics of the 19th- and the 20th-century European novel.¹²⁰ As a critic Baroja shows great independence, a striking sincerity and, like Pardo Bazán, a passionate love of his subject; he was also “un docente estupendo”.¹²¹ However, in his study of Baroja’s literary criticism, Vaz de Soto mentions Dostoevsky only three times, and the references are only fleeting. In no sense do they do justice to Baroja’s lifelong critical appreciation of the Russian writer.¹²² Reference is made to Baroja’s treatment of French writers, especially Gide, and due note is taken of José Corrales’s work *Baroja y Francia*, but apart from one brief mention of Tolstoy and a passing reference to Raskol’nikov as a literary type, Vaz de Soto has nothing to say at all of Baroja’s long-standing interest in Russian literature.¹²³

In 1943, Baroja produced a substantial piece of Dostoevsky criticism in his essay “El desdoblamiento psicológico de Dostoyevski”. Here he chose to concentrate his attention on a central theme in Dostoevsky’s writings - one which has received a considerable amount of discussion from both Russian and Western critics.¹²⁴ D. Chizhevsky, for example, the title of whose article “The Theme of the Double in Dostoevsky” comes close to that of Baroja’s own study, stresses that

this theme is not only one of the most important in all of Dostoevsky's fiction but that it

recurs through his writings in various metamorphoses [and] we can even say that this idea is an answer to the deepest spiritual problems of the 19th century and that it is still alive in the philosophy of our own time.¹²⁵

There have, of course, been many studies made of the theme of the "Double" in literature: Otto Rank, for example, has interpreted the "transformation of the double idea from an image of the immortal soul in primitive religion to its appearance as herald of death as evidence of the disintegration of modern personality".¹²⁶ Frances Wyers, on the other hand, while discussing this same theme in the works of Unamuno, believes that

there are two basic kinds of doubles in fiction. The first is the division of the self into two incompatible or conflicting parts which may represent the conscious self and the unconscious (or latent) one. (E.T.A. Hoffman used the double as the physical embodiment of the unconscious).¹²⁷

The other type of double, according to Wyers, is based

not on contrast but on duplication... This double threatens the "real" self's claim to absolute autonomy... In *The Double*, Dostoevsky shows very clearly how the protagonist's strange encounter is intimately connected with his secret intention not to be himself.¹²⁸

At the age of seventeen, Dostoevsky had written the following:

Man is a secret. You must work it out and if you spend your entire life doing this, then your time has not been

wasted; I am engaging my life in doing precisely this, working out the secret, since I wish to be a man.¹²⁹

Kudriavtsev believes that it is precisely *The Double*, from amongst Dostoevsky's earlier works, which fits in best with these remarks. The critic observes that "... in every work [of Dostoevsky] there is contained some central problematic issue... In *The Double* it is the complexity of man".¹³⁰ Dostoevsky describes the protagonist of *The Double* in these terms:

In the depths of his soul... he knew well how he should act, that is to say, he knew nothing at all.¹³¹

And of Goliadkin's "ontological insecurity" Chizhevsky makes the following comment:

The appearance of the double and his success in squeezing out Golyadkin from his place only shows that Golyadkin's place was completely illusory to begin with... Here Dostoevsky raises the ethical and ontological problems of the fixity, reality and security of individual existence – surely one of the most genuine problems of ethics.¹³²

Recent theological and medical studies have also made reference to this theme of the double. In the first instance it has been shown how, according to certain scholars, two opposing and divided parts of the person were seen to be reconciled by divine healing.¹³³ R.D. Laing, for example, in his work *The Divided Self* deals with the case-histories and the treatment of individuals manifesting states of being not unlike those dealt with by Dostoevsky in literary form.¹³⁴

It is into this field, then, that Baroja enters with his own contribution, "El desdoblamiento psicológico de Dostoyevski". He too offers his readers a brief history of the theme of the double in literature, referring, for example, to R.L.

Stevenson's *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Baroja's medical background can be clearly observed too as he attempts to define the phenomenon of "desdoblamiento" in the light of new discoveries in the field of psychological medicine.¹³⁵

The essay falls into three main sections. Baroja begins by confirming his own long-standing interest in the works of Dostoevsky: "... es un autor que llevo leyendo ya más de cuarenta y cinco años."¹³⁶ He then singles out the special feature of those works which had so stimulated his attention as both reader and critic for so many years:

... he vuelto a mi antigua idea de que en Dostoyevski lo más sugestivo no son sus pensamientos, ni sus personajes, ni su técnica, sino que lo que produce la impresión más profunda es el desdoblamiento de su espíritu, unido a su gran acuidad psicológica.¹³⁷

In the first section of this essay Baroja reveals that the works of Dostoevsky which had impressed him most were "...*Los poseídos, El eterno marido, El espíritu subterráneo*", rather than *Crime and Punishment*, for example.¹³⁸ In the second section of the essay, Baroja examines the phenomenon of "desdoblamiento psíquico" not only from the vantage point of an author and literary critic but also from the standpoint of a trained doctor who, although no longer practising medicine, had obviously retained a great interest in his subject; he observes: "Desde hace más de veinte años se habla en revistas médicas y en artículos de periódico del desdoblamiento psíquico..."¹³⁹

In this part of his essay Baroja briefly defines his terms and, with a passing reference to a letter by Dostoevsky touching on the subject, he maintains that this "desdoblamiento psíquico", observable both in the author Dostoevsky and in his literary creations, is "... lo que se llama en términos científicos esquizofrenia".¹⁴⁰ Baroja takes matters even further along this course by asserting that much of Dostoevsky's greatness as a writer

se basa, en gran parte, en su esquizofrenia, en su mezcla de sensibilidad, de barbarie, de humildad y de sadismo, y al mismo tiempo en que toda la vida que refleja es por vez primera en la literatura integramente patológica.¹⁴¹

Subsequently Baroja defines schizophrenia in the light of works by Freud, W. James and Ramón y Cajal; he goes on to offer his own definition: “La esquizofrenia es una defectuosa organización de las ideas, que produce la duplicidad espiritual...”¹⁴²

Baroja emphasizes another outstanding feature of Dostoevsky’s greatness as a writer – his seeming failure to control his literary creations. Dostoevsky’s characters “tienen un carácter y unos motivos de obrar que parecen independientes de las intenciones del autor”.¹⁴³ Baroja reworks this same idea into the final section of his essay in a very striking image, where he compares Dostoevsky’s works to a garden

lleno de plantas parásitas, obra del azar...[y Dostoevski] las trata con odio y con desprecio, y las ve confundidas y mezcladas, en un ambiente brumoso, como si no fuera él que las cultivó, sino como si hubieran nacido espontáneamente.¹⁴⁴

In the second section of his essay, having defined the term “desdoblamiento”, Baroja places Dostoevsky as an equal to Shakespeare and even to Euripides. All three, he declares, are, to the highest degree, creators “en los cuales la vida inconsciente se refleja con gran energía en su obra”.¹⁴⁵ Such tantalizing literary comparisons – rarely developed in full – are very much a feature of Baroja’s essays. A more specific parallel is drawn at the end of the second section with Euripides’s *Bacchae*:

Las Bacantes de Eurípides, por ejemplo, es una tragedia en la cual el autor parece perder la razón al mismo tiempo y al compás de sus héroes y de sus tipos.¹⁴⁶

In the third and last section of his essay Baroja offers a comparison between Dostoevsky and Cervantes. It is a most relevant parallel, since Dostoevsky's admiration for Cervantes and *Don Quijote* is well-documented, in particular with regard to the genesis of his novel *The Idiot*.¹⁴⁷ Baroja states that in his view Dostoevsky is a mediocre philosopher but that, thanks to his states of heightened awareness and psychological perspicacity, he arrives at a profound understanding of his fellow man's inner life:

El conocimiento profundo del hombre lo saca, en parte, de su enfermedad, que le da ampliada, y de una manera monstruosa, lo que en el hombre normal es de dimensiones exiguas.¹⁴⁸

According to Baroja, Dostoevsky is the greatest exponent of “las anomalías espirituales”, since he is “enfermo y médico al mismo tiempo, sujeto y observador”. It is clear, in fact, that Baroja believes that many of the extraordinary qualities of Dostoevsky's works are due to the latter's “enfermedad”, to his ability to fix his attention on “naturalezas dislocadas y, en parte, brutales, como la suya” – with quite remarkable results.¹⁴⁹

In the closing pages of his essay Baroja turns his attention briefly to certain Dostoevskian characters: “Raskolnikoff... que tiene dos caracteres opuestos,... Kirilof... que se va a suicidar por motivos metafísicos,... Starvoroguin [sic], el ‘dandy’ satánico...” The women characters in Dostoevsky are described thus: “... unas son angelicales, otras son buenas, amables, pero caprichosas y fantásticas...”¹⁵⁰ Baroja then deals very briefly with the much-discussed theme of pride in Dostoevsky's novels, before dismissing it, as follows:

Los hombres de nuestro autor, en general, no tienen orgullo, no son celosos, ni sienten espíritu de venganza... Para Dostoyevski, el orgullo es el mayor pecado. El cree que se puede perdonar todo, menos el orgullo.¹⁵¹

Baroja is equally succinct when he refers to the theme of formal religion, as found in Dostoevsky's works. The latter's characters are "cristianos fervientes" and, perhaps with tongue in cheek, Baroja follows this claim with the comparison that "en esto son el polo opuesto del hombre latino, en el cual el orgullo, la presunción y la venganza toman en ocasiones caracteres violentos".¹⁵²

Finally Baroja answers the claims made by "el escritor ruso Merejkovski", that the symbols used by Dostoevsky to describe the fantasies of his characters ("las grandes arañas, los escorpiones, las serpientes o los perros amenazadores") have a metaphysical significance.¹⁵³ In a rather abrupt tone Baroja denies that this level of meaning exists, and categorically states that "creo que no significan más que impresiones de terror y repugnancia".¹⁵⁴ In fact, Baroja is keen to sweep away all notions regarding "misterios" or "oscuridades místicas" in Dostoevsky's novels, and his final comment is that in the latter's works "hay...sólo patología, patología genial".¹⁵⁵

Two main points emerge from this essay. The first of these is self-evident: that Baroja had given careful consideration to the major works of Dostoevsky and had also read some of his more prominent critics - among them, judging from the contents of his library - André Gide.¹⁵⁶ Secondly, at least one main area of interest which Baroja found in Dostoevsky's writings had to do with the latter's psychological dimension. The theme of the double appears to have fascinated Baroja not only as it features in the characters of the novels but also as a manifestation of the author's own complex personality; as he notes:

El esquizofrénico tiene como norma la inconsecuencia y la contradicción. Es lo que sucede a

Dostoyevski, que, sin querer o queriendo, inventa todos sus personajes con las mismas o parecidas taras que tiene él.¹⁵⁷

Baroja's essay could well be found wanting in one respect: there is no detailed analysis of any one work by Dostoevsky. Nevertheless Baroja makes up for this lack by the original ideas and comparisons which he gives or suggests to his reader. One is often left wishing that he might have taken his views to greater lengths or developed them in another essay. It may not be wrong to assume, however, that Baroja's purpose in writing this essay was to stimulate the interest in Dostoevsky of the Spanish reading public of that time, much as Pardo Bazán had done some fifty years before. This essay, it must be remembered too, was written in 1943, at a time when Spain's relations with the former Soviet Union had, to all extents and purposes, ceased to exist. This seems yet another proof of Baroja's great commitment to Russian literature. He succeeded admirably in this work thanks to his originality of theme and his clarity of interpretation. He fulfils the conditions put forward by René Wellek for what constitutes the "valid and worthwhile Dostoevskian critic" – the critic

who can see Dostoevsky for what he primarily is: a novelist, a supreme creator of a world of imagination, an artist with a deep insight into human conduct and the perennial condition of man.¹⁵⁸

At eighteen and at seventy-one years of age Baroja tried his hand at formal criticism of Dostoevsky. His ideas had obviously matured and altered as far as Dostoevsky was concerned. But one constant had remained and was to remain until the end of Baroja's life: his great interest in Dostoevsky. There are very many other references to both Dostoevsky and other Russian writers scattered throughout Baroja's essays and autobiographical writings, but the early and late examples studied here are more substantial altogether. They represent landmarks in the

development of a writer whose own creative work carries the unmistakable imprint of the Russian novelist whom he so passionately admired.

(6) MISTAKEN IDENTITY:

BAROJA AND GOR'KY

“Baroja es el novelista español más próximo a Dostoyevski en su cualidad de creador de un mundo singular, inalienable, personalísimo...”

Angel María de Lera¹⁵⁹

Julio Caro Baroja, in a short article dedicated to his uncle in which he offers some valuable insights into the latter's character and literary tastes, states:

Sus escritores favoritos seguían siendo, así, Dostoyevski, Dickens... Después de haber leído a los clásicos rusos del siglo XIX continuó interesado por Rusia como productora de novelistas. Pero Gorki le aburría. A otros los encontraba retóricos, como a Merejkowski y a Andreiev... Después de la Revolución la literatura programada es claro que no podía producirle más que aburrimiento. En general, los rusos modernos le parecía que hacían “recuelos” de los antiguos.¹⁶⁰

The statement is both emphatic and authoritative. Yet a number of critics have sought to assert that the literary relationship which matters most to Baroja is, in fact, that with Gor'ky. The earliest of these, George Portnoff, states confidently:

Gorky crea bohemios (tipos casi no vistos en la literatura rusa) con fuerte carácter, de alto relieve, y con un vigor extraordinario... Esos bohemios ultraindividualistas creemos que han dejado huella psicológica en el alma de

Baroja, el cual la reflejó en algunos de sus tipos, sobre todo en los de *La busca*, *Mala hierba* y *Aurora roja*.¹⁶¹

It will be recalled, however, that in her essay on Gor'ky, Pardo Bazán had pointed out that the latter's "bohemios" would strike a definite chord with his Spanish readers, given the important tradition of the "pícaro" in Spanish literature. Baroja, consequently, did not need to look beyond his own literary tradition, should he have required inspiration of that sort. Portnoff does admit that there is a certain affinity between Baroja and Dostoevsky: he remarks that "en ciertos aspectos nos parece que Dostoevsky ha ejercido influencia en el novelista vasco, por la gran semejanza en los temperamentos de estos dos autores".¹⁶² However, Portnoff's ultimate conclusion in this matter is that Gor'ky was the Russian author who had most captivated and influenced Baroja:

Tanto Gorky como Baroja son escritores compasivos, líricos, sentimentales, aunque no quieran parecerlo; en ambos hay un profundo dolor y un pesimismo idéntico.

Baroja himself, by contrast, on many occasions rejected such opinions out of hand, and firmly declared, for example:

Yo siempre he dicho que mis escritores favoritos han sido Dickens, Poe, Balzac, Stendhal, Dostoyevski y Tolstoi. La gente ha debido de creer que yo tenía secretos. ¿Qué secretos va a tener un escritor que ha publicado setenta u ochenta volúmenes? Uno de los secretos que tenía era haber imitado a Gorki. – Usted ha sido un imitador de Gorki. La verdad es que mis libros no se parecen nada a los de Gorki. No se pueden parecer, porque yo no he leído más que dos o tres cuentos de este señor y un artículo biográfico sobre él

hace más de cuarenta años. Después, nada, porque no me producían mucho interés. En cambio, de Dostoyesvski he leído toda su obra, y hasta varias veces, y ha tenido que influir en mí.¹⁶³

In the light of this declaration, Leo Barrow's assertion that Baroja was greatly interested in the writings of Gor'ky and that

one of the things that surely would be of interest to Baroja in the writings of Gorky is the latter's tendency to take his characters out of their natural habitat and to strip them of almost everything they once possessed in order to reveal them

must be regarded with a certain scepticism.¹⁶⁴

Another critic, Rosalie Wahl, has claimed that both Gor'ky and Dostoevsky "influenced Baroja's style", although she does not develop this matter any further.¹⁶⁵

Baroja, himself, takes up references to an article which had appeared in *El Sol*:

Todo el mundo sabe, por ejemplo, que Anatole France influyó en Azorín, y Máxim Gorki en Pío Baroja. Solamente que en estos detalles todo el mundo grosero se equivoca. Acaso el único escritor ruso que no ha impresionado a Baroja es Gorki...¹⁶⁶

Again, when the Basque critic Zunzúñegui was asked in an interview with which foreign author he would associate Baroja, he answered:

Con Gorki: los dos hacen una literatura itinerante. Baroja necesita en la mayoría de sus novelas sacar al

protagonista a la carretera al cuarto o quinto capítulo...
 construye sus novelas en función de un viaje... y, como en
 Gorki, no hay mujeres en su literatura.¹⁶⁷

The last point made is not true even of Gor'ky. One might mention his celebrated novel *The Mother* and two of his short stories, *First Love* and *Twenty-Six Men and a Girl*, all of which have female protagonists; it has also been pointed out many times that in his fiction Gor'ky was "particularly prone to idealize women".¹⁶⁸

Baroja's own short critical article entitled "Gorki", written in 1904 – ends with a quotation borrowed from Pardo Bazán's descriptions of Dostoevsky. Nonetheless, the piece does throw an interesting light on the Baroja/Gor'ky relationship.¹⁶⁹ Baroja had first heard mention of Gor'ky in Paris in 1902, as he notes:

en la Redacción de *L'Humanité Nouvelle*, de Paris,
 oí hablar por vez primera de Gorki, un escritor ruso a quien
 algunos llamaban el poeta de los vagabundos.¹⁷⁰

Baroja then goes on to make one of the few references to Chekhov to be found in his critical writings, as he attempts to establish a rather curious literary parallel. The link which he postulates between Chekhov and Dostoevsky, would lead us to assume that he had, at this point, read very few of Chekhov's works:

Entonces el escritor ruso de moda era Tchekhov, el
 autor de *Los mujicks*, que seguía gloriosamente la tradición
 de Dostoyevski; hoy Gorki ha borrado el nombre de
 Tchekhov, y en Francia y en Alemania no se habla más de
 éste último...¹⁷¹

Baroja stresses Gor'ky's role as an “explorador de la sociedad” and, after briefly considering his biography, attempts a short critical appreciation of his fiction. He notes that the majority of Gor'ky's stories are

cortas [y] de todas ellas se desprende una personalidad que constituye un caso típico de patología social. En los cuentos de Gorki, un cortejo de mendigos, de borrachos, de ladrones, se pegan, se insultan, roban, abominan de la sociedad.¹⁷²

He then proceeds to compare Gor'ky and Dostoevsky, in terms which make clear the reason for the special attraction which he felt for the latter:

En las obras de Dostoewski brotan también por todas partes miserias y sufrimientos, anatemas y blasfemias; pero este gran escritor legitima las deformidades morales y las santifica con una inmensa piedad; Gorki, no; Gorki arroja la deformidad moral sobre la sociedad y la defiende como buena.¹⁷³

Baroja attributes Gor'ky's success as a writer to his “amoralidad” and also to the fact that he turns his “vagabundos criminales” into heroes. Perhaps what Baroja did admire about Gor'ky was “[e]ste instinto anárquico que todos vagamente sentimos...[y] que hace que leemos con gusto y saboreemos sus páginas con la alegría perversa con que se goza de todo lo prohibido”.¹⁷⁴

There is not, however, sufficient evidence from this article or indeed from the other references which Baroja makes to Gor'ky to allow a firm literary relationship to be postulated between the two. While it is possible to state that the two authors, roughly speaking contemporaries, both covered a vast area in their literary creation – stories, novels memoirs, drama – I do not believe that there exists any justification for a deeper comparative study of the two.¹⁷⁵ I maintain that

because of Baroja's great interest in Russian literature in general and in Dostoevsky in particular he, as a matter of course, turned his attention to Gor'ky but was in no way either influenced by him or especially interested in him; I feel that Baroja's own statements and the claims made by Julio Caro Baroja should be accepted as providing the more accurate picture of this matter.

Nevertheless, from Baroja's *El escritor según él y según los críticos* it is quite clear that the Baroja/Gor'ky polemic had by no means been silenced. It is also apparent that the repeated assertions of a supposed "influence" of Gor'ky on Baroja had become rather irksome to the Spaniard. Baroja yet again takes up the matter:

Además, si yo hubiera intentado imitar a Gorki, la cuquería natural del escritor que piensa hacer esto me hubiera impulsado a no hablar de él...Y, sin embargo, es posible que el primer artículo que se escribió sobre Gorki en España fuera el que yo publiqué hace cuarenta años en no sé que periódico.¹⁷⁶

Baroja was actually wrong on this latter point; Pardo Bazán had "beaten him to it" by three years.

As a final comment on this issue, before laying it – as he hoped – to rest once and for all, he quotes, with obvious gratitude, comments made by the journalist Benítez de Lugo:

Los vagabundos y aventureros de Gorki son los hombres mudos de la rebelión triste y resignada, aun de la rebelión triste contra los hombres o contra el Destino. En lo más íntimo de los personajes de Baroja late siempre el impulso de la rebelión locuaz y desenfadada y se manifiesta la tendencia crítica en que pone el autor la sal de su propio juicio.¹⁷⁷

In the light of later Gor'ky criticism by both Russian and Western scholars, the above statement expresses an important major difference between the writings of Gor'ky and Baroja.

However, the matter was not yet closed: Domingo Pérez Minik “resurrected” the entire Gor'ky/Baroja polemic, but very much in Baroja's favour. Minik categorically states that if one considers the authors Bourget, Conrad, Galsworthy, Henry James and Gor'ky, then “con ninguno de estos escritores tiene relación Pío Baroja”: Minik refutes any charges that Baroja might have been an imitator of Gor'ky, and will allow only one point of comparison to stand: that in the works of these two “el novelista baja el podium ochocentista y se pierde en la calle con sus personajes”.¹⁷⁸ What seems to have aggravated Minik most of all about the entire matter was the fact that in any world history of literature Gor'ky occupies a most important place, whereas Baroja remains virtually unknown. Minik gives his verdict on the Baroja/Gor'ky controversy in these terms: “La posición de Maxim Gorki cara a Dostoyevski es igual a la de Pío Baroja cuando se le opone a Galdós.”¹⁷⁹

I firmly believe that if Baroja had held Gor'ky in great esteem and had he been influenced by him in his own literary career, then, without doubt, Baroja's sincerity as a critic and writer would have forced him to admit this. I also believe that he would have wanted to share his discoveries with his Spanish readers, and would then have written at much greater length about the life and works of Gor'ky. I feel that Baroja's claims as regards Gor'ky are authentic and that Dostoevsky was the Russian author who had the greatest influence on Baroja's own literary works and his novelistic world.

(7) DOSTOEVSKY AND THE NOVELISTIC WORLD

OF PIO BAROJA

SOME THEMES AND IDEAS

“Podemos decir que ningún escritor de nuestro tiempo ha realizado una obra comparable por su magnitud y variedad... Baroja es un mundo más, como Tolstoy, como Balzac, como Dostoiewsky, para quienes mostró su complacencia... Don Pío ha ido por todas partes. Lo ha visto todo.”

Ignacio Elizalde¹⁸⁰

“It is fascinating to see how the problems facing groups, classes and societies become embodied in literary figures with a life and an individuality of their own and, at the same time, a representative quality that wins recognition throughout Europe and beyond...”

S. S. Praver¹⁸¹

From the outset of his literary career to the end of his long and productive life as an essayist, critic and novelist – (he was a candidate for the Nobel Prize in 1940) – Pío Baroja was captivated by Russian literature and in particular by Dostoevsky. Dostoevsky is the Russian novelist who figures most frequently in Baroja’s essays and autobiographical writings. He is also mentioned in several of the novels.¹⁸² Critics have remarked upon the influence of Nietzsche, whom

Baroja had read in 1901 thanks to translations made for him by his friend Paul Schmitz, as this is evident in *Camino de Perfección*; the influence of Dostoevsky, however, goes right back to his first two literary works, *Vidas sombrías* and *La casa de Aizgorri*.¹⁸³ In the former, a definite Dostoevskian influence was noted by Unamuno, and Arbó observed too that this work “tiene influencias de Poe; tiene sabor de estampa bíblica, sabiduría de viejo apólogo; se siente en otras partes a Ibsen, a Dostoevski...”¹⁸⁴

Since Baroja was himself such an original writer there is no single work by him which is actually shaped, in my view, by this pervasive Dostoevskian influence. Baroja, in turn, had correctly pointed out that Spanish literature had exerted its own influence and made a special impact on the 19th-century Russian novel:

Todavía la huella española se advierte en tres grandes escritores: en Gogol, en Turgueniev y en Dostoyevski. En los tres se nota la influencia de *Don Quijote*, mucho en *Las almas muertas*, de Gogol, y en las alusiones constantes que hacen Turgueniev y Dostoyevski a la literatura española del siglo XVII.¹⁸⁵

Dostoevsky's influence on Baroja's fictional world may be detected, I believe, over his writings as a whole, becoming apparent with greater or lesser intensity as the theme of this or that novel or story permits. The same may be said of character portrayal. There is no one outstanding character in Baroja's fiction who bears a strong or a striking resemblance to a Dostoevskian counterpart. Nonetheless certain facets of some of Baroja's characters can be linked with the overall influence of Dostoevsky.

Baroja had greatly admired Dostoevsky's skill in creating characters - “y su don de crear personajes enigmáticos y presentar así más posibilidades de interpretación”; similar words have been used many times to describe Baroja's own

literary creations.¹⁸⁶ However impressed Baroja had been with Dostoevsky's technique in character portrayal, and however many points of identification he had found in Dostoevsky's writings as a whole, he was very far from offering his readers a mere copy of Dostoevsky. Yet he found Dostoevsky's treatment of religious themes, his examination of the criminal mind, and his studies of abnormal psychology to be of great interest. Possibly, in many cases, these things came close to his own thoughts.¹⁸⁷

Cipljuskaitė believed that Baroja's favourite Dostoevskian work was *The Brothers Karamazov*, though no evidence can be found in any of Baroja's writings to support such a claim.¹⁸⁸ Baroja had, in fact, singled out this novel for special praise, but within a specific context. *The Brothers Karamazov* was the only anti-clerical [sic] work of which he fully approved, since Ivan's dream, a crucial part of that novel, contains "más filosofía, y más alma que en todas las obras de nuestros anticlericales, incluidos Galdós y Blasco Ibáñez".¹⁸⁹ Judging from certain of Baroja's own short essays where he deals with various religious themes, it is very obvious that he was deeply concerned by what he saw as the decline of sincere religious faith in the Spain of his day:

Por lo que yo he observado entre los españoles cultos de hoy, la creencia en Dios es muy débil... La mayoría de la gente cree en lo sobrenatural quizá porque no tiene una idea clara de lo natural... También la idea del diablo está en franca crisis. El gran demonio de la religión, rival en otra época de Dios, ha decaído much, casi no existe.¹⁹⁰

Many of Dostoevsky's critics have noted, of course, that in certain of his characters he attempted to present "man without God"; Raskol'nikov, for example, incarnates the "radical break of the human spirit with the religious consciousness", and Kirilov demonstrates "the inevitable religious reformulation of this break with God in the ideology of mangodhood".¹⁹¹ With a lesser degree of intensity than

Dostoevsky, Baroja too was concerned about the ultimate condition of man without sincere religious beliefs. Dostoevsky's formulation and examination of these questions doubtless interested him greatly. In connection with this, it is interesting to observe that many of Baroja's contemporaries and critics accused him of being "anti-religious, anti-clerical, atheistic". Much closer to the truth, I believe, is Elizalde, who stresses that "llama la atención al leer la extensa obra del escritor vasco su preocupación por el tema religioso".¹⁹² Four of Baroja's major works have a central religious theme, these being *Camino de perfección* (1902), the two plays *La leyenda de Jaun de Alzate* (1922) and *El "nocturno" del hermano Beltrán* (1929), and his novel *El cura de Monleón* (1936); other works, for example, *César o nada* (1910), *El árbol de la ciencia* (1911) and *La sensualidad pervertida* (1920), also deal with religion but from a much more critical standpoint.¹⁹³ It cannot be said that Baroja's four main religious works offers us the intensity or the great inner dynamism of Dostoevsky's great novels. Yet they can nonetheless be said to coincide with Dostoevsky's oeuvre in that they spring principally from the examination of an "idea"; Grossman has defined this concept with regard to Dostoevsky's novels:

An abstract concept of a philosophical character serves him as the central core around which he hangs all the multitudinous, complex and confusing events of the plot...¹⁹⁴

In *El cura de Monleón* the central "idea" is the challenging of some of the main tenets of the Roman Catholic church and the Christian faith in general, which Baroja accomplishes through his main protagonist Javier Olarán. Olarán's questionings (although much less dramatic and tortured than those of a Dostoevskian character) lead him to reflect as follows:

No son detalles teológicos los que me producen dudas, sino que toda la religión se me cae como una costra...

Estoy dispuesto a romper con todo, no puedo vivir con la mentira.¹⁹⁵

However, Olarán does retain a certain “religious” feeling, which he explains and defines in the following way:

Se van evaporando en mi espíritu los fantasmas de la religión y de la teología; pero queda el sentimiento religioso, que no sé si podré dirigirlo en otra dirección, aunque sea baja y supersticiosa.¹⁹⁶

One of Dostoevsky’s chief preoccupations was precisely the correct orientation of a similar feeling. He observes that

man’s greatest beauty... and greatest purity... are turned to no account, are of no use to mankind... solely because there has not been genius enough to direct the wealth of these gifts.¹⁹⁷

As a result of his spiritual crisis, Olarán reaches the “desmoronamiento de su fe y el comienzo de su irreligión”, and Baroja describes his protagonist’s feelings at this stage in the following way:

Por todas partes le había llegado la incredulidad y el escepticismo... No lo sabía, pero podía comprender claramente que la duda se cernía por todos los ámbitos de la sociedad española. La gente obrera, socialista o revolucionaria, no era religiosa; la burguesía radical tampoco lo era, y el resto de la clase media se mostraba indiferente. El porvenir le parecía bastante negro para el cristianismo.¹⁹⁸

Dostoevsky believed, in “answer”, so to speak, to Olarán’s dilemma, that the ideal situation on earth would occur when all were connected

in a mysterious unity which contains the potentiality of genuine brotherhood... Who but an abstract doctrinaire could accept the comedy of bourgeois unity on earth?¹⁹⁹

If Baroja, through his protagonist Olarán, had attempted to present an authentic picture of “la existencia... de Jesucristo” as something which was totally separate from the official dogma of the Church, then such an idea was, of course, a fundamental one for Dostoevsky. For him, the essence of Christianity was not “the Truth... but the personality of Christ”, and in his notebooks for the novel *The Devils* he wrote:

Christ walked on earth to show mankind that even in its earthly nature the human spirit can manifest itself in heavenly radiance, in the flesh, and not merely in a dream or ideal – and this is both natural and possible.²⁰⁰

Olarán can then be seen to follow the tradition of a Dostoevskian “seeker of religious truth”. He works through a process of rejecting the religious traditions which surround him, yet at the same time he is searching for some answer to the problems of man’s existence at a deeper spiritual level. Baroja offers no clear-cut answer at the end of the novel. It is left open-ended, and the reader senses that Olarán’s new life may be about to begin.

Dostoevsky’s own attitude to the Roman Catholic Church has been widely discussed by his critics. Eliseo Vivas makes an important observation:

Dostoevsky believes that socialism and catholicism are identical as to ends: both seek to relieve men of the burden of freedom. But happiness without God is a delusion that leads men to devour one another or leads a

strong man to gain power over his fellows for their own good, and gives them happiness at the price of keeping them from realizing their full humanity.²⁰¹

It may well be that this encapsulates Olarán's views at the end of *El cura de Monleón* and also to a certain extent Baroja's own attitude to formal religion. For Baroja the following qualities were of supreme importance

la autenticidad, amor a los demás, piedad, comunión en el sufrimiento y en la lucha, utópica las más de las veces, por la libertad, rechazo de todo lo que suene a farsa, a hipocresía, a intolerancia y a fanatismo;

It follows from this that many of his characters who display such qualities will be led, as Baroja was himself led, to challenge many of the established institutions and tenets of Spanish society. Often, in fact, they will be brought to "un escepticismo metafísica y religioso, anarquismo político y social, pesimismo ético..."²⁰²

One of the central ideas in Russian spirituality, and one which certainly finds expression in the writings of Dostoevsky, is that of the heroic selfless exploit, the "podvig". Two necessary components of this are humility and denial of self. Towards the latter half of the 19th century another dimension was added to the idea of the "podvig", namely that it was frequently associated with the revolutionary movement and even with revolutionary terrorists.²⁰³ The compassion which certain revolutionaries felt for suffering humanity was elevated almost to a divine level, and the sense of mission and self-sacrifice which they often displayed came, on certain occasions, close to martyrdom.²⁰⁴ Raskol'nikov, for example, has been interpreted in the light of such views and Aliosha Karamazov has been described as "a monk and a revolutionary".²⁰⁵ A link may be established too between the original definition of "podvig" and the sense of heroic mission which accompanied

Don Quijote on his “salidas”. (The interest in and the deep understanding of Cervantes’s novel in Russia has already been noted.) With regard to the history of the revolutionary activity of the above-mentioned variety, Elizalde remarks that in Spain

suele ser muy enraizada, desde la existencia de Don Quijote, la convicción de que la justicia humana, espontánea, natural, aventaja en todo momento a los fríos procedimientos jurídicos.²⁰⁶

In *Aurora roja* Baroja “justifies” Juan Alcázar’s violent action and bloodshed in order to create a new society:

Para Juan, en su exaltación, todos los caminos, todos los procedimientos eran buenos, con tal que trajeran la revolución soñada. Esta sería la aurora de un nuevo día, la aurora de la justicia, el clamor del pueblo entero, durante tantos años, vejado, martirizado, explotado, reducido a la miserable situación de bestia de carga. Sería una aurora... en donde a la luz de los incendios crujiría el viejo edificio social...²⁰⁷

But when Juan discovers that, contrary to his expectations, “el oro de las almas humanas no salía a la superficie”, and when his disillusion commences, this is expressed through the dream of his brother Manuel. Juan dies and does not see “su ideal realizado, en una clara, luminosa, radiante mañana de mayo”, but also “sin volver a la cordura de Alonso Quijano”.²⁰⁸ The ideas which are expressed in many episodes of *Aurora roja* and also the notion of the dream, suggest a possible relationship with Dostoevsky’s novel *The Brothers Karamazov*; it must have caught Baroja’s attention that the chief protagonist in the dream sequence of this novel was the Grand Inquisitor, the scene being set in Seville. According to Dostoevsky’s

Inquisitor, man is not free because of three demands which he makes – for miracle, mystery and authority. Man is, according to the Inquisitor, too weak to bear the burden of freedom, and so this will be “carried” for mankind by a small élite in exchange for the obedience of the rest of the species, who have relinquished their personal freedom in return for “happiness”.²⁰⁹ With a much lesser degree of intensity, the dialectic between Juan and Manuel in *Aurora roja* recalls the arguments between Christ and the Inquisitor, or between Ivan (Juan) and Aliosha in Dostoevsky’s novel. Manuel expresses man’s need for “bread”, as the Inquisitor had done. In the same way that the Inquisitor had believed that Christ’s teachings imposed too great a burden on mankind, Manuel considered that his brother’s ideas of a perfect, future state were impossible to realize.

There are many characters throughout Baroja’s writings whose ideas echo those of the Grand Inquisitor. In *El gran torbellino del mundo*, for example, Larrañaga denies that he is an enemy of religion, stating that he recognizes the intrinsic value of the Christian faith, amongst the last true apostles of which he numbers Dostoevsky. However, he maintains that

el sentimiento cristiano está muerto. Probablemente puro, nunca ha sido patrimonio más que de individualidades extraordinarias, porque constantemente ha aparecido mistificado por la Iglesia oficial. La masa jamás ha podido sentir con fuerza la idea de la caridad y del amor al prójimo.²¹⁰

From this very brief exposition it is clear that both Baroja and Dostoevsky were to a certain extent investigating similar spiritual ideas. Both held the view that modern materialistic society was destroying man’s inner life and essential nature. Both feared and mistrusted a superficial religious “system” which failed to satisfy man’s deepest needs and which was often corrupt and false. Baroja feared the ultimate spiritual degeneration of Spain much in the same way that Dostoevsky

viewed Russia's future with trepidation.²¹¹ Fernando Ossorio's description of Yécora in *Camino de perfección* - a title which in itself is suggestive of the idea of the "podvig" - highlights what Baroja dreaded most for Spain:

En Yécora... todo es nuevo en las cosas, todo es viejo en las almas... El arte ha huido... ha dejado [todo] en los brazos de una religión áspera, formalista, seca... La vida en Yécora es sombría, tétrica, repulsiva; no se siente allí la alegría de vivir; en cambio, pesan sobre las almas las sordideces de la vida.²¹²

However frequent and however bitter Baroja's anti-clerical and anti-religious remarks may be, he nevertheless held certain basic Christian beliefs. Fully convinced of Baroja's deep and authentic sentiments in this area, Francisco Pérez even talks of "un franciscanismo barojiano".²¹³ The passage which had been so heavily underlined in Baroja's New Testament would seem to sum up what don Pío regarded as the essential ideas of the Christian faith. The same passage was greatly admired by Dostoevsky, and its words are not so far removed either from the basic ideal of the "podvig":

La piedad pura y sin mancha ante Dios Padre es ésta:
asistir a los huérfanos y viudas en su desgracia y guardarse
limpio de este mundo.²¹⁴

Bagno, of course, deals in a short section of his work with the influence of Russian literature on Baroja. He points to the Russian protagonists of Baroja's novel *El mundo es así* (1912). He mentions in particular the fact that of all the Russian writers whose work Baroja admired "the most influential for him... was Dostoevsky", though he does not attempt to develop this any further.²¹⁵ However, he does give a fairly detailed account of what he describes as "one of the most interesting episodes in the history of the reception of Dostoevsky in Spain": the

polemic over the interpretation of the Russian's work which arose between Baroja and Ortega y Gasset.²¹⁶ Bagnó has his own opinions to add to the dispute over Baroja and Gor'ky: he concludes that, in fact, "the pessimistic and tragic note... in [some of Baroja's] characters... is even stronger than in his supposed Russian teacher", and he states that, in his opinion, "Gor'ky did not influence Baroja at all".²¹⁷

With his continuation of Pardo Bazán's work as communicator and popularizer, Baroja's particular importance is that of an original and stimulating critic of Dostoevsky. Don Pío's own popularity and well-deserved reputation, both in Spain and in Latin America, enabled him to establish and consolidate the latter's reputation throughout the Hispanic World. He also absorbed, as a creative element in his own imaginative writings, the distinctively modern example which Dostoevsky had furnished.

By contrast, the Spanish novelist to whom Baroja owed most – a greater literary figure in himself than any of his compatriots so far discussed – was in no sense a major intermediary between Russian and Spanish culture. Benito Pérez Galdós dedicated no critical studies to Russian writers (apart from his short article on Pardo Bazán's lectures on Russian literature). His extensive European travels never brought him to Russia, and he had no knowledge of the Russian language. Yet critics have, from time to time discerned the possible influences of Turgenev and of Tolstoy in certain of his works and Galdós's own love of both these writers has been well documented.²¹⁸ In the final section of this chapter, the reception of Turgenev in Spain will be considered briefly and the possibility of his having influenced Galdós's novel *Doña Perfecta* will be examined. Once again, however, we are bound to remind ourselves that the seemingly great impression which Russian literature made on him was accomplished through the medium of translation.²¹⁹

(B) TURGENEV AND GALDOS:**THE GENERATION CONFLICT**

“Pérez Galdós [was]... a man of almost unbelievable industry. Not even Scott or Balzac left so many books behind them... His personal attitude to the world is always connected with his feelings for human beings. For this reason his books lack that extra dimension, so richly provided by Tolstoy and Turgenev... How different from the manner of Dostoevsky, who, though he fills his books with border-line cases, uses them to real imaginative effect... Galdós, on the other hand, is confined to the limits of the realistic novel, and the comparison that occurs to our mind... is rather to some of the veristic painting and wood sculpture done by Spanish artists in the seventeenth century.”

G. Brenan²²⁰

“[In Russia in the 1850s] [t]he novel became at once a chronicle of the immediate past and a means of prescribing for the future in terms of a historical perspective. Nostalgia became quite as strong a motive force as revolutionary sentiment. The novel achieved stability and dominance as a literary form and the groundwork was laid for the Russian novel to emerge during the sixties as a literary phenomenon capable of attracting and influencing the literatures of Europe... [Turgenev’s] novels were all love stories involving the gradual revelation of the hero’s character

through his confrontation with the heroine, and the process always involved a peripeteia in which the respective roles of strong and weak were reversed.”

R. Freeborn²²¹

As stated at the outset, one of the aims of the present work is to provide, wherever relevant, information about the research in the field of Russo-Spanish relations which has been carried out by Russian Hispanists, whose work has not been translated either into English or into Spanish. The section which follows, concerning the reception of Turgenev in 19th-century Spain and the supposed relationship between his novel *Fathers and Children* and Galdós's *Doña Perfecta* will include the treatment of these topics by Bagno.²²²

Bagno firmly believes that

given the great interest which I.S. Turgenev showed towards the literature, the language and the history of Spain... the history of his reception into that country has been studied only very superficially.²²³

The first translations of Turgenev's works began to appear in Spain in the 1880s; in 1882, for example, the Spanish rendering of *Smoke* was published and this was followed in 1883 by the translation of *A Nest of Gentlefolk* and *Rudin*.²²⁴

The first really widely diffused reference to Turgenev in Spain occurs in Valera's *Cartas desde Rusia*. More information was provided some years later by Pardo Bazán. Alekseev, however, believed that Turgenev might possibly have been mentioned by K.L. Kustodiev (who was attached to the Russian Embassy in the 1860s) in a lecture on Russian history which he gave in the "Ateneo": I have found no trace of this, however.²²⁵ Again Turgenev's name might have been familiar to Spanish readers from foreign journals such as *Revue des Deux Mondes* and, of course, from Emilio Castelar's *La Rusia contemporánea*.²²⁶ All this leads

Bagno to believe that “by the end of the 1880s–1890s Turgenev had become one of the most popular writers in Spain” and he quotes the comment by Enrique Díez Canedo that, in fact, every educated Spaniard in the late 1890s considered it to be his duty to have read almost all of Turgenev’s works.²²⁷ During the years 1891–1894 most of Turgenev’s major fiction, for example *Primer Amor*, *Hamlet y Don Quijote*, *Padres e hijos*, had appeared in Spanish translation, many of them being published in *La España Moderna*.²²⁸

Bagno further considers that Turgenev was “very highly regarded amongst Spanish writers and that his influence on many of them, for example, on E. Pardo Bazán, B. Pérez Galdós and Juan Valera was profound and a fruitful one”.²²⁹ Unfortunately Bagno does not develop this idea but proceeds, instead, to discuss a single instance in some detail: the supposed relationship between *Fathers and Children* (1862) and *Doña Perfecta* (1876).²³⁰

On hearing of Turgenev’s death in 1884, Galdós is known to have declared that he had lost his greatest teacher and to have expressed his profound admiration for the Russian’s works. It is also known that the two had corresponded and that Galdós, with great pride, had kept Turgenev’s letters in his archives.²³¹

Bagno begins his study of *Doña Perfecta* and *Fathers and Children* by referring to an article by the American scholars, Chamberlin and Weiner: Bagno reveals that, in fact, this topic had been discussed very much earlier and in considerable detail by the Russian philosopher and critic V.V. Lesevich (1837–1905) – a contemporary of both Galdós and Turgenev.²³² Lesevich believed that

... in Galdós’s novel there is an interesting juxtaposition: on the one hand there is doña Perfecta, and on the other there is Pepe Rey, and they represent two different generations and two different outlooks on life... And it is here, in this juxtaposition, that the main... idea of the novel is contained.²³³

Bagno himself finds three main areas where the two novels appear to coincide, having first made the point (with which I would fully agree) that

Galdós's novel is more dramatic, since it is a reflection of two opposing factions within Spanish society... The social situation which is shown in *Fathers and Children* does not have the same dramatic force.²³⁴

Bagno's first point is that the two male protagonists, Bazarov and Pepe Rey, belong to the generation of the "children". Both are interested in the natural sciences; both defend progress, especially economic progress, and in defence of their ideas both refer to the new scientific achievements of Germany, France and England.²³⁵ Second, Bagno points to the fact that both young men die in tragic circumstances, partially as a result of their failure to utilize this knowledge for the good of their respective societies.²³⁶ Bagno acknowledges, however, that the death of Pepe Rey was "brought about" by his opponents, clearly in the grip of religious fanaticism, a situation which does not obtain in Turgenev's novel.²³⁷ As a third point Bagno indicates the presence in both novels of a "young man 'in the background' who, in the final instance, will become reconciled with the world of the 'fathers'": these two young men, he continues, have only a passing and brief contact with the "new ideas" and they end by reaching a compromise with the "fathers".²³⁸ Bagno is, of course, referring to Arkadii and Jacinto, and he sees their similar functions within these novels as "being vitally important from a structural point of view".²³⁹

Bagno concludes his brief analysis of the two novels by highlighting areas in them which are quite different. In this phase of his argument he quotes frequently from Chamberlin and Weiner.²⁴⁰ For Galdós, according to Bagno, "the natural sciences in the hands of the young generation would provide the key to the renewal and salvation of the country", whereas Turgenev did not agree with such a view.²⁴¹ Also much more attention is paid in *Doña Perfecta* to matters of religion,

this being one of the central themes of the Spanish novel.²⁴² Bagno's final comment is as follows:

Therefore, even if a certain presence of Turgenev's *Fathers and Children* may be detected in Galdós's novel *Doña Perfecta*, this does not in any way prevent the latter from being an independent work of literature and from being one of the finest examples of Spanish realist prose fiction.²⁴³

Although the central idea of the conflict between the generations is certainly common to both novels, the differences between the two deserve a greater emphasis than Bagno allows. It is true that the concept of the journey is important for both novels. The two works begin with the journey of the "children" into the world of the "fathers" and both Bazarov and Pepe Rey arrive as strangers in this new environment. But Turgenev's novel lacks, for example, a female (or indeed a male) character belonging to the older generation who displays the malign power and the force of doña Perfecta; Nikolai Petrovich, the "father" in Turgenev's novel, could not be compared to her in any way. Consider, for example, the way in which he anxiously awaits the return of his son in order to reveal his own "illicit" relationship with Fenechka. Also the endings of these novels display, in my opinion, a completely different atmosphere and mood: although both Bazarov and Pepe Rey die – the depiction of Bazarov's death could be described as a masterpiece of Turgenev's art – yet that novel could be said to end on a note of possible reconciliation, suggested in particular by the description of the natural world. Galdós's novel, by contrast, ends with a mood of foreboding, gloom and warning. *Fathers and Children*, then, ends as follows:

НЕ ОБ ОДНОМ ВЕЧНОМ СПОКОЙСТВИИ ГОВОРЯТ
НАМ ОНИ, О ТОМ ВЕЛИКОМ СПОКОЙСТВИИ

«равнодушной» природы; они говорят также о вечном примирении и о жизни бесконечной...

while *Doña Perfecta* concludes:

Esto se acabó. Es cuanto por ahora podemos decir de las personas que parecen buenas y no lo son.²⁴⁴

In general, there would appear to be too many important differences between these two works in mood, in character and in overall meaning to allow us to talk of a major influence of Turgenev on Galdós. Above all, there is the question of how, at the time of composition of *Doña Perfecta* in the mid 1870s, Galdós could have been acquainted with Turgenev's novel. It seems highly improbable that there could have existed any early Spanish translation, now totally lost. Knowledge of a French version is a more plausible hypothesis, but Galdós's visit to Paris in the late 1860s seems too early in date, and his fictional interests at this time seem to have been drawn rather to Balzac and to Dickens. Bagno offers no clue to the mystery and, pending its solution, the case for any input from Turgenev must remain non-proven.

Other critics have discussed the influence of Tolstoy on later works by Galdós, such as *Realidad* and *Angel Guerra*, and I myself believe that there may have been some influence of Dostoevsky's early writings – *Poor Folk*, for example, on *Misericordia* and possibly on *Tristana* too. Some of Dostoevsky's religious views may also have helped to shape the themes of *Nazarín*.²⁴⁵ However, a further study of these matters would take us beyond the parameters of the present thesis.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER 3

1. Pío Baroja, *Obras Completas* (Madrid, 1976), VII, p.812. This will be further referred to as O.C.
2. H. Levin, *Grounds for Comparison* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1972), p.248.
3. Doubt was first cast on the authenticity of this statement by the Russian scholar Leonid Grossman. It is assumed that these words were first attributed to Dostoevsky by Vogüé in *Le Roman russe*, p.96, D. Fanger in *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism* (Massachusetts, 1965), discusses this in chapter IV.
4. Pío Baroja, *O.C.*, V, p.1066.
5. José Alberich, "La biblioteca de Pío Baroja", in *Pío Baroja*, ed. J. Martínez Palacio (Madrid, 1974), pp.263–282.
6. *Ibid.*, p.271.
7. Antonio Machado's comments on the continuing unreliability of such translations are given in the fourth chapter of this thesis.
8. *Pío Baroja*, ed., J.M. Palacio, pp.264–265. On p. 264 Alberich regrets that his stay in Baroja's library had been very short and, consequently, "no me haya permitido hacer un catálogo completo...".
9. This is reproduced in *Pío Baroja: Escritos inéditos* (Madrid, 1973), pp.353–410. Like Chekhov, who had also studied medicine, Baroja retained a life-long interest in new medical discoveries, in particular in the field of psychological medicine.
10. Alberich, p.273.
11. Claude Bernard, *Introduction à l'étude de la médecine expérimentale* (Paris, 1865). Chekhov was also greatly interested in this work. Also see Biruté Ciplijauskaitė, *Baroja, un estilo* (Madrid, 1972).

- 12 Alberich, pp.275-276.
- 13 See, for example, Sigmund Freud's article "Dostoevsky and Parricide" in *Dostoevsky: A Collection of Critical Essays* (New Jersey, 1962), ed. R. Wellek, and also A. Boyce-Gibson, *the Religion of Dostoevsky* (London, 1973).
- 14 Pío Baroja, O.C.VII, p.445.
- 15 Ibid., p.446.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Ibid., p.447.
- 18 Ibid., pp.446-447.
- 19 Ibid., pp.448-449.
- 20 Fernández Almagro in Pedro Laín Entralgo, *La generación del noventa y ocho* (Madrid, 1961), p.45.
- 21 Alex de Jonge, *Dostoevsky and the Age of Intensity* (London, 1975), p.9.
- 22 See, for example, Ciplijauskaitė.
- 23 Jonge, p.207.
- 24 Ibid., p.114.
- 25 Pío Baroja, O.C.I, pp.255-647.
- 26 Pío Baroja, "El desdoblamiento psicológico de Dostoyevski", O.C.V, pp.1066-1071.
- 27 Boyce-Gibson, p.209.

- 28 Pío Baroja, O.C.V, p.456.
- 29 Francisco Pérez in *Pío Baroja*, ed. Palacio, p.207.
- 30 Boyce–Gibson, p.209.
- 31 Ciplijauskaitė, p.117.
- 32 Pío Baroja, O.C.VII, p.810.
- 33 Ciplijauskaitė, p.43.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Pío Baroja, O.C.VII, p.607.
- 37 Pío Baroja, *Hojas sueltas* (Madrid, 1973), pp.41–89. This will be further referred to as H.S. This edition carries a “Nota preliminar” by Julio Caro Baroja, pp.7–10, and a prologue by Luis Urrutia Salaverri, pp.11–35. Salaverri also writes a short commentary on Baroja’s essays on Russian literature on pp.105–110.
- 38 Ibid., p.105.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 Ibid., p.40.
- 41 See section (6) of this chapter for a fuller discussion of this matter.
- 42 Pío Baroja, H.S., pp.77-81. This is mainly a discussion of Hertsen.
- 43 Ibid., p.41.
- 44 See chapter 2 of this thesis.

- 45 Pío Baroja, H.S., pp.41-49.
- 46 Ibid., p.42.
- 47 Ibid., pp.43-44.
- 48 Ibid., pp.45-46, (Lomonosov); p.48, (Karamzin).
- 49 Ibid., p.106.
- 50 Ibid., pp.49–55. For Pushkin see p.49 and for Lermontov, p.54.
- 51 Ibid., p.49.
- 52 Ibid., p.52.
- 53 Ibid., p.53.
- 54 Ibid., p.54.
- 55 Ibid., p.55.
- 56 For a brief synopsis of the character of Pechorin, see, for example, John Mersereau Jr. in *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, pp.187–188.
- 57 Pío Baroja, H.S., pp.56–77.
- 58 Ibid., p.56.
- 59 A detailed study of the presence of Gogol' in later Spanish authors, for example, Valle-Inclán, remains to be carried out.
- 60 Pío Baroja, H.S., p.60.
- 61 See the following section of this chapter.
- 62 Pío Baroja, H.S., p.63.

- 63 Ibid., p.66.
- 64 Ibid., p.65.
- 65 Salaverri, commentary on Baroja, in Baroja, H.S., p.108.
- 66 Baroja, H.S., p.73.
- 67 Ibid., pp.69–73.
- 68 Salaverri, commentary on Baroja, in Baroja, H.S., p.108.
- 69 Baroja, H.S., p.72.
- 70 Ibid., p.74.
- 71 Ibid.
- 72 Ibid., p.76.
- 73 Ibid., p.77.
- 74 Tatyana Mamonova, *Russian Women's Studies: Essays on sexism in Soviet Culture* (Oxford, 1989), p.37.
- 75 Schanzer, p.xiv.
- 76 Ibid., pp.xiv–xvii.
- 77 Ibid., p.xiv.
- 78 Ibid., p.51.
- 79 Ibid.
- 80 Ibid., p.56.

- 81 Ibid.
- 82 Ibid., p.58.
- 83 Ibid., p.xiv.
- 84 Ibid., p.85. It may be, of course, that as the Spanish title suggests “sleepless nights”, these items were included as possible remedies? Schanzer does not comment.
- 85 Ibid., p.52.
- 86 This translation belongs to the series “Círculo de lectores”. No mention is made at all of the translator. It was published in Barcelona in 1965. “Izquierdo” was/were responsible for the design on the cover.
- 87 S.V. Belov, *A Commentary on “Crime and Punishment”* (Leningrad, 1979), pp.43–45. This is an excellent and illuminating study of the novel.
- 88 Belov, p.43, stresses the importance of the opening of the novel.
- 89 Dostoievski, *Crimen y castigo* (Barcelona, 1965), p.5. The translator has altered the Russian K to X.
- 90 Praver, p.65, quotes this.
- 91 Ciplijauskaité, p.102.
- 92 Praver, p.69.
- 93 See C. Nallim, *La novela en Pío Baroja* (Mexico, 1963), p.30. Baroja discusses this relationship with “la dama rusa” in O.C.VII, pp.939-946. This episode in his life is entitled “Intermedio sentimental”. He expresses his fear that in recounting this in his novel *La sensualidad pervertida*, O.C 11, p.843-994, “no había obrado con mucha discreción” (Baroja, O.C.VII, p.946).
- 94 Ciplijauskaité, p.103.

- 95 Ibid.
- 96 Ibid.
- 97 Peace, p.298.
- 98 Pío Baroja, O.C.IX, p.973.
- 99 Peace, p. 298.
- 100 Leonard Kent, *The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevsky* (The Hague, 1972), p.123. Baroja, O.C.VII, p.959.
- 101 Pío Baroja, O.C.IV, p.1072.
- 102 Peace, p.298.
- 103 Ibid., p.299.
- 104 See final bibliography for a short list of critical works on Chekhov.
- 105 See Schanzer, p.47.
- 106 Ibid., p.49.
- 107 Ibid., p.50.
- 108 Pío Baroja, O.C.VII, p.815. Baroja relates this incident with great humour.
- 109 More detailed discussion of Chekhov's treatment of women will be presented in the next two chapters of this thesis.
- 110 Pío Baroja, O.C.VI, pp.499–514.
- 111 Pío Baroja, O.C.II, pp.571–752 and A.P. Chekhov, *Diadia Vania*, *Poln. sobr. sochtu* (Moscow, 1978), vol.12, p.61.

- 112 Pío Baroja, O.C.II, pp.445–570 and A.P. Chekhov, *Tri sestry*, *Pis'ma sobr. Sochn.* (Moscow, 1978), vol.12, p.117.
- 113 Ciplijauskaitė comments on p.106 .
- 114 Ibid., p.105.
- 115 Ibid., p.106.
- 116 Ibid.
- 117 Bulgakov's novel *The Master and Margarita*, for example, has been published in Spanish by Alianza Editorial, no.124, Madrid, 1974. The citation from Julio Caro Baroja is given in full in note 160.
- 118 Pío Baroja, O.C.VII, p.1046. At this point Baroja also discusses *Recuerdos de las casa de los muertos*, *El idiota* and *Los hermanos Karamazoff*.
- 119 Sigmund Freud in Wellek, ed., p.98.
- 120 Vaz de Soto, "Baroja, crítico literario", in *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, 265-267, (July-September, 1972), 302.
- 121 Rafael Ferreres, "Pío Baroja, crítico literario" in *Los límites del modernismo* (Madrid, 1964), p.105.
- 122 Vaz de Soto, p.105.
- 123 José Corrales Egea, *Baroja y Francia* (Madrid, 1969).
- 124 Pío Baroja, O.C.V, pp.1066–1071.
- 125 Contained in Wellek ed., p.113.
- 126 Otto Rank, "The Double as Immortal Self" in *Beyond Psychology* (New York, 1958), pp.62-101.

- 127 Frances Wyers, *Miguel de Unamuno: The Contrary Self* (London, 1976), p.83.
- 128 Ibid., p.84.
- 129 Iu.G. Kudriavtsev, *Tri kruga Dostoevskogo* (Moscow, 1979), p.154, quotes this.
- 130 Ibid.
- 131 F.M. Dostoevsky, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, (Leningrad, 1976), vol.I, p.254.
- 132 Contained in Wellek, p.116.
- 133 See, for example, *Biblical Studies: Essays in Honour of William Barclay*, ed. McKay and Millar, (London, 1976).
- 134 R.D. Laing, *The Divided Self* (London, 1980).
- 135 Pío Baroja, O.C. V, p.1066.
- 136 Ibid.
- 137 Ibid.
- 138 Ibid.
- 139 Ibid.
- 140 Ibid.
- 141 Ibid.
- 142 Ibid.
- 143 Ibid., p.1068.
- 144 Ibid., p.1069.

- 145 Ibid., p.1068.
- 146 Ibid.
- 147 Ibid., p.1069.
- 148 Ibid., p.1068.
- 149 Ibid., p.1070.
- 150 Ibid., pp.1070-1071.
- 151 Ibid., p.1071.
- 152 Ibid.
- 153 Ibid.
- 154 Ibid.
- 155 Ibid.
- 156 Alberich, op. cit., p.268.
- 157 Pío Baroja, O.C.V, p.1070.
- 158 Wellek, ed., p.14.
- 159 Angel María de Lera, “Baroja, el innovador” in *Encuentros con don Pío* (Madrid, 1972), p.87.
- 160 Ibid., p.22.
- 161 Portnoff, p.54.
- 162 See chapter 2 of this thesis and Portnoff, p.55.

- 163 Baroja, O.C.VII, p.425.
- 164 Leo Barrow, *Negation in Baroja* (Arizona, 1971), p.173.
- 165 Rosalie Wahl, *The Literary Doctrine of Pío Baroja* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1959), p.95.
- 166 Baroja, O.C.VII, p.425.
- 167 Zunzúñegui, "Encuesta en torno a Baroja", in *Indice*, p.23.
- 168 F.M. Borrás, *Maxim Gorky the Writer* (Oxford, 1967), p.23. See also R. Hare, *Maxim Gorky, Romantic Realist and Conservative Revolutionary* (Oxford, 1962), and Mamónova, pp.55–62.
- 169 Pío Baroja, O.C.V, pp.37–39.
- 170 *Ibid.*, p.37.
- 171 *Ibid.*
- 172 *Ibid.*, p.38.
- 173 *Ibid.*
- 174 *Ibid.*, p.39.
- 175 See Borrás for a list of the complete works of Gor'ky.
- 176 Pío Baroja, O.C.VII, pp.425–426.
- 177 *Ibid.*, p.425.
- 178 Domingo Pérez Minik in *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, 55–65.
- 179 *Ibid.*, p.64.
- 180 Ignacio Elizalde, *Personajes y temas barojianas* (Deusto, 1975), p.34.

- 181 Praver, pp.102–103.
- 182 See first section of this chapter.
- 183 See, for example, Sebastián J. Arbó, *Pío Baroja y su tiempo* (Barcelona, 1963), p.242.
- 184 Ibid.
- 185 See, for example, Elizalde, p.24. Baroja, O.C.VII, p.1077.
- 186 See, for example, Ciplijauskaité, p.66.
- 187 Bagno, as will be seen at the end of this present section, hardly deals with this at all.
- 188 Ciplijauskaité, p.57.
- 189 Pío Baroja, O.C.VI, p.83.
- 190 Ibid., p.183.
- 191 Wellek, ed., p.165.
- 192 Elizalde, p.83.
- 193 Pío Baroja, *Camino de perfección* in O.C.VI, pp.7–130, *La leyenda de Jaun de Alzate*, O.C.VI, pp.1099–1174, *El “nocturno” del Hermano Beltrán* O.C.VI, pp.1175–1220, *El cura de Monleón* O.C.VI, pp.721–882, *César o nada*, O.C.II, pp.571–752, *El árbol de la ciencia*, O.C.II, pp.445–570 and *La sensualidad pervertida*, O.C.II, pp.843–994.
- 194 Leonid Grossman, *Dostoevsky* (London, 1965), p.156.
- 195 Pío Baroja, O.C.VII, pp.872–873.
- 196 Ibid., p.871.

- 197 Wellek, ed., p.154.
- 198 Pío Baroja, O.C.VII, p.876.
- 199 Wellek, ed., p.155.
- 200 Ibid., p.136.
- 201 Ibid., p.38.
- 202 See Elizalde, p.144.
- 203 See, for example, N. Gorodetsky, *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought* (London, 1938), and M. Morris, *Saints and Revolutionaries: The Aesthetic Hero in Russian Literature* (New York, 1993).
- 204 See note 203 above.
- 205 See short list of critical works on Dostoevsky in the final bibliography.
- 206 Elizalde, p.147.
- 207 Pío Baroja, O.C.IV, p.1031.
- 208 Idem. and Elizalde, p.156.
- 209 See, for example, Kudriavtsev, p.305.
- 210 Pío Baroja, O.C.IV, p.107.
- 211 See, for example, Elizalde, pp.53–81.
- 212 Pío Baroja, O.C.VI, pp.86–87.
- 213 Pérez, p.381.

- 214 Ibid., p.332.
- 215 Bagno, pp.129–132.
- 216 Ibid., pp.131–136.
- 217 Ibid., p.137.
- 218 See next section of this chapter.
- 219 Some of the earliest Spanish translations of Turgenev will be mentioned in the next section of this chapter.
- 220 Gerald Brenan, *The Literature of the Spanish People* (Cambridge, 1963), pp.348–349 and p.364.
- 221 Richard Freeborn, *The Rise of the Russian Novel* (Cambridge, 1973), p.124.
- 222 Bagno, “Galdós’s ‘Doña Perfecta’ and ‘Fathers and Children’” in *I.S. Turgenev: Life and Works* (Leningrad, 1982), pp.115–124.
- 223 Bagno, p.115.
- 224 Ibid., note 8.
- 225 Ibid., p.116.
- 226 Ibid.
- 227 Ibid., pp.118–119.
- 228 Bagno quotes all of them on p.119, note 21, but his source for all his information is Schanzer.
- 229 Bagno, p.120.
- 230 Ibid., pp.121–124.

- 231 Bagno discusses this at length on p.120, note 29.
- 232 Bagno, p.121 and note 32 for details regarding Lesevich.
- 233 Ibid.
- 234 Ibid., p.122.
- 235 Ibid.
- 236 Ibid.
- 237 Ibid.
- 238 Ibid., p.123.
- 239 Ibid.
- 240 Idem.
- 241 Ibid.
- 242 Ibid.
- 243 Ibid., p.124.
- 244 A detailed reading of the endings of the two novels makes this difference very clear.
- 245 As far as *Misericordia* (1897) is concerned, it will be recalled that Galdós himself said that in this novel he was descending to “las capas más ínfimas de la sociedad matritense, describiendo y presentando los tipos más humildes, la suma pobreza, la mendicidad profesional, la vagancia viciosa, la miseria, dolorosa casi siempre...”. Galdós, *Doña Perfecta; Misericordia* (Mexico, 1971), p.115. It would be an interesting and profitable study to look for glimpses of Dostoevskian influence on the protagonist of this

novel, *Benigna*, and also to examine the novels *Tristana* and *Nazarín* for the possible influence of Dostoevsky.

CHAPTER 4

“CLARIN”, UNAMUNO, GANIVET AND RUSSIA
 (1) “THOSE WHO WAIT BEHIND THE WINDOW”

«КУРИЦА - НЕ ПТИЦА,
 БАБА - НЕ ЧЕЛОВЕК.»¹

THE WOMAN QUESTION

AN INTRODUCTION

“There is in Russian folk tales other testimony to the patriarchal way of life. In ‘The Enchanted Ring’, they... ‘took the unfaithful wife, tied her to the tail of a wild stallion and set him free in an open field. The stallion flew like an arrow and tore her to pieces along ravines and steep gullies’ . *The Enchanted Ring* is a folk tale, handed down from long, long ago, but in real life at the end of the nineteenth century Maxim Gorky wrote about the inhuman punishment of unfaithful wives which he himself had witnessed, proving that cruel reality often outdid fairy tale fantasies”.²

“‘Don’t destroy me... Take me alive, take me home with you, and put me at your window. But watch me. ... These words are put into the mouth of a female character in order to excuse the hero... So they triumph: justice for him: injustice for her.’”³

One of the stated aims of this thesis was an investigation of the so-called woman question, a topical and highly polemical issue in Europe during the time-span we are examining here. Aspects of this matter are, in my opinion, powerfully represented in Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* and in "Clarín"'s *La Regenta*; in a later section of this chapter these two novels will be compared and contrasted. We shall also consider briefly the impact which Tolstoy's shorter work *The Kreutzer Sonata* made both in Russia and in Spain.

The late Monserrat Roig addressed the question of "those who wait behind the window" in a lecture given some years before her untimely death.⁴ On being asked to offer an explanation for the proliferation of the so-called "novels of adultery" at the end of the nineteenth century, she ventured the suggestion that the male authors of these works were attempting to investigate how, if at all, attitudes to women had changed or developed in their respective societies.⁵ Through the vehicle of the so-called realistic novel the "progress" which women had made could be admirably monitored and tested. My own investigation into this matter will be, as stated, confined to the two novels mentioned above; in the course of my brief examination I shall be considering what common themes are present in these works and, finally, the vision that these two authors give us of "those who wait behind the window".

In his illuminating essay on the dissemination of the realistic novel Levin notes that

[w]hen we speak of a work as realistic, we are voicing the opinion that it corresponds to known and felt realities. Our criterion is a variable, since it must depend upon the experience of various individuals, more or less like ourselves; it must be subjective in essence, though objectified by the environment and interests they have in common. The colors and the contours of reality will vary from one country to another.⁶

We shall pay brief attention to the “colors and contours” affecting these two novels, concentrating rather on the themes which emerge from a close reading of them.

The theme of a work has been defined as “the axis that maintains the unity and consistency of meaning” in it.⁷ As we shall see, the central “axis” of both novels concerns the adultery of a woman protagonist. But the struggle to avoid the adulterous relationship and the tragic consequences which resulted from a failure to do so also emerge as important themes. Additionally, both novels powerfully depict the entrapment of these female characters within a hostile environment; the two women can find, as we shall see, no escape, either through relationships or through occupations, the final state of both works suggesting a senseless waste of talents and of life itself. The themes that we have just described can, of course, be found in other major novels of this genre; however, *Anna Karenina* and *La Regenta* are, in my view, set apart and betray a special affinity, as I will argue, because of their depiction of another theme. Running parallel to the description of the vicissitudes of the female characters, both novels introduce a male character who, in many ways, provides a “counterbalance” to the woman’s fate. This theme will be examined more fully in the relevant section. Finally, we will observe that in both works there is a profoundly pessimistic world-view, namely that often “les choses sont contre nous”.

In an earlier chapter of this thesis we noted the possible prejudices which surrounded the literary achievements of Pardo Bazán; after all she was a woman writer, emerging in a society where the place for “la mujer honrada”, (together with “la pata quebrada”), might well still have been “la casa”.⁸ By the later decades of the nineteenth century the women’s movement in Russia “was already sufficiently developed and was urgently raising the issue of women’s education”.⁹ This movement, in fact, “reflected the most vital issues of [Russian] society in the 1880s...”.¹⁰ But, of course, there were objections and obstacles; for example,

fears were voiced “(in Russia, as elsewhere) that [women] would lose their femininity, their supposed natural modesty and even their capacity to bear children”.¹¹ These matters will be further considered in our examination of the two novels.

Religious attitudes to marriage and divorce have an important role to play in both works. It is instructive to comment, then, that while Roman Catholic Spain did not, of course, permit divorce, the latter was granted, but reluctantly, by the Orthodox Church. The Orthodox Church condemned the breakdown of marriage “as a sin and evil” and, in fact, divorce was regarded as “an exceptional but necessary concession to human sin.”¹² Should a second marriage be contracted, in the eyes of the Orthodox Church this could never be the same as the first “... and so in the service for a second [alliance] several of the joyful ceremonies are omitted, and replaced by penitential prayers”.¹³

This, then, is a brief background for one of the major topics to be addressed in the course of this chapter. At this point it will be appropriate to consider some of the salient facts surrounding Tolstoy’s reception in nineteenth-century Spain.

(2) THE POPULARITY OF TOLSTOY

IN 19TH-CENTURY SPAIN

A SUMMARY

“There was not a single Russian writer who exerted so much influence... as Tolstoy. The sphere of his influence was not restricted to Europe either... By the end of the 19th century it had reached India, Japan, China, the USA and the countries of Latin America. At the present time one of the countries where his influence has been researched least of all is Spain.”

V. E. Bagno¹⁴

“The soul of the Spanish people may be found in their literature”.

L. N. Tolstoy¹⁵

If the complex world of Dostoevsky was not properly known and appreciated in the Hispanic World until the twentieth century, “the wave of Tolstoy’s popularity”, as Schanzer notes, “began in the late eighties.”¹⁶ In this short introductory section a summary will be given of the reception of Tolstoy’s writings in Spain - again with conclusions reached by Russian Hispanists clearly in mind. Bagno reminds us that the works of Tolstoy were late in reaching Spain in comparison with other European countries, and he emphasizes the vital importance in their eventual diffusion there of Pardo Bazán’s lectures and essays.¹⁷ Mention

should also be made here of those later articles in which doña Emilia continued and developed her critical studies of Tolstoy.¹⁸

The first Spanish translation of *Anna Karenina* had been published in Barcelona in the year of Pardo Bazán's lectures (1887). *War and Peace* first appeared in its Spanish version two years later; both works had, of course, been available earlier in French.¹⁹ Bagno contends that Pardo Bazán's initial treatment of Tolstoy contained "a richness and a breadth of material... and drew important and profound conclusions".²⁰ One of the most important of these conclusions was her perception that "the true hero of Tolstoy's epic [*War and Peace*] is Russia". In Bagno's opinion she was the first Spanish critic who successfully managed to define and to understand Tolstoy's theory of non-violent resistance to evil.²¹

It is another tribute to Pardo Bazán's success as a popularizer (though it clearly owes something, too, to the initiatives of translators and publishers) that, as Bagno emphasizes, Spanish interest in Tolstoy "was not confined merely to intellectuals and writers... but reached out into much wider circles".²² Schanzer concludes from his research that during the period from 1888-1910

Tolstoy's works were published and republished in Spain [in Spanish and in Catalan] 93 times, whereas during this same period... the works of Dostoevsky were published only 18 times.²³

Dostoevsky did not overtake Tolstoy in popularity in Spain until after the First World War; Baroja's major article on him, we recall, appeared in 1943.

Following Pardo Bazán's lectures and essays more and more journals, such as *La España Moderna* and *El Liberal*, printed articles about Tolstoy's writings; many of these did not deal exclusively with his literary works; for example Araujo's "Tolstoi y la literatura evangélica en el siglo XIX" presented his religious teachings, while other pieces presented his social views, translations of his diaries, letters, and the personal reminiscences of those who had met him.²⁴ The Spanish press

devoted more space than did that of any other European country to the details of Tolstoy's last days and his death. There were special assemblies in Bilbao, Barcelona and Valencia as a sign of public mourning for him; these meetings had even involved clashes with the Spanish police.²⁵

Tolstoy himself had a keen interest in Spanish culture; he owned many works of Spanish literature, for example, K. D. Bal'mont's 1902 Russian version of Calderón's *La vida es sueño* and a small collection of Valera's novels.²⁶

As far as Tolstoy's practical influence on Spanish authors is concerned, Bagno sees this as extending to Galdós, "Clarín" and, to a much lesser extent, Valera, Pereda, Palacio Valdés and Blasco Ibáñez. Yet he offers no examples of the presence of Tolstoy in any of the last four authors mentioned.²⁷ With regard to Galdós, Bagno discusses briefly the "similarities which exist between *Realidad* and *Anna Karenina*", and points out that these were observed "long ago".²⁸ He disagrees with Portnoff's approach to this subject, by way of a one-to-one comparison of the characters, believing that the true point of contact between the two novels lies in the portrayal of their main female protagonists.²⁹ Bagno also sees a possible influence of Tolstoy's social teachings in Galdós's *Nazarín* and suggests a link between *War and Peace* and the third series of *Episodios nacionales*.³⁰ He concludes this short appraisal by noting that:

There can be no doubt that further study of the influence of Tolstoy on Galdós, taking into account a wider selection of his works, would lead to many new and interesting conclusions."³¹

About "Clarín", as we shall see, he had certain comments to make too.

"Clarín" himself took an active part in the promotion of Russian literature in late 19th-century Spain. Many of his critical articles deal with the works of Russian writers, especially of Tolstoy. These include an important and original treatment of *Master and Man*, written in 1895, but regrettably unknown (or virtually so) to

specialists in Russian studies. Its comparison between Tolstoy's story and *Don Quijote* must have helped many Spanish readers to make the transition from their own literary culture to this new literature which was gaining such popularity among them.³² In addition to all this, his major novel *La Regenta* belongs, as we have commented, with Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* in the tradition of so-called 19th-century "novels of adultery". The question of influence, therefore, proves inescapable, but it is not to be resolved (as has sometimes been suggested) in terms of surface similarities between the two novels.³³ In the following pages, I will show that they contain more significant internal resemblances, being very close in mood and tragic irony, and confronting, in a manner not hitherto attempted, what was known as the "woman question".

(3) "CLARIN" AND TOLSTOY:

LA REGENTA AND ANNA KARENINA

TWO NOVELS WHICH "EXALTAN LO VITAL"

"¡Tolstoi! También este famoso conde ruso aburre ya a muchos franceses y españoles... que no le han leído... Los más no han tenido paciencia para leer y digerir los cuatro tomos de *Guerra y Paz*, los dos de *Ana Karenina* y los varios volúmenes que cuenta su historia íntima... Algunos críticos superficiales, que ahora abundan en ciertos periódicos franceses, ya nos habían declarado que estaban cansados de Tolstoi, como si los hombres de genio pudieran tomarse y dejarse como los pantalones anchos y los cuellos de pajarita."

"Clarín"³⁴

"My dress was blue, but now the sun
Has turned it pale and white.
No, my beloved didn't leave me
I left him. Serve him right.

If they had told me what the swine
Was going to do to me,
I'd never have loved him at the time
But drowned him in the sea!"³⁵

After Emilia Pardo Bazán, pioneer and popularizer, and Pío Baroja, the reflective fictional pupil of Dostoevsky, the third most significant cultural intermediary between Spain and Russia in this era is, without doubt, Leopoldo Alas.³⁶ Like Pardo Bazán and Baroja, “Clarín” did not know Russian (although Bagno puts forward the suggestion that he might have had a reading knowledge of the language), nor had he ever visited Russia. He too, therefore, made the acquaintance of Russian literature through translations.³⁷

Commenting on the difficulties of relying solely on translations of Russian writers, Antonio Machado remarks that, since Slavonic languages were “perfectamente ignoradas en España... [la] producción literaria rusa nos es conocida por traducciones no siempre directas, frecuentemente incompletas, defectuosas muchas veces”. Machado reminds his readers that to translate a work “es someterla a una dura prueba y traducirla mal es casi borrarla”. Yet he firmly believed despite the poor quality of the translations which circulated in Spain in the 19th and early 20th centuries that the essential values and fundamental truths of the original works were not lost. Not that Machado can do anything but deplore the standard translating practices of his day:

Aquellos libros que leíamos siendo niños, y que llegaban a nosotros, trasegados del ruso al alemán, del alemán al francés y del francés al español chapucero de los más baratos traductores de Cataluña, dejaban en nuestras almas ... una huella muy honda...³⁸

Yet there does seem to have been a slow improvement of translation standards in the early years of the 20th century, and this may explain, in part, how the more “difficult” Dostoevsky – now, at last, rendered accessible – came to supplant Tolstoy in the forefront of public esteem. “Clarín”’s own decisive preference for Tolstoy, then, may be partly a generational feature. Yet it was also a highly personal matter: he quotes frequently from Tolstoy’s work, and even did so

while delivering his lectures at Oviedo University. “Clarín” also testifies directly to the depth of his appreciation of Tolstoy, and alludes to the latter’s possible influence on his own works when he notes that, “Tolstoi, ese ruso a quien nunca veré, también es padre de algo mío.”³⁹ Besides his perceptive and little-known analysis of Tolstoy’s *Master and Man*, he produced an introduction to the first Spanish translation of *Resurrection* – the novel of 1889 whose description (Part 1, chapter 39) of the sacrament of Holy Communion was the main reason for Tolstoy’s eventual excommunication from the Orthodox Church.⁴⁰

Many 19th-century novels, of course, deal with the fate of the adulterous woman. The theme is shared by – among many others – Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina* (1876-77) and “Clarín”’s *La Regenta* (1884-85) and the points of comparison between them – not all as obvious as this – will repay further discussion.⁴¹ Critics have indicated that *Anna Karenina* marks the final stage in Tolstoy’s depiction of so-called “natural or living life” (“zhivaia zhizn”), before he turned his attention to concentrate primarily on the “exposure of reality and the unmasking of illusions”.⁴² His later short and supremely powerful work *The Kreutzer Sonata* does have an important series of links back to *Anna Karenina*; for example, in the former Tolstoy already depicts the seduction of Anna by Vronsky as though he were describing a murder. But *The Kreutzer Sonata*, taken overall, deals with the question of marriage from a very different standpoint. One year after the appearance of the *The Kreutzer Sonata*, “Clarín” too was to present another facet of marriage in his second novel *Su único hijo*. Both these later works offer bitter criticisms of the institution of marriage, through the exploration of a range of common themes, though “Clarín”’s unfinished novel does not display the great dramatic force and tension of *The Kreutzer Sonata*. There is also a reflection of certain Tolstoyan themes and preoccupations to be glimpsed in some of “Clarín”’s *Cuentos morales*.

At a purely superficial level it can be noted that the adulterous female protagonists of both *Anna Karenina* and *La Regenta* are named Anna, and that the woman’s adultery is presented in both, as in other novels of that era, (*Madame*

Bovary, *Effie Briest*, *O primo Bazilio*) as the catalyst of a chain of tragic consequences. Both women are in due course shunned by their respective societies. Both have, in a sense, become non-persons, forfeiting an identity which, as the titles of the two novels confirm, was theirs only in virtue of their dependence, through marriage, on a male “other”.⁴³

In *Anna Karenina* the heroine commits suicide at the end of the novel, while in *La Regenta* Ana Ozores remains physically alive, but her elderly husband Víctor is killed in a duel as a direct outcome of her adultery. Simultaneously with the account of the main female characters, in each novel there is a parallel and no less interesting account of a male protagonist. In the case of *La Regenta* this involves the presentation of Fermín de Pas, and in *Anna Karenina* the story of Levin. Structurally these two additional plot-lines are of great significance. De Pas provides a frame for *La Regenta*. At the beginning of the novel he appears as a figure of splendour and power surveying his “spiritual kingdom” of Vetusta from a high tower, while at the end he violently rejects a penitent Ana, who had spurned his (admittedly sacrilegious) love for her. Levin’s spiritual searchings, on the other hand, provide a counterpoint to Anna’s struggle and final downfall. The “Levin segments” are inserted into the story of Anna and Vronsky at strategic places throughout the novel. At times the two elements come tantalizingly close to each other; repeatedly they reflect similar themes - until Anna and Levin finally meet near the end of the work. Although *La Regenta* does not conclude with the physical death of Ana Ozores, it could be argued that “Clarín” presents a more desolate world-view than Tolstoy. The kiss which Celedonio gives Ana at the end of the novel, a repulsive travesty of the human affection which she had sought so earnestly, seems to capture perfectly both the atmosphere of the fictional world which “Clarín” has been depicting throughout and Ana’s failure to find any meaningful human relationship within it:

Ana volvió a la vida rasgando las nieblas de un delirio que le causaba náuseas. Había creído sentir sobre la boca el vientre viscoso y frío de un sapo.⁴⁴

Both authors coincide in presenting a stifling and almost inevitably tragic milieu for their female protagonists. In the same way as the St. Petersburg society reacts to Anna's relationship with Vronsky, Vetusta both delights in and at the same time disapproves of Ana Ozores's "fall". At the end of *La Regenta*, "Clarín" suggests that Ana's future life there may be like: "Ahora nada: huir del dolor y del pensamiento".⁴⁵ The sense of inevitability is enhanced because "Clarín" provides much more background detail for Ana Ozores than Tolstoy does for Anna Karenina, thus allowing the reader greater insight into Ana's subsequent development. As Minik has aptly pointed out, "Ana Ozores, como complejidad, no tiene precedentes en nuestra novela".⁴⁶

Again external features of the two novels coincide: both women had their marriages of convenience arranged for them, and while the elderly and theatrical don Víctor may be a more sympathetic figure than the "cerebral" Karenin, nonetheless Ana Ozores's arranged and subsequently childless marriage is not a happy one. She earnestly searches for a solution to this dilemma and an acceptance of her situation in the first instance, through "un misticismo exaltado" and a relationship with "el hermano mayor del alma", de Pas.⁴⁷ The struggle of Ana Ozores to find a meaning for her existence through religious "exaltation" may be, to a certain extent, paralleled by Anna Karenina's attempts, at least initially, to find compensation for her unhappy marriage through her son:

On her first-born, although he was the child of a man she did not love, had been concentrated all the love that had never found satisfaction.⁴⁸

It is when Ana Ozores is finally disillusioned with de Pas and has recalled her father's words "el celibato clerical es sólo una careta", that she finally succumbs to the carefully planned attentions of the local dandy, don Alvaro. The theme of celibacy or chastity of the clergy – a very important sub-theme of *La Regenta* – occurs in a great many 19th-century novels: for example Galdós's *Tormento*. Tolstoy, of course, also deals with this subject in *Father Sergius*, and the theme of celibacy, even within marriage itself, was to be one of the subjects which he dealt with most controversially in *The Kreutzer Sonata*.⁴⁹ For "Clarín", however, the celibacy of de Pas hardly functions as a positive value (save as an aspect of fidelity to his priestly calling). In Ana's life, it is one more source of sterility: she can neither find fulfilment in a merely chaste and pious relationship with de Pas, nor even begin to contemplate as acceptable a relationship that would be anything else. The resulting sense of entrapment is not dissimilar in mood to what Anna Karenina feels, as she experiences the tormenting division between love for Vronsky and love for her son

... a feeling akin to that of a sailor who can see by the compass that the direction in which he is sailing is wide of the proper course, but is powerless to stop.⁵⁰

Neither woman is offered any escape from these patterns of sterility and frustration. Hints are offered by "Clarín" at various stages throughout his novel that Ana might have had talent as a writer but that in the society in which she lived such pretensions would have come to nothing. There was, apparently, no solution for her isolation within the provincial atmosphere of Vetusta, and her life was doomed to be one of sterility, similar to the life of de Pas, trapped within a false vocation. In *Anna Karenina* Dolly observes towards the end of the novel that although outwardly it may appear that Anna has attained happiness and satisfaction in her new life with Vronsky and their daughter, her continuing inner division and

torment are inescapable. They will lead her, in the final instance, to take her own life.

This meeting with Dolly at the end of the novel is of crucial importance within the complex pattern of “cross-relationships” to be found throughout Tolstoy’s work. Anna had made her first appearance, ironically, as the mediator between Dolly and her husband Stiva (Anna’s brother) at the time of Stiva’s adultery. When Dolly visits Anna in the closing sections of the novel, Anna is herself, of course, living out her own adulterous relationship with Vronsky, having abandoned her husband and her son. It would appear that Dolly is being used by Tolstoy here as a kind of “counterpoint” to Anna. Dolly is preoccupied above all with the cares of her family, with her many children, and she has long accepted the fact of her husband’s adultery. It seems as if Tolstoy is suggesting (he was to suggest such a thing on many occasions) that this was the correct way for a woman to live: bearing many children and living a life of selfless and unquestioning devotion to the family. It has often been asserted that Anna was finally driven to suicide by her awareness of how far she had moved away from this ideal, and that this “woman’s world”, with all its domestic duties and preoccupations, was lost to her forever once she abandoned her lawful marriage. Dolly’s life could be described (at least in terms of the number of children she had borne and her dedication to their wellbeing) as being a truly “fruitful” one, whereas Anna’s new home with Vronsky strikes Dolly as being artificial and false. She notices, for example, that Anna does not know how many teeth her daughter has - and the mention by Anna of her use of contraception would appear symbolically to hint at a kind of self-imposed sterility within Anna’s life. Contraception was, of course, anathema to Tolstoy, who regarded it as one the major evils of society.

While it cannot be said that “Clarín” employs such a complex web of relationships to bring to the fore the concepts of “sterility” and “fruitfulness”, these are, evidently, important notions within both novels.

In parallel with the story of Ana Ozores, "Clarín" also portrays the falsity and, to a certain extent, the tragedy of the life of Fermín de Pas. In part, he too is a victim - of the greed and worldly ambition of his mother, doña Paula - and at the end of the novel his ultimate fate may be seen to be almost as tragic as that of Ana herself:

Sí, Anita, sí, yo era un hombre... Yo soy tu esposo;
me lo has prometido de cien maneras.⁵¹

Tolstoy, on the other hand, in developing the story of Levin offers an alternative (albeit maybe only a temporary one) to Anna's mode of escape from her unhappy marriage. After long searching and even a suicide attempt, a truth finally strikes Levin as the result of a conversation with one of his peasants: that man must learn to live for God and for others:

And all of a sudden this same Fiodor declares that...
we must live for truth, for God, and a hint is enough to
make me understand what he means.⁵²

There is surely a strange irony in the fact that "Clarín"'s professional man of religion seeks and temporarily finds a meaning for his life through his love for Ana, while Levin finds a meaning for his life – possibly only temporarily too – after finally comprehending certain religious truths. Levin chooses to go on living, and the novel closes with Kitty's domestic preoccupations and Levin's thoughts about his future life which, in the light of his "religious conversion" seems, he muses, to be invested with a new meaning and purpose.

At the end of *La Regenta* there is no such glimmer of hope for the future. The only character who stands apart from the stultifying atmosphere of Vetusta is "Frígilis", but he can offer no real solution or alternative for Ana. Indeed, he was the chief instigator of her contrived union with don Víctor in much in the same way

as he attempted to carry out artificial grafting of plants. And “Frígilis”, as his name implies, is all too aware of the fragility of human nature.⁵³

There is no conclusive evidence to prove that “Clarín” had read *Anna Karenina* either before or during the writing of *La Regenta*. Indeed, from this brief summary, it has already been shown that the novels, though having certain external similarities, nonetheless reveal major differences too. What may be concluded at this stage is that both authors coincided in depicting adulterous relationships which had tragic outcomes for the central female characters involved (a very common theme in the 19th-century novel). Both Tolstoy and “Clarín” also paint a grim picture of the social and religious mores of their times. Neither author confines his attention to the central adulterous relationship. And it is in this aspect that the special affinity of the two works may reside. Both novels are opened out and achieve an extra dimension with the presentation and resolution of the parallel plot lines of Fermín de Pas and Levin respectively. It is as though each author were testing questions of freedom and morality from both a male and female point of view. Certainly, we are not given the impression in either novel that these additional plot lines are of much less importance than those of the female protagonists.

In the case of *La Regenta* it seems as though both Ana and de Pas have been forced to play false roles in life. The episodes where de Pas is described in non-clerical dress seem to suggest that his “real self” too has been artificially “grafted” on to a profession, the Roman Catholic priesthood, for which he had no true vocation. There is a self-evident parallel with Ana’s “unnatural” marriage, which bore no fruit (literally or figuratively), but stifled and choked her true inner being. In Tolstoy’s novel there is a close shadowing of the stories of Anna and Levin, and the novel presents a curious, but vitally important, “criss-crossing” of relationships. Kitty, later Levin’s wife, had first loved Vronsky, who “rejects” her in favour of this passion for Anna, and the unrealized possibility of some form of

relationship between Levin and Anna, although never overtly stated by Tolstoy, seems almost to beg the question.⁵⁴

On a more superficial level, both novels give a symbolic value to certain names and locations; Tolstoy, for example, uses a city location to represent whatever he sees as false and ultimately harmful for a person's correct spiritual development, whereas the Russian countryside is viewed as being the proper environment for one's true inner harmony. Critics often noted that Levin is most at home in the country and feels ill at ease when in the city. Vetusta, a fictional Oviedo, by its very name signifies that which is stagnant and life-depriving. The majority of its inhabitants live up to this idea only too well. Through don Alvaro's surname, Mesía (and, indeed, through his first name too which hints, perhaps, at a well-known Romantic hero), "Clarín" offers a grotesque parody of the idea of Ana's long awaited "saviour". Critics of Tolstoy's novel have noted the implications which may be deduced from the Greek origin of the name Karenin.⁵⁵

More significantly, both authors invest the lives of their female protagonists (for whom they feel, I believe, a genuine sense of compassion) with a profoundly tragic sense. The situation of both women suggests a feeling of hopelessness and tragic inevitability and, perhaps worst of all, a sense of the pointless waste of human life and talent.

In these two novels we observe too that adultery committed by men even evoked society's approval or at least its acceptance – both Tolstoy and "Clarín" make this very clear in the two novels presently being examined. Quite a different scale of values was still applied in the case of adultery committed by a woman. These ambivalent values were not only social; they were religious as well.⁵⁶ Montserrat Roig suggested additionally that, in most cases, the male authors of the "novels of adultery" felt a strong sense of identification with their female protagonists and sympathized profoundly with the tragedy of their often wasted lives.⁵⁷ *La Regenta* and *Anna Karenina* are, in my opinion, both novels which "exaltan lo vital". (Anna Karenina, it will be remembered, had difficulty in

controlling an unruly curl of black hair, and critics have pointed to this as a symbol of the life-force [living life] within her which she could somehow not quite suppress.) They are works which above all show with what facility life may be senselessly and tragically destroyed. I believe that, in this aspect, these novels may demonstrate a much more important affinity than is exhibited by their merely external points of similarity.

Tolstoy, as is well-known, was proud of the “architecture” of *Anna Karenina* and on many occasions referred to the “secret corner-stone” concealed deep within its fabric. It has been suggested that this corner-stone may be the fact that Anna and Levin almost met before Anna’s adulterous relationship with Vronsky began. A relationship between Anna and Levin, which might have brought about an authentic sense of communion and understanding, very nearly happened but was somehow prevented from taking place. From the existence of this corner-stone, then, emanates part of the tragic sense of the novel. The impression which Anna makes on Levin in the closing chapters, when their plot-lines finally converge, is conveyed as follows:

And Levin saw a new trait in this woman whom he already found so extraordinarily attractive. In addition to her intelligence, grace and beauty, she also possessed sincerity... and a feeling of tenderness and pity came over him which surprised him.⁵⁸

It could be said that a similar tragic thread runs through “Clarín”’s novel, in that the relationship between Ana and de Pas in other circumstances might have released each of them from the false and unsatisfactory life they lived - or rather, they were forced to live by circumstances. But as has already been observed, the novel comes to its end with a very powerful emphasis on the senselessness and wanton destruction of life, and no hopeful vision of a better future. Each in his

own way, then, both Tolstoy and “Clarín”, reflect in these novels the tragic irony that so often “les choses sont contre nous”.

It has been suggested that Chekhov wrote his short story *The Lady with the Little Dog* as his response to Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina* (much in the same way as his story *Ariadna* was a response to *The Kreutzer Sonata*); in *The Lady with the Little Dog* the adulterous relationship between the protagonists is described at the end of the story in the following way:

He and Anna loved each other... as man and wife or as close friends do... and they felt that this love of theirs had changed them.⁵⁹

No such situation is represented as even possible in the case of Ana Ozores or of Anna Karenina. From the very outset, Anna Karenina’s relationship with Vronsky is surrounded by omens and portents of doom and destruction (for example, the death of the race-horse Frou-Frou prefigures Anna’s own death).⁶⁰ Ana Ozores found neither fulfilment nor happiness through her relationship with don Alvaro, after she had rejected her spiritual friendship with de Pas - not that this can promise her anything more lasting.

Critics have often pointed to the “theatricality” of *La Regenta*, indicating the important part which the theatre plays not only in the lives of the characters but also in the way in which they (often falsely) perceive themselves. In Tolstoy’s novel, Anna’s visit to the theatre, after her relationship with Vronsky is well-established, reveals clearly to her that society’s rejection of her is now irrevocable and that she will never again be accepted within its fold.⁶¹

A final point of coincidence between the two novels may lie in the way in which both novelists manage to “peel off the outer husk” and unmask their characters, presenting the true essence of their situation, however stark this may be. It has, indeed, been observed that Tolstoy’s intention in such unmaskings - a most important concept within his later art in general - may be, in fact, to “make the

reader feel that he himself was wearing the mask that was to be torn off. Generally accepted ideas become illusion, and the normal was revealed as abnormal".⁶² The effect of "Clarín"'s presentation of Vetusta society and its half-collaborative victims is much the same.

The main points of affinity between these novels, then, would appear to be not so much in their external similarities as in a more profound affinity of mood, and atmosphere, in the feeling and the irony which runs so powerfully through them both, concerning the tragedy of wasted lives and talents. Both novels also show clearly, as the efficient cause and outward sign of this tragedy, the double standards – especially in regard to women – which pervaded the social morality of their respective settings. A later section of this thesis will explore a very different case in which two Russians (Ostrovsky and Chekhov) and a Spaniard (Lorca) coincide in their portrayal of "the woman question".

(4) *MASTER AND MAN AND THE KREUTZER SONATA*

“‘Clarín’ was above all attracted by... the breadth of Tolstoy’s views as expressed in his novels... and by his criticisms... of society.”

V. E. Bagno⁶³

“*The Kreutzer Sonata*... was published [in Spain] under many titles... which greatly facilitated pirated editions; such variations also made it easier to produce reprints or new editions, even in the same publishing house.”⁶⁴

In July 1895 “Clarín” wrote a brief article on Tolstoy’s story *Master and Man* (*Amo y criado*) - a story which was both well-known and popular in Spain at that time. The idea for *Master and Man* had occurred to Tolstoy during the years 1892-93 when he was in charge of a relief organization for starving peasants. The story is first mentioned in his diary entry for September 6th, 1894, and although its initial version was completed in a matter of seven days, the final version was not handed over for publication by him until February of the following year.⁶⁵ In an accompanying letter Tolstoy indicated that the composition of this work had “given him great pleasure” but that he was uncertain as to “how it would turn out”.⁶⁶ It was finally published, after various corrections, in March, 1895; consequently there was only a delay of some four months before “Clarín” presented his critical appraisal of it in Spain.⁶⁷ Once again, “Clarín” must have made the acquaintance of this story via its French translation, since the first Spanish version was not published until 1899.⁶⁸

Regarding the translation of the title of the story and its major themes, “Clarín” offers his readers a guidance which makes it very clear that he was well acquainted with the latest developments in Tolstoy’s writings:

En rigor, criado no es la palabra exacta; se trata de un ‘mujik’... Sea como quiera, el creador... una vez más trata artísticamente de las cuestiones que más le preocupan: las relaciones del propietario ruso y el ‘mujik’, y el gran problema de la otra vida, de la piedad religiosa como solución para las contrariedades de este mundo.⁶⁹

From this article it is apparent that “Clarín” also knew of Tolstoy’s spiritual crisis which, in his view, had converted “al antiguo aristocrata ruso... en una especie de asceta civil”. In the summer of 1892 “Clarín” himself had experienced a similar crisis, the essence of which is expressed in his short story *Cambio de luz*. The protagonist Jorge Arial loses his sight but attains a new kind of spiritual illumination.⁷⁰ The music which provides the background to this story is “La Sonata de Kreutzer”. “Clarín”’s story also contains hints and echoes of Tolstoy’s earlier work *The Death of Ivan Il’ich*, which Alas could have known from a French rendering, since the first Spanish translation did not appear until 1894.⁷¹ Some three years later, in the introduction to his *Cuentos morales*, “Clarín” refers to his own spiritual condition in the following way:

Como entiendo y siento yo a Dios, es muy largo y algo difícil de explicar. Cuando llegue a la verdadera vejez, si llego, acaso, dejándome ya de cuentos, hablaré directamente de mis pensares acerca de lo Divino.⁷²

Since the time of his spiritual crisis Tolstoy, as “Clarín” rightly notes, had engaged himself in the writing of parables, and *Amo y criado* represents for “Clarín” just such a parable, “un comentario del Evangelio”, in which the author

stresses that it is of the greatest importance to love “lo otro al pintar... y al vivir”.⁷³ Within the scope of his short study, “Clarín” draws a very interesting parallel between this story and *Don Quijote*, observing that in Tolstoy the roles of master and servant are curiously reversed. Brekhunov is “un Sancho Panza, no escudero, sino de burgués andante, no en busca de entuertos que desfacer, sino de compras ventajosas que realizar. Aquí el escudero es el Quijote”.⁷⁴ It is Nikita who is the true “Quijote por dentro, un idealista con harapos, sin discurso de la Edad de Oro que él no sabe que ha existido, pero que adivina allá, en la otra vida...”. In Tolstoy’s tale there is no Dulcinea of flesh and blood, but “Clarín” suggests that for Nikita “Dulcinea es la otra vida, que por fuerza ha de ser mejor”.⁷⁵ The ending of *Master and Man* – the death of Brekhunov who, free at last from “el peso enorme de su ciego egoísmo”, passes the heat of his body to Nikita, thus saving the latter’s life - made a profound impression on “Clarín”, who refers to the “grandeza sublime” of this outcome.⁷⁶

In a similar way to Baroja, who in his essay *El desdoblamiento psicológico de Dostoyevski* produced an original and thought-provoking critical article on a topic of Russian literature, “Clarín”, some fifty years before Baroja, does the same in his commentary on *Master and Man*, and it is to be regretted that his analysis remains virtually unknown in the wider field of Tolstoy criticism.

“Clarín”’s own *Cuentos morales* were published in 1895; Bagno mentions in passing the possible influence of *Master and Man* on one of these stories, *El Torso*. The suggestion is based on the fact that “the theme of the story is the relationship between a young aristocrat and his old servant, Torso. The latter succeeds in awakening the aristocrat’s finer feelings...”.⁷⁷ There are, however, many other traces of a possible Tolstoyan influence in these *Cuentos*; for example, the short *Boroña* hints at Tolstoy’s more complex work *The Death of Ivan Il’ich*, while “Clarín”’s story *El Quin* in which “se trata de estudiar el estado de alma de un perro” recalls Tolstoy’s *Kholstomer* or *The Story of a Horse*.⁷⁸

With regard to *Resurrection*, “Clarín” remarks that in 1900 it was “el libro de la temporada” in Spain and that in this novel “todo es admirable... Libros así... enseñan más que muchos tratados de filosofía y de sociología”. He firmly believed too that this work was equal, if not indeed superior, to both *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina* - “aun las aventaja en ciertas cualidades, que justamente son de las que suponen mayor atención al objeto artístico, a la forma, a la composición”.⁷⁹ In fact, for “Clarín” *Resurrection* was “la novela más hábil, más perfecta de Tolstoy”, and he provides for his readers an interesting point of reference to Spanish literature in that he compares the sincerity of his work, its scope and its breadth of ideological content to the plays of Lope de Vega.⁸⁰

Tolstoy’s comments on the family as expressed in the opening lines of *Anna Karenina* are well-known, his scathing attack on the institution of marriage in *The Kreutzer Sonata* perhaps less so. “Clarín”’s observation with regard to marriage as expressed in his *Cavilaciones* provide an interesting point of comparison:

El matrimonio es una gran institución, pero se celebra al revés. La ceremonia debía dejarse para el último día de la unión en la tierra. Al morir uno de los esposos, la Iglesia y el Estado, previa declaración de las partes, podrían decir con conocimientos de causa: éste fue matrimonio. Todo lo demás es prejuizar la cuestión.⁸¹

In December 1889 Tolstoy completed the final version of what was to be his most bitter condemnation of the institution of marriage, *The Kreutzer Sonata*. Almost at once illegal copies of this work began to circulate in St. Petersburg. The story has been described as “a significant event in Russian intellectual life in the 1890s”, and much has been written about the public debate which took place in Russia regarding it, as well as about Tolstoy’s own “Epilogue” to it.⁸² (In Spain Pardo Bazán, we recall, was the first to produce a serious article on it.) The debate on *The Kreutzer Sonata* in the Russian press lasted for almost two years, up to the

beginning of 1892. Among other topics raised was the so-called “sexual question”. Tolstoy’s ideas regarding this matter derive, of course, from his own idiosyncratic way of interpreting the Gospels.⁸³

La España Moderna had published this work in 1890; from Schanzer’s listings, and taking into consideration the fact that the work appeared under many other titles, *The Kreutzer Sonata* enjoyed a tremendous success in the Hispanic World.⁸⁴ (It was even published in Caracas in 1934 as *Sobre el amor, las mujeres, y el matrimonio*.)⁸⁵

One year after *The Kreutzer Sonata* “Clarín” published his second novel, *Su único hijo*, in which the marriage of Emma Valcárcel and Bonifacio Reyes is closely scrutinized and found to be severely wanting. It is interesting to note that in this novel the “disintegration” of a marriage is told almost exclusively from a male point of view. Consequently it becomes a kind of “male confessional literature” – words which have also been used to describe *The Kreutzer Sonata*.⁸⁶ *Su único hijo* has a background of provincial life into which a group of musicians arrive. (The role of music as an art form which can often and all too easily arouse physical passions is emphasized in both works.) The adultery in “Clarín”’s novel is committed in the first instance by Bonifacio, who finally, however, decides to abandon this relationship out of a sense of dedication to his son:

Yo, en adelante, quero vivir para mi hijo... Nuestros amores... eran ilícitos... Debo a Dios un gran bien, una gracia... el tener un hijo...⁸⁷

The name of Tolstoy’s male protagonist Pozdnyshev may derive from the Russian work “pozдно”, meaning late, signifying that he discovered too late all the dangers inherent in relationships between the sexes.⁸⁸ (Compare Emma’s surname in “Clarín”’s novel, which suggests a reference to imprisonment.) Pozdnyshev murders his wife, convinced of her infidelity and her illicit relationship with a musician; no such dramatic intensities are to be found in *Su único hijo*. However,

in “Clarín”’s novel *Bonifacio* does have an adulterous relationship with the singer “la Gorgheggi” and both works coincide in being profoundly critical of the institution of marriage. Both male protagonists, each in his own way, rebel against the emptiness and the meaninglessness of their lives, in curious contrast to the situation in *La Regenta* and *Anna Karenina*, where this is the predicament principally of the female characters. Reyes is, however, left at the end of *Su único hijo* with some remnant of faith – “tengo fe, tengo fe en mi hijo” – although it is not certain whether the infant Antonio is, in fact, his son at all; at the end of *The Kreutzer Sonata* Pozdnyshév’s final state is one of total desolation:

It was only when I saw her dead face that I realized what I’d done. I realized that I’d killed her, that it was all my doing that from a warm, moving, living creature she’d been transformed into a cold, immobile waxen one, and there was no way of setting this to rights, not ever, not anywhere, not by any means.⁸⁹

This passage does, however, call to mind the observations which Reyes makes to himself about the physical appearance of Emma after the birth of her son:

En medio de aquella espuma aparecía, como un náufrago, el rostro demacrado, amarillento de Emma, que definitivamente había vuelto a desmoronarse en ruina que no admitía ya restauraciones.⁹⁰

Gramberg’s comment on *Su único hijo* “lo que ataca ‘Clarín’ es la inautenticidad de cualquier forma de vivir determinada no por móviles espontáneos, internos, sino por una fórmula exterior” – could well apply to *The Kreutzer Sonata* too.⁹¹ Once again the two authors have taken on very similar subject matter. Of course, “Clarín”’s second novel did not achieve the notoriety of *The Kreutzer Sonata*; all else apart, *Su único hijo* was never finished. Tolstoy’s story, on the

other hand, caused such a furore that it made the theme of marriage topical in the last decade of the 19th century.⁹²

Towards the end of his life “Clarín” became even more powerfully drawn towards the works and teachings of Tolstoy, recognising in the latter “un espíritu más profundo que el que Zola poseía”.⁹³ Coming from the most influential and intellectually formidable Spanish literary critic of his age, “Clarín”’s advocacy of the Russian novelist was bound to have a major impact, and for this reason alone he would rank as an important intermediary between the two literatures. But the very evident traces of Tolstoyan ideas and attitudes – as well as, occasionally, of similar literary motifs to be found in his fiction offer proof of an influence absorbed at a more creative level. Without that influence it is by no means clear that “Clarín” would have found ways of addressing the “woman question” as profoundly searching as those which he found in *La Regenta*. This whole topic remains to be investigated in much greater detail, and a full study of Tolstoy’s influence on the writings of “Clarín” would be of immense value.

(5) UNAMUNO AND RUSSIAN LITERATURE

“Todo lo que de Rusia, de mi Rusia, sé, es lo que por algunos libros, sobre todo de un inglés, de Mackenzie Wallace, ya algo antiguo, y por algunos artículos de revistas y de diarios he podido colegir y, sobre todo, por las obras literarias rusas - ¡naturalmente traducidas! - he adquirido.”

Miguel de Unamuno⁹⁴

Given the great importance of Miguel de Unamuno (1864-1936) within the cultures of the Hispanic World, his critical reactions to Russian literature constitute a topic of obvious interest here. Some areas of his work reflect the possible influences of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, and these are topics to which Hispanic research in Russia has made its own contribution. Widely-read as his work was in both Spain and Spanish America, Unamuno also achieved a great deal in familiarizing the Spanish public with Russian literature at the end of the 19th century and into the first decades of the 20th.

Unamuno, although familiar with many languages, knew no Slavonic language; consequently, his acquaintance with Russian literature was as indirect as his predecessors. He is known to have read the works of Russian writers in Spanish, French, English and German translations. Despite the obvious disadvantages attendant upon this, Unamuno knew certain works of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky well, and assimilated certain of their ideas, transforming them, in some cases, into his own fictional world.⁹⁵ He was well acquainted too with Pardo Bazán's work on Russian literature, whose significance he recognized.⁹⁶

As early as the 1890s, reference can be found in his letters to the beginnings of an interest in the Russians, in particular Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. In a letter to Ganivet he writes:

Me alegro verte metido en el ruso. Hace falta en España persona de inteligencia verdadera que pueda darnos impresión directa de lo ruso... Las cosas rusas me interesan mucho. Tolstoi y Dostoyesqui me entran muy adentro, y aún creo ver en ellos algo de afrancesamiento. Me gustaría conocer lo ruso más ruso...⁹⁷

Like Pardo Bazán, Unamuno detected certain spiritual and other similarities between Spain and Russia. These he describes as:

[l]a resignación, el modo de ver la vida, el concepto objetivo de lo religioso en los más y los impulsos místicos en algunos, la misma organización económica, ya que aquí existe no poco del 'mir'.⁹⁸

As might be expected, he shows as lively an interest as Baroja in the state of religion in Russia and compares this to the religious situation in his own country; as far as the teachings of Tolstoy were concerned, he maintains that “[e]l tolstoísmo mismo es más inteligible aquí que en Francia o en Italia, países más latinos y más paganos que el nuestro”.⁹⁹ Finally he exhorts Ganivet to help him broaden his knowledge in this field:

Si usted topara con algún trabajo de valía con respecto al espíritu ruso, y sobre todo a su vida religiosa, le agradecería me lo indique. Conozco algo... y no me satisface.¹⁰⁰

In a letter to Pedro de Mugica, Unamuno refers to Tolstoy's *War and Peace* and to its significance for his own work *Paz en la guerra*:

Conozco bastante a Tolstoi. Tengo *La Guerre et la Paix*, que me gusta mucho y que me ha ilustrado bastante,

pues yo estoy metido en un argumento también de paz y guerra.¹⁰¹

However, Unamuno is aware of the many differences which exist between his approach to the subject and that of Tolstoy. As he remarks “... mi modo de tratar el asunto, mi estilo, mi punto de vista, todo difiere del suyo muchísimo”.¹⁰² It was inevitable that the resemblances between *Paz en la guerra* and *War and Peace* should have attracted considerable attention. In 1897 Gómez de Baquero pointed out that Tolstoy and Unamuno share at least some similar attitudes.¹⁰³ This same critic indicates that the closeness between *Paz en la Guerra* and *War and Peace* lies in the way in which both authors enrich their vision of history with a philosophical content and with descriptions of the inner world of their protagonists.¹⁰⁴ Oostendorp considers that Unamuno’s acquaintance with *War and Peace* helped him “dar forma artística a su propia visión de la vida”.¹⁰⁵ He further stresses that the two works, so obviously linked by their titles (though Unamuno at one stage intended to call his novel *Paz*), herald “una nueva época en que se iba reconociendo al hombre como un ser individual e insustituible sin tomar en cuenta el sitio que ocupaba en la sociedad o la profesión que ejercía”.¹⁰⁶

Russian Hispanists too have observed the relationship between the two novels. Bagno, for example, believes that Unamuno used Tolstoy’s novel as a stimulus for the elaboration of his own ideas about history, but stresses the fact that Unamuno always absorbed Tolstoy’s works in a highly creative and personal way.¹⁰⁷ He adds that there are two main areas in which the influence of one novel on the other is evident: the presentation of history, and the depiction of characters.¹⁰⁸ Dealing with the first of those, Bagno observes;

The influence of Tolstoy is obvious in the very concept of war itself... in the novel of the Spanish writer. Throughout the entire novel one finds echoes of Tolstoy’s view that a man taking part in a battle or a war fails to grasp

the meaning and the purpose of what he is actually doing. Ignacio, one of the main protagonists of Unamuno's novel, observes the state of panic and mutual misunderstanding which pervades the fields of battle...¹⁰⁹

Bagno also believes that Unamuno's concept of "intrahistoria" is comparable in certain ways to the ideas about history presented by Tolstoy. These ideas, concentrated in the epilogue of *War and Peace*, may be summed up in the assertion that:

Man's life is double-faced: there is the individual personal life of every man, in which he possesses true, albeit short-lived, freedom, and the life of the collective, in which a man forfeits his freedom of will, submitting this to the laws which are common to all...¹¹⁰

For Bagno these views of Tolstoy have been absorbed by Unamuno and used in his notion of "intrahistoria": "from the point of view of the Spanish writer, political and military history are of scant interest and [Unamuno] as a social researcher concentrates his entire attention on the life of the individual."¹¹¹

As for Unamuno's presentation of character another Russian critic, Terterian, detects Tolstoy's influence in the way in which *Paz en la guerra* is constructed around two main protagonists, "reminding us of the main characters in *War and Peace*".¹¹² Pachico, like Pierre Bezukhov, becomes the mouthpiece of the author's innermost thoughts, and like Pierre, he too finds peace in the midst of war and is well acquainted with philosophical crises and moral searchings.¹¹³

The reflections which pass through the mind of the wounded Ignacio are very similar to those of Prince Andrei, wounded at Austerlitz, and one cannot escape the notion that Unamuno had been deeply impressed by those passages in

Tolstoy. Bagno also points to the possible influence of Tolstoy's Kutuzov on the portrayal of the Commander-in-Chief of the Carlist army, Elio.¹¹⁴

In his essay *La generación de 1898* Azorín notes the principal influences on the writers of this group and observes that these were:

Más complejas; pero gracias a esa comunicación con el pensamiento literario de fuera de España, se produce entre nosotros una renovación de las letras.¹¹⁵

According to Azorín, the three most profound influences on Unamuno were Ibsen, Tolstoy and Amiel. Russian Hispanists have been quick to indicate that one of the most obvious areas where Unamuno was deeply influenced by Tolstoy was that of the latter's ethical-religious thought; indeed, Bagno states unambiguously: "Unamuno, who from his youth showed an intense interest in questions of religion and morality, found in the works of L.N. Tolstoy all that was close to him in this respect."¹¹⁶ Moreover G. Stepanova and other Russian critics consider that Unamuno's position as regards the Catholic Church in Spain offers an obvious parallel to Tolstoy's own situation vis-à-vis the Orthodox Church in Russia.¹¹⁷ Unamuno himself comments on the early effect that Tolstoy's religious ideas had upon him; in a letter to Mugica he states:

Me habla V. de los heterodojos místicos, de Tolstoi y de Schopenhauer. Ahí está el clavo. No le debe a usted chocar que sean tránsito a Sta. Teresa. El misticismo no es cosa que vaya inseparable de una religión dogmática... La teología dogmática es escuela de servidumbre y muerte y el misticismo de libertad y vida. Se puede ser místico ateo.¹¹⁸

Tolstoy had clearly impressed him as being an authentic disciple of "el evangelio socialista, que es el verdadero cristianismo hoy"; in a short article published in *La lucha de clases* (1896) he remarks:

Si se habla de alguno que, como Tolstoi, por ejemplo, lleva a la conducta de su vida procedimientos más para admirados que para imitados... dicen al punto de él: está loco, es un chiflado; no hay que hacerle caso.¹¹⁹

Russian Hispanists, attempting to define what Unamuno understood by “religion”, have concluded that, like Tolstoy, Unamuno regarded religion not as a series of teachings about God but as a moral teaching concerned with the ultimate meaning of life and with whatever gives purpose and direction to a person’s life: “for the Russian and for the Spaniard, religion is not so much faith (although both authors use this word in titles of their works), but more of a protest”.¹²⁰ Unamuno and Tolstoy, it may be said, shared the view of religion as a means of protest against the destruction of man’s spiritual potential and as a protest against the order of their respective societies. For example, in Tolstoy’s *Gospels in Brief* his primary interest is in the teaching and the ethical stance of Christ. The miraculous, the supernatural and Christ’s claim to be divine are ignored or greatly underplayed, and wherever Tolstoy refers to the enemies of Christ he employs a single general term “the Orthodox”.¹²¹

There is, of course, an obvious contradiction in both writers as regards religion. Levin, at the end of *Anna Karenina*, after his long struggle and search for faith, reaches the conclusion that man should live for God, for others and for his soul.¹²² This Levin has learned not by his reason, nor by his intellect, but from the simple faith of a peasant and from the Christian beliefs in which he had been educated. Unamuno, in *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*, following in Tolstoy’s footsteps, as it were, comes to the conclusion that it is precisely the primitive and “static” faith of the people, far removed from city life and living according to the ways of their ancestors, which will give them a truer understanding of life’s meaning.¹²³ It is this too which will instil into them an authentic life-force and settle for them “the contradiction between the finite and the infinite, Unamuno’s

much sought after ideal".¹²⁴ As Unamuno says at the end of *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*:

Bien sé que en lo que se cuenta en este relato no pasa nada; mas espero que sea porque en ello todo se queda, como se quedan los lagos y las montañas, y las santas almas sencillas asentadas más allá de la fe y de la desesperación, que en ellos, en los lagos y las montañas, fuera de la historia, en divina novela, se cobijaron.¹²⁵

Unamuno's generally sympathetic response to Tolstoyan social attitudes is perhaps best summed up in a reaction to *The Kreutzer Sonata*, here cited virtually in full:

De lo que conozco de Tolstoi lo que más me gusta es *La Sonata de Kreutzer*, aquella rudeza, aquella verdad áspera y dura, aquel soplo agitado de poderosísimo psicólogo, aquel estilo febril y sólido a la vez, todo me satisfizo. La he leído dos veces, el relato del crimen es maravilloso, la pintura de la educación de nuestros jóvenes admirable, sus consideraciones las de un místico iluminado que ve muy claro, las de la suprema lucidez, que es la que se alcanza en el delirio. Aquí ha tenido mucho éxito y la traducción española ha corrido y hecho furor. Es hermoso ver a ese extravagante venir de las estepas rusas y largar esa ducha violenta a esta sociedad burguesa podrida, anémica, neurosilla, infatuada, corroída de las pestes gangrenosas del intelectualismo, del pietismo, de la bigotería, de la educación fina y del buen tono. Casi todo lo que el buen Tolstoi dice del matrimonio es de perlas.¹²⁶

In 1915 Unamuno dedicated a short essay to Tolstoy entitled “El egoísmo de Tolstoi”, this being the first of three such works devoted to *Letras rusas*.¹²⁷ Here Unamuno paradoxically sets out to show that Tolstoy was an egoist, but in the best possible sense of the word. He demonstrates that people of the calibre of Tolstoy have the right to be egoists - their egoism being, in fact, merely a special form of altruism: “Aquél que entrega su yo al servicio de los demás, de la humanidad, tiene derecho a defenderlo, en bien de los otros, con la mayor violencia posible.”¹²⁸ Tolstoy’s egoism, according to Unamuno, was a striving for self-perfection and at the same time a legacy which he bequeathed to his readers:

Y Tolstoi, el gran egoísta según los pequeños egoístas, el pródigo de su yo, nos lo ha dejado, nos ha dejado su yo, que es nuestro yo, es de cada uno de los que leemos sus obras, sus actos, y enriquece nuestro yo...¹²⁹

The examples discussed are sufficient to demonstrate that the influence of Tolstoy on Unamuno was many-sided and at the same time creative. As has been shown, Unamuno himself recognized this influence which affected, according to Bagnó, “not only the personality of Miguel de Unamuno but the very basis of his ‘Weltanschauung’”. For this reason it is reflected not only in the articles and essays where Unamuno examines Tolstoy’s works but, more importantly, “in the Spanish writer’s artistic and philosophical conceptions of the world”.¹³⁰

Apart from his great interest in the works of Tolstoy, Unamuno was also drawn, as might be expected, to Dostoevsky’s novels, which in many cases dealt with philosophical problems similar to those which had captured his own attention. In addition, the writings of Gor’ky proved attractive to him, and whilst in Paris in the 1920s he discovered the philosophical works of L. Shestov.¹³¹

Unamuno readily admitted that he had been influenced by many writers and thinkers, but he never included Dostoevsky in such a list. In 1920, in the second of his short essays devoted to Russian literature, *Sobre el género novelesco*,

Unamuno compares Russian novels, which he describes as “una expresión de realidad íntima – no digamos realismo – que llega a hacer daño”, to, for example, *Sotileza*.¹³² From this comparison Unamuno deduces that in Russia “la novela no es de género, y no es literatura”; the Russian novel is creation, it is history and it is also prophecy.¹³³ With his customary paradox, Unamuno claims that Dostoevsky the anti-revolutionary becomes the true prophet of the Russian Revolution and the “creator” of Lenin – “Lenin ha salido de las novelas de Dostoyevski, y tiene toda la realidad íntima de los agonistas de esas novelas.”¹³⁴

From the above it would appear that Unamuno knew Dostoevsky’s work well, and it could be suggested that he even made a certain use of the latter’s ideas in his own writings. Unamuno became acquainted with Dostoevsky’s novels at the same time as his enthusiasm for Tolstoy’s works was growing. In 1897 he had written to Mugica: “Mándeme usted de la Biblioteca universal de Reclam. Dostoyevski: *Schuld und Suhne*.”¹³⁵ However, it appears that a more intense interest in Dostoevsky developed in the 1920s, when more frequent mention is made of him.

The only article which Unamuno dedicated entirely to Dostoevsky was written in 1933, this being the last of his three articles on Russian literature. The piece in question, *Dostoyevski, sobre la lengua*, disappoints in that it is only a brief discussion about a passage from Dostoevsky’s *Diary of a Writer*, which Unamuno had read in French translation.¹³⁶ Unamuno shows greater insight, however, into Dostoevsky’s works in an earlier article, *Un extraño rusófilo* (1914), where he claims:

Mi visión de Rusia, de mi Rusia, procede de haber leído obras literarias de rusos... y en especial de Dostoyevski. Dostoyevski es, debo confesarlo, mi principal fuente respecto a Rusia. Mi Rusia es la Rusia de Dostoyevski, y si la Rusia real y verdadera de hoy no es ésta, todo lo que voy a decir carecerá de valor de aplicación real,

pero no de otro valor. Yo hago votos por el triunfo de la filosofía, es decir, de la concepción y el sentimiento que de la vida y del mundo tenía Dostoyevski.¹³⁷

Unamuno, as he had done with Tolstoy, uses Dostoevsky as a link to compare the political situation in Spain and Russia, and in passing refers to the great impact that Dostoevsky's *Notes from the House of the Dead* had made upon him:

España no es ciertamente la Rusia autocrática de hace todavía un año y menos. Nuestro Rey, legalmente constitucional, no es un Zar absoluto. Y sin embargo, hay absolutismo en España... El absolutismo de la arbitrariedad en España es acaso peor que fuera en Rusia porque como no llega a tan violentos excesos, no ha podido provocar reacciones tan violentas... El absolutismo zarista ruso produjo un Dostoyeusqui y un Tolstoi... y tantos otros... Dostoyeusqui escribió un libro inmortal - *La casa de los muertos* - describiendo los martirios y torturas de los que el absolutismo imperial ruso deportaba a Siberia, ¿pero un Dostoyeusqui podría en España conmover los corazones describiendo las miserias del pobre empleadillo a quien el cacique hace que le trasladen de un extremo a otro de España porque no votó al candidato caciquil para diputado o para concejal acaso?... Tener que trasladarse de la provincia de Sevilla, pongamos por caso, a la de Huesca con una familia numerosa y un sueldo de 1,500 o 2,000 pesetas, puede llegar a ser un caso digno de lo que lo narre un Dostoyeusqui.¹³⁸

Russian Hispanists would agree that, whereas it is not possible to find in Unamuno's work a direct influence of Dostoevsky with regard to either style or technique, nevertheless the two writers at times come close "in the realm of ideas". This judgement seems well-founded.¹³⁹ This proximity can, perhaps, best be observed in the attitudes of the two to the question of immortality. In the *Diary of a Writer* (October, 1876), Dostoevsky notes the following:

But when I ask myself this endless question, I cannot be happy - even during moments of the most spontaneous love for my fellow man or when such affection is shown towards myself - for I know that tomorrow all of this will be destroyed: I myself, all happiness, all love, all mankind - we will be transformed into nothingness, into chaos. Under such conditions, I can find no way to enjoy happiness... since I will not, nor cannot, be happy... in the knowledge that this tomorrow, this void, is approaching...¹⁴⁰

It is not known whether Unamuno reacted in any special way to these lines, but he did identify closely with the ideas expressed there in his reference to Dostoevsky as the true instigator of Christian anguish and despair.¹⁴¹ Bagno notes, for example, that for both Unamuno and Dostoevsky immortality was perhaps the most problematic of all questions. The conclusions reached by Russian Hispanists indicate, however, that despite proximity in ideas, there exist more philosophical differences than coincidences between the two writers. "All Unamuno's philosophy", writes Bagno, "is extreme individualism - he even subjects Christianity to a radical, individualistic transformation, whereas Dostoevsky's point of departure in his philosophy is by what means the good in any man may triumph over the evil. If Unamuno needs God as a proof of

immortality, of life after death, if God is vital to give a purpose, a meaning to life, Dostoevsky needs God precisely in this life, during man's sojourn on earth".¹⁴²

For researchers into Spanish-Russian literary relations and influences, one of the most obvious comparisons to be made would be the parallels which exist between Dostoevsky's "Legend of the Grand Inquisitor", a most important episode in his novel *The Brothers Karamazov*, and Unamuno's *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*.¹⁴³ Bagno puts forward the interesting suggestion that, in his character of Manuel, Unamuno carried out the experiment of combining Dostoevsky's Aliosha and Ivan from *The Brothers Karamazov*, Aliosha representing faith and Ivan rejection of faith.¹⁴⁴ Don Manuel as pastor of his flock, yet secretly an atheist, at times comes close to the feelings expressed by Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor: "And they will all be happy, all these millions of beings, except the hundred thousand who rule and guide them".¹⁴⁵ Unamuno has, of course, transformed Dostoevsky's ideas by "individualizing" the situation and commenting on the tragic plight of one man, don Manuel. The latter is, besides, a much less malign and in some senses less complex figure than Dostoevsky's Inquisitor: he is distinctive, again, in his attempts to identify himself with the people of the village, to save his faith in theirs. As Angela noted about don Manuel:

Y él me enseñó a vivir, él nos enseñó a vivir, a sentir la vida, a sentir el sentido de la vida, a sumergirnos en el alma de la montaña, en el alma del lago, en el alma del pueblo de la aldea, a perdernos en ellas para quedar en ellas. El me enseñó con su vida a perderme en la vida del pueblo de mi aldea...¹⁴⁶

According to Bagno, Unamuno's concept of the village and its inhabitants in this work "has a strong Russian 'accent'", in that it comes close to a Tolstoyan concept of the "mir".¹⁴⁷

Unamuno also had a high opinion of the writings of Gor'ky and claimed, in the essay which he wrote about him, that when reading his works sitting by the river Duero he could hear the song of the Volga; Gor'ky "el amargo", claims Unamuno, will give his salt to the salt of the oceans of all the peoples.¹⁴⁸

Among all the Russian writers whom he admired, however, Unamuno's deepest affinity, like "Clarín"'s seems to have been for Tolstoy. Indeed, it is with Tolstoy, not Dostoevsky, that Russian Hispanists associate him most closely, and they assert that Tolstoy's influence on Unamuno exceeded that of any other Russian writer.

Unamuno himself has fared reasonably well in the former USSR as far as translations of his works and critical material about him are concerned. The earliest Russian translation of any of his works is the 1927 version of *Dos madres*, published in Moscow.¹⁴⁹ There are entries about him in Russian encyclopedias, and since the 1950s a notable increase in Russian studies of his novels, poetry and other writings can be observed; in 1956, for example, there is a fairly long entry on Unamuno in the *Large Soviet Encyclopedia*, giving not only biographical details but a brief discussion of both *Paz en la guerra* and *Niebla*.¹⁵⁰ The author describes Unamuno's world view as "tending towards pessimism"; much praise is given to the "symbolism of Unamuno's dramatic works", and *El Cristo de Velázquez* is singled out as being Unamuno's "special philosophical monologue".¹⁵¹ In the 1983 *Encyclopedic Dictionary* there is a shorter entry on Unamuno, purporting to analyse in greater depth Unamuno's religious philosophy.¹⁵² At the centre of the latter, claims the author, "there stands the figure of Don Quijote, the very soul of Spain, an incarnation of Spain's tragic reality"; according to this author the central themes of Unamuno's writings are "love, death, solitude and a search for God".¹⁵³

In his historical work *La Rusia contemporánea* of 1881 Emilio Castelar had remarked that "hoy... nadie puede apartar los ojos de esa Rusia... y su historia contemporánea, la cual parece una creación dramática, llena de inverosímiles aventuras, desenlazadas por grandes e irreparables tragedias".¹⁵⁴ This

responsiveness to the sheer “difference” of Russian reality and the Russian imagination is perhaps the common thread linking all our sharply contrasted intermediaries. Yet how could that “difference” not have struck a chord with the supreme individualist Miguel de Unamuno?

(6) ANGEL GANIVET IN RUSSIA

“Angel Ganivet and his relationship with Russia could be the subject of a special study... While in Russia, one of his biographers tells us that he ‘was involved in the study of Russian and that he hoped to make the acquaintance of the major works of Russian literature’... Ganivet was especially interested in the spiritual closeness which he felt there existed between the Russian and the Spanish peoples.”

V. E. Bagno¹⁵⁵

Had it not been for his suicide in Riga while serving as the Spanish consul in Riga, Angel Ganivet (1865-1898) might have provided the important linguistic link which would have been so valuable for Spanish/Russian relations in the late 19th century. Ganivet was intensely interested in languages - as he demonstrated in works such as *Importancia de la lengua sánscrita* (which had been his Doctoral Thesis, presented in 1889) and in sections of his *Cartas finlandesas*, where he shows great interest in the language (and the culture) of Finland, (a country then part of the Russian Empire) where he had lived from February 1896 to August 1898.¹⁵⁶ During that time he had also visited St. Petersburg, and his *Cartas finlandesas*, in some ways parallel to Valera’s letters from Russia, give certain first-hand details of Russian customs which Ganivet had observed and about which he had heard in Finland.

From the passage cited as an epigraph to this section, and from other sources, it is known that Ganivet was engaged in a serious study of the Russian language shortly before his death. He was, in fact, at that time “obsesionado con el estudio del ruso y con la posibilidad de acercarse a los textos de su literatura...”; he

had also studied Swedish and his teacher had been “una joven rusa... Mascha Djakoffsky... con la que sostengo ratos de conversación.”¹⁵⁷

Ganivet had written a collection of essays on Norwegian literature entitled *Hombres del norte* and he had promised that during his stay in Riga he would compose a similar series on Russian writers.¹⁵⁸ He had also expressed his firm intention to become acquainted with these writers in the original.¹⁵⁹ Sadly his intentions were never carried out.

Most of Ganivet’s writings about Russia whilst stationed in Riga (also part of the Russian Empire at that time) are of a socio-historical nature; for example, not long before his death he had written a short essay entitled *España y Rusia* in which he examines the existing trade relations between the two countries and considers their prospects for the future.¹⁶⁰ This work was a routine report written in his capacity as consul.

Ganivet had arrived in Riga on August 10th 1898 - at that time the city handled all the commercial shipping between Spain and Russia - and he lived there for only three months before his suicide on November 29th (17th by the Russian calendar). Unfortunately there is little documentation about his life in Riga, although this brief period was a fairly productive one in literary terms.¹⁶¹ It is known that he lived in the Hagenberg area of the city - “el número 22 de la Taubenstrasse... Vivo en mi nueva casa, cerca del Dvina... que es el lado más pintoresco y silencioso de la ciudad” - and that he greatly valued the solitude which his consular residence provided for him in that district.¹⁶²

While in Riga Ganivet continued to write and send to Spain articles dealing with the current situation there, about which he remained “intellectually preoccupied”, in particular after Spain’s two important defeats at the hands of the U.S. Navy in May and July of 1898.¹⁶³ Unlike Valera, Ganivet was living in Latvia and not right at the heart of cultural events in Russia. During these years a most complex and fascinating period was commencing which might be “characterized as the era of modernism in its various manifestations”.¹⁶⁴

Chekhov's play *The Seagull* had been completed in 1896, the Russian symbolists had begun publishing in the middle of the 1890s, Konstantin Bal'mont had printed his work *Silence* in 1898 - it is recalled too that Bal'mont had translated *La vida es sueño* into Russian. Sologub's first novel *Bad Dreams* had come out in 1896, Bryusov was writing and publishing, and Zinaida Gippius published her first novel *The Victors* in 1898. Bely and Blok were young men in 1896, as was Gumilyov; Akhmatova, Mandel'shtam, Mayakovsky and Zamyatin were all alive too. One may only speculate, but given Ganivet's commitment to literature and culture in general, it is almost certain that he would have been able to provide fascinating details of this great Russian literary wealth for his fellow Spaniards, had he survived. The reality is that, sadly, there are very few references in Ganivet's work to Russian literature or, indeed, to Russia itself. In *El porvenir de España*, (the collected edition of his correspondence with Unamuno), he notes:

Sus ideas de usted son comparables a las que Tolstoi expuso en su manifiesto titulado *Le non agir*, aunque Tolstoi, no contento con combatir la guerra, combate el progreso industrial y hasta el trabajo que no sea indispensable para las necesidades perentorias del vivir.¹⁶⁵

In his *España filosófica contemporánea* he remarks that:

El socialismo de Owen, Fourier, Enfantin y sus secuaces y el nihilismo de Herten, Cernicevsky y Bakunin son una misma cosa; solo difieren en su manifestación externa, que guarda armonía con el medio más o menos tolerante en que se desarrollan.¹⁶⁶

In *Idearium español* he mentions Russia's role in the Napoleonic wars and also refers to the constant threat which Russia (and France) pose to "la independencia de algunas naciones".¹⁶⁷ His *Cartas finlandesas* contain more

references to Russia, and here he makes various observations about the country and its tradition: “Aunque aquí [en Finlandia] la mujer no es tan libre como en Rusia”, he notes, and he also mentions the “medidas enérgicas” which Russia adopted in an attempt to “‘rusificar’ a los finlandeses”.¹⁶⁸ He later refers to Russia as “un coloso” and discusses “las largas guerras” which had taken place between Russia and Sweden, “motivadas por la posesión de Finlandia”.¹⁶⁹ In his study *Importancia de la lengua sánscrita* he mentions that “... la gran zarina de Rusia Catalina 1, había demostrado su afición decidida a los estudios lingüísticos, encargando al capellán Dumaresq la formación de un Diccionario universal, siendo resultado de esta comisión el *Vocabulario comparativo de la lenguas orientales*”.¹⁷⁰ From his consular report *España y Rusia* we learn that at that time there was a Spanish “colonia” in Odessa, in Rostov there were “vicecónsules honorarios españoles”, and Ganivet advises the learning of Russian in preparation for the development of future contacts between the two countries.¹⁷¹

As far as the presence of Russian authors in Ganivet’s own work is concerned, Bagno suggests that there could be an influence of some of Tolstoy’s social, moral and ethical ideas in *Los trabajos del infatigable creador Pío Cid*, in that “in this work... there is also a Tolstoyan criticism of modern society”.¹⁷²

It may well be that Spain lost a vitally important link in her literary relationship with Russia as a result of Ganivet’s death. It would certainly seem that he had both the linguistic and the intellectual curiosity needed to offer detailed information to Spain about cultural life in Russia at that particularly fascinating time. His own, tragically obdurate, suicide put an end to all that.

“En el vapor ‘Tiber’ salen del Báltico los restos de Ganivet y el día 28 de marzo de 1925 llega al Puente Internacional de Hendaya”; among those who attended the special “comisión”, held in Madrid in that same year by the “colonia granadina” in memory of Ganivet, was the young Federico García Lorca.¹⁷³

NOTES FOR CHAPTER 4

- 1 On a visit to Glasgow University in 1988 the late Montserrat Roig gave an informal talk entitled "Those who wait behind the window". In the course of this, she discussed the portrayal of women in the so-called 19th-century "novels of adultery". Some of her views are presented in this chapter. The Russian saying is one of many "folk proverbs" which present women in a non-flattering light.
- 2 Mamonova, p.7.
- 3 *Ibid.*
- 4 See note 1 above.
- 5 See note 1 above.
- 6 Levin, p.246.
- 7 This definition was given by L.M. O'Toole in his article "Structure and Style in the Short Story", (*Slavonic and East European Review*, vol.LXV, III, No.114, Jan. 1971), 45.
- 8 Galdós, of course, develops this further in *Tristana*. See also two excellent studies of women characters in Galdós: Condé, L., *Women in the Theatre of Galdós* (Ontario, 1990) and Condé, L., *Stages in the Development of a Feminist Consciousness in Pérez Galdós* (Ontario, 1990).
- 9 Mamonova, p.49.
- 10 *Ibid.*
- 11 Edmondson, ed., p.77.
- 12 T. Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (London, 1972), p.302.
- 13 *Ibid.*

- 14 V.E. Bagno, “Lev Tolstoy and 19th-Century Spanish Writers”, in *Russkaia literatura*, 3 (1978), 72.
- 15 I.I. Zherebtsov, “Books on Spain in [Tolstoy’s] library at Iasnaia Poliana”, in *Iasnopolianskii sbornik* (Tula, 1974), p.219.
- 16 Schanzer, p.xiv.
- 17 Bagno, p.72.
- 18 See chapter 2 of this thesis.
- 19 Bagno, p.72. Bagno’s information here has been taken from Schanzer.
- 20 Bagno, p.75.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Ibid., p.78.
- 23 Schanzer, p.xvi.
- 24 Ibid., p.176.
- 25 Bagno reports on the assemblies as a sign of public mourning in Spain on p.80.
- 26 For further information on the Spanish books in Tolstoy’s library see Zherebtsov, pp.219-224. Tolstoy, according to Zherebtsov, p.224, had sent an article to “la redacción de la revista española *Revista blanca*”. No details are given of this, except the quotation on p. 224 of a line from this letter where Tolstoy expresses his admiration in general terms for Spain .
- 27 Bagno, p.89.
- 28 Ibid.

- 29 Ibid., p.88.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ibid., p.89.
- 32 “Clarín”, “*Amo y criado* – último cuento de Tolstoi”, in *Obra olvidada* (Madrid, 1973), pp.161-170. This will be further referred to as O.O.
- 33 This will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.
- 34 “Clarín”, O.O., p.162. The words “exaltan lo vital” were suggested to me by the title of the article by Mariano Baquero Goyanes, “Exaltación de lo vital en *La Regenta*”. This article is contained in *Leopoldo Alas “Clarín”*, ed. J.M. Cachero (Madrid, 1978), pp.15-179.
- 35 There are lines from the popular late nineteenth-century “chastushka”. Quoted by Catriona Kelly, “Better Halves?” in Edmondson, ed., p.19, and in note 53, p.28.
- 36 As stated in the introduction to this thesis, these four intermediaries are not being studied in their chronological order, but in order of what I believe to be their importance in this area.
- 37 Bagnò suggests this on p.88, note 75, but offers no evidence at all to support his claim.
- 38 Antonio Machado, “Sobre la Rusia actual”, in *Poesía y prosa* (Madrid 1989), IV p.2219.
- 39 “Clarín”, *Obras Selectas* (Madrid, 1966), p.xiii. This will be further referred to as O.S.
- 40 This was the introduction to the Spanish translation of *Resurrection*, which was published in 1900 by Maucci, Barcelona. In it “Clarín” states that: “En *Resurrección* todo es admirable...”

- 41 There have been several comparative studies on *La Regenta* and *Madame Bovary*. See, for example, Carlos Clavería, "Flaubert y *La Regenta*", in *Leopoldo Alas "Clarín"*, ed. J.M. Cachero (Madrid, 1978), pp.179-194. "Clarín" answered some of the accusations of plagiarism himself in "Mis plagios", O.S., pp.1235-1254. He was replying here to the accusations of Luis Bonafoux y Quintero. Here he notes on p. 1242: "Ahora mismo me acuerdo (y conste que yo leo pocas novelas) de *Guerra y Paz*, de Tolstoi, en que a cada momento se va al teatro la acción; *Ana Karenina*, del mismo Tolstoi".
- 42 Peter Ulf Møller, *Postlude to the "Kreutzer Sonata"*, (Leiden, 1987), p.5. This is an excellent study of *The Kreutzer Sonata*, and gives a detailed account of the polemic which arose as a result of its publication.
- 43 I am grateful to Professor N. Round for this observation.
- 44 "Clarín", O.S., p.554. These are, in fact, the very last words of the novel. Fernando Méndez Leite has been "...cuatro años...enfascado en la adaptación de *La Regenta* para televisión". He has made ten different versions of this project "hasta quedarse con las dos finalistas: una, la favorita del autor, contempla cuatro episodios de hora y media; la otra es una versión reducida a tres capítulos". TVE will decide which of these versions to use and production will begin in six months time. Fernando Rey will play don Víctor, Juan Luis Galiardo will be don Alvaro; details of the other actors and actresses chosen were not revealed. Méndez Leite describes the main problems of adapting the novel for television: "Encontrar la estructura cinematográfica, porque la novela no está contada en forma lineal. Las novelas de Torrente Ballester, por ejemplo, o del mismo Galdós, son mucho más cinematográficas. 'Clarín' es demasiado literario, muy barroco, y resulta difícil construir la estructura". *Epoca*, 21 December 1992, 154-155.
- 45 "Clarín", O.S., p.552.
- 46 Domingo Pérez Minik in "*Clarín*" y "*La Regenta*" (1884-1984) (Madrid, 1985), p.189.

- 47 The role of de Pas will be discussed more fully later in this section. When Anna sees Karenin again after her return from Moscow, the latter is described as follows: “As soon as the train stopped at Petersburg and she got out, the first person she noticed was her husband. ‘Good heavens, why are his ears like that?’ she thought, looking at his cold distinguished figure...” *Anna Karenin*, trans. Rosemary Edmonds (London, 1954), p.119. This edition will be used throughout.
- 48 *Anna Karenin*, p.567.
- 49 This work will be mentioned more fully later in this chapter.
- 50 *Anna Karenin*, pp.203-204.
- 51 “Clarín”, O.S., p.531.
- 52 *Anna Karenin*, p.832.
- 53 I am grateful to Professor N. Round for the observation about “Frígilis”.
- 54 It would seem that the Anna/Levin relationship is the missing one in the series.
- 55 R.F. Christian discusses this in *Tolstoy, A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge, 1969).
- 56 Formal religion does not provide any final answers for either of the female protagonists of the novels presently being examined.
- 57 See note 1 above. The defined parameters for this thesis do not allow a longer analysis of these two novels which might include, of course, an examination of many other matters.
- 58 *Anna Karenin*, p.732.
- 59 A.P. Chekhov, *Dama s sobachkoi* (Moscow, 1962), p.498. Chekhov's treatment of the “woman question” will be addressed more fully in the following chapter of this thesis.

- 60 *Anna Karenin*, pp.217-218 for the description of the race where Frou-Frou's back is broken. Many critics have seen this as a symbolic prefiguration of Anna's death.
- 61 The duel and the subsequent death of Don Víctor in *La Regenta* also display certain theatrical qualities.
- 62 Møller, p.4.
- 63 Bagno, p.88.
- 64 Schanzer, p.xvi.
- 65 L.N. Tolstoy, *Khoziain i rabotnik in Poln. sobr. soch.*, vol.29 (Moscow, 1954), pp.3-46.
- 66 *Ibid.*, pp.375-380 for a short history of the writing and publication of this story. See also V.A. Zhdanov, "The writing of *Master and Man*" in *Iasnopolianskii sbornik* (Tula, 1965), pp.101-126. Zhdanov notes on p.125 that one year before he began the writing of this story Tolstoy had remarked, "God is the master. The people are the men."
- 67 As we noted in the text, "Clarín" published his article in July 1895.
- 68 Schanzer, p.149. The story was also called "*Amo y servidor*".
- 69 "Clarín", O.S., p.161.
- 70 "Clarín", *Cambio de luz*, O.S., pp.1009-1021. A production of *La muerte de Iván Ilich* took place in Madrid from 1st October to 1st November 1992 in El Círculo de Bellas Artes. This was reported in *Panorama*, October 12, 1992, 114.
- 71 Schanzer, p.164.
- 72 "Clarín", O.S., p.xxxix

- 73 "Clarín", *Amo y criado*, p.170.
- 74 Ibid., p.168.
- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Ibid., p.169
- 77 Bagno, *Emilia Pardo Bazán and Russian Literature in Spain*, p.110.
- 78 "Clarín", *Boroña*, in O.S., pp.1004-1008, and *El quin* in *Cuentos* (Oviedo, 1953), pp.149-171.
- 79 "Clarín", "Palique. (Sobre *Resurrección* de Tolstoi)", O.O., pp.209-210.
- 80 Ibid.
- 81 "Clarín", "Cavilaciones", O.S., p.1031.
- 82 See Møller for full details of this.
- 83 Møller, p.170.
- 84 Schanzer, pp.170–171.
- 85 Ibid., p.170.
- 86 Møller discusses this on p.12.
- 87 "Clarín", *Su único hijo*, in O.S., p.712.
- 88 Møller, p.13, for a discussion of the names in *The Kreutzer Sonata*.
- 89 L.N. Tolstoy, *Kreitserova sonata*, , vol.10, p.341.
- 90 "Clarín", O.S., p.707.

- 91 Eduard J. Gramberg, “*Su único hijo*, novela incomprendida de Leopoldo Alas”, in Cachero, ed., p.208.
- 92 Møller discusses this.
- 93 “Clarín”, O.S., p.XIII.
- 94 Unamuno, “Un extraño rusófilo”, in *Obras Completas*, vol. IX (Madrid, 1966), p.1248. This will further be referred to as O.C.
- 95 See Mario J. Valdés and Elena Valdés, *An Unamuno Source Book* (Toronto, 1973).
- 96 Bagno discusses this in his conclusion to *Emilia Pardo Bazán and Russian Literature in Spain*.
- 97 See A. Gallego Morell, *Estudios y textos ganivetianos* (Madrid, 1971), p.100.
- 98 Ibid.
- 99 Ibid.
- 100 Ibid.
- 101 *Cartas inéditas de Miguel de Unamuno*, ed. Sergio Fernández Larraín (Santiago de Chile, 1965), p.173.
- 102 Ibid.
- 103 E. Gómez de Baquero, “*Paz en la guerra* por Miguel de Unamuno”, in *La España Moderna*, 4 (1897), p.126.
- 104 Ibid.
- 105 H.T. Oostendorp, “Los puntos de semejanza entre ‘*La guerra y la paz*’ de Tolstoi y ‘*Paz en la guerra*’ de Unamuno”, BH, 69 (1967), 103.

- 106 Ibid.
- 107 Bagno, p.117.
- 108 Ibid. See note 123 for a discussion of this point.
- 109 Ibid., pp.117-118.
- 110 Ibid.
- 111 Ibid.
- 112 Bagno quotes Terterian on p.118, note 126.
- 113 Ibid.
- 114 Ibid.
- 115 Azorín, “La generación de 1989”, in *Obras Completas*, vol.1 (Madrid, 1975), p.1133.
- 116 Bagno, p.120.
- 117 G.V. Stepanova, *M. de Unamuno* (Moscow, 1973), p.8.
- 118 *Cartas inéditas de Miguel de Unamuno*, p.178.
- 119 Unamuno, “Locos o vividores”, O.C.IX, p.684.
- 120 Bagno, p.121.
- 121 L.N. Tolstoy, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, vol.24, pp.801-941.
- 122 See previous section of this chapter.
- 123 Unamuno, *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*, in O.C.11.
- 124 Bagno, p.122.

- 125 Unamuno, O.C.11, p.1154. I am grateful to Dr. P. Donnelly, Department of Hispanic Studies, University of Glasgow, who suggests that this may not really be the true conclusion of the novel. “Don Manuel thinks that mortals are happy in that setting provided that they do not question. Questioning leads to uncertainty and doubt”.
- 126 Unamuno, *Cartas inéditas*, p.173.
- 127 Unamuno, “El egoísmo de Tolstoi” in O.C.IX, pp.1395-1399.
- 128 Ibid., p.1397.
- 129 Ibid., p.1399.
- 130 Bagno, p.122.
- 131 Idem.
- 132 Unamuno, *Cartas inéditas*, p.253.
- 133 Idem.
- 134 Idem.
- 135 Idem.
- 136 Unamuno, “Dostoevski, sobre la lengua”, in O.C.IV, p.1403-1405.
- 137 Unamuno, “Un extraño rusófilo”, O.C. 1V, p.1248.
- 138 C. Cobb, ed., *Miguel de Unamuno, Artículos olvidados sobre España y la Primera Guerra Mundial* (London, 1976), pp.88-89,
- 139 Bagno, p.124.
- 140 F.M. Dostoevsky, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, XI (Leningrad, 1976), p.426.

- 141 See, for example, Bagno, p.124.
- 142 Idem.
- 143 See, for example, A.L. Crone, "Unamuno and Dostoevsky: Some thoughts on atheistic humanitarianism", *Hispanófila*, 64 (1978), pp.43-59.
- 144 Bagno, p.125.
- 145 Critics have pointed to the importance of these lines for Zamyatin's novel *We*. See final bibliography for works on Zamyatin. This novel is mentioned again in Chapter 5.
- 146 Unamuno, *San Manuel Bueno, mártir*, O.C. 1V, p. 1152.
- 147 Bagno, p.126.
- 148 Ibid., p.127.
- 149 Unamuno, *Dve materi* (Moscow, 1927).
- 150 *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia*, ed. B.A. Vredenskii (Moscow, 1956), pp.231-232.
- 151 Ibid., p.232.
- 152 "Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'", ed. A.M. Prokhorov (Moscow, 1983), p.1377.
- 153 Ibid.
- 154 E. Castelar, *La Rusia contemporánea* (Madrid, 1881), p.5. Bagno discusses the importance of this work on pp.17-20.
- 155 Bagno, pp.127-128.
- 156 Both works are contained in Angel Ganivet, *Obras Completas*, vol.I (Madrid, 1961). This will further be referred to as O.C.

- 157 J. Ginsberg, *Angel Ganivet* (London, 1985), p.69 discusses Ganivet's relationship with this Russian. On p.101, considering the possible motives for Ganivet's suicide, Ginsberg notes: "The incidence of twentieth-century artists whose fathers died when they were children and who later were the victims of suicide is striking: Ernest Hemingway, Valdimir [sic.] Mayakovsky, Cesare Pavese and Sylvia Plath." Ganivet, however, in my opinion, may be more aptly compared with the Russian writer Garshin (1855-1888), who also committed suicide at the age of thirty-three.
- 158 Ginsberg, p.101, comments on Ganivet's intentions to write this work on Russian literature. Angel Ganivet, *Hombres del Norte*, O.C.11, pp.1021-1059.
- 159 A. Gallego Morell, *Angel Ganivet – el excéntrico del 98* (Madrid, 1974), p.166. He also discusses Ganivet's relationship with "Mascha Djakoffsky", pp.137-141.
- 160 Ganivet, *España y Rusia*, O.C.1, pp.995-969.
- 161 Ginsberg, p.105, discusses this.
- 162 Ginsberg, p.104, comments, as does Gallego Morell, p.166.
- 163 Ginsberg, pp.105-107 discusses this.
- 164 Evelyn Bristol in *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, p.387.
- 165 Ganivet, *El porvenir de España*, O.C.11, p.1067.
- 166 Ganivet, *España filosófica contemporánea*, O.C.11, p.583.
- 167 Ganivet, *Idearium español*, O.C.1, p.239.
- 168 Ganivet, *Cartas finlandesas*, O.C.1, p.673.
- 169 *Ibid.*, p.674.

- 170 Ganivet, *Importancia de la lengua sánscrita*, O.C.1, p.890.
- 171 Ganivet, *España y Rusia*, O.C.1, p.963.
- 172 Bagno, p.129.
- 173 Gallego Morell, p.185.

CHAPTER 5

(1) "MULIER IN SILENTIO DISCAT."¹*THE STORM, THREE SISTERS**AND LA CASA DE BERNARDA ALBA*

"Mi generación vio a los revolucionarios de 1917, a los compañeros de Lenin y Trotsky, confesar ante sus jueces crímenes irreales en un lenguaje que era una abyecta parodia del marxismo, como el lenguaje santurrón de las protestas de fe que Sor Juana firmó con su sangre son una caricatura del lenguaje religioso. Los casos de los bolcheviques del siglo XX y el de la monja (mejicana) poetisa del XVII son muy distintos pero es innegable que, a pesar de las numerosas diferencias, hay entre ellos una semejanza esencial y turbadora: son sucesos que únicamente pueden acontecer en sociedades cerradas, regidas por una burocracia política y eclesiástica que gobierna en nombre de una ortodoxia."

Octavio Paz²

"For it is my belief that...if we have the habit of freedom...if we escape a little from the common sitting-room and see human beings not always in their relation to each other but in relation to reality; and the sky, too, and the trees or whatever it may be in themselves;...if we face the fact, for

it is a fact that there is no arm to cling to, but that we go alone and that our relation is to the world of reality and not only to the world of men and women, then the opportunity will come...”

Virginia Woolf³

“[Man] guards the woman from [the open world]; within his house, as ruled by her, unless she herself has sought it, need enter no danger, no temptation, no cause of error or offence.”

John Ruskin⁴

Octavio Paz in the passage cited above suggests striking similarities between the fate of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, forced to renounce her literary output shortly before her death at the end of the 17th century, and that of dissidents in the former Soviet Union some three centuries later. Paz maintains that these two societies, so far removed from another in time and space, were astonishingly alike. In 17th-century Mexico and the former USSR, he observes, the authorities were not content “con castigar las rebeldías, las disidencias y las desviaciones sino que exigen la confesión, el arrepentimiento y la retractación de los culpables.”⁵ Sor Juana’s defence of the rights of women and her own ambiguous situation within the claustrophobic Mexican society of that era – being simultaneously a professed religious and a famous and successful writer – led, in the latter years of her life, to violent conflicts with the ecclesiastical authorities and ultimately to her “confession” and her “silencio”. For Octavio Paz Sor Juana becomes “un emblema” of all the contradictions within her society, and her fate, that of all free-thinking intellectuals “en nuestro siglo...en sociedades dominadas por una ortodoxia y regidas por una burocracia”.⁶

Ostrovsky, Chekhov and Federico García Lorca, centuries after the death of Sor Juana, portrayed in certain of their dramatic works the ambiguous, marginalized and, in many cases, tragic situations of women within their respective societies. *The Storm*, *Three Sisters* and *La casa de Bernarda Alba* all, in my opinion, convey a powerful sense of the entrapment of dependent women. *The Storm* and *La casa de Bernarda Alba* explore the ramifications and complexities of “maternal power”, while the latter play and *Three Sisters* present parallel configurations of sisters and investigate the ensuing relationships. These three plays are further united, I believe, by the depiction of the shifting balance of power between and among the women themselves. The younger female protagonists of these plays (we exclude Natasha in *Three Sisters* from this consideration) are childless. Key male characters in all three works are portrayed as weak, ineffectual and, in many significant ways, inferior to their female counterparts.

I propose to compare *La casa de Bernarda Alba* and *Three Sisters* through a detailed textual analysis covering, in turn, the striking similarities between them in terms of plot, the use of time, characterization and fictional world.⁷ The main focus of interest will be the configuration of sisters in Chekhov and in Lorca. *Three Sisters* was written in 1900 and Lorca’s play 36 years later. This analysis supports the view that *Three Sisters* may have provided an important creative source for Lorca in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.

Lorca could also have been influenced – at least in his portrayals of Bernarda and Adela – by the earlier Russian dramatist, A.N. Ostrovsky (1823-1886). In *The Storm*, (1859), the powerful matriarchal figure of Kabanova prefigures the later character of Bernarda; the former’s daughter-in-law, Katerina, who commits suicide at the end of the play, is in many ways similar to Lorca’s Adela. I believe that sufficient evidence will emerge to support my theory that Lorca may well have been creatively inspired by these two Russian works in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.⁸

Lorca professed a great interest in Russian culture. Through his well-known friendship with Manuel de Falla he regularly followed developments in Russian music; in the course of his own writings there are frequent references to this topic and mention is additionally made of Russian writers.⁹ During his stay in New York in 1929 the Civil Repertory Theater there staged three of Chekhov's plays, *Three Sisters*, *The Seagull* and *The Cherry Orchard*.¹⁰ Although these productions are not discussed by Lorca, he might well have attended some or all of them – given his love of the theatre and of the Russian arts in general. Moreover, by that time most of Chekhov's works had already been translated into Spanish; *Three Sisters*, for example, had appeared in a Maucci edition of 1910.¹¹ Critical studies of Chekhov had also been published in Spain by that date too; in 1902 Juderías's article appeared in *La Lectura*, and in 1904 an essay dedicated to Chekhov was printed in *Revista Contemporánea*.¹² *The Storm* had been translated by Narcís Oller in 1911; in 1900 Araujo had published an article on Ostrovsky in *La España Moderna*, entitled *El novísimo drama en Rusia y Alejandro Ostrowsky*.¹³ From the evidence presented above, there is every possibility that Lorca was at least aware of the works of these two Russian dramatists. My own view is that he knew both plays.

Regarding the prominence of female characters in the drama of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Gail Finney very aptly notes that this “had everything to do with the situation of women... at a time when the first feminist movement was challenging the traditional view that women are fundamentally different from and subordinate to men”.¹⁴ Since the drama also represents “the most public and social of all literary genres” it is not surprising, then, that this should have been an important channel through which “the immense upheavals in the condition of women” at that time were convincingly portrayed.¹⁵ While it is, of course, true that male dramatists “caught up in these contrary trends... were often deeply ambivalent toward women”, I do not intend to pursue my investigations along such lines; I shall concentrate here primarily on textual evidence to illustrate my theory that *The*

Storm and *Three Sisters* may have provided Lorca with important creative sources for *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.¹⁶

(2) "SUFFER AND BE STILL":

THREE SISTERS AND LA CASA DE BERNARDA ALBA

"... [M]y six sisters had absolutely nothing to do except dabble in paints and music... and wander aimlessly from room to room to see if by any chance 'anything was going on'....[E]very aspiration and outlet, except in the direction of dress and dancing, was blocked; and marriage, with the growing scarcity of men, was becoming every day less likely, or easy to compass. More than once girls of whom I least expected it told me that their lives were miserable 'with nothing on earth to do'".

Edward Carpenter¹⁷

"With your milk, Mother, you fed me ice. And if I leave, you lose the reflection of life, of your life... Each of us lacks her own image; her own face, the animation of her own body is missing. And the one mourns the other. My paralysis signifying your abduction in the mirror."

Luce Irigaray¹⁸

(1) PLOT

(A) INITIAL STATE (ZAVIAZKA)

In their literary theory the Formalists distinguish between "fabula", that is events told in their "chronological or logical-causal" order, and "siuzhet", plot events as they occur within a given text; Ann Shukman notes in her definition of

plot that “[t]here has to be produced a feeling of change, an awareness of a new state of affairs.”¹⁹ The Formalists employed three terms to provide a basic schema for plot analysis, “zaviazka”, initial state, “peripeteia” or turning-point(s) and “razviazka” or denouement; this basic schema may be supplemented by “several interlocking plots, different characters each having their own plot-line, or there may be plot ambiguity...”.²⁰ Examining the two plays under consideration in terms of “fabula” and “siuzhet” clearly shows that neither play reveals any remarkable distortion in this area. In both plays events are presented in their logical-causal order, although an important event in terms of the subsequent development of each has taken place before the action proper begins on stage.²¹ Significantly the initial action of both plays takes place in the shadow of a father’s death. In *La casa de Bernarda Alba* the play opens with a reference to a funeral, in the servant’s words: “Ya tengo el doble de esas campanas metido entre las sienas”.²² Before a word is uttered, the “gran silencio umbroso” of the stage directions has been broken by the tolling of bells off-stage. Very quickly our attention is alerted to the death of a father: “Era la única que quería al padre...”, the initial conversation of the play taking place between two women who appear to be outwith the family circle of the other women being discussed by them and also of a lower social class.²³

In *Three Sisters* the father’s death had occurred exactly one year before the action begins; this fact is revealed by Ol’ga in the first words of the play. There is also the intrusion at this point of the symbolically important on-stage noise – the chiming of a clock. Ol’ga also recalls the salute, the gunfire and the music that had been played at the sisters’ father’s funeral.

The initial action of both plays, then, is directly linked to a father’s death; the events in which the two groups of sisters are presently engaged for the most part have developed as a direct result of this. At the beginning of *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, as if to reinforce this idea, we learn that since the death of her own father Bernarda had not permitted “las gentes bajo estos techos”. Here we have an early suggestion too of the vulnerability of “mujeres sin hombre” and our attention

is directed inwards, to the enclosed world of “la casa”. In both plays we are, in fact, quickly introduced into this enclosed world of women, Lorca’s play bearing the subtitle *Drama de mujeres en los pueblos de España*. The two plays refer, of course, explicitly in their main titles to women, Lorca additionally stressing the important motif of the house.²⁴ This, I will argue, has a central role to play in both works. Very soon we will be drawn into the complex labyrinth of relationships which exists between and among the women themselves and with the external world. One of the central themes of both plays is, I believe, the movement from “outer to inner”.

Various hints are provided at the outset of each play of other major themes which will be further developed in subsequent acts. One of these is solitude and isolation – even within the supposedly close (and supportive) family unit. Both plays reveal deep flaws in such relationships, and it is significant that in each work, from the very beginning, certain members of the two groups of sisters seem to be separate in some way, or ways, from the others. The initial stage directions in *Three Sisters* suggest Masha’s alienation from her two sisters, and this is taken up by Ol’ga’s first command to her, as if correcting her unseemly behaviour: “Don’t whistle, Masha...” Masha is the only married sister – we are informed later that she became the wife of the schoolteacher Kulygin when she was only eighteen years of age. In *La casa de Bernarda Alba* we learn that Magdalena had fainted during her father’s funeral (Irina in *Three Sisters* had done so too), and the servant responds with: “Es la que se queda más sola.” From this opening conversation we also discover that of “las cinco hijas feas”, Angustias stands out from the rest; she was the daughter of Bernarda’s first husband and the only one of the sisters to have any personal fortune of her own.²⁵ She is also the only one of the five sisters who can entertain any real hope of escape from “la casa” – her engagement being announced towards the end of Act 1. (We will see, however, that her proposed escape through marriage, had it been realized, would have done little to alter her dependent state.)

Another central theme in both plays is that of failure to escape from an environment which is perceived by the majority of the women to be both restrictive and oppressive. Poncia asks the servant after the loud off-stage cry of “¡Bernarda!” has been heard: “La vieja. ¿Está bien cerrada?” Various forms of “cerrar” occur with regularity throughout Act 1 and it is interesting to note that the act ends with María Josefa’s cry: “¡Quiero irme de aquí!...A casarme a la orilla del mar...” (The sea and flowing water in this play come to be associated with freedom and with life outside the confines of both “la casa” and “el pueblo”. Bernarda herself describes the village early in the first act as “este maldito pueblo sin río, pueblo de pozos, donde siempre se bebe el agua con el miedo de que esté envenenada.” This image accurately describes the stagnation and the life-depriving atmosphere of the village.)

In *Three Sisters* Ol’ga expresses her longings to escape from her present life. This is taken up by Irina’s first utterance of the refrain which will echo throughout the play with differing degrees of intensity – the proposal that the sisters, with the exception of Masha, should return to Moscow, to an idyllic life there, thus escaping present misfortunes.²⁶ For these sisters, now “trapped” in a provincial town, Moscow represents an ideal world, closely connected too with the past and carefree childhood days.

Another vitally important theme is suggested at the outset of both plays – a lack of meaningful (or in some cases any) communication between and among the groups of women and the other characters who populate their world. Bernarda’s first on-stage utterance is “¡Silencio!” and this is the final word of the play which she speaks too. Thus, the idea of an all-embracing silence is brought full circle, clearly indicating that for those sisters there would be little chance of escape from the stifling and repressive environment in which they were forced to live. (Adela’s attempts to leave it brought her the permanent silence of death.)

Chekhov had also hinted at a similar situation when Tuzenbach makes a remark, not directed at Ol’ga, but coming immediately after the latter had outlined her plans for the return to Moscow: “What rubbish you’re talking, it’s tiresome

even to listen to you...”.²⁷ These words not only express the futility of all that Ol’ga has just said but they also suggest a talking at cross-purposes. Words are so often spoken in this play in a void; they are neither understood by anyone else nor have they any direct bearing on the situations of the other characters. Many striking examples of empty, meaningless speech can be found in *Three Sisters*, as will be noted later.

The initial situation of both plays, then, presents two configurations of sisters whose vulnerability is suggested in the first instance as a direct result of the recent, or fairly recent, death of their respective fathers. In Lorca’s play the figure of the mother will, of course, acquire immense significance; in Chekhov’s play the sisters’ mother has been dead for some time but, as will be shown later, her influence is nonetheless present in a symbolic way. Initially in both plays characters outwith the family groups move freely off and on stage and there is a hint given that a male character, as yet unseen by the audience (in *La casa de Bernarda Alba* there are no on-stage male characters at all), may provide a solution to present difficulties. Irina points out that the sisters’ brother will most likely become a professor and hence the departure to Moscow will be assured, except for Masha. Unlike her two sisters, Masha has the “protection” of her husband, Kulygin. In the first stages of Lorca’s play a remark is directed at Angustias – “Pepe el Romano estaba con los hombres del duelo”, suggestive of a possible future relationship between them. It is significant that the sisters’ brother Andrei and the shadowy figure of Pepe El Romano are mentioned at relatively early stages; both men will play a vital role in the final outcome of each drama, directly affecting the lives of the sisters.

Further, in the initial state of each play there is a hint of the theme of betrayal and treachery. Masha announces her dislike of Protopopov and very shortly afterwards expresses her disbelief that her brother could be in love with Natasha – “He is simply teasing us”, she notes. In this same speech she remarks that only the day before she had heard that Natasha was to marry Protopopov –

“And that’s a good thing...”²⁸ From the opening conversation between Poncia and the servant we learn that both women secretly loathe Bernarda; we are also informed that the family of her late husband had likewise detested her. We discover that the servant had been the mistress of Bernarda’s late husband, her reminiscences of this being abruptly brought to an end by the first entry on stage of Bernarda herself.

INITIAL STATE (ZAVIAZKA): SUMMARY

Both plays show groups of sisters without the protection of a paternal figure. Their resulting vulnerability is stressed in each work. In *La casa de Bernarda Alba* Bernarda assumes the dominant, matriarchal role (her power not only reaches “forward” to her daughters but “backwards” to her own mother as well) – this being clearly suggested in the play’s title. In *Three Sisters* the sisters’ brother would be endowed with a similar dominant role as far as Ol’ga and Irina are concerned at least. We will see later that Bernarda wields less authority than she appears to possess at the outset of the drama; Andrei’s physical and moral degeneration will be noted too. There are hints given by both dramatists of complex relationships within the family groups, of solitude, of a lack of meaningful communication, of betrayal possibly from within the family group itself and from those outwith it. In each play a male figure has been mentioned (or suggested) as being vital for producing longed-for change for the better in the lives of certain of these two groups of sisters. The use of extraneous noises has been briefly noted. This important feature in both plays, together with the symbolic use of colours, language and stage properties, will be discussed more fully later, as will the motif of the house, which I believe is central to both plays.²⁹

(B) PERIPETEIA

In her definition of this term Ann Shukman writes of “a turning point... which will lead to the final state”.³⁰ In *Three Sisters* it could be suggested that two major events in the course of the drama symbolically represent this change – the fire which has occurred by the beginning of Act 3, representing, among other things, the burning of past illusions, and, later in that same act, the dropping and breaking of the clock, which had belonged to the sisters’ late mother. Chebutykin drops this clock, significantly enough just after Irina’s words: “And we are leaving!”

In Lorca’s play it could be argued that this point of change occurs at a very early stage, when the engagement of Angustias to Pepe el Romano is made known to the other sisters (in particular to Adela), thus unleashing the feelings and the actions which will lead directly to the final outcome.³¹

However, it could also be posited that both plays contain a significant secondary point of change, this moment belonging in each play to the sister who stands out from the others either by her actual rebellion or by her attempt to rebel. I would argue that this secondary peripeteia deals with the more personal and individual issues of the two plays, yet these key moments have a wider significance too. In *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, just after the only moment of “comic relief” (Poncia’s account of her courtship by her late husband), Adela remarks (and we are told “fuerte”): “¡Yo hago con mi cuerpo lo que me parece!” Some few lines further on she repeats the idea : “¡Mi cuerpo será de quien yo quiera!” It is assumed that the moral framework for this play would be a Christian (Roman Catholic) one, the play having opened with the sound of bells for a Requiem Mass. Poncia calls to Adela’s attention the fact that her illicit relationship with her sister’s fiancé not only goes against family ties, but also “contra la ley de Dios”. It is not Bernarda, despite her claim to be in control of all that happens within her home and to be omniscient, but Poncia who has discovered this secret relationship.³² The fact makes her rebuke all the more authoritative. Nevertheless, it is clear at this point not only that

Adela has no intention of terminating this relationship but, that as she indicates to Poncia; “Ya es tarde...Nadie podrá evitar que suceda lo que tiene que suceder.” The play now moves on inexorably to its tragic final state, which is brought about largely by Adela’s refusal to accept the “status quo” – “Yo no puedo estar encerrada”, she had announced in Act 1 – and her act of rebellion against the accepted moral code, against the tyranny and despotism of her mother and finally against the ties of sisterly affection which might have been expected to bind her in some way to her half-sister, Angustias. Adela’s attempts to find personal happiness and some degree of freedom for herself have proved to be far stronger than any of the restraints which surround her. Regarding any sense of duty towards her half-sister Angustias, Adela herself remarks in the final sequences of the play in her conversation with Martirio, the sister who will, through jealousy and her own secret passion for Pepe el Romano, ultimately betray Adela to Bernarda: “Nos enseñan a querer a las hermanas. Dios me ha debido dejar sola en medio de la oscuridad, porque te veo como si no te hubiera visto nunca.” This significant quotation will be examined more fully later; we note too the frequent references to “seeing”. It will turn out, of course, that only Adela, Martirio and Poncia actually “see” with any clarity what is really happening within the walls of “la casa”.

A similar moment, representative of a significant point of change, had belonged to Masha in Act 3 of *Three Sisters*. A conversation has been taking place between Ol’ga and Irina. Irina has reached a certain degree of awareness of the true situation in which the sisters find themselves. She reveals her fears and unhappiness to Ol’ga; “Where has it all gone...I can’t even remember the Italian for ‘window’...We won’t be leaving for Moscow ever...”. Ol’ga, in her attempts to comfort her, advises Irina to accept the proposal of marriage made to her by Tuzenbach and reveals that she herself would have married without being in love; “...I’d even have married an old man...”, she adds. Just after this remark Natasha crosses the stage with a candle in her hand, and to Masha’s observation about her, Ol’ga retorts: “Masha, you’re stupid. You’re the stupidest in our family...” It is

just after the pause following this remark that Masha makes her “confession” to her sisters: “I love, I love, I love that man...I love Vershinin...” (Masha’s repetition of “I love, I love...” reminds us of her conjugation of the Latin verb “amare”, with the stage direction “angrily”, some few lines before in response to her husband’s declaration of his love for her. This provides yet another example in this play of meaningless communication and will be discussed more fully later. Masha’s words at this point are also, of course, a repetition of Vershinin’s declaration of his love for her which he had made in Act 2.) Symbolically, Ol’ga’s response to Masha’s confession is to retire behind the screen and then she replies to Masha “Stop that. I’m not even listening to you.” Masha too, has by this point reached a new awareness of her present situation: “How are we to go on, what’s going to happen to us...?” Unlike Adela, Masha does not, however, take her “rebellion” against the “status quo” or, rather, against her marriage to Kulygin, to its final stage. She resolves, like “Gogol’s madman”, to be silent.³³ The words which end this important speech are “silence...silence...”; Masha’s life, it seems, was also to be enveloped in silence. The final outcome of the play is now assured. Masha will continue with her life as before, Ol’ga will continue to dream dreams, which one assumes may not be realized, and Irina will start her new life; “I will work, I will work...”, she exclaims. Again we may wonder about the veracity of Irina’s grandiose claims. At an earlier point in the play she had clearly expressed her weariness and disenchantment with the work in which she had, in fact, already been engaged.

I would conclude here that these moments of confession made by Masha and Adela are of special significance both as turning points of the plays and for the development of certain themes which will be discussed more fully later.

(C) FINAL STATE (RAZVIAZKA)

Lorca's play ends with the suicide of Adela – she had been deliberately misinformed by her sister Martirio that their mother had killed Pepe el Romano. Adela had betrayed her half-sister Angustias, driven on by her passion for Pepe, “Yo soy su mujer”, she announces shortly before her death. For her part, driven on by her own hidden passion for the same man, Martirio betrays Adela's illicit relationship to Bernarda, thus quickly bringing about the final main event in the play. Adela, in almost the last moments of the play, breaks the stick which had been the symbol of Bernarda's power over her daughters, and exclaims: “En mí no manda nadie más que Pepe.” (Although a full analysis of the character of Chebutykin lies outwith the purpose of the present study, it is noted here that in Act 4 of *Three Sisters* we are told that he too is carrying a stick: Chebutykin has a relationship with the past of the sisters – he had loved the sisters' late mother – and he is the one who symbolically “breaks” the sisters' present when he drops the clock. He has a role to play in their future too, in that he tells Irina of the death of the Baron. Her proposed future marriage will not now be taking place. He shares the finale of the play with Ol'ga.)

Adela also notes, in what are practically her final words, that this man, never actually seen on stage, “dominará esta casa”. Pepe escapes, but Bernarda warns him: “Pepe: tú irás corriendo vivo por lo oscuro de las alamedas, pero otro día caerás.” Adela's rebellion is total. She was prepared to defy not only her mother but even public opinion: “Todo el pueblo contra mí, quemándome con sus dedos de lumbre...” Such is the intensity of her individual rebellion that “Ya no aguanto el horror de estos techos después de haber probado el sabor de su boca”, she reveals. However, it is only by her death that she finally succeeds in releasing herself from the entrapment of “la casa”, and it could be argued that she is also betrayed by Pepe, who makes his escape at the end of the play. He, of course, had also betrayed his “novia formal”, Angustias, fulfilling Magdalena's belief that he

had chosen the former “por el dinero”. María Josefa had uttered the sombre warning earlier in the play: “Pepe el Romano es un gigante. Todas lo queréis, pero él os va a devorar...” (The prophetic nature of María Josefa’s words will be examined more fully later.) Poncia was aware of the immense power that Pepe wielded over this house of women, although he never set foot inside it. In this respect Poncia remarks to the servant that these sisters are “mujeres sin hombre, nada más. En estas cuestiones se olvida hasta la sangre.” It is particularly significant to note that Pepe remains throughout “en la calle”, the “forbidden zone” for the sisters. He makes his first proper “appearance” in the play announced by the servant thus: “Pepe el Romano viene por lo alto de la calle.” It would seem that “la casa” and “la calle” are worlds apart for these enclosed women, in very much the same way as Moscow had been the longed-for, yet unattainable, ideal for the sisters in Chekhov’s play.

As has been noted, the final words of Lorca’s play belong to Bernarda herself. In her final speech are to be found references to many of the central themes of the play. She states, “Yo no quiero llantos...”, a suggestion that she will once more assume full authority over her remaining daughters, controlling their very emotions. No feelings are to be publicly expressed after Adela’s death; these must either be denied or suppressed. Death has to be accepted calmly and to another daughter she utters the command “¡Silencio!”, shortly to repeat this same idea: “¡A callar he dicho!” Not only have feelings to be suppressed, but words must be kept in check. The force of words and feelings poses a dangerous threat, as Adela’s death demonstrated all too clearly. The remaining sisters are to be submerged in a silent blackness – “nos hundiremos todas en un mar de luto...” – the word “mar” suggesting at this point not life and freedom, but rather the profound desolation which will now engulf the lives of these women. In the “La España negra” which Lorca himself knew so well, “guardar las apariencias” mattered most of all; as if to prove this point Bernarda continues: “La hija menor de Bernarda Alba ha muerto virgen.” The external world, outwith the walls of “la casa”, must not learn the truth

about what had taken place within. “¿Me habéis oído?”, Bernarda retorts. The play began with the father’s funeral taking place off-stage; we now have come full circle. Funeral preparations for the only daughter who dared to rebel against the “status quo” will also take place “off-stage”. Bernarda herself gives the orders for the funeral bells (which had been heard at the beginning of the play), to be sounded the following dawn. In Martirio’s final remark, in which she betrays her secret envy of her late sister, “Dichosa ella mil veces que lo pudo tener”, any hint of a possible future rebellion goes totally unnoticed by Bernarda. In the 1987 film version of the play Mario Camus shows Martirio symbolically assisting her mother to climb the stairs in the closing sequences, suggesting a possible close future collaboration between the two.³⁴

With the rebellious daughter dead, the final state of the play leaves us within the enclosed world of “la casa”, but without the colour and the life-force which had belonged to Adela. She is, naturally, to be buried in white, but this may not merely be interpreted as a sign of her “virginity”. White is also a “non-colour”.³⁵ Now dead, Adela’s influence has been neutralized; Bernarda will again restore the blackness within these whitewashed walls together with the silence, and all will be even worse than before. (It will be remembered that several times in the course of the play our attention was drawn to the whiteness of the walls of Bernarda’s house, and early on in the play Bernarda herself gives the orders that these are to be whitewashed, reminding us of a possible association with the biblical notion of “whitened sepulchres”.)

For these women, one assumes with little or no formal education, there was no possibility whatsoever that they might in any way have or take control of their own lives. Bernarda’s prophetic statement in Act 1 that for women of their social standing their lot would be “hilo y aguja” has been verified by subsequent events. Unlike Bernarda’s daughters, who, apart from Angustias, have nothing of their own save “mucha puntilla bordada, muchas camisas de hilo, pero pan y uvas por toda herencia”, Poncia tells the servant that they, women of a much lower social

class, at least have “nuestras manos y un hoyo en la tierra de la verdad.” Bernarda’s daughters can hope for no escape from the walls of the house which, one assumes, will be cut off from “la calle” for even longer as a result of Adela’s death.

The final state of *Three Sisters* may not appear, at least on the surface, to possess the powerful dramatic intensity of the finale of *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. On the face of things in this play too the new state of affairs is even worse than before, in terms of the sisters’ lives at least. Masha will remain with her husband. She says to him (and Chekhov gives no instructions as to the possible tone of her voice) in the closing episodes: “We’ll have to go home...Where’s my hat and my cape?” It will be remembered that Masha’s second utterance (but her first “original” words, since her first speech in the play is, in fact, a quotation) in Act 1 of the play was, “I’m going home”. Masha, consequently, returns at the end of the play to her initial point of departure, the entrapment of her marriage. Here the notion of “home” does not suggest an enriching personal space; it points rather to the stifling enclosure of a monotonous existence, not unlike the one which Lorca later depicted for the unmarried sisters in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.

Chebutykin, linked with the sisters’ late mother, is the bearer of the news of the Baron’s death in a duel, thus dashing Irina’s hopes of marriage, albeit a loveless one too. Chebutykin will now resort to silence; after imparting the news of the Baron’s death he announces this intention, and adds that “it doesn’t really matter anyway!” He repeats this idea after softly humming to himself a line from a song, bringing us back again to the theme of the futility of even trying to communicate in a meaningful way. Irina’s objective situation at the end of the play is superficially unchanged from the initial state. With the Baron’s death she will not be marrying, at least for the moment. There will be no return to Moscow. She may, however, realize her dream of studying, after which she declares that she will devote her life to anyone who might need it, but by this time we are not too convinced by her

claims and her promises. Irina, like Masha, has no proper “home” of her own at the end of the play.

The opening of the play had belonged to Ol’ga, and she too utters its final words: “If only we knew, if only we knew!” It would seem that Ol’ga here is taking up an earlier idea which had been expressed by Chebutykin, just after he dropped the clock:

Perhaps I didn’t smash it. Perhaps it only appears that I did. Perhaps it only appears to us that we exist, whereas in reality we don’t exist at all. I don’t know anything, no one knows anything.

Ol’ga’s longing to return to Moscow has not been fulfilled, Natasha has succeeded in ousting her from the family home; her dreams of escape from her teaching duties have not been realized and at the end of the play she seems to question the very meaning and direction of her life.

Ol’ga, Masha and Irina in *Three Sisters* comparatively speaking have certain advantages over the sisters in Lorca’s play; they are educated women, significantly, we note, because of the efforts of their late father. This play, unlike the later Lorca play, contains many literary references. The three sisters would appear to enjoy a much richer cultural life and a greater external freedom than their counterparts in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. However, they do not arrive at the destination – neither the literal nor the figurative one – for which they yearned, as will be indicated shortly. Neither do they possess, by the end of the play, any “room of their own”; Masha returns to a state of precarious dependence on her husband.

Despite these differences, I would like to suggest that there is, in fact, a striking similarity in the final state of the two configurations of sisters. Not a single one of them in either of the two plays achieves any kind of lasting sense of personal freedom, fulfilment or happiness. Adela, it could be argued, experiences this all too briefly, and she was fully prepared to accept whatever role she might have to

play in her future relationship with Pepe el Romano, even after his marriage to Angustias. She declares to her sisters at the end of the play: “Vamos a dormir, vamos a dejar que se case con Angustias, ya no me importa, pero yo me iré a una casita sola donde él me verá cuando quiera, cuando le venga en gana.” But her fleeting time of happiness and relative freedom is all too quickly over and her suicide is brought about primarily by the frenzied jealousy of her sister Martirio.

For all their talents and superior education, it is only Masha who is seen to experience some brief moments of happiness in *Three Sisters*; these occur in her short-lived relationship with Vershinin. Towards the end of the play she observes:

When you have to take your happiness in snatches,
in small parts, and then you lose it, as I have done, then little
by little you become hard, you seethe with anger... (She
points to her breast.) Something is boiling over inside me
here...

Vershinin also betrays Masha.³⁶ If Pepe had abandoned Adela to her fate within “la casa” after their illicit relationship had been discovered, in the earlier play we note how Vershinin departs from the town, leaving Masha and maintaining the “status quo” of his own unhappy marriage.

On two occasions in *Three Sisters* Chebutykin quotes the first line of an aria from an old comic operetta, namely that nature created man “for love alone”.³⁷ It is striking that not one character in this play, save Masha and very briefly at that, succeeds in achieving any authentic love relationship; even her situation could be questioned, given Chekhov’s portrayal of Vershinin. There are many declarations of love in this play, for example Andrei’s declaration of love to Natasha at the end of Act 1 which all too quickly proves to have been a mistake on his part, ultimately harmful for himself and for his sisters. Chebutykin declares how much he had loved the sisters’ late mother, but she was married, he tells the sisters, and so he remained alone. Ol’ga announces that she would have loved her husband, if she

had had one, but at the end of the play she too is still alone. Irina, young and talented, was prepared to marry a man she did not love, and when he is killed she too is left alone and aware of a profound sense of desolation.

In *The Lady with the Little Dog*, Chekhov had, as we noted, depicted a relationship where love, forgiveness, compassion and meaningful communication existed between the two protagonists. Such qualities are almost totally absent from the final state of the two plays presently being examined. In this respect I believe that their dénouements are very similar. What they present to us as the final curtain falls are two groups of sisters, who have failed in their search for any kind of authentic personal happiness or who are limited in some way by circumstances over which they would appear to have little or no control. It would seem to make little difference that Lorca's characters exist in an enclosed world, cut off from "la calle" and dominated by their mother. Chekhov's sisters have also failed to "make it" to Moscow, Moscow having been transformed into "la calle" in Lorca's play. Chekhov's sisters have relinquished most of their own personal space in the family home to Natasha, the outsider, who is in turn betraying her husband, the sisters' brother. Hints have also been supplied that Natasha's domination could, within a relatively short space of time, be complete. In both plays women betray, seek to dominate each other and, on occasions, insidiously encroach upon the lives of other female characters. Masha has "gone home", Adela is dead. Ol'ga questions the meaning of it all, and the four remaining sisters in Lorca's play will continue, we suppose, in their silent enclosure. Although Chekhov's sisters were not subjected to the same intensity of entrapment as Angustias, Amelia, Magdalena and Martirio, nevertheless I believe that the profound lack of inner freedom of the former women is as great as that of Lorca's characters. At this point it is appropriate to recall Irina's comment:

I've never even once been in love in my life. Oh,
how I've dreamed about love, I've dreamed about it for such

a long time, day and night, but my soul is like an expensive piano which has been locked up, and the key has been lost.

These words surely provide a perfect comment too on the sterility and the entrapment of the lives of the sisters in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.

(2) TIME

In *Three Sisters* the lines from the fable by I.A. Krylov *The Peasant and the Workman* – “He did not have time to cry out before the bear fell on him” – are spoken three times, once by Solyony at the beginning of the play and again by him in the final act. Chebutykin repeats them shortly after Solyony, also in Act 4 of the play. The importance of the “podtekst”, or “hidden meaning”, for a Chekhovian work has, of course, been examined many times by critics, as has the importance within his works of the theme of time and the references to the brevity of existence.³⁸ It could be suggested that this line from Krylov stands out in *Three Sisters*, a play in which the theme of the passing of time is of crucial importance, as a kind of ominous warning, not only of the shortness of life, but also of the swiftness and unexpectedness with which disaster may strike, putting an end to hopes and illusions, and even to life itself. In Lorca’s play a hint of this same idea is given by Poncia in the second act when she observes to Bernarda that “[nadie] puede conocer su fin”.

With regard to the function of time in drama, Ann Shukman notes:

In drama, long periods of event time have to take place (or are announced as taking place) in the intervals between acts and scenes...Drama, in fact, because its event time coincides with its narration time, has less capacity than narrative for summarizing: it rather shows the action in a

series of scenes (though the scenes may of course include substantial summarizing speeches).³⁹

It is interesting to note that in the stage instructions which precede each of the four acts of *Three Sisters* Chekhov “fixes” them all in “clock time”. In Act 1 it is almost noon – the clock will strike twelve shortly after the play begins. In Act 2 we learn it is eight in the evening, and barely has this act started than Natasha asks Andrei the time. In Act 3 the action begins at three o’clock during the night, and in Act 4 significantly it is noon again, the time of the initial action of the play. Thus we have gone full cycle, passing from morning, through evening and night and returning once more to late morning. In Act 3 a conversation quickly develops about events in the past, and in Act 4 references are equally quickly made to possible reunions in the future.

In *La casa de Bernarda Alba* Lorca does not fix each act within such a strict framework of “clock time”, but nevertheless we are given significant details to this end. In the stage instructions for Act 1 we are told that it is summer, and although the exact time of day is not known, Poncia reveals in her first speech, “Llevan ya más de dos horas de gori-gori...”. From the nature of the events which have already taken place it can be assumed that they occurred in daylight. It is not until almost the end of the act, however, that an accurate reference is supplied: Angustias asks the time, and Magdalena replies, “Ya deben ser las doce”. At this information Angustias indicates her disbelief: “¿Tanto?”, suggesting that time seems to move very slowly. Many events have, however, taken place on stage by this relatively early hour. In Act 1 too the central idea of endless repetition and monotony is first mentioned by Martirio. She observes: “Pero las cosas se repiten. Yo veo que todo es una terrible repetición”. Early on in this same act Bernarda establishes the fixed period of time for the mourning of her late husband, eight years, during which, she warns her daughters, “...no ha de entrar en esta casa el viento de la calle”.

In Act 2 there are very many attempts to fix time accurately. We are not given any precise stage instructions regarding the time of day, but we quickly learn from Amelia's remark to La Poncia, "[a]bre la puerta del patio a ver si nos entra un poco de fresco", that it is still summer, and probably the hottest hour of the day. Angustias's remark made just before Amelia's, (which, of course, may be interpreted on two different levels), "...pronto voy a salir de este infierno", also suggests the burning heat of early afternoon. However, within this act we are provided with a number of direct references to clock time. We learn that the previous night had been extremely hot – "Era la una de la madrugada y subía fuego de la tierra...", remarks Poncia. Then a discussion starts as to the exact time when Pepe had left "la ventana". "Se iría a eso de la una y media", states Amelia, and later Poncia notes: "Pero ... yo lo sentí marchar a eso de las cuatro." Later we are given a direct reference to event time, provided by Poncia after the sound of distant bells has been heard – significantly, "como a través de varios muros". It is just after three o'clock in the afternoon, and in the outside world, beyond the confines of "la casa", the men are returning from work.

This act also contains one of the most important references in the entire play to the theme of the passing of time, of repetition, of tedium and monotony within the sisters' enclosed world. To Amelia's question "¿Qué te pasa?" Martirio replies: "Estoy deseando que llegue noviembre, los días de lluvias, la escarcha, todo lo que no sea este verano interminable". In a matter of few words Lorca has expressed the passing of time and the seasons, and from Amelia's reply, "Ya pasará y volverá otra vez", we have the inevitability of it all, the unchanging cycle which so powerfully depicts the fate of these enclosed women – Poncia had referred earlier in this same act to "la casa" as "un convento", adding yet another symbolic dimension to this motif. (It is notable too that in *Three Sisters*, when Masha and Vershinin are beginning their conversation about their respective spouses in Act 2, Masha "glances at her watch" just after Vershinin has announced that he would like tea. "They'll bring it presently", states Masha, and here too we have a suggestion of the

monotony of the lives of these sisters. It is also appropriate here to recall Irina's remark: "It's autumn now, winter will soon be here, and the snow will cover everything..."; this prefigures, of course, the suggestion of endless repetition within the sisters' lives which we have noted in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.)

At the end of the same act another discussion arises regarding the exact time of Pepe's departure from "la reja" earlier that morning. Poncia's son claims to have seen him "a las cuatro y media de la madrugada", while Angustias responds that "Pepe lleva más de una semana marchándose a la una". Here Lorca deliberately mystifies; we may already suspect what has happened during this lapse of three hours, and we are surprised when Bernarda, despite her protestations that she wields total control over her daughters' lives, is persuaded to dismiss this matter as "falsos testimonios", although she does promise some lines later that "[a]quí no se vuelve a dar un paso sin que yo lo sienta". (Ironically this remark is yet another of her grandiose claims, no reflection of the true reality within the walls of "la casa".)

The stage instructions for Act 3 reveal that it is night, and the very first words give an indication of the duration of the opening event. In Act 1, when outsiders had been within the house for the funeral wake, in this act Prudencia has visited Bernarda, (but we note that she is seated "aparte"). She remarks: "Ya me voy. Os he hecho una visita larga". A more accurate "time check", closely related to the religious framework of the play, is given a few lines later when Prudencia asks Bernarda, "¿Han dado el último toque para el rosario?", to which Poncia replies, "Todavía no". We discover too that in three days' time the official betrothal ceremony for Angustias will take place. The visit of Prudencia comes to a close with the sound of "el último toque". At this point it may be suggested that, where Chekhov uses "clock time" and other extraneous sounds as a means to present and to control the time structure within his play, Lorca makes use of church bells in particular and other off-stage noises to do virtually the same thing.

In *Three Sisters* Chekhov had brought us full circle, suggesting the endless repetition in the lives of these women. Masha remarked in Act 2 that "People who

don't even notice whether it is summer or winter are lucky', whilst she noted her own tedium with winter. She had forgotten what summer was like and she seems to suggest that the constant referring to the passing of "external" time might imply a kind of inner emptiness. Martirio's comment in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, "Yo hago las cosas sin fe, pero como un reloj", would seem an apt comparison at this point.

La casa de Bernarda Alba opens with the sound of the tolling of funeral bells, and these same bells will sound again only a few hours after the events of the play are over. The play must end with Bernarda's imposition of silence, but shortly before she orders "Avisad que al amanecer den dos clamores las campanas". Here too "time" has come full cycle. We have passed through day and night and we know what will occur the following dawn. In *Three Sisters* our attention is frequently drawn to the passing of "clock time"; in *La casa de Bernarda Alba* the passing of time is often punctuated by the pealing of bells. This sound in particular, together with other extraneous noises heard in the course of the play, breaks into events on stage and provides a grim reminder of both the inexorable passing of time and the frailty of human existence. The sound of these bells also suggests the oppression and the dreadful monotony of the lives of the sisters. In Act 1 it appears to control the coming and going of the servant and Poncia; after the latter's departure the servant imitates the bells – "Tin, tin, tan. Tin, tin, tan" – just prior to her conversation with the beggar woman. While the servant dismisses the beggar woman, refusing her "las sobras de hoy", the sound of bells suddenly ceases; it is not referred to again until Act 2, when Poncia warns Adela that she will sound the bells, thus making known the latter's illicit relationship with Pepe el Romano. A sound of distant bells reaches the house in this act too, a reminder of life beyond the walls. But the arrival of the "segadores" is heralded not by church bells, but by the sound of drums and singing, much more appropriate, since these young men are associated with colour, happiness, laughter. (The distraction of the group of players was likewise eagerly awaited in *Three Sisters*; their performance

within the sisters' home was forbidden by Natasha.) The sisters in Lorca's play listen to these sounds, we are told, "en un silencio traspasado por el sol". The song of the men is full of rich sensual imagery – "el segador pide rosas", for example, and their words echo ideas of freedom: "Abrir puertas y ventanas...", an alien world for the sisters, with the possible exception of Adela. Act 2 comes to a close with another sound from the outside world, "rumores lejanos", which grow to become "el tumulto". This extraneous noise comes as a harbinger of the tragedy which will later befall Adela. "El pueblo" has congregated to kill "la hija de la Librada", who had murdered her illegitimate child. Whereas Adela begs that she should be set free, Martirio and her mother are implacable. The act ends with Bernarda's exclamation "¡Matadla! ¡Matadla!"

Act 3 begins, unusually, with a domestic noise, a direct contrast to events at the close of the previous act; there is a silence which is broken by "el ruido de platos y cubiertos". The conversation between Bernarda and Prudencia is punctuated by the sound of the "caballo garañón", which has been "encerrado y da coces contra el muro" (an ironic reference, perhaps, to Adela). Just before the departure of Prudencia there is the sound of distant bells. In a later conversation with Angustias, Bernarda returns once more to question the exact time of Pepe's departure; on this occasion we are told that he departed "a las doce y media". Bernarda again asks Poncia if her son still sees Pepe "a las cuatro de la mañana", and to Poncia's request, "¿A qué hora quieres que le llame?", Bernarda gives the curious reply, "A ninguna". The extraneous sounds which break into the remainder of this act, providing a temporal framework, are the barking of dogs, a portent of some tragic event to come, as Poncia observes. María Josefa enters with the lamb in her arms and we hear the strains of her song. (This will be discussed later.) Finally there is a whistle, as Pepe signals, we assume, to Adela, and then Bernarda's shot. The very last sound which is heard on stage is the "golpe", as Adela kills herself, and then, finally, the promise of the funeral bells which will sound the following dawn.

We have noted how *Three Sisters* contains many references to the passing of time and to the brevity of human existence; I will argue too that we are alerted on many occasions to the necessity of being fully aware of the relentless moving on of time. Some examples only will now be cited, given that the play contains so many allusions to this theme. We begin with Ol'ga's reminiscences of the sisters' father's death and funeral, both the time and the season (spring) being accurately given. We are informed that eleven years have gone by since the sisters' late father had been made a brigadier, and as a result, the family left Moscow for the provinces. Ol'ga notes that these years have gone by, "...yet I remember everything about it, as if we'd only left yesterday...". We also very quickly learn that Ol'ga has been a teacher for four years, and we are surprised to learn that she is only 28 years old. "As for me, I've just aged...", she remarks. A rather sinister warning about the fleeting nature of individual existence is made by Solyony. "In twenty-five years time you won't be alive...", he remarks to Chebutykin, and after the arrival of Vershinin, more reminiscences about the past and life in Moscow take place before the latter declaims (and, we are told, "happily") "How times flies! Oh, oh, how time flies!" In this act a great deal of "philosophizing" takes place about both the past and the future. Kulygin appears and we note that he makes two deliberate references to "clock time". We learn in this act too that Masha had married him when she was only eighteen, and Natasha, the only character who, at this point, could be described as an "outsider", makes an appearance at the end of this act, which concludes with Andrei's declaration of his love for her and his proposal of marriage. This, apart from the celebrations for Irina and the arrival of Vershinin, is the only main event in present time which has occurred in the course of the entire act.

Act 2 opens with "the outsider" now securely in place within the sisters' home and making plans as to future domestic arrangements which will involve the claiming of Irina's space, her room, for Natasha's child. Although Chekhov does not indicate in his stage instructions the exact amount of time which has elapsed

between these acts, we can assume that it must be about one year or slightly more, given that the marriage of Natasha and Andrei has taken place and that they now have a small son. Natasha, we observe, makes several attempts at the beginning of the act to establish the correct time, and with the later entry of Ferapont reminiscences of the past begin again. Irina refers to the fact that Andrei has recently been losing money at cards, and in this same speech we are given the exact month of event time, January. Irina has remarked that they will be leaving for Moscow "...in June. How many months are there till June?...February, March, April, May...nearly half-a-year!" Vershinin continues to "philosophize" about the future, trying to imagine what life will be like in "two or three hundred years". Towards the end of the act, event time is once again firmly fixed for us by Rode, who notes that it "has only just gone nine o'clock". Andrei remarks to Chebutykin, "One shouldn't marry. One shouldn't marry", and we can recall, of course, his words which ended the previous act and the relatively short duration of his married life. The act ends with the cancellation of the performance by the players within the sisters' home at Natasha's instigation, the latter's plans for a "rendez-vous" with Protopopov (again many accurate time references are made by her at this point), Irina's loss of her own room to Bobik, and Ol'ga's weariness with her new teaching duties. Kulygin's quotation of Cicero's words "O, fallacem hominum spem!" would seem to be an apt summing up of events so far. The last words of the act belong to Irina, now alone; she calls with great longing, "Moscow! Moscow! Moscow! Moscow!"

Act 3 opens in the room now shared by Ol'ga and Irina, an ironical comment on Irina's last words of the previous act. Time is firmly fixed – it is now three a.m. and the fire is raging outside. Ferapont quickly takes us back to the burning of Moscow in 1812, and prior to the entry of Natasha, Anfisa tells Ol'ga her age and expresses her fears that she may be dismissed because of her infirmity. We are not told the exact period of time which has elapsed between Act 2 and Act 3, but we learn very quickly that Natasha now has a daughter, Ol'ga will most likely

be promoted to headmistress and Vershinin and his brigade will probably be leaving the town. Vershinin yet again indulges in speculation as to what life will be like in two or three hundred years time, and later in the act we are informed by Irina that Andrei has abandoned his dreams of becoming a professor and seems to be content to be a member of the local council “with Protopopov as chairman”. In this act the three sisters all express their fears for the future. Irina remarks, “...I feel I’m moving away from any hope of a genuine, fine life...”; Ol’ga notes, “I’m not going to be a headmistress...I couldn’t do it...” and Masha reveals that “...it’s all rather frightening, isn’t it?” The act ends with Andrei’s “defence” of Natasha and of his own situation, with his revelation to the sisters of his debts and the mortgaging of their house, and Irina’s decision to marry the Baron. “We’ll be all alone,” she notes to Ol’ga, if the rumoured departure of the troops is true. Her words end this act too, as she pleads with Ol’ga: “Let’s go, please do let’s go! There’s nowhere in all the world like Moscow. Let’s go, Olya! Let’s go!”

Act 4 is, among other things, the act of farewells. Plans are made for meeting again in 10 or 15 years time. Event time has been fixed at the outset – it is noon – but once again no accurate information is given regarding the amount of time that has elapsed between acts 3 and 4. Characters talk of their plans for the future, and accurate time references are made for the departure of the troops. Masha gives some indication of what the future may hold for her; she suddenly seems to notice the freedom and happiness of a flock of birds as they fly away, and Andrei makes a long speech full of regrets for his present existence and paints a grim picture of the future. Tuzenbach, just as he leaves to fight the duel (though Irina does not realize this), becomes aware of the beauty of the trees, as if for the first time in his life, and he remarks: “What beautiful trees – and how beautiful, when you think of it, life ought to be with trees like these!” We note that Vershinin looks at his watch on three separate occasions within a very short space of time before his final departure. Natasha makes arrangements for the future. Andrei will sleep separately in Irina’s room and Natasha’s daughter will have his former room.

The sisters and, to a certain extent, their brother too have been successfully removed from their home by the former outsider, now firmly in control within the house and outside too, as she makes her plans for the cutting down of the fir trees – their beauty had previously been noted by the Baron. The play ends with the departure of Vershinin, the death of the Baron and Masha's return to her husband, while Ol'ga remains to teach at the school and Irina will leave to start a new life alone. In their final speeches, each one of the three sisters makes a direct reference to the theme of the passing of time and possibilities for the future. Masha notes: "They have gone forever... and we are left quite alone, to begin our lives again...". Irina "philosophizes" in her final speech: "Some day", she notes, "people will know why such things happen...but meanwhile we must go on living and working...". Ol'ga, whose words close the play, announces in her penultimate speech: "The time will come when we will be gone forever... But our sufferings may be transformed into joys for those who come after us...and in a little while we may know why we are alive, why we have suffered...".

There is a powerful impression at the end of the play that we have come full circle. The final sound of the play – the sound of music, which is growing fainter and fainter – had been referred to by Ol'ga at the beginning of Act 1, when she mentioned the music that had been played at their father's funeral. This final reference to music may remind us of that death. As in the later Lorca play, we begin and end with death. The clock, which had struck twelve at the beginning of this play, had been later destroyed by Chebutykin. The fact that the clock had belonged to the sisters' late mother might suggest that something representative of the values in which the sisters had been educated had been carelessly smashed by an outsider, someone who had claimed to have loved the owner of the clock. This incident may represent another facet of the theme of time. Most of the characters, with the exception of Natasha, spend a great deal of their present time talking about the past and about the future, while the present is relentlessly being destroyed, like the clock, and will never return. It is revealing that Chebutykin shares the finale of

the play with Ol'ga, as he hums a line from a song, reads a newspaper and declaims that, "Nothing matters, nothing matters!"

TIME: SUMMARY

From this brief analysis of *La casa de Bernarda Alba* and *Three Sisters* we can draw important conclusions. Both dramatists, I believe, make a similar use of time structure and suggest closely related warnings about the fleeting nature of time. Both plays have a circular time structure in that we return to the initial point of departure in terms of the majority of the lives of the two groups of sisters. (The lives of most of the characters in both plays have actually deteriorated – if not ended – during the time period covered.) In *Three Sisters*, ironically enough, Natasha, through her marriage to the sisters' brother, is the only woman to have "progressed" through time; she has married, she has children, she is involved in an adulterous relationship, we assume, and by the end of the play she possesses a home of her own, which she has largely wrested from two of the three sisters. Andrei, on the other hand, has made a significant "regression" through time. He may have one or two children (if Natasha's daughter is, in fact, his), he has a wife, whom he does not love (and who no longer loves him), and he has betrayed his own professional ideals and the faith which his sisters had in him. Chekhov also highlights in the course of this play another (possibly more significant) relationship with time. Many hints are given about the temporary nature of life; the present should be lived fully in the light of this awareness and chances of happiness ought to be snatched before it is too late and "the bear falls". Of all the sisters Masha, I will argue later, comes to realize this most fully, although she returns once again to her previous life. Perhaps Ol'ga's questions at the end of the play suggest that she too will experience this deeper awareness. Adela, in the later Lorca play, chose passion and snatches of freedom, being unable to tolerate the monotony of her life

and the limitations imposed upon her; such a situation could not last through time, and had come to an end with her premature death.

Finally, both dramatists use constant references to time, both to “clock time” and to the passing of the seasons and of the days, to suggest, on the one hand, the monotony of a restricted and repressed existence, and the brevity and fleeting nature of life on the other. Both dramatists, in my opinion, pose essentially the same questions with reference to the groups of sisters. How could these women reconcile the restrictions of their lives with their own need for inner happiness and freedom; how could they live the present in a meaningful way, given the limitations which surrounded them? Masha’s words, spoken at the beginning of *Three Sisters*, sum up their dilemma very well: “Oh, what a damnable life! It’s intolerable...”

(3) CHARACTERIZATION

If “time provides the... framework on which the other elements [of a literary work] are suspended and within which they are contained... [then] one of the other elements which make up the fictional world of the work is character”.⁴⁰ I now propose to examine some of the protagonists of the two plays using a series of five basic categories and then demonstrate the resulting conclusions. I also believe that these plays contain certain polyphonic elements – to use a Bakhtinian term.⁴¹ The five categories are: (1) outward/physical appearance of the character and setting, (2) social status of character, (3) “voice” of character, (4) actions of character and (5) inner world of character.⁴² These categories represent “the subject-matter of characterization... both external characterization and... internal characterization”.⁴³

(1) Outward appearance of characters and their backgrounds

Within the limitations of the drama, the dramatist cannot (and normally does not) devote the same amount of time to detailed descriptions of the appearances of the characters, as we find in the novel, for example.⁴⁴ We would expect to have references to the appearance of characters either directly from the dramatist (in stage instructions, for example), from descriptions given by other characters, or in the characters' own words. In the case of the two plays being examined, we are not given much detail in the stage instructions about the appearances of any of the characters. What we are given is, however, of immense symbolic meaning.

In the stage instructions for Act 1 of *La casa de Bernarda Alba* we learn, significantly, about the "interior de la casa de Bernarda", the whiteness of the walls being highlighted by the use of the superlative of the adjective. There is a curious reference made to pictures which depict "paisajes inverosímiles de ninfas o reyes de leyenda", an ironic comment by the author, perhaps, on the scenes which are we about to witness.⁴⁵

The stage instructions for Act 2 again stress the white room inside the house, and we are told that the sisters are sitting "en sillas bajas cosiendo". Act 3 opens with instructions which mention both the whiteness of the set and also its simplicity. On this occasion the walls have a bluish tinge, this being the only act which takes place at night and by moonlight, (the moon having great symbolic importance in other works by Lorca too).⁴⁶

In *Three Sisters* Chekhov was likewise sparing in his character description. In the instructions for Act 1 we are told that Ol'ga is wearing the regulation dark-blue uniform of a secondary school teacher; Masha is dressed in black and Irina in white. Symbolically, however, these sparse details may reveal much about the three women: blue is a colour which, among other things, may represent "entropy", "stagnation", and the fact that Ol'ga is presented to us in uniform might suggest that her external persona wins at the expense of her inner world.⁴⁷ These points will be

discussed later. Black is a colour which, naturally, is associated with mourning and death; it is also, of course, connected with the irrational, the mysterious. Masha is first presented to us while she is reading, a fact which may hint at the important literary “podtekst” which comes to be associated with her in the course of the play. Of the three sisters, she is the one who makes most references to literature, quoting on several occasions a line from Pushkin’s *Ruslan and Liudmila*. With this Chekhov may be suggesting that Masha applies fictional expectations to her own life; as a result, she fails, or has failed in the past, to perceive correctly the true reality which surrounds her. She awakens from her illusions about life when it may be already too late to bring about any significant change.⁴⁸ Irina is dressed in white, and although this colour is traditionally associated with purity and innocence, it is also a “non-colour”. Irina is described as “lost in thought”, which might suggest an ineffectuality about her, despite her somewhat grandiose plans for the future. Chekhov seems to be drawing our attention to the “outer casings” of the three sisters in a symbolic way.⁴⁹

As in the later Lorca play, the action for Act 1 takes place inside the home of the three sisters.⁵⁰ At this stage in the play, the house represents a certain security for two of the sisters at least. This “personal space” will later be lost to Natasha. The setting for Act 2 is identical, but here Natasha, candle in hand, makes her first entry as Andrei’s wife and usurper into the home of the sisters. (This will be discussed more fully later). Act 3 is located inside the room which is now shared by Ol’ga and Irina, and Masha is described as being “... as usual in a black dress”. In the stage instructions for Act 4, which takes place in the garden (a reminder, perhaps, that by now the sisters have been virtually removed from their own home owing to the incompetence of their brother and the machinations of their sister-in-law), we are given a few details about the appearance of some of the other characters. Kulygin has shaved off his moustache, Chebutykin appears to be “benevolent”, and the soldiers seem ready for departure. These details will be commented upon later.

Given, then, that the stage instructions provide relatively few details about the protagonists (in the case of the Lorca play we are merely told that the women are “de luto”), we would expect this information to be forthcoming from the other characters or from the characters themselves. Poncia is the first in Lorca’s play to offer information about Bernarda’s physical appearance. She refers at the beginning of Act 1 to Bernarda’s “sonrisa fría”.⁵¹ Poncia then goes on to reveal that Bernarda is “la más aseada” (pointing out, perhaps, that for the latter an ordered external appearance has supreme importance). We also learn that Bernarda is “la más alta”, a possible reference to the domination of her five daughters. The first description given of the latter again comes from Poncia. After the death of Bernarda’s second husband, Poncia notes that Bernarda has been left with “cinco hijas feas”. At this point, no details of the physical appearances of these women have been supplied, but in a society which preoccupied itself so much with “lo externo”, and where marriage was one of the two acceptable options open to women (the other being the convent), the adjective “feas” carries with it a wealth of suggestions of ostracism and rejection. Poncia further reveals that of the five sisters Angustias is the eldest. All the information given so far has been relayed exclusively from Poncia’s point of view. The latter reveals too that she had served in “la casa” for many years and that she hated Bernarda. Poncia is allowed, then, to manipulate our perceptions of both Bernarda and her daughters. Later in this same act the age and the identity of “the voice”, which had been heard crying off-stage, are revealed; Bernarda’s eighty-year-old mother is further described as “fuerte como un roble”. The servant now takes over to provide us with information, but the reason for the enforced “seclusion” of this old woman is not yet made clear. From the incident of the fan and from the earlier instruction given by Lorca (the women are “de luto”), we already know they are all dressed in black. Bernarda reminds her daughters that they are not to change their outer mourning attire, even “el pañuelo de la cabeza”. Shortly after this, Bernarda herself describes one of her daughters.

Angustias is depicted by her mother as “blanda... untuosa”, and we learn at this point too that Angustias is thirty-nine years of age.

From a later conversation in the same act between Martirio and Amelia, the latter refers to the former’s ill-health, and Martirio then describes herself as “débil y fea”. Because of this, she notes, she will be unable to marry, a remark which reinforces the importance of external appearances in this society. Magdalena then takes up the describing of appearances. Amelia makes the rather curious remark to her that her shoelace is undone, warning her that she may injure herself. Magdalena replies that this will mean simply “una menos”, a brief hint, perhaps, of her inner despair. The significant incident of the green dress is reported. Adela, in defiance of the strict mourning imposed both by society and, in particular, by her mother, had put on her green dress, giving to herself both colour and individuality. Adela has already been symbolically linked with bright colour from the incident when she offered her mother the coloured fan, so violently rejected by Bernarda. Green was, of course, of considerable symbolic importance for Lorca, being associated with life, freedom and the promise of rebirth.⁵² (It is interesting to note that at the end of Act 1 in *Three Sisters*, a reference is also made to this colour, when Ol’ga’s remarks to Natasha that her pink dress is wrong with her green belt. Green is also a colour which is associated with Masha; it is mentioned in the line from *Ruslan and Liudmila* which she quotes so frequently.) We then discover that Adela is the youngest of the sisters and immediately Magdalena’s voice continues to describe Angustias. The latter is “lo más oscuro de esta casa” and Magdalena reveals that Angustias, “como su padre, habla con las narices”. In almost direct contrast to her elder half-sister, Magdalena now tells us that Pepe el Romano is twenty-five years old and that he is “...el mejor tipo de todos estos entornos”. Adela, on hearing of the engagement between Angustias and this young man says of herself: “...no quiero perder mi blancura en estas habitaciones...”. Magdalena has also informed us that Angustias is “vieja, enfermiza, y... siempre ha sido la que ha tenido menos méritos de todas nosotras. Porque si con veinte años parecía un

palo vestido, ¡qué será ahora que tiene cuarenta!”. Once again our perceptions, this time of Angustias, have been cleverly manipulated by Magdalena. She has juxtaposed the youth and handsome appearance of Pepe with the age and not only unattractive appearance of Angustias, but her unpleasant voice too. We may recall Poncia’s description of all the sisters as being “feas”, but at least we are assured of Adela’s youth and vitality.⁵³ (It is noted too that it is through Magdalena’s “voice” that the other sisters learn of the forthcoming wedding between Angustias and Pepe el Romano.)

Two objects, normally connected with female beauty or attempts to achieve some degree of outward attractiveness, are particularly associated with Angustias – the “polvos y esencia”, which Poncia purchased for her in Act 2. However, in a striking incident in Act 1 Bernarda accuses her eldest daughter of having applied “povos a la cara” and violently removes all traces of this. Martirio had also noted earlier to Amelia that their friend Adelaida, since her formal engagement, “...ahora ni polvos se echa en la cara”; Martirio further remarked: “Antes era alegre”. These words, while possibly betraying Martirio’s envy, also provide yet another example of the restrictions imposed on women in that society.

The last description of appearance in Act 1 is that of Bernarda’s mother; the authorial “voice” relates that she is “...viejísima, ataviada con flores en la cabeza y en el pecho”. The mention of flowers suggests two associations at this stage. First, the colour hints at a possible link with Adela. María Josefa manages to escape from her “seclusion” occasionally too, and will not accept her entrapment easily. (In the 1987 film version of the play Mario Camus deliberately develops this connection between Adela and her grandmother.)⁵⁴ The other link is, perhaps, more significant. Earlier in this act Poncia and Bernarda had discussed the exploits of Paca la Roseta, “la única mujer mala que tenemos en el pueblo”, judges Bernarda, who does not suspect as yet the fate which awaits her own youngest daughter. The doubly restrictive and enclosed world of both “casa” and “pueblo” is revealed through Poncia’s reply to Bernarda: “Porque no es de aquí.” Paca la

Roseta is described as returning to the village with “una corona de flores en la cabeza” and this incident suggests a link too with María Josefa: “...yo quiero un varón para casarme y para tener alegría.” Through the connection with María Josefa a link between Paca la Roseta and Adela may also be posited. The Paca la Roseta incident almost prefigures the later illicit relationship between Adela and Pepe. At the end of Act 1 María Josefa also makes reference to her jewels, especially to her “gargantilla de perlas”. None of these things is to be for Bernarda’s daughters, because, as María Josefa prophetically remarks “...ninguna de vosotras se va a casar”. (The ring which Pepe later gives to Angustias is “de perlas”, not, as Adela states, of diamonds, as it should be. Prudencia, the outsider, remarks that pearls, in fact, “significan lágrimas”, an obvious hint of the final state of the relationship between Angustias and Pepe.)

Act 2 does not greatly increase our knowledge of the physical appearances of the characters; the details supplied merely reinforce what we have already learned. At the beginning of the act, Poncia notes that Adela is “temblona, asustada”, indicative of a change in her inner state. Angustias reluctantly discloses that Pepe had declared to her on their first meeting: “necesito una mujer buena, modosa y ésa eres tú si me das la conformidad”. (These words clearly indicate the total submission expected of her as a wife; a similar “obedience” was exacted from this woman of thirty-nine years of age by her mother.) Magdalena then reinforces our views of the physical appearance of Pepe. She reminds us that he is “un hombre tan guapo”, to which Angustias replies: “No tiene mal tipo”. Amelia and Angustias discuss Adela. Angustias notes that: “La envidia la come” and that: “Se le está poniendo mirar de loca” – yet another suggestion of a link between Adela and María Josefa. Adela announces that she would like to be “invisible”, and in the ensuing argument with Martirio she refers to her own eyes as “frescos” and says to her sister, “Si quieres te daré mis ojos que son frescos y mis espaldas para que te compongas la joroba que tienes...”. Later Adela repeats this idea to Poncia, referring thus to her sister Martirio: “¡No me deja respirar! Y siempre, ¡qué

lástima de cara!, ¡qué lástima de cuerpo, que no vaya a ser para nadie!” Through these last exchanges Lorca has, of course, presented the perfect ingredients for the powerful jealousy which will spark off Martirio’s final betrayal of Adela. Poncia, in her attempts to encourage Adela to end the relationship with Pepe, points out that in time she may well occupy Angustias’s place: “...Angustias es una enferma. Esa no resiste el primer parto. Es estrecha de cintura, vieja,... y Pepe hará lo que hacen todos los viudos de esta tierra, se casará con la más joven, la más hermosa y ésa eres tú”. Again we note the power assigned to Pepe. Adela, we assume, must be content to “wait behind the window”.

Towards the end of this act the “segadores” arrive, and they are described through Poncia’s voice thus: “¡Alegres! ¡Como arboles quemados!” The latter description reflects the physical strength and the healthy skin colour of these young men, in direct contrast with the whiteness of the sisters, who are denied access to the outside world. Poncia describes one of the “segadores” as “apretado como una gavilla de trigo”, and his eyes are green, the colour already being associated with Adela, with freedom and the healthy natural world, beyond the confines of the walls of “la casa”.

The link with “ojos” is carried on by Magdalena, who remarks that as far as the sisters are concerned, “ni nuestros ojos siquiera nos pertenecen”. Perhaps here she is suggesting that the eyes, which so often are seen as the “mirror of the soul”, or as representative of the inner life, do not properly belong to these women either. Bernarda at the close of this act makes another reference to eyes: to Poncia’s warnings to her that not all is as it should be within her home, she replies: “Nací para tener los ojos abiertos. Ahora vigilaré sin cerrarlos ya hasta que me muera.” The irony here is that Bernarda has failed to “see” much of what has been happening almost “in front of her very eyes”, and she does “see” only when it is far too late either to stop or to remedy what has taken place.

Very little is added in Act 3 to the appearances of the characters. Poncia notes that Martirio is like “un pozo de veneno”, referring to her envy. This

description recalls the episode in Act 1, when Bernarda had described the village as “...pueblo de pozos, donde siempre se bebe el agua con el miedo de que esté envenenado”. (The village, we note, has no flowing, pure water. This image reinforces the idea of stagnation, deprivation of freedom and, of course, fear.) Earlier Bernarda had referred to “el veneno” of the tongues of those who had come to mourn her late husband. This cross-reference could be a subtle way of proposing an inner link between Martirio and her mother, much in the same way as there is the possibility of a symbolical connection between Adela and María Josefa. María Josefa takes over the “describing” voice towards the end of the play. When she comes on stage carrying the lamb she repeats the following lines three times: “Bernarda, cara de leoparda. Magdalena, cara de hiena.” Here Bernarda and Magdalena are “linked”, and later María Josefa addresses Martirio as: “Martirio, cara de Martirio”, thus suggesting a possible “triangular” relationship, comprising Bernarda, Martirio and Magdalena. María Josefa later refers to her own white hair and past friendships in the “outside world” with her “vecinas”. She says to Martirio, “Tu tendrás el pelo blanco, pero no vendrán las vecinas”; there will be no contact, far less communication, with those beyond “la casa”.

At the end of the play the authorial voice tells us that Adela “Viene un poco despeinada”, in contrast, of course, to the “externally” ordered appearance of her mother, stressed at the start of the play. Martirio is described at this point by Adela as “débil”, while Angustias makes her final comment to Adela: “De aquí no sales con tu cuerpo en triunfo”.

While Lorca does not provide a vast amount of detail about the external appearances of his characters, from that which is given he builds up an important system of links within the play. Chekhov had treated the presentation of the appearances of his characters in a very similar way. In her opening speech Ol’ga describes her sister Irina to us, contrasting her present appearance (“You’re wearing white, and your face is radiant”) to her appearance at their father’s funeral: “You had fainted and were lying quite still as if you were dead.” Ol’ga then refers to her

own weariness, her constant headache and the fact that she “has the thoughts of someone quite old”. Ol’ga then tells both sisters that they look pretty, and sounds a note of warning about Andrei: “Andrei could be good-looking, but he’s become so stout. It doesn’t suit him. As for me, I’ve just aged and grown a lot thinner.”⁵⁵ Because she is at home – in the course of the play Ol’ga and Irina are virtually ousted from this house – Ol’ga remarks that she “feels much younger” and it is surprising to discover, given her earlier remarks, that she is only twenty-eight. Later we learn that Irina is only twenty and Ol’ga informs us that “Irina always wakes at seven – but she stays in bed till at least nine, thinking about something or other. And with such a serious expression on her face, too!” Ol’ga also comments on Masha’s sad expression, to which the latter replies: “...the place is as quiet as a tomb. I’m going home. I’m depressed today, I’m sad, so don’t listen to me...” (The reference here to Masha’s “home” is significant. If her sisters lose control of the family home by the end of the play, it could be argued that Masha has no real place where she belongs either, given that she depends on a husband whom she does not love.)

Vershinin almost immediately refers to the change in the sisters’ outward appearance: “Dear, dear, how you have changed!... I remember there were three little girls. I don’t remember their faces...”. Turning to Masha, he says, “I seem to remember your face a little”. This observation establishes the beginning of the link which will develop later between them. In response, Masha recalls that Vershinin had been called “the lovesick Major” and she says: “In those days you had a moustache... Oh dear, how much older you look...” (Masha’s husband appears at the end of the play having shaved off his moustache.) Vershinin then excuses his altered appearance, “I was in love then. It’s different now”. (We have already learned something of the appearance and character of his second wife.)

With these details, then, Chekhov sets up an important system of links between certain of his characters. He also constantly draws our attention to the ages of the characters, prefiguring a similar situation in Lorca’s play. In this way,

both dramatists bring to the forefront the central theme of the inexorable passing of time. Ol'ga continues her reflections as she observes to Vershinin: "But you haven't a single grey hair! You've aged, yes, but you're certainly not an old man." (We subsequently learn that Vershinin is forty-two.) Towards the end of this act Masha's voice presents a very lengthy description of Natasha, first of her clothes ("...they are simply pathetic") and later of her physical appearance: "And her cheeks look as if they have been scrubbed, they are so shiny...". Ol'ga, later in the same act, tackles Natasha about her bad dress sense: "You've a green belt on...it just doesn't go with your dress".⁵⁶ Andrei reveals that their father "...used to wear us out with learning...but I must confess that since he died I've begun to grow quite stout...I've grown quite stout in a year." (This may be a warning signal of Andrei's moral and physical degeneration.)⁵⁷ Irina reveals that Masha was out of humour, linking this in some way with her marriage at eighteen to Kulygin. We learn that at that time Masha regarded her husband as "the cleverest man in the world". Irina goes on to use the same words to describe Masha's present marital situation as Vershinin had used to describe his own state: "It's different now". In the closing sequences of this act Tuzenbach refers to Irina's beauty, Natasha enters and glances at her reflection as if to check her external appearance: "My hair seems to be all right", she notes. In the closing speech of the act Andrei says to her, "How young you are, how wonderfully, beautifully young..."

Act 2 opens with Natasha inside the sisters' home, and obviously by now very much in control. She refers to Andrei's stoutness: "The doctor says you ought to have nothing but sour milk, or you'll never get thinner...". (This would seem to point to the ever-continuing deterioration of Andrei.) Later in this act Vershinin says to Masha: "You really are a wonderful creature...It's quite dark in here, but I can see your eyes shining." This provides a direct contrast to Masha's ill-humour of the first act. Masha notices that Irina has grown thinner, and she says: "You look younger too...and your face looks quite boyish." Vershinin refers again to his "grey hair", and after his departure to attend to his wife we note that Masha is once

more “bad-tempered”, as Irina notices. Natasha remarks on Masha’s “good looks” and almost at the end of the act Solyony praises Irina’s “glorious, marvellous, entrancing eyes”.

In Act 3 Natasha once again checks her hair in the mirror and states that people claim that she has “grown stouter...”. “But it’s not true!”, she adds. Later Tuzenbach declares to Irina: “You are so pale, so beautiful, so fascinating...Your pallor seems to light up the darkness around you...” We recall Ol’ga’s words that Irina’s face was “shining”. However, in direct contrast, later in this same act Irina refers to herself as “thinner, uglier and older, and I find no satisfaction in anything”, she remarks. Immediately after Ol’ga suggests to Irina that she should accept Tuzenbach’s proposal of marriage, she comments: “It’s true, he’s not good-looking...” She continues: “When the Baron resigned his commission and came to see us in his civilian clothes, I thought he looked so plain that I started to cry...” Masha, though she had judged Natasha by her external appearance, does not seem to grant such importance to this as far as Vershinin is concerned. In her “confession” to her sisters she states: “I...love everything about him...his voice, his talk, his misfortunes...” Outward appearances in both plays, I believe, have a special symbolic significance. They also constitute a frequent topic of conversation for many of the characters.

In the stage instructions for Act 4 we are given details of the appearances of Kulygin and Chebutykin. Kulygin, now clean shaven, is also wearing a “decoration around his neck”, whilst Chebutykin is wearing an army cap and holding a walking stick. Irina comments that she cannot bear to look at Kulygin’s face, while the latter justifies having shaved off his moustache as follows: “The director shaved his moustache off, so I shaved mine off when they gave me an inspectorate... Whether I’ve got a moustache or not, it’s all the same to me.” Chebutykin refers to the change in Kulygin’s appearance thus: “It’s a pity you’ve shaved your moustache off...”. Chekhov places such importance on this detail possibly to suggest that we now have a somewhat clearer vision of this man; we

therefore feel greater pity for Masha who will return “home” with him at the end of the play. There could be here too a secret allusion to *Ruslan and Liudmila*, the first line of which is so frequently quoted by Masha throughout the play. In this poem the power of the evil Chernomor, who abducts Liudmila, is contained in his beard. Once that beard is cut off, Chernomor will lose all his magical powers and become a helpless dwarf. Chekhov lays such emphasis on these references to “beards” and “moustaches” in connection with Kulygin, that surely we are intended to pick up this hidden reference.⁵⁸ Andrei, in a bitter moment of truth, recognizes that, “My wife is my wife... but there’s something about her which pulls her down to the level of an animal...a sort of mean, blind, thick-skinned animal – anyway, not a human being”. The masks have now been removed. Chebutykin advises Andrei to depart: “Go away, and don’t ever look back...”.

Solyony refers to “the smell” of his hands, despite all the scent he had used (later in this act he is to kill Tuzenbach) and the latter makes a last reference to Irina’s beauty. Andrei utters his final long tirade against the “poshlost” of the town and its inhabitants. Kulygin dons a false beard in an ill-starred attempt – or so one imagines from her sobbing - to distract Masha after the departure of Vershinin. Kulygin echoes Natasha’s praises of the beauty of her daughter, and the final reference to outer appearance in the play is left to Natasha. This description brings us full circle, clearly showing the extent of Natasha’s power and her insidious progress into the world of the sisters. She did not achieve this by any “merits” of her own; her place as Andrei’s wife permitted her initial entry into the sisters’ home and the former’s weakness allowed the rest. Natasha observes to Irina, in much the same way as Ol’ga had done to her in Act 1, while she was still an outsider: “My dear, that belt you are wearing doesn’t suit you at all.”

Both dramatists offer us few, but very subtle, references to the appearances of their characters, establishing a vitally important system of inner links which allow us to penetrate to a deeper level of meaning. Many of these references are

significantly related to the themes of the passing of time, the acquisition of power, and the control (real or imaginary) of others – crucial themes in both plays.

(2) Social status

Both groups of sisters in these plays enjoy a social position of relatively high standing. In Lorca's play the only sister to have financial means of her own is Angustias. Despite this, Bernarda is not prepared to sell her daughters in marriage. She says to Poncia:

No hay en cien leguas a la redonda quién se pueda
acercar a ellas. Los hombres de aquí no son de su clase.
¿Es que quieres que las entregue a cualquier gañán?

To Angustias, who had gone to observe “el duelo de los hombres”, she addresses the following tirade: “¿Es decente que una mujer de tu clase vaya con el anzuelo detrás de un hombre...?” To Poncia's suggestion that Bernarda should have allowed Martirio to marry Enrique Humanas, Bernarda retorts: “¡Mi sangre no se junta con la de los Humanas mientras yo viva! Su padre fue gañán.” “Los pobres”, notes Bernarda too, at the beginning of the play, “son como los animales, parece como si estuvieran hechas de otras sustancias”.

Throughout this play there is, as we have noted, a constant reference to the keeping up of appearances. When María Josefa escapes, Bernarda's main preoccupation is that “...desde aquel sitio las vecinas pueden verla desde su ventana”. Amelia notes later in Act 1 that “De todo tiene la culpa esta crítica que no nos deja vivir...”, and on this same topic Magdalena observes that “...nos pudrimos por el qué dirán”. Poncia has established her own code of honour too within the “casa”, apparent when she remarks to Adela “¡Velo! Para que las gentes no escupan al pasar por esta puerta...”, later stating too “...quiero vivir en casa

decente”. After the incident of the stealing of Pepe’s picture, Bernarda’s main preoccupation is that “Estarán las vecinas con el oído pegado a los tabiques”. In the final act of the play, shortly before Adela’s suicide, Bernarda stresses to Angustias that she wishes her to forgive her sister Martirio (who had stolen the picture), and that, above all, she desires “... buena fachada y armonía familiar”.

Bernarda’s reactions after Adela’s death have already been discussed; despite her pretensions regarding possible suitors for her daughter, it is somewhat surprising that we know virtually nothing at all about Pepe el Romano, apart from a brief reference to his external appearance. After all, he will be the cause of the destruction within Bernarda’s “casa”; it is significant that he achieves this from “outside” the house (unlike Natasha in *Three Sisters*, who succeeds in her machinations from within).

If social class and hierarchy were of the utmost importance for Bernarda, there is a curious repetition of this same idea among the lower classes too. At the beginning of the play the servant treats and dismisses the beggar woman in much the same way as Bernarda will deal with her. “Fuera de aquí...”, she orders; later Bernarda will give the servant a similar command: “Vete. No es éste tu lugar.” Poncia, who might have expected to enjoy a certain “confianza” with Bernarda, is told firmly by the latter, “Obrar y callar a todo. Es la obligación de los que viven a sueldo”. Yet we had learned at the very beginning of the play that Poncia had spent thirty years “...mirando por la rendija para espiar a los vecinos y llevarle el cuento” and that during this time they had “vida sin secreto una con otra”. Nevertheless, the social class system is firmly imposed by Bernarda. Poncia and the servant, however, despite their lowly position, enjoyed at least a greater freedom of movement than Bernarda’s own daughters.

In Chekhov’s play we are given detailed information about the sisters’ late father’s military profession and about their former life in Moscow. Ol’ga has a profession of her own, the same as that of Masha’s husband. Irina expresses her longing to work. “Man must work by the sweat of his brow whatever his class...”,

she remarks. Tuzenbach tells how he has not been accustomed to work. "I was born into a family where work and worries were unknown." He also predicts the time when "a mighty storm will come...and in twenty-five or thirty years' time every man or woman will be working". Andrei relinquishes his hopes of becoming a professor and becomes secretary of the local council, of which Protopopov is chairman. While the sisters treat their servants with consideration, Natasha is eager to be rid of Anfisa. "She's quite useless here. She's just a peasant woman, her right place is in the country...", she remarks to Ol'ga. Anfisa, like Poncia in Lorca's play, had served in the sisters' family for thirty years; Natasha continues to Ol'ga: "But she can't do any work now...Whatever do we want this old woman for?" After this exchange with Natasha, Ol'ga confesses that she has "aged ten years".

While Natasha rises in social status, her husband falls. The sisters remain as before in this aspect of their lives, though by the end of the play they have lost their home and two of them live directly in the shadow of the threatening rise of Natasha. Bernarda's daughters also remain within their defined social status, with the exception of Adela, who, driven on by her passion for Pepe, attempted to defy both social conventions and status. She had announced to Poncia: "Por encima de ti que eres una criada, por encima de mi madre saltaría para apagar me este fuego que tengo levantado por piernas y boca."

(3) Voice

I have suggested that the term polyphonic could be applied to these two plays.⁵⁹ Although this term was largely employed in relation to the medium of prose fiction, these plays, in my opinion, contain significant polyphonic elements.⁶⁰ Bakhtin, for example, in his writings on the novel pointed to the diversity of voices which can be said to create a hidden dialogue within a work of fiction.⁶¹ These voices are further described as gaining independence from the authorial voice.

In *La casa de Bernarda Alba* one of the most striking features is the number of different female voices, all of which are engaged in a kind of secret discussion of the contrasting roles of women and men in their society. These voices provide a kind of secret “under-text” in their own right, often questioning the role of women in this closed society and at other times commenting on the inevitability of their fate, given both the moral and the social structures which surrounded them. These voices begin at the lower end of society: the beggar woman, pleading with the servant for scraps of food, says to her: “Mujer, tu tienes quien te gane. ¡Mi niña y yo estamos solas!” The servant, refusing to assist her, comments: “También están solas los perros y viven.” This is, in fact, a curious pre-echo of what Bernarda will say to the servant some lines later, “Los pobres son como los animales...”, and it also refers back to Poncia’s words about herself. She states, “...yo soy buena perra; ladro cuando me dicen...”. As far as Bernarda is concerned, Poncia does not even have a voice of her own.

Prior to the first appearance of Bernarda on stage, the servant remembers her relationship with the latter’s husband, one of the first betrayals and hidden layers of the play. (We do not know if Bernarda was aware of this relationship, although given the social norms in backward rural Spain at that time it is likely that such a relationship between master and servant was a fairly frequent occurrence.) The servant recalls to herself, her words spoken as if in secret dialogue with

Bernarda's husband: "¡Ya no volverás a levantarme las enaguas detrás de la puerta de tu corral!" (This early reference to "enaguas" prefigures the final appearance and situation of Adela, as Martirio indicates in the final scene of the play with her words: "¡Mira esas enaguas llenas de pajas de trigo!")

By extracting Bernarda's voice, certain significant features of her mode of speech become apparent. The majority of her utterances are, in fact, semi-"refranes", exclamations, commands or rigid clichéd forms of speech. This can be noted from her second utterance of the play (her first word [and her last] in the play was "¡Silencio!"), when she advises the servant, "Menos gritos y más obras". This point can be well substantiated from other examples within the play. Her difficulties in educating her daughters to her own exacting requirements were expressed to Poncia as follows: "¡Cuánto hay que sufrir y luchar para hacer que las personas sean decentes y no tiren al monte demasiado!" When the picture of Pepe el Romano is stolen, Bernarda's orders have a quasi-military tone. "Registra los cuartos...", she orders Poncia, and to her daughters, one of whom is almost forty, she exclaims: "Esto tiene no ataros más cortas. ¡Pero me vais a sonar!" Later on in this same act she reminds these women that "...tengo cinco cadenas para vosotras...".⁶² In a subsequent conversation with Poncia, Bernarda declares with great certainty: "¡Yo sé mi fin! ¡Y él de mis hijas!" This provides yet another example of Bernarda's erroneous belief that she is totally in control of her house and its inhabitants. Her mother, for example, whom she describes as "loca", resists and defies her daughter's domination by both words and deeds. Bernarda's most destructive utterance – in that it most fully expresses the rigidity of her thinking, the total joylessness of her existence (and the one which she imposed on her daughters) – is disguised in a kind of smug religiosity. She declares categorically to Poncia: "Las cosas no son nunca a gusto nuestro". Finally, her firm declaration, "Nadie me traiga ni me lleve" proves again, as the play unfolds, to be false; within her own household her servant has enjoyed a secret relationship with her late husband, her youngest daughter is flouting maternal authority through

her illicit relationship with her half-sister's fiancé, whilst yet another daughter is spying on the youngest, spurred on by envy and her own secret passion for the same man. Bernarda's voice, then, clearly reflects her cast of mind, and we gradually realize, despite all her protestations to the contrary, that she neither controls her household nor is she fully aware of the turbulent events taking place within its walls. Bernarda never engages in meaningful dialogue; her speech is, for the most part, limited to the issuing of orders or to utterances designed to reinforce her power and authority. Even on the one occasion when she attempts to "communicate" with one of her daughters – towards the end of the play, she tries to give pre-nuptial advice to Angustias – this is reduced to a series of abrupt questions and answers, until Bernarda finally gives her daughter the following orders, her "blueprint" for a successful marriage: "No le debes preguntar. Y cuando te cases, menos. Habla si él habla y míralo cuando te mire. Así no tendrás disgustos." According to Bernarda, Angustias should continue in her state of passivity and submission even as a married woman; she had been well prepared for such a role by her mother. Relatively speaking, since the play's title refers directly to her, Bernarda appears very little on stage; the power of her voice is, however, omnipresent. Given the violence concealed in many of her utterances, her voice permeates the play's deepest levels and starkly reinforces the sense of entrapment of her five daughters.

The five sisters offer in turn their respective views of the role of women in society. Their voices form, in my opinion, an illuminating hidden text within the fabric of the play. Magdalena begins this secret "podtekst" with her response to Bernarda's definition of the "possibilities" which await unmarried women of their social class. Magdalena observes: "Malditas sean las mujeres". Her words provide a most appropriate subtitle for the play itself. This utterance comes after Magdalena's realization that she herself will never marry. We are not given any specific reason for this but Magdalena seems to be the most masculine of the sisters – she had enjoyed a special closeness to her late father – and this attribute is further

suggested in her remark that she would prefer to “...llevar sacos al molino. Todo menos estar sentada días y días dentro de esta sala oscura” – yet another reference to the tedium of the sisters’ existence and to its symbolic blackness.

The next voice to engage in this hidden dialogue is that of Amelia. She comments to Martirio, “Ya no sabe una si es mejor tener novio o no”, to which Martirio replies, “Es lo mismo”. Martirio’s voice then continues at considerable length as she offers her view of “los hombres”. She states, “Es mejor no ver a un hombre nunca. Desde niña les tuve miedo...y siempre tuvo miedo de crecer por temor de encontrarme de pronto abrazada por ellos.”

She had noted just prior to this that “...los hombres se tapan unos a otros las cosas...”. Martirio goes on to express her views of marriage within their society, stressing that “a [los hombres] les importa la tierra, las yuntas, y una perra sumisa que les dé de comer”. Later in this same act Martirio’s voice questions the marriage-making conventions when she observes, “Verdaderamente es raro que dos personas que no se conocen se vean de pronto en una reja y ya novios”. In opposition to this statement, the voice of Angustias answers: “Pues a mí no me chocó...porque cuando un hombre se acerca a una reja ya sabe por los que van y vienen, llevan y traen, que le va a decir que sí.” Poncia then adds her voice of experience on this same matter:

A vosotros que sois solteras os conviene saber de todos modos que el hombre a los quince días de la boda deja la cama por la mesa y luego la mesa por la tabernilla y la que no se conforma se pudre llorando en un rincón.

Poncia, however, reveals that she belonged to “la escuela” of Bernarda and to Martirio's questions “¿...le pegaste algunas veces?” her affirmative draws this response from Magdalena: “¡Así debían ser todas las mujeres!”

The arrival of the segadores sets off another series of responses. Poncia remarks that she had given her son “dinero para que fuera...(con) ..una mujer

vestida de lentejuelas...Los hombres necesitan estas cosas”. For the first time Adela's voice is heard in this dialogue as she notes, “Se les perdona todo”, to which Amelia adds, providing yet another relevant sub-title for the play, “Nacer mujer es el mayor castigo.”

When challenged by Martirio about her relationship with Pepe, Adela declares that “[él] me quiere para su casa”, and she describes the blind force of her attraction to Pepe in the following way: “Yo no quería. He sido arrastrada por una maroma.”

Another angle on the treatment of women in this society presents itself in the closing episode of Act 2. Differing views are expressed as to a fitting punishment for the girl who murdered her illegitimate child. In the village, the people want to kill her, a sentence with which Bernarda, as might be expected, agrees – “Y que pague la que pisotea la decencia”, she exclaims. Adela, who had shortly before observed that the faults of men are always overlooked, orders her sisters back with the cry, “¡Qué la dejen escapar!” Martirio echoes her mother's views and her very words: “¡Qué pague lo que debe!”.

In Act 3 Bernarda's voice takes its place in this hidden dialogue. To Prudencia's revelation that her husband, for many years, due to a family quarrel, “...no ha salido por la puerta de la calle”, Bernarda comments, “Es un verdadero hombre”. On learning that he would not pardon his daughter she adds, “Hace bien”. The final voices in the play which make up this hidden dialogue belong to Bernarda, the servant and Poncia. In answer to Angustias's doubts about her relationship with Pepe, Bernarda offers the following additional advice, “...y, desde luego, que no te vea llorar jamás”. It is left for the two women of lower class to round off the discussion. The servant observes that “Bernarda...no sabe la fuerza que tiene un hombre entre mujeres solas”, to which Poncia replies that not all the blame should fall on Pepe. “[Adela] estaba loca por él, pero ella debió estarse en su sitio y no provocarlo. Un hombre es un hombre.” This last comment by Poncia would seem to sum up the hidden dialogue running through the play which

is composed of the voices of the major women characters. (The role of María Josefa's voice will be discussed in a later section.) This secret "conversation" between and among the women serves to reinforce certain of the ideas that we have already encountered. In that enclosed, repressive society women had very few, if any, opportunities of self-realization outwith marriage, and marriage itself is perceived by most of the voices as a loveless match, based, for the most part, on the material interests of the man and the total submission of the woman. To a certain extent Bernarda's own powerful and domineering character could well be regarded as a natural development in that stifling and restricted society where women who were alone and unprotected by a strong male figure faced enormous difficulties and prejudices. In such a society it would appear that, while on the one hand men cannot lose, on the other hand women can never win or, if they seem to gain some advantage or some taste of happiness for themselves, there will have to be a price to be paid for this sooner or later. We have observed too that even among the women themselves there is little sense of support or of solidarity. Additionally, there is an almost total absence of compassion, forgiveness and of love, either between man and woman or between members of a family, based on mutual respect or human dignity.

In *Three Sisters* we are likewise very aware of the interaction of many different voices. Indeed, there is a great deal of talking, in particular by certain of the male characters – much of this speech seeming to be totally out of context and irrelevant. As in the Lorca play, there exists here too a secret dialogue which forms an important and revealing "podtekst" (a salient feature of Chekhov's drama and later prose fiction too).⁶³ If Bernarda's "voice" was characterized by the use of many quasi folk-sayings and proverbs, in *Three Sisters* there are numerous examples of quotations, usually, but not always, of a literary nature, which we come to associate with the voices of several of the characters. I believe that a detailed study of the secret text which they constitute would lead to most interesting conclusions. (For example the role and function of the Latin phrases which are

used so frequently by Kulygin.) However, an examination of these voices will be limited to those of the main female characters of the play.⁶⁴

The voice of Masha provides one of the most interesting examples of this use of quotations. Masha does not participate in the opening conversation of the play, which takes place largely between Ol'ga and Irina; she is reading (we are not told what) and quietly whistling. Masha's first words in the play do not even belong to her, in that she quotes the first two lines from Pushkin's epic poem *Ruslan and Liudmila*.

A green oak grows by a curving shore, And round
the oak hangs a golden chain...⁶⁵

She quotes this at several points throughout the play. At the end of the first act, when she repeats these lines for a second time, she asks herself: "Why am I saying this? These lines have been with me since morning..." *Ruslan and Liudmila* tells of the capture and enchantment of the heroine Liudmila by the sorcerer Chernomor and her subsequent rescue by the knight Ruslan, after many dangers and adventures.⁶⁶ This may serve as a kind of warning signal that Masha is inwardly identifying herself (and possibly her own situation too) with that of a heroine of folk legend and that she hopes to be wakened from her present reality and to recognize, as Liudmila had done, that: "He is here!"⁶⁷ It may also be that Masha will perceive other people from a similar point of view, and this may explain her sudden infatuation with Vershinin, whom she envisages as a possible saviour. Masha falls under the spell of Vershinin's words – we recall her sudden decision not to go home after Vershinin's long speech which had been prompted by Masha's claim that she and her sisters knew many unnecessary things. In her first long speech in Act 1 Masha recalls what life had been like when their father was alive. Nowadays, she adds, "...there is only a man and a half...Today I'm depressed..."⁶⁸ We are also told that she laughs "through her tears", a stage

direction which brings us directly to the next author to be quoted by Masha's voice, Gogol's *The Story of how Ivan Ivanovich quarrelled with Ivan Nikiforovich*.⁶⁹

In Act 2, after Vershinin had declared his love for Masha – the stage instructions here frequently tell us that “Masha laughs quietly....” – she quotes the words which conclude Gogol's story: “It's a bore to be alive in this world, gentlemen”.⁷⁰ In the course of the first two acts we have noted Masha's tendency to switch (and often abruptly) from a state of sadness to one of joy. Gogol's final words here provide a “key to that unexpected shift from comedy to melancholy, which occurs in the final section of the tale”.⁷¹ However, an important change has taken place in Gogol's narrator. At the end of the tale he is no longer a “naive, optimistic simpleton” but a “thoughtful, world-weary observer of human folly”.⁷² Also, the two male characters in Gogol's story live out what has been described as a “vegetable existence”.⁷³ Apart from its relevance to Masha's own rather volatile character there are two interesting points to be drawn from this quotation in the context of *Three Sisters*. First, there may be the suggestion that Masha, who quotes these words will, in the first analysis, have lost some of her own naive and romanticized attitude to life and will have reached a new awareness. Secondly, the quotation may also offer a subtle indication of the monotonous “vegetable” existence which the sisters, all talented young women, endure in the provincial town in which they live, with special reference to the poignancy of Masha's own situation. Masha displays a tendency to repeat Vershinin's words and ideas and, to a lesser extent, her husband's utterances too. This might suggest her naive and impressionable character and might clearly indicate that she did not possess decisive ideas of her own as yet; Masha has been strongly influenced by both literature and the dominant male characters in her life.

At the end of Act 3 Masha again refers to Gogol'. Throughout this act her voice has been on occasions outspoken and critical of others. (We noted this tendency from Act 1, when she pointed to the appearance of Natasha and implied her dislike and mistrust of Protopopov.) After her confession to her sisters of her

love for Vershinin she states – and her words here may indicate a new sense of awareness:

When you read a novel, everything in it seems so old and obvious, but when you fall in love yourself, you suddenly discover that you don't really know anything, and you've got to make your own decisions...

Masha then tells her sisters that, "...now I'll keep quiet...I'll be like Gogol's madman...silence...silence". In Gogol's *The Notes of a Madman* the protagonist lapses into madness after experiencing an acute crisis of identity. Here it seems as though "madness ...is the outer world's lack of harmony transformed to the inner realm".⁷⁴ (In *La casa de Bernarda Alba* many devastating truths were uttered by María Josefa in what could be described as coded language, and she was described by her daughter as "loca". There was also a reference to Adela's incipient madness, yet another link between the two characters). In *Three Sisters* the reference to Gogol's story, without taking analogies to extremes, could suggest that Masha, through her short-lived relationship with Vershinin, has herself experienced a kind of identity crisis. She feels she can no longer accept her role as Kulygin's wife, yet with the departure of Vershinin she has no alternative, at least for the moment. Masha's quotations from Gogol form part of a fuller sentence and appear at a relatively early stage in the story before Poprishchin has lapsed into his final delusion that he is the King of Spain. They are to be found in the entries for October 4 and for November 8, 11, 12, and 13. On all occasions these words are closely connected with the suppression of feelings by the protagonist.⁷⁵

Masha, in fact, returns at the end of the play to her initial state; nor does she take her rebellion to its final consequences, as Adela does in Lorca's later play. The reference to *The Notes of a Madman* made by Masha's voice does, however, indicate a hidden link between madness and rebellion. In his novel *We*, written approximately 20 years after this play, Zamyatin, through his main character D503,

also expresses such a connection, when D503 declares, “Sun, heads, a green serrated line against the blue, and I shout, ‘Yes, yes, madness!’ And everyone must lose his mind, everyone must! The sooner the better! It is essential – I know it”, encouraging his audience to go mad and rebel in order to retain their own individuality.⁷⁶

In Act 4 of the play Masha’s voice is heard very little. Early on in the act she complains that there is “...talk, nothing but talk all day long!”. When Vershinin departs and Kulygin comes on stage, Masha, through her weeping, once again quotes the lines from *Ruslan and Liudmila*. At the end of the quotation she remarks, “Oh, I’m going mad...”. After the sound of the shot which killed the Baron is heard, she cites these lines again but she mistakenly quotes “a green cat” for “a green oak”, the reference to the cat coming in the third line of the poem. She then continues, “I’ve got it all mixed up...”. This returns us to the quotation from *The Notes of a Madman*, where, finally, the protagonist mixes up both words and numbers.⁷⁷ Like Adela, who shortly before her death asks for water, in the closing sequences of *Three Sisters* Masha too drinks water and then reveals, “My life’s messed up...I don’t want anything now...What is the curving shore?...My thoughts are all mixed up”.

Masha’s voice, then, hints at a perception of life that was over-influenced by romantic expectations and by the ideas of others. However if, unlike the later character of Adela, Masha did not allow her feelings to lead her to an act of total rebellion against her circumstances, nevertheless her voice does mature and develop. By the end of the play perhaps Masha, alone of the three sisters, reaches some new state of awareness and realizes the complexities and difficulties which may lie ahead of her. Her final words: “We must go on living, we must go on living...” have a much more authentic and, at the same time, tragic ring than the final words of Irina and Ol’ga.

The voices of Irina and Ol’ga refer on numerous occasions to the proposed and longed-for return to Moscow. In one of Ol’ga’s first speeches in Act 1 she

declares, “When I woke up this morning...and saw the spring, I was filled with joy and I felt such a longing for Moscow”.⁷⁸ This is swiftly taken up by Irina, who shortly afterwards states, “If only we could go back to Moscow. Sell the house, finish off everything here and go to Moscow...”. Whilst the voices of Ol’ga and Irina continue to make their plans for the future, Natasha, very much like the bear in the line from the fable cited in the play, takes control of the present of the sisters and, to a certain extent, of their past and future as well.

There is also a passive resignation to be detected in the voices of Ol’ga and Irina. Irina says in Act 1: “Everything will settle itself with God’s will”, and Ol’ga shortly follows this remark with, “I suppose everything that God wills must be right and good, but I can’t help thinking that if I’d got married and stayed at home all day, then that would have been better.”

It would seem that neither Ol’ga nor Irina find many advantages in the present. To Vershinin's observation that the river near the present home of the sisters is “magnificently wide...” and that “you have a really good...climate here” Ol’ga replies, “Yes, but this is a cold place... and there are too many mosquitoes”. Later on in this act Irina responds to Tuzenbach’s remark that “life appears beautiful to me” with:

You say that life is beautiful...Our lives, I mean the
lives of us three sisters, haven’t been beautiful up to now.
The truth is that life has been stifling us, like weeds in a
garden...

(These last words could apply particularly well to the sisters in Lorca’s play.)

If, as we noted in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, there was an absence of solidarity among most of the sisters, in Chekhov’s play the voices of the three sisters unite symbolically in the finale. We are given the stage instructions that the sisters stand “huddled together” before their final speeches.⁷⁹ Irina puts her head

on Ol'ga's breast, while in a later instruction Ol'ga "embraces both sisters". Each one of the voices of the sisters makes an affirmation at this point that they will go on living, despite the solitude and the suffering. However, by this final stage the only voice which might convince us that this living will be done in the light of a new awareness is that of Masha.

I conclude by suggesting that both dramatists, through the voices of their female protagonists, allow us to hear many views on the situation of women. This is accomplished by a hidden or secret dialogue which these voices elaborate within the fabric of the plays.

(4) Actions

Both plays, I believe, are characterized by a striking movement from "outer" to "inner". In Lorca's play this is symbolized by the cutting off of the sisters from life outwith the walls of the house and forcing them in on themselves and further into the stifling, claustrophobic atmosphere within the whitewashed walls of their mother's home. At the end of Act 2, when the sisters are trying to discover the reason for the great commotion outside, their mother accuses them violently, "¿Dónde vais? Siempre os supe mujeres ventaneras...". (For these women there is not even to be the consolation of "waiting by the window".) The "justification" for the initial seclusion of these sisters had been the death of Bernarda's husband, the father of all of them, except Angustias. We feel that this was merely a pretext. Given the society which Lorca was describing, there could be little hope of any freedom of action at all for these women.⁸⁰ The only sister who attempts by her actions to escape from this enclosed world is doomed to failure. Martirio, motivated by her jealousy of Adela and her frustrated passion for Pepe, operates from within the house, bringing about the death of Adela by summoning Bernarda and preventing Adela's meeting with Pepe.

María Josefa provides a kind of grim warning of and a commentary on the life of these women. At the end of Act 1 she says, “Me escapé porque me quiero casar...”. When Bernarda attempts to silence her, María Josefa responds, “No, no me callo. No quiero ver a estas mujeres solteras, rabiando por la boda...y yo me quiero ir a mi pueblo.” When she appears in the final act of the play, with a lamb in her arms (this lamb could, of course, be a symbol of Adela, who is sacrificed both as punishment for her rebellion and in order to maintain the honour of “la casa”), she declares: “Yo quiero casas, pero casas abiertas y las vecinas acostadas en sus camas con sus niños...” María Josefa, then, both through her prophetic words and her frequent attempts to escape from the domestic prison to which she is also confined by Bernarda, points to what was totally absent from this house of women, namely freedom of speech and actions and the warmth of human relationships.

In *Three Sisters* the only truly active female character is Natasha, in that she manages to move from “outside” “inside”, into the home of the sisters and to displace two of them. In many of her appearances Natasha is seen carrying a candle, giving to her the aura of a Lady Macbeth figure. She also seems in general to be concerned about light. At the very beginning of Act 2, when her presence inside the sisters' house is in its initial stages, she checks that “...no-one has left a light anywhere...”. Masha later refers to Natasha as “a petty little ...housewife”, but Natasha's associations in the play with light might possibly have more sinister connections in that she “puts out the light” for many of the aspirations of the sisters and she invades their personal space with her own absence of “light” and desires to impose, it may be, her own “darkness”.⁸¹ It could be argued that the sisters were longing to leave this house anyway and to return to Moscow, but when these dreams, like the clock, were shattered, at the end of the play the three sisters return to each other for some kind of support and strength for the future. They have not succeeded in moving “out”, either to Moscow, to (or from) marriage or to meaningful work. They have, in a certain sense, all come “home”, but they do not really have a home to return to in physical terms because this now belongs almost

completely to Natasha. We are not convinced at all at the end of the play that Masha will find even a moderately happy life at “home” with Kulygin, nor do we think that Ol’ga will be fulfilled in her work, nor Irina for that matter either. These women too, I would like to suggest, are in a sense thrown back on each other, and the planned movement or escape into the “outside world” does not take place.

There is a static quality which can be noted about the sisters in both plays, apart, of course, from Adela, who states at the end of the play that she had seen “la muerte debajo de estos techos y he salido a buscar lo que era mío, lo que me pertenecía...”, and, to a much lesser extent, Masha. It is remembered that Lorca gave the following instructions about *La casa de Bernarda Alba*: “El poeta advierte que estos tres actos tienen la intención de un documental fotográfico.” In Act 4 of *Three Sisters* Fedotik takes a photograph before the departure of the soldiers, and this could suggest, perhaps, a similar quality in this earlier play too. Both dramatists, then, point to a certain “immobility” about the majority of these sisters and highlight their failure to move into the “external” world, be this a dream of a return to Moscow or simply of freedom to leave the confines of the maternal home for “la calle”.

(5) Inner world

The inner worlds of Masha and of Adela are clearly characterized by references to poetry and to the use of poetic language. We have already commented on the association which exists between Masha and *Ruslan and Liudmila*. In the final act of *La casa de Bernarda Alba*, shortly before her suicide, Adela notes the immense beauty of the sky and notes that there are “estrellas como puños”. She also quotes the poetic saying about “Santa Bárbara bendita”. To Amelia’s remark that she prefers to close her eyes to “muchas cosas que hemos olvidado”, Adela retorts that she likes to watch “correr lleno de lumbre lo que está quieto y quieto

años enteros”. Adela also believes that her relationship with Pepe was fully justified. “Vino por el dinero [de Angustias], pero sus ojos los puso siempre en mí...”, she replies to Martirio. Like Masha, Adela has a greater insight into the characters and motives of others. She realizes that Martirio’s desire to put an end to her relationship with Pepe was provoked by her sister's own secret passion for him: “Por eso procuras que no vaya con él...Ya puede estar cien años con Angustias, pero que me abrace a mí se te hace terrible, porque tú le quieres también...”

At the end of the play Adela is especially aware of her own solitude, even amongst her sisters. She remarks to Martirio at this point that she truly sees her as she really is for the very first time. We note too that Adela is the only one of the sisters to use the verb “querer” in relation to her sisters.

Martirio’s inner world is characterized by a series of contradictions. We learn from her at the beginning of the play that she was weak and afraid of men, whereas in the final scene she has risen to great strength, both physically and in the immensity of her own secret passion for Pepe and her jealous hatred of Adela: “Tengo el corazón lleno de una fuerza tan mala que, sin quererlo yo, a mí misma me ahoga.”

The finale provides a certain insight into the inner worlds of the other sisters. When Adela’s relationship has been discovered and her challenge to both her mother and her sisters is made, namely that “¡Nadie podrá conmigo!”, Angustias is the first to react and tell Adela that she is “...¡Deshonra de nuestra casa!”. We might have expected grief at her betrayal by both Pepe and by her half-sister, but Angustias's first thoughts are for “la casa” and the upkeep of its honour. Magdalena asks that Adela be allowed to go “donde no la veamos nunca más”, suggesting a more lenient attitude towards her sister, and Magdalena too, on learning that Martirio had deceived Adela, refers to the former as “¡Endemoniada!”. The only sister who does not contribute to this final chorus is Amelia. In the course of the play she has been seen to try from time to time to placate her sisters, in

particular Martirio. As we have no monologues spoken in this play by any of the sisters, and very few occasions where the sisters reveal their innermost thoughts, we learn only fragments about their inner worlds from their voices and from their actions on stage.

In *Three Sisters*, the sisters tended to vocalize their thoughts to a greater extent and so we glean more information about their inner worlds. (We observe that here too the use of the voice is of great importance, especially in the case of Masha.) Ol'ga frequently refers to her inner weariness: "I've been feeling as if my strength and youth were running out of me drop by drop, day after day..." Irina, like Masha, has a somewhat poetic cast of mind. In Act 1 she declares: "Why is it I'm so happy today? Just as if I were sailing along in a boat, and above me the wide blue sky, and in the sky great white birds drifting by?". Natasha's inner world is characterized by a preoccupation with her own advancement and success, as has been noted already.

In both plays I would like to suggest that the concept of inner world has a great deal to do with awareness and an ability to "see" events and people as they really are. Bernarda, despite all her declarations to the contrary and despite all her alleged vigilance, was completely unaware of what was taking place within the walls of her home. Angustias had no suspicion of the relationship between her fiancé and her half-sister. Neither Magdalena nor Amelia knew of this either. Both Poncia and Martirio had seen what was happening – "hay una tormenta", as Poncia notes – and she tries to warn both Bernarda and Adela of what might occur. Masha's awareness is somewhat clouded, as we have noted, by a possible overromanticized attitude to life, although she is the only sister who is aware from the outset of the danger associated with Natasha. Ol'ga and Irina tend to concentrate their thoughts overmuch on past events and the future and in this way, the present slips away from them. We have seen that it is mainly through the voices of these female characters, which we examined earlier, that both Lorca and Chekhov give us some access to their inner worlds.

(4) FICTIONAL WORLD

It has been observed that “Chekhov had an established readership for his work, he had no need to emphasize dates, settings, no need to draw the reader into some recognized world: the readers of Chekhov’s mature writings knew what he was writing about. It was their world, their age, their society”.⁸² In *Three Sisters* the scene is set in a provincial town; there is a description of a military environment, similar to the one with which Chekhov had become familiar in 1884.⁸³ There are many references to literature in this play – to Pushkin, Gogol’, Lermontov, for example – and the quoting of lines from songs, proverbs and of Latin tags by Kulygin. There are also references to real historical persons, to Balzac, for example, and to real historical events – for example, the fire in Moscow. The social milieu of the play is well-defined, the only anomaly being the rapid rise of Natasha, who was outwith this environment at the beginning of the play, although Chekhov does not give us any detail about her past life.

In *La casa de Bernarda Alba* Lorca situates us directly in the environment of provincial Spain; there are numerous references to religious traditions – the Requiem Mass and prayers for the deceased, for example. In this play there are no references at all to real historical events which take or took place outwith the walls of the house or to any real historical persons. The social milieu of this play is also well-defined, and we are surprised that the events which take place within this “fictionalized” house take so long to be discovered by the “fictionalized” owner of the house, Bernarda.

In both plays the fictional world presents a group of marginalized women characters. In Lorca’s play these women, except for Adela, fail to leave, or are prevented from leaving, the hostile world in which they are forced to live, and in Chekhov’s play, although the sisters are free to leave their world, two of them are,

in a sense “pushed out” of it and not one of them achieves either the life or the goal in life she wishes. In the fictional world of *La casa de Bernarda Alba* the facts that the main protagonists are women and are, even at fairly advanced years, totally dependent, with no freedom of their own, and that they are shown to be socially disadvantaged because they are women are, of course, very significant. To a lesser extent this is also true of the women in *Three Sisters*. Natasha advances largely due to her marriage to the sisters’ brother, Masha is unhappy in her marriage where she depends on Kulygin, and the other two sisters cannot find any inner satisfaction in their professional lives. Irina may do so in the future, but this is by no means certain.

CONCLUSIONS

In a recent interview given to the Spanish press Octavio Paz commented:

Para mí la realidad no es explicable, pero es conversable. El hombre es diálogo con el mundo...El hombre es un aparato de comunicación...El amor es eso, comunicación, pero resulta difícil y por eso muchos fracasan....⁸⁴

In the two plays which have been examined, these two elements, “amor” and “comunicación”, are largely absent, and the failure to achieve or to maintain them leads, in the case of certain of the female protagonists, to solitude and despair, and in one such case to death. Both plays begin in the shadow of a death and in each of them a death takes place, in one a suicide and in the other a fatality in a duel. We are reminded of death in the endings of both plays too – though obliquely in the case of *Three Sisters*. Both plays contain symbolic warnings about the brevity of life, and each of the plays gives us certain valuable insights regarding the “woman

question”, on the one hand in rural Spain in the early years of this century, and on the other in provincial Russia some years earlier. From the conclusions presented above, I believe that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Lorca may well have been creatively inspired in *La casa de Bernarda Alba* by aspects of Chekhov’s dramatic techniques and certain of the themes present in *Three Sisters*.

(3) "MEEKLY TAKE THY PLACE ASSIGNED"⁸⁵:*THE STORM AND LA CASA DE BERNARDA ALBA*

A BRIEF SYNOPSIS

“Comparative study of the use of symbols in literature... is a fruitful field that could bear further cultivation, even though... someone has recently proposed a Society for the Protection of Symbols from Literary [Studies]”.

S.S. Praver⁸⁶

“The ‘bell-jar syndrome’ of... mother-daughter relations is vividly captured in ...the comparison between [the daughter] and a fossilized insect in amber: 'Erika is an insect in amber, timeless, ageless. Erika has no history and she is not going to make history. This insect has long lost its ability to scramble and to crawl. Erika is baked into the cakepan of eternity'...”.

M.-R. Kecht⁸⁷

In *The Storm* there are, in my opinion, certain elements which strikingly prefigure *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.⁸⁸ I am thinking in particular of the strong bonds which are forced on the “daughters” by the “mothers”, destructive ties from which there is no escape, save through the ultimate self-destruction (and liberation) of suicide. Both plays are bleakly pessimistic; additionally, they point forward to the “steady flow of ... writing – fictional as well as non-fictional – that has centred

on the formerly marginal issue of mother-daughter relationships”.⁸⁹ Clearly a deeper and more detailed study of the two plays would be in order – but within the scope of this thesis it would be impossible to enumerate and discuss all the parallels.

The first (and the most obvious) point of convergence between the plays, as we have suggested, resides in the portrayal of the wealthy widow, Kabanova and the later depiction of Bernarda. The former exacts total obedience and submission from her household, in particular from her married son and daughter-in-law. She criticizes the latter, among other things, for her preoccupation with the world beyond the confines of her home for “gaping at the windows”.⁹⁰ (Of course, Kabanova is not Katerina’s “biological mother”, but the burdens which she forces her daughter-in-law to bear, together with her manipulation of her behaviour, strikingly prefigure Bernarda’s treatment of her five daughters.) After Katerina’s suicide Kabanova forbids any outward display of grief; the ending of the play suggests a return to the entrapment and the stifling milieu which her home represents. Although Kabanova, like Bernarda in the later play, makes relatively few on-stage appearances, her powerful utterances echo throughout; Kabanova’s speech is similarly characterized by the frequent use of commands and exclamations. Kabanova and Bernarda share a similar tyrannical and possessive nature. Both matriarchs impose the kind of domestic order which is characterized by Kecht’s summary:

Any form of socialization ... is made practically impossible: contacts with peers... are screened carefully and always judged negatively; relatives are also considered to be dangerous intrusions into the “family idyll”, and possible boyfriends or lovers are presented as incarnations of evil long before they even appear on scene.⁹¹

Katerina, like the later Adela, chooses death rather than enclosure, having briefly enjoyed the love of Boris. The latter remarks that “when a girl marries here, she might as well have been buried!”; we recall the submission which awaited Angustias, had her marriage to Pepe actually taken place. We noted too that Adela’s speech was characterized by her use of poetic language; Katerina’s language frequently refers to a poetic dream world and to bright colours:

It would have been better if I had died when I was little. I would have looked down from Heaven at the earth, and rejoiced in it all. Or else I would have gone flying invisibly, wherever I wanted. I’d have flown over the fields, and gone from one blue cornflower to another blue cornflower, flying on the wind.⁹²

There are also strong hints of madness connected with Katerina – “Oh, I’m mad”, she cries; in Act 2 her voice relays a vivid description of the life of women:

And it is bitter the bondage; oh, how bitter it is!...
Most of all us wives – like I am now. I go on living and struggling, and I can’t see even a glimmer of hope, and I don’t suppose I ever shall...[My mother-in-law] has broken me...[I] hate the place; I loathe the very walls.⁹³

The suffering which women inflict upon other women is a striking feature of all three of the plays examined here.

The symbolic title of Ostrovsky’s play finds an echo in the closing sequences of Lorca’s play where Poncia remarks that “hay una tormenta en cada cuarto. El día que estallen nos barrerán a todos”. Likewise the prophetic words spoken by the half-mad old woman in the former play remind us of the role of María Josefa in the latter. The function of Glasha to a certain extent mirrors too that of Poncia. A cold religiosity pervades Ostrovsky’s play too, represented largely

through the character of the widow; we have already mentioned this aspect of Lorca's protagonist. Many other points of similarity could be cited, but enough have been mentioned to allow us to suggest convincingly that Ostrovsky's play could well have provided an important source of creative inspiration for Lorca in *La casa de Bernarda Alba*.

The evidence reviewed in this chapter at least renders it credible that Lorca knew these two Russian plays and that he absorbed certain elements of them into the creation of *La casa de Bernarda Alba*. There, as in Ostrovsky's work, the theme of maternal "omnipotence" is examined and arraigned. In their treatment of this theme both Ostrovsky and Lorca suggest the debasing of the "daughter" to an "object, a piece of precious property, guarded and locked up, or to a marionette on strings, whose desire for autonomy and struggle for separation are squelched with shocking brutality."⁹⁴ Not one of the "daughters" is depicted in a maternal role; all, save Katerina, Masha and Adela (two of whom commit suicide) are, it would seem, unable to "express and experience love".⁹⁵

Could it be, then, that the daughters and sisters in the plays we have briefly examined here were "victims of a kind of socio-biological destiny ... deprived of the power of free-will"?⁹⁶ Gail Finney, in her discussion of Bernard Shaw's *Candida* and Strindberg's *Laura* ("two of the most complex of the many mother figures that populated the stage ... at the turn of the century"), aptly comments that :

while motherhood has been a major source of women's oppression...it has also been the one area of life in which women have typically exercised power, through their authority and control over another human being.⁹⁷

From the short analysis presented above it is certainly clear that all three dramatists were depicting complex areas of "the woman question" – many of them, of course, matters which other writers, in their turn, have gone on to develop further.⁹⁸ For the purposes of this thesis it has been instructive to note the potential

source of creative inspiration which Ostrovsky and Chekhov, writing on such themes, offered to Lorca. These were precedents which he had the opportunity to know, and there is much in the text of *La casa de Bernarda Alba* which makes it seem probable that he used that knowledge to good purpose.⁹⁹

NOTES FOR CHAPTER 5

- 1 Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, *Obras Selectas* (Barcelona, 1976), p.794. Sor Juana vigorously defended “women’s rights” in her *Respuesta de la poetisa a la muy ilustre Sor Filotea de la Cruz*. The quotation used here is on p.799.
- 2 Octavio Paz, *Las Trampas de la Fe* (Mexico, 1962), p.602. Attention is also drawn to the film made by María Luisa Bemberg, one of Argentina’s most distinguished film directors, “Yo, la peor de todas” (1990), which is based on this book by Octavio Paz and which deals in great detail with the last years of Sor Juana’s life. The role of Sor Juana is played by Assumpta Serna. For an edition of Sor Juana’s own works see note 1, above.
- 3 Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One’s Own* (London, 1945), p.112.
- 4 John Ruskin, “Of Queens’ Gardens” in *Sesame and Lilies* (New York, 1865), pp.90-91.
- 5 Octavio Paz, p.602.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p.602.
- 7 As Schanzer points out (in another context altogether), it would be an impossible feat of “detective work” to ascertain which versions of these plays Lorca might have read. We have established that by the twentieth century the overall standard of translations from Russian and the availability of Russian literature had greatly improved in the Hispanic World. Consequently, I am examining the three plays by way of their original texts. All translations from Russian will be my own unless otherwise indicated. The editions of the first two plays examined were: Federico García Lorca, *La casa de Bernarda Alba, Obras Completas* (Madrid, 1969), pp.1449-1532 and A.P. Chekhov, *Tri sestry, Poln. sobr. soch.* (Moscow, 1978), 13, pp.117-188. For the purpose of this analysis these two plays are examined on a textual basis only. However, critical works about the two authors are included in the final bibliography.

- 8 My analysis of the two plays will not follow a strict chronological order, but will highlight the salient points where Lorca may have been inspired by Chekhov.
- 9 In Federico García Lorca, *Obras Completas* (Madrid, 1969), there are references to Russian music and literature. For example, on p.94 he makes a comparison between “las canciones de cuna rusas...y españolas”. On p.46 he refers to Turgenev: “Como Ivan Turguenef vio a sus paisanos, sangre y medula rusas convertidos en esfinge, así veo yo a muchísimos poemas de nuestra lírica regional.”
- 10 For the references to the Chekhov plays in New York see Ian Gibson, *Federico García Lorca* (Barcelona, 1987), vol.2, p.77. As Dr. P. Donnelly points out, however, Lorca did not speak or understand English. In “Treinta entrevistas a García Lorca” (Madrid, 1989), Lorca refers to Alberti’s visit to Russia and that the latter returned “...comunista y ya no hace poesía, aunque él lo crea, sino mala literatura de periódico”.
- 11 The first Spanish translation of *Three Sisters* was done by Vicente S. Medina and José Carbó and published by Maucci in 1910. See Schanzer, p.46.
- 12 Julián Juderías’s was entitled “Tchejoff”, *La Lectura* (Madrid) September 1902, 165-170; See also Antonio Morillo, “Literatura rusa. Anton Tchekhoff”, *Revista Contemporánea* (Madrid), 128, (1904), 173–86. There were several anthologies of Russian drama published in Spanish by the early years of the 20th century. See, for example, Schanzer, pp.48-49.
- 13 Schanzer, p.129.
- 14 Gail Finney, *Women in Modern Drama* (Cornell, 1989), p.ix. This excellent study does not, however, mention Lorca at all and makes only brief passing reference to Chekhov.
- 15 *Idem.*
- 16 A detailed study along such lines falls outwith the parameters of this thesis. Finney discusses this in her introduction. Also see Mamonova, ed., for an

interesting article entitled “Anton Chekhov and the Women’s Movement”, pp.38-54.

- 17 Edward Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams* (London, 1916), pp.31-32.
- 18 Maria-Regina Kecht quotes this in “The Victim as Oppressor: Mirror Structures in Mother-Daughter Relations in Recent German Women’s Fiction”, p.107 in *Comparative Literature East and West*, vol.1, ed. Moore and Moody (Hawaii, 1989). This is an excellent study.
- 19 Ann Shukman, “Ten Russian Short Stories”, *Essays in Poetics*, vol.2, no.2, University of Keele, 1977, p.65.
- 20 Ibid., p.66.
- 21 I mean here that the deaths of the two fathers do not, of course, take place on stage, but in both plays they “trigger off” the initial action of the plays.
- 22 In the recent film version of *La casa de Bernarda Alba* by Mario Camus (1987), one of the opening shots takes place in the church during the funeral of Bernarda's husband. At this early point our attention is drawn to Bernarda's “bastón” as symbol of her power. The part of Bernarda is very powerfully played by Spanish actress Irene Gutiérrez Caba. As this chapter contains many quotes from the two texts being examined, page references will be given only where the relevant quotation has not been clearly situated within its appropriate act.
- 23 In the film the role of Poncia is played by Florinda Chico. In this part she gives one of the most outstanding performances of the film.
- 24 The motif of the house will be examined more fully in the text.
- 25 The importance of money is noted as an interesting sub-theme in both plays. In *Three Sisters* Andrei gambles away a great deal of money and thus threatens the financial security of two of his sisters, Ol'ga and Irina – although they are both seen in the course of the play to earn their own livings.

- 26 As will be mentioned later in the text, the sisters' refrain "To Moscow!" has a near equivalent in the Lorca play in the idea of "la calle".
- 27 In Chekhov's play there are many examples of such crossed purposes in dialogue. A detailed examination of it falls outwith the scope of the present work, but it is noted that this topic would make a most interesting and revealing study in its own right.
- 28 Masha and Adela are also alike in that they are rather outspoken. This will be discussed later in the text.
- 29 The symbolic use of colour made in these two plays calls to mind the use of colour made by Zamyatin (1884-1937) in his novel *We* (1920-21). Reference is made to this novel later in the text.
- 30 Ann Shukman, p.65.
- 31 Adela's reaction is first noted in the stage instruction "con emoción contenida" and then in her words "Pero Pepe el Romano...", as if to suggest that she did not expect to hear this information. We learn, but only at the end of the play, from Poncia that "Es verdad que el año pasado anduvo detrás de Adela y ésta estaba loca por él..."
- 32 Bernarda, as will be pointed out in the course of this study, does not, in fact, "see" most of what is happening, despite all her claims to the contrary.
- 33 This reference is discussed more fully in a later section of this chapter.
- 34 Camus also implies a close tie between these two characters during the incident of the fan in Act I, where Martirio swiftly gives the black fan to her mother.
- 35 The symbolic use of colour in *La casa de Bernarda Alba* is discussed in the text.
- 36 It is outwith the purpose of the present study to discuss fully the character of Vershinin, and at this point it will suffice to point out that Chekhov gives us certain hidden warnings about him; for example, his loquacity and his

tendency to philosophize. It is also noted that in his relationship with time he tends to concentrate on both the future and the past, and he too may be missing the opportunities in the present.

37 Again a detailed analysis of the character of Chebutykin is outwith the purposes of of the present study. However, certain points about his function within the play are mentioned in the course of this chapter.

38 Most of the major critics of Chekhov's writings at least mention this subject For a short list of critical works about him, see the final bibliography of this thesis.

39 Ann Shukman, pp.33-34.

40 Ibid., p.52.

41 This term will be explained more fully later in the text.

42 Ann Shukman, p.55.

43 Idem.

44 This necessarily very general statement must be taken as normative, rather than absolute.

45 I am reminded here of Pushkin's use of the wood-cuttings depicting the story of the Prodigal Son in his tale *The Stationmaster*. These provide a kind of ironic commentary or parody on the events of the story. It may be that Lorca is doing much the same thing here.

46 We are told that "A Pepe le gusta andar con la luna". Adela notes too that "Mirando sus ojos me parece que bebo su sangre lentamente".

47 The word "entropy" was used by Zamyatin both in his novel *We* and in his essay on that subject.

48 In Russian literature this type of female character can be observed, for example, in Pushkin's "novel in verse", *Evgenii Onegin*, and in some of his

Tales of Belkin; within Chekhov's own work there is a very good example of a female character, almost completely influenced by the male characters in her life, to be found in his story *The Darling*.

- 49 Chekhov's story *The Man in a Case* is recalled at this point.
- 50 In both plays the notion of house/home is a very important one. We note that none of the sisters has in the real sense "a room of her own".
- 51 This is portrayed strikingly well by Irene Gutiérrez Caba in the film version.
- 52 See final bibliography for works by and about Lorca.
- 53 In the Camus film the part of Adela is played by Ana Belén. The episodes of the coloured fan and the green dress are given special prominence.
- 54 In the film Adela on occasions "assists" María Josefa's escape by leaving doors open – a symbolic gesture, perhaps.
- 55 Chekhov's story *Ionich* is recalled here. The increasing corpulence of the protagonist seems to represent his moral and physical decline.
- 56 It is the colour green, with its special symbolic significance that is wrong against the pink of Natasha's dress.
- 57 See note 55 above.
- 58 Some possible explanations for the references to beards are discussed in the text.
- 59 See, for example, J. Stiredder, *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value* (Harvard, 1989).
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 M. Bakhtin, *Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo* (Moscow, 1972).

- 62 In a stage version of the play which toured Spain and Portugal in the early 1970s, the role of Bernarda was played by a man and “she” was attached to “her” daughters by chains.
- 63 See works by and about Chekhov in the final bibliography of this thesis.
- 64 It would be a fascinating study to analyse all the voices in this play.
- 65 A.S. Pushkin, *Ruslan and Liudmila* (Moscow, 1948), p.209.
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 Ibid., p.235.
- 68 For a discussion about the Russian word that is used here to express Masha's sadness, see *Tri sestry*, p.464.
- 69 For a discussion of this story see Richard Peace, *The Enigma of Gogol'* (Cambridge, 1981).
- 70 N.V. Gogol', *Povest' o tom, kak possorilsia Ivan Ivanovich s Ivanom Nikiforovichem* (Moscow, 1973), pp.379-424.
- 71 Peace, p.88.
- 72 Idem.
- 73 Idem.
- 74 Idem.
- 75 Ibid., p.130.
- 76 Zamyatin, trans. Mirra Ginsburg, *We* (New York, 1972), p.158. This incident occurs in the “Twenty-seventh Entry”.
- 77 Peace discusses this, pp.124-130.

- 78 The Russian word which is used here is not in fact “Moscow”: it is the word that is used for one's “native land”.
- 79 For a fuller discussion of the possible implications of this ending and other details about the play see *Tri sestry*, pp.421-467.
- 80 For a detailed description of Lorca’s Spain see Ian Gibson, *Federico García Lorca* (Barcelona, 1985). Until fairly recently married Spanish women were not allowed to have their own passports or were allowed to have a passport only with the permission of the husband. For details about the position of women in Russian society see, for example, *Women and society in Russia and the and the Soviet Union*, ed. Linda Edmondson (Cambridge, 1992). The late Montserrat Roig’s description “Those who wait behind the window” was discussed in chapter 4 of this thesis.
- 81 It may be that apart from the obvious Shakespearean connections Natasha is also linked to the so-called “kingdom of darkness”. Russian readers of Lorca’s play may well have compared the figure of Bernarda with that of the widow Kabanova in Ostrovsky’s play *The Storm (Groza)*. This is discussed in a later section of this chapter. See too the article by Dobrolyubov ‘A ray of light in the kingdom of darkness’, first published in *The Contemporary*, X,1860.
- 82 Ann Shukman, p.55.
- 83 For a discussion of this see *Tri sestry*, p.423.
- 84 *Telva*, January 1990, pp.46-50.
- 85 This line cited from a hymn by the Rev. Gaskell, in Jennie Uglow: *Elizabeth Gaskell: A Habit of Stories* (London, 1993), quoted by Jackie Wullschlager, *Financial Times Weekend*, 30-31 January, 1993, xiv.
- 86 Prawer, p.131.
- 87 Kecht, p.107. The novel being discussed here is Elfriede Jelinek’s *Die Klavierspielerin* (1983).

- 88 A.N. Ostrovsky, *Groza (The [Thunder]storm)*, Moscow, 1963. There are also some interesting parallels between the two Russian plays discussed in this chapter. Ostrovsky's play, for example, opens with the lines of a popular song, written by A.F. Merzliakov, reminiscent of the lines repeated by Masha.
- 89 Kecht, p.107.
- 90 There are many references throughout this play, most of them spoken by Katerina, to the stifling environment in which she was forced to live after her marriage. The reference here to windows occurs in Ostrovsky, Act 2, scene 3, p.23.
- 91 Kecht, p.111.
- 92 Ostrovsky, Act 2, scene 8, p.27.
- 93 Ibid., Act 2, scene 10, p.28.
- 94 Kecht, p.109.
- 95 Ibid.
- 96 Ibid., p.108.
- 97 Finney, p.185.
- 98 An excellent bibliography for further reading is provided by Finney,
- 99 Much more could have been written on this topic but a further detailed study would take us far beyond the parameters of this thesis.

CONCLUSION

A veces me ha sucedido oír censuras por mi afición a estudiar el movimiento literario extranjero y darlo a conocer en mi patria; siendo así que no tienen las letras españolas, las castizas, las de manantial, quien con más sincera devoción las ame y procure servir las. Mas esta devoción no pide la ignorancia, desprecio y odio fanático de la belleza cuando se realiza en países extraños.

Emilia Pardo Bazán¹

The spiritual world of Spain must be close to that of Russia since there, as here [in Russia], the railway lines cannot be used by other European trains.

*New Times*²

Veía mi estancia en Leningrado como si no la hubiese vivido. Como una fantasía que me producía añoranza: añoraba el yo que había dejado, a mí misma, que ya no era la de Barcelona.

Montserrat Roig³

In the course of this work we have seen how Russian literature made its way into 19th-century Spain, at first tentatively – we recall the distortions and the inexplicable omissions from the early Spanish translations of Pushkin and Gogol’ – and later with greater assurance, impact and wider diffusion. The outstanding champion of the familiarization of this new literature in 19th-century Spain was, without doubt, Emilia Pardo Bazán – a capable, dedicated and energetic

intermediary between the two cultures. Despite the many difficulties which confronted her in this task, she set the standards for those who were to continue and develop what she had so successfully begun. No other writer or critic in 19th-century Spain achieved as much as she did in this field. Her work on Russian literature clearly demonstrates that her commitment to its popularization in Spain was both sincere and ongoing. Notable, too, were her scholarly approach to the subject and her determined attempts to overcome her lack of first-hand experience of the country and her ignorance of its language by whatever legitimate means she could.

The three other outstanding popularizers of Russian literature in early modern Spain (Baroja, "Clarín" and Unamuno), found in this new culture a source of inspiration for their own works. Baroja, the lifelong critic and promoter of Dostoevsky, discovered, as we have seen, themes and ideas in the Russian's work which he creatively assimilated into certain of his own writings. "Clarín", the perceptive and original critic of Tolstoy, found inspiration in the latter's exposition of the "woman question" in *Anna Karenina* and in his devastating critique of marriage in *The Kreutzer Sonata*. Unamuno responded to Russian literature in critical essays and by the original transformation of certain ideas of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky into his own fictional world.

The work of these four intermediaries is framed by the lesser achievements in this field of Valera and Ganivet. Valera's early *Cartas* paved the way for Pardo Bazán; more generally, these letters provided for Spanish readers first-hand details of life in Russia and, at the very least, the names of certain Russian writers. The vital role which Ganivet might subsequently have played in the promotion of both Russian language and literature in Spain was abruptly terminated with his suicide in Riga.

One of the most topical questions in 19th and early 20th-century Europe was the so-called "woman-question". The topic was treated in closely coincident ways in two very powerful 19th-century novels, *Anna Karenina* and *La Regenta*,

the former being a possible source of inspiration for the latter. In a later period, it seemed likely that Lorca could have found inspiration for *La casa de Bernardo Alba* in Chekhov's *Three Sisters* and in the earlier play by Ostrovsky *The Storm*. The fates of women within their respective societies are presented in these plays as having much in common with the later Spanish work. These conclusions also imply a close affinity between the two cultures as regards their attitudes to and treatment of women.

After the active promotion of Russian literature in the later years of the 19th century and in early 20th century Spain (achieved in great part through the efforts of the intermediaries we have studied here), there descended, of course, a silence of many years – at least officially – between the two countries.⁴ One of the first Spanish writers who tried to break this silence and begin the restoration of cultural relations between Spain and Russia was the late Montserrat Roig.⁵ Her work *La aguja dorada* represents one of the first serious attempts to popularize Russian culture in Post-Franco Spain.⁶ With the (almost simultaneous) advent of “democratization” in both countries, a marked improvement in the relationship between them can, naturally, be clearly observed; in order to monitor aspects of this, I have examined a wide selection of Spanish magazines and journals over the past four years.⁷ I have been looking for evidence that good, accurate and well-presented articles and reports about Russia have been available for Spanish readers. Some salient items among my findings will be presented briefly under two main headings: culture and current affairs.

(1) CULTURE

One of my most surprising discoveries has been the number of interesting and well-documented reports about cultural life in Russia (and in Eastern Europe) which appeared over the past four years in *Telva*.⁸ This magazine, founded in the Franco era, has carried excellent articles on the arts in Russia, and has covered the topic far more regularly than any other journal examined in the course of this enquiry.⁹ Numerous examples could be cited; the three which follow are perhaps of exceptional interest. In 1988 there was an interview with Boris Grois, which went far beyond the merely superficial and predictable.¹⁰ Readers were offered accurate, detailed and stimulating information about culture in Gorbachov's Russia; Grois also spoke of his impressions of life and culture in the West.¹¹ In the following year there appeared a lengthy report entitled *Las mujeres de la perestroika*.¹² Women involved in various aspects of cultural affairs in Russia were interviewed in detail about their work.¹³ Carmen Bravo-Villasante spoke in a long interview for this same magazine of her strong commitment to Russian literature and mentioned her work on a new biography of Pushkin.¹⁴

The other journals examined by me have also carried regular reports concerning Russian writers and culture; *Tiempo*, for example, presented a long interview with Evtushenko entitled "Quiero dirigir un '*Don Quijote*' con Paco Rabal y Vanessa Redgrave".¹⁵ This report was stimulating, accurate and informative on many levels.¹⁶ *Cambio 16* offered a lengthy discussion with the Estonian writer and Hispanist Juri Talvert - together with the first Spanish translation of one of his stories, *La cabra y los dos chivatos*.¹⁷ *Epoca* featured a fascinating and well-researched report on the life of Gala Dalí - "La Mesalina de nuestra época" - including a short bibliography and hitherto unpublished photographs.¹⁸ Elena Bonner wrote a revealing article for *Blanco y negro* in which she discussed, among other things, "el mito de Gorbachov" and culture under "perestroika".¹⁹

An endless list of examples could have been provided. It should also be stressed that all the magazines and journals which I examined carried regular information about Russian cultural events taking place in Spain; *Panorama*, for example, published special guides for “Expo ‘92” and “Madrid ‘92” in which visits by Russian theatre groups, orchestras and other cultural personalities to Spain were given prominent mention.²⁰ *Tiempo* also ran a long feature on Almodóvar’s visit to Moscow and mentioned the short season of his films which was presented there.²¹

My material clearly demonstrates that, at least from the selection of journals and magazines which I examined, over the past four years Spain has received (and still does to date) an ongoing source of information about culture in Russia. The existence of this material (and the regularity with which it appears) indicates that there is in present-day Spain a greater awareness of Russia’s cultural heritage and ample scope for the publication of accurate, well-presented and original materials on such matters.

(2) CURRENT AFFAIRS

Once more, from the periodicals which I have studied over the past four years, it is apparent that current affairs in Russia are receiving wide and accurate coverage in Spain today. Many of the journals have devoted extensive features to Russia; *Epoca*, for example, offered a special edition entitled “El entierro del comunismo”, while *Tiempo* published several special numbers dedicated to Russia, among them “Rusia dinamita la URSS” and “Así será el mundo sin Gorbachov”.²² Events of August 1991 in Moscow were widely reported too; *Epoca* ran a feature entitled “Crónica 91: el fin de los mitos del siglo XX” and *Blanco y negro* offered its readers the article “Paraíso soviético, la gran estafa”.²³ Gorbachov’s first visit to Spain the previous year produced a spate of responses in the press, for example the headline (and article) in *Panorama* - “Bienvenido Mr. ‘Gorby’”, and the impact of this visit even made itself felt in the so-called “prensa rosa”.²⁴ Federico Jiménez Losantos, writing in *Epoca*, offered the provocative title for his article “Gorbachov acabará en el Vaticano” and in that same periodical Emilio Romero noted that he was “el primer escritor español que ha escrito un libro sobre Mijail Gorbachov”.²⁵ There have also been many interviews with Russian politicians and other figures actively involved in the changes which are taking place in Russia today; *Tiempo*, for example, printed “Una entrevista con Anatoli Sobchak, alcalde de Leningrado”, and in a lighter vein *Telva* published an interview with “Naina Yeltsin”, entitled “Todavía puedo ir al super”.²⁶ *Telva* also presented a lengthy and detailed feature - “La odisea cotidiana” - in which the daily lives of many Russian (and East European) women were examined.²⁸ The former Soviet Army has also provided material for many reports in the Spanish press; *Blanco y negro*, for example, discussed its fate in “Liquidación por derribo”, while *Tiempo* devoted an article in 1990 to “Militares españoles y soviéticos se coordinan por primera vez en materia de defensa”.²⁸

Two attempts at collaboration on a political level between Spain and Russia have featured in the Spanish press in recent times; the first of these, which *Epoca* described as “Esperpento español en Moscú”, was not a success.²⁹ The so-called “Semana Española” in Moscow had been organized by the Universidad Complutense, sponsored by Banesto (“[m]ás de 100 millones de pesetas ha costado la fiesta”), and had been attended on the Spanish side, among others, by Felipe González, Mario Conde and Alfonso Guerra.³⁰ The Russian participants failed to attend in sufficient numbers and the whole venture was described by *Epoca* as “[un] desastre... y ... una tomadura de pelo”.³¹ On a more positive note, *Panorama* featured an interview with Manuel García Álvarez, “titular de Derecho Constitucional en la Universidad de León y el único español que forma parte del equipo que realiza la nueva Carta Magna de la Federación Rusa”.³² In this informative article Álvarez, a fluent Russian speaker, reveals that “comenzaron... mis viajes [a Rusia]... en 1989, y entré en contacto con políticos, directores de periódicos y catedráticos constitucionales rusos interesados en mis artículos”.³³

From the few examples cited above it is clear that there is no scarcity of good, reliable and lively information being presented in Spain today about many aspects of Russia. This shows no sign of decreasing. Writers such as Soledad Puértolas and Carmen Martín Gaité have recently acknowledged their debt to Russian literature in interviews given to *Telva* and many of the periodicals examined have carried information about new Spanish translations of Russian literary works.³⁴ It is hoped that this present situation may long continue. Thus, the laudable achievements of the 19th-century and early 20th-century promoters of Russian literature in Spain - in particular the admirable pioneering work of Pardo Bazán - will, after all, be vindicated.

NOTES FOR CONCLUSION

- 1 Emilia Pardo Bazán, *Obras completas* (Madrid, 1973), 111, p.1497
- 2 *Novoe vremia*, 49, 1990, p.46. I am grateful to Mr. M. Dewhirst, Department of Slavonic Languages, University of Glasgow, for this article and also for the number of bibliographical references which he has so generously supplied about Russian translations of Spanish literature.
- 3 Montserrat Roig, *La aguja dorada* (Barcelona, 1985), p.206. On a private visit to Glasgow in 1988 the late Montserrat Roig expressed her intentions to develop her literary contacts with Russia even further.
- 4 Certain recent histories of Franco's Spain make brief reference to Hispano-Russian relations in those interim years; for example, R. Carr and J.P. Fusi, *Spain: Dictatorship to Democracy* (London, 1979). A very popular Spanish film of the 50s was *Embajadores en el infierno* which dealt with the exploits of the División Azul in Russia.
- 5 cf.Montserrat Roig, prologue to *La aguja dorada*, p.5, "Este libro no lo escribí para aquellos intelectuales que citan frases brillantes de grandes autores... quise transmitir lo que [Leningrado] había despertado en mí... Modestamente, sólo espero que algo de aquellos reflejos dorados queden en vuestra retina..."
- 6 As she tells us on p. 8, Montserrat Roig was first invited to the former USSR in 1980 by "la editorial 'Progreso'" She also warns her readers": "Si esperáis leer un libro sobre el paraíso soviético, dejadlo estar, no sigáis. Si buscáis las reflexiones de una intelectual desencantada por las traiciones de la URSS, también... Porque, en realidad, este libro es la historia de una pasión. En 1980 me enamoré de la ciudad de Leningrado. Si alguno de vosotros comparte conmigo algo de esta pasión, me sentiré satisfecha."
- 7 Over a four year period I have regularly examined the following Spanish weekly journals: *Epoca*, *Panorama*, *Tiempo*, *Cambio 16*, and *Blanco y negro*. All of these are published in Madrid and have a wide diffusion

throughout the country. *Telva*, a magazine for women, deserves a special note. The diversity, quality and regularity of its reports about Russia and East Europe were quite remarkable - and to me, totally unexpected. From time to time, I have also “sampled” “la prensa rosa”, for example, *Semana*.

- 8 *Telva* was founded in 1963 using the promotional slogan “*Telva* es tu revista, mujer”. (Until 1989 it appeared fortnightly. Since then it has been published monthly.) A short history of the magazine appeared in the January edition for 1993, p.11. It is commonly believed that the magazine has had (and may still have) some connection with the “Opus Dei” Movement. The present editor, to whom I am indebted for her prompt and detailed response to my written enquiries, is Covadonga O’Shea.
9. Mention should also be made of the striking (and often unusual) photographs which, typically, accompany *Telva*’s reports on Russia - and on Eastern Europe in general. In January 1991, for example, there was a photographic feature on Moscow entitled “Moscú, desde el aire”, 10-15. In November 1989 there was a report on an exhibition of icons at the Museo Arqueológico Nacional accompanied by excellent reproductions.
- 10 Interview by Mercedes Montero, *Telva*, April, 1988, 74-75.
- 11 He was asked questions about the role of women in Russia and religious freedom, for example.
- 12 *Telva*, July 1989, 10-21. This report featured interviews with many Russian women, for example, the editor of *Rabotnitsa*. *Telva* also ran a short feature later that same year entitled “Novelas de la Perestroika”. This article begins with words which recall the statement made by Pardo Bazán almost one hundred years earlier - “Moscú, literariamente, está de moda”.
- 13 One very interesting item in this report was the interview with Irina Antonova “quien prepara una fiesta de aniversario de Pasternak”.(p.17)
- 14 Interview by Concha Albert. Carmen Bravo-Villasante in “Radiografía de los románticos”. *Telva*, March 1988, 44-48. Sra. Bravo-Villasante replied to my letter with assurances of her deep personal commitment to the promotion of Russian literature in Spain.

- 15 Interview by J.J. Armas Marcelo, *Tiempo*, 8th April, 1991, 152–156. In the course of these lengthy exchanges Evtushenko remarks: “Cuando vine a España por primera vez en años sesenta le dije a Fraga que me dejara en paz, que yo no venía aquí a hacer espionaje para el KGB”. (p.152)
- 16 Evtushenko was introduced in this article as “hombre de literatura siempre”. (p.152)
- 17 *Cambio 16*, 29th July, 1991, 76-83. The title of the article was “Las tres hermanas bálticas, una historia trágica”.
- 18 José Luis Vila-San-Juan wrote this in *Epoca*, 2nd November, 1992, 67-76.
- 19 *Blanco y negro*, 17th March, 1991, 6-7. The title of her article was “Occidente creó el mito Gorbachov”.
- 20 In May 1992 *Panorama* published three special *Guías*, for Madrid, Barcelona and Seville. Many Russian musical events took place in Seville, for example, during “Expo ‘92 and Russia (CEI) had its “pabellón” in Avenida 111 de Las Palmeras.
- 21 *Tiempo*, 3rd December 1990, 152-155.
- 22 The title “El entierro del comunismo” featured on the cover for *Epoca*, 2nd September 1991. The report was on pp.6-19 and it included a report “España y la crisis de la URSS. Desconcierto en la izquierda” (18-19). “Rusia dinamita le URSS” was the title of a special feature presented by *Tiempo* on 2nd September 1991, 55-70. It included a full report on “El ‘golpe’ de Boris Yeltsin”. *Tiempo* also dedicated a special 24-page supplement entitled *Así será el mundo sin Gorbachov* to Russia on 26th August 1991, just after the “coup”.
- 23 On 15th January 1992 *Epoca* ran a special report on Russia, pp.28-33, and also included a short article entitled “Madrid acepta el ‘purgante’ Yeltsin”, 8-9. *Blanco y negro*, 17th November 1991, ran the article “Paraíso Soviético, la gran estafa”, 22-25.

- 24 *Panorama* had this headline on 11th April, 1990, 9. For that same date *Semana* presented a short report on Gorbachov, 35.
- 25 *Epoca*, 10th December, 1990, 45.
- 26 *Tiempo*, 16th September, 1991, 64-66; *Telva*, July, 1992, 61-62.
- 27 *Telva*, March 1990, 182-186.
- 28 *Blanco y negro*, 24th January 1992, 60-66. *Tiempo* 3rd December 1990, 48-56.
- 29 *Epoca*, 26th July 1991, 22-25, see also *Panorama* 15th July 1991, 26-33.
- 30 cf *Epoca*, 26th July 1991, 22: “Mario Conde, el mecenas de la Complutense, regresó a Madrid en un avión privado muy satisfecho por haber tenido ocasión de entrevistarse con Gorbachov. Pero estaba hecho una furia por la ingenuidad de los organizadores de la universidad de verano: 50 personas traídas desde España (entre ponentes e invitados) para audiencias ridículas de 13 alumnos en el caso de Alfonso Guerra y 3 en la conferencia de Virgilio Zapatera”.
- 31 Gustavo Villapalos, rector of the Universidad Complutense, dismissed the entire venture as “un magnífico disparate”. (Ibid., 24)
- 32 *Panorama*, 30th November 1992, 36-37.
- 33 He also reveals that he has translated for his Russian counterparts “los estatutos [de Castilla y León] de autonomía”. (Ibid., 36)
- 34 Soledad Puértolas, “El estilo tan transparente”, in “Novelistas que triunfan”, *Telva*, October 1992, 21. She mentions her debt to both Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. Carmen Martín Gaité, in an interview where she discusses her latest novel *Nubosidad variable*, mentions that she invented the term “narcisismo-leninismo”. C. Martín-Gaité, “Sin pasión no hay novela”, *Telva*, January 1993, 32-36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The author-listings include all the major writers mentioned in this thesis. This bibliography uses the format established in *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*.

(1) WORKS BY RUSSIAN HISPANISTS

Айхенвальд, Ю.А., *Дон Кихот на русской почве* (New York, 1982)

Алексеев, М.П., *Очерки истории испано-русских литературных отношений XVI-XIX вв.* (Leningrad, 1964)

Багно, В.Е., *Эмилия Пардо Басан и русская литература в Испании* (Leningrad, 1982)

Багно, В.Е., 'Традиции русской литературы в испаноязычной прозе Латинской Америки', *Восприятие русской литературы за рубежом* (Leningrad, 1990), pp.156-185

Багно, В.Е., *Дорогами «Дон Кихота»* (Moscow, 1988)

Багно, В.Е., 'Зарубежная архитектура в русской поэзии конца XIX-начала XX-века', *Русская литература и зарубежное искусство* (Leningrad, 1986), pp.156-188

Багно, В.Е., 'Лев Толстой в оценке испанских писателей XIX века', *Русская литература*, (3), 1978, 72-89

Багно, В.Е., 'К теме «Пушкин в Испании»', *Времменик Пушкинской комиссии* (Leningrad, 1983), pp.163-168

Багно, В.Е., '«Донья Перфекта» Б. Переса Гальдоса и «Отцы и дети» Тургенева, И.С. Тургенев: вопросы биографии и творчества (Leningrad, 1982, pp.115-124

Багно, В.Е., 'Русско-каталонские культурные связи и первая антология русской поэзии в Каталонии', *Русская литература*, (1), 1986, 191-201

Bajno, V., Estado actual de la Hispanísta en la URSS, *Revista de la Universidad Complutense*, (1), 1984, 92-116

Балашов, Н.И., 'Пушкин и испанская драма XVII в. на славянские темы', *Русско-европейские литературные связи* (Leningrad, 1966), pp.27-38

Васильева-Шведе, О.К., 'Автограф Хуана Валеры в архиве С.А. Соболевского', *Русско-европейские литературные связи* (Leningrad, 1986), pp.371-373

Григорьев, А.Л., *Русская литература в зарубежном литературоведении* (Leningrad, 1977)

Додолев, М.А., *Россия и Испания 1808-1823 гг.* (Moscow, 1984)

Дуарте, М.-К., 'Первые переводы произведений Пушкина в Чили', *Русско-европейские литературные связи* (Leningrad, 1966), pp.192-197

Пугачев, В.В., 'Испанский «Гражданский катихизис» и В.К. Кюхельбекер в 1812 г», *Русско-европейские литературные связи* (Leningrad, 1966), pp.109-114

Рахманов, В.В., 'Русская литература в Испании', *Язык и литература*, V, 1930, 329-346

Силюнас, В.Ю., *Испанская драма XX века* (Moscow, 1980)

Шур, Л.А., 'Статья о бразильской литературе в альманахе «Цинтия», *Русско-европейские литературные связи* (Leningrad, 1966), pp.149-157

Шур, Л.А., 'Латиноамериканские литераторы в России в начале XIX в., *Международные связи русской литературы* (Leningrad, 1963), pp.175-192

(2) **BILBIOGRAPHICAL WORKS**

Portnoff, G., *La literatura rusa en España* (New York, 1932)

Schanzer, G.O., *Russian Literature in the Hispanic World: a bibliography* (Toronto, 1972)

(3) **BIBLIOGRAPHIES
OF INDIVIDUAL RUSSIAN AUTHORS****BELINSKY, V.G.**

Bowman, H., *Vissarion Belinsky, 1811-1848: a study on the Origins of Social Criticism in Russia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954)

Randall, F., *Vissarion Belinskii* (Newtonville, 1987)

CHEKHOV, A.P.

Чехов, А.П., *Полн. собр. соч. и писем в тридцати томах* (Moscow, 1978-1983)

Hahn, B., *Chekhov: a Study of the Major Stories and Plays* (Cambridge & New York, 1977)

Hingley, R., *A New Life of Anton Chekhov* (New York, 1976)

Peace, R., *Chekhov: A Study of the Four Major Plays* (New Haven, 1983)

Pitcher, H., *The Chekhov Play: a New Interpretation* (New York, 1973)

Winner, T., *Chekhov and His Prose* (New York, 1966)

DERZHAVIN, G.R.

Державин, Г.Р., *СТИХОТВОРЕНИЯ* (Moscow, 1958)

Hart, P.R., *G.R. Derzhavin: a Poet's Progress* (Ohio, 1978)

DOSTOEVSKY, F.M.

Достоевский, Ф.М., *Полн. собр. соч. в тридцати томах* (Leningrad, 1980)

Boyce-Gibson, A., *The Religion of Dostoevsky* (London, 1973)

Catteau, J., *Dostoevsky and the Process of Literary Creation* (Cambridge, 1989)

Fanger, D., *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism* (Mass., 1965)

Grossman, L., *Balzac and Dostoevsky* (Ann Arbor, 1973)

Jones, M., *Dostoevsky: the Novel of Discord* (New York, 1976)

Jonge, A. de, *Dostoevsky and the Age of Intensity* (London, 1975)

Kent, L., *The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevsky* (The Hague, 1972)

Peace, R., *Dostoevsky: an Examination of the Major Novels* (Cambridge, 1971)

Wasiolek, E., *Dostoevsky: The Major Fiction* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964)

Wellek, R. (ed.), *Dostoevsky: a Collection of Critical Essays* (New Jersey, 1962)

Бахтин, М.М., *Проблемы поэтики Достоевского* (Moscow, 1972)

Белов, С.В., *Роман Ф.М. Достоевского «Преступление и наказание»* (Leningrad, 1979)

Бурсов, Б.И., *Личность Достоевского* (Leningrad, 1979)

Кудрявцев, Ю.Г., *Три круга Достоевского* (Moscow, 1979)

Реизов, Б.Г. (ed.), *Достоевский в зарубежных литературах* (Leningrad, 1978)

GOGOL', N.V.

Гоголь, Н.В., *Полн. собр. соч.* (Moscow, 1952)

Erlich, V., *Gogol* (New Haven & London, 1969)

Karlinsky, S., *The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol* (Chicago & London, 1976)

Meyer, P. & Rudy, S. (eds.), *Dostoevsky and Gogol* (Ann Arbor, 1979)

Nabokov, V., *Nikolai Gogol* (New York, 1944)

Peace, R., *The Enigma of Gogol* (Cambridge, 1981)

Rowe, W., *Through Gogol's Looking Glass* (New York, 1976)

Багно, В.Е., «Гоголь и испанская литература», *Гоголь и мировая литература* (Moscow, 1988)

Манн, Ю.В., (ed.), *Гоголь и мировая литература* (Moscow, 1988)

Манн, Ю.В., (ed.), *Николай Гоголь: жизнь и творчество* (Moscow, 1988)

Маркович, В.М., *Петербургские повести Н.В. Гоголя* (Leningrad, 1989)

GOR'KY, A.M.

Borras, F.M., *Maxim Gorky the Writer: an Interpretation* (Oxford, 1967)

Hare, R., *Maxim Gorky: Romantic Realist and Conservative Revolutionary*, (London, 1962)

LERMONTOV, M.Iu.

Лермонтов, М.Ю., *Избранные произведения в двух томах* (Moscow, 1973)

Manning, C., 'Lermontov and Spain', *The Romanic Review*, XXII, 1931, 126–129

Mersereau, J.Jr., *Mikhail Lermontov* (Carbondale, 1962)

OSTROVSKY, A.N.

Островский, А.Н., *Гроза*, (Moscow, 1963)

Hoover, M., *Alexander Ostrovsky* (Boston, 1981)

Patouillet, J., *Ostrovski et son théâtre de moeurs russes* (Paris, 1912)

PUSHKIN, A.S.

Пушкин, А.С., *Полн. собр. соч. в десяти томах* (Leningrad, 1977)

Bayley, J., *Pushkin: a Comparative Commentary* (Cambridge, 1971)

Debreczeny, P., *The Other Pushkin: a Study of Alexander Pushkin's Prose Fiction* (Stanford, 1983)

Lezhnev, A., *Pushkin's Prose* (Ann Arbor, 1983)

Mirsky, D., *Pushkin* (New York and London, 1926)

Troyat, H., *Pouchkine* (Paris, 1936)

Vickery, W., *Alexander Pushkin* (New York, 1970)

Губер, П.К., *Дон-Жуанский список Пушкина* (Paris, 1979)

РЫСКИН, Е.И., *Журнал А.С. Пушкина 'Современник' 1836-1837* (Moscow, 1967)

Томашевский, Б.В., *Пушкин — работы разных лет* (Moscow, 1990)

TOLSTOY, L.N.

Толстой, Л.Н., *Полн. собр соч.* (Moscow, 1954)

Bayley, J., *Tolstoy and the Novel* (London, 1966)

Benson, R.C., *Women in Tolstoy* (Illinois, 1973)

Berlin, I., *The Hedgehog and the Fox* (New York, 1953)

Christian, R., *Tolstoy: a Critical Introduction* (London, 1969)

Matlaw, R. (ed.), *Tolstoy: a Collection of Critical Essays* (New Jersey, 1967)

Møller, R., *Postlude to the Kreutzer Sonata* (Leiden, 1988)

Patterson, D., *The Gospel according to Tolstoy* (Alabama, 1992)

Simmons, E., *Tolstoy* (London, 1973)

Steiner, G., *Tolstoy or Dostoevsky* (New York, 1959)

Tolstoy, L.N., *Anna Karenin*, trans. R. Edmonds, (Middlesex, 1954)

Wilson, A.N., *Tolstoy* (London, 1988)

Яснополянский сборник (Tula, 1965)

Яснополянский сборник (Tula, 1974)

Шифман, А.Н., *Лев Толстой и восток* (Moscow 1971)

TURGENEV, I.S.

Тургенев, И.С., *Пол. собр. соч. и писем в двадцати восьми томах* (Moscow, 1964-1970)

Freeborn, R., *Turgenev: the Novelist's Novelist. A Study* (London, 1960)

Knowles, A., *Ivan Turgenev* (Boston, 1988)

Pritchett, V., *The Gentle Barbarian* (London, 1977)

Troyat, H., *Turgenev* (London, 1988)

ZAMYATIN, E.I.

Замятин, Е.И., *Избр. произведения* (Moscow, 1989)

Richards, D., *Zamyatin: a Soviet Heretic* (New York, 1962)

Shane, A., *The Life and Works of Evgenij Zamjatin* (Berkeley, 1968)

(4) BIBLIOGRAPHIES
OF HISPANIC AUTHORS

ALAS, L. ("CLARIN")

Alas, Leopoldo ("Clarín"), *Obras selectas* (Madrid, 1956)

Alas, Leopoldo ("Clarín"), *Cuentos*, (Oviedo, 1953)

Alas, Leopoldo ("Clarín"), *Obra olvidada* (Madrid, 1973)

Agudiez, J., *Inspiración y estética en "La Regenta" de "Clarín"* (Oviedo, 1970)

Beser, S., *Leopoldo Alas, crítico literario* (Madrid, 1968)

Bull, W., "'Clarín's' literary internationalism", *Hispanic Review*, XVI, 1948, pp.321-344.

Gramberg, E., *Fondo y forma del humorismo de Leopoldo Alas, "Clarín"* (Oviedo, 1958)

Martínez Cachero, J.M.. (ed.), *Leopoldo Alas* (Madrid 1978)

Posada, A., *Leopoldo Alas "Clarín"* (Oviedo, 1946)

Varela Jácome, B., *Leopoldo Alas "Clarín"* (Madrid, 1980)

BAROJA, P.

Baroja, P., *Obras completas* (Madrid, 1978)

Baroja, P., *Hojas sueltas* (Madrid, 1973)

Arbó, S., *Pío Baroja y su tiempo* (Barcelona, 1963)

Barrow, L., *Negation in Baroja* (Arizona, 1971)

Ciplijauskaitė, B., *Baroja: Un Estilo* (Madrid, 1972)

“*Cuadernos Hispánicoamericanos*”, 265-267, (Madrid, 1972).

Elizalde, I., *Personajes y temas Barojianos* (Valencia, 1975)

Martínez Palacio, J., *Pío Baroja* (Madrid, 1974)

Nallín, C., *El problema de la novela en Pío Baroja* (Mexico, 1964)

GALDÓS, B.P.

Galdós, Benito Pérez, *Doña Perfecta and Misericordia* (Mexico, 1971)

Casalduero, J., *Vida y obra de Galdós* (Madrid, 1951)

Condé, L., *Stages in the Development of a Feminist Consciousness in Pérez Galdós* (Toronto, 1990)

Condé, L., *Women in the Theatre of Galdós* (Toronto, 1990)

Nuez and Schraibman, *Cartas del Archivo de Galdós* (Madrid, 1967)

GANIVET, A.

Ganivet, A., *Obras completas* (Madrid, 1961)

Gallego Morrell, A., *Angel Ganivet – el excéntrico del 98* (Madrid, 1974)

Ginsberg, J. *Angel Ganivet* (London, 1985)

GARCIA LORCA, F.

García Lorca, F., *Obras Completas* (Madrid, 1969)

Bustos and Fonquerne (eds.), *Valoración actual de la obra de García Lorca* (Madrid, 1988)

García Lorca, Francisco, *Federico y su mundo* (Madrid, 1980)

Gibson, I., *Federico García Lorca*, (Barcelona, 1987)

GONZAGA, T.A.

Gonzaga, T.A., *Marília de Dirceu* (São Paulo, 1964)

PARDO BAZÁN, E.

Pardo Bazán, E., *Obras completas* (Madrid, 1973)

Albuin, P., *Presencia de Curros y doña Emilia* (Vigo, 1951)

Bravo-Villasante, C., *Vida y obra de Emilia Pardo Bazán* (Madrid, 1962)

Clémessy, N., *Pardo Bazán, romancière* (Paris, 1973)

Osborne, R.E., *Emilia Pardo Bazán: su vida y sus obras* (Mexico, 1956)

SOR JUANA INÉS DE LA CRUZ

Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, *Obras selectas* (Barcelona, 1976)

Paz, O., *Las Trampas de la Fe*, (Mexico, 1982)

UNAMUNO, M. de

Unamuno, Miguel de, *Obras completas* (Madrid, 1966)

Batchelor, R., *Unamuno Novelist: a European Perspective* (Oxford, 1972)

Fernández Larraín, S., *Cartas inéditas de Miguel de Unamuno* (Santiago de Chile, 1965)

Cobb, C., (ed.) *Miguel de Unamuno, Artículos olvidadas sobre España y la Primera Guerra Mundial* (London, 1976)

Gómez de Baquero, E., “‘Paz en la guerra’ por Miguel de Unamuno”, *La España Moderna*, 4 (1897), 126.

Marías J., *Miguel de Unamuno* (Buenos Aires, 1942)

Round, N. (ed.), *Re-reading Unamuno* (Glasgow, 1989)

Sánchez Barbudo, A., *Estudios sobre Unamuno y Machado* (Madrid, 1959)

Wyers, F., *Miguel de Unamuno: The Contrary Self* (London, 1976)

VALERA, J.

Valera, J., *Obras completas* (Madrid, 1968)

Bermejo Marcos, M., *Don Juan Valera, crítico literario* (Madrid, 1968)

Bravo-Villasante, C., *Biografía de don Juan Valera* (Barcelona, 1959)

Rubio Cremades E., (ed.), *Juan Valera* (Madrid, 1990)

VALLE-INCLÁN, R. del

Valle-Inclán, R. del, *Obras Escogidas* (Madrid, 1974)

Doménech, R. (ed.), *Ramón del Valle-Inclán* (Madrid, 1988)

Smith, V., *Ramón del Valle-Inclán* (New York, 1973)

(5) LITERARY THEORY ETC.

Aldridge, A., *Comparative Literature: Matter and Method* (Illinois, 1969)

Dieckmann, Levin & Motekat, *Essays in Comparative Literature* (Missouri, 1961)

Fowler, R., (ed.) *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* (London, 1973)

Frye, N., *Anatomy of Criticism* (London, 1990)

Gullón, G., *La novela del XIX; Estudio sobre su evolución formal* (Amsterdam, 1990)

Levin, H., *Grounds for Comparison* (Cambridge, Mass. 1972)

Lukás, G., *Studies in European Realism* (London, 1978)

Moore & Moody (eds.), *Comparative Literature East and West: Traditions and Trends*, Hawaii, 1989)

Prawer, S.S., *Comparative Literary Studies* (London, 1973)

Shklovsky, V., *Theory of Prose*, trans. B. Sher, (Illinois, 1990)

Strieder, J., *Literary Structure, Evolution, and Value* (Cambridge, Mass., 1989)

Thompson, E., *Russian Formalism and Anglo-America New Criticism* (The Hague, 1971)

Wellek & Warren (eds.), *Theory of Literature* (London, 1956)

(6) HISTORY AND HISTORIES OF LITERATURE

Brenan, G., *The Literature of the Spanish People* (Cambridge, 1951)

Carr, R., *Spain 1808-1975* (Oxford, 1983)

Candido, A. and Aderaldo Castello, J., *Presença da Literatura brasileira* (São Paulo, 1973)

Castelar, E., *La Rusia contemporánea* (Madrid, 1881)

Coutinho, A., *Antologia brasileira de Literatura* (Rio de Janeiro, 1969)

Freeborn, R., *The Rise of the Russian Novel*, (Cambridge, 1973)

García Duran, J., *La guerra civil española: Fuentes*, (Barcelona, 1985)

Gifford, H., *The Novel in Russia* (London, 1964)

Guerard, A., *The Triumphs of the Novel* (Chicago, 1976)

Madrid en sus diarios, II, III, IV, V, (Instituto de Estudios madrileños, Madrid, 1971)

Moser, C. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature* (Cambridge 1992)

Soares Amora, A., *História da Literatura brasileira* (São Paulo, 1967)

Tamames, R., *¿Adónde vas, España?* (Barcelona, 1976)

Vogüe, E.M. de, *Le Roman Russe* (Paris, 1886)

(7) OTHER WORKS CONSULTED

Azorín, *Obras Completas* (Madrid, 1975)

Benavente, J., *Obras Completas* (Madrid, 1964)

Cross, A., *Russia under Western Eyes* (London, 1971)

Edmondson, L. (ed.), *Women and Society in Russia & the Soviet Union* (Cambridge, 1992)

Finney, G., *Women in Modern Drama* (Cornell, 1989)

Forstetter, M., *Voyageurs en Russie* (Vevey, 1947)

Franco, F., *Discursos y mensajes 1951-1954* (Madrid, 1955)

Franco, F., *Discursos y mensajes 1955-1959* (Madrid, 1960)

Laing, R.D., *The Divided Self* (London, 1980)

Machado, A., *Poesías y prosa* (Madrid, 1989)

Mamonova, T., *Essays on sexism in Soviet Culture* (Oxford, 1989)

Marsh, R., *Images of Dictatorship – Portraits of Stalin in Literature* (London, 1989)

McKay & Millar (eds.), *Biblical Studies: Essays in Honour of William Barclay* (London, 1976)

Молева, Н.М., *Константин Коровин: жизнь и творчество* (Moscow, 1963)

Morris, M., *Saints and Revolutionaries: The Ascetic Hero in Russian Literature* (New York, 1993)

- Pattison, W., *El naturalismo español* (Madrid, 1965)
- Peñuelas, M., *Jacinto Benavente* (New York, 1968)
- Queiroz, E. de, *O primo Bazilio* (Lisbon, 1969)
- Roig, M., *La Aguja dorada* (Barcelona, 1986)
- Sábato, E., *O.C.*, (Buenos Aires, 1960)
- Trilling, L., *Beyond Culture* (London, 1967)
- Turkevich, L.B., *Cervantes in Russia* (Princeton, 1950)
- Vachon, M., *La Russie au soleil* (Paris, 1886)
- Voglié, E.-M.de, *Journal – Paris; Saint-Pétersbourg* (Paris, 1932)
- Ware, T., *The Orthodox Church* (London, 1972)
- Woolf, V., *A Room of One's Own* (London, 1950)