Hispanic

THE INFLUENCE OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE ON SPANISH AUTHORS IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES

RECEPTION, TRANSLATION, INSPIRATION

Margaret H. Tejerizo

With a Foreword by
Beata Cieszynska

The Edwin Mellen Press
Lewiston•Queenston•Lampeter

INTRODUCTION

(1) Definitions

> *Exoticism*: "... tendency to adopt what is foreign."
> *Familiarization*: ".... the act of making ... well-known".[1]

In the first part of this study 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 *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 study as a full examination of this topic falls outside the stated limits of the present work).[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 study a synopsis will be provided of 'literary fortunes' of certain selected 19th-century Russian writers in Spain; again, a fuller treatment of this topic cannot be discussed within the confines of this work).[10]

One area which will be mentioned is 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, seeking within it, in many cases, answers to their own intellectual and moral dilemmas. Indeed, it occasioned frequent (and varied) responses. Many Spanish writers could be defined as "cultural intermediaries" but rigorous standards were set for inclusion into this category. Additionally, a further subdivision of *major intermediaries* and *minor intermediaries* has been established.

(a) **Major Intermediaries:** A major intermediary will have provided continuous, accurate and original information about Russian writers in the years being reviewed in the first sections of this work. 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 study, 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. Taken overall, he does not adequately fulfil my criteria during the time-span under review in this study; Machado, together with the poet Rafael Alberti, will, however, be mentioned very briefly in a later chapter of this work which will look briefly at the tenuous cultural links which were established between Spain and the USSR.[14]

(b) **Minor Intermediaries:** Into the above category have been placed those Spanish writers who provided a more limited amount of information about Russian culture but who, because of the special and unusual 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, of course,) which offered readers impressions of that distant and exotic land, Russia. In Forstetter's *Voyageurs en Russie*, for example, one may find 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 later sections of this study certain aspects of the trajectory of "the woman question" will be traced as these emerge in selected 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) **Houses Of Broken Dolls** :

> 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" 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 nevertheless, 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 *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 *The Storm* may have supplied for the same Spanish work will also be in order.[23];

Que Vienen Los Rusos![24] The exclamation cited here 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 Dramátic, 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 orginal versión de *La señorita Julia*, dirigida por Khomski.[26]

In the concluding chapter of this work some recent Spanish responses to Russia's literature and culture will be presented. A selection of those which appeared in the Spanish press just after the advent of glasnost' will first be examined briefly and then some examples from the current situation will be given. It will be shown that, after the virtual "freeze" of relations between the two countries for many years (for political reasons), both, almost simultaneously experienced a renewed sense of European belonging and in the new millennium there is a sense of new cultural closeness between the two countries. 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 too it will emerge that another woman, the late Montserrat Roig, was a prominent figure at the beginning of this new process, as was 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 work 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

1 *Oxford English Dictionary* V (1989), pp.551-552 and p.706
2 *The Shorter Oxford Dictionary* II (1978), p.1300 and ibid., I, p.1096
3 Ibid., I, p.704
4 George Schanzer, *Russian Literature in the Hispanic World: a bibliography* (Toronto, 1972), p.xxi.
5 Ibid.
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*, Übersetzungswissenschlaftliche, 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, op. cit., 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)

20 J. Stuart Mill, *La esclavitud femenina* (Madrid, 1892)
21 Quoted in the late Lisa Condé, *A Feminist Consciousness in Galdós* (Toronto, 1990), pp.2-3
22 Quoted in the study by the late 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 *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 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
27 Alfonso Ussia, *Epoca*, 5 April, 1993, 38
28 Such a study falls outwith the parameters of this work. Information about some of these new translations did appear in magazines such as *Epoca*, *Tiempo* and, of course, *Telva*

CHAPTER 1

In the Beginning...

1.1 Spain and Russia: "Dos tierras de desmesura y sinrazón"

> "...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 Arnold[1]

> "Comparative literature...is [the] study of literary relations and communications between two or more groups that speak different languages."
>
> René Wellek[2]

As S.S. Prawer 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 work, however, it is not the intention to "[peer] into every nook and cranny" of this vast abode.[3] Initially the focus will be fixed upon 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 will be seen.

Within the time-span to be investigated at the beginning of this work, 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 most 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 the first chapters of this study 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 later chapters I 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 study, 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), have already been 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 work 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*.

Moving forward in time, the next Spanish author to be included in this work is Federico García Lorca (1898-1936). His play *La casa de Bernarda Alba* will be compared to *Three Sisters* by Chekhov. Lorca's own engagement with Russian culture will be noted and the striking similarities between the above-mentioned 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 silence which was imposed between Spain and the USSR from 1939 until the death of Franco was, nevertheless, broken by some outstanding incidents and individuals, certain details of which will be briefly mentioned in the concluding chapter of this work.

The third aim of this study 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.

The victory of Franco at the end of the Spanish Civil War meant an abrupt termination of cultural relations between Spain and the USSR. A full investigation of the vital role which both Russian and Soviet culture played during the years of the Spanish Republic remains to be done and, of course, falls outside the limits of the present work. The presence of many items of interest for Russo-Spanish literary investigation in the recently-opened Civil War Archives in Spain also remains as an outstanding work of investigation for any researcher in this field.

Throughout this work the term "Russian" will be used throughout, 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 work 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 work 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, (and because 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 work 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. Chapter 1 will be concluded by brief mention of two major themes which will be investigated more fully in a future study by this author. The first of these is the vitally important role played by Cervantes within Russian literature and the second the central contribution made by the Jesuits as cultural 'promoters' of Spanish literature in Russia.

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 briefly. In this chapter too a brief account of the reception of Dostoevsky in 19th-century Spain will be given.

In the following chapter the reception of Turgenev in 19th-century Spain will be presented and 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 work. 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 this fourth chapter too 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 the Conclusion some trends in the revival of a cultural relationship between Spain and the former USSR will be briefly reported. A range of Spanish periodicals over a critical four-year period (1989-1993) was examined, and reference will be made to various articles and interviews which pointed to new cross–cultural perceptions and understandings between the two countries at that time. 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". Some more recent trends and collaborations will also be noted and discussed briefly. Mention too could have been made of various other moments of approximation; for example, there is, to date, no full study of the role played by Rafael Alberti as an important 'promoter' of Russian culture in Republican Spain. Additionally, Alberti makes no reference to the meeting he had with Stalin in 1934. Ilya Ehrenburg's interview with Antonio Machado also marks an important 'crossing' between the two cultures and detailed reference could also have been made of the fascinating and poignant episode of the fate of the 'Spanish Children' in Russia. Some of these topics will be dealt with in a future work by this author.

Above all, however, I hope to prove conclusively in this study 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 will be clear that, as a direct result of the greater "transparencia" within these countries (and despite the economic and other problems which beset the former Soviet Union), in the final decade of the 20th century and in first years of this present century a fruitful and creative restoration of important cultural links between Spain and Russia is being established. Consequently, the pioneering work of Emilia Pardo Bazán and the other writers studied here will, after all, have been vindicated.

1:2 Russian 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:

> Perteneciente Rusia a la periferia de Europa, con rasgos de sociedad y mentalidad feudales, siempre mostró cierta similtud 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 and 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 study, as will the important 'cultural space' occupied within Russian culture by Cervantes.)

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.) Today her portrait hangs on the walls of the 'Ateneo', the only woman among her illustrious male colleagues... 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]

1:3 '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 Stalin[29]

> "...[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 Franco[30]

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

209 Ibid., p.1242.
210 Idem
211 Idem
212 Ibid., p.1247.
213 Ibid., pp.1497–1519.
214 Ibid., p.1497.
215 Idem
216 Ibid., p.1498.
217 Ibid., p.1502.
218 Ibid., p.1503.
219 Idem
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 Bagno, op. cit., 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 study.
228 Both of these short stories are contained in Pardo Bazán, op. cit., vol.III – *El Conde llora*, pp.392–395, and *El conde sueña* pp.395–398.
229 Ibid., p.393.
230 Ibid., p.397.
231 Idem
232 Julian Connolly, in *the Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, op. cit., p.340.
233 Bagno, "Lev Tolstoy and 19th-Century Spanish Writers", in *Russkaya literatura*, 3, (1978), 85. *La quimera* is contained in Emilia Pardo Bazán, op. cit., vol.I, pp.705–899, and *La sirena negra* is in op. cit., vol.II, pp.871-929.
234 Kirby, introduction to Emilia Pardo Bazán, op. cit., vol.III, p.xv.
235 See, for example, Richard Peace, in *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, op. cit., p.235, for a discussion on Pavlova and also Charlotte Rosenthal, "The Silver Age: highpoint for women?" in ed. Linda Edmondson, op. cit., pp.40–42. Rosenthal notes, for example, 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." Op. cit., p.41. Her achievements cannot, however, be compared in any way with those of Pardo Bazán.
236 A fuller comparative study of Russian and Spanish women writers will be carried out in the future.

CHAPTER 3

Cries and Whispers

3:1 Pío Baroja and Russian Literature

> "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 Baroja[1]

> "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 finallywhat 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. Levin[2]

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 a much older 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:

> Dostoeyevski 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, Vasilii 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 Ciplijauskaité 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 Monléon* 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, 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."

3:2 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 Baroja [36]

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 naturalism 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 griego 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 Oneguin* 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 (has 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 referes 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 enseña 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 Doestoevsky's genius in *Crime and Punishment* as revealed in his penetrating

"análisis de las sensaciones y pasiones de los personajes" surpasses that of botl Poe and Baudelaire.[69]

In the last of these early articles devoted to Russian literature, publishe on March 24th 1890, Baroja turns to Tolstoy. Tolstoy, he declares, is the true hei of Turgenev, or at least he had been, until "ha abandonado la literatura...cuando l gloria le sonreía, y estima más la fama de un buen agricultor que la que le dan su triunfos literarios".[71] Baroja himself was, of course, to write man autobiographical works at a later stage in his own literary career. He mention that *War and Peace* had been translated into Spanish only months before hi article was written. He also refers to the recent translation of *Anna Karenina* a he observes the fine juxtaposition by Tolstoy of "el amor adúltero de Ana y d Vronsky a la par que el puro de Kitty y Constantino Levine".[72] As his fina 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 majuestoso de todos los escritores rusos."[73]

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

3:3 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...

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...[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 see inspiration in the works and ideas of another. He made the following penetratin 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 hav presented his "own ethic" in a similar way.

3:4 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 Ciplijauskaité[91]

> "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. Prawer[92]

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's and Dostoevsky together 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 Akakiy 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 Akakiy 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-réading 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 dirgirse. ¿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 study).

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] Ciplijauskaité, 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]

Ciplijauskaité 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 Ciplijauskaité'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 "literature 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]

3:5 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 Freud[119]

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]

Kudryavtsev 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 Golyadkin'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 e artículos de periódico del desdoblamiento psíquico..."[139]

In this part of his essay Baroja briefly defines his terms and, with passing reference to a letter by Dostoevsky touching on the subject, he maintain that this "desdoblamiento psíquico", observable both in the author Dostoevsk and in his literary creations, is "... lo que se llama en términos científico esquizofrenia".[140] Baroja takes matters even further along this course b 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 *Bacchae*:

> *Las Bacantes* de Euripides, por ejemplo, es una tragedia en la cual el autor parece perder la razón al mismo tiempo y al compás de sus héroes y des 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 to 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.

3:6 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, personalísmo..."
>
> A.M.de Lera[159]

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 según 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... Despúes 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 must 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 "[illegible] 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 mi.[163]

In the light of this declaration, Leo Barrow's assertation 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 is 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 sanctifica 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 leamos 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.

3:7 Dostoevsky and the Novelistic World of Pío 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 Elizalde[180]

> "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. Prawer[181]

From the outset of his literary career to the end of his long and productiv life as an essayist, critic and novelist – (he was a candidate for the Nobel Prize i 1940) – Pío Baroja was captivated by Russian literature and in particular b Dostoevsky. Dostoevsky is the Russian novelist who figures most frequently i Baroja's essays and autobiographical writings. He is also mentioned in several o 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 Pau 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:

> Todaviá 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]

Cipljauskaité 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] Judgi from certain of Baroja's own short essays where he deals with various religio themes, it is very obvious that he was deeply concerned by what he saw as t 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 hi characters he attempted to present "man without God"; Raskol'nikov, fo example, incarnates the "radical break of the human spirit with the religiou consciousness", and Kirilov demonstrates "the inevitable religious reformulatio of this break with God in the ideology of mangodhood".[191] With a lesser degre of intensity than Dostoevsky, Baroja too was concerned about the ultimat condition of man without sincere religious beliefs. Dostoevsky's formulation an examination of these questions doubtless interested him greatly. In connectio with this, it is interesting to observe that many of Baroja's contemporaries an critics accused him of being "anti-religious, anti-clerical, atheistic". Muc closer to the truth, I believe, is Elizalde, who stresses that "llama la atención al leer l extensa obra del escritor vasco su preocupación por el tema religioso".[192] Fou 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 arból 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 hiopcresía, 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 metafisica 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 Alyosha 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 qu la justicia humana, espontána, 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 Alyosha 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 ansí* (1912). He mentions in particular the fact that of all Russian writers whose work Baroja admired "the most influential for him... Dostoevsky", though he does not attempt to develop this any further. However, he does give a fairly detailed account of what he describes as "one the most interesting episodes in the history of the reception of Dostoevsky Spain": the polemic over the interpretation of the Russian's work which ar between Baroja and Ortega y Gasset.[216] Bagno has his own opinions to add the dispute over Baroja and Gor'ky: he concludes that, in fact, "the pessimi and tragic note... in [some of Baroja's] characters... is even stronger than in supposed Russian teacher", and he states that, in his opinion, "Gor'ky did influence Baroja at all".[217]

With his continuation of Pardo Bazán's work as communicator a popularizer, Baroja's particular importance is that of an original and stimulati critic of Dostoevsky. Don Pío's own popularity and well-deserved reputati both in Spain and in Latin America, enabled him to establish and consolidate t latter's reputation throughout the Hispanic World. He also absorbed, as a creati element in his own imaginative writings, the distinctively modern example whi Dostoevsky had furnished.

By contrast, the Spanish novelist to whom Baroja owed most – a great literary figure in himself than any of his compatriots so far discussed – was in sense a major intermediary between Russian and Spanish culture. Benito Pér Galdós dedicated no critical studies to Russian writers (apart from his short artic on Pardo Bazán's lectures on Russian literature). His extensive European trave never brought him to Russia, and he had no knowledge of the Russian languag Yet critics have, from time to time discerned the possible influences of Turgene

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]

3:8 Turgenev and Galdós: 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. Brenan[220]

> "[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. Freeborn[221]

As stated at the outset, one of the aims of the present work is to provid wherever relevant, information about the research in the field of Russo-Spanis relations which has been carried out by Russian Hispanists, whose work has n been translated either into English or into Spanish. The section which follow concerning the reception of Turgenev in 19th-century Spain and the suppose relationship between his novel *Fathers and Children* and Galdós's *Doña Perfect* 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 th 1880s; in 1882, for example, the Spanish rendering of *Smoke* was published an this was followed in 1883 by the translation of *A Nest of Gentlefolk* and *Rudin*.[22

The first really widely diffused reference to Turgenev in Spain occurs i Valera's *Cartas desde Rusia*. More information was provided some years later b Pardo Bazán. Alekseev, however, believed that Turgenev might possibly hav been mentioned by K.L. Kustodiev (who was attached to the Russian Embassy i the 1860s) in a lecture on Russian history which he gave in the "Ateneo": I hav

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 work.

Notes

1. Pío Baroja, *Obras Completas* (Madrid, 1976), VII, p.812.
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*, op. cit., p.96, D. Fanger in *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism* (Massachussetts, 1965), discusses this in chapter IV. Peace also discusses in op. cit., p.298.
4. Pío Baroja, *O.C.*, V, p.1066.
5. José Alberich, "La biblioteca de Pío Baroja", in *Pío Baroja*, ed. J.M. 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 work.
8. *Pío Baroja*, ed., J.M. Palacio, pp.264–265. Alberich regrets that his stay in Baroja's library had been very short and, consequently, "no me haya permitido hacer un catálogo completo...". Op. cit., p.264.
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, op. cit., 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 Ciplijauskaité, *Baroja, un estilo* (Madrid, 1972).
12. Alberich, op. cit., 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, op. cit., vol.VII, p.445.
15. Ibid., p.446.
16. Idem
17. Ibid., p.447.
18. Ibid., pp.446-447.
19. Ibid., pp.448-449.
20. Fernández Almagro in Pedro Laín Entralga, *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, Ciplijauskaité, op. cit. Many of the articles contained in the special edition of *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, 265–267, (July–September, 1972), devoted to Baroja, support this view.
23. Jonge, op. cit., p.207.
24. Ibid., p.114.
25. Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.I, pp.255–647.
26. Pío Baroja, "El desdoblamiento psicológico de Dostoyevski", op. cit., vol.V, pp.10(1071.
27. Boyce-Gibson, op. cit., p.209.
28. Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.V, p.456.
29. Francisco Pérez in *Pío Baroja*, ed. Palacio, op. cit., p.207.
30. Boyce-Gibson, op. cit., p.209.
31. Ciplijauskaité quotes this in op. cit., p.117.
32. Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.VII, p.810.
33. Ciplijauskaité, op. cit., p.43.
34. Idem
35. Idem
36. Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.VII, p.607.
37. Pío Baroja, *Hojas sueltas* (Madrid, 1973), pp.41–89. This edition carries a "N preliminar" by Julio Caro Baroja, pp.7–10, and a prologue by Luis Urrutia Salaver pp.11–35. Salaverri also writes a short commentary on Baroja's essays on Russi literature on pp.105–110.
38. Ibid., p.105.
39. Idem
40. Ibid., p.40.
41. See section (6) of this chapter for a fuller discussion of this matter.
42. Pío Baroja, op. cit., pp.77-81. This is mainly a discussion of Hertsen.
43. Ibid., p.41.
44. See chapter 2 of this work.
45. Pío Baroja, op. cit., 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. *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*, ed., cit., pp.187–188.
57. Pío Baroja, op. cit., 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, op. cit., p.60.
61. See the following section of this chapter.
62. Pío Baroja, op. cit., p.63.
63. Ibid., p.66.
64. Ibid., p.65.
65. Ibid., p.108.
66. Ibid., p.73.
67. Ibid., pp.69–73.
68. Ibid., p.108.
69. Ibid., p.72.
70. Ibid., p.74.
71. Idem
72. Ibid., p.76.

73 Ibid., p.77.
74 See, for example, Tatyana Mamonova, *Russian Women's Studies: Essays on sexism in Soviet Culture* (Oxford, 1989), p.37.
75 Schanzer, op. cit., p.xiv.
76 Ibid., pp.xiv–xvii.
77 Ibid., p.xiv.
78 Ibid., p.51.
79 Idem
80 Ibid., p.56.
81 Idem
82 Ibid., p.58.
83 Schanzer, op. cit., 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, op. cit., 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 Prawer, op. cit., p.65, quotes this.
91 Ciplijauskaité, op. cit., p.102.
92 Prawer, op. cit. p.69.
93 See C. Nallim, *La novela en Pío Baroja* (Mexico, 1963), p.30. Baroja discusses this relationship with "la dama rusa" in op. cit., vol.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*, op. cit., vol.II, pp.843-994, "no había obrado con mucha discreción" (Baroja, op. cit., vol.VII, p.946).
94 Ciplijauskaité, op.cit., p.103.
95 Idem
96 Idem
97 Peace, op. cit., p.298.
98 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.IX, p.973.
99 See the final bibliography of this work. Also Peace, op.cit., p.298.
100 Leonard Kent, *The Subconscious in Gogol and Dostoevsky* (The Hague, 1972), p.123. Baroja, op. cit., vol.VII, p.959.
101 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.IV, p.1072.
102 Peace, op. cit., p.298.
103 Ibid., p.299.
104 See final bibliography for a short list of critical works on Chekhov.
105 See Schanzer, op. cit., p.47.
106 Ibid., p.49.
107 Ibid., p.50.
108 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.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 study.
110 Pío Baroja, opp. cit., vol.VI, pp.499–514.
111 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.II, pp.571–752 and A.P. Chekhov, *Dyadya Vanya*, Poln. sobr. soch. (Moscow, 1978), vol.12, p.61.

112 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.II, pp.445–570 and A.P. Chekhov, *Tri sestry*, Poln. sobr. sc (Moscow, 1978), vol.12, p.117.
113 Ciplijauskaité, op. cit., p.106 comments.
114 Ibid., p.105.
115 Ibid., p.106.
116 Ibid.
117 Bulgakov's novel *The Master and Margarita*, for example, has been published in Span by Alianza Editorial, no.124, Madrid, 1974. The citation from Julio Caro Baroja is gi in full in note 160.
118 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.VII, p.1046. At this point Baroja also discusses *Recuerdos de casa de los muertos*, *El idiota* and *Los hermanos Karamazoff*.
119 Sigmund Freud in Wellek, ed., op. cit., p.98.
120 Vaz de Soto, "Baroja, crítico literario", in *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos* op. cit., 302.
121 Rafael Ferreres, "Pío Baroja, crítico literario" in *Los límites del modernismo* (Mad 1964), p.105.
122 Vaz de Soto, op. cit., p.105.
123 Ibid and José Corrales Egea, *Baroja y Francia* (Madrid, 1969).
124 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.V, pp.1066–1071.
125 Contained in Wellek ed., op. cit., p.113.
126 Otto Rank, "The Double as Immortal Self" in *Beyond Psychology* (New York, 195 pp.62-101.
127 Frances Wyers, *Miguel de Unamuno: The Contrary Self* (London, 1976), p.83.
128 Ibid., p.84.
129 Yu.G. Kudryavtsev, *Tri kruga Dostoevskogo* (Moscow, 1979), p.154, quotes this.
130 Idem
131 F.M. Dostoevsky, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, (Leningrad, 1976), vol.I, p.254.
132 Contained in Wellek, op. cit., p.116.
133 See, for example, *Biblical Studies: Essays in Honour of William Barclay*, ed. McKay a Millar, (London, 1976).
134 R.D. Laing, *The Divided Self* (London, 1980).
135 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol. V, p.1066.
136 Idem
137 Idem
138 Idem
139 Idem
140 Idem
141 Idem
142 Idem
143 Ibid., p.1068.
144 Ibid., p.1069.
145 Ibid., p.1068.
146 Idem
147 Ibid., p.1069.
148 Ibid., p.1068.
149 Ibid., p.1070.
150 Ibid., pp.1070-1071.
151 Ibid., p.1071.
152 Idem
153 Idem
154 Idem
155 Idem
156 Alberich, op. cit., p.268.
157 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.V, p.1070.

158 Wellek, ed., op. cit., 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, op. cit., p.54.
162 See chapter 2 of this study and Portnoff, op.cit., p.55.
163 Ibid and Baroja, op. cit., vol.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, op. cit., vol.VII, p.425.
167 Zunzúñegui, "Encuesta en torno a Baroja", in *Indice*, p.23.
168 F.M. Borras, *Maxim Gorky the Writer* (Oxford, 1967), p.23. See also R. Hare, *Maxim Gorky, Romantic Realist and Conservative Revolutionary* (Oxford, 1962), and Mamonova, op. cit., pp.55–62.
169 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.V, pp.37–39.
170 Ibid., p.37.
171 Idem
172 Ibid., p.38.
173 Idem
174 Ibid., p.39.
175 See Borras, op. cit., for a list of the complete works of Gor'ky.
176 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.VII, pp.425–426.
177 Ibid., p.425.
178 Domingo Pérez Minik in *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, ed. cit., 55–65.
179 Ibid., p.64.
180 Ignacio Elizalde, *Personajes y temas barojianas* (Deusto, 1975), p.34.
181 Prawer, op. cit., 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 Idem
185 See, for example, Elizalde, op. cit., p.24. Baroja, op. cit., vol.VII, p.1077.
186 See, for example, Ciplijauskaité, op. cit., p.66.
187 Bagno, as will be seen at the end of this present section, hardly deals with this at all.
188 Ciplijauskaité, op. cit., p.57.
189 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.VI, p.83.
190 Ibid., p.183.
191 Wellek, op. cit., p.165.
192 Elizalde, op. cit., p.83.
193 Pío Baroja, *Camino de perfección* in op.cit., vol.VI, pp.7–130, *La leyenda de Jaun de Alzate*, op. cit., vol.VI, pp.1099–1174, *El "nocturno" del Hermano Beltrán* op. cit., vol.VI, pp.1175–1220, *El cura de Monleón* op. cit., vol.VI, pp.721–882, *César o nada*, op. cit., vol.II, pp.571–752, *El árbol de la ciencia*, op. cit., vol.II, pp.445–570 and *La sensualidad pervertida*, op. cit., vol.II, pp.843–994.
194 Leonid Grossman, *Dostoevsky* (London, 1965), p.156.
195 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.VII, pp.872-873.
196 Ibid., p.871.
197 Wellek, ed., op. cit., p.154.
198 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.VII, p.876.
199 Wellek, ed., op. cit., p.155.
200 Ibid., p.136.
201 Ibid., p.38.
202 See Elizalde, op. cit., p.144.

203 See, for example, N. Gorodetsky, *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thoug* (London, 1938), and M. Morris, *Saints and Revolutionaries: The Aesthetic Hero 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, op. cit., p.147.
207 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.IV, p.1031.
208 Ibid. and Elizalde, op. cit., p.156.
209 See, for example, Kudryavtsev, op. cit., p.305.
210 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.IV, p.107.
211 See, for example, Elizalde, op. cit., pp.53–81.
212 Pío Baroja, op. cit., vol.VI, pp.86–87.
213 Pérez, op. cit., p.381.
214 Ibid., p.332.
215 Bagno, op. cit., 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 ne section of this chapter.
220 Gerald Brenan, *The Literature of the Spanish People* (Cambridge, 1963), pp.348–349 an 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 an Works* (Leningrad, 1982), pp.115–124.
223 Bagno, op. cit., p.115.
224 Ibid., note 8.
225 Ibid., p.116.
226 Idem
227 Ibid., pp.118–119.
228 Bagno quotes all of them, op. cit., p.119, note 21, but his source for all his information i Schanzer, op. cit.
229 Bagno, op. cit., p.120.
230 Ibid., pp.121–124.
231 Bagno discusses this at length in op. cit., p.120, note 29.
232 Bagno, op. cit., p.121 and note 32 for details regarding Lesevich.
233 Idem
234 Ibid., p.122.
235 Idem
236 Idem
237 Idem
238 Ibid., p.123.
239 Idem
240 Idem.
241 Idem
242 Idem
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

"Clarín", Unamuno, Ganivet and Russia: Questions of Gende and Belonging. "Those who Wait behind the Window"

Курица – не птица,
Баба – не человек[1]

4:1 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* in 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 study was a brief investigation of the s called woman question, a topical and highly polemical issue in Europe during tl time-span being examined here. Aspects of this matter are, in my opinio powerfully represented in Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* and in "Clarín"'s *La Regent* in a later section of this chapter these two novels will be compared ar