Cervantes and the Rise of the Russian Novel

Gillian Mroz
Kellogg College
DPhil in Medieval and Modern Languages
Trinity 2019

Gillian Mroz (Kellogg College)
DPhil in Medieval and Modern Languages (Spanish and Russian)
Thesis title: Cervantes and the Rise of the Russian Novel
Submitted: Trinity 2019

ABSTRACT (1)

This thesis examines Cervantes' contribution to the development of the Russian novel tradition by exploring his reception by four canonical nineteenth-century Russian writers: Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky. These authors have been chosen for the significance of their contribution to the development of the Russian canon and the clear presence of responses to Cervantes in their *oeuvres*. In order to paint a comprehensive picture of Cervantes' reception in Russia (and, by extension, his impact on the Russian novel), this thesis takes into account the authors' entire *oeuvres* while concentrating on the texts most pertinent to the study. While focus rests on Cervantes' *magnum opus*, *Don Quixote*, his other works, particularly his *Exemplary Tales*, are also considered in relation to the Russian authors' narrative developments. References and allusions to Cervantes and intertextual echoes with his texts are examined in both the Russian writers' narrative fiction works (narrative poems, short stories and novels) and paraliterary texts (correspondence, notes and essays). This is the first time that references and allusions to Cervantes by these four writers are enumerated, examined and analysed all in one place. This comprehensiveness allows trends to be traced across the authors' reception of Cervantes and its coincidence with their narrative developments. This enables the reader to understand both the extent to and manner in which Cervantes and his works contributed not only to the development of each writer's individual *oeuvre*, but also, by extension, to the rise of the Russian novel tradition.

Gillian Mroz (Kellogg College)
DPhil in Medieval and Modern Languages (Spanish and Russian)
Thesis title: Cervantes and the Rise of the Russian Novel
Submitted: Trinity 2019

ABSTRACT (2)

In this thesis I examine Cervantes' impact on the development of the Russian novel tradition by exploring his reception by four canonical nineteenth-century writers: Pushkin (1799–1837), Gogol' (1809–52), Turgenev (1818–83) and Dostoevsky (1812–81). These authors have been chosen for the significance of their contribution to the development of the Russian canon and the clear presence of responses to Cervantes in their *oeuvres*.

Although several studies into the influence of Cervantes in Russia have previously been undertaken, the most notable of which are Turkevich (1950), Bagno (1988) and Holl's PhD thesis (1992), there exists neither a comprehensive analysis of these four authors' reception of Cervantes, nor consideration of its impact on the wider Russian novel tradition. There are several reasons why the previous studies fail to paint a complete picture of the authors' reception of Cervantes. In the case of Turkevich and Bagno, this is because the scope of the projects is too broad: they consider too many writers, enumerate too many irrelevant details, and fail to mention a number of pertinent references. In the case of Holl, the scope is too narrow: although he limits his study to six Russian writers, he focuses only on the *Quixote* and one novel by each Russian writer, thereby also omitting pertinent information. Furthermore, these works also do not consider, however briefly, the possible effects of this reception on the development of the Russian novel.

My thesis differs from the above studies in several ways. The first point of departure is that the scope of my project is narrowed to examine the reception of Cervantes by just four nineteenth-century Russian authors, as opposed to by a broader range of writers across the eighteenth, nineteenth and/or twentieth centuries. This has been done for two reasons: firstly, it enables me to consider each of the four authors in greater detail, and therefore to present a comprehensive analysis of their responses to Cervantes; secondly, given that one of the aims of this thesis is to consider Cervantes' contribution to the development of the Russian novel, which took place during the nineteenth century, significant consideration of writers outside of this period is therefore not pertinent to the study. The second point of departure is that, having narrowed the project's scope in this way, I have been able to broaden it in another: to consider the reception of Cervantes' entire *oeuvre* (and not just the *Quixote*) in the entire *oeuvres* of the four chosen authors, with focus resting on the works most pertinent to this study. Although Holl attempts to differentiate his work from the breadth of Turkevich and Bagno's monographs by focusing on the reception of just the *Quixote* in only one novel by each of his six chosen writers, he fails to realise, firstly, the importance of Cervantes' *Exemplary Tales* in the earlier

nineteenth-century prose developments (particularly in the works of Pushkin and Gogol'), and, secondly, that references and allusions found elsewhere in a writer's *oeuvre* can shed important light on the development of their narrative works. By considering Cervantes' complete fiction output (with focus on the *Quixote* and the *Exemplary Tales*), and the Russian writers' entire *oeuvres*, including both fiction works (narrative poems, short stories and novels) and paraliterary texts (correspondence, notes and essays), I am able to feature, discuss and analyse all references, allusions and intertextual echoes, without omitting any pertinent information, in one place for the first time. In this way my project is able to paint a comprehensive picture of Cervantes' contribution to each individual writer's narrative endeavours and, by extension, the development of the Russian novel.

In addition to an Introduction and Conclusion, this thesis consists of four content chapters, one on Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky respectively. The Introduction sets the ground for the study: it examines how and when Cervantes' works came to Russia, when they were translated into Russian, and how they were received. It also examines the shifting perceptions of Don Quijote by the Russian reader up to the end of the nineteenth-century. A literature review of previous comparative studies between Cervantes and my chosen four authors is also provided. In each of the content chapters I begin by providing background regarding each Russian writer's relationship with Europe, Spain and, in particular, Cervantes. Here I examine references made by the authors to the Spaniard and his works, mostly from paraliterary texts but also from certain narrative works. This begins to show not only that each author engaged with Cervantes' works, but also the nature of this reception. I then move on to considering in detail two or three texts by each author. Although my main approach is to examine, where possible, direct allusions and references, the wider literary tradition that Cervantes created is also considered. In the Pushkin chapter I discuss the narrative poem *The Gypsies* (*Tsygany*), inspired by Cervantes' 'The Little Gypsy Girl' ('La gitanilla'), parody and prose development in the *Tales of Belkin* (*Povesti Belkina*), before considering Harry Levin's idea of the 'quixotic principle' in *Evgeny Onegin*. In the Gogol' chapter I examine 'Diary of a Madman' ('Zapiski sumasshedshego') as a response to both the *Quixote* and 'Dialogue of the Dogs' ('El coloquio de los perros'), and the quixotic heritage in *Dead Souls* (*Mertvye dushi*). In the chapters on Turgenev and Dostoevsky I examine responses to Cervantes in one non-fiction work and one narrative work each. In the Turgenev chapter I provide a detailed analysis of his interpretation of Don Quijote in his speech *Hamlet and Don Quixote* (*Gamlet i Don Kikhot*), before examining his intention to re-create the Don Quijote type in *Rudin*. In the Dostoevsky chapter I look at an essay from his *Diary of a Writer* (*Dnevnik pisatelya*) entitled 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie' ('Lozh' lozh'yu spasaetsya') in which he creates his own episode based on the *Quixote* before he moves on to discuss Cervantes and the protagonist more broadly. I conclude the chapter with analysis of *The Idiot*, examining Dostoevsky's various references to the *Quixote* made during his development of the work and the clear typological echoes between Prince Myshkin and Don Quijote.

With the exception of Dostoevsky's *The Idiot* (*Idiot*), none of the texts I have chosen have been examined previously in any significant detail. Although Turkevich and Bagno touch upon, and Holl focuses his attention towards, the four main novels examined in my thesis—*Evgeny Onegin*, *Dead Souls*, *Rudin* and *The Idiot*—their analyses lack crucial information and are therefore inconclusive. In my thesis I build on their observations and contribute my own ideas to provide a comprehensive discussion of the intertextual echoes between Cervantes' works and those of my chosen Russian authors. The remaining works, meanwhile—*The Gypsies*, 'Diary of a Madman', *Hamlet and Don Quixote* and 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie'—have generally been neglected in comparative scholarship, despite the fact that they represent the richest responses to Cervantes by each author. This may be because they are, unlike the other works, not novels. However, it is important to consider these texts in order to obtain a more complete understanding of the authors' reception of Cervantes and, in turn, how this helped to shape their novelistic and typological developments.

By not limiting Cervantine considerations to the *Quixote*, and by considering each Russian writer's complete range of references and allusions to Cervantes, this study not only provides a comprehensive overview of each author's reception of the Spaniard and his works, but in so doing also illuminates a number of trends in nineteenth-century responses and their relationship with Russian prose developments. These are discussed in the Conclusion. Firstly, the development of the Russian novel tradition is clear throughout the thesis: Pushkin starts as primarily a poet experimenting in short prose texts and narrative verse forms; Gogol' experiments in theatre and poetry, but finds success primarily with his short stories, as well as the first part of his intended novel trilogy; Turgenev also dabbles with poetry and theatre, but through his shorter and longer prose endeavours helped to establish the novel tradition; and Dostoevsky further cements the Russian novel with his broad range of shorter prose fiction works and extensive novels. Secondly, there is a clear relationship between these prose tendencies and the authors' responses to Cervantes. Among the earlier writers (Pushkin and Gogol'), when the Russian prose tradition was still at an embryonic stage, focus was directed towards Cervantes, his creative genius, and a wider range of works: not just the *Quixote*, but also the *Exemplary Tales*. This contrasts with later writers (Turgenev and Dostoevsky) who, following the establishment of the novel tradition, shifted their attention away from Cervantes' creativity and various works and focused it on Don Quijote's character typology: with the novel tradition developed, it was now time to develop its protagonists. That said, this does not mean that the character of Don Quijote was neglected in the first half of the century; attention was rather distributed across a wider variety of areas. Thirdly, and relatedly, there are also clear shifts regarding the reader's perception of Cervantes' knight errant: during the Romantic period there was a tendency to view Don Quijote as a noble hero, while during the Realist movement he was viewed primarily as an impractical eccentric. As my thesis shows, however, there are exceptions to these trends, particularly in the case of Turgenev and Dostoevsky who, although on opposite ends of the political and ideological spectrum, began by viewing Don Quijote negatively, as was traditional in the second half of the century, before adopting a positive,

Romantic approach. This clearly demonstrates that, while contemporary socio-ideological trends can and do influence a reader's response, this is not enough to guarantee a specific interpretation, and particularly not of the multifaceted Don Quijote. But even if a Russian writer was not particularly fond of Don Quijote (such as Gogol', or Turgenev and Dostoevsky before reaching maturity), he nevertheless still admired the *Quixote* as literary masterpiece and respected the talents of its creator, whether for his creativity and dexterity in his narrative experimentation or for his creation of an endlessly intriguing and complex literary type.

As in the previous studies undertaken on the topic, my thesis illustrates just how popular Cervantes was in Russia during the nineteenth century. Although awareness of the *Quixote* during this period should not be surprising, particularly in light of contemporary society's curiosity towards Western European culture, of its great sense of national spirit and of its blossoming literary creativity, my thesis reveals just how deep-rooted interest in Cervantes' novel was during this period, and consequently its impact on the nation's prose developments. But, especially at the beginning of the century, it was not just the *Quixote* that was popular: Cervantes' *Exemplary Tales* were also widely enjoyed, with Pushkin and Gogol' developing their early narrative works in response not only to the *Quixote*, but also to these shorter texts. My thesis therefore shows that Cervantes was one of a great number of sources for writers during the nineteenth century, and that his contribution to the Russian canon was perhaps more significant than many readers have heretofore realised. In this light, it would not be erroneous to add Cervantes' name to, and even place it towards the top of, the list of great writers whose works inspired generations of Russian authors and who, as a result, played a key role in the development of the Russian novel tradition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A NOTE ON RUSSIAN TRANSLITERATION AND TRANSLATION

Transliteration

This study follows the custom of using non-specialist transliteration in the text to facilitate accessibility for the non-Russian reader, and the Library of Congress system in the footnotes (e.g. Dostoevsky and Dostoevskii, Vyazemsky and Viazemskii, and Yepanchin and Epanchin, respectively). Hard and soft signs have been retained (e.g. Gogol').

All Russian titles and quotations follow modernised orthography.

Translation

Unless specified, the following primary sources and translations have been used:

Cervantes

Don Quixote:

- *Don Quijote de La Mancha*, ed. by Francisco Rico, 2 vols (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 2004)
- *Don Quixote*, trans. by John Rutherford (London: Penguin, 2003)

Exemplary Stories:

- *Novelas ejemplares*, ed. by Harry Sieber, 2 vols (Madrid: Cátedra, 1994–95)
- *Exemplary Stories*, trans. by Lesley Lipson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Pushkin

Original texts:

- *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich, 17 vols (Leningrad: Akademia nauk, 1937–59)

Tales of Belkin:

- *The Queen of Spades and Other Stories*, trans. by Alan Myers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

The Gypsies and *Evgeny Onegin*:

- My own translations

Gogol'

Original texts:

- *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by Vasilii Vasil'evich Gippius, 14 vols (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1937–52)

Short stories:

- My own translation

Dead Souls:

- *Dead Souls*, trans. by Robert Maguire (Herts: Wordsworth Classics, 2010)

Turgenev

Original texts:

- *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem: v dvadtsati vos'mi tomakh*, ed. by M. P. Alekseev, 28 vols (Sochineniia [Works]: 15 vols; Pis'ma [Letters]: 13 vols) (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960–68)

Hamlet and Don Quixote:

- My own translation

Rudin:

- *Rudin*, trans. by Richard Freeborn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975)

Dostoevsky

Original texts:

- *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii: v 30-ti tomakh*, ed. by V. G. Bazanov, 30 vols (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972–90)

Diary of a Writer:

- My own translation

The Idiot:

- *The Idiot*, trans. by David McDuff (London: Penguin, 2004)

I have occasionally made edits to the published translations: these are indicated by the use of square brackets. Any other unspecified translations are my own.

Page numbers to the above works are indicated in parentheses. References to the *Quixote* follow the format '(part—chapter—translation page number/original page number)'. References to the collected works of the four main Russian writers follow the format '(volume—page number)', with two exceptions:

- In the case of Pushkin's *Evgeny Onegin*, the chapter and verse are also provided in Roman numerals.
- In the case of Turgenev, volume and page references are preceded with the letters 'P' or 'S' to indicate whether the quotation is from the volumes of letters ('pis'ma') or of works ('sochinenia').

All secondary criticism is provided in English translation.

INTRODUCTION

Miguel de Cervantes is widely considered the inventor of the modern novel, and his *Don Quixote* is venerated and enjoyed as much today as it was upon its first publication in two parts in 1605 and 1615. The far-reaching success of the novel is visible not only in its continued popularity, but also in the fact that it has served as an essential source in the development of subsequent world literature, particularly the novel tradition. The American critic Harold Bloom is not incorrect when he asserts that 'Cervantes is inescapable for all writers who have come after him',[1] as can be seen in the numerous studies that have been undertaken on his influence on world literature,[2] particularly on English,[3] French[4] and German[5] writers. The warm reception of the Spaniard and his *magnum opus* extends beyond Western Europe and the Americas, however, to a country frequently overlooked in Cervantes scholarship—Russia. Russian responses to the *Quixote* reached their peak in the nineteenth century, with the prolific Russian critic Vissarion Belinsky describing the *Quixote* in a letter of 1837 as a 'brilliant work' ('гениальное произведение'),[6] and Fyodor Dostoevsky alternating in his *Diary of a Writer* (*Dnevnik pisatelya*, 1873–81) between describing the novel as a 'great book' ('книга великая') and 'the greatest' ('величайшая') (XXVI: 25). In the following century the Russian critic

[1] Harold Bloom, 'Introduction', in Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, trans. by Edith Grossman (London: Vintage, 2005), pp. xxi–xxxv (p. xxii).
[2] Jean Canavaggio, *Don Quijote, del libro al mito*, trans. by Mauro Armiño (Madrid: Editorial Espasa Calpe, 2006); Manuel Durán and Fay R. Rogg, *Fighting Windmills: Encounters with Don Quixote* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).
[3] Darío Fernández-Morera and Michael Hanke, *Cervantes in the English-Speaking World: New Essays* (Kassel: Reichenberger, 2005); José Manuel Barrio and María José Crespo Allué, *La huella de Cervantes y del Quijote en la cultura anglosajon*a (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2007); Dale B. J. Randall and Jackson C. Boswell, *Cervantes in Seventeenth-Century England: The Tapestry Turned* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); and the various monographs and edited volumes by J. A. G. Ardila: *Cervantes en Inglaterra: el Quijote en los albores de la novela británica* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2006); *The Cervantean Heritage: Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain* (London: Legenda, 2009); *Cervantes en Inglaterra: el Quijote y la novela inglesa del siglo XVIII* (Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá, 2014).
[4] Esther Josephine Crooks, *The Influence of Cervantes in France in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1931).
[5] Gabriele Eckhart and Meg H. Brown, *Shifting Viewpoints: Cervantes in Twentieth-Century and Early Twenty-First-Century Literature Written in German* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013).
[6] V. G. Belinskii, Letter of 28 June 1837 to Mikhail Bakunin, in *Sobranie sochinenii*, 9 vols (Moscow: Khudozh. lit, 1976–82), IX, p. 43.

Vsevolod Bagno, looking back on these and other responses, would comment on 'the deep-rooted mark that Cervantes' novel left on Russian culture'.[7]

As this thesis demonstrates, the 'mark' left by the *Quixote* on Russian literature and culture manifests itself not only in the frequently laudatory and often rather hyperbolic references to the novel by certain critics and writers, but also in the development of the Russian novel tradition itself. Given the geographical and temporal distance, such influence may initially be considered surprising. But there are two main factors that help to explain the phenomenon. Firstly, nineteenth-century Russia experienced a surge in enthusiasm towards Spanish culture: this was connected to the Napoleonic Wars, and particularly to interest in Spanish guerrilla warfare. Secondly, it was a time of great literary creativity. During this period the novel tradition developed in Russia and a remarkable abundance of prose fiction works appeared in a condensed period of time: those of Pushkin, Gogol' and Lermontov in the 1830s and 40s, and those of Turgenev, Goncharov, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy from the 1850s until the end of the century. As Harry Levin comments, since the *Quixote* 'assumed so prominent a place in the canon of European classics, and stood so near the beginnings of the novel, it was destined to figure in the formation of nearly all the other novelists'[8]—among whom we can count those of the Russian literary Golden Age.

The primary aim of this thesis is to provide a comprehensive understanding of how Cervantes was received in nineteenth-century Russia, and how this reception contributed to the development of the Russian novel during this period. To do so I shall focus on four writers who were not only influential in the creation of the Russian prose tradition, but in whose writing and fictional works the influence of Cervantes is, in one form or another, most evident: Alexander Pushkin (1799–1837), Nikolai Gogol' (1809–52), Ivan Turgenev (1818–83) and

[7] Vsevolod Bagno, *El Quijote vivido por los rusos* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1995), p. 16.
[8] Harry Levin, *Grounds for Comparison* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), p. 235.

Fyodor Dostoevsky (1812–81).[9] Examination of their personal responses will reveal the contribution of the Spaniard and his works in shaping their individual *oeuvres,* and in so doing will uncover trends in the reception of Cervantes, his work and his characters, throughout the century. An awareness of these shifting perceptions is essential to extend this study away from the impact of Cervantes on specific Russian writers and towards his impact on the development and trajectory of the broader Russian novel tradition.

But how did the *Quixote* make its way to Russia in the first place? Was it the only work by Cervantes known in Russia, or were his other texts also available, in translation or otherwise? And, perhaps most importantly, what were the initial responses, did they affect nineteenth-century reception, and, if so, what was their impact on the development of Russian prose? It is only once the context of nineteenth-century Russia's interest in Cervantes and his works has been depicted that his impact on the Russian canon and its development can be truly understood.

First Encounters

During the Early Modern period Spain enjoyed its own Golden Age of literary and artistic creativity, at a time of colonial expansion and Catholic fervour, as well as abundant commercial, political and dynastic connections with much of Western Europe, North Africa and the New World. Even when it began to experience economic and military decline in the

[9] Apart from Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky, other canonical nineteenth-century Russian writers display little to no evidence of their responses to Cervantes and his influence on their literature in their writing. One exception is found in the 1838 dramatic poem 'Segeliel, or Don Quixote of the Nineteenth Century' ('Segeliel, ili Don-Kikhot XIX stoletiya') by Prince Vladimir Odoevsky (1803–69); however, his reception of Cervantes is limited to this one text (see p. 230 of this study). By contrast, Ivan Goncharov (1812–91), Alexander Herzen (1812–70) and Nikolai Chernyshevsky (1828–89) frequently refer to the character of Don Quijote in their non-fiction writing (see pp. 14–16); however, their reception of Cervantes is not perceptible in their creative works. As for Mikhail Lermontov and Lev Tolstoy—perhaps the two most prolific writers other than the four chosen for this thesis—no references to Cervantes or the *Quixote* have been traced in the works of the former, and only references to Turgenev's speech, *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, are found in the latter's writing (see p. 137, n. 228).

seventeenth century, literature and art continued to prosper for the better part of that century. During this period Russia remained a relatively underdeveloped nation state: it could not boast of the sudden expansion of learning, creativity, trade and empire that had been taking place in Spain, and remained locked in its semi-feudal social structures on the other periphery of Europe.

Cultural, political and commercial exchanges between Spain and Russia during this period were virtually non-existent. In 1524 the first political contact was made, with the arrival of Duke Ivan Zaseikin in Madrid under the orders of the Grand Duke of Moscow.[10] It was only a century later that such a visit was repeated, when Petr Potemkin arrived in Madrid in 1668 and 1681 as ambassador to Spain,[11] and it was only reciprocated for the first time in 1727, when Spain sent an embassy to the court of Tsar Peter II.[12] Although this was the first political contact Russia had with Spain on home soil, it was not the first social or cultural encounter. During the sixteenth century a number of foreign merchants resided in Russia, some of whom were Spanish. Around the same time a number of Jesuits went to Russia in an attempt to convert its Orthodox populace to Catholicism. This contact not only exposed Russia to Spanish customs and religion, but Spanish society also benefited from the stories brought back by the Jesuits. Lope de Vega's play *The Grand Duke of Muscovy* (*El gran duque de Moscovia*, first published in 1617 but likely written in 1608 or 1613),[13] for example, was inspired by their account of the False Dmitry (Dmitry 1, reign: 1605–06), pretender to the Russian throne, who claimed to be the youngest son of Ivan the Terrible and to have escaped the assassination attempted upon him in his childhood.

[10] Ludmilla Buketoff Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), p. 3.
[11] Ibid., p. 4.
[12] Yakov Malkiel, 'Cervantes in Nineteenth-Century Russia', *Comparative Literature*, 3.4 (1951), 310–29 (p. 314).
[13] Luis Iglesias Feijoo, 'Secretos y supercherías en una comedia de Lope de Vega: "El gran duque de Moscovia"', *Hipogrifo*, 5.1 (2017), 277–91 (p. 277).

Despite the intermittent nature of the nations' contact, cultural exchange had been initiated and, as a result, the *Quixote* was slowly beginning to gain popularity in Russia. Although it is not known exactly how Cervantes' novel made its way to Russia, it probably sparked interest during these rare moments of political and social contact. Slav Gratchev speculates that a copy of it was brought over by servants of Tsar Peter the Great (Peter I, reign: 1682–1725). This is certainly possible: in 1716 the Tsar brought a painting depicting a scene from the novel by the French painter Charles-Antoine Coypel, whose most famous works depict scenes from the *Quixote*.[14] Furthermore, in Maikov's *Nartov's Tales about Peter the Great*, the author recalls that 'the Tsar, leaving for Dunkirk and seeing a great number of windmills, laughed, and said to Pavel Ivanovich Yagushinsky: '"That would be a lot of work for Don Quijote!"' ('Государь, отъезжая к Дюнкиржену и увидя великое множество ветряных мельниц, разсмеявшись, Павлу Ивановичу Ягушинскому сказал: «То-то бы для Дон-Кишотов было здесь работы!»').[15] Although this by no means proves that Peter the Great had read the novel, it nevertheless suggests some understanding of and clear interest in it. That the Tsar should have been one of the first Russians to be familiar with the *Quixote* is not surprising: during his reign he implemented reforms across Russia in order to modernise it according to Western customs, ranging from the introduction of European dress in court to the founding of St Petersburg in 1703 as a window to Europe.

The developing interest in the *Quixote* in the first half of the eighteenth century is supported by the first commentary to appear in Russian on the novel. Published in an obscure text of 1720, *Reasoning on Observations of the World* (*Rassuzhdeniya o okazatel'stvakh k miru*), translated from French, it provides perhaps the first primitive summary of the book to the Russian reader:

---

[14] Slav N. Gratchev, 'Don Quixote in Russia in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: The Problem of Perception and Interpretation', *South Atlantic Review*, 81.4 (2016), 107–26 (pp. 108–09).
[15] L. N. Maikov, *Rasskazy Nartova o Petre Velikom* (St Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk, 1891), p. 87.

> In the book entitled Don Kiskhot, the fabled life of the Spanish knight, known as Don Kiskhot, is described, who, travelling around the whole world, did many fantastic things worthy of laughter; and, on behalf of every man he considered offended, he entered into solitary battle. In the same book it is described that, thinking that windmills were great giants, he thrashed them to pieces.
>
> В книге, называемой Донкисхот, описано фабульное житие гишпанского кавалера, Донкисхотом называемого, который, ездя по свету, многие достойные смеху фантастические дела делал и за всякого человека, которого он обижен быть почитал, вступался и один воевал. О нем же в той же книге описано, что он с ветряными мельницами, почитая оные за великих богатырей, дирался.[16]

Among the more influential and notable Russians to have been acquainted with the *Quixote* in the early stages of its reception in Russia were Vasily Tredyakovsky, a Russian poet and literary theoretician who, in his *Conversation about Spelling* (*Razgovor o pravopisanii*, 1748), commented that 'conversation should be natural, exactly as it was during all the amazing adventures between the knight errant Donkishot and his squire Sancho Panza' ('разговору должно быть натуральну, а именно такому, какой был, при всех удивительных похождениях между скитающимся рыцарем Донкишотом и стремянным его Саншею-Пансою'),[17] and Mikhail Lomonosov, a poet and scientist who owned a copy of the novel in German translation.[18] His possession of the *Quixote* is demonstrative of the widening reach of the novel in Russia: it was now no longer simply the preserve of foreigners in Russia, but also began featuring in the private libraries of the Russian aristocracy and educated classes.

---

[16] The Russian is quoted in Vsevolod Bagno, *Dar osobennyi: Khudozhestvennyi perevod v istorii russkoi kul'tury* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2016), p. 106. The first sentence is also quoted in Gratchev, 'Don Quixote in Russia in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries', p. 110.

[17] In the next sentence he also talks of the beautifully composed epistles in praise of Dulcinea. See V. K. Trediakovskii, 'Razgovor o pravopisanii', in *Sochineniia Tred'iakovskogo*, 3 vols in 8 (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1994), III.I, 301.

[18] Bagno, *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*, p. 18. As Tredyakovsky's comment was made in 1748, with the first Russian translation of the *Quixote* only appearing in 1769, Gratchev suggests that Tredyakovsky must therefore have read the novel in Spanish. This is highly unlikely: despite Tredyakovsky's erudition, given the relatively non-existent direct transmission of Spanish culture into Russia during this time, it is far more plausible that, like Lomonosov, he would have been familiar with the *Quixote* through a German or French translation. See Gratchev, 'Don Quixote in Russia in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries', p. 110.

With the foundations for Russia's cultural interaction with Western Europe laid at the beginning of the eighteenth century by Peter the Great, it was during the second half of the century, under the reign of Tsarina Catherine the Great (Catherine II, reign: 1762–96) and during the Russian Enlightenment that interest in European culture blossomed. Often credited with the importation and dissemination of foreign culture and literature in Russia—inspired no doubt by her own Western orientation, having been born in Germany and steeped in French culture—Catherine can take some responsibility for Russia's cultural development. It was during her reign that trade was finally established between Spain and Russia in a more official capacity with the foundation of trading companies in both nations,[19] which led to greater travel between the two countries and in turn facilitated cultural exchange. Ballets, operas and theatre performances, on European and particularly Spanish themes, flourished under her rule, while closer attention also began to be paid towards specific Golden Age writers, such as Cervantes, Lope de Vega and Calderón.[20] Indeed, seven years into her reign the first Russian translation of the *Quixote* appeared, having previously only been accessible to the Russian elite in French and German translations.[21] The Tsarina led Russia's cultural development by example: she translated sections of Calderón's *El escondido y la tapada* (*The Hidden and the Concealed*) from French into Russian, referred to Don Quijote in her correspondence,[22] and even compiled her own compendium of Sancho's proverbs.[23]

The continued rise in Cervantes' popularity during the Enlightenment is demonstrated not only in the appearance of the first translations of some of his works into Russian,[24] but also in the growing number of references to the novel and its protagonist in literature. The first

[19] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 6–7.
[20] Malkiel, 'Cervantes in Nineteenth-Century Russia', p. 314; Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 18.
[21] For more information on the translations of Cervantes' works into Russian, see pp. 17–24.
[22] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 18.
[23] Bagno, *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*, p. 20.
[24] In addition to two translations of the *Quixote*, the period also saw translations of several *Exemplary Tales* (*Novelas ejemplares*) and two translations of *La Galatea*. See pp. 22–23.

known reference appears in ‘Felitsa’ (1782), an ode by Gavrila Derzhavin dedicated to the Tsarina. It is here that he coined the neologism, ‘донкихотствовать’ (‘donkikhotstvovat’’), which can be translated as ‘to act as a Don Quijote’. Supporting Peter the Great’s comment about Don Quijote and the windmills, Derzhavin’s term and its usage reflect the common eighteenth-century perception of Cervantes’ hero as little more than a ‘humorous eccentric’ who acts in a foolish manner.[25] From this point onwards the word became established in the Russian language and, together with ‘сражаться с ветряными мельницами’ (‘to battle with windmills’, or to fight against something imaginary), is still in use today.

While further literary allusions feature in the works of writers like Mikhail Chulkov and Nikolai Karamzin, who continued the eighteenth-century trend to view the *Quixote* as little more than an entertaining parody of the romances of chivalry,[26] it is in the allusions made by the author and social critic Alexander Radishchev that a more complex understanding of the novel and its characters first becomes apparent. In his pseudo-chivalric poem, ‘Bova’ (c. 1798), he comments that the knights at the wedding feast are ‘not inferior/ […] to Don Quijote’ (‘не хуже/ […] Дон Кишота’), and adds that they proclaim: ‘Dulcinea of Toboso/ the most beautiful maiden in the world’ (‘Дульцинея Тобозийска/ Всех прекраснее на свете’), despite the fact that:

As you gaze upon this beauty,	А как воззришься в красотку,
You will see under the mask	То увидишь под личиной
Of all the powders, rouges and beauty spots,	Всех белил, румян и мушек
A monkey, or a cat,	Обезьяну, или кошку,
Or a Moscow belle.	Иль московску щеголиху.[27]

[25] E. N. Liubimova, ‘Servantes i Turgenev’, in *Servantes i vsemirnaia literatura*, ed. by N. I. Balashov and others (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), pp. 181–196 (p. 182).
[26] Liubimova, ‘Servantes i Turgenev’, p. 181.
[27] A. N. Radishchev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii A. N. Radishcheva*, ed. by V. V. Kallash, 2 vols (Moscow: Izd. V. M. Sablina, 1907), I, 399.

In his comparison between Dulcinea and the ladies of Moscow, Radishchev provides a clear reference to the illusory nature of Dulcinea's beauty under which lies the reality of Aldonza Lorenzo, the peasant girl on whom Dulcinea is based. In his *Journey from St Petersburg to Moscow* (*Puteshestvie iz Peterburga v Moskvu*, 1790), meanwhile, the travel motif enables the protagonist to encounter characters from all walks of life which in turn facilitates the author's social criticism of contemporary society, just as it does in the *Quixote*. During his journey the protagonist encounters groups of chained prisoners, and there are clear parallels with Don Quijote's encounter with the galley slaves (I.XXII): the traveller approaches them and, upon discovering that they have been taken into the army as slaves, guides them to liberty by his words, in the same way that Don Quijote leads the galley slaves to liberty by his sword.[28] The reader also finds an explicit reference to Don Quijote in the description of the arrival of an officer, when the narrator suggests that, in the cries in the distance, the horses' speed and the moving cloud of dust, 'Don Quijote would have seen here something marvellous' ('Дон-Кишот, конечно, нечто чудесное бы тут увидел').[29]

The end of Catherine's reign at the turn of the nineteenth century did not signify a decline in interest in Western Europe. On the contrary, Yakov Malkiel describes Russia during the first half of the nineteenth century as having reached a 'climax of a mood of hospitality, curiosity, and adaptability' in its relationship with Western culture, and particularly with Spain.[30] Mikhail Alekseev similarly describes the 1840s as the decade during which interest in Spain among Russians was at its height: there was great enthusiasm directed towards Spanish culture and its people, and the influence of Spain on Russian literature and art gained new momentum.[31] Furthermore, many Russians travelled to Spain and shared their experiences, for example the essayist and publisher Vasily Botkin, whose *Letters on Spain* (*Pis'ma ob Ispanii*)

[28] Radishchev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, I, 345.
[29] Ibid., I, 350.
[30] Malkiel, 'Cervantes in Nineteenth-Century Russia', p. 316.
[31] Mikhail Alekseev, 'Turgenev i ispanskie pisateli', *Literaturnyi Kritik*, 11 (1938), 136–44 (p. 136).

is one of his most famous works,[32] and the composer Mikhail Glinka, who incorporated Spanish themes into a number of compositions. Ballets, operas and theatre productions on Spanish subjects were by now commonplace, and Spanish books continued to be read. But there was one major development: Russian Hispanophilism was now 'no longer a mere echo of European trends'.[33] The French, German and even the few Russian translations that existed of these texts were no longer sufficient, and the demand to be able to understand and speak Spanish (no longer simply the vocation of philologists, but now also a frequent desire among the *literati*) led to the appearance of the first Spanish grammar in 1811 by Yakov Langen, with one by I. Rut following in 1840.[34]

In addition to heightened curiosity about Spain and the prominence of travel memoirs, there are also several literary factors which contributed to Russia's interest in Cervantes reaching its peak during the nineteenth century. The first of these was Vasily Zhukovsky's translation of the *Quixote*, with three editions published between 1804 and 1820. Given his reputation as a talented poet and translator, his translation was immediately warmly received and made the *Quixote* more widely accessible.[35] The second factor was the shifts that occurred in Russian reading culture. The 1830s saw the 'decline of the aristocratic hegemony over the written word', which had until this point been centred almost entirely on poetry, as well as a 'change from an oral to written culture' outside of this demographic.[36] These two factors, together with the commercialisation of literature, saw the two formerly distinct readerships combine, as John Garrard describes it, into 'a single, more homogenous audience', whose interests were veering away from poetry towards prose.[37] The third was the rise of Russian

[32] For Gogol''s comments on Botkin's travel letters, see pp. 82–83.
[33] Alekseev, 'Turgenev i ispanskie pisateli', p. 136.
[34] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 11–12.
[35] For more on Zhukovsky's translation of the *Quixote*, see pp. 18–20.
[36] John Garrard, 'Introduction: The Rise of the Novel in Russia', in *The Russian Novel from Pushkin to Pasternak*, ed. by John Garrard (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 1–29 (p. 13).
[37] Ibid., p. 14.

Romanticism, a literary and philosophical movement (of which Zhukovsky was a proponent) whose advocates sought the development of a national prose literature and turned to Western sources for inspiration.

The Romantics were drawn to Spain because of its reputation as an exotic 'other' situated on the opposite European periphery: little was known about it, and it therefore inspired curiosity. They were drawn to Cervantes, meanwhile, because some Russian intellectuals were beginning to seek a national literature which encompassed the ideas of 'национальность'[38] and 'народность',[39] which they found in the *Quixote*. They revered the author for his creative genius and national spirit, and viewed his novel not as a satire on the romances of chivalry, but as a satire of life. They transformed Don Quijote from a mad knight errant into a hero whose nobility of soul, unwavering devotion to his ideal and dedication to his country elevated him to the status of myth. But while the German Romantics 'rejected earlier views of the knight as a ridiculous fool or a mere object of satire',[40] the Russian Romantics, rather than refuting his comical aspect, instead ennobled it. This is suggested in the journalist Prince Pyotr Vyazemsky's comment that 'although Don Quijote may be comical, he is first and foremost chivalrously noble' ('Дон Кихот может быть смешон, но прежде всего он рыцарски-благороден').[41] While contemporary authors like Pushkin, Zhukovsky and Belinsky held similar views, they were not shared by everyone, particularly towards the middle of the century. Many writers continued to acknowledge, to a greater or lesser extent, the folly behind Don Quijote's behaviour, and were even critical of him, such as Gogol'. While his negative view can be considered to hearken back to Enlightenment perceptions of Don Quijote as little more

[38] National'nost': nationality, but more broadly the idea of national identity.
[39] Narodnost': nationhood and folk identity, native people and national character.
[40] Eric Ziolkowski, *The Sanctification of Don Quixote* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), p. 98. See also Anthony J. Close, *The Romantic Approach to Don Quixote: A Critical History of the Romantic Tradition in Quixote Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 29–41.
[41] Petr Andreevich Viazemskii, 'Staraia zapisnaia knizhka', in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii kniazia P. A. Viazemskogo v 12 tomakh*, 12 vols (St Petersburg: Izd. grafa S. D. Sheremeteva, 1878–96), VIII, 223.

than a fool or eccentric, his work can also be considered to mark the transition from the Romantic to the Realist period in Russian literature and thought, appearing at a time when responses to the knight errant were far more varied, and some not at all complimentary.

The two literary movements are distinguished, according to Victor Terras, by the former's 'preoccupation with the extraordinary individual' and the latter's 'interest in the concerns of ordinary men and women, in social problems and in the life of the lower classes'.[42] There is one other key difference: while writers like Pushkin and Gogol' experimented with and sowed the seeds for the Russian prose tradition during the Romantic period, it was the Realist writers like Turgenev, Goncharov, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy who truly established the Russian novel tradition. Perceptions of the *Quixote* also shifted: the Romantics' dual focus on Don Quijote's nobility and heroism and Cervantes' creative genius and literary success tended to be replaced by the Realists' focus on the nature of the protagonist and, more frequently, his socio-political function.

Among the Realist writers Goncharov is perhaps unique in focusing on Don Quijote from a literary, rather than socio-political, perspective. Echoing Pushkin and Gogol''s comments in the 1830s and 40s,[43] he comments on the great influence of Cervantes' hero, as well as of many other literary types, on world literature: 'Don Quijote, King Lear, Hamlet, Lady Macbeth, Falstaff, Don Juan, Tartuffe and others have already given rise, in the works of the latest talents, to whole interrelated generations of affinities' ('Дон Кихот, Лир, Гамлет, леди Макбет, Фальстаф, Дон Жуан, Тартюф и другие уже породили, в созданиях позднейших талантов, целые родственные поколения подобий').[44] He expands his discussion by suggesting that the success of Don Quijote, as well as of King Lear, is not because

[42] Victor Terras, 'The Realist Tradition', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Classic Russian Novel*, ed. by Malcolm V. Jones and Robin Feuer Miller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 190–209 (p. 190).
[43] See Chapters 1 and 2 of this study.
[44] Ivan Goncharov, 'Luchshe pozdno chem nikoga', in *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by A. Rybasov, 8 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1952–1955), VIII, 64–114 (p. 104).

they are 'portraits of eccentrics' ('портреты чудаков'), but rather because they are 'types, that is, mirrors that reflect countless affinities from human society of the past, present and future' ('типы, то есть зеркала, отражающие в себе бесчисленные подобия—в старом, новом и будущем человеческом обществе').[45]

Given that Goncharov is known primarily as a novelist, it is perhaps to be expected that his considerations of the *Quixote* should follow a literary vein. Socio-political interpretations were, however, becoming increasingly common in the essays of writers and thinkers of various ideologies, who, as can be glimpsed in Gogol' before them, drew upon Cervantes' hero, often in a critical way, to support their own ideological arguments. Westernisers (liberals who believed that Russia should look to Europe in order to progress as a nation) were particularly fond of comparing Slavophiles (conservatives who believed that Russia should adhere to its own values and traditions in order to advance) to Don Quijote for their unwavering and, according to the Westernisers, ill-founded adherence to past traditions. This is apparent in the radical Russian writer Dmitry Pisarev's comment that 'Slavophilism is Russian Don Quixotism' ('Славянофильство есть русское дон-кихотство') and his comparison of the beliefs of the Slavophiles with Don Quijote's inability to discern reality from fiction: 'where there stand windmills, the Slavophiles see armed giants' ('где стоят ветряные мельницы, там славянофилы видят вооруженных богатырей').[46] The term was also used to describe their fellow radicals. Alexander Herzen frequently referred to the participants of the 1848 French Revolution as Don Quijotes: in a letter of 1851 to Alexander Chumikov, he commented that 'the Don Quijote of revolutionary circles is worthy of his knightly predecessor' ('Дон Кихот революционных кругов стоит своего рыцарственного предшественника').[47] He criticised

[45] Goncharov, 'Luchshe pozdno chem nikoga', in *Sobranie sochinenii*, VIII, 108.
[46] D. I. Pisarev, 'Russkii Don-Kikhot', in *Sochineniia D. I. Pisareva: polnoe sobranie v shesti tomakh*, 6 vols (St Petersburg: F. Pavlenkov, 1901), II, 217–38 (p. 238).
[47] Letter of 9 August 1851 to Alexander Chumikov, in Alexandr Herzen, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*, ed. by M. K. Lemke, 22 vols (St Petersburg: Gos. izd-vo, 1919), VI, 29.

them not for their optimism, but rather for their antiquatedness, inability to adapt to new trends, and general mismanagement of the Revolution. His comparison between Don Quijote and the 1848 Revolutionaries would be embodied in Turgenev's Rudin (*Rudin*, 1856), who likens himself to Cervantes' hero before meeting his death on the barricades in Paris. The critic and nihilist Nikolai Dobrolyubov's 1860 comment about Turgenev's *On the Eve* (*Nakanune*, 1860) is an extension of this idea: he compares the novel's protagonist, Insarov, with contemporary Russian idealists, whom he describes as 'comical Don Quijotes' ('смешные Дон-Кихоты') who do not understand the true purpose of the war they wage.[48]

Somewhat surprisingly, despite the overall criticism directed towards Don Quijote, a number of nihilists in fact admired the *Quixote* and its hero. Nikolai Chernyshevsky, for example, explains in an early diary entry:

> I have read all of *Don Quixote*; it is very good, although it is Chaplet's translation. It is rather clever; everything that he says, even about chivalry, is excellent, but only here does he not quite grasp the circumstances.
>
> Читал всё Дон-Кихота,—весьма хорошо, хоть это перевод Чаплета,—весьма умно, и Дон-Кихот говорит преумно, превосходно все, что он говорит и даже о рыцарстве, но только здесь он не разбирает обстоятельств.[49]

Even more surprising, and rather paradoxical, is the fact that the nihilists' steadfast belief in the importance of Western customs and scientific materialism, based around Darwin's *Origin of Species*, can also, as Ludmilla Turkevich points out, be compared to Don Quijote's devotion to making Spain a better place through his own literary idealism.[50] In this light it becomes less surprising that Turgenev's most famous nihilist character, Bazarov in *Fathers and Sons* (*Ottsy*

[48] N. A. Dobroliubov, 'Kogda zhe pridet nastoiashchii den', in *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by D. B. Bursov and others, 9 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1961–64), VI, 96–140 (pp. 125–26).
[49] N. G. Chernyshevskii, diary entry of 11 October 1848, in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by B. P. Koz'min and others, 16 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1947–53), I, 147.
[50] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 79.

i deti, 1862), should have been compared so often to Cervantes' protagonist.[51] Although this would, for the most part, have been considered a slight on Bazarov and the nihilists he was intended to represent, the liberal Turgenev was probably not overly offended by this comparison, nor indeed by those of his other characters to Don Quijote: in his speech, *Hamlet and Don Quixote* (*Gamlet i Don Kikhot*, 1860), he praises the knight errant for his altruism, his desire for action over idleness, and his unwavering devotion to his ideal. Turgenev thus betrays his Romantic perception of Don Quijote, a somewhat unexpected approach for a liberal writer in the second half of the century. His view was not unique, however, and was shared, again rather paradoxically, by his literary and ideological rival, the novelist and fervent Slavophile Dostoevsky. The great disparity in perceptions of Don Quijote, which range from Romantic hero through to incompetent fool, would remain the norm among readers and writers until the end of the nineteenth century.

Translations and Adaptations

Cervantes and his works first became known in Russia through French and German translations. The rising popularity of the *Quixote* from the late eighteenth century onwards is visible in the sudden appearance and density of Russian translations, usually via a French intermediary, within a short period of time. According to E. Lyubimova, between 1769 and 1831, thirty-two different editions of the *Quixote* had been published in Russia.[52] The early renderings are more akin to adaptations of the novel than accurate translations, since they feature a number of omissions, abridgements and stylistic deviations, and are often incomplete. Nevertheless, they enabled Cervantes' works to reach a wider, albeit still upper-class

[51] For discussion of comparisons between Bazarov and Don Quijote, see pp. 171–72.
[52] Liubimova, 'Servantes i Turgenev', p. 181.

readership, and were thus instrumental in the dissemination of the story of Don Quijote and his adventures around Russia.

The first two of these translations appeared during the reign of Catherine the Great. The first was by Ignaty Teils, a professor of German, in 1769. He used Filleau de Saint Martin's French translation as his intermediary, and only translated the first 27 chapters, omitting the two spurious parts affixed to the end of the French version. It is heavily abridged and incomplete, which Gratchev suggests was due to Teils' self-funding of the publication of his translation.[53] Furthermore, instead of capturing the Spanish spirit, Teils was more eager to retain the 'French taste': 'I believed that a translation must always conserve some scent of its original, and that it is too large an undertaking to move entirely away from the spirit of the author.'[54] In this case, the 'original' is the French intermediary. The second translation of the *Quixote* was made by the poet, writer and government official Nikolai Osipov in 1791, with an updated version appearing in 1812. Although slightly longer and more complete than Teils' 1769 work, it shares a number of the shortcomings found in its predecessor, including abridgements, incompleteness, and fidelity to the French intermediary resulting in translation errors. Turkevich suggests that Osipov also used the de Saint Martin translation for his work, and observes that 'in accommodating the original to the French spirit, [the translator] destroyed much of the Spanish colour and charm of the *Quixote*'.[55] Despite a number of errors, abridgements and Gallicisms, these first two translations are significant for their introduction of the *Quixote* to the eighteenth-century Russian readership.

The third translation of the *Quixote* was created by Zhukovsky, a prolific poet who also translated widely from French and German into Russian. He began to translate the *Quixote* in 1803 when he was twenty-one, and between 1804 and 1806 six volumes of his work were

[53] Slav N. Gratchev, *The Polyphonic World of Cervantes and Dostoevsky* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2017), p. xiv.
[54] The original has been unavailable. See Bagno, *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*, p. 24.
[55] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 12.

published.[56] Departing from the previous *Quixote* translators, he chose the Florian translation as his intermediary for no reasons other than his fondness for the Frenchman and the popularity of this translation throughout Europe. Florian's version was, however, somewhat different to the original: the Frenchman believed that 'fidelity to the original should be sacrificed to the creation of a pleasing impression in the translation', and focused on 'the smoothness and purity of language', even if it meant altering or even discarding certain elements. Zhukovsky followed and expanded Florian's theory of translation, adapting and cutting the French intermediary work even more than Florian did the Spanish original. As a result, 'little of the Cervantes spirit is retained in the Florian translation; none remains in Zhukovsky's work'.[57] Zhukovsky understood, however, that his Russian translation had digressed significantly from the original, vocalising his awareness of his work's shortcomings in a letter of 1809 to Alexander Turgenev: 'Je sens trop fort ma misère. Let them say: he has translated *Don Quixote*, but not a word about *how* he translated it' ('Пусть скажут: он перевел «Дон-Кихота», но *как* перевел ни слова').[58] To make up for the flaws in his first rendition, he published a second, revised edition in 1815, and a third in 1820. Despite the digressions, abridgements and omissions which remained in these later editions, Zhukovsky's poetic and literary skill enabled him to create a very readable translation which successfully conveyed the principal ideas in the *Quixote* and soon became the definitive Russian version of the novel in the first half of the nineteenth century.[59] The significance of the translation extends beyond the mere popularisation of the *Quixote* for the Russian reader: Zhukovsky's Romantic approach to Cervantes' novel and its hero helped to shift common perceptions away from the Enlightenment view (the *Quixote* as a

[56] Bagno, *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*, p. 32.
[57] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 13.
[58] Letter of 15 September 1809 to Alexander Turgenev, in V. A. Zhukovskii, *Sobranie sochinenii v chetyrekh tomakh*, 4 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1959-1960), IV, 466.
[59] Ernesto Caballero, *Don Quijote ante el mundo* (Puerto Rico: Inter American University Press, 1979), p. 53.

funny book about a comical madman) towards a Romantic one (the *Quixote* as a serious book about a noble hero).

The 1830s saw two new translations of the *Quixote* into Russian. The first of these, by Count Samuel de Chaplet, an engineer and translator of French and English works into Russian, was published in 1831 in six volumes. Like its predecessors, it was also undertaken via a French translation, but the specific intermediary is unknown.[60] The second is of greater significance as it was the first Russian version to have been translated directly from the Spanish. It was created by Konstantin Masal'sky, a Hispanist, author and writer, in 1838, with a second edition released in 1848. Although incomplete, only covering around the first half of the first part of the *Quixote*, and although rendered rather literally with a few mistranslations, omissions and variations, it was nevertheless the most faithful Russian translation of the novel available at the time. The decade also saw the publication of a significant new French translation of the *Quixote* by Louis Viardot in 1836–37. Despite not being written in Russian, it is mentioned here because it was well known by Turgenev and Dostoevsky, with the latter praising it as 'excellent' ('превосходный') (XXI: 68). This is no exaggeration: it is indeed a very well written and faithful rendering of Cervantes' novel. He followed its success with a translation of Cervantes' *Exemplary Tales*, published in 1838.

The first complete translation of the *Quixote* into Russian (with the exception of the prologue and dedications) was by Vladimir Karelin in 1866. Although Karelin claims that he translated the novel directly from Spanish, Turkevich suggests that a French intermediary was used instead, given the gallicisation of proper names. The translator also included a short biography of Cervantes; however, it is riddled with errors and creative liberties. Despite some omissions, grammatical mistakes, and moments where the original meaning has been misunderstood, it is nevertheless written in an 'excellent style' and 'conveys much of the charm

[60] V. G. Belinskii, 'Velikolepnoe izdanie "Don Kikhota"', in *Sobranie sochinenii*, II, 305–06 (p. 305).

and flavour of the *Quixote*'.[61] The success of the translation led to two further editions: one in 1873, and another in 1881. Although a new translation of Cervantes' novel appeared in 1883 by an unknown translator,[62] the completeness and general accuracy of Karelin's version (particularly in comparison to its predecessors) meant that it quickly became the standard translation of the *Quixote* in the second half of the nineteenth century, and remained so until new translations emerged in the twentieth.

The nineteenth century also saw a great number of adaptations of Western literary classics in order to make them more accessible to children. The first and most popular children's adaptation of the *Quixote* was by Aleksey Grech, the son of the prolific writer and journalist Nikolai Grech. Adapted from Abbott Le Jeune's French version, it was originally published in 1846 with revised editions in 1860, 1868 and 1880.[63] According to Bagno, the adaptation of literature for children's consumption was shaped predominantly by the removal of love interests or sexual intrigue. Although this is already relatively scarce in the *Quixote* due to the protagonist's chastity and unwavering fidelity to Dulcinea, Grech went further by removing certain major characters (and, therefore, parts of the plot) from his adaptation: there is no Cardenio-Fernando-Dorotea-Luscinda love-square, no Maritornes, no Altisidora, and there is no mention even of Dulcinea.[64] Grech's children's adaptation was joined by several others in the nineteenth century, including those by L'vov (1867), Gernet (1874), Filonov (1875), Rogova (1883), and Andreyevskaya (1896).[65] Given that adaptations of literary texts for children in Russia was 'usually reserved for native masterpieces',[66] the great appeal of

[61] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 66–67.
[62] Little is known about this 1883 work: it was edited by an M. Chistyakov, consisted only of 354 pages (which suggests it was an abbreviated version), and had undergone five editions between its original publication and 1914. See Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 67–68.
[63] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 70–71, 231; Bagno, *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*, p. 52.
[64] Bagno, *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*, p. 125.
[65] All adaptations, other than that of Andreyevskaya, are listed in Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 71, 234–36.
[66] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 222–23.

Cervantes' novel throughout the nineteenth century, among children and adults, is thus made apparent.

Although the *Quixote* is unquestionably Cervantes' most famous work both in Russia and around the world today, it was not the first of his works to be translated into Russian. Even before Teils' 1769 translation of the *Quixote,* Russian readers would have been familiar with two of Cervantes' *Exemplary Tales*: 'The Two Damsels' ('Las dos doncellas'), whose translator is unknown, was first published in 1763 with a second edition in 1769;[67] and 'The Power of Blood' ('La fuerza de la sangre'), translated from the French by Pavel Fonvizin, the younger brother of the playwright Denis Fonvizin, in 1764.[68] For the next three decades no other *Stories* were translated into Russian, until a new adaptation of 'The Power of Blood', translated by Pavel L'vov, using Florian's French version as an intermediary, appeared in 1794. This was followed in 1795 by a translation of 'The Little Gypsy Girl' ('La gitanilla'), a rare edition published in Smolensk, also undertaken via the French.[69] The first complete collection of the *Exemplary Tales* in Russian translation was undertaken by Fyodor Kabrit and appeared in 1805. Translations of individual stories continued throughout the nineteenth century: in the first half there appeared new versions of 'The Power of Blood' in 1839 and 'The Little Gypsy Girl' in 1842, while the latter half saw Alexander Kirpichnikov's translation of 'The Lady Cornelia' ('La señora Cornelia') in 1872, and 'Rinconete and Cortadillo' ('Rinconete y Cortadillo') by an anonymous translator, and 'The Jealous Man from Extremadura' ('El celoso extremeño') by Glivenko, both in 1892.[70]

[67] Although the *Quixote* had not yet appeared in Russian at the time of the publication of the translations of 'The Two Damsels', it was still known to the reader, as the subheading to the story—'A Spanish tale by Miguel de Cervantes, author of Don Quixote' ('Гишпанская повесть Мих. Цервантеса Сааведры, авктора Дон Кишота')—confirms. See O. M. Buranok, 'Russkii Servantes: nachalo osvoeniia', *Zdanie. Ponimanie. Umenie*, 2 (2006), 177–80 (p. 179, n. 2).
[68] Buranok, 'Russkii Servantes', p. 177.
[69] Ibid., p. 177; Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 245.
[70] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 14, 245.

Although not quite as popular as the *Quixote* or the *Exemplary Tales*, a number of Cervantes' other works were also translated and accessible to the Russian reader. Towards the end of the eighteenth century Cervantes' pastoral novel, *La Galatea*, written predominantly in prose but which features many sections in verse, was published in two different translations in 1790 and 1799, its popularity correlating with the sentimental tastes of the Russian aristocratic audience of the time. Almost a century later Cervantes' theatrical *Interludes* (*Entremeses*) were translated by the playwright Alexander Ostrovsky in 1879. Considering his translations to be not quite up to his usual standard of writing, he refused to present them to the actor Fyodor Burdin to be performed and made excuses to avoid their publication.[71] They eventually appeared individually in *Elegant Literature* (*Izyashchnaya literatura*)[72] in 1883, but the journal was discontinued before their publication was complete. With the exception of 'The Widower Bully' ('El rufián viudo'), all were finally published in a completed edition in 1886.[73]

An awareness of the translations available to nineteenth-century Russian writers is important in order to gauge which of Cervantes' texts would have been available, and therefore probably known, to the writers examined in this thesis. The above analysis not only confirms the existence of translations of the *Quixote* in Russia, but also demonstrates that interest in the novel began to develop in earnest from the 1820s onwards due to the wider accessibility of translations, particularly those of Zhukovsky and Masal'sky. This in turn strongly suggests that nineteenth-century writers like Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky would have at least been familiar with the *Quixote*, even if they had not read it in its entirety. It also illustrates that the *Quixote* was not unique among Cervantes' texts available in Russia, and shows the readers' interest particularly in the *Exemplary Tales* in the latter half of the eighteenth and the first half

[71] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 16, 68.
[72] Also often translated into English as *The Journal of Belles-Lettres*.
[73] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 68–70, 247–48.

of the nineteenth century, a phenomenon examined in further detail in the chapters on Pushkin and Gogol'.

Methodology and Approach

The main aim of this study is to explore how Cervantes contributed to the development of the nineteenth-century Russian novel tradition by examining the responses to him and his fiction in the works of Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky. In order to paint a comprehensive picture of Cervantes' reception in Russia, this thesis will take into account the authors' entire *oeuvres* while focusing on the texts most pertinent to the study. The primary approach will consist of intertextual analysis of the writers' narrative, fictional works: short stories, long poems and novels. Paraliterary sources, such as correspondence, essays, articles, notes and translations, will also be examined in order to provide further context for each Russian author's responses to Cervantes.

This project's approach to intertextual analysis is twofold. Firstly, it re-evaluates—sometimes strengthening, sometimes repudiating—previous, usually isolated observations in comparative scholarship, such as the similarities between the *Quixote* and Gogol''s *Dead Souls* (*Mertvye dushi*, 1842) or Dostoevsky's *The Idiot* (*Idiot*, 1868–69). Secondly, it offers a new range of insights on other texts which have not hitherto been examined with any comprehensiveness, such as Pushkin's *The Gypsies* (*Tsygany*, 1824), *Tales of Belkin (Povesti pokoinogo Ivana Petrovicha Belkina*, 1836) and *A History of the Village of Goryukhino* (*Istoriya sela Goryukhina*, 1830),[74] and *Evgeny Onegin* (1833); Gogol''s 'Diary of a Madman' ('Zapiski sumasshedshego', 1836); Turgenev's *Hamlet and Don Quixote* and *Rudin*; and Dostoevsky's *Diary of a Writer*, particularly his essay 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie'.

[74] The work was written in 1830 but only published posthumously in 1837.

Although the main approach of this study is to examine, where possible, direct allusions and references, the wider literary tradition that Cervantes created will also be considered. Victor Shklovsky defines literary tradition as not 'one writer's dependence on another', but rather 'his dependence on some sort of communal warehouse of literary norms'.[75] While the idea of literary tradition can be applied to any work or genre, it can, in the case of Cervantes, be defined further. Harry Levin, in tune with Shklovsky's theory, suggests that 'what should concern us rather more centrally is not so much the direct line of Cervantes' impact as the basic process he discovered and its wider employment', an idea he calls the 'quixotic principle', whose underlying premise is the finely interwoven nature of people and literature, or the discrepancy between fiction and reality.[76] Howard Mancing, meanwhile, examines the tradition of the 'quixotic novel', which he defines broadly as 'any novel that bears some degree of intertextual relationship to the *Quixote*,' and more specifically as one 'that involves a character who has some of those qualities we associate with Don Quixote and/or displays an innovative, postmodern, narrative self-awareness that places a work in juxtaposition to Cervantes'.[77] Pedro Javier Pardo instead chooses to focus on the tradition of the 'quixotic pattern', which consists in submerging a character's 'romantic worldview in an anti-romantic or realistic world' for comic effect.[78] Such theories are particularly applicable to Russian writers in the first half of the nineteenth century, such as Pushkin and Gogol', when the novel tradition was still in an embryonic stage and writers were looking broadly at other literary traditions for inspiration. Furthermore, rather than detracting from the analysis of direct allusions and references, consideration of literary tradition and its 'quixotic' variations instead sheds an alternative but

[75] Viktor Shklovskii, 'Paralleli u Tolstogo', in *Khod konia* (Moscow-Berlin: Gelikon, 1923), pp. 115–25 (p. 122). Translated in Emily Finer, 'Eugene Onegin (Pushkin and Sterne): Translated from the Russian by Emily Finer', *Comparative Critical Studies*, 1.1–2 (2004), 171–93 (p. 172).
[76] Levin, *Grounds for Comparison*, p. 235.
[77] Howard Mancing, 'Don Quixote: Coming to America', in *Cervantes y su mundo*, ed. by Kurt Reichenberger and A. Robert Lauer, 6 vols (Kassel: Reichenberger, 2005), III, 397–418 (p. 397).
[78] Pedro Javier Pardo, 'Tobias Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* and the Cervantine Tradition in Eighteenth-Century England', in *Cervantes in the English Speaking World: New Essays*, ed. by Darío Fernández-Morera and Michael Hanke (Kassel: Reichenberger, 2005), pp. 81–106 (p. 92).

no less illuminating light on the impact of Cervantes on the development of the Russian novel tradition.

Literature Review

To date there does not exist a study that comprehensively traces the impact of Cervantes on the development of the nineteenth-century Russian novel tradition. Of the more extensive studies undertaken on the reception of Cervantes in Russia, the more revealing are the monographs by Turkevich and Bagno, and Bruce Holl's unpublished PhD dissertation.[79] Although by no means comprehensive guides to the reception of Cervantes in Russia, with their varying levels of evidence and discussion, they nevertheless provide a useful starting point for English, Russian and Spanish readers interested in the topic.

Turkevich's *Cervantes in Russia* was the first major study undertaken into the reception of Cervantes in Russia. Her approach to her overview of the influence of Spanish culture in general and of Cervantes more specifically on Russian cultural and intellectual life from the mid-eighteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries comes predominantly in the form of enumeration: she lists the various histories, plays, operas, ballets and literary texts that were in some way inspired by Spain and/or Cervantes, as well as the various references made by intellectuals to Cervantes and the *Quixote*. However, while the introduction contains an overabundance of references, the content chapters (dedicated to specific writers such as Radishchev, Odoevsky, Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev, Dostoevsky and Ostrovsky) fail to cite a significant number of the references and allusions pertinent for comparative study, and there is little discussion of the few that are mentioned. Although the work can be considered somewhat unbalanced, it nevertheless succeeds in clearly showcasing for the first time Russia's

[79] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*; Bagno, *Dorogami 'Don Kikhota'* and *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*; Bruce T. Holl, '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel: A Comparative Analysis', (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1992).

developing interest in Spanish culture, while at the same time inadvertently highlighting the need for further study.[80]

Bagno's monographs are similar to that of Turkevich: he also turns his attention to a variety of references and examples that demonstrate the presence of Cervantes' influence on Russian culture, but he does not offer much analysis of what they mean in terms of an author's reception of Cervantes or of the Spaniard's contribution to the development of Russian literature. His *Dorogami 'Don Kikhota'* offers one of the first more mainstream Russian expositions of the world of Cervantes: the first part contains a general study of the *Quixote*, while the second and third parts examine its trajectory through the rest of Europe and Russia, respectively. In the latter two sections references are particularly abundant, with less focus on discussion or analysis. In his *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*, meanwhile, he focuses on many of the same ideas found in his previous monograph's section on the impact of Cervantes on Russian culture and literature. Given that this work is targeted at a Spanish audience, the most developed discussion in the work is on Dostoevsky, with whom the reader would be most familiar. Although both Turkevich and Bagno opted for breadth rather than specificity, the main difference between their works is the former writer's insistence on Cervantes' influence on Russian culture, in contrast to the latter's theory of literary 'scaffolding', whereby a text exerts a strong influence in the early stages of the creation of another literary work, but usually ends up being little more than an afterthought once the work is complete.[81]

---

[80] Turkevich's monograph, which appeared in 1950, inspired two significant academic responses in the following year. In his journal article Pujals essentially summarises Turkevich's study, mentioning the same vestiges of Cervantes' influence from the Romantic up to the Soviet period, but without adding any further insights. Malkiel's article, meanwhile, is a critical response to her monograph. Unlike Pujals, he embellishes the cultural history of Cervantes in Russia with further information, and does not take all of Turkevich's arguments for granted. Furthermore, not only does he not approve of the wealth of unaddressed references, but he is particularly critical of the zeal with which she attempts to prove the scale of Cervantes' influence on Russian culture. See Esteban Pujals, 'Proyección de Cervantes en la literatura rusa', *Revista nacional de educación*, 11.101 (1951), 22–37; Malkiel, 'Cervantes in Nineteenth-Century Russia', pp. 310–29.

[81] Bagno, *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*, p. 56; Bagno, *Dorogami 'Don Kikhota'*, p. 357. The idea is also repeated, verbatim, in his article 'El Quijote en los borradores de "El Idiota" de Dostoievski', *Anales Cervantinos*, 32 (1994), 265–70 (p. 265).

In his PhD dissertation Holl makes clear his awareness of the shortcomings of Turkevich's and Bagno's respective works. He comments that they were incorrect 'in mentioning one author after another without demonstrating how and, more important[ly], why a given author incorporates Don Quixote in his text', and endeavours instead to provide a 'detailed analysis of the Spanish novel's impact on those authors who have used it the most extensively'.[82] To support his aim, Holl deviates from his scholarly predecessors by opting for specificity as opposed to breadth. However, by focusing on the influence of just the *Quixote*, he overlooks the value placed by early nineteenth-century Russian writers on the *Exemplary Tales* and on Cervantes' own creative genius, and how these different perceptions contributed to the development of the Russian novel. Furthermore, by concentrating on select novelistic works—Pushkin's *Evgeny Onegin*, Gogol''s *Dead Souls*, Turgenev's *Rudin*, Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*, Fyodor Sologub's *The Petty Demon* (*Melky bes*, 1907) and Andrey Platonov's *Chevengur* (1926–30)[83]—he omits a number of pertinent references and allusions in his chosen authors' other fiction and non-fiction, and is therefore unable to paint a comprehensive picture, not only of each author's individual reception of Cervantes in particular, but consequently also of his impact on the Russian prose tradition in general. Holl's discussion of the reception of the *Quixote* in each of the Russian texts is, nevertheless, persuasive. However, in endeavouring to differentiate his thesis through its specificity, his work is also somewhat unbalanced, and leaves just as many questions unanswered (albeit different ones) as Turkevich's and Bagno's monographs.

The twenty-first century has thus far witnessed a rise in studies tracing Cervantes' influence throughout world literature, and in some of these the reader can find glimpses of the reception of the *Quixote* in Russia. In their monograph Manuel Durán and Fay Rogg, like

[82] Holl, '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel', pp. 1, 10.
[83] Although written between 1926 and 1930, Platonov's *Chevengur* was only published in the USSR in 1988.

Bagno, provide an overview of Cervantes' novel before offering abbreviated guides to its influence on English, French, Spanish, American and Russian literature. They touch upon Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky, but perhaps most interestingly mention briefly the quixotic natures of two characters in Lev Tolstoy's *War and Peace* (*Voina i mir*, 1867): they cite Prince Andrey's zeal for military reform, and Pierre Bezukhov's naïveté, the ease with which he is influenced, and his desire to change the world for the better.[84] A similarly brief analysis can be found in Jean Canavaggio's monograph. Although the work is predominantly a study of the character of Don Quijote, Canavaggio extends his observations of the protagonist towards his position as a source of inspiration for subsequent world literature in England, France and Russia, and in so doing provides, like Durán and Rogg, brief summaries of the reception of the *Quixote* by Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky.[85]

In addition to the chapters on specific authors found in Turkevich, Bagno and Holl, a number of individual articles and chapters also exist on the reception of Cervantes by one or another Russian author. Jack Weiner and Evelynne Meyerson's article offers perhaps the most innovative insights on Pushkin: it covers Pushkin's general familiarity with Spanish works and his introduction of Spanish themes into his own writing, before discussing his translation exercises of Cervantes, 'The Little Gypsy Girl' ('La gitanilla'), and providing a brief comparative analysis of Cervantes' and Pushkin's use of the theme of gypsy life in the former's exemplary tale and the latter's narrative poem *The Gypsies*.[86] Olga Prjevalinsky Ferrer's article on Gogol', meanwhile, despite offering one of the more complete introductions to Gogol''s relationship with Spanish culture, omits many important considerations: she enumerates a good number of Gogol''s references to Cervantes, but the list is not complete; she poses the question of the language in which Gogol' read the *Quixote*, but she does not answer it, nor does she

[84] Durán and Rogg, *Fighting Windmills*, pp. 182–84.
[85] Canavaggio, *Don Quijote, del libro al mito*.
[86] Jack Weiner and Evelynne Meyerson, '*La Gitanilla* de Cervantes y *Tsigane* de Pushkin', *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 17.1–2 (1963–64), 82–87.

consider the possibility that he had not in fact read it, at least not in its entirety; she discusses his anecdotes of his (in fact apocryphal) trip to Spain, but she seems to be unfamiliar with Gogol''s tendency towards exaggeration and invention; and finally, although she raises the connection between *Dead Souls* and the *Quixote*, intertextual analysis is left wanting.[87] While it is not quite as innovative or conscientious as Weiner and Meyerson's article, Prjevalinsky Ferrer's study nevertheless offers a basic introduction to the reception of Cervantes by Gogol'.

Given the evident significance of Turgenev's general Westernism and more specific Hispanophilism, there should be little surprise that there exist more isolated studies addressing his relationship with Spanish culture. T. Bron', in his chapter article, focuses on Turgenev's fondness for Spanish culture through language: he touches on the writer's study of Spanish, enumerates a number of the Spanish phrases that appear throughout his correspondence, and refers to his desire to undertake a translation of the *Quixote*.[88] I. Rosenkranz similarly focuses on Turgenev's Spanish references and offers some basic discussion of Turgenev's responses to Calderón and Cervantes.[89] Lyubimova's chapter article is one of the most comprehensive for comparative Cervantes-Turgenev scholarship. She opens her chapter by providing a contextual overview of the rising interest in the *Quixote* during the first half of the nineteenth century in Russia, before looking at several of Turgenev's references to Cervantes. She then goes on to offer intertextual analysis between the *Quixote*, Turgenev's *Rudin* and certain episodes from his *Sportsman's Sketches* (*Zapiski okhotnika*, 1852), before discussing in quite some detail the writer's view of Don Quijote, which becomes apparent in his speech *Hamlet and Don Quixote*.[90]

---

[87] Olga Prjevalinsky Ferrer, 'Las almas muertas de Gogol y Don Quijote', *Cuadernos de literatura (Revista general de las letras)*, 8 (1950), 201–14.
[88] T. I. Bron', 'Ispanskie tsitaty u Turgeneva', in *Turgenevskii sbornik: materialy k polnomu sobraniiu sochinenii i pisem I. S. Turgeneva*, ed. by M. P. Alekseev, 5 vols (Moscow: Nauka, 1964–69), I, 303–12.
[89] I. L. Rosenkranz, 'I. S. Turgenev i ispanskaia literatura', *Slavia: časopis pro slovanskou filologii*, 6 (1927–28), 609–12.
[90] Liubimova, 'Servantes i Turgenev'.

Despite the growing number of articles on Turgenev's responses to Cervantes, comparative scholarship is at its richest when it comes to Dostoevsky, to the point where a quotation, somewhat adapted, from his *Diary of a Writer* serves as the epigraph for Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce's book on Don Quijote, a work which has nothing to do with comparative Russian literature.[91] In his monograph on the 'sanctification' of Don Quijote, Eric Ziolkowski takes a comparative approach to the *Quixote* and looks at the religious incarnations of Cervantes' hero in eighteenth-, nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature.[92] The middle section is solely concerned with Dostoevsky: in the first of the two chapters, the author provides a detailed account of the Romantic view of Don Quijote and how Cervantes' hero came to be viewed as a saintly figure, before his insightful chapter on the religious transformation of the knight errant into Prince Myshkin, the protagonist in Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*. Although the scope of the topic is a narrow one, Ziolkowski offers a detailed and compelling account of the Christ-Quijote-Myshkin relationship. Gratchev, meanwhile, focuses on the *Quixote* and *The Idiot* as 'twin novels' in his monograph, and applies the Bakhtinian theories of heteroglossia and polyphony to them throughout his work.[93] However, rather than a comparison of the two texts under a theoretical framework, the work instead offers individual theoretical discussions of the *Quixote* and *The Idiot*, and the task of comparison is left, for the most part, to the reader. The most significant work on Cervantes and Dostoevsky in the Russian language is by Karen Stepanyan.[94] The approach to his study is multifaceted: it contains not only narrative and stylistic comparison of Cervantes' and Dostoevsky's texts, again with recourse to Bakhtin, but also religious and philosophical considerations. Furthermore, although focus remains on the

[91] Juan Bautisa Avalle-Arce, *Don Quijote como forma de vida* (Madrid: Castalia, 1976), epigraph. The quotation is taken from Dostoevsky's essay, 'Don Carlos and Sir Watkin. Again, Symptoms of "The Beginning of the End"' ('Don Karlos i ser Uatkin. Opyat' priznaki «nachala kontsa»') (XXII: 92). Although a loose translation, it nevertheless conveys the same sense as Dostoevsky.
[92] Ziolkowski, *The Sanctification of Don Quixote*.
[93] Gratchev, *The Polyphonic World of Cervantes and Dostoevsky*.
[94] Karen Stepanian, *Dostoevskii i Servantes: dialog v bol'shom vremeni* (Moscow: Iazyki Slavianskoi Kul'tury, 2013).

Quixote and *The Idiot*, Stepanyan also looks at their other texts, for example in his final chapter on the authors' final works, *Persiles and Sigismunda* (*Persiles y Sigismunda*, 1617) and *The Brothers Karamazov* (*Brat'ya Karamazovy*, 1879–80). The final work that requires some mention is an article by Francisco Maldonado de Guevara.[95] Although significantly predating the above monographs, it is nevertheless an important work in Cervantes-Dostoevsky criticism because it was the first to shift focus away from *The Idiot* and draw scholarly attention to the relationship between the *Quixote* and an obscure essay in Dostoevsky's *Diary of a Writer*, 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie', which opens with the author's creative invention of a scene involving Don Quijote and Sancho. Although the article contains some contentious arguments, which will be discussed in the chapter on Dostoevsky, it is nevertheless significant: it demonstrated for the first time that Dostoevsky's reception of Cervantes is more profound and pervasive than many readers realise, extending beyond his fiction and into his journalistic writing.

Although the primary aim of this thesis is most akin to that of Turkevich, Bagno and Holl, it differs from these works in several ways. The first and most significant divergence lies in the narrowing of the project's scope to the reception of Cervantes by just four canonical nineteenth-century authors, as opposed to a broader range of writers across both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This is done primarily to increase the work's thoroughness. Previous studies—whether the longer monographs which cover a wide range of Russian writers or the shorter articles and chapters which focus on one specific author—have failed to provide a comprehensive overview of their chosen writers' responses to Cervantes and his works: they mention some references and discuss some allusions, but information and/or analysis is always missing. By limiting the number of authors discussed in detail, this thesis is able to consider the writers' entire *oeuvres* and in this way not only compile, but also discuss all the material relevant to their reception of Cervantes in one place for the first time.

[95] Francisco Maldonado de Guevara, 'Dostoievski y el "Quijote"', *Anales Cervantinos*, 2 (1953), 367–75.

The second point of departure is the study's examination of Cervantes' contribution not only to the development of each chosen author's narrative works, but also, by extension, to the development of the Russian novel. While Holl stated his intention 'to demonstrate how the changing use of *Don Quixote* in Russia parallels to some extent changing views of the novel itself',[96] there does not seem to be any indication that he has done so in his work. This is probably due to the unbalanced focus of his study: he looks at the reception of only the *Quixote* in only one major work by six Russian writers across the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In this light, it becomes clear that an exhaustive examination of references, allusions and intertextual affinities across a range of fiction and paraliterary texts is necessary for the nature of Cervantes' contribution to the development of the Russian novel tradition to be revealed. Furthermore, given that the seeds of the Russian prose tradition were sown in the first half of the nineteenth century and became firmly established in the second, examination of twentieth-century responses to Cervantes would thus be beyond the scope of this project.

By taking into consideration the wider *oeuvres* of Cervantes and the chosen Russian writers, each author's complete range of references and allusions to Cervantes and his works, as well as the most significant intertextual affinities, can be discussed, without omitting any relevant information. This study therefore not only provides a comprehensive overview of each author's reception of Cervantes, but in so doing also illuminates a number of trends in nineteenth-century responses and, consequently, in Russian prose developments. These include, for example, Pushkin and Gogol''s focus on Cervantes and his creative genius, rather than on Don Quijote, and their adaptation of formal aspects found in the Spaniard's works (at a time when the Russian novel was still in an embryonic state and genres had no defined boundaries). This is in contrast to Turgenev and Dostoevsky's focus on the character of Don Quijote, rather than on Cervantes' creativity, and their discussion and borrowing, not so much

[96] Holl, '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel', p. 2.

of formal devices, but rather of certain typological aspects found in Cervantes' protagonist (at a time when the Russian novel tradition had, at last, been established). Other trends are less easy to define, however, such as in the authors' interpretations of Don Quijote, which depend as much on contemporary literary and ideological movements as they do on each writer's individual disposition. These borrowings, adaptations and interpretations, and how they are manifested in and contribute to the authors' writing, are touched upon in the content chapters and drawn together in the Conclusion. In this way a comprehensive picture of Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky's reception of Cervantes is finally painted, and his contribution to the development of the Russian novel tradition can be discerned.

1. PUSHKIN AND CERVANTES

Background

Alexander Pushkin is to Russian literature what Cervantes is to Spanish. Both were literary pioneers, developing their literary skills through generic experimentation at the turn of the seventeenth century in Spain and in the early nineteenth century in Russia respectively, times during which the reader's growing demands for prose fiction would have been perceived by both writers. Writing during a period when Russian educated society was steeped in European culture and interest in Spain was reaching its height, there can be little surprise that Pushkin should have turned his attention towards Cervantes, one of the first modern novelists, in the development of his literary, and particularly novelistic, ambitions.

Pushkin's fondness for European culture was visible from an early age and reflects the change in attitude in Russia over the previous centuries, with westernisation at the forefront of Peter the Great's reign and Francophone culture at the heart of that of Catherine the Great. During his youth Pushkin attended the Lycée at Tsarskoe Selo, 'the most progressive educational institution in its day in Russia'. It was here that he was nicknamed 'the Frenchman' for his prowess in the language and his understanding of its literature. He struggled with other subjects, however, managing 'to graduate at the bottom of his class, excelling only in Russian, French and fencing', an early indicator of his passion for languages and literature, as well as his fiery temperament and later fondness for duelling, which led to his death at the age of thirty-seven.[97] In addition to French, he also knew Latin, Greek, English, Italian and, somewhat unusually, had a basic, most likely self-taught, knowledge of Spanish, and was well versed in Spain's history and culture. This might be explained by a general desire to expand his literary

[97] David Bethea and Sergei Davydov, 'Pushkin's Life', in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. by Andrew Kahn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 11–25 (pp. 12–13).

and cultural repertoire; indeed, according to Weiner and Meyerson, he was known as 'the minister of literary relations of his country'.[98]

Pushkin's work most frequently associated with Spanish culture is his tragic play in one act, *The Stone Guest* (*Kamennyi gost'*, 1830). Although it was not directly inspired by Tirso de Molina's *The Trickster of Seville and the Stone Guest* (*El burlador de Sevilla y el convidado de piedra*)—there is no evidence that Pushkin was familiar with Tirso's play—but rather by Mozart's *Don Giovanni* and/or Lord Byron's satirical *Don Juan*, it nevertheless demonstrates his interest in the legend of Don Juan and in the figure of supernatural judgement. Among Pushkin's lyrical poetry, his most famous work which touches on Spanish themes is his lyric poem, *The Night Zephyr* (*Nochnoi zefir*, 1824), set on a Spanish evening by the Guadalquivir. Other works, mainly unfinished, which betray Pushkin's interest in Spanish culture include *The Spanish Romance* (*Ispanskii romans*, 1827), *Before a Noble Spanish Lady* (*Pred ispankoi blagorodnoi*, 1830), *Inesilla, I am here (Ya zdes', Inezil'ya*, 1830*), Alfonso (Al'fons saditsya na konya*, 1836*)* and *Rodrigo (Rodrig*, 1833–35).

Pushkin's library also reflects his hispanophilism. Bagno provides a detailed list of its contents: multilingual texts on Spanish history and literary criticism; Spanish textbooks, grammars and dictionaries; and a number of Spanish literary works, such as *Lazarillo de Tormes* and Gracián's *Criticón*, both in French, and a collection of Calderón's plays and certain texts by Cervantes in Spanish.[99] These consist of three editions of the *Quixote*: one in Spanish, one in English, and one in Russian, translated by Osipov.[100] It is likely that, of the three, Pushkin referred mostly to the Russian text, since the 'pages of the Spanish one are uncut, and neither [the Spanish nor the English] copy bears marginal inscriptions or any other evidence of Pushkin's

[98] Weiner and Meyerson, '*La Gitanilla* de Cervantes y *Tsigane* de Pushkin', p. 82.
[99] Vsevolod Bagno, *Rossiia i Ispaniia: obshchaia granitsa* (St Petersburg: Nauka, 2006), p. 242.
[100] For Osipov's Russian translation, see the editor's note in A. S. Pushkin, *Pis'ma*, ed. by Lev Borisovich Modzalevskii, 3 vols (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1926), I, 272. For the English and Spanish editions, see Holl, '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel', p. 22.

reading'.[101] The library also contains two Spanish editions of the *Exemplary Tales*, the first of which was published in four volumes in Perpignan in 1816 and the other in one volume in Paris in 1835.[102]

While this information supports the notion of Pushkin's familiarity with Spanish literature in general and with Cervantes more specifically, it does not provide a clear idea of the scope of the Spanish writer's influence. The rest of this chapter will aim to demonstrate just how great Pushkin's knowledge and appreciation of Cervantes really was, and how, to what extent, and to what effect the former responded to and adapted the latter's works in the creation of his *oeuvre*. It will also take into consideration the tradition of the *Quixote*, in particular Levin's theory of the quixotic principle, and how these wider influences helped to shape Pushkin's writing.

In Pushkin's *oeuvre*, four main works crossing three different genres will be analysed intertextually alongside those of Cervantes. Comparative analysis of his poem, *The Gypsies*, will expand upon previous research and develop new points of comparison to explore how Pushkin's reception of Cervantes extends beyond the *Quixote* and to the *Exemplary Tales*, namely 'The Little Gypsy Girl'. Discussion of Pushkin's prose fiction works, *Tales of Belkin* and the posthumously published fragments of *A History of the Village of Goryukhino*, will examine similarities in both authors' experimentation with prose devices. This will also be a new scholarly undertaking, as neither text has been discussed in any detail in relation to Cervantes. The final text for discussion will be Pushkin's novel in verse, *Evgeny Onegin*, which will offer both a more comprehensive assessment and *re*assessment of existing scholarship on the echoes of the *Quixote* found in the work, as well as new typological analysis. Discussion will consider not only Pushkin's direct responses to Cervantes, most prominent in *The Gypsies*, but also the broader influence of the *Quixote*'s literary tradition as it appears in the *Tales*, *Goryukhino*, and *Evgeny*

[101] Holl, '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel', p. 22.
[102] K. N. Derzhavin, 'Zaniatiia Pushkina ispanskim iazykom', *Slavia*, 13 (1934), 114–20 (p. 118).

Onegin, thereby painting a detailed picture of the true nature and scope of Pushkin's reception of Cervantes.

Pushkin and Cervantes

Pushkin not only owned two editions of the *Exemplary Tales*, but he also undertook two translation exercises involving Cervantes' 'The Little Gypsy Girl'.[103] The first was written in pencil on a sheet of paper divided vertically into equal parts, the left side containing a French translation of 'The Little Gypsy Girl', and the right containing a Spanish variant. The second was also written in pencil, but this time the Spanish is beneath the French. The first seems to have been written some time during 1820–24, and the second during 1828–33.[104] In both cases Pushkin translated the Spanish into French. Then, without recourse to the original, he translated it back into Spanish. This is suggested by the fact that the Spanish follows the French, in addition to all the Gallicisms which litter the latter passages. Given that the translation exercises were undertaken before the Paris publication of the *Exemplary Tales* in 1835, Pushkin must have used the 1816 Perpignan edition as his source. Furthermore, the pages of the Perpignan edition are cut exactly on those pages where the passages used by Pushkin in his exercise are found.[105] The exercise serves as evidence not only for Pushkin's drive towards language acquisition, but also for his admiration of Cervantes as an exemplar of Spanish writing.

Pushkin's fondness for Cervantes manifests itself not only in his translation exercises, but also in the notes, diaries and letters of his acquaintances. In her notes Madame Smirnova recalls a conversation she had with Pushkin and Zhukovsky on the topic of European literature. Having asked Pushkin what he thinks of Spanish literature, he responds:

[103] This is discussed in detail by Derzhavin and by Weiner and Meyerson throughout their respective articles.
[104] Weiner and Meyerson, '*La Gitanilla* de Cervantes y *Tsigane* de Pushkin', p. 83.
[105] Derzhavin, 'Zaniatiia Pushkina ispanskim iazykom', p. 118.

> It is a beautiful and fully national literature. It has wonderful theatre, all lyrical, but completely real. That is, they don't have theatrical dialogue […] *Don Quixote* is an example of truthfulness, and meanwhile Cervantes' thought is almost hidden; it appears only in the actions of both heroes—Don Quijote and Sancho Panza: ideal and real, soul and body, idealist and realist. I read it in French and marvelled at every page; in the very first chapter there's a whole *chef-d'oeuvre*, and in the following ones, what splendid places! The death of the *hidalgo*, everything that he says, his death bed, when even coarse people do not understand clearly that a great heart has stopped beating… I adore this Don Quijote.
>
> Она прекрасна и совершенно народна, и у нее—чудесный театр, весь лирический, но совершенно реальный, т. е. у них нет театрального диалога […] «Дон Кихот» образец правдивости, а между тем мысль Сервантеса почти скрыта, она проявляется только в действиях обоих героев—Дон Кихота и Санчо-Панса: это идеальное и реальное, дух и тело, идеалист и реалист. Я читал его по-французски и поражался каждой страницей; одна первая глава—целый chef-d'oeuvre, а в последних какие превосходные места! Смерть гидальго, все, что он говорит, это ложе смерти, когда даже грубые люди неясно сознают, что перестает биться великое сердце... Я обожаю этого Дон Кихота...[106]

Pushkin was fascinated by 'народность' ('narodnost''), the concept of nationhood, folk identity and national character, and throughout his literary career looked to imbue his own works with a sense of national spirit. He elaborates his notion of 'народность' in his 'On National Spirit in Literature' ('O narodnosti v literature', 1826), in which he explains that it is not a matter of vocabulary or choosing subjects from one's national history. Rather, as Tatiana Wolff summarises:

> Its climate, its form of government, its faith, gives to each nation distinguishing features which are more or less reflected in poetry's mirror. There is a cast of mind and quality of feeling, there are a multitude of customs and traditional beliefs and habits, which belong exclusively to a single nation.[107]

[106] A. O. Smirnova-Rossett, *Zapiski A. O. Smirnovoi: iz zapisnykh knizhek 1826–1845 gg.* (St Petersburg: Tip. M. Merkusheva, 1895–97), pp. 157–58.
[107] Tatiana Wolff, *Pushkin on Literature* (London: Athlone Press, 1986), p. 168.

Wolff's description could have been written about the *Quixote*, a work which Pushkin is correct in mentioning in his discussion of 'national' literature with Smirnova and Zhukovsky in its colourful yet accurate portrayal of Spanish life at the turn of the seventeenth century. Although Smirnova is often prone to embellishment in her notes, the intricate details and astute observations pertaining to Cervantes' novel, as well as the corroborating descriptions of 'народность' in Pushkin's draft essay, suggest that the conversation is recorded to a decent level of accuracy. The extract not only provides a snapshot of Pushkin's views on national literature, but also supports suggestions of his hispanophilism and, more importantly, demonstrates his knowledge of the *Quixote*, which, according to Smirnova's reminiscence, he had read in French.[108]

The most reliable sources for Pushkin's reception of Cervantes are the references scattered throughout his *oeuvre*. The first is found in an 1825 letter to Count Vyazemsky in which Pushkin, responding to the Count's offer to introduce him to Nikolai Polevoy, the editor of *The Moscow Telegraph*, explains that he would be happy to assist the editor and critic and highlights several errors in his writing, such as that 'Don Quijote eradicated all knights errant in Europe!!!' ('Дон Кихот искоренил в Европе странствующих рыцарей!!!') (XIII: 184).[109] The triple exclamation marks confirm Pushkin's understanding of the *Quixote* and its wider context. Unlike Polevoy, he is clearly aware that knights errant were fictional characters, and so could not have been 'eradicated' by Don Quijote. Furthermore, although Cervantes derides the romances of chivalry in his novel, in so doing he provides knight errantry with a new lease of literary life through his protagonist and his adventures, rather than destroying it.

His references become more theoretical in his 'Letter to the Editor of *The Moscow Telegraph*' ('Pis'mo k izdatelyu "Moskovskogo vestnika"', 1827), addressed to the same

[108] Although no French translation of the *Quixote* was recorded from Pushkin's library (see pp. 36–37), this does not prove that he did not possess, or at least have access to, a copy of it at some point.
[109] The specific date is not given, but the editor of the collected works suggests that it was probably written around the middle of June 1825 (XIII: 183).

Polevoy. Here he criticises the journalists who 'autocratically divide literary Europe into the Classical and the Romantic schools' ('самовластно разделяют Европу литературную на классическую и романтическую') and who automatically assign the literature of the Latinate south to the first group and that of the Germanic north to the second. In this way, 'Dante (*il gran Padre Alighieri*), Ariosto, Lope de Vega, Calderón and Cervantes find themselves in the Classical phalanx' ('Данте [il gran Padre Alighieri], Ариосто, Лопец di Vega, Калдерон и Сервантес попались в классическую фалангу') (XI: 67). His criticism of these journalists stems from his own interpretation of Romanticism, not as Byronic or Germanic, but fundamentally as the breaking of neo-classical moulds. As John Bayley explains:

> If the label 'romantic' meant anything for Pushkin, it could be applied in any age to any work which obeyed no rules but its own […] the proper sense of romanticism was for him a literary technique, not a movement of the soul, an aspiration, a spiritual attitude to the universe.[110]

Despite this interpretation, the influence of Byronic Romanticism finds its way into Pushkin's earlier works. During his exile in southern Russia (1820–24), he was introduced to the British writer's works and was intrigued by the 'cult' of Byron. Later on, however, his interpretation of Romanticism shifted to seeing it as a mode of literary creativity. In this light it can be understood that Pushkin, when writing his 'Letter to the Editor' in 1827, considered Cervantes a Romantic, not in the Byronic or Germanic fashions, but in terms of his breaking of literary moulds in the creation of innovative works like the *Quixote* and the *Exemplary Tales*.

Pushkin continues the theme of Romanticism in his 1834 essay 'On the Insignificance of Russian Literature' ('O nichtozhestve literatury russkoi'). Here he declares the early modern period in Europe as the birthplace of nineteenth-century Romanticism (that is, literary creativity), praises its growth and prosperity, and classifies Cervantes as a Romantic:

---

[110] John Bayley, 'Introduction' to A. S. Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003), pp. ix–xlviii (p. xv).

> Romantic poetry opulently and majestically flourished across all of Europe. Germany for a long time had its Nibelungs; Italy, its tripartite poems; Portugal, *The Luisiads*; Spain, Lope de Vega, Calderón and Cervantes; England, Shakespeare; and the French, Villon […]
>
> Романтическая поэзия пышно и величественно расцветала по всей Европе. Германия давно имела свои Нибелунги, Италия—свою тройственную поэму, Португалия—Лузиаду, Испания—Лопе де Вега, Калдерона и Сервантеса, Англия—Шекспира, а у французов Вильон […] (XI: 269)

His interpretation of Romanticism is the same here as in the previous example. He is not listing authors of the Byronic cast, but rather literary innovators who, by challenging commonplace literary norms with their fearless inventiveness, helped to shape subsequent generations of literature.

Various other references to Cervantes and his characters are found throughout Pushkin's writing. Mention of Cervantes is seen in his essay 'On Milton and Chateaubriand's Translation of *Paradise Lost*' ('O Mil'tone i Shatobrianovom perevode "Poteryannogo raya"', 1836), in which he discusses the growing demand in France for 'more truth and less delicacy' ('более верности, и менее щекотливости') from translators and the desire of the readership to see 'Dante, Shakespeare and Cervantes in their own forms, in their native clothes' ('Данте, Шекспира и Сервантеса в их собственном виде, в их народной одежде') (XII: 137). In a draft of his essay 'Alexander Radishchev' (1836), meanwhile, he calls the eighteenth-century author and social critic a 'political Don Quijote, acting with energy and with good conscience' ('политического Дон-Кихота, действующего с энергией и по совести'), while in another draft he refers to him as a 'political Don Quijote, of course mistaken, but acting with astonishing energy and acting with knightly conscientiousness' ('политического Дон-Кихота, заблуждающегося конечно, но действующего с энергией удивительной и с рыцарскою совестливостию') (XII: 353). The comparisons demonstrate Pushkin's reception of the knight errant as an energetic, passionate and revolutionary figure who, despite being persecuted by

those who disagree with his beliefs and who disapprove of his actions, is unafraid to put his ideas into action in his steadfast belief that they will make the world a better place.[111]

Direct references in Pushkin's creative works are limited to a chapter omitted from the final version of his historical short novel, *The Captain's Daughter* (*Kapitanskaya dochka*, 1836). Shvabrin, having usurped command of the Belogorsk fortress during the Pugachev rebellion, surrounds the barn in which the hero of the story, Grinev (or, as he is known in this version, Bulanin), is taking refuge. Shvabrin calls to him: 'I will order the granary to be burnt and then we will see what you will do, you Don Quijote of Belogorsk' ('А велю поджечь анбар и тогда посмотрим, что ты станешь делать, Дон-Кишот белогорский') (VIII: 379). This is a reference to Grinev's steadfast commitment to the Russian Empire, to his love for Masha Mironova (who had previously spurned Shvabrin) and to his ceaseless energy and optimism in the face of adversity. The comparison continues with Shvabrin referring to him as a knight: 'Goodbye, Maria Ivanovna, I do not ask for your forgiveness: you are probably not bored in the darkness with your knight' ('До свидания, Мария Ивановна, не извиняюсь перед вами: вам, вероятно, не скучно в потемках с вашим рыцарем') (VIII: 379). Although Shvabrin's intention is to insult Grinev, Pushkin, through his Romantic lens, saw Cervantes as a literary innovator and Don Quijote as a serious and noble hero worthy of admiration and respect. Shvabrin's comparison can thus be considered to pay Grinev an inadvertent compliment.

Although Pushkin's *oeuvre* may not contain as many references to Cervantes and his works as those of his literary successors, his understanding of and appreciation for the Spaniard and his familiarity with his works cannot be denied. The basic relationship thus having been established, the following sections in this chapter will examine in greater detail the nature of

[111] In their study Weiner and Meyerson suggest that Pushkin made one other written allusion to the *Quixote* in a letter to his former schoolmate, Stepan Frolov: 'I have not forgotten that you called me Sancho Panza for my frequent proverbs…' ('я не забыл, что зывали вы меня за мои частые пословицы Саншо-Пансо') (XIII: 7). However, this text is in fact attributed to Ivan Malinovsky, one of a number of contributors to the letter.

Pushkin's response to Cervantes in his literary endeavours: how he adapted aspects of the Spaniard's works in his own writing, and whether this was intentional, such as in *The Gypsies*, or simply a by-product of the literary tradition initiated by *Quixote*.

The Gypsies

Pushkin began writing *The Gypsies* during his exile in southern Russia between 1820 and 1824 and completed it when he moved from the south to his ancestral estate of Mikhailovskoe. During his southern exile his sense of nationhood and Romantic sensibilities began to blossom: not only was he introduced to the works of Byron, but he was also inspired by the wild scenery, relative primitivism and different ethnic communities of the Caucasus and the Black Sea region, with 'local "colour" [being] an adjunct to Romanticism'.[112] Although Pushkin interpreted Romanticism primarily as literary innovation, particularly later on in his career, at the beginning he was attracted to the 'cult' of Byron and consequently Byronic Romantic elements seep into his early works.

Having been exiled from St Petersburg, the heart of Russian westernisation and civilisation, Pushkin threw himself into travelling around the south and learning about the culture and customs of the local tribes. It was during one such trip, through Bessarabia in 1821, where he 'was intrigued by the various nomadic communities he saw living in the steppe, including gipsies and bands of outlaws', that he took inspiration for *The Gypsies*.[113] His travels through the 'exotic' south also inspired his short lyric poem, *The Night Zefir*, whose Spanish setting was motivated by his Caucasian environment, as well as a much later lyric poem which he also titled *The Gypsies* (1830).[114] His observations of these new cultures highlighted the stark contrast between the uncomplicated freedom of life in southern Russia and the vanity and

[112] Wolff, *Pushkin on Literature*, p. 24.
[113] Ibid., p. 30.
[114] All other references to *The Gypsies* are to the 1824 long poem.

pretence of civilised urbanity. This dichotomy, explored in Pushkin's original *Gypsies*, is also present in Cervantes' 'The Little Gypsy Girl'. Like Pushkin, Cervantes spent much time travelling and learning about different cultures and used these experiences to shape and colour his work. During his military career, for example, he travelled widely across the Mediterranean, including a period of captivity in Algiers, which is echoed in the autobiographical account of Ruy Pérez in the *Quixote* (I.XXXIX–XLI), while later his travels became more localised as he made his way through Spain as a tax collector.[115]

The Gypsies reflects a transitional period in Pushkin's evolving view of Romanticism from Byronic inspiration towards focus on literary technique. On the one hand the work is imbued with typical romantic mannerisms such as 'vagueness of motivation and characterisation, emphasis on local colour [and] cliché-ridden ideas of the corruption of civilisation as opposed to the purity of nature and those who live close to her'.[116] On the other, it contains an experimental medley of forms, such as lyrical verse, speech, and even stage directions. Michael Wachtel is thus correct to observe that 'Pushkin incorporated Byronic elements that he found congenial, but combined them with a host of other sources to create a unique form of Romanticism'.[117]

One of these sources is 'The Little Gypsy Girl'. Pushkin's familiarity with Cervantes' story has already been evidenced in his translation exercises; however, the fact that Pushkin undertook the first of these translations between 1820 and 1824, the same time that he was exiled in the south and began work on *The Gypsies*, further supports the idea that the work was written, at least in part, as a response to his reading of Cervantes' text. While the narrative genres of the two works differ—Cervantes having written a short story, and Pushkin a poem—

[115] William Byron, *Cervantes: A Biography* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978).
[116] A. D. P. Briggs, 'Fallibility and Perfection in the Works of Alexander Pushkin', in *Problems of Russian Romanticism*, ed. by Robert Reid (Aldershot: Gower, 1986), pp. 25–48 (p. 41).
[117] Michael Wachtel, 'Pushkin's Long Poems and the Epic Impulse', in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. by Andrew Kahn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 75–89 (p. 79).

the opening premise of both is almost a direct parallel. Both feature a young gentleman who abandons life in the city in order to join a gypsy camp. The primary reason for the drastic change is the same for both characters: love. Cervantes' Juan falls in love with the gypsy girl Preciosa, while Pushkin's Aleko falls in love with the gypsy girl Zemfira. Both works consist of the hero's struggles in shaking off his past life among the upper classes and adjusting to the gypsy community. But it is in the denouement of the heroes' relationships, combined with their inability to suppress fully their former selves, that the works take on different identities: Cervantes' tale ends in marriage, a reward for Preciosa's chastity, while Pushkin's poem ends in death and despair, driven by Zemfira's adultery, outcomes that reflect the authors' differing intentions for their works.

While Preciosa and Zemfira differ significantly, Juan and Aleko are of a more similar typological cast. Both abandon their social privileges for a life on the fringes of society. Their sudden fall in social status could not have been an easy decision for either character, but for both it is facilitated by the respective gypsy girls with whom they fall in love. Juan, having seen Preciosa perform on the streets of Madrid, initially proposes that she abandon her gypsy lifestyle, marry him and rise in society. However, he easily succumbs to her counter demand that, should he desire to marry her, he must join her community for a two year period before a marriage can take place. Despite the life-changing nature of the decision Juan has to make, his youthful playfulness contributes to his lack of hesitation and his infatuation to his admission of complete submission to her in their first meeting: 'I only wish to serve her in the manner which best pleases her. With regards to her desires, my soul is wax wherein she may leave whatever impression she chooses' (24) ('sólo quiero servirla del modo que ella más gustare: su voluntad es la mía. Para con ella es de cera mi alma, donde podrá imprimir lo que quisiere') (I: 84). Thus do they agree that he is to join the gypsy camp a week later and adopt the name of Andrés Caballero, as he is known throughout the rest of the text.

How Aleko became a gypsy is more obscure, with Zemfira revealing to her father little more than:

I bring a guest; I met him recently	Веду я гостя; за курганом
Behind the mound in the wilderness	Его в пустыне я нашла
And invited him to spend the night in our camp.	И в табор на ночь зазвала.
He wishes to live as a gypsy like us;	Он хочет быть как мы цыганом;
The law pursues him […]	Его преследует закон [...] (IV: 180)

There is a parallel here with 'The Little Gypsy Girl', for Juan and Preciosa also interact for the first time in a rugged landscape—a valley. However, Aleko's pursuit by the law echoes more closely how Clemente—another nobleman-cum-gypsy in Cervantes' story—joins the gypsy band. But there is one key difference: while Cervantes reveals that Clemente's misdemeanour is his complicity in the jealousy-driven murder of two noblemen, Pushkin sheds no light on Aleko's offence. The reader is left to speculate: was Aleko's crime a political one, echoing the reasons for Pushkin's exile in the south, or was it murder, foreshadowing the character's later behaviour? Was the intention of the ambiguity to bypass the censor, create a Romantic sense of mystery, or both?

Although Aleko's background is less clear than that of Juan, his love for his gypsy maiden is no less evident. Like a Byronic hero he possesses a fiery temperament, but like Juan he is willing to submit to the desires of his gypsy girl: 'How his passions played upon/ His submissive soul!' ('Как играли страсти/ Его послушною душой!') (IV: 184), where use of 'послушный' has the combined meanings of 'submissive', 'obedient', 'docile' and 'malleable'. Aleko may have twice the reason to join the gypsy band than Juan—both for love and in fear of the law—but he is equally faithful.

While there is a clear difference in their acceptance into the camp by the gypsy girls—Preciosa inviting Juan with caution, Zemfira inviting Aleko with enthusiasm—the welcome they receive by the unnamed 'old man' in both texts, who acts as a gypsy sage, is similar. The

selection of the 'old man' to fulfil the role of oracle was not by chance: it not only reflects the 'respect and allegiance [directed] to male clan elders' in gypsy communities, but in *The Gypsies* it also suggests a direct borrowing from Cervantes.[118] Fyodor Kel'in, in his introduction to the 1935 Russian edition of the *Exemplary Tales*, comments upon such 'undoubtable resemblances' between the two old men that it 'springs to one's eyes'. However, the only observation of detailed kinship that he makes is the old gypsy lecturing 'a man of the city'.[119] But the old gypsies do more than admonish the newcomers: they offer both information about and advice on the gypsy lifestyle and its laws, as well as a warm welcome. In this guise Weiner and Meyerson compare the invitation of the old gypsy in 'The Little Gypsy Girl' to Juan to settle 'in the nest under our wings' (43) ('en el nido debajo de nuestras alas') (I: 105) with Zemfira's father's welcome of Aleko into their tribe:[120]

Stay until the morning	Останься до утра
Under the canopy of our tent	Под сенью нашего шатра
Or even stay with us longer,	Или пробудь у нас и доле,
As you wish. I am ready	Как ты захочешь. Я готов
To share with you my bread and roof.	С тобой делить и хлеб и кров.
Be one of us […]	Будь наш […] (IV: 180)

Despite the welcoming nature of the speeches, they contain one significant difference: that of the elder in Cervantes' text is replete with irony. Although his oration is intended to highlight the positive aspects of the gypsy community and criticise court society, the hyperbolic nature of his praise instead draws greater attention to the moral flaws of their way of life. As Colin Thompson explains:

[118] Richard J. Pym, *The Gypsies of Early Modern Spain, 1425–1783* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 5.
[119] F. V. Kel'in, 'Introduction' to Miguel de Cervantes, *Nazidatel'nye novelly*, trans. by B. A. Krzhevsky (Moscow: Academia, 1935), pp. vii–xlviii (p. xii).
[120] Weiner and Meyerson, '*La Gitanilla* de Cervantes y *Tsigane* de Pushkin', p. 86.

> The old man believes he is commending gipsy life to its newest recruit, Andrés, but in so doing reveals its true nature. It may have many attractive features, but the alert reader will set these against the fact that [transgressions against] three of the Ten Commandments, theft, adultery and murder, are integral to gipsy life, while incest is disregarded. […] Far from representing gipsy life as ideal, it reveals it to be shot through with serious moral faults.[121]

Irony is entirely absent from the speech of Pushkin's old gypsy. When Aleko relays his fears that Zemfira no longer loves him, the old man responds:

Here the people are free, the sky is blue,	Здесь люди вольны, небо ясно,
And the women are famed for their beauty.	И жёны славятся красой.
[…]	[…]
Console yourself, my friend, she is a child.	Утешься, друг: она дитя.
Your dejection is irrational:	Твое унынье безрассудно:
You love so sorrowfully and earnestly,	Ты любишь горестно и трудно,
But a woman's heart is light and easy.	А сердце женское - шутя. (IV: 193)

His speech on the freedom of gypsy life, its proximity to nature and the beauty of their women is intended both to console and to instruct Aleko. The overarching message is that life in the gypsy community is different to that in the cities: its women are free to act as they please, while its men, rather than feeling jealousy, accept it as part of their way of life. The speech can be considered instructional not only for Aleko, but also for Pushkin himself: like his protagonist (whose name, Aleko, is a variant of his own, Alexander), Pushkin was naturally a passionate type, and consequently admired the gypsy world for its liberty and lack of jealousy.

While the irony in the old gypsy's speech in Cervantes' story draws the reader's attention to the importance of Christian values, the lack of irony in the speech of Pushkin's gypsy sage has a similar purpose and effect: it highlights the incompatibility of moral codes, such as honour and fidelity, between city and gypsy life.

---

[121] Colin Thompson, 'Eutrapelia and Exemplarity', in *A Companion to Cervantes's Novelas Ejemplares*, ed. by Stephen Boyd (Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2010), pp. 261–82 (p. 268).

Despite Juan and Aleko's seamless acceptance into their respective gypsy camps by the elders, their personal transition into gypsy life is more complicated. Although both struggle in adopting the morally questionable ways of their new society and shedding traces of the old, the fact that neither character hesitates to reject his privileged background to join a community considered not only inferior, but completely outcast, points towards the authors' criticism of urban society, its structure and its values. This is more subtle in Cervantes's work where the narrator, recalling Juan's happiness at joining the gypsy community, explains that:

> His only regret was that he had not discovered such a merry way of life earlier, and from that moment on he renounced his profession as a gentleman and the vanity of his illustrious lineage. (40)
>
> sólo le pesaba no haber venido más presto en conocimiento de tan alegre vida, y que desde aquel punto renunciaba la profesión de caballero y la vanagloria de su ilustre linaje. (I: 103)

While there is a certain amount of irony in the narrator's description of 'such a merry way of life', particularly considering the various unchristian vices described by the old man soon thereafter, Juan's rejection of social convention may nevertheless act as a quiet suggestion that life in the lower and 'outsider' classes, although not without its flaws, may actually offer more happiness, freedom and integrity than life among the privileged, vain and vice-ridden higher classes.

In *The Gypsies* there is once again no irony, and social criticism of urban society is more direct. Instead of the narrator paraphrasing the hero's praise of his new lifestyle and masking the undertones of disapproval of his former life, as in 'The Little Gypsy Girl', the speech comes directly from Aleko:

Zemfira:	Земфира:
Tell me, my friend, do you not regret	Скажи, мой друг: ты не жалеешь
That you have given everything up forever?	О том, что бросил навсегда?
[…]	[…]
Aleko:	Алеко:
What is there to regret? If you could but see,	О чём жалеть? Когда б ты знала,
If you could but imagine	Когда бы ты воображала
The lack of freedom in the stifling cities!	Неволю душных городов! (IV: 185)

Aleko does not mask his negative feelings towards urban life and proceeds to list all the things he does not miss, such as the people, who 'are ashamed of love, oppress thought,/ and barter with their freedom' ('Любви стыдятся, мысли гонят,/ Торгуют волею своей') (IV: 185). While the desire to reject social vanity contributes to the ease with which both characters reject their former positions, these desires are slightly differently nuanced. Juan's decision to enter the gypsy community is based more on reality, that is, the rejection of the concerns of profession and lineage. Aleko's decision, meanwhile, is based more on the existential concerns of 'воля' ('volya', translated above as 'freedom', but which can also be translated as 'free will') and the extent to which man has and is able to implement his free will. Nevertheless, in both cases love for the gypsy girl, coupled with the relative freedom that gypsy life brings, outweighs the supposed privileges that civilised society has to offer.

Both characters soon adapt to life in the gypsy camp and betray few signs of missing their former lives, but neither is fully able to shed his innate sense of nobility. Juan, now known as Andrés, initially worries about his personal honour and questions Preciosa's fidelity; however, he is soon reassured about her chastity. He struggles to accept the concept of thieving to the extent that he financially recompenses the victims of his fellow gypsies for their losses. Instead of thieving in groups, as per gypsy custom, he goes alone in order to purchase items which he offers as spoils to his group. While Juan is able to maintain his honour in the first situation and reconcile his former and present lives in the second, his noble upbringing and innate sense of honour rise to the fore when he is affronted by the mayor's soldier nephew. He

believes that Juan, in stereotypical gypsy fashion, has stolen the possessions of a young woman who has fallen in love with him, when in fact she placed them in his bag in order to prevent his departure. The situation escalates beyond what the infatuated Juana Carducha could have imagined. The soldier, having insulted Juan by calling him a 'rotten little gipsy' (60) ('el gitanico podrido') (I: 124):

> […] lifted his hand and dealt Andrés such a vigorous blow that it shook him out of abstraction and reminded him that he was not Andrés Caballero but don Juan and a gentleman. He rushed at the soldier [with much agility and even more anger] unsheathed his sword, and […] plunged it into his body, leaving him dead on the ground. (60)
>
> […] alzó la mano y le dio un bofetón tal, que le hizo volver de su embelesamiento, y le hizo acordar que no era Andrés Caballero, sino don Juan, y caballero; y, arremetiendo al soldado con mucha presteza y más cólera, le arrancó su misma espada de la vaina y se la envainó en el cuerpo, dando con él muerto en tierra. (I: 124)

While in Golden Age Spain it would have been acceptable for a nobleman to avenge himself of such an insult in this manner, gypsies, even if they possessed a personal sense of honour, were not entitled to this right. In the heat of the moment Juan forgets his new identity and is no longer able to suppress his past self.

Aleko is also placed in a situation which causes him to forget his new life and to rekindle his jealous tendencies. When Zemfira's father tells Aleko of his own wife's departure with a gypsy from another tribe, and of his lack of vengeance, Aleko responds:

> I am not like that. No, I will not renounce — Я не таков. Нет, я не споря
> My rights without a fight! — От прав моих не откажусь!
> Or at least I'll enjoy vengeance. — Или хоть мщеньем наслажусь. (IV: 195)

Following this indication that Aleko's past self is not fully suppressed, the reader is not surprised when, upon finding Zemfira with another man, Aleko fails to comply with the customs of his new community and kills them both on the spot.

Because Pushkin's gypsies do not tolerate vengeance for adultery (unlike those of Cervantes), the only punishment the old man bestows upon Aleko for the murder of his daughter is his exile from the band.[122] This, it could be argued, is not so much a punishment for the specific murders, but rather for the bloodshed in general, since Pushkin's gypsies are 'enemies of violence and blood'.[123] But it can also be viewed as a punishment for Aleko's failure to control his jealousy, and consequently to comply with the laws of the community. Juan, meanwhile, having killed the mayor's nephew in an urban setting (and not a fellow gypsy in the countryside), is taken to a civic prison and faces hanging as punishment for his crime. However, in a twist of fate typical to Cervantes' *Exemplary Tales*, Juan is saved when it is revealed that Preciosa is in fact Constanza, the long-lost daughter of the town's Chief Magistrate. In this new position she is able to confirm that he is not the gypsy Andrés Caballero, but the nobleman Don Juan de Cárcamo. He is pardoned, and the two are free to marry as befits their true rank.

The social injustice in Cervantes' text could not be more apparent. As a gypsy Juan is to be hanged for his crime, but as a nobleman he is rewarded for avenging himself and his honour. The juxtaposition emphasises the social inequality of the Golden Age honour code, where members of the nobility were considered entitled to a sense of honour while those outside of this social class were not. Aleko's punishment, meanwhile, rests between the two extremes faced by Cervantes' protagonist: instead of being killed as a punishment for his action or rewarded for seeking vengeance, he is dismissed from the community. This 'semi-punishment' is perhaps fitting in the context: he has not killed a member of the nobility, but rather two members of his own tribe of outsiders, and therefore the punishment is, superficially,

[122] The old man in 'The Little Gypsy Girl' says to Juan: 'there is no adultery; when we find our own wives guilty of it, […] we do not seek justice from the law. We ourselves are the judges and executioners of our wives' (39) ('no hay ningún adulterio; y, cuando le hay en la mujer propia […] no vamos a la justicia a pedir castigo: nosotros somos los jueces y los verdugos de nuestras esposas o amigas') (I: 101). See Thompson's discussion of the irony in this passage in 'Eutrapelia and Exemplarity', p. 267.
[123] Weiner and Meyerson, '*La Gitanilla* de Cervantes y *Tsigane* de Pushkin', p. 86.

less severe. On a personal level, however, the punishment could be considered more stringent. There is a certain sense of *déjà vu* in Aleko's situation: at the beginning of the poem a crime causes his exile from high society; at the end of the poem a crime causes his exile from gypsy society. He thus becomes an outcast from an already outcast community, thereby suffering the ultimate fall from grace.

Although the precise messages conveyed by both writers differ according to their socio-historical contexts and personal values, each author utilises the 'noble gypsy' paradox to examine various social and, in the case of Pushkin, personal issues. Cervantes' criticism is directed towards the vanity of urban life, the unchristian nature of gypsy life, and the social injustice pertaining to status and the honour code. Pushkin, meanwhile, maintains only the criticism of urban vanity from Cervantes' text in his poem: rather than criticising gypsy life, he praises it, and he exchanges the idea of status and the honour code with that of his own jealous tendencies. But while the intentions of the authors differ on some levels, Weiner and Meyerson are not incorrect in their observation that:

> Both works have […] the same 'thesis': that a change in environment leads to a deeper knowledge of ourselves, and that civilised man will never be able to detach himself completely from the moral concepts and the prejudices of the society in which he was raised.[124]

The transposition of the protagonist from court society to gypsy life not only points a critical finger at the former lifestyle, but also suggests the impossibility of changing one's character completely. As much as they try, Juan and Aleko are unable to reject their former selves and embody fully the concept of the 'noble savage', an outsider untainted by civilisation. In the case of 'The Little Gypsy Girl', this is because gypsy life, although portrayed as free of vanity, is riddled with unchristian sin—it is not worthy of Juan, and for this reason Cervantes returns

[124] Weiner and Meyerson, '*La Gitanilla* de Cervantes y *Tsigane* de Pushkin', p. 85.

him to a society in which Christian values are upheld. In the case of *The Gypsies*, this is because Aleko's corruption by civilization, particularly his relentless jealousy, is too great—he is therefore not worthy of gypsy life, and for this reason Pushkin has him banished from the community. While Juan is a typical character of the *Exemplary Tales*, detached from Cervantes himself, Aleko is a clear embodiment of Pushkin's desire to break free from urban ostentation and his own unfettered jealousy.

The affinities and variations between 'The Little Gypsy Girl' and *The Gypsies* demonstrate Pushkin's use of the Cervantine text as a major source, as well as his adaptation thereof for his own purposes. Of all Pushkin's works the reception of Cervantes is most visible in *The Gypsies*, but this is not to say that the Spanish writer did not succeed in shaping his other narrative texts in one form or another. As shall be seen, the spirit of Cervantes, and particularly the quixotic tradition, is very much alive in a number of Pushkin's other narrative texts.

The Tales of Belkin

Although Pushkin is predominantly known for his poetry, he also completed, in addition to a number of dramas, four major prose texts, and left a number of drafts of other incomplete stories. Both he and Cervantes were writing at times of social, cultural and artistic change, with prose fiction no longer considered simply an inferior genre intended for the middle and lower classes, but rather one which aristocratic circles were also beginning to consider worthy of their attention. For this reason, although Cervantes began as a playwright in verse form, he gained popularity for his prose fiction. Pushkin, too, 'prompted partly by the growing commercial success that other less talented writers were having with popular prose works […] turned his creative energies to writing fiction'.[125] This was the context in which he wrote his comical

[125] Irina Reyfman, 'Prose Fiction', in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. by Andrew Kahn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 90–104 (p. 90).

Tales of Belkin, a collection of five stories supposedly compiled and edited by the fictional Belkin, and the unfinished *History of the Village of Goryukhino*, during the autumn of 1830 at his ancestral estate in Boldino, one of the most fruitful and lucrative periods of his literary career.

Paul Debreczeny considers two of the Belkin stories, 'The Lady Peasant' ('Baryshnya-krest'yanka') and 'The Blizzard' ('Metel''), rife with absurdities,[126] a comment which would not be entirely amiss in relation to Cervantes' *Quixote*, a work which relentlessly pushes against the boundaries of verisimilitude. The affinity between the texts lies primarily in their parodic function, which is facilitated for the most part by the 'fiction versus reality' motif. The works in question feature protagonists whose actions rely so heavily on the literature they have consumed that the lines between reality and fiction begin to blur for them—a phenomenon dubbed by Levin as the 'quixotic principle'.[127] They begin to act in a similar fashion to the characters about whom they have read, and in so doing become parodies of them. In the *Quixote* the reader is told that 'the lack of sleep and the excess of reading withered [Don Quijote's] brain, and he went mad' ('del poco dormir y del mucho leer, se le secó el celebro de manera que vino a perder el juicio') (I.I.26–27/42). This madness, caused by excessive reading of the romances of chivalry, compels Alonso Quijano to adopt the persona of Don Quijote and lead the life of a fictional knight errant, and in this way he becomes a parody of the literary type. In 'The Lady Peasant', Liza, knowing that her father would never allow her to visit Alexey, the recently returned son of their neighbour Berestov, decides to exploit the situation by dressing up as a peasant girl in order to interact with him. She not only calls herself Akulina and dons the appropriate attire, but also adopts peasant language, just as Don Quijote adopts archaisms appropriate to a medieval knight. Her altered behaviour also paves the way for comic irony:

[126] Paul Debreczeny, *The Other Pushkin: A Study of Alexander Pushkin's Prose Fiction* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1983), p. 80.
[127] Levin, *Grounds for Comparison*, p. 235.

she attempts to espy Alexey when he is out hunting, and thus the hunter becomes the hunted.[128] In her playful pursuit of her neighbour Liza takes inspiration from sentimental literature and parodies its heroines. In 'The Blizzard', meanwhile, the reader is told that the heroine, Maria Gavrilovna, 'had been brought up on French novels and, consequently, was in love' (19) ('Марья Гавриловна была воспитана на французских романах и следственно была влюблена') (VIII: 77). Like Don Quijote, she is influenced by the fiction she reads and adopts the traits of the characters she admires or with whom she can sympathise. This becomes more pronounced towards the end of the story when her new admirer, Burmin, finds her 'by the pond, under the willow; she was wearing a white dress and had a book in her hand, like a true heroine [from a] novel' (28) ('Бурмин нашел Марью Гавриловну у пруда, под ивою, с книгою в руках и в белом платье, настоящей героинею романа') (VIII: 85). Like Liza in Pushkin's *Queen of Spades* (*Pikovaya dama*, 1833) and Tatyana in *Evgeny Onegin*, Maria Gavrilovna not only develops the psychological aspect of a Romantic heroine, but also adopts her physical guise, and in so doing serves to parody the literary type.

Parody extends beyond the quixotic principle and into the generic make-up of the works. The *Quixote* may be best known as a parody of the romances of chivalry, but it also mocks, among other genres, the Italian epic and the pastoral. The *Tales* similarly parody a number of sources, not only of sentimental literature in 'The Lady Peasant' and 'The Blizzard', but also Romanticism in 'The Shot' ('Vystrel'), whose plot revolves around the anti-Byronic Silvio, and the historical novel in *Goryukhino*. As Anthony Briggs notes, 'it is quite probable that Pushkin could not resist poking fun at his predecessors by treating in a purely realistic manner subjects which in his time were being given a sentimental or romantic colouring',[129]

[128] Andrew Kahn, 'Introduction' to A. S. Pushkin, *The Queen of Spades and Other Stories*, trans. by Alan Myers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. vii–xlviii (p. xx).
[129] A. D. P. Briggs, 'Introduction' to A. S. Pushkin, *Povesti pokoinogo Ivana Petrovicha Belkina = Tales of the Late Ivan Petrovich Belkin* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1991), pp. xi–xxvi (p. xvi).

an observation which is also applicable to Cervantes' relationship with his literary predecessors and contemporaries.

The formal structures and devices support the works' parodic function. In his 1822 draft article, 'On Prose' ('O proze'), Pushkin wrote: 'precision and brevity—those are the first virtues of prose' ('Точность и краткость—вот первые достоинства прозы') (XI: 19). In the *Tales*, however, Pushkin contradicts his own theory. Although the basic concept of the work as a collection of stories is superficially more in line with the *Exemplary Tales*, Pushkin complicates its structural framework by implementing the two main formal devices found the *Quixote*: narrative framing, facilitated by the 'found manuscript'. For both authors the creation of fictitious narrators was a 'parody of a well-worn device'.[130] As Paul Debreczeny reminds the reader, 'jugglery with fictitious narrators […] was fashionable in the 1820's in Russia'.[131] Indeed, around the same time that Pushkin was writing his *Tales*, Gogol' was writing his *Evenings on a Farm near Dikan'ka* (*Vechera na khutore bliz Dikan'ki*, 1829–32), which features the same device adapted in an original way. Given the popularity of framed narratives during this period, Pushkin's use thereof served simultaneously to appeal to the reader of popular fiction and to parody the very fiction he or she was consuming. As Mikhail Bakhtin affirms:

> Play with a posited author is also characteristic of the comic novel […], a heritage from *Don Quixote*. But […] such play is purely a compositional device, which strengthens the general trend toward relativity, objectification and the parodying of literary forms and genres.[132]

[130] E. C. Riley, *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel* (Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1992), p. 205. The device was as 'well-worn' at Cervantes' time of writing as it was at Pushkin's.
[131] Debreczeny, *The Other Pushkin*, p. 63.
[132] M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. By Michael Holquist, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), p. 312.

The comic nature of the works relies heavily on the authors' 'play with a posited author' and consequently on the parody that the varying levels of complexity and ambiguity brings to the text. In the *Quixote* there are three narrative levels: the story was purportedly originally written and narrated by the Arabic first author-narrator, Cide Hamete Benengeli, in *aljamiado* (Spanish written in Arabic script); it is then transliterated into Castilian by a *morisco*, commissioned by the second author-narrator, who finds the remainder of the manuscript in a market in Toledo (I.IX), and who is often identified by readers as Cervantes himself. In the *Tales*, Pushkin also includes three basic narrative levels: the first author-narrators; the compiler and editor, Belkin; and the final editor, A.P. However, he furthers the complexity by implementing not one first author-narrator, but four: 'The Stationmaster' ('Stantsionnyi smotritel'') is purportedly narrated by Titular Counsellor A.G.N; 'The Shot' by Lieutenant Colonel I.L.P.; 'The Undertaker' ('Grobovshchik') by the steward B.V.; and 'The Blizzard' and 'The Lady Peasant' by the maiden K.I.T. They then somehow pass their anecdotes on to Belkin, who acts as the second-author-narrator. The manuscript then makes its way to the editor, A.P., whose initials lead the reader to believe that this fictional editor is Pushkin himself.[133] To take an example from Gogol''s *Dikan'ka* collection, in 'St John's Eve' there are also three basic narrative levels: the original story is told to Foma Grigorievich, the deacon, by his grandfather; Foma then passes the story on to the reader via the compiler and final narrator of the collection, Rudy Pan'ko. But this is not before the arrival of a man from Poltava with a notebook containing, according to Foma, an incorrect version of his grandfather's story, which serves as both a minor narrative detour as well as motivation for Foma's narration.

The complexity of Cervantes, Pushkin and Gogol''s narrative frames is clearly intended to mock this commonplace literary device. It enables the authors to bring a wide range of

[133] The identities of the four narrators are provided in a footnote in A.P.'s comical and improbable prologue headed 'From the Editor', in which he explains that he acquired this information from the notes written above each story in Belkin's manuscript.

narrative voices to their texts, whose untrustworthy natures facilitate humour and drive parody. In the case of the *Quixote*, Cide Hamete is a Moor and the transliterator is a *morisco*, two demographics which were considered suspicious and untrustworthy during Cervantes' time of writing. The second author-narrator even provides a disclaimer: 'If there is any objection to be made about the truthfulness of this history, it can only be that its author was an Arab, and it's a well-known feature of Arabs that they're all liars' ('Si a esta se le puede poner alguna objeción cerca de su verdad, no podrá ser otra sino haber sido su autor arábigo, siendo muy propio de los de aquella nación ser mentirosos') (I.IX.76/120). Cervantes' play on contemporary racial stereotyping enables him to parody the narrator of the romances of chivalry while bringing comic irony to his text: how can it be called a 'true history' ('verdadera historia') (II.XVII.595/835), as the second-author narrator regularly calls it, if it is written by a Moor? As Edward Riley explains:

> The existence of Cide Hamete is a joke—and such a successful one that the significance of his absurdity is almost invariably passed over. He offers the one instance of total inverisimilitude in the book […] For, by making a patently unbelievable character supposedly responsible for the story, Cervantes wraps his vivid simulacrum of historical reality safely in an envelope of fiction.[134]

In the case of the *Tales*, although Pushkin's narrators have not been coloured with racial stereotypes, they nevertheless represent different social and cultural backgrounds, some of which would be considered more trustworthy than others. For example, the maiden K.I.T. narrates 'The Blizzard' and 'The Lady Peasant' in a sentimental fashion and, against the context of her maidenly position and the nature of her stories, would have been stereotyped as sentimentalising and hyperbolising not only the language but the content of the story as well, thereby parodying the sentimental narrator. Furthermore, the fact that her two protagonists are,

[134] Riley, *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel*, pp. 209–10.

like herself, country maidens, provides comic irony by suggesting to the reader that the narrator is not too dissimilar from her two fictional heroines, and herself might wish to be more like them. In the case of the *Dikan'ka* texts, although there is nothing stereotypically untrustworthy about the narrators, Gogol' nevertheless makes the reader question their reliability. Rudy provides 'St John's Eve' with the subtitle, 'A True Story Told by the Deacon of — Church' ('Быль, рассказанная дьячком —ской церкви') (I: 137), in a similar vein to Cervantes' insistence that his work is a 'true history'. The story, however, is even less plausible than the *Quixote*: it is full of witchcraft and devilry, and concludes with the protagonist, Petro, turning into a pile of ash. The juxtaposition between the sheer fantasy of the narrative with the strength of the declarations of its veracity is perhaps the clearest example of the comedic potential of the framed narrative as a parody of storytelling.

In addition to facilitating parody and humour, the ambiguity that arises from the myriad narrative voices in a framed narrative also allows the original authors to voice their own social concerns while deflecting any criticism directed towards them. In the *Quixote*, the second author-narrator comically explains that, if anything worthwhile is missing from the text, 'it's my belief that it's the dog of an author who wrote it that's to blame' ('para mí tengo que fue por culpa del galgo de su autor') (I.IX.76/121).[135] The premise can be extended to social criticism in the text: if the reader does not approve of certain social commentaries, then their presence in the narrative is the fault of Cide Hamete and not the Cervantine second author-narrator. Although it is not necessary for the first narrator to be a Moor for Cervantes to be able to deflect any criticism, in the context of Golden Age Spain it would have been both relevant and humorous. It is difficult to doubt that Pushkin incorporates his panoply of fictional narrators for a similar reason. The ambiguity of the narrators' identities and the lengthy game of 'Chinese whispers' played with the stories suggest that a lot of the details have been distorted

[135] Riley, *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel*, p. 212.

or omitted along the way, thereby rendering the texts untrustworthy. Because of this, any errors, or any comments that might be considered socially critical, cannot be attributed to Pushkin or the Pushkinian editor A.P., but rather the various individual first narrators. In this way narrative framing enables both authors to shift the reader's (or, indeed, the censor's) criticism from the writers themselves and onto their fictional narrators.

Although in many instances the authors' opinions are often finely interwoven with those of the various narrators, there are other occasions where the narrative voices are easily distinguished. For example:

> 'Blessed be almighty Allah!' says Hamete Benengeli at the beginning of this eighth chapter. 'Blessed be Allah!', he repeats three times, and he says that he's uttering these blessings because Don Quixote and Sancho are in the field again at last […]
>
> «¡Bendito sea el poderoso Alá!», dice Hamete Benengeli al comienzo deste octavo capítulo. «¡Bendito sea Alá!», repite tres veces, y dice que da estas bendiciones por ver que tiene ya en campaña a don Quijote y a Sancho […] (II.VIII.532/748)

The passage is a clear reminder to the reader that the first author of the 'delightful history' ('agradable historia') (II.VIII.532/748) is a Moor and can therefore not be trusted. There is also comic irony in his religious exaltations, praising Allah four times for the simple reason that Don Quijote and Sancho 'are in the field again at last', a parodic reworking of the Christian praise the narrators of chivalric romances would afford their knights errant for their noble deeds. But Cide Hamete's language is so distinctive that it is often identifiable without introduction, even when there is no religious colouring, for example in his exclamation: 'Most happy and fortunate were the times when that most daring knight Don Quixote de la Mancha appeared on this earth […]' ('Felicísimos y venturosos fueron los tiempos donde se echó al mundo el audacísimo caballero don Quijote de la Mancha […]') (I.XXVIII.247/347). His zealous and enthusiastic language about Don Quijote, and particularly his use of superlatives such as 'most daring' ('audacísimo'), not only betrays his presence in its clear juxtaposition

with the more tempered voice of the second author-narrator, but also serves to parody the language employed by the narrators of the romances of chivalry.

The individual voices of the narrators in the *Tales* also parody those of popular literature at the time. The maiden K.I.T.'s vocabulary, for example, is 'derived partly from Karamzinite sentimentalism, partly from a romanticism à la Marlinskii'.[136] Although K.I.T.'s narrative voice is prominent throughout her narratives, in 'The Lady Peasant' Belkin's presence is exposed. In the phrase, 'Were I to follow my own inclinations, I would certainly give a detailed account of how the young people used to meet' (59) ('Если бы слушался я одной своей охоты, то непременно и во всей подробности стал бы описывать свидания молодых людей') (VIII: 117), the verbs 'слушался' (translated here as 'to follow') and 'стал бы' (translated as 'I would certainly') are in the masculine form.[137] In addition to unmasking Belkin's authorship of this sentence and hinting at his further-reaching editorial role throughout the work, the sudden presence of the masculine voice, in a work which is otherwise clearly written by a maiden, further adds to the comic value of the text. In 'The Stationmaster', meanwhile, the narrative is ridden with pathos which is more consistent with sentimental literature. But this does not stop its narrator A.G.N. from also serving, like K.I.T., as a parody of Karamzin in his frequent addresses to the reader, rhetorical questions, exclamations, and use of archaic forms, such as 'токмо' instead of 'только' ('only'), or 'столь' ('so') and 'сии' ('these') (VIII: 97–98).[138] This is not unlike Don Quijote's frequent use of archaisms, such as 'fermosura' instead of 'hermosura' ('beauty') and 'facer' instead of 'hacer' ('to make' or 'to do'). Although parody of the narrator 'forms part of the literary game', Andrew Kahn is correct

[136] Debreczeny, *The Other Pushkin*, p. 89.
[137] Ibid., p. 92. Originally noted in V. V. Vinogradov, *Stil' Pushkina* (Moscow: Ogiz, Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1941), p. 551.
[138] Debreczeny, *The Other Pushkin*, p. 124.

in his observation of 'The Stationmaster' that 'it does not distract or detract from the power of the story to move the reader'.[139]

Parody is also a significant component of *History of the Village of Goryukhino*, another text written and narrated by Belkin (this time as sole author-narrator), which parodies the local histories popular at the time in Russia. But there is also an ironic, Cervantine wordplay which pervades the text. This is suggested in the choice of place names. Goryukhino is the most common spelling of the town in the manuscript, but it also appears several times as Gorokhino (VIII: 698, 711). The Russian reader would associate 'Goryukhino' with 'горе' ('gore' = sorrow), which evokes pathos in its reflection of the destitution and demise of the village and the sorrow of the peasants. But the village is also spelled 'Gorokhino', where 'горох' ('gorokh' = pea) would have generated a comical comparison of the village with a small, insignificant vegetable. This is not unlike Cervantes, who described Don Quijote as coming from La Mancha, which, although a region of Spain, can also be translated as 'the stain'.

Although the ambiguity of the village's name is likely to be due to the incompleteness of the text, it also serves to parody the amateur local historian through Belkin's own confusion about the very name of the place about which he is writing his history. Cervantes uses the same device in his 'historia' when his narrator cannot recall the eponymous hero's original name (he wonders whether it is Quijada, Quesada, or Quijana, which conjure images of a jawbone, cheese, and a complaint respectively), and he takes his mockery of the historical narrator a step further with his own narrator's open admission: 'In a village in La Mancha, the name of which I [*do not want to*] recall […]' ('En un lugar de la Mancha, de cuyo nombre *no quiero* acordarme […]') (I.I.25/37).[140] Once more the reader is presented with comic irony in Cide Hamete's authorship of the 'true history'.

[139] Kahn, 'Introduction', p. xx.
[140] My italics. The nuance is often overlooked in English translations.

Although it is difficult to argue that the *Tales* and *Goryukhino* were written as a response to the *Quixote*, Debreczeny is correct in his observation that:

> Some passages seem to indicate an affinity […] For example, [in *Goryukhino*] Belkin sits over his copybook chewing on his pen and wondering what to write in much the same manner as Cervantes, in a quandary over his Prologue; inspiration is brought to Belkin by his housekeeper, to Cervantes by a friend.[141]

Pushkin's attempts to branch out into prose fiction are imbued with the quixotic tradition. At their core, the *Quixote*, *Tales* and *Goryukhino* are all parodic texts. In the *Tales* in particular, parody is directed at a range of genres, character types and formal and structural features, just as it is in the *Quixote*. There should be little surprise that both Cervantes and Pushkin founded their works on the device as it provided them with an opportunity to create something new while mocking existing literary norms. But while Cervantes succeeded in creating the first modern novel, Pushkin was still some way from creating the first Russian one. According to Garrard, the density of multivoiced collections of stories like the *Tales* during the 1820s and 30s in Russia suggests that such works 'seem to be as close as [writers] could get to a long work in prose at this still quite primitive stage in the development of Russian prose fiction'.[142] Despite this 'primitive stage' of Russian prose, seeds were nevertheless being sown for what would become the Russian novel, a genre to which Pushkin's greatest contribution would be his 'novel in verse', *Evgeny Onegin*.

Evgeny Onegin

Pushkin's *Evgeny Onegin* is widely considered the masterpiece that launched the nineteenth-century Russian literary canon. The 'novel in verse' was written between 1823 and 1830 (with

[141] Debreczeny, *The Other Pushkin*, p. 311, n. 35.
[142] Garrard, 'Introduction', p. 17.

further editions made in the following few years), and published between 1825 and 1832. Pushkin was only twenty-four when he began the work, in exile in the south, and completed it when he was thirty-two, in his 'full maturity as a poet'.[143] Pushkin's lengthy creative process is visible in the development of the work, not only in the irregular appearance and publication of chapters over the years and its loose framework, but particularly in the development of the protagonists, Onegin and Tatyana, who undergo significant transformations throughout the course of the novel.

Lord Byron is the most commonly identified source of influence in Pushkin's works, and particularly in *Evgeny Onegin*, which the Russian began to work on soon after his introduction to Byronic Romanticism. This is seen throughout the text, which features a number of allusions and responses to Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* and *Don Juan*: they are all 'novels in verse' with numbered verse stanzas and with the omission of some lines; they were 'published in chapters that appeared irregularly over many years, with no ostensible end point envisaged'; and they feature:

> […] a loose framework associated with the adventures of an eponymous hero that allowed the poet to incorporate disparate material (literary, historical, cultural and quasi-autobiographical). From chapter 1 to the 'Fragments of Onegin's Journey' […] Pushkin's protagonist appears 'Childe-Harold-like' […] that is, as a type whose (in Byron's words) 'early perversion of mind and morals leads to satiety of past pleasures and disappointment in new ones'.[144]

How Onegin is, or is not, a Byronic hero will be discussed in greater detail later in this section.

Although Byron played a significant role in the shaping of Pushkin's masterpiece, he was not the only influence. *Evgeny Onegin*, like Pushkin's entire *oeuvre*, reflects an array of literary sources and traditions. As Russia did not yet have a novel tradition from which Pushkin

[143] A. D. P. Briggs, 'Introduction' to A. S. Pushkin, *Evgenii Onegin = Eugene Onegin* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2000), pp. vii–xx (p. vii).
[144] Marcus Levitt, '*Evgenii Onegin*', in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. by Andrew Kahn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 41–56 (pp. 41–42).

could draw influence, he turned his attention towards various foreign novels to see how their authors undertook and navigated such a gargantuan task while managing to imbue their works with the spirit of their nation. Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, a work which Pushkin discusses in relation to 'народность' ('nativeness') and is one of the first modern novels, naturally falls into this consideration.[145] There should be little surprise, therefore, that the quixotic tradition can be clearly perceived in *Evgeny Onegin*.

As with the *Tales of Belkin*, the two primary points of convergence between the *Quixote* and *Evgeny Onegin* are formal experimentation and parody. However, before these two are discussed, one more similarity needs to be addressed: neither author had a concrete plan for the development of his work. Pushkin took around eight years to write *Evgeny Onegin*, which suggests that he did not have a clear vision from the outset. The narrator also admits this in the work: 'I've already thought about the form of my plan/ And what I'll name the hero' ('Я думал уж о форме плана/ И как героя назову') (VI: 30: I.LX). He has only considered the novel's structure and development, rather than decided on it and, although he knows the name of his hero, at this point he knows nothing more about his character and relationships and how they will develop. According to Marcus Levitt:

> *Evgenii Onegin*'s specific 'form of [the] plan' changed at least three times during the course of its writing and publication, from a projected two parts in twelve chapters, to nine chapters with a tripartite structure, and finally, to eight chapters, with the decision to destroy the (later very partially deciphered) politically sensitive—and unpublishable— 'chapter 10'.[146]

The changing character of Onegin—who originally appears to be a quintessential Romantic hero before Tatyana, together with the reader, is able to see through his façade to his

[145] For discussion of Pushkin's views on the *Quixote* and 'народность', see pp. 39–40.
[146] Marcus Levitt, '*Evgenii Onegin*', p. 45.

ordinariness—also reflects Pushkin's growth as a writer and his movement away from Byronic Romanticism towards his own interpretation of Romanticism as literary innovation.

Cervantes similarly did not have a plan for how his *Quixote* would take shape. As Edwin Williamson argues, 'Cervantes had initially set out to write a short parody of the Spanish romances no longer than one of his exemplary *novellas*'.[147] This is suggested in the first few chapters where Don Quijote begins his first sally alone before returning home and acquiring Sancho as a squire, before the pair proceed on their adventures for the remainder of the novel (I.V–VII). Further evidence is also visible in Part II. One key example is when Don Quijote, having earlier stated his intention to go jousting in Zaragoza, changes his mind and decides to go to Barcelona instead. This change is motivated by his desire to prove that he is the 'real' Don Quijote, rather than the 'fake' Don Quijote who, in the spurious second part to the novel by Avellaneda, follows the former's original intention of going to Zaragoza (II.LIX). There is also the example of Don Quijote's death (II.LXXIV), which, rather than being planned from the beginning, Cervantes likely added to avoid any risk of further spurious sequels.

Because neither author had a clear plan for their novels, it meant that they had a blank canvas on which to experiment with form and genre. Given that *Evgeny Onegin* is written in verse form, the reader, both contemporary and modern, may be sceptical as to whether it even qualifies as a novel. Pushkin, however, was firm in his decision to classify his work as such from the beginning. His first mention of his work is found in a letter from 4 November 1823 to Count Vyazemsky in which he states that there is a 'devil of a difference' ('дьявольская разница') between a novel and a novel in verse (XIII: 73). Such generic ambiguities are a hallmark of the development of a literary tradition, and feature as much in the Spanish Golden Age as they do in the Russian. Pushkin's indifference to generic boundaries is also visible in

[147] Edwin Williamson, *The Halfway House of Fiction: Don Quixote and Arthurian Romance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 161.

his narrative poems *The Gypsies*, which features speech and stage direction, and *The Bronze Horseman* (*Mednyi vsadnik*, 1833), for which he provides the subtitle: 'A Petersburg Tale' ('Peterburgskaya povest''). The reverse would later be seen in Gogol''s *Dead Souls*, a prose narrative work which he subtitles a 'poema'.

There are a number of possible reasons as to why Pushkin subtitled his work a 'novel in verse'. Firstly, the subtitle would have evoked Byron, whose *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* and *Don Juan* belonged to the same genre, and would have subconsciously prompted the reader to compare Pushkin with the English poet and Onegin with his eponymous heroes. Secondly, the controversial and ambiguous nature of the subtitle would have caused the reader to rethink what constitutes a novel: it would have generated confusion and discussion among his readers, who would have considered a typical novel to be written in prose, and 'exasperate[d] latter-day neoclassical critics who protested the work's deliberate jumbling of styles, genres, and tones'.[148] Such responses would have added to the work's renown, which would have been particularly important to Pushkin during his early stages of writing: having been a Petersburg socialite and prominent in literary circles, he feared that his exile would lead to him being forgotten. Thirdly, and relatedly, the subtitle also generates controversy and ambiguity from a thematic perspective, since the term 'роман' ('roman') can mean both a 'novel' and a 'romance' or 'love affair'. The Russian reader, therefore, would expect the work to feature some romantic intrigue, but instead has their expectations subverted when they are greeted with an anti-climax. Finally, the controversial genre definition allowed Pushkin, like Cervantes in the *Quixote*, not only to incorporate an array of forms and genres (such as epistolary correspondence, dream recollections and lyrical depictions of nature) but also to parody them. Levitt, supporting Pushkin's generic classification of *Evgeny Onegin*, draws upon Bakhtin's

[148] Garrard, 'Introduction', p. 12.

suggestion that the 'novel', whether in prose or verse, is actually an 'anti-genre' which both recycles ('cannibalises') and subverts ('carnivalises'), and comments that:

> True to this description, *Evgenii Onegin* absorbs and parodically reworks a panoply of literary discourses, both those of specific poetic genres (elegy, love lyric, epigram, friendly epistle, ode) and those of particular novelistic prose traditions.[149]

The same can be said of the *Quixote*. It is not a novel because of its prose format, but rather because it too 'absorbs and parodically reworks a panoply of literary discourses'.

Like the *Tales of Belkin, Evgeny Onegin* is also a parody. Turkevich is not wrong when she says that 'just as Cervantes satirised the books of chivalry with their extravagant heroes, so Pushkin parodied the sentimental novel with its spineless (and equally extravagant) heroines'.[150] Parody in the *Quixote* is evident from the outset of the novel through its comic portrayal: Alonso Quijano, despite being a middle aged, lowly *hidalgo*, decides to become a knight errant, while his nag plays the role of steed, and his rotund, chatterbox, peasant neighbour plays the role of squire; their adventures are also humorously diminutive in comparison to the battles of the knights of the chivalric romances. As in *Evgeny Onegin*, parody in the *Quixote* is intertwined with humour, wit and irony, but unlike in Pushkin's text, the comic aspects are more overt and parody is therefore more easily recognisable. In the case of *Evgeny Onegin*, Turkevich refers to the character of Tatyana as a parody of a 'spineless' heroine from sentimental literature. Turkevich forgets to add, however, that the work is predominantly a parodic reworking of the Romantic tradition. For example, although Tatyana parodically possesses the emotions and vocabulary of a sentimental heroine, she also possesses the courage of a Romantic one. Onegin, meanwhile, is a parody of Byron as much as of his characters in his sombre mood, nonchalance, selectivity of friendships, and in his duel with, and murder of,

[149] Marcus Levitt, '*Evgenii Onegin*', p. 45.
[150] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 42.

his only friend in the novel, the young poet, Lensky. Although Lensky plays only a small role in the work, it is worth noting that he is mocked for both his youthful sentimentality and his naïve view of German Romanticism, and is thus a parody of both the sentimental and the Romantic hero. Herein lies the most evident link between Don Quijote, Onegin, Tatyana and Lensky: they are all parodies of literary types which were popular at or just before each author's time of writing—Don Quijote is a parody of the knights from chivalric romance; Onegin, of the English Romantic hero; Tatyana, of the French sentimental heroine, with traces of the Romantic heroine; and Lensky, of the sentimental or German Romantic hero.

Previous scholarship has thus far only examined the relationship between Tatyana and Don Quijote. This started with Dmitry Pisarev's 1865 article, 'Pushkin and Belinsky', in which he wrote of Tatyana:

> She imagined that she was in love with Onegin, and actually fell in love with him; she started to burn with passion and to do silly things similar to the somersaults of the lovelorn Don Quijote on the Sierra Morena. Later she imagined that her life was shattered, and as a result became thin and pale.[151]

The comparison between Don Quijote and Tatyana's apparently foolish behaviour—the former as a knight errant and the latter in her lovelorn state—has been sufficient to unite the pair in comparative literature. Holl is correct in his assertion that Pisarev's 'equation of Tatyana with Don Quijote is meant to undermine her reputation as an admirable character'.[152] The comparison, intended to make Tatyana look foolish, borderline mad, and lacking in respectability, reflects the growing trend in the 1860s for critics to use comparisons to Cervantes' knight as a form of criticism.

[151] D. I. Pisarev, 'Pushkin i Belinskii', in *Sochineniia D. I. Pisareva: polnoe sobranie v shesti tomakh*, 6 vols (St Petersburg: F. Pavlenkov, 1901), v, 1-120 (p. 46).
[152] Holl, '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel', pp. 16–17.

While it would be erroneous to say that Pushkin based Tatyana on Don Quijote, they both share a number of characteristics. The main mutual elements are their love of reading and the ease with which they allow themselves to be influenced by the works they read. Both characters are defined by these traits from early in the works. When the narrator first introduces the reader to Tatyana, she is described as follows:

She had been fond of novels from early on;	Ей рано нравились романы;
They replaced everything for her;	Они ей заменяли всё;
She became enamoured with the falsehoods	Она влюблялася в обманы
Of both Richardson and Rousseau.	И Ричардсона и Руссо.

(VI: 44: II.XXIX)

The narrator of the *Quixote* similarly examines Don Quijote's reading habits, explaining that he 'took to reading books of chivalry with such relish and enthusiasm that he almost forgot about his hunting and even running his property' ('se daba a leer libros de caballerías, con tanta afición y gusto, que olvidó casi de todo punto el ejercicio de la caza y aun la administración de su hacienda') (I.I.25–26/39). For both Don Quijote and Tatyana, reading is a form of escape, replacing the monotony of their lonely, although not entirely isolated, life in the country with a more entertaining, although fictitious, existence. The ennui deriving from their surroundings nurtures their impressionability and motivates the transformation which takes place in their characters. It causes them to read books and eventually to aspire to become an amalgam of the heroes and heroines about whom they have read. This phenomenon, the quixotic principle, is not uncommon in literature: it appears elsewhere in Pushkin's *oeuvre* in Maria Gavrilovna ('The Snowstorm') and his two Lizas ('The Lady Peasant' and *Queen of Spades*); is present in Jane Austen's Emma Woodhouse, who is described as 'an imaginist' (*Emma*, 1815);[153] and reaches tragic heights in Gustave Flaubert's Emma Bovary (*Madame Bovary*, 1856).

[153] Jane Austen, *Emma* (London: Penguin, 2012), p. 329.

The first stage of Don Quijote and Tatyana's transformation process (and, indeed, of all the aforementioned heroines) is 'perceiv[ing] himself/herself not as a reader, but rather as a character in his or her chosen literary tradition'.[154] In the first chapter of the *Quixote,* the narrator explains that 'the poor man could already see himself being crowned Emperor of Trebizond, at the very least, through the might of his arm' ('Imaginábase el pobre ya coronado por el valor de su brazo, por lo menos del imperio de Trapisonda') (I.I.27/44), just like the fictitious chivalric knight, Renaud de Montauban.[155] Tatyana is similar, imagining herself to be one of the sentimental heroines found in Richardson, Rousseau, and Madame de Staël:

Imagining herself as the heroine	Воображаясь героиной
Of her beloved authors,	Своих возлюбленных творцов,
Clarissa, Julie, Delphine […]	Кларисой, Юлией, Дельфиной [...][156]
	(VI: 55: III.X)

Pushkin compares Tatyana to these characters in order to heighten her parodic function. However, although she primarily parodies the sentimental heroine through her language and emotion, her courage later on in the novel parodies the Romantic heroine. Similarly, although Don Quijote is ultimately a parody of a knight errant, his character, like Tatyana's, also features a combination of emotional sentimentalism and courage.

Having perceived themselves as literary characters, the second stage in their transformation process is to adopt the characteristics and qualities of their chosen type. There is a significant similarity in Don Quijote's transformation into a knight errant and Tatyana's sentimental persona: both require someone to love if they are to fulfil their new roles. The sentimental heroine needs a sentimental hero over whom she can pine, while the knight errant

[154] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia,* p. 39
[155] In Spanish, Reinaldos de Montalbán.
[156] Tatyana's sources are Richardson's *Clarissa Harlowe*, Rousseau's *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloise,* and Mme de Staël's *Delphine*. See Vladimir Nabokov, *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse*, 4 vols (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), II, 338–48.

needs a noble lady to whom he can dedicate his victories. In neither case is Don Quijote or Tatyana's love organic, as it is in the chivalric romances and sentimental novels, but rather it is a requirement for their new roles.

Don Quijote chooses for his love interest Dulcinea. She is a fabrication, based on the unattractive peasant girl, Aldonza Lorenzo, with whom the narrator says he once was in love (I.I), but in reality he has seen her only a handful of times. The elevation of ugly peasant girl to beautiful noblewoman is also in keeping with the parodic and comic function of the text. Tatyana, meanwhile, chooses Onegin. This love seems, superficially at least, more natural than that of Don Quijote. However, the reader must remember that she meets him only once before dedicating all her feelings to him (not so unlike Don Quijote and Aldonza/Dulcinea), and her sudden infatuation likely stems from her emotional susceptibility, augmented by her reading and idleness. In adopting qualities of the sentimental heroine, she requires a hero with whom she can fulfil the emotional aspect of her new character. She is so emotionally absorbed, however, that she does not realise that Onegin is an impetuous dandy with little regard for those around him, rather than the Romantic hero she perceives him to be. Ultimately, both Don Quijote and Tatyana fall in love not with the real, but with the ideal. Don Quijote falls in love with the ideal Dulcinea, the image of a noble lady he projects on to the real Aldonza Lorenzo. Tatyana falls in love with the ideal Onegin, the image of the Romantic hero she projects on to the real Onegin. In both cases Dulcinea and Onegin act as arbitrary figures whom Don Quijote and Tatyana use to fulfil their literary fantasies.

The third and final stage in both characters' transformations occurs at the end of the novels when Don Quijote and Tatyana abandon their fictional selves and return to reality. In the *Quixote*, there is no doubt about the hero's return to sanity:

> You must congratulate me, my good sirs, because I am no longer Don Quixote de La Mancha but Alonso Quixano, for whom my way of life earned me the nickname of 'the Good'. I am now the enemy of Amadis of Gaul and the whole infinite horde of his descendants […]
>
> Dadme albricias, buenos señores, de que ya yo no soy don Quijote de la Mancha, sino Alonso Quijano, a quien mis costumbres me dieron renombre de «bueno». Ya soy enemigo de Amadís de Gaula y de toda la infinita caterva de su linaje […] (II.LXXIV.977/1330)

Tatyana also abandons her idealised, fiction-based way of life. Following a period of around two years after Lensky's death and Onegin's subsequent departure from the countryside, he and Tatyana—now a princess, married to an old general—are reunited at a ball in Moscow. The reader would expect her once more to be aflame with passion, but she treats Onegin civilly, even coolly. Previously Tatyana had been impassioned and sent Onegin a letter declaring her love, to which he sent no formal reply; now Onegin is impassioned, sending her letters, using the same language that she had used in her letter to him, to which she does not respond. She seems to have undergone a full transformation—until he finds her weeping over his letters. This emotion might suggest that she has not overcome all traces of her life as a sentimental heroine; however, her ultimate rejection of Onegin proves that she has undergone a significant transformation. She may be emotional, but this outpouring is not a sign of her former fictitious, sentimental character, but rather a sign of being a mature woman, with real emotions, being reminded of a troublesome and emotional past. Like Don Quijote, in her return to reality she gives up her fictional self and, simultaneously, the idealised love of the sentimental heroine.

Although previous scholarship has focused on the relationship between Don Quijote and Tatyana, affinities also exist between the eponymous heroes. This is most evident at the end of the novel. While Tatyana sheds her fictional self and transforms into a stoic Russian heroine, Onegin transforms into a more Don Quijote-like character: having previously scorned Tatyana, he is now suddenly in love with her. Although there is a difference in the heroes' love

interests, with Don Quijote being in love with the *imaginary* Dulcinea while Onegin is in love with the *real* Tatyana, there is one key similarity: both are in love with women of high rank. Don Quijote does not care for the peasant girl Aldonza Lorenzo but does for the noble lady Dulcinea; Onegin, similarly, does not care for the country girl Tatyana, but does for the princess Tatyana. From both heroes' situations the reader can determine the authors' subtle criticism of social status and of obsessive ambition to rise in society.

Parody remains the main point of convergence between the protagonists: just as Don Quijote is not a real knight errant but a parody of one, so too is Onegin not a Romantic figure, but a parody of one. While Don Quijote's parodic function is evident from the outset of the novel through his appearance, actions and speech, there are also traces of evidence, albeit more subtle, of Onegin fulfilling an analogous role. One key example is when Tatyana enters Onegin's study, following his departure from the countryside, and she reads through his notes and books. Her Romanticised image of him, already confused after his murder of Lensky, continues its process of fading into obscurity the more she reads in his library:

Sad and dangerous eccentric,	Чудак печальный и опасный,
Creation of heaven or hell,	Созданье ада иль небес,
This angel, this arrogant demon,	Сей ангел, сей надменный бес,
Which is it? Is he really an imitation,	Что ж он? Ужели подражанье,
A paltry phantom, or also	Ничтожный призрак, иль еще
A Muscovite in Harold's cloak,	Москвич в Гарольдовом плаще,
Interpretation of foreign whims,	Чужих причуд истолкованье,
A complete lexicon of fashionable words?	Слов модных полный лексикон?
Is he then but a parody?[157]	Уж не пародия ли он?

(VI: 149: VII.XXIV)

Her understanding of Onegin's true character is, paradoxically, both clarified and obscured: she begins to realise that he is not the Romantic hero she had imagined, but his true identity remains a mystery. Whoever he is, there is a sense of falsehood about him and a distancing

[157] The translation used here is from Levitt, '*Evgenii Onegin*', p. 51.

from reality. She begins to realise that many of his traits are adopted from characters in the books he has read. His library consists of many of Byron's works, with passages marked with his fingernail, and she wonders if he could be a 'Muscovite in Harold's cloak' ('Москвич в Гарольдовом плаще'), and whether he is some sort of parody of the characters in the works he has read: 'Is he then but a parody?' ('Уж не пародия ли он?'). The realisation of his shallowness facilitates her later rejection of him.

Onegin is a parody of the Romantic hero, just as Don Quijote is a parody of a knight errant, because he fails to adopt accurately the characteristics of his chosen type. In trying to emulate fictional characters, both heroes exaggerate their characteristics and the ensuing hyperbole paves the way for parody. This is seen in the *Quixote* when the protagonist asks to fight the caged lions in order to prove that he possesses the bravery of a knight errant, rather than letting trials come his way (II.XVII). There is extra comic value in the lions' unwillingness to attack him: the one whose cage is opened merely yawns, turns his back on Don Quijote, and goes back to sleep. Another example is when Don Quijote goes to the Sierra Morena with the intention of actively imitating the title character of *Amadis of Gaul*, before choosing to imitate the eponymous hero of Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* instead (I.XXV–XXVI): he tries so hard to prove that he is a knight errant that his endeavours only highlight the disparities between how he perceives himself and how others do.

Onegin's exaggerated Romantic character is seen in his friendship with eighteen-year-old Lensky. Although the narrator explains that they are friends, Onegin nevertheless wishes to take revenge on him for convincing him to attend a soirée at which he sees Tatyana in an emotional state. This revenge comes in the form of flirting and dancing with Lensky's almost-betrothed, Olga. Although Onegin may think that the punishment he bestows upon Lensky (his revenge) matches the latter's crime (inadvertently making the protagonist see an emotional and forlorn Tatyana), he fails to take into consideration his friend's disposition. Lensky, in the

throes of youthful passion—and himself possessing a sense of impetuousness not unlike that of Don Quijote—demands that Onegin should fight a duel, and the latter accepts the challenge. From a contextual perspective James Forsyth is correct to note that:

> The honourable settling of an offence without fighting was also part of the gentleman's code of honour, and if in any sense Onegin were 'a superior being' and not 'a plaything of convention', he would have apologised to Lensky.[158]

Onegin accepts, holds his nerve, and pulls the trigger—causing Lensky's death—because that is what he thinks a Romantic figure would do, without considering the implications it will have on his real life. In taking on this persona, he stifles his inner feelings of friendship towards Lensky and his acceptance of his youthfulness and naiveté. Instead of apologising, which would not only have been acceptable but honourable, he proceeds to let his fictitious, contrived persona override his original character. Like Don Quijote, he goes to extremes to prove that he is someone he is not—a Romantic hero rather than an ordinary person. However, the heroes' irresponsible actions instead highlight how removed they are from the types they are trying to be. But there is one significant difference between the two protagonists in their desire to take on a different guise: while Don Quijote is content for his companions to take shelter during his intended battle with the lions, the reverse is true of Onegin, whose warped Romantic character is defined by his hyperbolic indifference towards Lensky.

While it would be difficult to argue that Pushkin created Onegin and Tatyana as a direct response to Don Quijote, the quixotic principle is unquestionably a fundamental aspect of these two characters: like Don Quijote, they are shaped by the literature they read and end up becoming parodies of its protagonists. There should be little surprise that parody plays as significant a role in Pushkin's works, and particularly in those discussed in this study, as it does

[158] James Forsyth, 'Pisarev, Belinsky and Yevgeniy Onegin', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 48.111 (1970), 163–80 (p. 170).

in the *Quixote*. On the one hand, both writers set out to mock literary commonplaces and contemporary reading habits. On the other, parody is a natural occurrence in literary evolution. As Bakhtin asserts, 'the most important novelistic models and novel-types arose precisely during this parodic destruction of preceding novelistic worlds', a comment which is applicable to both Cervantes and Pushkin in their generic experimentation and literary development.[159]

Pushkin was keenly aware of the importance of literary experimentation and of looking to West European sources for inspiration in order to develop the Russian prose tradition. This is reflected in his Romantic approach to literature, and particularly to Cervantes and his works. While Pushkin's Romanticism began in a predominantly Byronic cast, traces of which can be seen in *The Gypsies*, it soon became focused on literary genius and creativity, as is reflected in his own experimentation in a variety of genres. Although Pushkin is known primarily as a poet, he also found success with his modest prose output, and helped to lay the foundations for Russian prose developments with various works, including the prose parody *Tales of Belkin* and his novel in verse *Evgeny Onegin*.

Despite the shift in Pushkin's Romantic attitude from one of Byronism towards one of literary creativity, his approach to the character of Don Quijote seems to have remained relatively constant throughout his career. His Romantic interpretation of Cervantes' knight errant is most visible in the character of Grinev/Bulanin from his drafts to *The Captain's Daughter*, but elements can also be discerned in Tatyana's courage and ultimate emotional fortitude. A Romantic reworking of Andrés from Cervantes' 'Little Gypsy Girl' can also be seen, to some extent, in Aleko in *The Gypsies*. But Pushkin's most striking reinterpretation of a figure of Spanish legend appears in his one-act play *The Stone Guest*. He strays somewhat from the myth of Don Juan in his portrayal of him not so much as an 'odious betrayer of women and slayer of rivals', but rather as someone who is 'capable of real love and is raised to the

[159] Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 309.

stature of a tragic hero […]'.[160] Given Pushkin's attraction to the exoticism with which Spain was commonly perceived during the Romantic period, as well as his wider awareness of the importance of considering Western sources in the development of his own literature, it is unsurprising that he should have been fascinated by some of the nation's most colourful literary figures and sought to rework them in his own texts. His Romantic interpretation of them is clear: he downplays their negative aspects—Don Juan's lechery and Don Quijote's folly—and ennobles those which he admired and with which he would have felt some kinship—Don Juan's passionate nature, and Don Quijote's innate sense of honour and devotion to his beloved. In reworking the myths of two of Spain's most prolific literary figures, Pushkin was able to foreground their admirable qualities, and in so doing encourage the Russian reader to view them in a different, Romantic light.

[160] Briggs, 'Fallibility and Perfection in the Works of Alexander Pushkin', p. 31.

2. GOGOL' AND CERVANTES

Background

Nikolai Gogol' began his literary journey when Pushkin was reaching the height of his career. Although they were contemporaries, and although Gogol' treated Pushkin with great fondness, admiration and reverence, there is one significant difference in their legacies: Pushkin is widely remembered as a poet, while Gogol' is widely remembered as a prose writer and playwright. Nevertheless, Pushkin also experimented with the prose tradition, as discussed in the previous chapter, while Gogol', too, despite his expansive prose output, also experimented with poetry. His first attempt in his literary career, the 1829 Romantic poem inspired by German idyll life, *Hanz Küchelgarten,* was met with universal derision. This caused the young writer not only to buy up and burn every copy, but also to vow never to write poetry again. Prose fiction, and particularly plays, thus became the route by which he was to achieve the fame he sought.

As much as Gogol' admired Pushkin, the aspiring writer also looked to a range of non-Russian sources. His interest in foreign literature can be traced back to his school days in Nezhin in Little Russia (as Ukraine was often referred to in the Russian Empire). Although he knew only Russian, Ukrainian and Polish, since western languages were poorly taught at the time, he was nevertheless drawn to European literature, particularly German Romanticism, and even copied out portions of Schiller's collected works for his own pleasure.[161]

Upon finishing school Gogol' moved to St Petersburg, Russia's then official capital and its 'window to Europe'. Here, frequenting literary circles, he was able to broaden and nourish his literary and his European education. He became acquainted not only with Pushkin, but also with the poet Zhukovsky, who had produced the popular translation of the *Quixote*; the Russian composer Glinka, who felt a kinship between Russia and Spain and included a range of Spanish

[161] Aleksei Nikolaevich Veselovskii, *Zapadnoe vlianie v novoi russkoi literature* (Moscow: 4-e dop. izd., 1910), p. 190.

motifs in his works; and the writer Sergei Sobolevsky, who had visited Spain and was acquainted with a number of Spanish writers. Given this hispanophile company, together with Gogol''s interest in European culture, there should be little surprise that some form of response to Spanish culture and literature should be seen in his writing.

While it is certain that Gogol' spent some time in Germany and France, and spent most of the twelve years from 1836 living in and developing his admiration for Italy, his reminiscences about a trip to Spain are more doubtful. Although he discussed such a trip with his good friend Alexandra Smirnova, and spoke of his turbulent voyage from Marseille to Barcelona, dirty bedsheets at an inn and the innkeeper's witty response, and receiving a cold cutlet for dinner, there is no other evidence that this journey actually occurred.[162] The reader must, in general, be cautious with Gogol', who was prone to hyperbole and invention. It is probable that in this instance, drawn to the allure of Spain, he allowed his active imagination, in Don Quijote-like fashion, to fabricate such a journey. Despite the lack of evidence for a trip to Spain, Gogol''s anecdotes nevertheless provide evidence for an interest in the country. This can also be seen in his letter of 8 August 1847 to Count A. P. Tolstoi, in which he asks:

> Please tell me the title of the Spanish history that you are reading; I, too, would like to read it. […] Old Spain, for sure, could have had everything, and lost it all. But new Spain, in its present form, is worth examining: this is the start of something. The other day I skimmed through the letters recently published in *The Contemporary* by Botkin, who had been there; they are in many ways very interesting and reveal the freshness of the strength of the people and their character […]
>
> Напишите мне заглавие той испанской истории, которую вы читаете; мне хотелось бы также прочесть ее […] Старая Испания, точно, всё могла бы иметь и всё потеряла. Но новая Испания в ее нынешнем виде стоит того, чтоб ее рассмотреть: это начало чего-то. Я пробежал на днях напечатанные в Современнике письма русского там бывшего, Боткина, которые, во многих отношениях, очень интересно, обнаруживают свежесть сил народа и характер […] (XIII: 358–59)

[162] A. O. Smirnova-Rosset, *Zapiski, dnevnik, vospominaniia, pis'ma* (Moscow: Federatsiia, 1929), pp. 312–13; V. I. Shenrok, *Materialy dlia biografii Gogolia*, 4 vols (Moskva: Tip. A. I. Mamontova, 1892), I, 336.

The letter highlights not only his interest in Spain, but also his desire to understand more fully the country, its history and its culture. Although it is difficult to ascertain precisely what Gogol' means by 'old' Spain, he is likely referring to the Spanish Golden Age, the time of Spain's geographical discoveries and imperial expansion—and the period during which Cervantes was active. But Gogol' was also interested in Spain's contemporary culture, having written to Pavel Annenkov on 12 August 1847 that he had read Botkin's letters 'with great curiosity. In them everything is interesting, perhaps because the author had mentally undertaken to determine for himself what makes the modern Spaniard' ('с любопытством. В них всё интересно, может быть, именно оттого, что автор мысленно занялся вопросом разрешить себе самому, что такое нынешний испанский человек') (XIII: 363).

Although Gogol' was not quite as overtly hispanophilic as Pushkin, who inserted a wide range of Spanish themes and motifs into a number of his works, this is not indicative of a lack of interest in the country and its culture. It is instead symbolic of Gogol''s tendency to embrace his own 'Russianness', despite (or, perhaps, because of) his upbringing in Little Russia and his Ukrainian-Polish heritage. Indeed, even during his sojourn in Paris, 'he had not come to France to mingle with the French, but to feel himself more Russian in their midst. He was fiercely determined to remain a foreigner, a tourist in this country of chameleons'.[163] Gogol''s interest in Spain was similar: rather than interacting directly with its culture, he preferred to view it from afar and to respond to it with his own Russian perspective.

Although Gogol' was interested in Spanish culture, he did not possess the same enthusiasm towards it as Pushkin did. This gap is bridged, however, in Gogol''s reception of Cervantes, and particularly in his admiration for the Spanish writer's literary talents. The rest of this chapter will examine Gogol''s responses to Cervantes and his works, and consider their contribution to the Russian writer's literary development. The first section will examine direct

[163] Henri Troyat, *Gogol: The Biography of a Divided Soul* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1974), pp. 172–73.

evidence in the form of Gogol''s references to Cervantes, the *Quixote*, and the novel's eponymous hero, in a range of paraliterary and non-novelistic texts. The next two sections will follow an intertextual, comparative approach. The first of these will examine the theme of madness in 'Diary of a Madman'. Analysis will refer not only to the *Quixote*, but also the closing double tale of Cervantes' *Exemplary Tales*, 'The Deceitful Marriage' ('El casamiento engañoso') and 'Dialogue of the Dogs' ('El coloquio de los perros') which are united through metafiction, the latter apparently having been written by one of the characters in the former. The final section will focus on both authors' seminal works, the *Quixote* and *Dead Souls*. It will examine not only Gogol''s direct references to Cervantes and his protagonist in his drafts to both extant parts of his novel, but also intertextual narratological and typological affinities both through reassessment of previous scholarship and new discussion of further Cervantine echoes found in Gogol''s text.

Gogol' and Cervantes

Gogol''s references to Cervantes and his literary world not only demonstrate that he was familiar with the Spaniard and his writing, but also help the reader to understand his interpretation of the *Quixote* and its hero through his critical and creative responses. The references feature primarily in his discursive contemplations about contemporary literature and in his response to the Don Quijote type which was beginning to manifest itself in Russian culture.

Perhaps the most commonly quoted piece of evidence is Gogol''s recollection in his 'Author's Confession' ('Avtorskaya ispoved'') of how Pushkin, evoking Cervantes and the *Quixote*, 'gifted' him with the idea for *Dead Souls*:

> But Pushkin made me look at the matter seriously. He had long been trying to convince me to undertake a large work and finally, one time, after I had read him a brief description of a short scene, but one which nevertheless struck him more than anything I had previously read him, he said: "With this ability to discern a person and to present him, all of a sudden, in just a few brush strokes, as a living being—with this ability, not to undertake a large work! It's just sinful! Afterwards he started to describe to me my weak constitution and my ailments, which could end my life prematurely. He provided me with the example of Cervantes who, although he had written several excellent and good stories, if he had not undertaken Don Quixote, would never have occupied the place he now holds among writers. To conclude, he gave me a plot of his own from which he had wanted to write something in the form of a long poem and which, according to him, he would not have given to anyone else. This was the plot for Dead Souls.
>
> Но Пушкин заставил меня взглянуть на дело серьезно. Он уже давно склонял меня приняться за большое сочинение и наконец, один раз, после того, как я ему прочел одно небольшое изображение небольшой сцены, но которое, однако ж, поразило его больше всего мной прежде читанного, он мне сказал: «Как с этой способностью угадывать человека и несколькими чертами выставлять его вдруг всего, как живого, с этой способностью, не приняться за большое сочинение! Это, просто, грех!» Вслед за этим начал он представлять мне слабое мое сложение, мои недуги, которые могут прекратить мою жизнь рано; привел мне в пример Сервантеса, который, хотя и написал несколько очень замечательных и хороших повестей, но если бы не принялся за Донкишота, никогда бы не занял того места, которое занимает теперь между писателями, и, в заключенье всего, отдал мне свой собственный сюжет, из которого он хотел сделать сам что-то в роде поэмы и которого, по словам его, он бы не отдал другому никому. Это был сюжет Мертвых душ. (VIII: 439–40)

The anecdote is repeated by Smirnova:

> Pushkin spent four hours with Gogol and gave him the plot for a novel which, like Don Quixote, will be divided into episodes. The hero will travel round the provinces; Gogol' will make use of his own travel notes.
>
> Пушкин провел четыре часа у Гоголя и дал ему сюжет для романа, который, как Дон-Кихот, будет разделен на песни. Герои объедет провинцию; Гоголь воспользуется своими путевыми записками.[164]

[164] Shenrok, *Materialy dlia biografii Gogolia*, III, 393–94.

The double account of this conversation has led many scholars to believe in its veracity. The notion of the plot originally belonging to Pushkin is plausible: the poet had previously given Gogol' the basic plot for his play, *The Government Inspector* (*Revizor*, 1836), in the form of an anecdote which was circulating around Russia at the time and upon which he planned to base a major work of his own. However, there are several reasons why the reader must consider Gogol''s statement with caution. Firstly, and most importantly, there are no further mentions of this encounter in the writing either of Pushkin or of others from their literary circle. Although Smirnova also recalls it, the reader must be aware that her accounts were not always trustworthy. Secondly, and relatedly, given Gogol''s tendency towards hyperbole and invention, it is possible that, encouraged by the positive reception of the story of how the plot for *The Government Inspector* came into his possession, he wished to emulate it with *Dead Souls*. Thirdly, there is also the possibility that, just as Pushkin encouraged the reader to draw parallels between himself and Lord Byron, Gogol' also wished to encourage the reader to compare him with the Russian poet. This idea is augmented by Gogol' subtitling his prose fiction work, *Dead Souls*, a 'poema', in contrast to Pushkin subtitling his poetic work, *Evgeny Onegin*, a 'novel in verse', at a time when genre was still fluid and the Russian novel was in its infancy.[165] Regardless of how the plot for *Dead Souls* came into Gogol''s possession, the quotation serves to link the author with Pushkin and Cervantes, his previous short stories with Cervantes' *Exemplary Tales*, and his novel with the *Quixote*.

In Gogol''s 'Textbook of Literature for Russian Youth' ('Uchebnaya kniga slovesnosti dlya russkogo yunoshestva'), meanwhile, he discusses various literary genres. Of particular importance is his section on the 'minor epic', which he describes as:

[165] This is discussed in further detail in the section on *Dead Souls* (see pp. 101–02).

> […] a kind of narrative work that forms, as it were, a middle ground between the novel and the epic, whose hero, although a private and unremarkable character, is nevertheless significant in many respects for the observer of the human soul […] Many of [these works] are even written in prose, but can nevertheless be considered poetic creations.
>
> […] род повествовательных сочинений, составляющих как бы средину между романом и эпопеей, героем которого бывает хотя частное и невидное лицо, но однако же значительное во многих отношениях для наблюдателя души человеческой [...] Многие из [этих романов] хотя писаны и в прозе, но тем не менее могут быть причислены к созданиям поэтическим. (VIII: 478–79)

As the reader of the *Quixote* and *Dead Souls* will affirm, the description is appropriate for both works. Without realising it, Gogol' has followed Cervantes' own theory of the novel, which the Spanish writer manifests in the Canon of Toledo's speech criticising the romances of chivalry and other forms of literature (I.XLVII). As Riley observes, the Canon's speech 'ends with the statement which is the point of departure of [Cervantes'] whole novelistic theory: that the epic may be written in prose as well as in verse'.[166] Although it cannot be convincingly said that Gogol''s description of the 'minor epic' is a response to the Canon's speech, the Russian writer nevertheless betrays his awareness of the applicability of his theory to the *Quixote*. Not only does he refer to Cervantes on two occasions in drafts to *Dead Souls*,[167] but in this same essay he adds several lines later:

> Thus did Ariosto depict the almost dreamlike passion for adventure and for the marvellous, with which for a time the whole age was engaged, while Cervantes laughed at the thirst for adventure which remained in some people after the Rococo period, at a time when the world itself had already changed around them, and both writers had grown accustomed to their adopted view.
>
> Так Ариост изобразил почти сказочную страсть к приключениям и к чудесному, которым была занята на время вся эпоха, а Сервантес посмеялся над охотой к приключениям, оставшимся, после рококо, в некоторых людях, в то время, когда уже самый век вокруг их переменился, тот и другой сжились с взятою ими мыслью. (VIII: 479)

[166] Riley, *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel*, p. 49.
[167] See pp. 106–07.

Although Gogol' appears to conflate Golden Age Spain with the Late Baroque, despite the one-hundred-year gap between them, the passages nevertheless highlight the generic fluidity that was prevalent during Cervantes and Gogol''s respective times of writing. While Gogol' differentiated between the *Quixote* and *Dead Souls* by labelling the former a 'minor epic' and the latter a 'poema', the truth is that the genres are interchangeable. According to Gogol', both arise during times of cultural and artistic transition, intermingle the serious with the jocular, and result in a form of epic. Eugène-Melchior Vogüé, in his brief comparison of the two works, provides perhaps the simplest and most appropriate response to this generic affiliation: 'whatever name you give to the *Quixote*, you will have found one which also works for *Dead Souls*.'[168]

Another reference to Cervantes appears in his essay, 'On the Trend of Journal Literature in 1834–35' ('O dvizhenii zhurnal'noi literatury v 1834 i 1835 godu'). Here he discusses Russia's wide variety of literary journals and its contributors who, instead of discussing important literary events of recent years, such as the new editions of Derzhavin's and Karamzin's works or the increased reading of prose and the heightened indifference towards poetry, instead:

> […] accepted French literature with childish enthusiasm and claimed that fashionable writers had penetrated the secrets of the human heart, until now the preserve of Cervantes, of Shakespeare…
>
> Французскую литературу […] приняли с детским энтузиазмом, утверждали, что модные писатели проникнули тайны сердца человеческого, дотоле сокровенные для Сервантеса, для Шекспира... (VIII: 172).

Gogol' is criticising the tendency for journals during this period to extol contemporary French literature and compare it, undeservingly, with the works of Cervantes and Shakespeare, and its

[168] Eugène-Melchior Vogüé, *Le Roman Russe* (Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1886), p. 107.

characters with theirs. This suggests the esteem with which Gogol' viewed writers like Cervantes and Shakespeare and the gulf he perceived between them and contemporary French writers.

But while these examples indicate Gogol''s admiration towards Cervantes as a prolific writer and towards the *Quixote* as a literary exemplar, they do not betray his views on the novel's eponymous hero. An indication of his interpretation of Don Quijote (or, more specifically, of the Don Quijote type) can be discerned in his 'Leaving the Theatre after the Performance of a New Play' ('Teatral'nyi raz"ezd posle predstavleniya novoi komedii'). The work, written in dialogue, revolves around an unnamed playwright who wants to hear the first impressions of the departing audience of one of his plays. There can be little doubt that the playwright is Gogol' and that the work in question is his *Government Inspector* (*Revizor*, 1836). The playwright overhears a snippet of a conversation between a civilian and an army official regarding the type of characters mocked in the play:

> Civilian: You military men are all alike! You say, 'This should be on the stage' and you're ready to laugh your heads off over some civilian bureaucrat; but if the military is touched on in any way, and without even mentioning depraved tendencies, if there is even a suggestion that there are officers in such-and-such a regiment who have vulgar taste and offensive manners—that's enough for you to run to the Imperial Cabinet and lodge a complaint.
>
> Military man: Listen now, what do you take me for? Of course, there are Don Quixotes like that among us; but believe me, there are also many truly discriminating people who will always take pleasure in seeing someone who is a disgrace to his profession made a fool of in public. Where is the insult in that?[169]

> Статский. Ведь вот вы какие, господа военные! Вы говорите «это нужно выводить на сцену»; вы готовы вдоволь посмеяться над каким-нибудь статским чиновником; а затронь как-нибудь военных, скажи только, что есть в таком-то полку офицеры, не говоря уже о порочных наклонностях, но просто скажи: есть офицеры дурного тона, с неприличными ухватками, — да вы из-за одного этого готовы с жалобой полезть в самый Государственный совет.

[169] N. V. Gogol', *Hanz Kuechelgarten, Leaving the Theater and Other Works: Early Writings, Essays, Book Reviews and Letters*, trans. by Ronald Meyer (London: Duckworth Publishers, 2013), pp. 75–76.

> Военный. Ну, послушайте, за кого же вы меня считаете? Конечно, есть между нами такие донкишоты; но поверьте также, что есть много истинно рассудительных людей, которые будут рады всегда, если будет выведен на всеобщее осмеяние порочащий свое званье. Да и в чем здесь обида? (V: 152–53)

The soldier explains that there are two types of people: those who, like himself, enjoy the theatre and delight in seeing members of their own profession (if they deserve it) mocked and ridiculed, even if that profession is the same as his own; and those who, like Don Quijote, their anger and agitation aroused by something they find personally offensive, instantly charge to take action—in this case in the form of a complaint. Through the soldier Gogol' is demonstrating his condemnation of the Don Quijote type for his impulsive querulousness, lack of levelheadedness, and, ultimately, his folly. This interpretation becomes yet more apparent in the speech of the practical and successful landowner Kostanzhoglo, in which he condemns the eccentricity and frivolity of his fellow landowners, in the remaining drafts of Part II of *Dead Souls*.[170]

Although Gogol''s paraliterary *oeuvre* offers a relatively small selection of references to Cervantes and the *Quixote,* they nevertheless begin to provide the reader with an understanding of his admiration for Cervantes' creative skills and his less favourable disposition towards Don Quijote, in contrast with Pushkin's more Romantic view of the knight errant. This understanding will be developed throughout the rest of this chapter, which explores the writer's responses to the tradition of Cervantes through the implementation of various formal features and motifs; the clear allusions to specific texts through the manifestation and manipulation of certain themes; and his final creation of a novel which encapsulates formal and thematic affinities through direct references to Cervantes and his hero.

[170] See pp. 119–20.

‘Diary of a Madman’

Before writing his ‘poema’ in prose, *Dead Souls*, Gogol’ had become the master of short narrative fiction in Russia. A number of his short stories contain distant allusions to the tradition of Cervantes through the mutual use of certain structural devices, themes and/or motifs, but it is in his ‘Diary of a Madman’—a work which consists of a string of diary entries in which the protagonist’s descent into insanity is delineated—that the widest range of allusions to Cervantes can be discerned. The most obvious point of comparison is the writers’ exploration of the theme of madness. Although certain critics have attempted to draw comparisons between Gogol’’s Poprishchin and Cervantes’ Tomás Rodaja, the protagonist in ‘The Glass Graduate’ (‘El licenciado Vidriera’) from the *Exemplary Tales*, this is probably influenced more by the genre of the works (both are short stories) rather than by the finer details of the protagonists’ respective illnesses.[171] It is not so much with Tomás Rodaja (who thinks that he is made of glass), but rather with Don Quijote (who thinks that he is a fictional knight errant) that Poprishchin shares a number of characteristics.

The first point of comparison between Don Quijote and Poprishchin is that in both cases their madness can be considered a form of megalomania. Don Quijote is a lowly *hidalgo*, but elevates himself to the position of knight errant. Poprishchin is a lowly government clerk, but imagines himself to be a King—the imaginary King Ferdinand VIII of Spain, to be precise. Both are thus able to rise out of their respective lowly positions through their madness. The choice of each character’s trajectory is not arbitrary. Given the stagnation of the lower nobility in the countryside at the turn of the seventeenth century in Spain, it is unsurprising that the *hidalgo* Alonso Quijano should have spent so much of his time reading for enjoyment and

[171] Roberto Monforte Dupret, ‘Ecos cervantinos en la obra literaria de N. V. Gógol’, *Esclavistica Complutense*, 7 (2005), 7–18 (p. 10). F. Kel’in also says that ‘there is some basis for comparison between “Diary” and “El licenciado Vidriera”’, but adds that ‘here it would be too naïve to talk about any kindred links’. See F. V. Kel’in, ‘Introduction’ to Miguel de Cervantes, *Nazidatel’nye novelly*, trans. by B. A. Krzhevskii (Moscow: Academia, 1935), pp. vii–xlvii (p. xiii).

fantasising about a grander and more interesting life. The lowly government clerk, meanwhile, is not only a type commonly used by Gogol' in his Petersburg stories (consider, for example, Akaky Akakievich in 'The Overcoat' ['Shinel''], 1842), but was also a common profession to be found in asylums in the Russian capital during Gogol''s time of writing. As Donald Fanger explains:

> […] the flood of newspaper stories about insane asylums and their inmates (particularly in *The Northern Bee*) […] reached its apogee about a year before 'Diary of a Madman' appeared. From one such report, Gogol might have learned that the majority of patients in at least one Petersburg asylum were civil servants, the most common pathological symptoms being pride and ambition, followed by fear and timidity.[172]

Such 'pathological symptoms' become apparent in Poprishchin as his madness progresses.

The specific positions that the protagonists adopt are motivated not only by their desire for self-aggrandisement, but also by their reading. Just as Don Quijote believes he is a knight errant from his obsessive reading of the romances of chivalry, so too does Poprishchin believe himself to be the King of Spain from his reading of journal articles, in particular an article in *The Northern Bee* regarding the vacancy of the Spanish throne. He writes in the entry of 5 December:

> I spent the whole morning reading the papers. Strange things are happening in Spain. I can't even really figure them out. They write that the throne is vacant and that the grandees have found themselves in an awkward situation about electing an heir and that it's leading to indignation. It strikes me as extremely strange. How can a throne be vacant? They say that some doña must accede to the throne. A doña cannot accede to a throne. It's in no way possible. A king ought to be on the throne. Yes, they say that there is no king. It cannot be that there is no king. There can be no State without a king. There is a king, only he is lying low somewhere, incognito.
>
> Я сегодня всё утро читал газеты. Странные дела делаются в Испании. Я даже не мог хорошенько разобрать их. Пишут, что престол упразднен и что чины находятся в затруднительном положении о избрании наследника и оттого

[172] Donald Fanger, *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol* (London: Belknap Press, 1979), p. 115.

> происходят возмущения. Мне кажется это чрезвычайно странным. Как же может быть престол упразднен? Говорят, какая-то донна должна взойти на престол. Не может взойти донна на престол. Никак не может. На престоле должен быть король. Да, говорят, нет короля. — Не может статься, чтобы не было короля. Государство не может быть без короля. Король есть, да только он где-нибудь находится в неизвестности. (III: 206–07)

Thus does Gogol' clearly demonstrate his interest in the controversy surrounding the death of King Ferdinand VII and the succession of a female heir, his infant daughter Isabela, in 1833, the year before the writer started work on his story. By calling himself King Ferdinand VIII Poprishchin fabricates his own accession to the Spanish throne. In this way he comes to embody the quixotic principle, albeit a far more extreme version than the one prevalent in Pushkin's sentimental heroines. In addition to serving as evidence for Gogol''s interest in contemporary Spanish society and politics, Poprishchin's transformation also provides him with an opportunity to demonstrate his fantastic wit: 'Ispaniya' (Испания), Russian for 'Spain', is an anagram of 'pisaniya' (писания), Russian for 'writings', the very task undertaken by Poprishchin both as copy-clerk and in the creation of his diary. There arises, therefore, a clear transition from his first identity as copy-clerk to his second identity as king of Spain.[173]

In their belief that they are a knight errant and the King of Spain, respectively, Don Quijote and Poprishchin must change their attire to match their new positions. Don Quijote dons armour that had belonged to his ancestors and which, having been forgotten for centuries, is covered in rust and mould. His helmet is makeshift, comprised of a steel cap and some iron rods, because his original cardboard visor did not survive the blow he gave it with his sword (I.I). Poprishchin decides to create a mantle out of his new uniform, cutting it up himself because he does not trust tailors. His pride at his new attire is in stark contrast to his housekeeper's horror: 'The mantle is completely ready and sewn up now. Mavra cried out

[173] Richard A. Peace, 'The Logic of Madness: Gogol''s *Zapiski sumasshedshego*', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, 9 (1976), 28–45 (p. 43).

when I put it on' ('Мантия совершенно готова и сшита. Мавра вскрикнула, когда я надел ее') (III: 210). Poprishchin provides no further details on the design of his 'mantle', but from Mavra's response he has clearly destroyed his new, and probably not inexpensive, uniform. There is clear irony in the physical transformations of both Don Quijote and Poprishchin: while armour and a mantle would normally provoke admiration and respect, Don Quijote's armour is old and his helmet makeshift, while Poprishchin's new uniform loses its respectability in its transformation into 'mantle'. Both characters think that they are dressing to suit their new positions and, in a way, they are: their attire clearly reflects their madness.

Both protagonists are also deluded in their surroundings. While Don Quijote sees, among other things, the inn as a castle (I.II), the barber's basin as Mambrino's helmet (I.XXI), and windmills as giants (I.VIII), Poprishchin sees the mental asylum as the Spanish court; the inmates with shaven heads as grandees, soldiers or, later, tonsured monks; and the warden as the chancellor, and later as the Grand Inquisitor. This inability to distinguish fiction from reality also extends into their explanations of events: just as Don Quijote often believes that his misfortunes are due to enchanters, so too does Poprishchin justify the 'cold water poured over his shaven head' as simply 'the harsh customs of the land', before he becomes 'inclined to think that his court has fallen into the hands of the Inquisition'.[174] He realises the contradiction in his position and this idea, however: 'Only I still can't quite understand just how a king could be subjected to the Inquisition' ('Только я всё не могу понять, как же мог король подвергнуться инквизиции') (III: 213). Their skewed perspectives thus penetrate beyond their perceptions of themselves and into their perceptions of the world around them. They can only explain situations in the context of the literature they have read, an idea which will later be the focal point of Dostoevsky's 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie'.

[174] Peace, 'The Logic of Madness', p. 44.

There are also similarities in their desire for women that they cannot have: Dulcinea is unattainable because she is imaginary, while Sophie (the daughter of Poprishchin's boss) is unattainable because of the gulf in rank between her and Gogol''s protagonist. It is possible, however, that both madmen choose their respective beloveds for this very reason. The lack of information provided by both authors regarding their characters' relations with the opposite sex (neither Don Quijote nor Poprishchin has a wife or progeny) suggests that both are virgins, in their fifties and forties respectively, and have little to no interest in forming conventional relationships with women. This is a trait that Gogol' bestows upon the vast majority of his male characters: as soon as Chichikov, for example, begins to consider courting the Governor's daughter in *Dead Souls*, his whole scheme is unravelled and he has no choice but to leave the town.

But there is also one major difference between Don Quijote and Poprishchin: at the end of the respective works, Cervantes' hero regains his sanity and dies, while Gogol''s plunges further into the depths of insanity, an ending which finds striking parallels with Prince Myshkin's fate in Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*. In the *Quixote*, even though the protagonist does not quite succeed in making the world more like the romances of chivalry, he nevertheless inspires and invigorates the imaginations of those around him, and passes away surrounded by those whose hearts he has touched. In the case of 'Diary', Poprishchin does not inspire anyone. When his diary entries finish, he is still in the mental asylum. In the final entry there is one moment of apparent pathos-ridden lucidity:

> No, I no longer have the strength to endure. God! what are they doing to me! They pour cold water on my head! They do not heed, do not see, do not listen to me. What have I done to them? Why are they torturing me so? What do they want from me, a poor man? What can I give them? I don't have anything. I don't have the strength, I cannot withstand all their torments, my head is on fire and everything is spinning before me. Save me! […] Is that my house in the distance? Is that my mother sitting at the window? Mother, save your poor son! Shed a tear onto his sick little head! Look how they torture him! […]

> Нет, я больше не имею сил терпеть. Боже! что они делают со мною! Они льют мне на голову холодную воду! Они не внемлют, не видят, не слушают меня. Что я сделал им? За что они мучат меня? Чего хотят они от меня, бедного? Что могу дать я им? Я ничего не имею. Я не в силах, я не могу вынести всех мук их, голова горит моя, и всё кружится предо мною. Спасите меня! […] Дом ли то мой синеет вдали? Мать ли моя сидит перед окном? Матушка, спаси твоего бедного сына! урони слезинку на его больную головушку! посмотри, как мучат они его! […] (III: 214)

For the first time there is nothing amusing, nonsensical or vulgar about Poprishchin's writing. The reader cannot ridicule him, but only sympathise with him. According to Andrew Kaspryk, at this moment even Gogol' 'enters into a dialogic exchange with Poprishchin […]: he stands on the same plane with him, no longer treating him with contempt'.[175] However, as soon as Gogol' hints at Poprishchin's possible return to sanity in this lament, he juxtaposes the character's most pathetic musings with one of his most absurd: 'And do you know that the Dey of Algiers has a bump under his nose?' ('А знаете ли, что у алжирского дея под самым носом шишка?') (III: 214). In typical Gogolian fashion the pathos that builds in the reader throughout the passage is instantly undone by this final line. If Poprishchin's lament causes the reader to speculate about his return to sanity in a similar way to Don Quijote's own pathos-ridden liberation from his madness, then the final line serves to crush the reader's hopes. As Richard Gustafson observes, 'our feelings are brought back into focus, as we are reminded that this tear-jerking plea to mother is in fact part of the insane babblings of the madman'.[176] In a story that shares many affinities with the *Quixote*, it is in the darkness of the ending of 'Diary', a feature of all of Gogol''s Petersburg texts, and later those of Dostoevsky, that the Russian writer deviates most vehemently from Cervantes' work.

[175] Andrew Kaspryk, 'Gogol's Poprishchin in "The Diary of a Madman"', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, 29.3–4 (1995), 315–29 (p. 327).
[176] Richard F. Gustafson, 'The Suffering Usurper: Gogol's "Diary of a Madman"', *Slavic and East European Journal*, 9 (1965), 268–80 (p. 279).

But the *Quixote* is not the only work by Cervantes whose echoes can be discerned in 'Diary'. Poprishchin shares not only a number of typological features with Don Quijote in his madness, but also one major one with Campuzano, the protagonist of Cervantes' 'The Deceitful Marriage' and metafictional author of 'The Dialogue of the Dogs': hallucinations. Although Campuzano is not typically considered one of Cervantes' madmen (Don Quijote and Tomás Rodaja take pride of place here), he nevertheless briefly becomes one when his mental state is altered when he undergoes sweating treatment for syphilis, during which he experiences hallucinations. The device enables the authors to include the 'talking animals' motif into their works. Although the motif dates back to Antiquity with Aesop's fables, Gogol''s manner of implementation strongly resonates with that of Cervantes in various ways. Firstly, both authors choose for their animal conversationalists two dogs. Secondly, both protagonists, when they overhear the dogs speaking, are suffering some form of mental disturbance. Thirdly, they respond to these aural curiosities in similar ways: they begin by accidentally overhearing the dogs' conversation before actively engaging with it. When he is in the hospital Campuzano passively overhears the conversation between Berganza and Cipión before he decides to eavesdrop. On the street Poprishchin passively overhears the conversation between Madgie and Fidèle before he, too, decides to eavesdrop. But in typical Gogolian fashion he pushes his protagonist's madness one step further: listening to the canine companions is not enough, and so he decides to seek out Fidèle and steal the written correspondence she has received from Madgie. Campuzano and Poprishchin then record what they have heard and/or read, and in this way the dogs' conversations are transformed into metafictions. Campuzano writes down the dogs' discussion in the form of 'Dialogue of the Dogs' for Peralta, his friend and interlocutor in 'The Deceitful Marriage', who assumes the role of metafictional reader, to peruse and comment on the dialogue. Poprishchin writes down the dogs' conversation and interpolates it into his diary, and then becomes his own metafictional reader as he peruses and comments on

the dogs' correspondence. There is, however, one key difference between Campuzano and Poprishchin: the former appreciates the absurdity of the situation, explaining it as nothing less than a miracle, while the latter treats it as completely commonplace and attempts to justify it through scientific reasoning. Thus Campuzano says to Peralta:

> Don't take me for such a fool […] that I don't realise that only by some miracle could dogs talk […] many times since I heard them, I have been unwilling to believe my own ears […] (249)
>
> No me tenga vuesa merced por tan ignorante […] que no entienda que si no es por milagro no pueden hablar los animales […] muchas veces, después que los oí, yo mismo no he querido dar crédito a mí mismo […] (II: 293–94)

While Poprishchin explains to his reader:

> Actually there has already been a great number of similar examples in the world. They say that in England a fish swam out that said two words in such a strange language that scholars have already spent three years trying to define them and to this day they still haven't found anything. I also read in the newspapers about two cows that came to a shop and asked for a pound of tea.
>
> Действительно, на свете уже случилось множество подобных примеров. Говорят, в Англии выплыла рыба, которая сказала два слова на таком странном языке, что ученые уже три года стараются определить и еще до сих пор ничего не открыли. Я читал тоже в газетах о двух коровах, которые пришли в лавку и спросили себе фунт чаю. (III: 195)

Rather than convincing the reader of the reality of the talking dogs, Poprishchin's pseudo-scientific reasoning, and particularly the strength of his belief in such nonsense, instead only serves to highlight his madness.

Although the contents of the dogs' interactions are superficially very different, they nevertheless share a significant mutual feature: they serve as vehicles for social criticism. In 'Dialogue of the Dogs', Berganza narrates his picaresque autobiography of how he moved from one owner to another, while Cipión listens and interjects his philosophical musings. It is a

portrayal of society through a dog's eyes, depicting the various social classes and types that existed in Golden Age Spain, and criticising their various behaviours, albeit in an amusing way. In 'Diary of a Madman', the conversation and letters between Madgie and Fidèle are comparatively banal. On the surface, Madgie's letters, which talk about trivia such as what she had for dinner, offer no critique of society. However, it is significant to note that her owners are Poprishchin's boss, whom he fears and reveres, and his daughter, Sophie, with whom he is infatuated. Through Poprishchin's reactions to Madgie's comments about her owners (for example, his jealous response to the news that Sophie is engaged to the court chamberlain, Teplov), coupled with his own eventual transformation from lowly copy-clerk into the King of Spain, the reader can discern a certain amount of criticism towards the Table of Ranks, in particular towards the privileges afforded to those in higher positions and the difficulty with which one could rise up the table.[177] But Poprishchin is not attacking the whole system; rather, he 'merely wants to find a better station within the system; there is no Dostoevskian rebellion against the whole order of things'.[178] In both Cervantes' and Gogol''s texts any and all attacks are masked, however, by the fact that the criticism stems from a conversation between two dogs which are recalled by a madman. The combination of the canine status of the interlocutors and of the mental struggles of the narrators drives the texts into the realm of untrustworthy narrative to an even greater extent than Cervantes does with Cide Hamete, Pushkin with Belkin, or Gogol' with Rudy Pan'ko.

Overall it is difficult to deny that 'Diary of a Madman' contains a number of echoes of Cervantes' works. Although Gogol''s text was originally intended to be about a mad musician, inspired by Vladimir Odoevsky's stories about musicians and artists,[179] and although the theme

[177] The Table of Ranks was introduced by Peter the Great to Russia in 1722, and was used until 1917. It consisted of fourteen grades, and was applicable to military and government positions. Anyone from these professions could achieve hereditary nobility upon attaining the eight rank.
[178] Gustafson, 'The Suffering Usurper', p. 271.
[179] Fanger, *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol*, p. 115.

of madness was by no means unique to Gogol' (consider Hermann in Pushkin's *Queen of Spades*), the broad range of affinities between each author's manifestation of madness—from social climbing through to the talking dogs' motif and the protagonist's reliance on fiction—suggests that Cervantes became one of Gogol''s sources during the creative development of his text. Indeed, Donald Fanger describes the Cervantine parallels as 'striking': 'not only does this Gogolian "exemplary tale" exploit "El coloquio de los perros", it combines that dog's-eye satire with the Quixotic principle itself.'[180] Although Gogol''s familiarity with Cervantes 'Dialogue of the Dogs' is probable, given the popularity of the *Exemplary Tales* and his own reference to them in his anecdote of Pushkin 'gifting' him with the subject of *Dead Souls,* it remains possible that the idea of Cervantes' canine conversationalists could also have been mediated via E.T.A. Hoffmann's short story 'The Recent Adventures of the Dog Berganza', found in his *Fantasy Pieces in Callot's Manner* (*Fantasiestücke in Callots Manier*). Regardless of the source of inspiration, the Cervantine echoes, coupled with Gogol''s own interest in Spanish affairs, are clearly manifested in 'Diary'. But there is one clear distinction: Cervantes recalls the fates of his protagonists with a certain warmth, while Gogol' has no qualms about tearing the very foundations of his characters' narrative existence from underneath them. This is true of the majority of Gogol''s texts, and is done in different ways. In 'St John's Eve', for example, Petro turns into a pile of ash following his murder of Ivas, the younger brother of his beloved Pidorka, who subsequently secludes herself in convent life, while in 'The Two Ivans' the essence of the protagonists' very existence—their friendship—is irreversibly destroyed by the banality of Ivan Ivanovich taking hyperbolic offence at Ivan Nikiforovich calling him a goose. In 'Diary' Poprishchin finds no relief in his arrival in 'Spain', but plunges further into his own insanity. But even in works whose endings differ beyond comparison with those of Cervantes, a variety of echoes can nevertheless be discerned, from the formal features and

[180] Fanger, *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol*, p. 117.

motifs which resonate with the wider literary tradition that Cervantes helped to create, through to the theme of madness, whose manifestation in 'Diary' strongly suggests the work's development, at least in part, in response to Cervantes.

Dead Souls

Whether Pushkin's *Evgeny Onegin* or Gogol''s *Dead Souls* should be considered the first significant Russian novel is a perennial point of discussion for the reader of Russian literature. Although Gogol' only began writing the first part of his work in 1835, the same year as the publication of the final part of *Evgeny Onegin*, the ambiguity arises from the reader's perceptions of what constitutes a novel. For some it is a long narrative written in either prose or verse, a classification which befits Pushkin's 'novel in verse'. For others it is a long narrative written only in prose, and in this case Gogol''s work can be considered the first major exemplar of the genre in Russia. Despite *Dead Souls* being a novel in a more formally traditional sense, Gogol' nevertheless reflected the environment of literary innovation and generic experimentation typical in the first half of the nineteenth century in Russia by subtitling it a 'poema', a term which refers not to short verses, but to a 'long narrative poem, epic or mock-epic in the first place'.[181]

The reasons for his choice of subtitle echo many of those of Pushkin for subtitling his work a 'novel in verse'. Gogol', dreaming of fame, grandeur and literary prestige, did not want his work to be considered an ordinary novel. Although it appears to be a traditional novel with its prose narrative, the subtitle challenges the reader's expectations and encourages debate about genre boundaries and definitions. As Fanger explains, 'the word *poema* in all its suggestive vagueness is a promissory note signifying an intention of originality on the highest

[181] Fanger, *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol*, p. 165.

artistic level'.[182] It is also significant that Gogol''s definition of 'poema' closely matches his description of the 'minor epic', a combination of the epic poem and the novel, and a genre in which he classified the *Quixote*,[183] and would therefore have led the reader to draw comparisons between his work and Cervantes' masterpiece.

In addition to Gogol''s classification of *Dead Souls* and the *Quixote* as belonging, essentially, to the same genre, there are a number of intertextual echoes in his text which, together with his comments in his 'Author's Confession', suggest the development of certain aspects of his novel as a response, at least in part, to Cervantes' novel. The most evident point of comparison lies in their general plot formations: each work features a protagonist who travels around his native country on some kind of mission in the company of his manservant(s). The full title of Gogol''s work is *The Wanderings of Chichikov, or Dead Souls* (*Pokhozhdenia Chichikova, ili Mertvye dushi*). The first part would have enabled Gogol' to draw a comparison in the reader's mind between his work and the *Quixote*, a text which similarly revolves around the eponymous hero's 'wanderings' or 'adventures'. Indeed, both the *Quixote* and *Dead Souls* fit into the tradition of the *Reiserroman* and feature the device of the 'road chronotope'.[184] According to Bakhtin, chronotopes are 'the organising centres for the fundamental narrative events of the novel' which drive the plot through both time and space.[185] The main way the road chronotope does is this is by facilitating the introduction of new characters, since it is on the road that:

> […] the spatial and temporal paths of the most varied people—representatives of all social classes, estates, religions, nationalities, ages—intersect at one spatial and temporal point. People who are normally kept separate by social and spatial distance

[182] Fanger, *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol*, p. 167.
[183] See pp. 86–88.
[184] Identification of the 'road chronotope' as a unifying feature between the *Quixote* and *Dead Souls* is first mentioned, albeit not substantially discussed, in Holl, '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel', p. 62.
[185] Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 250.

> can accidentally meet; any contrast may crop up, the most various fates may collide and interweave with one another.[186]

This is particularly the case in the *Quixote*, where Don Quijote and Sancho's numerous encounters range from galley slaves to judges, from peasants to dukes and duchesses, from Moors to Catholic priests. Although Chichikov does not encounter criminals or aristocracy, *Dead Souls* nevertheless offers a snapshot of the various social classes. A clear example of this is when his *troika*, transporting him from Nozdryov's estate to Sobakevich's, becomes entangled with the carriage and horses of the governor's wife and daughter (high society), and the local peasants (lower society) somewhat farcically endeavour to untangle them. In addition to motivating the plot, the ability of the journey motif to facilitate the depiction of a wide range of society would have been as attractive to Cervantes and Gogol' as it was to a number of other writers experimenting with literature during the early stages of their respective nation's prose traditions, such as Mateo Alemán's *Guzmán de Alfarache* (1599–1609) in Spain, and Radishchev's *Journey from St Petersburg to Moscow* and Count Vladimir Sollogub's *Tarantass* (1845) in Russia.

But the traveller cannot travel forever, and for this reason both authors employ the inn motif. Don Quijote makes three visits to inns. The first takes place during his first sally, which he undertakes without the company of Sancho. He mistakes the inn for a castle, the innkeeper for its lord, prostitutes for *doncellas*, and has the innkeeper knight him (I.III). From this first visit alone the reader can see that for Don Quijote the inn is a hub of action. The same can be said of his second and third inn visits, on these occasions to the inn of Juan Palomeque. During Don Quijote and Sancho's first stay, the former experiences his first night-time escapade with Maritornes and a beating by a muleteer, and the latter is tossed up and down in a blanket (I.XVI–XVII). Their second sojourn is even more action packed: the reader is told the story of

[186] Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 243.

The Curious Impertinent (I.XXXIII–XXXV); Don Quijote experiences his somnolent battle with the wineskins (I.XXXV); Fernando is reunited with Dorotea, and Cardenio with Luscinda (I.XXXVI); Ruy Pérez and Zoraida arrive, share their experiences, and find succour (I.XXXVII–XLI); Don Quijote has his second night-time escapade with Maritornes (I.XLIII); and the barber arrives demanding the return of the 'baciyelmo' (I.XLIV), a neologism coined by Sancho which refers to the barber's basin ('bacía') which Don Quijote believes to be Mambrino's helmet ('yelmo'). Cervantes clearly exploits the full comic potential of the inn to bring together a wide range of characters, to provide intrigue, to begin and conclude narrative strands of the work and thereby embellish the protagonist's adventure.

As in the *Quixote*, *Dead Souls* also features two inns. While Chichikov's adventures at the inns are generally less elaborate than those of Don Quijote, they nevertheless provide an opportunity to bring characters together and develop narrative strands. At the inn on the road, for example, Chichikov meets the landowner Nozdryov and decides to accompany him to his estate, while at the inn in the town, where the protagonist lodges when he is not visiting the various landowners and officials, he discovers that he is being slandered and decides to flee. The landowners' estates, and particularly their parlours and drawing rooms, commonly depicted in nineteenth-century Russian literature, provide a better comparison with Cervantes' inns. Not only is Nozdryov's salon the venue for Chichikov's somewhat farcical near-fatal altercation with him, comparable to Don Quijote's beating by the muleteer and Sancho's blanket-tossing, but landowners' parlours are where 'the webs of intrigue are spun, denouements occur […] where *dialogues* happen, something that acquires extraordinary importance in the novel, revealing the character, "ideas" and "passions" of the heroes'.[187] Indeed, it is in the landowners' salons that Chichikov tries to acquire his dead souls—peasants who have died but have not been removed from the census and whom, for this reason, he would

[187] Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 246.

be able to purchase and mortgage. Gogol''s inn motif, therefore, when combined with the motif of the parlour, takes on a role similar to that of the inns found in the *Quixote*.

But perhaps the most striking formal comparison between the two works is their use of interpolation. In each novel this appears in the same two guises. The first involves authorial digressions, and the second is the insertion of a new, and often not entirely relevant, story. Both are abundant in the *Quixote*, particularly in Part I, and prominent in *Dead Souls*. In Cervantes' work, lyrical digressions most commonly appear in the form of Cide Hamete's musings which the second author-narrator has chosen to keep in the text. Such an example opens chapter 58 of Part II: 'To think that anything in this life will remain for ever in the same state is an idle fancy; on the contrary, it seems that life goes round and round like a wheel […]' ('Pensar que en esta vida las cosas della han de durar siempre en un estado es pensar en lo escusado, antes parece que ella anda todo en redondo […]') (II.LIII.845/1158). The serious message in this passage humorously contrasts not only with Cide Hamete's usual hyperbolic language but also with the basic narrative of the novel. A similar juxtaposition between lyrical digression and narrative proper is seen at the start of chapter 6 in *Dead Souls*. The narrator begins thus: 'Long ago, in the years of my youth, in the years of my childhood, which have passed never to return, I took delight in going for the first time to a strange place […]' ('Прежде, давно, в лета моей юности, в лета невозвратно мелькнувшего моего детства, мне было весело подъезжать в первый раз к незнакомому месту […]'), and finishes with the words: 'Now I approach every strange village with indifference […] Oh, my youth!' (113–14) ('Теперь равнодушно подъезжаю ко всякой незнакомой деревне […] О моя юность!' (VI: 110–11). This pathos-ridden speech not only concerns an idea similar to that of Cide Hamete—the passage of time—but it also finds itself, like the Moor's digression, in sharp opposition to the general tone of the narrative. Indeed, as soon as the digression ends, the narrator resumes with Chichikov laughing to himself 'over the nickname bestowed by the muzhik upon Plyushkin' (114) ('над

прозвищем, отпущенным мужиками Плюшкину') (VI: 111), with comical disregard for the previous digression. It is with similarly unanticipated swiftness in the transition from pathos to humour that Gogol' concludes his 'Diary of a Madman'.

But while Gogol''s lyrical digressions are part of a wider literary tradition (consider, for example, Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, 1759), there are two digressions which appear in drafts to *Dead Souls* which suggest that Cervantes was on Gogol''s mind, at least at times, during the development of the novel. The first, in a draft of Part I, chapter 8, is full of irony, in the narrator's comments on the descriptive abilities of Cervantes and other writers:

> Many poets […] busied themselves with descriptions of the finery and costumes of their heroes. In Antiquity, Homer, and later Cervantes, Walter Scott and Pushkin enjoyed depicting them get dressed. I know very well that the reader would have wanted terribly to see how Chichikov puts on a cranberry coloured tailcoat with a sparkle and starts to wash.
>
> Много поэтов […] занимались описанием убранства и костюма своих героев. В старину Гомер, позже Сервантес, Вальтер-Скотт и Пушкин любили живописать туалеты. Очень знаю, что читателю хотелось бы страшно видеть, как Чичиков наденет фрак брусничного цвета с искрой и станет умываться. (VI: 330)

Prior to this Gogol' has just described Chichikov's round chin, his shaving process, and how he is about to dress. The comic irony emerges from the juxtaposition between the banality of his own protagonist and the originality of those of the writers he lists. In this passage he makes clear not only his own awareness of the void between his anti-hero and the heroes created by his literary predecessors, but also the tendency among some contemporary readers to be interested in such triviality. For while the reader has every reason to be intrigued by the attire of a madman who thinks he is a chivalric knight errant, there is less reason to be interested in the attire of a banal, vulgar and not particularly likeable character.[188]

[188] These traits can be summed up in Russian by the term 'пошлость' ('poshlost''), which is untranslatable into English.

In the second reference to Cervantes there appears a similarly ironic digression. In a draft to Part I, chapter 11, Gogol' diverts the reader's attention from Chichikov and the story to focus instead on himself:

> [The author] does not have the habit of looking around when he writes; only occasionally does he unwittingly raise his eyes at the portraits hanging on the wall before him, of Shakespeare, Ariosto, Fielding, Cervantes, Pushkin, who painted nature just the way it was, and not in any way they pleased.
>
> […] не имеет [автор] обычая смотреть по сторонам, когда пишет, и только разве невольно сами собой остановятся изредка глаза только на висящие перед ним на стене портреты Шекспира, Ариоста, Фильдинга, Сервантеса, Пушкина, отразивших природу таковою, как она была, а не таковою, как угодно было кому-нибудь, чтобы она была. (VI: 553)

By listing these writers Gogol' is encouraging the reader to draw comparisons between the author of *Dead Souls* and these literary pioneers. As laudatory as this passage is, it also contains some irony: he mentions the writers' literary fidelity to nature and reality, but in the case of the *Quixote*, Cervantes pushes verisimilitude as far as he can, to the point where the plot, although possible, is highly improbable. This is seen, for example, in Sancho's apparently unmotivated decision to accompany Don Quijote as his squire, the Dorotea-Fernando/Luscinda-Cardenio love-square, and the Duke and Duchess' elaborately contrived machinations. Cervantes may paint a relatively honest portrait of Spanish life, but he does so in his own colours, an observation which is also applicable to Gogol''s portrayal of Russian provincial life in his novel.

Yet more prominent than the lyrical digressions is the interpolation of entirely distinct episodes into the text. In the Spanish Golden Age the main appeal of such interpolation was the variety it brought to a work and the consequent *admiratio* (a sense of wonder inspired by something marvellous) which the writer hoped they would evoke in the reader. As Riley explains, 'unity-variety was one of those bipartite concepts uniting antagonistic ideas, beloved

of the age'.[189] In Part I of the *Quixote* there is such an abundance of interpolated episodes, however, that the unity of the work is often superseded by this variety. As a result, in Part II Cervantes not only decides to interpolate no extraneous episodes, but also defensively addresses the issue through his narrator:

> […] and Cide Hamete added that to have his mind, his hand and his pen always constrained to writing about one subject and speaking through the mouths of so few characters was intolerable drudgery which yielded nothing to the author's advantage, and that to avoid this problem he had in the first part had recourse to certain tales, like those of *Inappropriate Curiosity* and the *Captive Captain*, which stand, as it were, apart from the main story – although the other tales narrated are events in which Don Quixote himself was involved and which could not be omitted. […] And so in this second part he decided not to include any disconnected or even tagged-on tales, but rather some similar-looking episodes developing, however, out of the events of the true history itself, and even these would be limited in number and told in no more words than were strictly necessary […]
>
> […] y decía [Cide Hamete] que el ir siempre atenido el entendimiento, la mano y la pluma a escribir de un solo sujeto y hablar por las bocas de pocas personas era un trabajo incomportable, cuyo fruto no redundaba en el de su autor, y que por huir deste inconveniente había usado en la primera parte del artificio de algunas novelas, como fueron la del *Curioso impertinente* y la del *Capitán cautivo*, que están como separadas de la historia, puesto que las demás que allí se cuentan son casos sucedidos al mismo don Quijote, que no podían dejar de escribirse […] Y, así, en esta segunda parte no quiso ingerir novelas sueltas ni pegadizas, sino algunos episodios que lo pareciesen, nacidos de los mesmos sucesos que la verdad ofrece, y aun estos limitadamente y con solas las palabras que bastan a declararlos […] (II.XLIV.776/1070)

In this passage (a digression, and therefore ironically also a form of interpolation) Cervantes provides two reasons for the interpolated episodes in Part I. Firstly, they provide something new and different, some variety, should the reader tire of Don Quijote and Sancho's adventures. Secondly, although they could be considered extraneous (such as the aforementioned Dorotea-Fernando/Luscinda-Cardenio love-square), they are interwoven into Don Quijote's own story, and could therefore not be omitted. He adds that any episodes in Part II which could be

[189] Riley, *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel*, p. 118.

considered digressive appear only because they, too, are connected to the protagonist's story. But there is one further reason which he leaves unmentioned: their parodic function. Interpolated stories were common in Renaissance literature and a key feature of the romances of chivalry. The profusion of variegated episodes in this genre is aptly described by the Canon of Toledo:

> I've never seen a book of chivalry that could be regarded as a whole body complete with all its members, and in which the middle corresponds with the beginning and the end with the beginning and the middle; on the contrary, their authors give them so many members that their intention seems more to produce a chimera or a monster than a well-proportioned figure.
>
> No he visto ningún libro de caballerías que haga un cuerpo de fábula entero con todos sus miembros, de manera que el medio corresponda al principio, y el fin al principio y al medio, sino que los componen con tantos miembros, que más parece que llevan intención a formar una quimera o un monstruo que a hacer una figura proporcionada. (I.XLVII.440/601)

Just over two centuries later Gogol' also included interpolation in *Dead Souls* in the form of 'The Tale of Captain Kopeikin', a story narrated by the postmaster in chapter 10 when the townspeople have gathered to discuss Chichikov's true identity. Both Cervantes and Gogol' use interpolation to entertain the reader by way of parody. According to Holl, 'The Tale of Captain Kopeikin' is a parodic response both to the *Quixote* and to one of its interpolated stories, the story of Ruy Pérez, often referred to as 'The Captive Captain' (I.XXXIX–XLI). His main argument focuses on the histories of each protagonist. Both Ruy Pérez and Kopeikin sacrifice themselves to fight for their countries and their ideals, partaking in battles which would have been in the relatively recent memories of Cervantes' and Gogol''s respective contemporary reader: for Ruy Pérez, the battle of Lepanto, some thirty years before Cervantes wrote the *Quixote*, and for Kopeikin, the war of 1812 against Napoleon, also some thirty years before Gogol' wrote *Dead Souls*. Both return in a wanting state: Ruy Pérez has his money

stolen on his way back to Spain by pirates, while Kopeikin, although still in possession of a meagre sum, is in need of further financial support. But there is one significant difference between their respective fates: Ruy Pérez is rewarded in his accidental reunion with his brother, a judge, who is able to provide financial aid, while Kopeikin, in the first draft, is not rewarded with a pension by the government. While the endings are different, they both contain an element of social criticism regarding the government's insufficient support for those in need. In the *Quixote*, although Ruy Pérez receives some reward, this is because of his fortuitous reunion with his brother who is, equally fortuitously, a judge, and is therefore able to help him. In *Dead Souls*, Kopeikin has no such luck. With the social criticism of the story discerned by the censor, Gogol' was forced to change the ending to a more positive one. Given that many contemporary readers would have been familiar with this alternative ending, in which Kopeikin receives financial reward, it would have served as another parallel between Gogol''s and Cervantes' captains.[190]

Although Holl's argument is persuasive, he does not take into consideration the power of coincidence and the possibility that Captain Kopeikin was not conceived as a response to Ruy Pérez, but simply as a representative of former Russian soldiers. But despite 'The Tale of Captain Kopeikin' possibly not being the parodic response to the tale of the Captive Captain that Holl claims it to be, there are nevertheless clear elements in both stories which suggest that they serve to parody the text in which they are respectively embedded. In the *Quixote*, both Ruy Pérez and Don Quijote strive for their ideals to succour the poor and defend their countries. However, while the former, acting practically and pragmatically, is rewarded for his efforts, the latter, acting whimsically, and somewhat narcissistically, is not rewarded. In *Dead Souls*, neither Kopeikin, whose actions are noble and commendable, nor Chichikov, whose actions

[190] Bruce T. Holl, 'Gogol's Captain Kopeikin and Cervantes' Captive Captain: A Case of Metaparody', *Russian Review*, 55.4 (1996), 681–91 (pp. 684–87).

are base and contemptible, receives any profit or reward. Gogol''s response to Cervantes could be summarised thus: 'you find positive alternatives to the foibles of your hero, while I find none.'[191] To add to the argument that each of these interpolated tales is a parody of the whole, with Ruy Pérez parodying Don Quijote, and Kopeikin Chichikov, Fanger suggests that Gogol''s tale:

> […] parodically mirrors the larger text of which it is a part. [He] makes this clear when, introducing it, he quotes the postmaster's claim that if the tale be told, the result would be 'sort of a whole *poema*'.[192]

Gogol', having subtitled his novel a 'poema', thus subverts his own work through the postmaster's use of the identical description for his interpolated narrative.

In both the *Quixote* and *Dead Souls* interpolation serves to generate both parody and metaparody. In the Spanish text, the audiences of the interpolated stories are metafictionalised versions of the reader: they discuss the interpolated stories just as the reader discusses the *Quixote*. This is developed in Part II when Cervantes introduces various characters who have read, and discuss, Part I of the novel, the most notable of whom is Sansón Carrasco. In *Dead Souls* metafiction occurs primarily in the postmaster's audience for his narration of 'The Tale of Captain Kopeikin'. This metafiction then transitions into metaparody. As Gary Morson explains:

> Metaparodies frequently work by first parodying an original, then parodying the parody of the original […] Readers of the *Quixote*, for instance, may be reasonably sure that the first book is a parody directed at naive readers of romances and tales of knight errantry. But they may be less sure about the second book, which seems to be directed at readers of the first book as well—readers who, we recall, appear as characters in the second book and are portrayed as growing increasingly trivial in their complacent and

[191] Holl, 'Gogol's Captain Kopeikin', p. 684.
[192] Fanger, *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol*, p. 178.

> sterile mockery. If Don Quijote is foolish, then so are we who think him foolish—a paradox that corresponds to the essentially ambiguous vision of the work.[193]

In the case of *Dead Souls*, metaparody emerges in the postmaster's audience. In the third line of his narrative, the postmaster explains that Kopeikin 'had lost an arm and a leg at Krasnoe or at Leipzig' (212) ('Под Красным ли, или под Лейпцигом […] ему оторвало руку и ногу') (VI: 200). Not only does the narrator's uncertainly about the exact location suggest his untrustworthiness (in the same way that Cervantes' narrator cannot remember the name of Don Quijote's village), but more significantly, since Chichikov has all his limbs, this sentence alone should be enough to reassure his audience (and Gogol''s reader) that they cannot be the same person. But the audience does not raise this discrepancy, and the postmaster is free to continue his story. It is only after another five pages that the chief of police finally interjects: 'surely you told us that Captain Kopeikin had lost an arm and a leg, but Chichikov…' (217) ('Только позволь […] ведь капитан Копейкин, ты сам сказал, без руки и ноги, а у Чичикова...') (VI: 205). It is at this point that the reader realises that they are no better than the postmaster's audience, and Morson's words are once more applicable: if the government officials are foolish, 'then so are we who think [them] foolish'. Gogol''s reader, having become so engrossed in 'The Tale of Captain Kopeikin' without questioning its relevance, thus falls prey to Gogol''s narrative trickery, gentle mockery, and metaparody.

Despite the abundance of formal echoes, the basis for most comparative study between the *Quixote* and *Dead Souls* has thus far been typological. Although Turkevich provides one of the more comprehensive comparisons between the two main protagonists, her argument is flawed in her assertion that Chichikov's 'character is an accurate inversion of that of the *hidalgo*'. While the reader at first glance might be inclined to side with Turkevich's opinion

[193] Gary Saul Morson, 'Parody, History, Metaparody', in *Rethinking Bakhtin*, ed. by Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1989), pp. 63–86 (pp. 81–82).

that ‘just as Don Quixote is completely good, so Chichikov is completely bad’,[194] upon closer examination the typological configurations of both characters are far more nuanced, complex and, significantly, similar.

The primary point of comparison between Don Quijote and Chichikov is in the transformative nature of their characters. This is seen in three main areas: madness (particularly the mad-sane paradox); the conflation of the real and the imaginary (believing they are someone they are not); and language. While Cervantes makes clear from the outset that Don Quijote is mad, with the narrator explaining that ‘the lack of sleep and the excess of reading withered his brain, and he went mad’ (‘del poco dormir y del mucho leer, se le secó el celebro de manera que vino a perder el juicio’) (I.I.26–27/42), Gogol’ ensures that the reader has no doubts about Chichikov’s sanity: everything he does seems to be premeditated, under control and, it would appear, sensible and sane. However, neither character fully fits the mould of the ‘mad’ or ‘sane’ type, but rather, paradoxically, is both mad and sane. The paradox arises on numerous occasions in the *Quixote*, for example in Don Diego’s bewilderment at the protagonist’s demand to fight the lions in order to prove his bravery and his subsequent rationalisation of his ‘victory’: he views the knight errant as ‘as a sane man with madness in him and as a madman with sane tendencies’ (‘un cuerdo loco y un loco que tiraba a cuerdo’) because ‘what he said was coherent, elegant and well expressed, and what he did was absurd, foolhardy and stupid’ (‘lo que hablaba era concertado, elegante y bien dicho, y lo que hacía, disparatado, temerario y tonto’) (II.XVII.597–98/838). Similar can be said of Chichikov who, although he behaves according to social propriety for the most part, nevertheless possesses a certain madness in his incessant quest to obtain dead souls. This is seen, for example, when Chichikov broaches the subject of his intended purchases with the landowner Manilov, who ‘wondered whether his guest had not unconsciously lost his mind’ (‘подумал, не спятил ли

[194] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 49–50.

гость как-нибудь невзначай с ума'), but who concludes that 'there was no wild, restless fire in them, such as leaps in the eyes of a madman; all was respectable and as it should be' (33) ('не было в них дикого, беспокойного огня, какой бегает в глазах сумасшедшего человека, всё было прилично и в порядке') (VI: 34). Manilov's bewilderment, but ultimate conclusion about Chichikov's sanity, is a common reaction for those who behold the protagonist and hear his proposals. Thus while Chichikov's obscure speech to Manilov makes the latter question his *sanity*, Don Quijote's elegant and well-reasoned speech makes his listeners question his *madness*; while the likes of Manilov conclude that Chichikov, despite his words, must be *sane*, Cervantes' characters conclude that Don Quijote, because of his behaviour, must be *mad*. It is difficult to dispute that Cervantes provides perhaps the most complete example of the mad-sane paradox in literature in Don Quijote, but upon closer reading of Gogol''s text it becomes clear that Chichikov in this context is a variation of the quixotic type.

Related to the mad-sane paradox is each protagonist's adoption of a different façade—or, in the case of Chichikov, different façades. In the *Quixote* Alonso Quijano becomes Don Quijote and in so doing not only dresses like a knight errant but also adopts the persona of one by acting chivalrously and courageously. In the episode of his battle with the lions, however, rather than proving his bravery, the contrived nature of the situation (Don Quijote insisting on their uncaging) instead suggests that his bravery is a façade he must adopt to fulfil the role of knight errant. Don Quijote subsequently explains that:

> […] since it fell to me to be one of the number of knights errant, I cannot fail to tackle anything that seems to me to come within the sphere of my duties, and attacking those lions a moment ago was therefore something that I had to do, even though I was well aware that it was foolhardy beyond measure […]

> […] como me cupo en suerte ser uno del número de la andante caballería, no puedo dejar de acometer todo aquello que a mí me pareciere que cae debajo de la juridición de mis ejercicios; y, así, el acometer los leones que ahora acometí derechamente me tocaba, puesto que conocí ser temeridad esorbitante […] (II.XVII.599/840)

By acknowledging the foolhardiness of the situation, and accepting that it was something that he 'had to do', it becomes clear that his is a false and contrived sense of bravery. It is also significant that in this scene he adopts yet another persona: the Knight of the Lions.

Chichikov also adopts different façades. Although he does not contrive situations in order to prove his bravery (since he does not adopt the role of knight errant, there is no need), he nevertheless wears a sword 'in order to inspire robbers with fear' (295) ('для внушения страха ворам') (VII: 29) and to demonstrate his valiant nature. Like Don Quijote, this is all a façade, and the reader witnesses Chichikov's true nature when, during his altercation with Nozdryov at the latter's estate, he 'turned pale as a sheet. He tried to say something, but felt that his lips moved without producing a sound' (88) ('стал бледен, как полотно. Он хотел что-то сказать, но чувствовал, что губы его шевелились без звука') (VI: 86). But his most quixotic moment arises when, with the transaction of dead souls confirmed, his imagination supersedes reality and he begins to fantasise that he is already a landed proprietor. At the chief of police's party to celebrate the completion of the transaction:

> Chichikov had never found himself in such a merry mood. He fancied that he was actually a landed proprietor in the Kherson [province], and talked about various improvements—about three-field farming; about the happiness and bliss of two souls; and began to recite to Sobakevich Werther's [epistle in verse] to Charlotte […] (159)

> Чичиков никогда не чувствовал себя в таком веселом расположении, воображал себя уже настоящим херсонским помещиком, говорил об разных улучшениях: о трехпольном хозяйстве, о счастии и блаженстве двух душ и стал читать Собакевичу послание в стихах Вертера к Шарлотте […] (VI: 152)

Not only does he believe that he is a landed proprietor, in the same way that Don Quijote believes he is a knight errant, but he also assumes the habits of one in his discussion of farming and marriage. Gogol' also lends him a cultured personality in a rare moment of literary indulgence. This is a significant deviation from his true character, for he admits in what remains of drafts to Part II that he has 'not even read *The Duchesse of La Vallière* through' (334) ('до сих пор еще «Графин Лавальер» не прочел') (VII: 63), the only literary work which he carries around with him. The scene is comparable to his misplaced musings on Plyushkin's peasants, where he sentimentally calls them 'my little doves' (143) ('мои голубчики') (VI: 137), and pictures what they were like when they were alive. In both examples a sense of imagination begins to materialise, but it is only following the transaction that his imagination, in Don Quijote-like fashion, begins to override reality.[195] Although Chichikov is mostly rooted in reality, and Don Quijote in the imaginary, both characters struggle with the real-imaginary dichotomy and allow the conflation of the one with the other.

The adoption of different façades also extends into their language. As has been seen in the discussion of Pushkin's *Tales of Belkin*, Don Quijote changes his language by adopting archaisms from the romances of chivalry. The inconsistency of his language, for example when in the same speech he alternates between the contemporary 'hermosa' and the archaic 'fermosa' ('beautiful') (I.VIII), suggests that his use of antiquated vocabulary might be a conscious effort, and consequently serves as further evidence that he might not be entirely mad, thereby bolstering the mad-sane paradox. In *Dead Souls* Chichikov also adopts different registers and mannerisms. With Manilov he is exceedingly polite and uses an unnaturally sickly sweet language, mimicking the manners and speech of his host, but with Korobochka his true nature emerges. When she greets him with 'Good morning, my friend. How did you sleep?'

[195] A similar example is found in Gogol''s play, *The Government Inspector*, when Khlestakov begins to believe that he is indeed the inspector, and boasts to the town officials of owning the best house in Petersburg, hosting balls with watermelons costing seven hundred roubles, and his friendship with Pushkin and his own status as writer (act 3, scene VI), reflecting Gogol''s own elaborations on his friendship with the poet.

(‘Здравствуйте, батюшка. Каково почивали?’) he echoes her language with ‘Well, very well […] And how did you sleep, my friend?’ (48) (‘Хорошо, хорошо […] Вы как, матушка?’) (VI: 48–49). But not long after these pleasantries, and after unsuccessfully broaching the subject of dead souls with her, his tone changes, and the narrator explains that ‘here Chichikov exceeded all the bounds of patience, dashed a chair to the floor, and consigned her to the deuce’ (54) (‘Здесь Чичиков вышел совершенно из границ всякого терпения, хватил в сердцах стулом об пол и посулил ей чорта’) (VI: 54). The swiftness of his transition to crude informality and anger reveals his true nature and highlights that his chameleon-like courteous behaviour and polite language are part of the façade he adopts in order to succeed in his quest to obtain dead souls, just as Don Quijote’s chivalrous behaviour and archaic language are part of the façade he adopts in order to succeed in his quest to restore the chivalric values of knight errantry to Golden Age Spain.

One final point of comparison lies in the nature of their quests. While at first glance it seems apparent that Don Quijote errs towards good and Chichikov towards bad, neither can be described, as Turkevich does, as ‘completely’ good or bad. Don Quijote may be guided by the ideals of chivalry with the intention of succouring the poor, saving damsels in distress, and serving justice, but he has another motive: to win ‘incredible fame throughout the universe’ (‘fama increíble por todo el universo’) (I.XXI.173–74/254). His adventures, previously viewed as altruistic, philanthropic and warm-spirited, thus become imbued with a sense of his self-aggrandisement and greed. While this characteristic is commonly overlooked by Cervantes’ reader, it is at the forefront of Chichikov’s personality and his quest for dead souls. But his greed is not so strong that it overrides propriety. For example, he rewards the little peasant girl (who has directed him and his lackey, Selifan, back to the main road following their stay with Korobochka) with a kopeck for her help, despite the fact that she does not know her left from her right. Although this is a paltry sum, the donation indicates that Chichikov cannot be

'completely bad', just as Don Quijote's desire for fame suggests that he cannot be 'completely good'. Don Quijote and Chichikov thus find themselves closer to one another on the good-bad spectrum than the reader (and Turkevich) is initially led to believe. Rather than being antithetical, they mirror one another in their desire for self-aggrandisement. If there is inversion, it lies not in their characters, but in their methods of fulfilling their ambition: Don Quijote through good deeds, and Chichikov through cunning.

Neither Cervantes nor Gogol' allows their respective protagonists to travel alone: Don Quijote is joined by Sancho, his peasant neighbour who becomes both his squire and close friend, while Chichikov is joined by his serfs Selifan and Petrushka. Although Gogol' does not develop the 'two friends' motif in *Dead Souls* in the way Cervantes does in the *Quixote*, and although Selifan and Petrushka are nowhere near as developed, or indeed as likeable, as Sancho, there is nevertheless one key point of comparison: the comic potential they bring to the text. During the onerous journey in torrential rain which concludes with Selifan and Chichikov's arrival at Korobochka's, the former accidentally tips the carriage causing the latter to fall out and become bespattered in mud. Such humour is comparable to the scene in the *Quixote* when Sancho, eager not to part with the cottage cheese he has acquired, places it in the 'baciyelmo' for safekeeping. Not long after this, his master calls for the helmet-basin in his battle with the lions, and places it on his head (II.XVII). Just as Selifan accidentally causes his master to be covered in mud, so too does Sancho accidentally cause his master to be covered in cheese. There is also a comic warmth in the way Sancho treats his Dapple, and Selifan his three horses. Not only do they speak warmly of and to their animals, but they also address them personally. Sancho's appreciation of his donkey is most apparent when Ginés de Pasamonte, having stolen it (I.XXIII), reappears with it: Sancho 'kissed it and caressed it as if it were a human being. The ass quietly accepted the kisses and the caresses without offering a word in reply' ('le besaba y acariciaba como si fuera persona. El asno callaba y se dejaba besar y

acariciar de Sancho sin responderle palabra alguna') (I.XXX.279/1349). Selifan also shows affection to his horses (or, at least, to two of the three) and personifies them to comic effect in his speech:

> Learn to do what you ought, you German pantaloon-maker! The brown is a respectable horse; he does his duty; and I shall take pleasure in giving him an extra measure, because he is a good horse: and the Assessor is a fine horse also… Come, come! what are you shaking your ears for? (40)
>
> Ты знай свое дело, панталонник ты немецкий! Гнедой — почтенный конь, он сполняет свой долг, я ему с охотою дам лишнюю меру, потому что он почтенный конь, и Заседатель тож хороший конь... Ну, ну! что потряхиваешь ушами? (VI: 40)

The reader can imagine Sancho speaking in a similar way, were he to have three horses (or donkeys) and if one of them were to misbehave.

There are two further characters who, although secondary and only appearing in the remaining drafts of Part II, provide the reader with perhaps the clearest understanding of Gogol''s response to Don Quijote in his fiction. These are the landlords Kostanzhoglo and Koshkaryov. The former, practical and successful, having just criticised the latter for his eccentricity, frivolousness and 'madness', continues his tirade about the very type to which his acquaintance belongs:

> How is [a] man to keep from going into a passion? It would be well enough if it were an extraneous matter, but this lies close to one's own heart. The vexatious point about it is, to see the Russian character being spoiled. A Don Quixoteism is now exhibiting itself in the Russian character, such as never appeared in it before. Cultivation strikes a man's fancy, and he becomes [an enlightened] Don Quixote. He establishes such schools as would never have entered the mind of even a fool! The schools turn out a man who is a good for nothing, either in town or country, except for a drunkard, and he is conscious of his worth! […] He goes into philanthropy, and becomes a Don Quixote […] (340)

> Да и ведь как не сердиться? Добро бы это было чужое, а то ведь это близко собственному сердцу. Ведь досадно то, что русской характер портится. Ведь теперь явилось в русском характере донкишотство, которого никогда не было. Просвещенье придет ему в ум—сделается Дон-Кишотом просвещенья, заведет такие школы, что дураку в ум не войдет. Выйдет из школы такой человек, что никуда не годится; ни в деревню, ни в город, только что пьяница, да чувствует свое достоинство. В человеколюбье пойдет—сделается Дон-Кишотом […] (VII: 68)

Kostanzhoglo's perception of Koshkaryov as a mad fool lies primarily in his unrealistic and impractical idealism. His estate is entirely in disarray, and yet his priority is for his serfs to 'read a book on [Franklin's] lightning-conductors, or the Georgics of Virgil, or a chemical analysis of the soil, as he followed the plough' (334) ('идя за плугом, будет в то же время читать книгу о громовых отводах Франклина, или Виргилевый Георгики, или Химическое исследование почв') (VII: 63). He believes, whimsically and impractically, that if the peasants were to read literature (while completing their work, and despite their illiteracy) then this would lead to greater productivity. Not unlike Don Quijote, his folly merges with his fondness for literature and blinds him from understanding the reality of his situation. To heighten the comparison, Gogol' also provides Koshkaryov with 'a vast hall, lined from top to bottom with books' (336) ('огромный зал, снизу доверху уставленный книгами') (VII: 65). Despite the similarities, it is probable that Gogol' created Koshkaryov more as an exasperated response to the folly and whimsy among many members of Russia's landowning class and less as a direct response to Don Quijote. That said, Kostanzhoglo's speech serves to paint his acquaintance (and, by extension, Cervantes' knight errant) in a negative light, and conjures the image of an eccentric individual whose impracticality leads to the decimation of his estate and the suffering of his serfs, in contrast to the prosperity of the practical and level-headed Kostanzhoglo.

Although Gogol' followed the Romantic approach in his admiration of Cervantes for his literary talents, his reception of Don Quijote—and, indeed, of much of the world around

him—was very much a negative one. The same negativity is manifested towards the characters in his *Dead Souls* albeit, at least initially, in a comic manner. At the end of Part I, Gogol' reveals that he never intended to depict in Chichikov a 'virtuous' character. The narrator explains that:

> […] a virtuous man cannot be taken for the hero […] the words *virtuous man* have turned to emptiness in the public mouth, for the virtuous man has been converted into a horse; and there is not a writer who has not ridden him, and urged him on with the whip, and with anything else which has come to hand. Hence, the virtuous man has been exhausted to such a degree, that there is no longer a shadow of virtue left in him […] (239)

> […] добродетельный человек все-таки не взят в герои […] праздно вращается на устах слово «добродетельный человек»; потому что обратили в лошадь добродетельного человека, и нет писателя, который бы не ездил на нем, понукая и кнутом и всем чем ни попало; потому что изморили добродетельного человека до того, что теперь нет на нем и тени добродетели [...] (VI: 223)

Given Gogol''s belief that the 'virtuous man' does not exist in reality or in fiction, despite what readers say and writers do, it should come as little surprise that he created Chichikov as a vulgar and repellent character, or that he was unable to view Don Quijote as an admirable one. In Gogol''s comparison of Koshkaryov with Don Quijote, for example, it is clear that he did not perceive any Romantic qualities in Cervantes' hero: his intentions might be commendable, but that does not make him a respectable, or virtuous, figure.

While Gogol' was originally intent on casting the virtuous man to one side in his creation of Chichikov, the struggle between virtue and vice would soon begin to plague the author and cause him to resent the character he had created. Following his near death encounter in Vienna, in the early 1840s Gogol' became 'convinced that God had spared him for the special purpose of representing truth and goodness to his fellow men through his writings'. Given the amplitude of vices depicted in *Dead Souls* (not only in Chichikov, but across all its

characters), he now 'shuddered at the thought of the novel just completed'.[196] This revulsion was augmented by another idea: that the vices with which he had imbued his protagonist reflected those of his own. This leads the reader to perhaps the most interesting point of comparison between Chichikov and Don Quijote—and, indeed, between Gogol' and Don Quijote. If Gogol' resented his protagonist because he saw in him his own vices, then it is quite possible that his negative response to Cervantes' hero was also due, at least in part, to seeing his own weaknesses reflected in him. This is suggested not only by the fact that Gogol' considered neither character virtuous, but also by the clear parallel between Gogol' striving to fulfil 'a God-given purpose by means of his work'[197] and Don Quijote striving to do so by means of knight errantry. Don Quijote's dedication to his task, his laboured efforts, and his ultimate failure to fulfil his purpose would have resonated with Gogol''s own anxieties and exposed and amplified some of his greatest fears: not being taken seriously, not reaching his true potential, and failing to make the impact he felt was his destiny. If Gogol' disliked the character of Don Quijote, this was less because of the influence of certain contemporary or literary or ideological trends, and more because he perceived in Cervantes' hero some of his own failings. Conversely, if Gogol' admired Cervantes, this was also less because of socio-ideological trends, and more because he envied his talent and success, and wished for himself the same fame and longevity enjoyed by the Spanish writer.

[196] Thaïs S. Lindstrom, *Nikolay Gogol* (New York, NY: Twayne Publishers, 1974), p. 181.
[197] Ibid., p. 181.

3. TURGENEV AND CERVANTES

Background

Despite having spent the majority of his early childhood at his family estate of Spasskoe in the Russian provinces, Ivan Turgenev's education and upbringing, even before the family's move to Moscow, were by no means bereft of European cultural or literary influence. The house had an extensive library with many French works, including the novels of Chateaubriand and Madame de Staël; Turgenev read poetry by the English Romantics and the novels of Dickens, his older brother Nikolai having 'apparently taught [him] to read English'; and the brothers also had a number of foreign tutors who taught them subjects including French, German, Russian grammar and literature, and Latin. Furthermore, between the years of 1822 and 1823 the household 'undertook a vast journey through Germany, Switzerland, France, and Austria, spending some six months in Paris'.[198] These formative years, both learning extensively about European language and literature and their extensive travels through Europe, no doubt helped to cultivate in Turgenev an interest in and affection for Western culture which would last a lifetime.

Following university study in Moscow and St Petersburg, where he studied literature, philology and classics, Turgenev moved to Berlin for postgraduate study in 1838. From this point forward he spent most of his time in Europe, living and travelling during early adulthood in Germany and Italy, and later in France, with visits to Germany and England. Although he returned to Russia for lengthy periods of time, he remained a 'Westerner', not only in his fondness for European culture, but also in his appreciation for and support of the need for social change in Russia. As Pavel Annenkov recalls:

[198] Leonard Schapiro, *Turgenev: His Life and Times* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 5, 7, 9.

> For him Europe was the land of regeneration: the root of all his aspirations, the ground for nurturing will and character, and the development of thought itself was also implanted in its soil […][199]

While Turgenev believed in social and cultural learning from the West as a means for social progress, his views were not radical and were 'tinged with nostalgia for the "old" Russia'.[200] This ambiguity is reflected in his perception of 'himself as a European in Russia and a Russian in Europe, a man who appointed himself as an unofficial intermediary between the culture of his birth right and the culture of his adoption'.[201] This is reflected in his literary relationships: he was not only close to a number of Russian littérateurs, but also European ones, including the French writers Flaubert, Zola, Maupassant and Daudet, as well as a young Henry James. He was not only 'anxious to popularise Russian literature abroad', but also sought to introduce the Russian reader to the works of foreign literature, himself translating scenes from Goethe's *Faust*, Flaubert's *The Legend of Saint Julian the Hospitalier* (*La légende de Saint-Julien l'hospitalier*) and *Hérodias*, and Byron's *Darkness*.[202] In his description of Turgenev's library at Spasskoe, Leonard Schapiro, with recourse to Mikhail Portugalov's study, provides an accurate snapshot of the diverse and extensive nature of the Russian's admiration of European literature:

> His time at the university in Berlin is marked by a large collection of Greek and Latin authors (always his favourite reading), edited with commentaries by German classicists. The German romantics (along with Goethe and Schiller) are well represented, as are also the philosophers such as Schlegel, Schelling, and Hegel, and the historians, like Ranke and Zumpt […] One item of this period is particularly notable: the works of Shakespeare, in English, but published in Leipzig. […] The interests of the years which he spent in France are evident in a large collection of works on the French Revolution and on the modern history of France. His love of the culture of Spain, aroused by his friendship with Pauline Viardot, and his study of the language after 1847, is marked by

[199] P. V. Annenkov, *Vospominaniia i kriticheskie ocherki: sobranie statei i zametok, 1849-1868 Gg.*, 3 vols (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1971), III, 191.
[200] Patrick Waddington, 'Introduction' to *Rudin*, by I. S. Turgenev (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1994), p. 10.
[201] Richard Freeborn, *Turgenev: The Novelist's Novelist: A Study* (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), p. xi.
[202] Waddington, 'Introduction', p. 12; Liubimova, 'Servantes i Turgenev', p. 184.

> such collections as the works of Cervantes and Calderón, of *romances* and *canciones*, as well as Spanish grammars.[203]

Although Turgenev's fondness for European literature began with French, German and English works, Spanish literature (as demonstrated in the description of his library) soon became, and would for the rest of his life remain, a major interest.

His fascination with Spanish literature and culture grew significantly following his acquaintance with the Spanish opera singer Pauline Viardot, neé García, at the end of 1843, of whom he would remain enamoured for the rest of his life. She was married to Louis Viardot, a French littérateur, Hispanist and Cervantes enthusiast. Viardot's fascination with Spanish culture, nurtured no doubt during his time with the French army in Spain, can be seen in his *Espagne et beaux-arts* (1866), which features a number of essays on influential Spanish personalities and literary works, as well as a translation of *Lazarillo de Tormes*. Prior to this he produced his most famous works pertaining to Spanish culture: the first full translation of the *Quixote* into French in 1836–37, followed by a translation of the *Exemplary Tales* in 1838. Turgenev himself praised the translation of the *Quixote*, while Dostoevsky, too, described it as 'excellent' ('превосходный') (XXI: 68). Given Turgenev's affection for Pauline, his friendship with her husband and his fondness for her Spanish family, there can be little doubt that his relationship with the Viardots played a crucial role in his growing hispanophilism.

Despite being able to communicate freely with the Viardots in French, at the end of 1847 Turgenev nevertheless undertook the task of learning Spanish. He not only likely used Franceson's *Grammatik der Spanischen Sprache*, which was in his library at Spasskoe,[204] but also took on a tutor. His acquisition of Spanish and reading of its literature is documented in his correspondence with Pauline. In a letter dated 19 October 1847, he wrote: 'J'ai déjà pris un

[203] Schapiro, *Turgenev*, p. 99. See also M. V. Portugalov, *Po Turgenevskim mestam* (Moscow: T-vo V. V. Dumnov, 1924), pp. 31–38.
[204] M. V. Portugalov, *Turgeniana: stat'i, ocherki i bibliografiia* (Orel: Orlovskoe otd-nie Gosizdata, 1922), p. 25.

maître d'espagnol: el señor Castelar' (P: I: 262). In another letter, dated 26 November 1847, he talks of his linguistic progress—and of spending time in France with Pauline's mother:

> We gather every evening in the Spanish *brasero* and talk in Spanish. Within about four months I'll speak only in this language. My teacher has showered me with many compliments for my perceptiveness… he doesn't know that I have a knack for learning.
>
> Мы каждый вечер собираемся у испанского «brasero» и говорим по-испански. Месяца через четыре я буду говорить только на этом языке. Мой учитель наговорил мне много комплиментов о моей понятливости... он не знает, что у меня есть шишка заучивания. (P: I: 266)

The final component of his Spanish study is revealed in a letter dated 4 January 1848 in which he explains that he has 'entré en correspondence avec un autre élève de mon maître, correspondence anonyme et n'ayant d'autre but que celui de nous perfectionner dans l'étude de la «magnifica lengua castellana»' (P: I: 293).

Not long after beginning to study Spanish, Turgenev was reading its literature in the original. In his 19 December 1847 letter to Pauline, he discloses that he has read Calderón's play *La devoción de la cruz* (*Devotion of the Cross*), and calls it a 'chef-d'oeuvre' (P: I: 279). Six days later, in his letter of 25 December 1847, he writes to her with the news that, since his last letter, he has also read Calderón's *La vida es sueño* (*Life is a Dream*), whose protagonist, Segismundo, he describes as 'le Hamlet espagnol'; that he is now starting to read *The Prodigious Magician* (*El mágico prodigioso*), which he describes as 'le «Faust» espagnol'; and coins a neologism in his description of himself: 'je suis tout encalderonisé' (P: I: 281).[205]

Turgenev did not restrict his reading of Spanish literature to Golden Age theatre. In his letter of 4 January 1848, he tells Pauline that he has almost completed reading Lesage's *Gil*

[205] It is worth noting the orthographical errors in Turgenev's Spanish, namely his capitalisation of nouns and the absence of accents: '*Devocion de la Cruz*' (*La devoción de la cruz*); '*La Vida es sueño*' (*La vida es sueño*); '*El Magico prodigioso*' (*El mágico prodigioso*); Calderon (Calderón); and earlier, 'magnifica lengua castellana' ('magnífica lengua castellana'). While his Spanish is of a very good level, it is not yet perfect.

Blas in Spanish translation and that he is in the process of translating Prévost's *Manon Lescaut* into Spanish (P: I: 293). A year and a half later, in a letter dated 6 July 1849, he writes that he has read *Doña Isabel de Solis, Queen of Granada: A Historical Novel* (*Doña Isabel de Solis, Reyna de Granada, novela historica*) by Francisco Martínez de la Rosa, 'pour m'exercer dans la langue espagnole'. He was not fond of it, however, calling it 'enfantin'. In the same letter he adds that he has also read *Histoire de la guerre en Espagne depuis 1807* by General Sarrazin.[206] Although the work was written in French, and not Spanish, it nevertheless shows that Turgenev's hispanophilism extended beyond a superficial interest in its literature towards learning about its history and culture.

His fondness for the language is also visible in the Spanish words and phrases which he interpolates into his letters. Most of these feature in his correspondence with Pauline and seem to be included for no reason other than whimsicality. In a letter dated 8 December 1847, he refers to her brother, Manuel García, as 'el hermano de V-d' ('your brother'), where 'V-d' is an abbreviation of 'Usted' (the polite form of 'you') (P: I: 272); in another, dated 25 December 1847, he adds the postscript: 'Que Dios bendiga a Vd' ('May God bless you') (P: I: 280); while in another, dated 9–10 July 1849, he refers to the opera, 'Don Sebastien, king of Portugal', as 'aburrido' ('boring') (P: I: 332). While there are numerous further examples of similar ilk, there are also others, as Bron' argues, which may have been drawn directly from Spanish literature. In a letter to Pauline dated 30 December 1848, Turgenev includes the expression 'Ay de mí!', which can be translated as 'Oh my!' or 'Woe is me!' (P: I: 287).[207] Bron' suggests that Turgenev learned, and borrowed, this phrase from the works of Calderón: it features a number of times in *Devotion of the Cross* and *Life is a Dream*, and provides the

[206] Ivan Turgenev, *Lettres à Madame Viardot*, ed. by E. Halpérine-Kaminsky (Paris: Charpentier, 1907), p. 87.
[207] Turgenev omits the '¡' with which the phrase should start.

source of witty word play in *The Prodigious Magician*.[208] Given that Turgenev wrote of having read these works, it is certainly possible, particularly in light of how often the phrase features in the texts, that they served as a primary source of the expression.

Turgenev's hispanophilism is also present in his prose writing. In his sketch, 'Chelovek v serykh ochkakh' ('The Man in the Grey Spectacles'), Turgenev includes a Spanish expression: 'Guerra, caza y amores […] Por un placer mil dolores' ('War, hunting, and love […] For one pleasure, a thousand sorrows') (S: XIV: 118).[209] Zviguilsky suggests that this was taken directly from 'Quelque chasses en Russie' by Louis Viardot.[210] His hispanophilism extends beyond phrases and into themes and motifs. His one-act play, *Neostorozhnost'* (*An Imprudence*), set in Spain, was written in 1843, a decade before his maturity as a writer and some months before his first meeting with the Viardots. While his primary model was Mérimée's *Théâtre de Clara Gazul*, to which he owed 'the Spanish setting, the compactness of the action and the melodramatic *dénouement*, not to mention the smouldering and murderous passion which brings it about',[211] the play also highlights the fact that Turgenev's interest in both European literature and Spanish culture existed before his acquaintance with the Viardots. The development of both his literary skill and his knowledge of Spanish, and appreciation for

[208] T. I. Bron', 'Ispanskie tsitaty u Turgeneva', pp. 305–06. The scene he mentions appears in Act II of *The Prodigious Magician*:

Cipriano:	¡Ay de mí!	Cipriano:	Oh dear!
	[…]		[…]
Clarín:	¡Ay de mí!	Clarín:	Oh dear!
Moscón:	¡Ay de mí también!	Moscón:	Me too, oh dear!
Clarín:	Llamar a este sitio es bien la Isla de los Ay-de-míes.	Clarín:	This place could well be called the Isle of Oh-dears.

Pedro Calderón de la Barca, *The prodigious magician = El mágico prodigioso*, ed. and trans. by Bruce W. Wardropper (Potomac, MD: Studia Humanitatis, 1982), 134–35. Wardropper anglicises the names of the characters in the translation; the originals have been maintained here.

[209] Although this sketch is part of Turgenev's 'Memories of Literature and Life' ('Literaturnye i zhiteiskie vospominaniia'), it was actually originally written in French and published in the journal *La Nouvelle Revue* (1879, I, 1865–90) edited by Flaubert.

[210] A. Zviguilsky, 'Tourguénev et l'Espagne', *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, 33 (1959), 50–79 (p. 58).

[211] Frank Friedeberg Seeley, *Turgenev: A Reading of his Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 48.

European literature in general, appears in his short story *First Love* (*Pervaya lyubov'*), published in 1860. The poet Maidanov has mentioned his friend's Spanish novel, *El Trovador*, and is interrupted by the heroine Zinaida, who asks: 'Is that the book with the question-marks upside down?' ('Ах, это та книга с опрокинутыми вопросительными знаками?'), to which the poet responds: 'Yes. It's the Spanish custom' ('Да. Это так принято у испанцев') (S: IX: 42).[212]

The above examples begin to demonstrate that Turgenev's interest in Spanish language and literature was more than merely superficial and penetrated deep into both his literary endeavours and daily life. His fascination with the culture, although present from early on, blossomed following his meeting with Pauline Viardot and significantly rivalled (if not, indeed, superseded) his interest in other European languages and cultures. As a littérateur, he was drawn to European literature, as is evidenced in his reading of Calderón and other Spanish texts. But even more influential than Turgenev for Calderón was Cervantes. The next section will explore his direct references to Cervantes and the *Quixote*, examining in closer detail: his potential borrowing of Cervantine phrases; references to both his desire for new a translation of the *Quixote* and his translation of one of Cervantes' *Exemplary Tales*; and his evolving views of Don Quijote. The following section will examine Turgenev's speech, *Hamlet and Don Quixote* (one of the most evident indications of a Russian writer's reception of Cervantes), in which he juxtaposes the Shakespearean and Cervantine protagonists. Examination of this speech will help to elucidate and define his reception and perception of the knight errant. The final section will focus on Turgenev's first short novel, *Rudin*, exploring intertextual similarities between the Russian work and Cervantes' novel, and will pay close attention to a

[212] Ivan Turgenev, *First Love and Other Stories*, trans. by Richard Freeborn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 173.

direct reference to the *Quixote*—and its significance in understanding Turgenev's interpretation of Cervantes' hero—towards the end of the text.

Turgenev and Cervantes

The role of Cervantes in Turgenev's literary pursuits is significant. This is seen primarily in his speech, *Hamlet and Don Quixote* (discussed in the following section), but it is also manifest in his references to Cervantes and the *Quixote* in correspondence and other texts. His fondness for the novel is seen in his frequent references to creating his own translation of it. This should not come as a surprise: as has been mentioned, he had already translated extracts from the works of Goethe, Flaubert and Byron, and was close friends with Louis Viardot, translator of Cervantes and other Spanish texts. Russia was also lacking a good translation of the *Quixote*. Although Masal'sky created the first translation of Cervantes' novel directly from Spanish into Russian in 1838, and although it was considered superior to previous translations undertaken via French intermediaries, it was still incomplete and featured a number of abridgments.[213] As Gratchev comments, 'it is not then so surprising that many educated and well-travelled Russian writers, including Ivan Turgenev, were not happy with reading the available translation and were planning to make another, better one'.[214]

During Turgenev's exile at his family estate of Spasskoe between May 1852 and November 1853 he regularly re-read classical and canonical texts, including the works of Homer and Molière, and Cervantes' *Quixote*.[215] The first indication of his desire to undertake a translation of the latter work appears in a letter from this period dated 9 July 1853 to Annenkov. Here he talks about his early work on a novel that would later be commonly referred to as *Two Generations*, and comments on his translation plans:

---

[213] See p. 20.
[214] Gratchev, 'Don Quixote in Russia in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries', p. 117.
[215] Schapiro, *Turgenev*, p. 98.

> […] this winter, if I do not continue with it [the novel], then I will start a translation of *Don Quixote*, for which I have long been preparing with my continuous re-reading of this immortal novel—Cervantes has become for me what Pushkin, probably, was for you.
>
> […] эту зиму – если я не буду его [этот роман] продолжать, примусь за перевод «Дон Кихота», к которому я давно готовлюсь беспрестанным перечитыванием этого бессмертного романа – Сервантес стал для меня тем, чем, вероятно, стал для Вас Пушкин. (P: II: 172)

Although Turgenev never completed *Two Generations*, he also never undertook his proposed translation of the *Quixote*. Nevertheless, the excerpt demonstrates just how fervently Turgenev admired Cervantes and his works: his comparison of his appreciation for Cervantes with that of Annenkov (who was 'essentially a Pushkinist by profession') for Pushkin begins to illustrate the strength of the influence the Spaniard had over him.[216] Furthermore, in containing the first mention of Turgenev's desire to translate the *Quixote*, it also suggests that he must have read it in the original, and been aware of the shortcomings found in the versions of Masal'sky and others, before July 1853.[217]

Despite not following through on his intentions, the idea to translate the *Quixote* nevertheless remained with him throughout his life. In a letter dated 17 February 1857 he wrote to Botkin: 'Since I am quite proficient in the Russian language, I intend to undertake a translation of *Don Quixote*' ('Так как я порядочно владею российским языком – то я намерен заняться переводом «Дон Кихота»') (P: III: 92).[218] The following decade, Petr Boborykin recalls a conversation he had with Turgenev in 1864, in which the latter asserted: 'I will write something. For so many years I have been thinking of making a good translation of

[216] Holl, '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel', p. 82.
[217] Bron', 'Ispanskie tsitaty u Turgeneva', p. 307.
[218] It might appear peculiar that Turgenev comments upon his proficiency in Russian, rather than Spanish, in undertaking a translation of the *Quixote*. However, he felt confident in his ability to convey the spirit of the *Quixote* and its linguistic nuances in his own Russian version, considering his Russian to be of comparable quality, unlike that of his predecessors, to Cervantes' Spanish.

Don Quixote' ('Кое-что буду писать […] Вот сколько лет мечтаю о том, чтобы сделать хороший перевод «Дон-Кихота»').[219] Four years before his death, Turgenev wrote to Yakov Polonsky on 18 February 1877: 'So that I don't lose the habit of the pen, I will probably undertake translations. I'm thinking of *Don Quixote*' ('Чтобы не отстать от привычки к перу – я, вероятно, займусь переводами. Думаю о «Дон-Кихоте»') (P: XII.I: 101). The fact that even towards the end of his life Turgenev was considering translating Cervantes' masterpiece suggests that his interest in the novel was, rather than superficial, an integral aspect of his literary endeavours.

Turgenev was also involved with translations of Cervantes' works in other ways. On 17 May 1879, he wrote to Mikhail Stasyulevich asking him whether his journal, *The European Bulletin* (*Vestnik Evropy*), accepted printed translations of scholarly articles, explaining that 'I have [made] an excellent translation [into Russian] of a large biographical-critical introduction to *Don Quixote* by L. Viardot' ('Есть у меня также отличный перевод биографически-критического предисловия к «Дон-Кихоту» Л. Виардо') (P: XII.II: 79), a reference no doubt to Viardot's 'Notice sur la vie at les ouvrages de Cervantès' which serves as an introduction to his translation of the novel.[220] He was unaware that a Russian version of the introduction had already been printed as the preface to Masal'sky's 1838 translation of the *Quixote*.[221] More significantly, in a letter to Annenkov dated 21 February 1866, Turgenev talks of having undertaken a translation of one of Cervantes' *Exemplary Tales*: 'I have [written] a translation of the short (but excellent) story by Cervantes, "Rinconete and Cortadillo"' ('у меня есть перевод небольшой (но отличной) повести Сервантеса – «Ринконет и Кортадильо»') (P: VI: 52). Reminiscent of Pushkin's translation exercises based on Cervantes 'The Little

[219] Petr Boborykin, *Turgenev doma i za granitsei* (Moscow: Mul'timediynoe izdatel'stvo Strel'bitskogo, 2018), p. 4.
[220] Louis Viardot, 'Notice sur la vie at les ouvrages de Cervantès', in *L'ingénieux hidalgo don Quichotte de la Manche*, by Miguel de Cervantes, 2 vols (Paris: J.-J. Dubochet et Compagnie, 1836–37), I, 1–48.
[221] M. Alekseev, 'Turgenev i ispanskie pisateli', *Literaturnyi Kritik*, 11 (1938), 136–44 (p. 139, n. 1).

Gypsy Girl', Turgenev's full translation of Cervantes' short story suggests a fluency in—or, at least, a passion for—Spanish, which was not experienced to quite the same extent by the Russian poet.

In his analysis of Turgenev's use of Spanish idioms, Bron' suggests that he borrowed directly not only from Calderón, but also from Cervantes. The first example appears in a letter dated 6 August 1861 to Countess Lambert, in which Turgenev uses the expression 'encoger los hombros', which can be translated into English as 'to shrug' or 'to hunch one's shoulders' (P: IV: 279). According to Bron', this could have been drawn from four places in the *Quixote*.[222] The second example is found in a letter to Flaubert dated 27 November 1878. Here Turgenev mentions another Spanish idiom, this time in French translation: 'Je viens d'avoir soixante ans, mon cher vieux. C'est le commencement de la queue de la vie. Un proverbe espagnol dit que c'est ce qu'il y a de plus difficile à dépoiter (*sic*): une queue.'[223] The idiom Turgenev is thinking of is 'estar/faltar el rabo por desollar', which can be translated literally as 'the tail is yet to be skinned', or, more idiomatically in English, 'the hardest part is yet to come', and which appears twice in the *Quixote*.[224] Bron' suggests that Turgenev intentionally chose these idioms from many other Spanish expressions because, having met them in the *Quixote*, he valued their

[222] These four are: Don Quijote, upon learning that a corpse being carried by mourners died of a fever which was brought by God, and realising that there is therefore no need to avenge him, explains that 'all one can do is shrug one's shoulders and be silent' ('no hay sino callar y encoger los hombros') (I.XIX.150/222); Sancho, explaining that certain mishaps, like being tossed in a blanket (I.XVII), cannot always be prevented, adds that 'if they do come your way there's nothing to be done but [shrug your shoulders]' ('si vienen, no hay que hacer otra cosa sino encoger los hombros') (I.XXI.169/247); when Cardenio, listening to Dorotea's story, hears the name of his beloved Luscinda, 'his only reaction was to hunch his shoulders […]' ('no hizo otra cosa que encoger los hombros […]') (I.XXVIII.256/360); and when the Duchess makes Sancho sit down with her for a conversation, 'Sancho shrugged [his shoulders], obeyed and sat down' ('Encogió Sancho los hombros, obedeció y sentóse') (II.XXXIII.713/987). The Real Academia Española edition of the *Quixote* provides a further explanation for the idiom as 'resignarse' ('to resign oneself'). See *Don Quijote de La Mancha*, ed. by Francisco Rico (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 2004), p. 222, n. 35; Bron', 'Ispanskie tsitaty u Turgeneva', pp. 307–08.

[223] Turgenev means 'dépiauter'. See Ivan Turgenev, *Ivan Tourguéneff d'après sa correspondance avec ses amis français*, ed. by E. Halpérine-Kaminsky (Paris: E. Fasquelle, 1901), p. 115.

[224] These two appearances are: Sancho, to Don Quijote's question, 'Is your story still incomplete, then?' ('Pues ¿hay más?'), about whether he has recollected all that he has heard about the reception of Part I of the *Quixote*, responds: 'I've still got the tail left to skin' ('Aún la cola falta por desollar') (II:II.501/702); and Merlin, in one of the Duke and Duchess' tricks, says to Sancho: 'Montesinos is sitting in his cave […] [waiting] for his disenchantment, because he still has the tail left to skin' ('Montesinos se está en su cueva […] esperando su desencanto, que aún le falta la cola por desollar') (II.XXXV.732/1013).

originality and expression of the Spanish character.[225] Given that Turgenev became acquainted with the *Quixote* before 1853, it is possible that his knowledge of these idioms originates from his reading of the novel. However, the reader must remember that these expressions are not uncommon in Spanish, and it is likely that his conversations with Pauline Viardot and her family were equally influential in the development of his idiomatic grasp of the Spanish language.

While Turgenev was evidently inspired throughout his life not only generally by Spanish language and culture, but also more specifically by Cervantes' *oeuvre*, his evolving views of the character of Don Quijote can also be discerned in his writing. While references to and analysis of Cervantes' hero appear mostly in his speech on *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, there are a few other instances where Turgenev demonstrates his response to the knight errant. The earliest example features in his 1846 satirical poem, 'Belinsky's Message to Dostoevsky' ('Poslanie Belinskogo k Dostoevskomu'), which he opens by calling the Russian novelist a 'knight of the sad visage' ('витязь горестной фигуры') before comparing him in the same stanza to a new pimple growing on the nose of literature (S: I: 360). It is interesting to note that Turgenev, who in his speech would later argue for Don Quijote's altruism, loyalty and moral superiority, should have originally considered him ripe for satirical endeavours. The disparity in his views highlights the impossibility of interpreting Cervantes' hero simply in one way, and how one reader's perception of him can and often does change the more he or she becomes acquainted with the text. Having written the poem in 1846, Turgenev must have been familiar with the *Quixote* by this point. However, it was after this juncture that he delved further into the novel and was able to consider more fully the typology and significance of its hero.

One final comment on Cervantes' hero appears in Turgenev's letter of 10 June 1856 to Countess Lambert, in which he voices his decision to return to France in order to be able to

[225] Bron', 'Ispanskie tsitaty u Turgeneva', p. 309.

spend time in the company of Pauline Viardot. He understands that in leaving Russia he is sacrificing any plans for a family life, and adds:

> I no longer look forward to happiness for myself […] When I take a look at my life thus far, it seems I have not done much more than carry on a wild goose chase. At least Don Quixote believed in the beauty of his Dulcinea, while the Don Quixotes of our time see that their Dulcineas are hideous, but still they chase after them.
>
> Я не рассчитываю более на счастье для себя […] Как оглянусь я на свою прошедшую жизнь, я, кажется, больше ничего не делал, как гонялся за глупостями. Дон-Кихот по крайней мере верил в красоту своей Дульцинеи, а нашего времени Дон-Кихоты и видят, что их Дульцинея – урод – а всё бегут за нею. (P: II: 365).

In this excerpt Turgenev appears to be comparing himself with Don Quijote and Pauline Viardot with Dulcinea. Like Don Quijote, Turgenev pines after a woman he cannot have; like Dulcinea, Pauline Viardot is unattainable—although this is due to her married status rather than Turgenev's inability to distinguish reality from fiction. Nevertheless, Turgenev embarks on an adventure—moving to France—which he knows will not provide him with happiness, in the same way that Don Quijote's adventures do not end in the success of attaining his ideal, but disillusionment and failure. Unlike Don Quijote, however, Turgenev is fully aware, firstly, that his beloved is not a typical beauty, and secondly, that chasing her will not lead to happiness. As Henri Troyat explains, 'to be miserable by her side seemed a more enviable fate […] than to be happy with somebody else'.[226]

It should also be mentioned here that a reference to the *Quixote* appears in Turgenev's first short novel, *Rudin*. Rather than a mere allusion to Cervantes' novel, the protagonist Rudin, upon leaving the estate of Dar'ya Lasunskaya, directly quotes the words Don Quijote offers to Sancho as they leave the duke and duchess' palace. This quotation, which will be analysed in

[226] Henri Troyat, *Turgenev*, trans. by Nancy Amphoux (London: Allison & Busby, 1989), p. 54.

full, together with further intertextual analysis, in the section on *Rudin*, is yet another example of Turgenev's perceptive reading of the text and provides further evidence of the influence of the *Quixote*.

That Turgenev had both a passion for and a keen understanding of the *Quixote*, together with an awareness of his *Exemplary Tales*, cannot be denied. A keen learner of languages and an advocate of literary and cultural exchange, throughout his life he was firm in the belief that Russia was in need of a translation of the *Quixote* which would finally convey to the reader the true complexity, intricacy and beauty of the novel. That he mentioned several times his own desire to undertake this task is suggestive of both his own confidence in Spanish and of his own in-depth perception of the novel and understanding of its nuances. But for Turgenev it was not just a matter of a great book, but also a great hero. While his view of Don Quijote began in a satirical and negative light (following on from the tradition of Gogol', whose *Dead Souls* was published in 1842, only four years before Turgenev wrote his poem about Dostoevsky), his perception changed drastically as his understanding of the text, and particularly of its eponymous hero, developed. This is seen in his fiction, in the form of *Rudin*, and is particularly evident in his speech, *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, works in which Turgenev was most broadly and creatively able to expound upon his perception of Don Quijote. It is consequently in these two works that the reader finds the clearest portrait of Turgenev's reception of Cervantes and particularly of his hero, and the clearest manifestation of his desire to create a protagonist based on his interpretation of the Don Quijote type.

Hamlet and Don Quixote

On 10 January 1860 Turgenev presented his lecture, *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, in St Petersburg, at a public reading in aid of the Society for the Welfare of Writers and Scholars in Need, and repeated it the following month in Moscow on 6 February. The speech, whose focus is the

comparison of the two eponymous types,[227] was originally envisaged as a journal article and was the culmination of a decade of reflection by Turgenev on Shakespeare and Cervantes' respective masterpieces.[228] According to his letter to his daughter, the audience's reaction was overwhelmingly positive: 'Cette lecture a eu lieu hier avec un succès extraordinaire. Ton père a été applaudi avec rage […]' (P: IV: 12). It was, in general, warmly received, not only by his fellow Russian writers and critics, but all over Europe, and helped to develop new and more profound interpretations of the *Quixote* and its eponymous hero. The aims of his speech can be divided into existential, literary, and personal. Firstly, he aimed to discuss certain broad universal questions which had occupied him throughout his life, such as 'the relationships between man and society, the necessity for a late or early man to realise his existence and

[227] This was not Turgenev's first comparison of Hamlet with types from Spanish literature. As has been mentioned, in his letter of 25 December 1847 to Pauline Viardot, he calls Segismundo, the protagonist of Calderón's *Life is a Dream*:

> […] le Hamlet espagnol, avec toute la différence qu'il y a entre le Midi et le Nord. Hamlet est plus réfléchi, plus subtil, plus philosophique; le caractère de Sigismond est simple, nu et pénétrant comme une épée; l'un n'agit – car son sang méridional le pousse – mais tout en agissant, il sait bien que la vie n'est qu'un songe. (P: I: 281)

[228] The first mention of Turgenev's intention to write an article on the two eponymous heroes is found in a letter from 5 September 1851 from Evgeny Feoktistov to Turgenev: 'I would particularly like to see the article on Hamlet and Don Quixote, which we discussed so long ago in Moscow' ('особенно желал бы я видеть статью по поводу Гамлета и Дон-Кихота, о которой мы так давно рассуждали в Москве'). (See V. A. Kovalev, 'О "prikrashennosti" izobrazhenia naroda v "Zapiski okhotnika" I. S. Turgeneva', in *Voprosy izucheniia russkoi literatury XI-XX vekov*, ed. by B. P. Gorodetskii [Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1958], 156–167 [p. 164]). His work on the article did not commence, however, until the second half of the decade. In a letter of 3 October 1856 he wrote to Ivan Panaev that 'by the New Year I will have ready an article with the following title: "Hamlet and Don Quixote"' ('до Нового года будет готова статья под заглавием: «Гамлет и Дон-Кихот»') (P: III: 19), and added on 19 October that he will set to work on the article immediately after finishing his new edition of *The Hanger On* (*Nakhlebnik*) (P: III: 28). It was only on 16 December 1856 that he finally wrote of having started the article: 'I have started on "Hamlet and Don Quixote", which I shall certainly finish within a few days […] With regards to "Hamlet and Don Quixote", you can rest completely assured: it will be with you at the start of January' ('я уже […] принялся за «Гамлета и Дон-Кихота», которую окончу непременно на днях […] а насчет «Гамлета и Дон-Кихота» ты можешь быть совершенно покоен: он будет у тебя в начале января') (P: III: 59). Despite his assurances to Panaev, the article was still not ready for publication in *The Contemporary* (*Sovremennik*) in January 1857. It seems that work on the article was finally underway in February/March 1857, while Turgenev was in Dijon with Lev Tolstoy, who wrote in his diary that 'Turgenev read the outline of G and F (*sic*) – good material, not useless and rather clever' ('Тургенев прочел конспект Г. и Ф. [*sic*] – хороший материал, не безполезно [*sic*] и умно очень'). (See Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 91 vols [Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1928–64], XLVII, 117.) Although Tolstoy writes of 'Г. и Ф.' ('G and F', Hamlet and Faust), this should in fact have been 'Г. и Д.' ('G and D', Hamlet and Don Quixote) (S: VIII: 554). The work was finally finished on 28 December 1859, before being presented on 10 January 1860 in St Petersburg and published in the January edition of *The Contemporary* (S: VIII: 555). For more information on the production and reception of the article-speech, see S: VIII: 552–67.

become a legacy for all humanity'.[229] Secondly, he wished not only to compare Hamlet and Don Quijote—two antithetical types in whom, according to Turgenev, two contrasting tendencies of human nature are embodied—but also 'to rehabilitate the figure of Don Quixote, whose significance had been misunderstood by his contemporaries'.[230] This relates to his third aim, on which he closes his speech: to encourage his audience to consider his chosen characters in a new light.

An essential part of the significance and success of the speech lies in Turgenev's original and in-depth re-evaluation of Don Quijote. He provides some context regarding the dominant attitudes towards Cervantes' protagonist at the time in Russia, explaining that the term 'Don Quixote' frequently referred to a fool, while 'don-quixotism' was synonymous with absurdity. It quickly becomes evident that he does not agree with these definitions, however, and stipulates that 'we really ought to recognise the lofty origins of self-sacrifice in "don-quixotism"—just with a comical side' ('в донкихотстве нам следовало бы признать высокое начало самопожертвования, только схваченное с комической стороны') (S: VIII: 172). Throughout the remainder of the speech Turgenev is on a quest to justify this belief by demonstrating that Don Quijote is more than a comical figure: he is a hero who possesses greater profundity and significance than the reader initially realises. It is difficult for the astute reader to argue with him in this belief. However, his assessment of Cervantes' work and its eponymous hero should be read with discretion, as becomes apparent in just the third paragraph. Having mentioned that the reader can draw 'varied conclusions' ('различные заключения') (S: VIII: 171) from *Hamlet*, Turgenev suggests that the *Quixote* 'offers less opportunity for interpretation' ('подает меньше повода к толкованиям') (S: VIII: 172). Those familiar with the *Quixote* may be somewhat puzzled by this statement, as part of its

[229] Bagno, *El Quijote vivido por los rusos*, p. 101.
[230] Freeborn, *Turgenev*, p. 89.

enduring success rests in the wide variety of interpretations it offers—indeed, although Turgenev viewed Cervantes' hero as a Romantic hero, a number of his contemporaries viewed him as little more than an optimistic but impractical fool.[231] For this reason, while this section will focus on dissecting and examining the Cervantine side of Turgenev's speech in order to understand more comprehensively how he interpreted and received Don Quijote, this will be done so with discretion and, during discussion of his more controversial statements, alternative readings will also be offered.

Turgenev's analysis of Don Quijote begins with the question: what does Don Quijote represent? The answer, according to the speaker, is belief: 'belief in something eternal, something unshakable; in truth […] found outside each individual' ('веру в нечто вечное, незыблемое, в истину […], находящуюся вне отдельного человека') (S: VIII: 173). Although his ambition to establish truth and justice on earth through the extermination of evil stems from the romances of chivalry, his basic desire to help and protect others, without necessarily thinking of himself, is innate and commendable. In this vein, Turgenev continues that 'there is no trace of egoism in him, he does not worry about himself; he is all about self-sacrifice' ('В нем нет и следа эгоизма, он не заботится о себе, он весь самопожертвование') (S: VIII: 174). This is an idea to which he returns later in his speech in his discussion of Hamlet and Don Quijote as representatives of the two antithetical laws of nature: egoism and altruism. He describes Hamlet as an 'expression of the fundamental, centripetal force of nature, by which every living creature considers itself the centre of creation and looks at all others as though they exist only for its sake' ('выражение коренной центростремительной силы природы, по которой всё живущее считает себя центром творения и на всё остальное взирает как на существующее только для него') (S: VIII: 184), and Don Quijote as a representative of the 'centrifugal force, according to whose law

[231] See pp. 15–16 for discussion of Pisarev, Herzen, Dobrolyubov.

every living creature exists only for something else' ('центробежной силы, по закону которой всё существующее существует только для другого') (S: VIII: 184). Thus, according to Turgenev, while Hamlets live only for themselves without thinking of others, Don Quijotes live only for others without thinking of themselves.

That Don Quijote wishes to help others cannot be denied, but the reader would be right to question Turgenev's assertions that 'there is no trace of egoism in him', or that he 'exists only for something else'—particularly following the comparisons between Don Quijote and Chichikov in the previous chapter. For while Don Quijote wishes to help people and restore chivalric values to the world, he also wishes to win fame and be praised for his knightly deeds (I.XXI).[232] His predominant altruism thus becomes tinged with a sense of egoism: his actions may appear selfless at first glance, but there is a selfish driving force behind them. Turgenev continues that Cervantes' hero, because of his lack of egoism, is 'fearless, patient, content with his meagre food, with his poor clothing' ('бесстрашен, терпелив, довольствуется самой скудной пищей, самой бедной одеждой') (S: VIII: 174). While this in itself is an apt, superficial analysis of his character, the following observation is more contentious: 'devoid of vanity, he does not doubt himself or his vocation, or even his physical strength' ('чуждый тщеславия, он не сомневается в себе, в своем призвании, даже в своих физических силах') (S: VIII: 174). All three statements are worth dissecting. Firstly, while Don Quijote contents himself with his rustic armour, he is not entirely devoid of vanity: it is, after all, his desire for fame and glory that constitutes one of his driving forces. Secondly, while he is persistent and remains confident in his endeavours in the first part of the novel, his belief begins to waver in the second part following his inability to see Dulcinea in the coarse peasant girl, despite Sancho's assurances that it is her (II.X). Although he continues his mission to restore chivalric values to the world around him after this point, it is now tinged with a sense of doubt,

[232] This attribute is also discussed in the sections on *Dead Souls* and *The Idiot*. See pp. 117, 188, 211.

both in his endeavours and in himself. This is alluded to when he enters the ducal palace. Here he is treated like the knights errant about whom he has read in the romances of chivalry, and his doubt is momentarily lifted: 'that was the first day when he was fully convinced that he was a real knight errant, not a fantasy one' ('aquel fue el primer día que de todo en todo conoció y creyó ser caballero andante verdadero, y no fantástico') (II.XXXI.693/962). Thirdly, while it seems at first glance that he has no doubts of his own physical strength (he is a man in his fifties who energetically sallies forth on his adventures) the strength of his insistence on battling the lions (II.XVII) suggests a certain amount of self-doubt in both his bravery and physical capabilities: he may have been victorious in the battle with the wineskins (I.XXV), but he was less victorious in his infamous battle with the windmills (I.VIII)—both of which he mistakes for giants—and wishes to prove his abilities in yet another trial, the result of which would, incidentally, be more valuable than his previous two battles for the simple fact that the lions are real.

Not only does Turgenev consider Don Quijote to epitomise altruism and self-belief, but also morality: he is 'the most moral being on earth' ('самое нравственное существо в мире') (S: VIII: 174). He is certainly a man of good intentions and a warm heart, but does he really deserve the superlative: '*most* moral'? His sense of morality is, like his perception of the world around him, somewhat skewed: his is the morality of a knight errant and is therefore incompatible with the real world. He may strive for a positive outcome, but often he causes more harm than good. This can be seen in the incident with the galley slaves: convinced of their unjust imprisonment, he releases them, unaware that they are a chain-gang of criminals (I.XXII). Although he acts morally according to his convictions, his madness prevents him from seeing reality and consequently from acting in the 'most' moral, and in this example legal, manner. In addition, his desire for fame and renown, which at least partly drive his actions, further denies his 'most moral' status. Turgenev's overwhelmingly positive response betrays

his Romantic perception of Don Quijote and, although his analysis often invites counter-interpretation, he nevertheless succeeds in illuminating a greater profundity in Cervantes' hero.

But the altruism, self-belief and morality which Turgenev sees in Don Quijote do not blind him to the humour in the novel. The mad knight remains 'perhaps the most comical ever drawn by a poet' ('едва ли не самая комическая фигура, когда-либо нарисованная поэтом'), a claim which Turgenev supports by adding that the name of Cervantes' protagonist is even commonly used as a humorous nickname among illiterate peasants (S: VIII: 176–77). The positive attributes do, however, help to redefine the comic nature of the protagonist, whom Turgenev describes as 'positively funny' or 'ridiculous' ('положительно смешон') (S: VIII: 176). With this he means that, although the reader laughs at Don Quijote, 'there is a reconciling and redeeming strength in our laughter' ('в смехе есть примиряющая и искупляющая сила') (S: VIII: 177). There is a clear parallel here with Turgenev's literary and ideological rival Dostoevsky's interpretation of Don Quijote, whom he describes as 'beautiful only because he is at the same time comical' ('прекрасен единственно потому, что в то же время и смешон') (XXVIII.ii: 251).[233] Turgenev provides an example of this dichotomy in his depiction of the knight errant as 'a gaunt, angular, hook-nosed figure, dressed in caricatural armour, riding the scrawny frame of his pitiful horse, the poor, eternally hungry and beaten Rocinante' ('тощая, угловатая, горбоносая фигура, облеченная в карикатурные латы, вознесенная на чахлый остов жалкого коня, того бедного, вечно голодного и битого Россинанта') (S: VIII: 177). The 'reconciling and redeeming strength in our laughter' stems from the fusion of humour and pathos: the reader simultaneously laughs at Don Quijote's appearance and sympathises with him for it. Because he evokes a positive response in the reader, he cannot be simply ridiculous, but 'positively ridiculous'. Following on from this reading, Turgenev's next comment appears inconsistent: 'anyone would be flattered to acquire the reputation of a Hamlet, while no one

[233] See p. 212.

would wish to earn the name of a Don Quixote' ('всякому лестно прослыть Гамлетом, никто бы не хотел заслужить прозвание Дон-Кихота') (S: VIII: 177). For Turgenev, Hamlet is analytical, reflective, self-deprecating, and produces no positive emotion in the reader or viewer of the play, whereas his perception of Don Quijote is quite the opposite. The discord between Turgenev's overarching character analysis and this statement suggests not only that his argument might need some fine-tuning, but also, more significantly, that no response towards Don Quijote, no matter how positive or Romantic, would be strong enough to mask fully his innate comicality.

The discussion of Don Quijote's humorous nature continues with two examples where his enthusiasm for his ideal does not quite equal his success. The first is Andrés' beating by his master: although Don Quijote intervenes (I.IV), it later transpires that his intervention leads not to Andrés' succour, but to an even greater thrashing (I.XXXI). The second is his adventure with the windmills. Turgenev talks of a 'hidden meaning' in these examples ('сокрытого в них смысла') (S: VIII: 178) applicable to everyone:

> We laugh at Don Quixote, but, ladies and gentlemen, who among us can, having in good faith questioned himself and his past and present beliefs, who will dare to claim that he always and in every instance has distinguished and will distinguish the barber's tin basin from a magical golden helmet? It therefore seems to me that the main things are the sincerity and strength of belief itself—and the result rests in the hands of fate. Only they can show us whether we have fought phantoms or real enemies, or with what armour we have covered our heads. Our concern is to arm ourselves and fight.
>
> Мы смеемся над Дон-Кихотом... но, мм. гг., кто из нас может, добросовестно вопросив себя, свои прошедшие, свои настоящие убеждения, кто решится утверждать, что он всегда и во всяком случае различит и различал цирюльничий оловянный таз от волшебного золотого шлема? Потому нам кажется, что главное дело в искренности и силе самого убежденья... а результат -- в руке судеб. Они одни могут показать нам, с призраками ли мы боролись, с действительными ли врагами, и каким оружием покрыли мы наши головы... Наше дело вооружиться и бороться. (S: VIII: 178).

According to Turgenev, each individual has different beliefs and perceptions. It is not the conviction itself which is important, but its strength. Only fate can determine whether one's belief is correct or not; all one can do is strive to do good with it. Durán and Fogg further expound upon this 'hidden meaning':

> The Russian novelist's interpretation brings us back to the old ethical problem of end versus means. If we were aiming toward a good goal, are we entitled to make endless mistakes and, more specifically, to hurt other people or commit crimes in the pursuit of such a good goal?[234]

Turgenev seems to answer their question with a resounding 'yes' in his speech. As his chosen examples show, Don Quijote aims towards a positive goal but makes endless mistakes, hurts other people, and even commits crimes—vandalism of the windmills, or the liberation of the galley slaves—in his pursuit of it. However, despite these lapses of judgement, he remains convinced that what he is doing is right—and this, according to Turgenev, is what is most important.

He continues that, even if an ambition is misunderstood by others, those who firmly believe in their ideal and strive towards their goal find followers in the masses:

> The masses always end up believing devotedly in those individuals whom they themselves had jeered, whom they had even cursed and persecuted, but who, fearing neither their persecution nor their curses, not fearing even their ridicule, march steadily forward, having directed a spiritual glance at their goal, visible only to them. These individuals search, fall, pick themselves up, and finally reach it. And quite rightly. Only he who is led by his heart will attain his goal.
>
> Масса людей всегда кончает тем, что идет, беззаветно веруя, за теми личностями, над которыми она сама глумилась, которых даже проклинала и преследовала, но которые, не боясь ни ее преследований, ни проклятий, не боясь даже ее смеха, идут неуклонно вперед, вперив духовный взор в ими только видимую цель, ищут, падают, поднимаются, и наконец находят... и по праву; только тот и находит, кого ведет сердце. (S: VIII: 180)

[234] Durán and Rogg, *Fighting Windmills*, p. 181.

While it is true that Don Quijote, persecuted and jeered, follows his heart, he otherwise does not fully fit this description, since he does not fully achieve his goal: he does not succeed in exterminating evil, succouring the poor, or being financially recompensed for his efforts, but he does succeed in inspiring those he meets, imbuing them with his chivalric spirit and leaving a positive impression. Turgenev denotes this group as the masses and Sancho as its representative. Indeed, despite being fully aware that Don Quijote is mad, he nevertheless agrees to leave his home and family to accompany him as his squire:

> He follows him everywhere, endures all sorts of tribulations, is faithful to him to death itself, trusts him, is proud of him, and weeps kneeling at the humble bed where his former master's life is ending.
>
> Он […] следует за ним повсюду, подвергается всякого рода неприятностям, предан ему по самую смерть, верит ему, гордится им и рыдает коленопреклоненный у бедного ложа, где кончается его бывший господин. (S: VIII: 180)

Turgenev suggests that Sancho's devotion 'cannot be explained by hope of reward or personal profit' because 'he has too much good sense' ('Надеждою на прибыль, на личные выгоды—этой преданности объяснить нельзя; у Санчо-Пансы слишком много здравого смысла') (S: VIII: 180). Rather, it is due to the 'happy and honest blindness' of the masses and its 'selfless enthusiasm [and] contempt towards direct individual gain, which for a poor man is almost the same as contempt towards daily bread' ('счастливого и честного ослепления […] бескорыстного энтузиазма, презрения к прямым личным выгодам, которое для бедного человека почти равносильно с презрением к насущному хлебу') (S: VIII: 180). Turgenev asserts that Sancho is aware that he will receive nothing, apart from the occasional pummelling, for his service to Don Quijote. However, Turgenev seems to forget that one of the main reasons for Sancho's initial decision to join the knight errant is the latter's promise that he will be made the governor of an island. Desire for self-aggrandisement thus plays a crucial role in Sancho's

original departure from home. The reason for his second sally, however, is more contentious—and more pertinent to Turgenev's study—because at this point he is aware that his travels offer a higher chance of beatings than of reward. Surprisingly, however, he is gifted with the governorship of the Isle (village) of Barataria: he not only proves himself to be a diligent and fair ruler, but rejects his elevated status and makes the decision to return to his humble former position of peasant-cum-squire (II.XLII–LIII). For this reason, while Turgenev's statement that 'hope of reward or personal profit' does not motivate Sancho is questionable, it is true that it becomes a lesser driving force in the second part (where it is replaced by his devotion to Don Quijote) and, by the end, does indeed even transform into 'contempt towards direct individual gain' in his rejection of the 'isle'.

Sancho's devotion to Don Quijote is rivalled only by the latter's devotion to Dulcinea. It should be little surprise that Turgenev, who views Cervantes' protagonist as the 'most moral being', should consider him to love Dulcinea 'ideally' and 'chastely':

> […] so ideally, that he does not even suspect that the object of his desire does not exist at all; so chastely, that when Dulcinea appears before him in the guise of a coarse and dirty peasant girl, he does not believe the evidence before his eyes and considers her transformed by evil enchanters.
>
> […] до того идеально, что даже не подозревает, что предмет его страсти вовсе не существует; до того чисто, что, когда Дульцинея является перед ним в образе грубой и грязной мужички, он не верит свидетельству глаз своих и считает ее превращенной злым волшебником. (S: VIII: 181)

Don Quijote's belief in Dulcinea's beauty, despite having seen her 'transformed' into a coarse peasant girl, persists even after he has been vanquished by the Knight of the White Moon, the disguised Sansón Carrasco: he agrees to return home and not undertake any chivalric adventures for a year, but he refuses to deny Dulcinea's beauty (II.LXIV). Turgenev paraphrases Don Quijote's speech to his conqueror: 'Stab me, sir knight, but let not my failure lessen the glory of Dulcinea; I still affirm that she is the most perfect beauty on earth' ('Колите

меня, рыцарь, но да не послужит моя слабость к уменьшению славы Дульцинеи; я все-таки утверждаю, что она совершеннейшая красавица в мире') (S: VIII: 181).[235] Turgenev's reference to this scene calls to mind the notion that, although Don Quijote, in his defeat, is forbidden from acting, he cannot be forbidden from believing: his convictions are too strong to be suppressed.

Continuing from his discussion of Don Quijote's 'ideal' and 'chaste' love for Dulcinea, Turgenev adds that 'there is not even a trace of sensuality' in Cervantes' protagonist ('Чувственности и следа нет у Дон-Кихота) (S: VIII: 181), to the extent that he has no real desire for a final union with Dulcinea. Although Turgenev does not provide evidence for this assessment, it likely stems from Don Quijote's possible fear of having to face, on the one hand, his sexuality, and on the other, the realisation that Dulcinea really does not exist. Turgenev's belief in Don Quijote's purity is, to an extent, correct: he is more often than not blind to the sensuality around him, as is seen when he mistakes two prostitutes for noble ladies (I.II). However, he also sees it, on occasion, where it does not exist. For example, he convinces himself that the innkeeper's daughter (whom he believes to be the daughter of the lord of the castle) has fallen in love with him and plans to lie with him that night. Although he feels anxious and ultimately resolves 'not to betray his lady Dulcinea del Toboso' ('no cometer alevosía a su señora Dulcinea del Toboso') (I.XVI.125/188), the scene demonstrates that he is

[235] The original reads as follows:

> Dulcinea del Toboso is the most beautiful woman in the world, and I am the most unfortunate knight in it, and it would not be right for my weakness to obscure the truth. Drive your lance home, sir knight, and take away my life, since you have taken away my honour.
>
> Dulcinea del Toboso es la más hermosa mujer del mundo y yo el más desdichado caballero de la tierra, y no es bien que mi flaqueza defraude esta verdad. Aprieta, caballero, la lanza y quítame la vida, pues me has quitado la honra. (II.LXIV.928/1267)

It is likely that the inconsistencies between Turgenev's version and the original are due to his paraphrasing of the material, rather than poor translations. Turgenev was no doubt most familiar with Louis Viardot's French translation, which offers a faithful rendering. Masal'sky's Russian translation, meanwhile, does not cover Part II. See Cervantes, *L'ingénieux hidalgo don Quichotte de la Manche*, trans. by Louis Viardot, 2 vols (Paris: J.-J. Dubochet et Compagnie, 1836–37), I, 669.

not as entirely devoid of sensuality, at least in thought, as the reader—and Turgenev—may originally believe.

Having thus expounded upon Don Quijote, Turgenev draws his analysis of the character type to a close with some final observations. The first is the recollection of an unnamed English lord who once, in his presence, called Don Quijote 'an exemplar of a true gentleman' ('образцом настоящего джентльмена') (S: VIII: 187). If the audience were to consider the definition of a gentleman to be simply a polite, considerate and respectful man, then this would indeed be a suitable term to describe Don Quijote. According to Turgenev, Don Quijote's gentlemanliness lies in the 'simplicity and calmness of his interactions' ('простота и спокойствие обращения') (S: VIII: 187), and justifies his claim with the example of the knight errant's composure when, at the ducal palace, the handmaids lather up his face (II.XXXII). However, it is likely that Don Quijote's awe at his surroundings and his desire not to offend the duke and duchess in their own home contribute to his comportment in this scene. Indeed, while this select example supports Turgenev's (and the English lord's) claim, it is not enough to erase the recurring image of a knight errant who draws his sword for no reason other than his madness-induced distorted reality. Turgenev nevertheless attributes the 'simplicity' of Don Quijote's manner to a 'lack […] of self-importance: he is not preoccupied with himself and, respecting himself and others, does not think of showing off' ('отсутствия […] самомнением; Дон-Кихот не занят собою и, уважая себя и других, не думает рисоваться') (S: VIII: 187). Once more, this is not quite correct. For example, when the hero arrives at the inn, battered and bruised from his thrashing by the Yanguesans, his first words to the innkeeper's wife are:

> Believe me, beauteous lady, you may account yourself fortunate to lodge in this your castle such a person as I, whom I refrain from praising because, as is often said, self-praise is no recommendation; but my squire will inform you about me.

> Creedme, fermosa señora, que os podéis llamar venturosa por haber alojado en este vuestro castillo a mi persona, que es tal, que si yo no la alabo es por lo que suele decirse que la alabanza propria envilece; pero mi escudero os dirá quién soy. (I.XVI.124/185)

Although Cervantes clearly bestows upon his knight errant the hyperbolic language of the romances of chivalry for parodic effect in this excerpt, it nevertheless demonstrates that Don Quijote does not entirely, as Turgenev suggests, lack self-importance. However, it remains true that his respectful and gracious nature is more prominent than his tendency to show off, and thus often overshadows this characteristic for the reader, including Turgenev.

The refinement of one's speech can also be considered a gentlemanly characteristic. However, while Turgenev considers Don Quijote to be a gentleman, he does not believe him to possess the same 'power of original and apt expression' ('сила своеобразного и меткого выражения') (S: VIII: 187) as Hamlet. Don Quijote's speech, although far removed from that of Hamlet, does nevertheless possess its own original expression: often imbued with archaisms and phraseology taken from the romances of chivalry, it is also, at times, engaging and eloquent, for example in his speech on the Golden Age to the group of goatherds (I.XI). More strikingly, Turgenev states that 'Don Quixote is hardly literate' ('Дон-Кихот едва знает грамоте') (S: VIII: 188), but how can this be the case when his madness is induced by the very literature he has read? Don Quijote is not only familiar with the chivalric romances, but a wide range of genres. His aforementioned speech on the Golden Age is, for example, itself an almost verbatim translation from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (I.XI).

Turgenev ends his analysis of Don Quijote's character by examining the suffering he endures. He explains that his thrashings are necessary for two reasons. Firstly, without them, Don Quijote 'would be less appealing to children, who read about his adventures with such hunger' ('он бы меньше нравился детям, которые с такою жадностию читают его похождения') (S: VIII: 188). Secondly, 'he would appear not in his true light, but somewhat haughty and cool, which would contradict his character' ('он бы показался не в своем

истинном свете, но как-то холодно и надменно, что противоречило бы его характеру') (S: VIII: 188). These comments, in conjunction with his earlier description of Don Quijote's physical appearance, suggest that his suffering is needed in order to evoke both humour and pathos. To Turgenev's analysis it can be added that, in Part I, the drubbings he endures are enveloped in a comical light, for example when he is beaten at the inn by the muleteer and tries, and fails, to remake the healing balm of Fierabras (I.XVI–XVII). In Part II, meanwhile, although Don Quijote suffers almost no more beatings, as Turgenev himself highlights, he still endures physical torment, for example being scratched by the cats to the extent that he is left bedridden at the ducal palace (II.XLVI). It could thus be argued that in Part I, because he brings his misfortune upon himself, humour outweighs pathos, while in Part II, because his misfortune is driven by external sources, pathos outweighs humour.

Turgenev draws attention to one last ordeal suffered by the knight errant at the end of Part II: being trampled by a herd of pigs. He considers the scene to contain a 'profound meaning' ('глубокий смысл') (S: VIII: 188):

> A trampling by pigs' hooves always occurs in the lives of Don Quixotes just before they end. It is the last tribute they must pay to coarse chance, to indifferent and impertinent misunderstanding […] Then they can die.
>
> Попирание свиными ногами встречается всегда в жизни Дон-Кихотов—именно перед ее концом; это последняя дань, которую они должны заплатить грубой случайности, равнодушному и дерзкому непониманию […] Потом они могут умереть. (S: VIII: 188)

Throughout their lives those of the Don Quijote type strive towards their goal, towards beauty, and endure tribulations along the way. The 'profound meaning' is that beauty, if it exists, is only fleeting: the coarseness of reality, symbolised here by the pigs, ultimately prevails. Nevertheless, Turgenev adds that, in comparison to Hamlet, who 'loses heart and complains from the slightest misfortune' ('от малейшей неудачи падает духом и жалуется'), Don

Quijote, ‘beaten by the galley slaves until he is unable to move, does not in the least doubt the success of his undertaking’ (‘исколоченный галерными преступниками до невозможности пошевельнуться, нимало не сомневается в успехе своего предприятия’) (S: VIII: 188)—that is, until the scene of the ‘enchanted’ Dulcinea (II.X). Despite his perennial suffering and his moments of disillusionment in Part II, he constantly strives towards his ideal, and only finally accepts defeat when he is on the brink of death. His goal may be tinged with the ridiculous, but his persistence is admirable. As Turgenev explains, such people are necessary in the world: ‘without these ridiculous Don Quixotes, without these eccentric inventors, mankind would not move forward’ (‘без этих смешных Дон-Кихотов, без этих чудаков-изобретателей не подвигалось бы вперед человечество’) (S: VIII: 189). Don Quijotes are necessary not so much because they act upon their ideas, but because they inspire other people to do so.

The pathos evoked by Don Quijote’s trampling by the pigs continues until his death, a scene which ‘evokes an unspoken tenderness in one’s heart’ (‘навевает на душу несказанное умиление’ (S: VIII: 191). Here Turgenev, having mentioned Sancho trying to comfort his dying master, provides a paraphrased version of Don Quijote’s closing words: ‘No, all this has gone forever, and I ask you all for your forgiveness; I am now not Don Quixote, I am again Alonso the Good, as they once called me, Alonso el Bueno’ (‘Нет […] всё это навсегда прошло, и я прошу у всех прощения; я уже не Дон-Кихот, я снова Алонзо Добрый, как меня некогда называли—Alonso el Bueno’) (S: VIII: 191). Turgenev has merged two different moments of speech in this example: Don Quijote’s revelation that he is once more

Alonso Quijano, and his apology to Sancho for making him seem as mad as his master.[236] Despite this synthesis, Turgenev's quotation not only succeeds in highlighting the 'unspoken tenderness' of the scene, but also aptly supports his argument for the underlying profundity of Cervantes' hero.

The rest of Turgenev's speech is dedicated to a brief discussion of Shakespeare and Cervantes. He mentions a striking similarity: both 'died on the very same day—26 April 1616' ('умерли в один и тот же день, 26 апреля 1616 года') (S: VIII: 186). Although this is not quite true (Cervantes died on 22 April 1616, while Shakespeare, buried on 25 April 1616, is thought to have died on 23 April),[237] the correct observation is no less fascinating. Furthermore, Turgenev observes, quite rightly, that while Cervantes was unlikely to have known of Shakespeare, the Englishman could have read the *Quixote*, the first part of which had been translated into English soon after its publication.[238]

His comparison continues: he calls Shakespeare a 'demigod' ('полубог') and Cervantes just a man, but one who 'has the right to stand on his own feet even before a demigod' ('имеет право стоять на своих ногах даже перед полубогом') (S: VIII: 185). Although the strength of the former's fame over that of the latter—away from the Hispanophone world, at least—persists until today, such a comparison can be considered unfair: if Shakespeare could be considered a 'demigod' of theatre, could Cervantes not be

[236] The first part of Don Quijote's speech reads as follows: 'You must congratulate me, good sirs, because I am no longer Don Quixote de la Mancha but Alonso Quixano, for whom my way of life earned me the nickname of 'the Good'. ('Dadme albricias, buenos señores, de que ya yo no soy don Quijote de la Mancha, sino Alonso Quijano, a quien mis costumbres me dieron renombre de «bueno») (II.LXXIV.977/1330). He later says to Sancho: 'Forgive me, my friend, for making you seem mad, like me' ('Perdóname, amigo, de la ocasión que te he dado de parecer loco como yo') (II.LXXIV.979/1332–33). Again, Viardot's French translation is faithful to the original, while Masal'sky's does not extend to this point in the novel. Viardot, *L'ingénieux hidalgo don Quichotte de la Manche*, II, 747, 749.

[237] Anthony J. Cascardi, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Cervantes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. xiii; Margreta De Grazia and Stanley Wells, eds., *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. xviii.

[238] The first translation of Part I of the *Quixote* into English was Thomas Shelton's 1612 adaptation. That Shakespeare knew this work is certainly possible: a lost play of 1613, known as *Cardenio* (which refers to one of the characters of Part I) is attributed to William Shakespeare and John Fletcher. See *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespere, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*, ed. by David Carnegie and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

considered a ‘demigod’ of the narrative world, having helped to create and establish the novel tradition?

In his discussion of the North-South divide Turgenev considers the writers’ temperaments, as well as their works, to be shaped by their environments. Although both were writing in the Early Modern period in Western Europe, Turgenev suggests that, while the mores of the Middle Ages had successfully passed in Spain by the turn of the seventeenth century, they were fading more slowly further north. For this reason, while the Middle Ages are represented through the gruesome violence in the plays of Shakespeare, it is reflected in Cervantes through the ‘Provençal poetry and the fairytale-like grace’ (‘провансальской поэзии, сказочной грацией’) of the romances of chivalry, which he ‘derided so good-naturedly and to which he paid his final tribute in *Persiles and Sigismunda*’ (‘над которыми Сервантес так добродушно посмеялся и которым сам же заплатил последнюю дань в *Персилесе и Сигизмунде*’) (S: VIII: 186). Mention of *Persiles and Sigismunda* at this juncture not only suggests Turgenev’s familiarity with Cervantes’ wider *oeuvre*, but also his awareness of the existence of the North-South divide that underlies this very work: the protagonists’ journey begins in the relatively barbaric and primitive North, in Scandinavia and around the British Isles, before ending in civilised and cultivated Rome. In the *Quixote*, meanwhile, although the reader could argue that violence is present in the form of the beatings endured by Don Quijote and Sancho, these are implemented for three reasons, different from those of Shakespeare: firstly, they were literary commonplaces at the time in Spain (consider any picaresque story from the period); secondly, they augment the humour and pathos of the work for the contemporary reader; and thirdly, they provide the novel with another element with which its author could parody the battles so often found in the romances of chivalry.

Turgenev’s final observation of note is that, while Shakespeare has a wide range of characters whom he takes from all walks of life, ‘from the heavens, from the earth’ (‘с неба, с

земли') (S: VIII: 186), Cervantes' range of characters is more limited. However, this is not necessarily a criticism, since he 'affectionately presents his few characters to his readers, as a father does his children; he takes only what is close to him—but how familiar it is to him!' ('ласково выводит перед читателем свои немногочисленные образы, как отец своих детей; он берет только то, что близко ему, но это близкое так ему знакомо!') (S: VIII: 186). His figures are well known to him because they represent, for the most part, types present in Spanish society of the time. Cervantes may have transformed them to fit his narrative moulds, but, as Turgenev suggests, they have ultimately been borrowed from the Spaniard's own experiences:

> Cervantes draws his richness from his own heart: bright, gentle, rich in life experience, but not embittered by it. It is not without reason that Cervantes, during his arduous seven-year captivity, learnt, as he himself said, the art of patience.
>
> Сервантес черпает свое богатство из одной своей души, ясной, кроткой, богатой жизненным опытом, но не ожесточенной им: недаром в течение семилетнего тяжкого плена Сервантес учился, как он сам говорил, науке терпенья. (S: VIII: 187)

Cervantes' Ruy Pérez, the semi-autobiographical captive captain in the *Quixote*, is perhaps the most evident example of a character drawn 'from his own heart'. Turgenev may have obscured the facts once more—Cervantes was in captivity in Algiers for five years between 1575 and 1580, not seven—but his remark nevertheless betrays his interest not only in the *Quixote* but also in the life of its creator. In addition, Turgenev's reference to Cervantes learning 'the art of patience' suggests his familiarity with the *Exemplary Tales*, in whose prologue the author explains that it was during his time as a captive that he 'learned to have patience in adversity' ('aprendió a tener paciencia en las adversidades') (I: 51).

It is possible that Turgenev's factual error regarding the duration of Cervantes' captivity, despite it being recorded conjointly in the prologue with his having 'learned to have

patience in adversity',[239] could have been an intentional exaggeration to dramatise the Spaniard's life in his speech. However, it could also have been caused by a translation error, either his own mistranslation of a Spanish edition, or that of another translator having adapted the prologue of the *Exemplary Tales* into French or Russian.[240] Turgenev himself was aware of the existence of errors, inadequacies and inconsistencies in translations of Cervantes' works, explaining towards the beginning of his speech that 'a good translation of *Don Quixote* would be a true service to the public, and universal gratitude awaits the writer who will translate this unique creation for us in all its beauty' ('Хороший перевод "Дон-Кихота" был бы истинной заслугой перед публикой, и всеобщая благодарность ждет того писателя, который передаст нам это единственное творение во всей его красоте') (S: VIII: 172). His Spanish was of a sufficient calibre to appreciate that extant Russian translations of the *Quixote* (and, most likely, of Cervantes' other works) were of insufficient quality. Even Masal'sky's 1838 adaptation, the first direct translation of the *Quixote* from Spanish into Russian, although widely received and generally well regarded, was incomplete, not even offering the first part in its entirely. Despite this literary gap, Turgenev was able, through his own knowledge of Spanish and the various translations available to him, having most likely used Louis Viardot's French adaptation at least of the *Quixote*, to develop an original and in-depth understanding of and appreciation for Cervantes and his works.

It is difficult to dispute that Turgenev's *Hamlet and Don Quixote* provides one of the strongest and most in-depth insights into a Russian author's reception of Cervantes, his novel, and particularly its protagonist. Although the speech was, in general, warmly received,[241] its

[239] The full sentence reads: 'He was a soldier for many years, and a captive for five and a half, during which time I learned to have patience in adversity' ('Fue soldado muchos años, y cinco y medio cautivo, donde aprendió a tener paciencia en las adversidades') (I: 51). It is peculiar that, despite the facts appearing side by side in the prologue, Turgenev mistakes the duration of Cervantes' captivity, yet accurately recalls his learning 'to have patience in adversity'.
[240] Viardot correctly translates the duration of captivity as five and a half years. See Louis Viardot, *Les nouvelles de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra* (Paris: Hachette, 1838), p. 2.
[241] See p. 137.

reception was not universally positive: Shtakenshneider commented that she 'simply did not like it',[242] Lavrov suggested that Turgenev's 'exaltation of Don Quijote […] seemed strained for the public',[243] while L'vov dedicated an entire monograph to refuting the contents of the speech.[244] He disagreed with Turgenev's interpretation of Don Quijote as an altruistic, moralistic, dedicated, inspiring, chaste, gentlemanly, and ultimately 'positively funny' character, and claimed that his speech was 'full of mistaken vagaries and poorly argued'; that Don Quijote was not the type of the idealist, but rather that his actions reflected his 'indisputable madness'; and that, rather than altruism, the reader instead finds examples of 'egoism, vanity, ambition and greed' in the knight errant.[245] But Turgenev's assessment of Hamlet is also not safe from critical scrutiny. For example, Turgenev inadvertently compares Polonius with Sancho in his suggestion that both are representatives of the masses. However, as Frank Seeley points out, if Polonius '"represents" anyone but himself, it is certainly not the people – perhaps the Court clique, the dominant minority'.[246] If there is a representative of the masses in *Hamlet* then it is surely Horatio, the eponymous hero's companion who wishes to die alongside him in the final scene. Seeley raises some further important questions:

> Turgenev proclaims that Hamlet 'loves no one'. But if he does not love his parents, why is he convulsed – to the point of having to struggle with thoughts of suicide – by his father's death and his mother's remarriage? If he does not love Horatio, what does he mean by saying that he wears him in his heart's core?[247]

While not everyone will agree with Turgenev's appraisal of Don Quijote or Hamlet, his speech is nevertheless significant for three main reasons. Firstly, it encouraged the reader of the *Quixote* to consider its protagonist in a new, positive light, in stark contrast with the common

[242] Elena Andreevna Shtakenshneider, *Dnevnik i zapiski: 1854–1886* (Moscow: Akademia, 1934), p. 246.
[243] Petr Lavrov, 'I. S. Turgenev i razvitie russkogo obshchestva', *Vestnik narodnoi voli*, 2 (1884), 69–149 (p. 89).
[244] A. L'vov, *Gamlet i Don-Kikhot i mnenie o nikh I. S. Turgeneva* (St Petersburg: V tip. L. Demisa, 1862).
[245] Konstantin Derzhavin, 'Crítica cervantina en Rusia', *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 94 (1929), 215–38 (pp. 219–20).
[246] Seeley, *Turgenev*, p. 165.
[247] Ibid., p. 164.

practice in the second half of the nineteenth century to use the term 'Don Quijote' to denote contempt and/or derision. Secondly, it offers the reader an in-depth understanding of how Turgenev perceived Don Quijote. And thirdly, and relatedly, it provides the reader with an additional tool with which to analyse and understand his fiction. Since Turgenev presented *Hamlet and Don Quixote* not long after the publication of *Rudin* (1856) and *A Nest of Gentlefolk* (*Dvoryanskoe gnezdo*, 1859), in the same year as *On the Eve* (*Nakanune*, 1860) and not long before the appearance of *Fathers and Sons* (*Otsy i deti*, 1862), it is 'commonly viewed as containing one key to understanding the heroes of all four' novels.[248] Indeed, according to Dmitry Mirsky, Turgenev 'had always wanted to create Quixotes', but 'the majority of his heroes were Hamlets'.[249]

All his protagonists are all talk but little action. In *A Nest of Gentlefolk*, Lavretsky is a typical 'superfluous man', cuckolded and unable to find happiness or make any form of positive impact. In *On the Eve*, although Insarov follows through on his intention to travel to his native Bulgaria to support their revolution, he dies along the way in Venice, before he is able to have any impact. In *Fathers and Sons*, Turgenev's most famous work, the fervent nihilist Bazarov is ultimately unable to follow through on his nihilistic intentions: he falls in love, fights in a duel, and, not taking the correct safety precautions during an autopsy, ends up carelessly contracting and dying from typhus. Later on in *Virgin Soil* (*Nov'*, 1877), Nezhdanov strives towards radicalising the peasantry, but eventually commits suicide. There is a clear trend even in this sample of Turgenev's novels: all the protagonists are men who talk of all the change they want to enact, but ultimately it all boils down to nothing: they either die, or are left to stagnate in the Russian provinces. On the occasions that Turgenev's protagonists succeed in inspiring people, these are usually young, impressionable provincial girls who become excited

[248] Seeley, *Turgenev*, p. 161.
[249] D. S. Mirsky, *A History of Russian Literature* (London: G. Routledge, 1927), p. 248.

by any semblance of an original idea, for example Liza with Lavretsky, Natal'ya with Rudin, and Elena with Insarov, among others. There is no instance in Turgenev's works of a hero and heroine who enjoy a successful and happy ending—there is only failure and/or death. It thus becomes clear that, although Turgenev may have intended to create inspirational Don Quijotes, he ended up creating inactive Hamlets unable to leave a positive mark on the world.

Turgenev seems to have been aware of the difficulty in recreating a Don Quijote figure that does not embody any of Hamlet's traits, as he declares in the conclusion to his speech: 'there are no complete Hamlets or complete Don Quixotes […] Life strives towards them, but never reaches them' ('полных Гамлетов, точно так же как и полных Дон-Кихотов, нет […] К ним стремится жизнь, никогда их не достигая') (S: VIII: 189). Because the extremes do not exist in reality, it is difficult to render each type's true portrait in fiction. For this reason the majority of Turgenev's characters ultimately reflect nature's tendency to create people who possess a combination of qualities from both human types, but they often veer, as Mirsky suggests, towards the Hamlet type. However, it is in Rudin, Turgenev's novelistic protagonist, that the author's desire to produce a 'Don Quijote' is most apparent. Although many elements of the Hamlet type nevertheless seep in, it was in Rudin that Turgenev succeeded in creating a character who certainly tends more towards the 'quixotic' end of the typological spectrum than the author's other protagonists.

Rudin

In the early 1850s, following a range of relatively unsuccessful poetic and dramatic works—with the exception, recognised later, of *A Month in the Country* (*Mesyats v derevne*, c. 1850)—Turgenev began to experiment with prose literature. His 1852 *Sportsman's Sketches* (*Zapiski okhotnika*) were widely acclaimed and are often considered to have contributed to the abolition of serfdom in 1861. In the first half of the decade he joined his contemporaries in wrestling

with the problem of the novel as a genre: by 1853 he had written 500 pages of his first attempt at a novel, often referred to as *Two Generations*, but abandoned it soon thereafter.[250] Two years later he began work on *Rudin*, which he wrote in the space of around seven weeks in June and July 1855. Although it was originally envisioned as a large story and was first published with the subtitle of 'povest'' ('story' or 'novella'), 'in the 1860 edition of his Works it appeared with his two subsequent novels', while 'in his last (1880) edition it was placed definitely at the head of the novels'.[251] This generic ambiguity, albeit incidental, recalls the experimental nature of Russian prose literature that appeared in the first half of the nineteenth century, adding to Pushkin's 'novel in verse' and Gogol''s 'poema' in prose, and echoes Cervantes' creation of the *Quixote*, often thought to have been begun as a short story before developing into an expansive novel.[252]

Despite Turgenev's completion of the first draft of *Rudin* by the end of July 1855, the editors of *The Contemporary* (*Sovremennik*), the journal in which it was published in January and February 1856, advised the author to make a number of revisions, primarily to make the eponymous hero 'more sympathetic', 'more complex and more objective', and less evidently modelled on Mikhail Bakunin, his former friend and a revolutionary activist, who spent the first few years of the 1850s imprisoned in Germany, Austria and finally Russia for his anarchist tendencies.[253] Rudin was thus transformed into a more generic 'superfluous man' of the 1840s in Russia, a type which Herzen described as an individual who is:

[250] Freeborn, *Turgenev*, p. 37.
[251] Seeley, *Turgenev*, pp. 167–68.
[252] This stems primarily from the fact that Don Quijote, having embarked on his first sally (which forms a complete narrative unit) returns home soon thereafter (I.V), before embarking on further adventures (I.VII) accompanied by his squire, Sancho. See José Ángel Ascunce Arrieta, *Los Quijotes del Quijote: historia de una aventura creativa* (Kassel: Reichenberger, 1997), pp. 65–142.
[253] Waddington, 'Introduction', p. 19.

> […] condemned to inactivity, useless and disoriented, a stranger in his family, a stranger in his country, [who] does not wish to do evil, but is powerless to do good; he ultimately does nothing, although he tries everything, with the exception of two things: firstly, he never stands on the side of the government; secondly, he does not know how to stand on the side of the people.[254]

Although the term is widely used to describe the typological phenomenon which emerged in the middle of the nineteenth century in Russia, applicable to Pushkin's Onegin, Lermontov's Pechorin, Goncharov's Oblomov and all of Turgenev's male protagonists, certain elements of it can also be ascribed to Don Quijote: he is a character disconnected from society, who aims to do good but in doing so often causes more harm, and who even accidentally commits crimes in his attempts to right wrongs. However, while Russia's superfluous men end up contributing nothing to society, do little to inspire those around them and are, for the most part, rather unlikeable, Don Quijote is quite the opposite: although he does not quite succeed in restoring customs from the romances of chivalry to Golden Age Spain, he nevertheless succeeds in inspiring those he meets on the road, is loved by his neighbours and friends, and is very much a memorable and likeable character.

Given that Rudin was written around the time that Turgenev was compiling his speech on *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, there should be little surprise that a number of allusions to both works, and particularly the *Quixote*, appear in the text. As Holl explains, 'the novel explores the question of how an individual with the ideals of Don Quixote could become trapped in a syndrome of Hamlet-like self-analysis, and fail to ever realise his ideals'.[255] Although Rudin's tendency is stronger towards Don Quijote than it is towards Hamlet, this is not always clear in the novel. Turgenev attempts to clarify his protagonist's predominantly quixotic tendencies in a passage that appears towards the end of the work in which the reader sees Rudin leaving the estate of the landowner Dar'ya Mikhailovna Lasunskaya where he has just spent the last two

[254] Herzen, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*, XVII, 188.
[255] Holl, '"Don Quixote'" and the Russian Novel', p. 88.

months. As he leaves in the *tarantass*, accompanied by Basistov, the tutor to her two young sons, he says to his companion:

> Do you remember […] what Don Quixote said to Sancho Panza after leaving the Duchess's court? 'Freedom,' he said, 'my friend Sancho, is one of man's most precious possessions, and happy is he to whom heaven has given a crust of bread, who has no need to be obliged to another man for it!' What Don Quixote felt then, I feel now… (142)

> Помните ли вы, […] что говорит Дон-Кихот своему оруженосцу, когда выезжает из дворца герцогини? «Свобода, – говорит он, – друг мой Санчо, одно из самых драгоценных достояний человека, и счастлив тот, кому небо даровало кусок хлеба, кому не нужно быть за него обязанным другому!» Что Дон-Кихот чувствовал тогда, я чувствую теперь... (S: VI: 335)[256]

Rudin's recollection of the scene in the *Quixote* in which Don Quijote and Sancho are departing from the Duke and Duchess' estate where they have undergone a series of trials and tribulations (II.LVIII) draws a parallel between not only Rudin and Don Quijote, but also Basistov and Sancho, and Dar'ya Mikhailovna and the Duke and Duchess.

Rudin spends the vast majority of the novel at Dar'ya Mikhailovna's estate. She echoes the behaviour of the Duke and Duchess in several ways, albeit to a far less creative degree, while her estate has similar effects on Rudin to those of the Spanish one on Don Quijote. Although not a titled member of the nobility, she is nevertheless a distinguished lady, with her house being 'regarded as being among the very finest in the whole of — province' (38) ('считался чуть ли не первым по всей —ой губернии') (S: VI: 246). Despite her wealth and

[256] Rudin is paraphrasing the original quotation:

> Freedom, Sancho, is one of the most precious gifts bestowed by heaven on man; no treasures that the earth contains and the sea conceals can compare with it; for freedom, as for honour, men can and should risk their lives and, in contrast, captivity is the worst evil that can befall them.

> La libertad, Sancho, es uno de los más preciosos dones que a los hombres dieron los cielos; con ella no pueden igualarse los tesoros que encierra la tierra ni el mar encubre; por la libertad así como por la honra se puede y debe aventurar la vida, y, por el contrario, el cautiverio es el mayor mal que puede venir a los hombres. (II.LVIII.873/1195)

status, like the Duke and Duchess she thinks only of herself, as is seen in Lezhnev's brief commentary on her belief that 'hospitals and schools are a lot of nonsense, so many unnecessary inventions. Charity ought to be personal' (30) ('больницы, училища — это всё пустяки, ненужные выдумки. Благотворение должно быть личное') (S: VI: 239–40). She not only possesses no trace of philanthropic impulses, but she actively endeavours to place others in awkward and difficult situations for her own entertainment. When an argument between Rudin and Pigasov has subsided, she attempts to reignite it:

> Dar'ya Mikhailovna suddenly took it into her head to tease Pigasov. She went up to him and said in a low voice: 'Why are you saying nothing and merely smiling caustically? Come on, have another go at him' – and, without awaiting his reply, summoned Rudin with a wave of the hand. (59)
>
> Дарье Михайловне вдруг захотелось подразнить Пигасова. Она подошла к нему и вполголоса проговорила: «Что же вы молчите и только улыбаетесь язвительно? Попытайтесь-ка, схватитесь с ним опять», — и, не дождавшись его ответа, подозвала рукою Рудина. (S: VI: 265)

Although her behaviour is a more subdued version of the Duke and Duchess' near tyrannical machinations inflicted upon Don Quijote and Sancho,[257] the authors' basic ideas are analogous: instead of directing their wealth and power towards good, the higher classes direct it towards filling their hours with self-entertainment, with little concern for those whom they degrade along the way.

There is also a parallel in the effects that their time spent on the estates has on the respective protagonists. Throughout Cervantes' novel the author paints his hero as a man of actions: from the very first chapter he not only desires to act but also sets out and follows through on his intentions. When he spends time at the ducal palace, however, he is restricted

[257] Don Quijote is bedridden by the scratches inflicted upon him by the cats released onto the balcony above his room (II.XLVI); Merlin declares that for Dulcinea to be disenchanted Sancho must whip himself 3,300 times (II.XXXV); and the Countess Trifaldi appears with instructions for Don Quijote and Sancho to ride the wooden flying horse Clavileño in order to disenchant the princess and her knight (II.XL–XLI), among other examples.

in his abilities. He is transformed from Cervantes' active protagonist into the Duke and Duchess' passive puppet. Because Turgenev's story opens with Rudin's arrival at Dar'ya Mikhailovna's estate, there is no narrative evidence of Rudin's activity before this juncture; however, his opening conversation quickly portrays him as a man of great wisdom and action. When he suggests to Natal'ya, Dar'ya Mikhailovna's daughter, the following day that he has grown tired of moving from place to place, she responds in astonishment: 'others can take a rest, but you… you should work, you should try to be useful' ('отдыхать могут другие; а вы... вы должны трудиться, стараться быть полезным'). His response is optimistic: 'Yes, I must act. I mustn't hide my talent' (78) ('Да, я должен действовать. Я не должен скрывать свой талант') (S: VI: 282). From this point forward the reader expects to see Rudin not only talking heatedly and passionately, but acting, like Don Quijote, in a corresponding fashion. But as much as Turgenev describes Rudin's nature as being akin to that of Cervantes' protagonist, the reader struggles to see the similarities, given his inability to achieve anything during his time at the estate. For despite the fact that 'he busied himself with everything' ('он входил во всё'), the only result of his attempted endeavours is that 'Dar'ya Mikhailovna sang [their] praises – and that was all' (86) ('Дарья Михайловна восхищалась ими на словах – и только') (S: VI: 289). Just like Don Quijote at the ducal palace, Rudin is not taken seriously and, even though he wishes to act, is stifled by an environment that prevents activity and causes stagnation.

The protagonists' inactivity during their time at the respective estates is juxtaposed with their activity away from them. While Rudin's temporary inertia may compel the reader to see him as more of a Hamlet than a Don Quijote, this consideration is cast aside in the Epilogue, which was not originally part of Turgenev's plans for *Rudin* and was added in 1855–56. It is here that the reader first observes an almost complete portrait of Turgenev's interpretation of the Don Quijote type in his protagonist. This is seen in what appears to be his constant activity since leaving the estate, which he recalls in his conversation with Lezhnev during their chance

encounter several years later. He describes three examples in detail. His first endeavour was to help a new acquaintance with agricultural plans on his estate, but this failed both due to their growing friction and to his lack of agronomical knowledge. The second was to make a river navigable, but this failed because 'the owners of the water-mills didn't want to know what we were up to, and above all we couldn't deal with the water without machinery and there wasn't any money for machinery' (171–72) ('владельцы мельниц никак не хотели понять нас, да сверх того мы с водой без машины справиться не могли, а на машину не хватило денег') (S: VI: 360), a possible allusion to Don Quijote's own misguided adventures with windmills, when he mistakes them for giants (I.VIII), and with water-mills, when he mistakes them for a fortress (II.XXIX). The third was to become a lecturer, but this failed due to his insufficient knowledge of the subject—Russian literature—and of how to present lectures, as well as internal politics preventing him from, in his opinion, making positive changes. The examples Rudin provides demonstrate his quixotic nature in two ways. They show, firstly, that his sojourn with the aristocracy is a brief period of inertia in an otherwise active life, and secondly, that all his endeavours, like those of Don Quijote, are met with failure.

Although both characters strive to make progress, their ultimate exhaustion under the weight of their failures leads to disillusionment and a return to their roots. Don Quijote, following his defeat by the Knight of the White Moon, returns to his village in La Mancha. Rudin, following his discussion with Lezhnev and his recollections of his activity, returns to his small estate in Tambov. The pathetic nature of his description of it to Lezhnev—'Something's left of it. Two and a half serfs. A corner in which to die' (177) ('Там что-то такое осталось. Две души с половиною. Угол есть, где умереть') (S: VI: 365)—seems to contain allusions to the *Quixote*, whose protagonist sees out his final days on his own small estate, and leads the reader to the assumption that Rudin will also, like Don Quijote, finally end his wanderings. However, in an addendum to the Epilogue in 1860, Turgenev provides one

final scene: Rudin's death on the barricades during the French Revolution of 1848. This was probably added to provide one final comparison with Don Quijote. This is seen not only in their comically inappropriate attire for their intended actions (as Holl observes, Rudin wears a straw hat, while Don Quijote wears Mambrino's helmet),[258] but also in their misguided understanding of the world around them. But it is significant to note that this addition was made in 1860, the year of Turgenev's speech on *Hamlet and Don Quixote*. The presentation of the speech would have caused him to reflect upon his novel and, unsatisfied with the character he had created (even after the original addition of the Epilogue), he added the death scene 'to show that he had intended [Rudin] to be primarily considered as a Quixote'.[259] The addendum also serves to draw one further parallel between the two heroes: neither, despite his best intentions, fights for his own country. In the *Quixote*, it is Ruy Pérez who, as a soldier, fulfils this role, not Don Quijote, while in *Rudin*, although the title character dies fighting for freedom and justice, this is not in Russia, but in France, where he is in any case mistaken for a Pole.

Although the Epilogue and its addendum serve to clarify Rudin's quixotic nature, there is evidence throughout the novel to suggest Turgenev's intention of creating a protagonist based on the Don Quijote type. The first is aptly summarised by Turkevich: 'in courtesy, generosity and candour Rudin is a true son of Don Quixote.'[260] In his argument with Pigasov during his first evening at the estate, Rudin does not become angry and remains composed, despite Dar'ya Mikhailovna's efforts to cause drama. Although she ultimately proves to be an unpleasant and even untrustworthy character, the reader cannot but agree with her initial judgement of her new guest: she was 'inwardly extremely pleased by the composure and elegant good manners of her new acquaintance' (56–57) ('внутренно весьма довольная спокойствием и изящной учтивостью нового своего знакомца') (S: VI: 263). In his speech

[258] Holl, '"Don Quixote' and the Russian Novel', p. 104.
[259] Waddington, 'Introduction', p. 25.
[260] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 103.

on *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, Turgenev also mentions Don Quijote's 'composure' or 'calmness' ('спокойствие') (S: VIII: 187), and refers to the scene in which the maids lather up his face on his first day at the ducal palace (II.XXXII). Turgenev's choice of vocabulary draws a clear parallel between both Rudin and his interpretation of Don Quijote, while his decision to deploy this description during the protagonist's first few hours at the estate echoes Don Quijote's face lathering upon his arrival at the ducal palace.

The second is their use of language and their inability to adapt it to their audiences. Turgenev's description of Rudin's speech during his first evening at the estate would not be inappropriate for many of Don Quijote's: 'Rudin spoke intelligently, passionately, and effectively; he exhibited much knowledge, a great deal of reading' (58) ('Рудин говорил умно, горячо, дельно; выказал много знания, много начитанности') (S: VI: 264). That said, for Turgenev this was probably more a comparison with Hamlet than with Don Quijote, whom he describes in his *Hamlet and Don Quixote* as 'hardly literate' ('едва знает грамоте') (S: VIII: 188), and, by extension, not particularly learned or eloquent. Regardless, Rudin and Don Quijote's eloquence often renders their speech inappropriate for their respective audiences. When Don Quijote expresses his learning and reading in his speech on the Golden Age (which, although inspired by acorns, reflects his knowledge of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*), the goatherds to whom he addresses his monologue 'listened without uttering a word, bemused and bewildered' ('sin respondelle palabra, embobados y suspensos, le estuvieron escuchando') (I.XI.86/135). Turgenev repeats this tendency in Rudin: 'A listener might not understand exactly what was being talked about' (63) ('слушатель, пожалуй, и не понимал в точности, о чем шла речь') (S: VI: 269).

The protagonists' inability to adapt their speech for their respective audiences relates to the third point of comparison: their inability to assess situations and judge human behaviour appropriately. Because of this, although both endeavour to help others, they more often than

not end up causing more harm than good. Perhaps the most evident example in the *Quixote* is Don Quijote's intervention in Andrés' thrashing by his master; however, instead of sparing the boy from corporal punishment, the result is that the boy is beaten even more severely following the knight errant's departure (I.XXXI). On a superficial level much the same can be said of Rudin, about whom his former friend Lezhnev provides the example of his interference in the early stages of a new amorous relationship:

> Rudin had no wish at all to do me any harm – quite the contrary! But because of his damned habit of pinning down a butterfly, he set about explaining to both of us our own selves, our relationship, how we should behave, despotically forcing us to give an account of our feelings and thoughts […] he finally drove us completely out of our senses! (101)
>
> Рудин нисколько не желал повредить мне, — напротив! Но вследствие своей проклятой привычки каждое движение жизни, и своей и чужой, пришпиливать словом, как бабочку булавкой, он пустился обоим нам объяснять нас самих, наши отношения, как мы должны вести себя, деспотически заставлял отдавать себе отчет в наших чувствах и мыслях […] Ну, сбил нас с толку совершенно! (S: VI: 302)

Although both Don Quijote and Rudin believe that they are helping those around them, the results are quite the opposite. But there is one significant difference between the characters: while Don Quijote genuinely wishes to help Andrés, is left embarrassed by the truth of his attempted succour, and feels some sense of culpability (reflected by Sancho, who shares with the boy some of his bread and cheese) (I.XXXI), Lezhnev explains that Rudin's interference was not due to a desire to help, but rather to his 'passion for interfering in things' (97) ('страсть его была во всё вмешиваться') (S: VI: 298). Much the same can be said of Rudin's visit to Volyntsev, who is in love with Natal'ya, a feeling which is, at this stage, unreciprocated. Rudin visits in order to express the recent proclamation of their own mutual love and, although he does so 'with the best of intentions' (120) ('из хорошего побуждения') (S: VI: 317), this disclosure, quite understandably, does nothing but anger Volyntsev, who rages: 'What to you

seems sincere, to us seems impertinent and immodest' (118) ('Что вам кажется искренним, нам кажется навязчивым и нескромным') (S: VI: 316). Both Lezhnev's example of his own experience and Rudin's visit to Volyntsev paint Rudin in a negative light and depict him as a character who 'helps' simply to remain active. It is true that Don Quijote's attempted liberation of Andrés could be considered to have been inspired by his belief that he must act as a knight errant, rather than by genuine charity. However, the fact remains that Don Quijote attempted to help a young boy who was being beaten, rather than a grown man embarking on an amorous relationship. The superfluity of Rudin's attempt to help his friend (and later, in a slightly different way, Volyntsev), rather than someone who actually needs it, draws the protagonist away from the Don Quijote end of the typological spectrum and closer towards that of Hamlet.

One final point of comparison concerns the protagonists' amorous relationships. Both characters seem to fall in love because they feel that they ought to. In the case of Don Quijote, as a knight errant he needs a lady to whom he can dedicate his victories. He explains his somewhat unusual choice of basing Dulcinea on the unattractive peasant girl Aldonza Lorenzo as follows: 'for what I want of Dulcinea del Toboso, she is as good as the most exalted princess in the world' ('por lo que yo quiero a Dulcinea del Toboso, tanto vale como la más alta princesa de la tierra') (I.XXV.216/311). According to Don Quijote, love for a lady is an inevitable part of being a knight errant. Something similar can be said of Rudin. Two years following the protagonist's departure from the estate, Pigasov recalls the words of Terlakhov, with whom Rudin had been travelling abroad: 'Rudin came [by way of philosophy] to the conclusion that he ought to fall in love. He began to look for a subject worthy of such a startling conclusion' (155) ('Рудин дошел путем философии до того умозаключения, что ему должно влюбиться. Начал он отыскивать предмет, достойный такого удивительного умозаключения') (S: VI: 347). The observation suggests that Rudin, like Don Quijote, sees love as a duty, rather than a natural and unpredictable occurrence.

Aside from the clear distinction between the protagonists' amorous choices—Dulcinea is imaginary, while Natal'ya, Dar'ya Mikhailovna's daughter, is very much real—there is one further distinguishing factor in their approaches to their respective beloveds. As has been seen, although Don Quijote agrees to go back to his village for one year following his defeat by Sansón Carrasco disguised as the Knight of the White Moon, he refuses to renounce his love for Dulcinea (II.LXIV).[261] This is representative of Don Quijote's love for Dulcinea throughout the novel: despite her imaginary status, he never wavers in his love for her. Rudin is never certain in his love for Natal'ya. As the narrator explains, Rudin 'was not in any condition to say truthfully whether he loved Natal'ya' (124) ('не в состоянии был сказать наверное, любит ли он Наталью') (S: VI: 321). Although he does eventually admit his love to Natal'ya, he does not hesitate to submit to Dar'ya Mikhailovna's demand soon thereafter that they not be together, and quickly retracts his earlier statement when he writes to Natal'ya of the possibility that his love for her was imaginary: 'How could I prove to you that I could love you with real love – a love from the heart, not one of the imagination […]' (144) ('Как доказать вам, что я мог бы полюбить вас настоящей любовью — любовью сердца, не воображения […]') (S: VI: 337). Had Turgenev succeeded in imbuing his character with the true spirit of Don Quijote, then Rudin would have striven against all obstacles to be with Natal'ya, rather than submitting to her mother without hesitation. In his refusal to take action and thereby control of his destiny, and his rejection of someone whose love for him is genuine, Rudin once more demonstrates his tendency towards the Hamlet type. There is also a certain irony in the juxtaposition between Don Quijote and Rudin at this moment, with the former's love for an imaginary figure appearing to be far stronger and more genuine that Rudin's imaginary love for a real girl.

[261] See pp. 146–47.

Just as there is evidence in the novel to suggest that Rudin both is and is not a Don Quijote-like figure, there is also evidence to suggest the same of Basistov with Sancho. There is certainly an element of Don Quijote's squire in his appearance and predilections, with the narrator explaining that Basistov 'dressed casually and let his hair grow long not because he wanted to be in fashion but out of laziness' ('Он одевался небрежно, не стриг волос, — не из щегольства, а от лени'), before adding that 'he was fond of eating and sleeping' (36) ('любил поесть, любил поспать') (S: VI: 245). Both also serve others, Basistov as the household tutor, and Sancho as squire to Don Quijote. Basistov's devotion to Rudin also finds similarities in Sancho's to Don Quijote. However, there is one clear discrepancy in the relationships between knight errant and squire, and philosopher and tutor:

> Basistov continued to worship Rudin and catch every winged word he spoke. Rudin paid little attention to him. On one occasion he spent a whole morning with him, discussed with him the most important world problems and aims and aroused in him the most lively enthusiasm, only to drop him afterwards… (86)
>
> Басистов продолжал благоговеть перед Рудиным и ловить на лету каждое его слово. Рудин мало обращал на него внимания. Как-то раз он провел с ним целое утро, толковал с ним о самых важных мировых вопросах и задачах и возбудил в нем живейший восторг, но потом он его бросил... (S: VI: 288)

As Turgenev makes clear throughout the text, the protagonist and the tutor are not friends—despite Rudin's reference to Don Quijote and Sancho's departure from the ducal palace when he and Bastistov are leaving Dar'ya Mikhailovna's estate. The above example demonstrates the stark contrast between their feelings towards one another: Basistov admires and is devoted to Rudin, just as Sancho is to Don Quijote; however, Rudin cares little for his disciple, whereas Don Quijote clearly cherishes his companion. Although it would be easy to perceive Rudin and Basistov's lack of friendship as a deviation from the *Quixote,* it is in fact very much in tune with Turgenev's reading of the work. In his speech, *Hamlet and Don Quixote,* he does not mention the strength of Don Quijote and Sancho's friendship, but instead focuses on Sancho's

role as a representative of the masses, who always end up 'believing devotedly' ('беззаветно веруя') (S: VIII: 180) in someone who inspires them. In his devotion to Rudin, Basistov becomes a representative of the masses, and in this way Turgenev draws another point of comparison with Sancho. However, this does not mask the fact that Turgenev has endowed his protagonist with a clear characteristic of the Hamlet type in Rudin's disregard for Basistov. Turgenev's discussion of Hamlet's relationship with the masses seems to echo crudely Rudin's relationship with Basistov: 'Hamlets despise the crowd […] Is it even worth it for him to occupy himself with the masses? They are so coarse and filthy!' ('Гамлеты точно бесполезны массе […] Да и стоит ли заниматься массой? Она так груба и грязна!') (S: VIII: 179–80). Despite the clear discrepancies between Basistov and Sancho, his devotion to Rudin nevertheless suggests that he is closer in type to Cervantes' peasant-squire than Turgenev's protagonist is to the knight errant.

Although Turgenev endeavoured to create in Rudin a protagonist of the Don Quijote type, certain traits of his interpretation of the Hamlet type also penetrate into his character. But it was not only with Rudin that Turgenev struggled to create a character whose import would be clear and therefore be fully grasped by the reader. As the writer reveals in his 'Apropos *Fathers and Sons*' ('Po povodu *Ottsov i detei*'), his original intention was to base Bazarov on a young provincial doctor. Although the 'impression made on me by this figure was very strong' ('впечатление, произведенное на меня этой личностью, было очень сильно'), he admits that it was 'at the same time indistinct' ('в то же время не совсем ясно') (S: XIV: 97). He attributes his difficulty in clarifying the nature of his intended protagonist to the fact that the type had not yet been portrayed in literature, but when he voices this concern to an acquaintance on the Isle of Wight, he is met with the following response: '"But it seems you have already portrayed a similar type… in Rudin?" I was speechless. What was there to say? Rudin and Bazarov – one and the same type!' ('«Да ведь ты, кажется, уже представил

подобный тип... в Рудине?» Я промолчал: что было сказать? Рудин и Базаров — один и тот же тип!') (S: XIV: 98).

Turgenev may have intended to create in Bazarov a new literary type, but his acquaintance is not wrong in his observation that the character—and, indeed, all of the author's subsequent protagonists—is in many ways an extension of Rudin. Because of this, and together with Turgenev's wider fascination with the *Quixote*, it is not surprising that Bazarov should share a number of traits with both Don Quijote and Rudin: all three wish to bring about positive change, but overall fail in their endeavours; they oscillate between ideal love and rationalism, and struggle with disillusionment; and they meet their death at the end of their respective novels. Bazarov's quixotic nature has not gone unnoticed by critics: Canavaggio comments that the 'ardent dogmatism' of Turgenev's character 'does not fail to recall the vehemence of Don Quijote's convictions',[262] while Durán and Rogg suggest that he possesses 'the decisiveness and courage of a modern Don Quixote'.[263] What they fail to note, however, is that Bazarov is plagued by a sense of Hamletism that overshadows his quixotic qualities, even more so than it does in Rudin. This is a trend that appears in all of Turgenev's characters to a greater or lesser extent, from the unnamed eponymous character of his early work, 'Hamlet of Shchigrovsky District' ('Gamlet Shchigrovskogo uezda', one of his *Sportsman's Sketches*), through to Nezhdanov in his final novel, *Virgin Soil*. It is true that Rudin, like all of Turgenev's characters, possesses many aspects of the Hamlet type, but by the end of his novel Turgenev leaves the reader in little doubt of his intention to instil in his protagonist the spirit of Cervantes' hero.

[262] Canavaggio, *Don Quijote, del libro al mito*, p. 178.
[263] Durán and Rogg, *Fighting Windmills*, p. 181.

4. DOSTOEVSKY AND CERVANTES

Background

Fyodor Dostoevsky is primarily known in the West for a range of novels which penetrate the core of the human psyche. However, while he has generally been regarded with admiration in the West, this attitude was not mutual. A fervent Slavophile for much of his life—believing that progress in Russia should come from within the nation, from its people, rather than drawing influence from Europe, as per Westerniser ideology—he possessed a deep-rooted sense of nationalism and was deeply critical of European customs and society. But there was one key exception to his European aversion: its literature.

As with Pushkin, Gogol' and Turgenev, Dostoevsky's exposure to literature and foreign culture began during childhood. He relished listening to the Russian folk tales of the household serfs, was taught to read by his mother at the age of four from a volume of Bible stories, and enjoyed the pleasant evenings at home with his family, during which he would listen to works ranging from Karamzin's *History of the Russian State* to the Gothic novels of Ann Radcliffe. It can thus be seen that, while Dostoevsky and his siblings were primarily exposed to national literature, foreign literature also played a large role in their cultural upbringing. In addition to being inspired by the likes of Pushkin, Lermontov and Zhukovsky, Dostoevsky and his brother Mikhail eagerly anticipated and perused the latest Russian translations, or at least reviews, of Balzac, Hugo and George Sand; read the works of Walter Scott, also in translation, supposedly in one summer alone; and 'pored over' literary works 'in their screened-off bedroom by candlelight'.[264]

Dostoevsky's more formal education also began at home: together with Mikhail he was taught basic French by a visiting tutor and Latin grammar by his stern father, before being

[264] Ronald Hingley, *Dostoyevsky: His Life and Work* (London: P. Elek, 1978), pp. 22–23.

enrolled, when he was twelve years old, at Chermak's, one of Moscow's most prestigious private preparatory schools. The establishment taught arts subjects well and allowed the brothers to pursue their literary interests; however, at the age of sixteen their father enrolled them at the army's Chief Engineering Academy in St Petersburg, despite the boys not having 'the slightest leaning towards the military life or applied technology'.[265] Fortunately some Russian and French literature was also taught, and Dostoevsky made sure to undertake further reading in these two subjects, reading the works of authors such as Balzac, Racine and Corneille (including his play, *Le Cid*, distantly based on the Spanish legend of El Cid),[266] boasting of his 'extensive conquests in French, German, English and Russian literature'.[267] This was probably all in Russian translation, 'for though he was soon to know French well enough to translate an entire novel creditably'—a reference to his 1843 translation of Balzac's *Eugénie Grandet* into Russian—'he was never to become equally fluent in German, and was to remain ignorant of English'.[268] Although the Academy continued to nurture Dostoevsky's literary interests, particularly in European literature, it was also the likely breeding ground for his life-long animosity towards non-Russians: two-thirds of the Academy's students were German and Polish citizens from the multi-national Russian Empire, and Ronald Hingley suggests that it 'was probably here that Dostoevsky began to conceive the extreme contempt in which he was later to hold members of these two nationalities'.[269]

While this hostility—indeed, xenophobia—is related to his Slavophilism, Dostoevsky, 'dissatisfied with the existing arrangements of socio-political life in his fatherland', took more of a Westerniser stance in his youth.[270] Whether fervent or not in his convictions, his perceived

[265] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, pp. 17–18, 30.
[266] See Dostoevsky's letter of 1 January 1840 to his brother Mikhail (XXVIII: 71).
[267] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, p. 33. See also Dostoevsky's letter of 9 August 1838 to his brother Mikhail (XXVIII: 51).
[268] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, pp. 33, 43.
[269] Ibid., p. 31.
[270] Joseph Frank, *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), p. 220.

'treason' against the state for his participation in the Petrashevsky Circle (whose founder was a proponent of social reform in Russia and where Dostoevsky debated 'judicial reform, serf emancipation, socialism and revolution')[271] led to his imprisonment and mock execution in 1849, and subsequent four-year exile in the *katorga* (hard labour in a military prison) in Omsk, Western Siberia.[272] Rather than the atrocious conditions, it seems that his greatest cause of suffering during this period was not being permitted to indulge his literary inclinations. Nevertheless, even in the *katorga* he found some respite, being occasionally allowed to rest in the sick-bay even when he was well, where 'he took the opportunity to read Vvedensky's translation of Dickens's *David Copperfield* and *Pickwick Papers*, which chanced to be available'.[273] Although he was to remain in military exile for another five years in Semipalatinsk (then in Siberia, now in Kazakhstan) following his stay in the *katorga*, he was now at least permitted once more to read and write. As his letters from 1854 demonstrate, he was eager to resume his reading habits and fervently asked for works to be sent to him from St Petersburg. In his letter of 27 March 1954 to his brother Mikhail, for example, he began his final paragraph with the words: 'And now I shall ask you for some books […]' ('А теперь попрошу у тебя книг […]') (XXVIII: 179).

Despite his anti-Europeanism, Dostoevsky journeyed to Europe on a number of occasions, initially to escape Russian creditors and later for his health. His first journey, during the summer of 1862, took him to England and France—whose deficiencies he criticises in his *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* (*Zimniye zametki o letnikh vpechatleniyakh*)—as well as

[271] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, p. 15.
[272] One of the main reasons for Dostoevsky's arrest was his recitation and alleged dissemination of Belinsky's 'Letter to Gogol'', which denounces Gogol' for 'revealing himself as a religious fanatic and political reactionary' and thereby 'the basic assumptions, political and religious, on which the Imperial Russian state rested' (Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, p. 62). Dostoevsky's imprisonment and exile have also been compared on numerous occasions with Cervantes' captivity in Algiers: see Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia,* p. 115; Santiago Montero Díaz, 'Cervantes en Turgenief y Dostoyevsky', *Revista de Estudios Políticos* (Madrid), 15 (1946), 111–42 (p. 138); Allan Trueblood, 'Dostoevski and Cervantes', *Inti. Revista de Literatura Hispánica*, 45 (1997), 85–94 (p. 86); Ziolkowski, *The Sanctification of Don Quixote*, p. 108.
[273] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, p. 74.

Germany, Switzerland and Italy. His second journey, in mid-1865, motivated purely by the prospect of imprisonment for his various debts, took him to Germany, with a brief visit to Copenhagen. His third journey, this time with his young wife Anna Grigoryevna, began in April 1867. Intended as a three-month long escape from both their domestic situation and Dostoevsky's pursuit by creditors, their European sojourn lasted until 1871. An exile which the novelist considered 'worse than Siberia', Dostoevsky and Anna Grigoryevna spent 'an initial four months in Germany, over a year in Switzerland, nearly a year in Italy, and a final two years back in Germany; their chief cities of residence were Dresden, Geneva and Florence, and then Dresden again'. Although the period was relatively fruitful from a literary perspective, the Dostoevskys deeply missed Russia: they 'despised' non-Russians,[274] particularly the Germans, and the novelist 'deeply disliked many Russians he encountered while in Europe, like Turgenev and Herzen'. After their belated return to Russia, Dostoevsky would venture to Germany on a number of subsequent occasions for health reasons, with Anna Grigoryevna commenting that he 'was fluent in German only when quarrelling' with the locals, a frequent occurrence while he was in Europe.[275]

Unlike Turgenev, Pushkin, and even Gogol', there is nothing in Dostoevsky's biography or writings to suggest a positive interest and curiosity in Spain—or in any European country, for that matter. There is no cultural appropriation of Spanish themes and motifs in his literary works or dabbling in the Spanish language, as with Pushkin and Turgenev, nor even references that betray a desire to learn more about Spanish culture, as in Gogol''s fabricated adventures through Spain or his request to read Botkin's travels through the Peninsula. The lack of warmth which Dostoevsky extends to Spain and its culture can be considered an extension of his general aversion towards Western Europe. However, although he did not

[274] This is ironic, since Anna Grigoryevna was only half-Russian: her mother was Swedish.
[275] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, pp. 106, 127, 133, 165.

particularly care for Spanish culture, he nevertheless took an interest in contemporary Spanish polemics. In his *Diary of a Writer*, in his essay 'Don Carlos and Sir Watkin. Again, Symptoms of "The Beginning of the End"' ('Don Karlos i ser Uatkin. Opyat' priznaki «nachala kontsa»', 1876), he discusses the arrival of Carlos VII—claimant to the Spanish throne and instigator of the Third Carlist War (1872–76)—in Folkestone, England, from France. Although the piece seems to promise political discourse about the Spanish monarchy, such considerations are obscured by Dostoevsky's gentle mockery of English etiquette through the juxtaposition of the reception of Carlos VII by Sir Edward Watkin, a Member of Parliament and railway entrepreneur, and the English public. The piece nevertheless demonstrates that Dostoevsky was indeed interested in foreign, and in this case Spanish, affairs; however, it also shows that this interest was eclipsed by his desire to deride the English.[276]

Although it is difficult to dispute that Dostoevsky cannot compare with Pushkin, Turgenev, or even Gogol', in their enthusiasm for Spanish culture, he nevertheless equals, if not surpasses them, in his affinity for *Don Quixote*. It may seem surprising that a writer with so much contempt for European culture and so little interest in Spanish culture should admire Cervantes' novel to such an extent. And yet, as the rest of this chapter will demonstrate, Dostoevsky owes a clear portion of his creative output to the Spanish text. The following section will examine how his reception of the *Quixote* is presented and implemented in his minor works, beginning with the epistolary *A Novel in Nine Letters* (*Roman v devyati pis'makh*, 1847), before focusing on his more mature writing: his correspondence, the *Notebooks* to two of his novels, *The Possessed* (*Besy*, 1871–72) and *A Raw Youth* (*Podrostok*, 1875), and pertinent sections in his *Diary of a Writer*. This is followed by a section on a particular essay from this last work: 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie'. This essay will be discussed independently since, rather than containing a reference or two to the *Quixote*, it is founded almost entirely upon it.

[276] For further discussion of the piece, see pp. 187–88.

The final section will examine Dostoevsky's novel *The Idiot*. As the work is perhaps the most discussed of all Russian texts in relation to the reception of the *Quixote* in Russia, this section will draw on and synthesise previous comparative scholarship and provide new ideas in order to answer the question of the extent to which its title character, Prince Myshkin, is indeed based on Don Quijote—a question generally left unanswered in previous research. This section will also draw on relevant paraliterary materials from Dostoevsky's correspondence and his *Notebooks* to *The Idiot* which address the creation of the novel. The ultimate aim of this chapter is to demonstrate both how and to what extent the *Quixote* and its protagonist—as opposed to Cervantes—inspired Dostoevsky in his creative processes, how he understood and interpreted the novel and its hero, and how this manifests itself in his literature, and will be achieved by drawing together and analysing his various direct references and indirect allusions across a pertinent cross-section of his fiction and non-fiction works.

Dostoevsky and Cervantes

Although Dostoevsky seemed to possess little interest in Spanish culture, this was not true for the *Quixote*. Turkevich and Ziolkowski, in their comparative studies of Cervantes and Dostoevsky, draw attention to the authors' biographical similarities: both their families were representatives of the lower nobility; both were sons of surgeons; both were writing in a climate of strict censorship; both found fame with their literature during their lifetime; both became involved in literary grudges, Cervantes with Lope de Vega and Dostoevsky with Turgenev; both struggled with debt; and both endured imprisonment, Cervantes as a captive in Algiers and later in the prisons of Seville and Valladolid, and Dostoevsky in St Petersburg, before being exiled to Siberia.[277] However, while such biographical affinities are interesting to note, they do not provide evidence for Dostoevsky's interest in Cervantes, which can only be uncovered and

[277] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 115; Ziolkowski, *The Sanctification of Don Quixote*, p. 108.

understood through examination of his paraliterary material and intertextual analysis of his fiction. As discussion of this material will demonstrate throughout the rest of this chapter, Dostoevsky cared less about Cervantes (and therefore about any biographical similarities) than he did about the *Quixote*.

Dostoevsky's references to the novel and its author span from 1847 through to 1880. The first appears in his early work, *A Novel in Nine Letters* (1847). The nine epistles between Petr Ivanovich and Ivan Petrovich revolve around the misunderstanding between the two characters as to whether an amount of money was lent or gifted to the former by the latter, and therefore whether or not it should be returned. In the sixth epistle, Ivan Petrovich (lender) tells Petr Ivanovich (borrower), that he expects the money to be returned in full and, betraying his mounting anger, accuses his correspondent of 'deceit, treachery, obliviousness to human decency and laws […]' ('обман, вероломство, забвение приличий и прав человека […]') (I: 238). Petr Ivanovich, in his response in the seventh letter, comments upon the strangeness of the previous letter and explains that his correspondent is no longer welcome at his home, before adding: 'My wife sends back to your spouse the book which she left at ours—"Don Quixote of La Mancha"—with thanks' ('Жена моя отсылает вашей супруге книжку ее, оставшуюся у нас,—«Дон-Кихота Ламанчского», с благодарностью') (I: 238). The mention of the *Quixote* supports Petr Ivanovich's claim that his friend is mistaken in his belief that he had lent, rather than gifted, the money. It also implies, mockingly, that his correspondent is, like Don Quijote, unable to distinguish truth from fiction, and that he is fabricating his own reality of the situation.

While this early reference demonstrates Dostoevsky's familiarity with the general premise of *Quixote* and his superficial interpretation of the protagonist as a comical figure, it is not sufficient evidence that he had read the novel in its entirety before this date. Indeed, it was not until the sixties—the decade during which Turgenev gave his famous speech on

Hamlet and Don Quijote—that Dostoevsky's engagement with the novel began in earnest. Between 1847 and 1868—the year in which he began writing *The Idiot*, and from which point the references become more elaborate and numerous—there is no record of any mention of Cervantes' novel or its protagonist. The silence until 1854 can be attributed to his exile in the Siberian *katorga*, during which time he was prohibited from undertaking literary pursuits, whereas the silence after this period suggests that Dostoevsky did not fully engage with the *Quixote* until the latter half of the sixties. This is perhaps to be expected: the sixties saw an increase in considerations of Don Quijote's character type by Russian writers and critics, while it was also towards the end of this decade that Dostoevsky reached maturity as an author.

Although Dostoevsky frequently wrote in his letters to his brother Mikhail both before and after his Siberian exile about the works he had read, references to the *Quixote* feature in his correspondence on only two occasions. The first appears in an 1868 letter to his niece, Sofia Alexandrovna, in which he discusses the creation of *The Idiot* (and which will, for this reason, be discussed in the section on this novel) and which is indicative of his maturing interest in the novel and its protagonist. The second reference appears at the height of his literary maturity and perspicacity. In a letter of 18 August 1880, just five months before his death, he wrote to Nikolai Osmidov with a number of recommended fictional books for his daughter and instructed him to 'introduce her to literature from previous centuries (*Don Quixote* and even *Gil Blas*)' ('Познакомьте ее с литературой прошлых столетий [Дон-Кихот и даже Жиль-Блаз]') (XXX.i: 121).

While this late letter demonstrates that his appreciation of the *Quixote* remained with him until the end of his life, a broader and more complete understanding of his interpretation of the novel and his perception of its protagonist can be gathered from a range of notes he made while planning not only *The Idiot*, but also *The Possessed* and *A Raw Youth*.[278] Ideas were

[278] For discussion of the notes to *The Idiot*, see the final section of this chapter.

usually written on random pages in his notebooks with little regard for chronology.[279] The notes are frequently quite cryptic: for example, it is often difficult to ascertain to whom or what Dostoevsky is referring, particularly as the novels in their nascent form often differ dramatically from their final version. Nevertheless, the notebooks provide evidence that Dostoevsky was beginning to think more seriously about both Don Quijote and his own characters' appropriation of certain quixotic tendencies. In notes to *The Possessed*, there are three allusions to Don Quijote's love for Dulcinea. They are undated, but were probably written 'in late 1869 or early 1870'.[280] They all refer to the character Kartuzov, whom Dostoevsky had originally planned to be the eponymous hero of another story, but who would later lose many of his quixotic elements and be transformed into the character of Captain Lebyadkin in the final version of *The Possessed*.[281] In one note the Count, talking with Kartuzov on the subject of love, says to him: 'You are just like Don Quijote' ('Вы такой-же Дон-Кихот').[282] In another, an unnamed character says to Kartuzov: 'you are like Don Quijote, you don't care even though your maiden might be married—you still love [her] faithfully' ('Вы как Дон-Кихот, вам дела

[279] Edward Wasiolek, who edited the English edition of the notebooks to *The Possessed*, comments on the adherence of the Russian edition of the notes to the original notebooks:

> The longer I worked with these notes the more distressed I became at the prospect of introducing the reader to the chaos and arbitrary associations of the paginal order, and the more convinced I became that the Russian editor had presented them in chaotic fidelity from excessive timidity and pedantry.

The Notebooks for The Possessed, ed. by Edward Wasiolek, trans. by Victor Terras (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 20.

[280] *The Notebooks for The Possessed*, p. 35.

[281] Many of Kartuzov's character traits that were originally inspired by Don Quijote have been lost or distorted to such an extent that they are no longer traceable in Lebyadkin. As Wasiolek explains:

> Kartuzov is ambiguously foolish and pure, dignified and comic, a defender of the Amazon's (Horsewoman's) honour and something of a pest in his defence of her. The portrait degenerates by the time it reaches the final version, where Lebiadkin is a drunk, a mistreater of his sister, only a pest to Liza, and the pawn of people like Liputin. The love and defence of his lady, and the dignity, are still there, but both are distorted, eccentric, unpredictable. Lebiadkin is a comic buffoon, foolishly clutching shreds of dignity.

The Notebooks for The Possessed, p. 36.

[282] E. N. Konshina, *Zapisnye tetradi F. M. Dostoevskogo* (Moscow: Academia, 1935), p. 383.

нет что дева хоть и замужем—вы все-таки верно <¿> любите').[283] The final note on this subject is far more detailed:

> Kartuzov falls in love *immediately and suddenly* by a process that makes it seem as though it were inevitable, in the eastern fashion, and that it could not be any other way. This is actually neither infatuation nor love, but merely unavoidable and inevitable adoration […] Kartuzov came to ascribe every perfection to her, moral and physical, up to the highest ideal; but Kartuzov, having ascribed these to *her*, not only does not doubt the perfect qualities of the ideal, not only can he not doubt them, but he cannot even think about or admit even the slightest shadow of a doubt! For him it is not some kind of opinion, or conclusion, or conviction, but rather something akin to faith, or even something higher than faith – [something] like a positive fact which is so tangible and positive that […] he loses the ability to question it […] It is a completely Don Quijote-esque conviction, with the difference that Don Quijote at least created a *question* for himself from […] his conviction, otherwise he would not have found it necessary to ride out onto the road and defend this conviction with his lance; but Kartuzov does not assume and has not even once thought about the possibility that someone might not agree with *her* perfection.
>
> Картузов влюбляется *непосредственно и вдруг* таким процессом что как-будто это неминуемо, по восточному, и иначе быть не могло. Это даже собственно не влюбленность и не любовь, а только *необходимое и неминуемое* обожание. […] прямо приписаны ей Картузовым все совершенства, нравственные и физические, до высочайшего идеала; но в этих совершенствах идеала, раз приписав их *ей* Картузов не только не сомневается, не только не может сомневаться, но не может даже и подумать и допустить хоть краюшек мысли о сомнении! Это в нем не мнение какое-нибудь, не заключение, не убеждение, а нечто в роде веры, или даже нечто выше вери, – в роде положительного факта, который до того осязаем и положителен, что […] теряет возможность составить вопрос […] Убеждение вполне Дон-Кихотовское, с тою разницею, что Дон-Кихот все-таки создал себе *вопрос* из [этого] своего убеждения, иначе не нашел-бы необходимости выехать на дорогу и защищать это убеждение копьем, а Картузов не предполагает и ни разу не подумал о возможности, что кто-нибудь может не соглашаться с *ее* совершенствами. [284]

[283] Konshina, *Zapisnye tetradi*, p. 385.
[284] Ibid., p. 386.

Don Quijote has thus been transformed in Dostoevsky's mind from a merely comical figure who struggles to differentiate fiction from reality into a character who, although still somewhat comical, more closely reflects the earlier nineteenth-century Romantic interpretation of Cervantes' character. This is shown, firstly, in the elevation of the ideal woman into an embodiment of general perfection, and secondly, in the strength of love which becomes akin to faith. In the final part of the passage Dostoevsky moves from his general Romantic interpretation to a more personal one in his juxtaposition of Don Quijote and Kartuzov's strength of faith and convictions, suggesting that the former on occasion questions his faith (his belief in Dulcinea as his ideal) and the latter never doing so. However, while there is some truth in Dostoevsky's comment that Don Quijote 'found it necessary to ride out onto the road and defend his conviction with his lance', the 'conviction' in this case is not his love for Dulcinea. As has been discussed in the previous chapter, Cervantes' knight errant never questions his love for Dulcinea: even when he is finally vanquished by the Knight of the White Moon, the disguised Sansón Carrasco, he still refuses to renounce his love for her (II.LXIV). It thus becomes clear that Kartuzov and Don Quijote are one and the same in their unwavering faith in their ideals, in their respective beloveds. But Dostoevsky is correct in his understanding that Cervantes' knight errant does struggle with doubt: it does not concern Dulcinea, but rather his own position as a knight errant. As has been seen in discussion of Turgenev's *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, this doubt emerges following his inability to see Dulcinea in the coarse peasant girl (II.X), and is most apparent in the narrator's admission upon Don Quijote's arrival at the ducal palace: 'that was the first day when he was fully convinced that he was a real knight errant, not a fantasy one' ('aquel fue el primer día que de todo en todo conoció y creyó ser caballero andante verdadero, y no fantástico') (II.XXXI.693/962).[285] Although Dostoevsky's perceptive reading of the *Quixote* is clear in his understanding that Don Quijote suffers from doubt and

[285] See p. 141.

finds it ‘necessary’ to ‘defend his conviction with his lance’, he errs in his understanding of what the nature of this doubt actually entails.

The final reference to the *Quixote* in the notes to *The Possessed* veers away from the relatively jovial ideas for the character of Kartuzov and instead concerns what was to become the final, censored chapter of the novel, in which the protagonist, Stavrogin, confesses to the monk Tikhon (Feodosy in the notes) his sexual abuse of an eleven year-old girl. The notes, probably written in 1872,[286] briefly concern Feodosy’s discussion with Stavrogin, before moving on to a more general character observation:

> And this ideal, who believed in his own resurrection and in divinity, as two plus two makes four, of course dies, it goes without saying, without resurrection.
>
> This is the strongest of all, and the ultimate word that art gave to this thought was only Don Quijote.
>
> И вот этот идеал веривший в свое воскресение и в божество как в дважды два умирает, конечно, разумеется без воскресения.
>
> Это сильнее всего, искусство последним словом в этой мысли дало только дон-Кихота.[287]

Although the notes do not provide a clear depiction of Dostoevsky’s intentions for the direction of his novel, they nevertheless suggest a brief comparison between Don Quijote and Feodosy in their innate goodness, their belief in God, and their ultimate ineffectiveness. This last trait is seen in Don Quijote’s failure to protect Andrés from being beaten by his master (I.IV; I.XXXI) and in Tikhon’s failure to prevent Stavrogin’s suicide. Dostoevsky’s borrowing of this particular typological affinity is not unique to Feodosy/Tikhon, however: it first appears in Dostoevsky’s *oeuvre* in Prince Myshkin in *The Idiot*, where it plays a significant role in his

[286] *The Notebooks for The Possessed*, p. 389.
[287] Konshina, *Zapisnye tetradi*, p. 350.

character composition.[288] Similar ineffectiveness, albeit without the religious undertones, is also a common trait among Turgenev's characters.[289]

Two very different references to the *Quixote* can be found in the notebooks to *A Raw Youth*. The first, most likely written in August or September 1874, is a general observation on the novel as a whole and the goals of the protagonist: 'In general the whole novel, through the figure of the youth seeking truth in life (Gil Blas and Don Quijote), can be very appealing' ('Вообще весь роман через лицо подростка, ищущего правды жизненной [Жиль-Блаз и Дон-Кихот], может быть очень симпатичен').[290] According to Edward Wasiolek, Dostoevsky probably refers to Gil Blas because 'he sees a relationship between the way the hero of Lesage's novel hunts for truth through various strata of society and the way the youth searches for truth in an unbelieving world', while he 'wanted to make the Youth a good-hearted idealist (like Cervantes' hero)'.[291]

The second note, probably written in November 1874, is not a reference to Don Quijote, but to his squire: 'Important. When he spends the night at Vasin's, he explains part of the essence of the idea to him (Sancho Panza)' ('Капитальное. Когда он ночью у Васина, то излагает ему часть сущности идеи [Санхо-Панса]').[292] This note in isolation makes little sense—what is the youth's 'idea', and why is Dostoevsky referring to Sancho Panza? According to Arkady Dolinin, the note should be considered in conjunction with two others:[293] 'in this document there was something that recalled the island in the Baltic Sea' ('в этом документе было что-то такое, напоминавшее остров в Балтийском море'),[294] and 'You have an *idea*? Independent [ruler], [as a] king of the island' ('У тебя *идея*? Независимый

[288] See pp. 229–30.
[289] See pp. 166–68.
[290] A. S. Dolinin, 'F. M. Dostoevskii v rabote nad romanom "Podrostok"', *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo*, 77 (1965), entire volume (p. 112).
[291] *The Notebooks for A Raw Youth*, ed. by Edward Wasiolek, trans. by Victor Terras (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 99, n. 19.
[292] Dolinin, 'Dostoevskii v rabote', p. 257.
[293] Ibid., pp. 490–91.
[294] Ibid., p. 261.

королем острова') (XVI: 419).[295] In this way Dostoevsky's thoughts on the youth's dream of governing an island in the Baltic become a direct response to Sancho's dream of governing an island, which he somewhat surprisingly (to all those other than Sancho himself, that is) but apocryphally briefly realises in his governorship of the 'island' of Barataria.[296]

A number of references to the *Quixote* also appear in Dostoevsky's *Diary of a Writer*. Rather than a diary, the work is a compilation of essays written between 1873 and 1881 and 'mostly consists of sustained sermons or harangues—often […] initially stimulated by some trivial item culled from the press—on social and political themes'.[297] The first reference appears in an 1873 essay titled 'Apropos the Exhibition' ('Po povodu vystavki'). Here, in Dostoevsky's discussion of the reception of Russian culture in Europe, and vice versa, he talks of his interest, in his youth, in Louis Viardot's translation of Gogol' from Russian into French, which he undertook without knowing anything of the former language and with the help of Turgenev, who was adept in French and loved and knew Gogol''s works well. Although Dostoevsky was critical of the Gogol' translation,[298] he had the opposite response towards another of Viardot's works:

> Viardot, of course, possessed an artistic-critical ability and, moreover, a sensitivity to the understanding of poetry of foreign nations—he demonstrated this with his excellent translation of *Don Quixote*.
>
> У Виардо, конечно, художественно-критическая способность и, сверх того, чуткость в понимании поэзии чужих национальностей, что он и доказал превосходным своим переводом «Дон-Кихота». (XXI: 68)

[295] The appearance of this second note in Dostoevsky's collected works, but not Dolinin's own 'Dostoevskii v rabote' on Dostoevsky's notes to *A Raw Youth*, is representative of the haphazard nature of the notes.
[296] The youth's dream of 'becoming as rich as Rothschild' ('стать так же богатым, как Ротшильд') can also be compared to Sancho's more general ambitions of acquiring wealth. Dolinin, 'Dostoevskii v rabote', p. 491.
[297] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, p. 173.
[298] Dostoevsky wrote in his *Diary*: 'Such a strange thing was produced from this translation that, although I had earlier anticipated that Gogol' cannot be rendered into French, I had nevertheless not expected such an outcome […] Gogol' had literally vanished' ('Вышла из этого перевода такая странность, что я, хоть и предчувствовал заранее, что Гоголя нельзя передать по-французски, все-таки никак не ожидал такого исхода [...] Гоголь исчез буквально') (XXI: 68–69).

The passage highlights Dostoevsky's admiration for Viardot's French adaptation. It does not, however (unlike with his reading of Viardot's translation of Gogol', which he read in his youth) provide any evidence as to when he might have become familiar with the Frenchman's translation of Cervantes, whether in his youth or more recently. The wider essay, meanwhile, sheds light on his anti-Europeanism: he does not condemn all European culture, but rather the Europeans' inability to understand fully Russian culture. Although he draws Viardot into his diatribe for his inability to translate Gogol' properly, he cannot but praise him for his 'admirable' (or 'excellent') translation of Cervantes' novel. This is an apt description, for it is indeed far more faithful to the original than the Russian renderings available at the time.

The second reference, of 1876, appears in an already mentioned essay in *Diary of a Writer*: 'Don Carlos and Sir Watkin. Again, Symptoms of "The Beginning of the End"'. Dostoevsky not only discusses the Spanish monarchy and English manners, but also juxtaposes Carlos VII with Count Chambord, pretender to the French throne between 1844 and 1883, before subsequently comparing the latter to Don Quijote. This comparison lies in the Frenchman's rejection of the French throne at the very moment when the opportunity arose. Dostoevsky explains that Count Chambord:

> […] was tempted by nothing, did not surrender his 'white banner', and thus demonstrated that he was a magnanimous and true knight, almost a Don Quijote, an ancient knight with his vow of chastity and poverty, a figure worthy of nobly drawing to a close his ancient lineage of kings.
>
> […] не прельстился ничем, не отдал своего «белого знамени» и тем доказал, что он великодушный и истинный рыцарь, почти Дон-Кихот, древний рыцарь с обетом целомудрия и нищеты, достойная фигура, чтоб величаво заключить собою свой древний род королей. (XXII: 92)

Dostoevsky's predominantly Romantic reception of Don Quijote as a figure who values chastity, humility and helping others over his own self-aggrandisement is apparent in this

passage. Although there are numerous references in Cervantes' novel to Don Quijote's fidelity to Dulcinea and his desire to succour the poor, he was by no means devoid of selfishness, for example when he admits his desire to win fame and glory (I.XXI).[299] Despite such comments, the Romantic perception of Don Quijote was nevertheless generally one of altruism and self-sacrifice. As if concerned that his admiration of Don Quijote, and therefore Count Chambord, were not sufficiently evident in the passage, Dostoevsky adds further on that 'I know no higher praise' ('выше похвалы не знаю') (XXII: 92) than to compare a man with Cervantes' hero.

In the second part of his discussion his Romantic admiration of Don Quijote moves towards more general praise of the novel proper, about which he asserts that 'in the whole world there is nothing deeper or more powerful than this work' ('во всем мире нет глубже и сильнее этого сочинения') (XXII: 92). This praise stems from his belief that the work is 'the last and greatest expression of human thought' ('последнее и величайшее слово человеческой мысли') and that it contains 'the most bitter irony which man has ever been capable of expressing' ('самая горькая ирония, которую только мог выразить человек') (XXII: 92). This 'most bitter irony' can be seen in his reference to Heine, who:

> […] recounted how, as a child, he had been in floods of tears when, reading *Don Quixote*, he had reached the place where [the hero] is conquered by the despicable and common-sense barber Sansón Carrasco.
>
> […] рассказывал, как он, ребенком, плакал, обливаясь слезами, когда, читая Дон-Кихота, дошел до того места, как победил его презренный и здравомыслящий цирюльник Самсон Караско. (XXII: 92).

The irony becomes apparent in the reader's bitter realisation (just as Heine experienced) that strength of faith and dedication to an ideal are not always enough to guarantee longevity, success, or happiness. However, there is another sense of irony, apparently unnoticed by

[299] See also pp. 117, 140, 211.

Dostoevsky, which lies in the nature of Don Quijote's defeat by Sansón Carrasco. Because Don Quijote is overthrown by another character who, in the spirit of the protagonist, is pretending to be someone he is not, his ideals, intentions and imagination are not fully destroyed: they instead find themselves distributed among other characters. Don Quijote's defeat may in itself be bitter, but it is not as complete as Heine or Dostoevsky might think.

The passage also contains errors which suggest a lack of comprehensiveness in Dostoevsky's reading of the *Quixote*. Although it is indeed Sansón Carrasco who defeats Don Quijote, he is not the barber (Nicolás), but a bachelor (II.LVIV). Ziolkowski draws attention to the fact that this error is the same as that made in Heinrich Heine's *Travel Pictures*, in which he refers to Sansón Carrasco as 'a disguised barber' ('ein verkappter Barbier').[300] Given Dostoevsky's reference to Heine in this passage, it is likely that he conflated the German writer's comments with the actual plot of the *Quixote*. Furthermore, although Sansón Carrasco is the main antagonist in Part II of the Quixote—indeed, he is the character who, essentially, brings Don Quijote's adventures to an end—it would be extreme to describe him as 'despicable' ('презренный').

Despite not fully grasping the nuances of the *Quixote*'s irony or of Sansón Carrasco's role, Dostoevsky nevertheless considered the work a masterpiece that contained profound expressions of human thought, displayed certain ironies of life, and generally encapsulated the nuances of humanity. His closing comments neatly summarise the significance and singularity he perceived in the work:

> […] if the world were to come to an end, and there, somewhere, people were asked: 'So, did you understand your life on earth and what conclusions have your drawn from it?', then a man could silently hand over *Don Quixote*: 'This is my conclusion on life. Can you judge me for it?'

[300] Ziolkowski, *The Sanctification of Don Quixote*, pp. 111, 115. These errors are repeated in 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie'.

> […] если б кончилась земля, и спросили там, где-нибудь, людей: «Что вы, поняли ли вашу жизнь на земле и что об ней заключили?» — то человек мог бы молча подать Дон-Кихота: «Вот мое заключение о жизни и — можете ли вы за него осудить меня?» (XXII: 92)

The third, and most extensive reference (with the exception of 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie') appears in an 1877 essay titled 'The Metternichs and the Don Quixotes' ('Metternikhi i Don-Kikhoty'). The work is a general discussion of Russian and European society, the socio-economic impact of war in Europe, and Russian foreign policy. It is on this last subject that Dostoevsky compares Russia and its policy makers to Cervantes' hero. Although this may initially appear to be a jibe at Russian politicians, the piece once more highlights Dostoevsky's overwhelmingly positive and predominantly Romantic view of Cervantes' hero. He begins by explaining that, despite Russia's occasional endeavours to imitate Western Europe and to establish 'its own Metternichs at home' ('у себя Меттернихов') (XXV: 49), it never quite succeeded. Instead, 'the Russian Metternich always suddenly turned out to be a Don Quijote' ('всегда […] русский Меттерних оказывался вдруг Дон-Кихотом') (XXV: 49).

Dostoevsky does not deny that 'Don Quijote was, naturally, ridiculed' ('Над Дон-Кихотом, разумеется, смеялись') (XXV: 49). This amusement is short-lived, however, when the beholder of Cervantes' protagonist begins to see his admirable qualities, such as the strength of his devotion towards his ideal. As a result, 'Don Quijote has started not to amuse, but to frighten' ('Дон-Кихот начал уже не смешить, а пугать') (XXV: 49). But he also possesses another quality: 'he is sometimes awfully sly, so that he will not let himself be deceived' ('он бывает иногда ужасно хитер, так что ведь и не даст себя обмануть') (XXV: 49). Extrapolating this to Russian policy makers, Dostoevsky is insinuating that their actions may not be understood, at least initially, by their observers. He continues with the idea that, instead of providing a source of amusement, Russia and its leaders, just like Don Quijote, should instead be feared for their strength and determination, and that they possess a certain slyness

and calculation which will protect them from being deceived. It is true that while Don Quijote is a predominantly comic character, there are nevertheless occasions when he instils fear in his beholders. One example is Don Quijote's violent anger at Sancho's mockery of him in the incident of the fulling mills, with the squire's reaction consisting of 'temor' ('fear') (I.XX: 240) of his master's wrath. Furthermore, in a cast of characters who treat Don Quijote with varying amounts of derision, there is one who takes him seriously: doña Rodríguez. At the ducal palace, she seeks help from the knight to right a wrong—her daughter has been seduced by Tosilos, a farmer's son, but the Duke refuses to force their marriage for fear of losing income from Tosilos' father (II.XLVIII). While these moments of fear and respect towards Don Quijote are uncommon, they nevertheless support, no matter how tenuously, Dostoevsky's comparison of Russia with Don Quijote. His assertion that Don Quijote possesses slyness and calculation, however, is not substantiated by the novel: it is true of Sancho, who on a number of occasions proves his peasant cunning—for example when he ties up Rocinante's legs, attributing his immobility to enchanters, so that Don Quijote cannot investigate the cause of the noise in the fulling mills episode (I.XX)—but there is no evidence to suggest that Don Quijote possesses these same qualities.

Dostoevsky closes his comparison by viewing Don Quijote, and therefore his Russian policy makers, through a Romantic lens, focusing on the knight errant's beliefs that he 'will prevail in his virtue and in his awareness of this virtue' ('выиграет в своем достоинстве и в сознании этого достоинства') and 'will not lose his sincerity in his quest for good and truth' ('не утратит искренности в стремлении к добру и к правде'), and that 'such consciousness will strengthen him in his further career' ('такое сознание укрепит его на дальнейшем поприще') (XXV: 50). Dostoevsky's final remark in this section, that 'Russia's mission will eventually become clear to even the most distorted minds both in our midst and in Europe' ('назначение России станет наконец ясно самым кривым умам, и у нас, и в Европе')

(XXV: 50), reflects once more the original premise of the passage: Russia and Don Quijote might originally be ridiculed at the beginning for their actions, but this is only until others finally begin to understand them—and subsequently to respect, fear, and even admire them.

Dostoevsky's only references to Cervantes himself appear towards the end of the *Diary*. He first referred to the Spaniard in his speech on Pushkin delivered on 8 June 1880 in Moscow at a meeting of the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature, to celebrate the unveiling of a statue of the poet:

> In fact, in European literature there have been artistic geniuses of tremendous magnitude—the Shakespeares, the Cervanteses, the Schillers. But just point even to one of these great geniuses who possessed such an ability for universal sensitivity as our Pushkin.
>
> В самом деле, в европейских литературах были громадной величины художественные гении—Шекспиры, Сервантесы, Шиллеры. Но укажите хоть на одного из этих великих гениев, который бы обладал такою способностью всемирной отзывчивости, как наш Пушкин. (XXVI: 145)

In highlighting Shakespeare, Cervantes and Schiller, Dostoevsky intended to praise these three writers for their own contribution to literature. However, because his comments could be interpreted as belittling three great European authors for their inability to compete with Pushkin, Dostoevsky felt compelled to clarify his meaning. This appeared in the prologue to the speech, printed in *Diary* in August 1880, entitled 'Explanatory Word Concerning the Address on Pushkin Printed Below' ('Ob''yasnitel'noe slovo po povodu pechataemoi nizhe rechi o Pushkine'). He defends his original speech by explaining once more that 'in Europe there had been the greatest universal artistic geniuses: the Shakespeares, the Cervanteses, the Schillers' ('в Европе были величайшие художественные мировые гении: Шекспиры, Сервантесы, Шиллеры') (XXVI: 130), and describing once more the singular, significant difference between Pushkin and these three European writers: the Russian poet's 'capacity for

universal sensitivity and for the fullest reincarnation of the geniuses of alien nations' ('способность всемирной отзывчивости и полнейшего перевоплощения в гении чужих наций') (XXVI: 130). Although Dostoevsky was quick to condemn Europeans, this was not true of European writers, whose literature he generally greatly admired. As the clarifying note suggests, his speech on Pushkin, and particularly his praise of the poet's ability to penetrate the heart of foreign literatures and cultures, was not intended to belittle or disrespect other authors—indeed, his reference to Shakespeare, Cervantes and Schiller as 'the greatest universal artistic geniuses' could not evoke higher admiration. Rather, the comparison was merely intended to highlight the talents of a beloved national poet at an event commemorating his life.

Despite the relatively haphazard nature and singularity of the notes and diary essays discussed above, as well as the epistolary novel and correspondence, they nevertheless begin to paint for the reader a detailed portrait of Dostoevsky's appreciation for and reception of the *Quixote* as a literary masterpiece and Don Quijote as a predominantly Romantic figure. His view of Cervantes' hero is multifaceted and clearly develops as he matures as an author: in his early writing and in his notes to his novels, Dostoevsky portrays him in separate instances as a man unable to distinguish fiction from reality, stubborn in unrequited love, with an almost divine goodness in his heart; in the diary essays, meanwhile, he is compared to monarchist pretenders, policy makers, and even Russia itself, and is depicted as a magnanimous figure who, although not taken seriously upon first glance, is ultimately worthy of reverence and respect. But Dostoevsky's reception of Don Quijote is yet more multifaceted than this, and even more revealing references can be seen not only in his correspondence and notes on *The Idiot*, which help the reader to understand the role Cervantes' masterpiece had in shaping the Russian novel, but also in one particular essay, also found in the *Diary of a Writer*, discussed in the following section.

‘A Lie is Saved by a Lie’

Dostoevsky’s ‘A Lie is Saved by a Lie’, written and published in September 1877, is perhaps the writer’s most revealing piece regarding his attitude towards Don Quijote and his interpretation of Cervantes’ novel. Rather than simply containing extended references to the *Quixote*, as in the various essays by Dostoevsky mentioned in the previous section, the piece instead concentrates entirely upon the Spanish text. It opens with a fictional passage, replicated in its entirety here:

> Once upon a time Don Quijote, the famous knight of the sad visage, the most magnanimous of all knights on earth, the simplest in soul and one of the greatest in heart, while roaming with his faithful squire Sancho in pursuit of adventures, was suddenly struck by a certain perplexity which made him ponder for a long time. The fact is that oftentimes great, ancient knights (starting with Amadis of Gaul), whose life stories survived in the most truthful books called the romances of chivalry (for the purchase of which Don Quijote did not regret selling a few of the best acres of his small estate)—often these knights, during their famous wanderings, beneficial to the whole world, would suddenly and unexpectedly meet whole armies, sometimes even a hundred thousand soldiers strong, dispatched against them by an evil force, by wicked enchanters who envied them and hindered them in every way possible in achieving their great goal and in being reunited at long last with their beautiful ladies. Usually it happened that when a knight encountered such a monstrous and evil army, he drew his sword, invoked the name of his lady for his spiritual aid, and then cleaved his way alone to the very midst of the enemies and annihilated all of them to the last man. It would seem to be a simple matter, but Don Quijote suddenly started pondering—and over what! It suddenly appeared to him impossible that one knight—no matter how strong he might be, and even if he were to swing his triumphant sword for days on end without any sign of tiring—could put down a hundred thousand enemies in one go, in just in one battle. Yet time is needed to kill every man; to kill a hundred thousand people, a vast amount of time is required and, regardless of how he swings his sword, one person cannot accomplish this in one go in just a few hours. Meanwhile it is told in these truthful books that the incident was over in precisely one battle. How could this have happened?
>
> ‘I have solved this puzzle, my friend Sancho,’ Don Quijote finally said. ‘Seeing as all these giants, all these wicked enchanters, were an evil power, so too did their armies possess the same magical and wicked character. I propose that these armies were comprised of people not quite like us, for example. These men were but an illusion, a creation of magic and, in all probability, their bodies did not resemble ours, but were more akin to the bodies of, for example, slugs, worms and spiders. In this way the strong

and sharp sword of the knight, held by his mighty hand, striking these bodies, instantly passed through them, almost without any resistance, as if through air. And if this is so, then with one blow he really could have sliced through three or four bodies, or even ten, if they were standing in a tight group. It is clear, then, that the matter was greatly accelerated, and that the knight really was able to annihilate whole armies of these evil Moors and other monsters in only a few hours…'

Однажды Дон-Кихот, столь известный рыцарь печального образа, самый великодушный из всех рыцарей, бывших в мире, самый простой душою и один из самых великих сердцем людей, скитаясь с своим верным оруженосцем Санхой в погоне за приключениями, вдруг был объят некоторым недоумением, которое заставило его долго думать. Дело в том, что часто великие древние рыцари, начиная с Амадиса Галльского, истории которых уцелели в правдивейших книгах, именуемых рыцарскими романами (для приобретения коих Дон-Кихот не пожалел продать несколько лучших акров своего маленького поместья), — часто эти рыцари, во время полезных всему миру и славных странствований своих, встречали вдруг и неожиданно целые армии, во сто даже тысяч воинов, насылаемых на них злою силою, злыми волшебниками, им завидовавшими и мешавшими им всячески достигнуть великой цели их и соединиться наконец с их прекрасными дамами. Обыкновенно происходило так, что рыцарь, встречая такую чудовищную и злую армию, обнажал свой меч, призывал в духовную помощь себе имя своей дамы и затем врубался один в самую средину врагов, которых и уничтожал всех, до единого человека. Кажется бы, дело ясное, но Дон-Кихот вдруг задумался, и над чем же: ему показалось вдруг невозможным, чтобы один рыцарь, какой бы он силы ни был и даже если бы махал своим победоносным мечом целые сутки без всякой усталости, мог зараз уложить сто тысяч врагов, и это в одном сражении. Чтобы убить каждого человека, нужно все-таки время, чтобы убить сто тысяч людей, нужно огромное время, и как ни махай мечом, а в несколько каких-нибудь часов, и зараз, одному этого не сделать. Между тем в этих правдивых книгах повествуется, что дело кончалось именно в одно сражение. Как же это могло происходить?

— Я разрешил это недоумение, друг мой Санхо—сказал наконец Дон-Кихот. — Так как все эти великаны, все эти злые волшебники, были нечистая сила, то и армии их носили такой же волшебный и нечистый характер. Я полагаю, что эти армии состояли не совсем из таких же людей, как мы, например. Люди эти были лишь наваждение, создание волшебства и, по всей вероятности, тела их не походили на наши, а были более похожи на тела, как, например, у слизняков, червей, пауков. Таким образом, крепкий и острый меч рыцаря, в могучей его руке, упадая на эти тела, проходил по ним мгновенно, почти без всякого сопротивления, как по воздуху. А если так, то действительно он мог одним взмахом пройти по трем или четырем телам, и даже по десяти, если те стояли в тесной куче. Понятно после того, что дело чрезвычайно ускорялось, и рыцарь действительно мог истреблять, в несколько часов, целые армии этих злых арапов и других чудищ... (XXVI: 24–25)

For many years following its publication there seemed to be little doubt that Dostoevsky had opened his essay with an excerpt from the *Quixote*. It was not until 1953 that Francisco Maldonado de Guevara clarified that the passage was not written by Cervantes, but by Dostoevsky himself,[301] and it was only the following decade, in 1969, that Sergei Bocharov brought the same observation to the attention of the Russian reader.[302] Bagno attributes the early reader's assumption that the piece was taken from the Spanish novel to Dostoevsky's reproduction of 'the style of Cervantes's novel, his syntax, his lexical features, the narrative details [and] descriptions […] with astonishing accuracy', together with 'the combination of local colour, plot details, the Russian writer's penetration into the essence of the Cervantine figure and the subtle stylisation of literary manner' that appear in the passage.[303] The delay offers a clear indication that, although the *Quixote* was enjoyed and commented upon by many Russian littérateurs, comprehensive study of Cervantes' novel in Russia by literary critics did not emerge until the second half of the twentieth century.

While Bagno is not mistaken in his assertion that the piece is imbued with a quixotic air, it contains certain discrepancies which make it deviate somewhat from Cervantes' novel. The first concerns the physical/illusory transformation of the enemy forces. As Maldonado de Guevara correctly asserts, the *Quixote* adheres to the Golden Age trope of *engaño*—illusory deception.[304] As a result, Cervantes' enchanters are not able to change the physical properties of objects, people and creatures, but rather only characters' perceptions of them. An example of this can be seen in the case of Mambrino's helmet, about which Don Quijote says: 'what looks to you like a barber's basin looks to me like Mambrino's helmet and will look like something else to another person' ('eso que a ti te parece bacía de barbero me parece a mí el

[301] Maldonado de Guevara, 'Dostoievski y el "Quijote"', pp. 367–75.
[302] Sergei Georgievich Bocharov, 'O kompozitsii "Don-Kikhota"', in *Servantes i vsemirnaia literatura*, ed. by N. I. Balashov (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), pp. 86–111 (p. 103).
[303] Vsevolod Bagno, 'Dostoevskii o "Don Kikhote" Servantesa', in *Dostoevskii: materialy i issledovaniia*, ed. by G. M. Friedlender, 19 vols (Leningrad: Nauka, 1978), III, 126–35 (p. 127).
[304] Maldonado de Guevara, 'Dostoievski y el "Quijote"', p. 370.

yelmo de Mambrino y a otro le parecerá otra cosa') (I.XXV: 209/303–04). In Dostoevsky's passage, meanwhile, the author seems to have conflated both illusory and physical transformation. His description of the bodies of the enemy forces being more akin to those of slugs, worms and spiders suggests a physical transformation, which, in light of the Spanish source and the role of *engaño*, Maldonado de Guevara describes as 'insolent and outrageous'.[305] The Spanish critic fails to note, however, that Dostoevsky does not entirely misunderstand the illusory nature of enchantment in the *Quixote*: before he describes the transformed bodies of the enemy forces, he suggests that they 'were but an illusion'. While it is certainly possible that Dostoevsky did not fully understand the nature of the enchanters' transformative abilities in the *Quixote*, it also does not appear to be a case of complete misunderstanding, as the Spanish critic suggests, but rather Dostoevsky's own artistic embellishment.

The second discrepancy lies in the nature of the comparison itself. In the *Quixote*, enemy forces are not compared to slugs, worms and spiders, but rather to something less sinister—'alfeñique', a sweet treat made from powdered sugar paste mixed with almond milk or egg whites,[306] not too dissimilar from marzipan. Examples of this comparison are found in the Canon of Toledo's discussion with the priest about the absurdity of the romances of chivalry—'What beauty can there be […] in a book or story in which a sixteen-year-old lad slashes at a giant as tall as a tower and slices him in two as if he were made of marzipan […]?' ('¿qué hermosura puede haber […] en un libro o fábula donde un mozo de diez y seis años da una cuchillada a un gigante como una torre, y le divide en dos, como si fuera de alfeñique?') (I.XLVII: 440/599)—and in Don Quijote's own speech from the beginning of Part II: 'Is there, perchance, anything new in a [single] knight errant destroying unaided an army of two hundred

[305] Maldonado de Guevara, 'Dostoievski y el "Quijote"', p. 367.
[306] *Don Quixote*: I.XLVII, p. 599, n. 47.

thousand men, as if they had but one throat between them or were made of marzipan?' ('Por ventura es cosa nueva deshacer un solo caballero andante un ejército de doscientos mil hombres, como si todos juntos tuvieran una sola garganta o fueran hechos de alfeñique?') (II.I: 489/685).[307] Although Maldonado de Guevara argues that this discrepancy once more serves as evidence for Dostoevsky's misinterpretation of the text, the change from a marzipan-like sweet to horrible creatures instead appears to have been a conscious decision. Firstly, Viardot, whose translation of the *Quixote* Dostoevsky knew and admired, renders 'alfeñique' quite faithfully as 'pâte à massepains' on these two occasions.[308] Secondly, the reader finds the following entry in Dostoevsky's notebook of 1875–76: 'Don Quijote, people [made] from kissel' ('Дон-Кихот, люди из киселя'),[309] where 'kissel' is an Eastern European and Baltic viscous, jelly-like fruit-flavoured dish. Finally, creepy crawlies, and particularly spiders, are a common symbol throughout Dostoevsky's *oeuvre* for depravity and evil. In *Crime and Punishment* Svidrigailov compares eternity to 'one little room, like a rural bath house, dingy, with spiders in every corner' ('одна комнатка, эдак вроде деревенской бани, закоптелая, а по всем углам пауки') (VI: 221) in his conversation with Raskolnikov, while in *A Raw Youth* Arkady concludes that his depraved dream about Liza arose because 'I had within me the soul of a spider!' ('во мне была душа паука!') (XIII: 306). It thus becomes difficult to dispute that Dostoevsky was aware of the original comparison in Cervantes' novel and intentionally chose to transform his enemy forces into spiders and similar creatures. This divergence enabled him to endow them not only with the physical attributes necessary for his Don Quijote to allay his

[307] In this example Rutherford translates 'alfeñique' as 'barley sugar', but 'marzipan' better conveys the sweet's softness and malleability.
[308] '[…] quelle beauté peut-il y avoir […] dans un livre, ou bien dans une fable, si l'on veut, où un damoiseau de seize ans donne un coup d'épée à un géant haut comme une tour, et le coupe en deux *comme s'il* était fait de pâte à massepains?'; 'Est-ce, par hasard, chose nouvelle qu'un chevalier errant défasse à lui seul une armée de deux cent mille hommes, *comme s'ils* n'eussent tous ensemble qu'une seule gorge à couper, ou qu'ils fussent fait de pâte à massepains?' My italics. (Viardot, *L'ingénieux hidalgo don Quichotte de la Manche*, I, 670; II, 12).
[309] L. M. Rozenblium, 'Neizdannyi Dostoevskii: zapisnye knigi i tetradi 1860–1881 gg, *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo*, 83 (1971), entire volume (p. 404).

doubt about the plausibility of their swift defeat (the ease with which they can be cut with a sword), but also to add the sense of darkness and depravity prevalent throughout his works.

Maldonado de Guevara's suggestion that the enchanters in Cervantes' *Quixote* are malevolent whereas in Dostoevsky's version they are benevolent is also contentious. He asserts that the enchanters in the Russian passage are positive because they help the knight errant to annihilate the enemy forces by transforming their bodies, whereas Cervantes' protagonist never benefits from enchanters, but rather finds himself constantly persecuted by them.[310] But while it is true that enchanters do not favour Cervantes' knight errant,[311] this does not mean that all enchanters are malevolent to all knights errant, as can be seen in Don Quijote's discussion of the enchanter Frestón and his own necessity to 'engage in single combat a knight who is a favourite of his' ('pelear en singular batalla con un caballero a quien él favorece') (I.VII.60/98). Furthermore, Maldonado de Guevara seems to conflate two distinct knights errant in Dostoevsky's passage: he fails to note that Dostoevsky's Don Quijote is not pondering how *he* was able to defeat the enemy forces with such ease, but rather how *another* fictional knight errant completed the feat. It is therefore not Dostoevsky's Don Quijote who is aided by enchanters, but, as in the *Quixote*, another fictional knight. It thus becomes clear that the Russian author understood Cervantes' novel better than the Spanish critic claims (and, perhaps, better than the Spanish critic himself).

As with the previous deviations, the question of doubt that Dostoevsky affords his Don Quijote is in some ways both similar to and different from the doubt experienced by Cervantes' knight errant. The discrepancy here is that Dostoevsky's character questions fiction (the romances of chivalry), while Cervantes' hero questions reality, and not once does he doubt the

[310] Maldonado de Guevara, 'Dostoievski y el "Quijote"', p. 370.

[311] Don Quijote says: 'I have been persecuted by enchanters, I am persecuted by enchanters and I shall be persecuted by enchanters until they have hurled me and my noble deeds of chivalry into the deep abyss of oblivion' ('Perseguido me han encantadores, encantadores me persiguen, y encantadores me persiguirán hasta dar conmigo y con mis altas caballerías en el profundo abismo del olvido') (II.XXXII.707/979).

veracity of the chivalric romances. Regardless of the nature of these doubts, both Don Quijotes use fiction to assuage them: Dostoevsky's character suggests that the only way that the other knight errant could have defeated such a large army in one session is because their bodies have been transformed, whether just in appearance or otherwise, by enchanters; Cervantes' character suggests that he cannot see Dulcinea in the coarse peasant girl, whom Sancho insists is Don Quijote's beloved, because her appearance has, to him at least, also been transformed by enchanters (II.X). As Erich Auerbach explains of Cervantes' knight errant, 'although this time too he manages to find a solution, a way to save his illusion, the solution (Dulcinea is under an enchantment) is so intolerable that henceforth all his thoughts are concentrated on one goal: to save her and break the enchantment'.[312] Although both Don Quijotes are able to assuage their doubts through justification of the situations by enchantment, in the case of Cervantes' hero this doubt and sense of disillusionment linger throughout the rest of the novel. It can thus be summarised that Dostoevsky's knight errant saves fiction with more fiction, while Cervantes' knight errant saves his reality with fiction—albeit only temporarily.

The characters have two possible responses to their respective doubts. The first is to believe that 'a lie is written' ('написана ложь'). It is impossible for either Don Quijote to do so, however, for 'if there is one lie, then everything is a lie' ('если уж раз ложь, то и всё ложь') (XXVI: 26). Acceptance of the lie would mean renunciation of Don Quijote's beliefs and his reality which, according to Dostoevsky, would be equivalent to the betrayal of his ideal, of his duty, of his love for Dulcinea and for mankind. He highlights this with the fact that when Cervantes' hero finally renounces his ideals and beliefs and recovers from his madness, following his defeat at the hands of the Knight of the White Moon, he swiftly passes away (XXVI: 26). Both protagonists instead opt for the second response: to justify their belief

[312] Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. by Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), p. 339.

through a further lie. Dostoevsky's suggestion that it is impossible to live without belief, whether based in reality or fiction, thus becomes apparent.

But why does Dostoevsky's knight errant deviate from Cervantes' protagonist and start to question the chivalric romances? The Russian author explains that his character's doubt is motivated by an external and isolated circumstance: he 'suddenly began to *miss realism*!' ('вдруг *затосковал о реализме*!'). It is this yearning for realism that causes him to ponder subconsciously the 'mathematical consideration' ('математическое соображение') at the heart of Dostoevsky's imitation: how could one man defeat an army of one hundred thousand men? Given that he yearns for realism, it is somewhat surprising that his response to his doubt (the transformation of the bodies of the enemy forces) is based on fiction, and not reality. There is a caveat, however, as what for the knight errant constitutes reality, for others constitutes fiction: while the reader might consider that Dostoevsky's knight errant is saving fiction with more fiction, the character himself considers that he is saving reality with more reality: '*realism* is satisfied, *truth is saved*' ('*реализм* […] удовлетворен, *правда спасена*') (XXVI: 26).

Dostoevsky clarifies his perception of the intimate relationship between fiction and reality, together with the importance of belief and the power of the imagination, in the final section of 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie'. He indicates his intention for the piece to serve as an allegory when he asks the reader: 'did not such a thing occur perhaps a hundred times in your life?' ('не случалось ли с вами сто раз, может быть, такого же обстоятельства в жизни?') (XXVI: 26). By this he refers to the reader's own fervent belief in something—a dream, an idea, a conviction or even love—and the ease with which doubt can seep into it. As Dostoevsky makes clear, it is only natural to seek reassurance in such a situation, to restore one's faith in one's belief or conviction, and to do so by any means possible, even if it means 'conceiving a new fantasy, a new lie, terrible and, perhaps, crude, but which you hastened lovingly to believe, only because it resolved your initial doubt?' ('новой мечты, новой лжи, даже страшно[й],

может быть, грубой, но которой вы с любовью поспешили поверить, потому только, что она разрешала первое сомнение ваше?') (XXVI: 27). These final lines suggest that Don Quijote's behaviour is, as Canavaggio suggests, 'less strange than it seems',[313] and that his madness, doubts and rationalisation, whether based more in fantasy or reality, can be extrapolated to anyone. Every person possesses belief in something; every person will at some point experience doubt regarding that belief; and every person will rationalise the situation in a way that relieves the doubt and brings comfort. In other words, everyone uses their imagination; everyone, at times, creates some fiction, in order to protect and maintain their belief and consequently their reality. It thus becomes clear that Dostoevsky not only created his pastiche on the *Quixote* as a creative exercise in the imitation of a text he greatly admired, but also to expand upon:

> […] those aspects of the Cervantine image which were necessary for him in the development of his own considerations regarding the relationship between fantasy and reality in art, as much as in the reinforcement of some of his own […] views.[314]

Dostoevsky's allegorical passage and its analysis make up the bulk of 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie', but there are several other observations within the essay—placed after the pastiche and before the analysis—which shed further light on his positive and predominantly Romantic interpretation of the *Quixote*. If creating an allegory in which Don Quijote is the main character were not sufficiently indicative of Dostoevsky's admiration for Cervantes' novel, it could not be made clearer than in his comment: 'Oh, this is a great book, not like those written nowadays; such books are bestowed upon mankind once every several hundred years' ('О, это книга великая, не такая, какие теперь пишут; такие книги посылаются человечеству по одной в несколько сот лет') (XXVI: 25). But he not only saw it as 'the greatest' ('величайшая') but

[313] Canavaggio, *Don Quijote, del libro al mito*, p. 181.
[314] Bagno, 'Dostoevskii o "Don Kikhote" Servantesa', p. 132.

also ‘the saddest book of all’ (‘самая грустная книга из всех’) (XXVI: 25), an observation in which his Romantic perception of the novel becomes most apparent. His description of the *Quixote*’s depiction of ‘man’s greatest beauty, his greatest purity, chastity, innocence, gentleness, courage and, finally, greatest intelligence’ (‘величайшая красота человека, величайшая чистота его, целомудрие, простодушие, незлобивость, мужество и, наконец, величайший ум’) which are ‘quite often (alas, even too often) reduced to naught’ (‘нередко (увы так часто даже) обращается ни во что’), with no benefit for mankind, is represented in the character of Prince Myshkin in Dostoevsky’s *The Idiot* who, like Don Quijote, possesses all the aforementioned positive qualities, but is unable to put them to good use. In the case of Don Quijote—and, by extension, Prince Myshkin—Dostoevsky explains his failure with the absence of one last gift: ‘*genius*, in order to administer the wealth of these gifts and all their power’ (‘*гения*, чтоб управить всем богатством этих даров и всем могуществом их’) (XXVI: 25). Once more the knight errant serves an allegorical function: while man may possess many positive characteristics, without one final quality—genius—he is unable to unlock the true potential of these gifts for the benefit of humanity.

Dostoevsky focuses mainly on Don Quijote’s character, qualities and beliefs in ‘A Lie is Saved by a Lie’, but he also briefly considers his squire. He draws attention to the paradox that Sancho poses to the reader of the *Quixote*: despite his common sense and prudence, he can also be considered mad for becoming the friend and fellow-traveller ‘of the most insane man on earth’ (‘к самому сумасшедшему человеку в мире’) (XXVI: 25). There can be no correct answer as to why Sancho joins Don Quijote on his journey, or why he possesses such unwavering belief that his master will one day reward him with an island. In a character who otherwise epitomises peasant wisdom, this unshakeable conviction, akin for some to delusion, appears to run parallel with Don Quijote’s steadfast belief that he is a knight errant, and prompts

the barber to exclaim as he and a number of other characters are taking Don Quijote back to the village:

> Do you belong to your master's fraternity as well, Sancho? As God is good, I can see you're going to be keeping him company in his cage, and be enchanted as he is, because of what you've caught of his character and his chivalry!
>
> ¿También vos, Sancho, sois de la cofradía de vuestro amo? ¡Vive el Señor que voy viendo que le habéis de tener compañía en la jaula y que habéis de quedar tan encantado como él, por lo que os toca de su humor y de su caballería! (I.XLVII.438/598)

Although Sancho fervently believes that he will one day be rewarded with an island, he does not, as Dostoevsky states, share or believe his master's fantastic dreams (XXVI: 25). In the episode of the Cave of Montesinos, for example, upon his master's return from the cave, Sancho comments ironically that the latter must be telling the truth, since 'everything that happens to him comes by way of enchantment, maybe what seems to us like an hour seems like three days and nights down there' ('todas las cosas que le han sucedido son por encantamento, quizá lo que a nosotros nos parece un hora debe de parecer allá tres días con sus noches') (II.XXIII.644/900). Although Sancho knows that Don Quijote cannot have been in the cave for much more than an hour, he never doubts that his master truly believes that he has been in the cave for three days—he accepts that he perceives things contrary to reality. Sancho, however, cannot himself believe the adventures that Don Quijote describes as having occurred to him in the cave. But it is not his master's (mis)perception of time or his fantastic meetings with various characters from chivalric literature that cause Sancho to have no doubt that Don Quijote was 'as mad as a hatter' ('loco de todo punto') (II.XXIII.645/902). Rather, it is his recollection of seeing Dulcinea in her 'enchanted' peasant form that Sancho cannot believe, since the squire 'knew the truth about Dulcinea's faked enchantment, he himself having been the enchanter' ('sabía la verdad del fingido encanto de Dulcinea, de quien él había sido el encantador') (II.XXIII.645/901–02)—Sancho having been the one to tell Don Quijote that the peasant before

them was Dulcinea. This 'enchantment' of Dulcinea supports Dostoevsky's assertion that Sancho, despite being 'charmed to the point of tenderness' ('до нежности очарован') by Don Quijote's great heart, nevertheless deceives him and cheats him like a child (XXVI: 25). Although Dostoevsky is correct in suggesting that Sancho follows his master in his whimsical antics without questioning them—not unlike Turgenev's description of Sancho as a representative of the devoted masses—the episode of the 'enchanted' Dulcinea shows that he does not share Don Quijote's beliefs and perceptions, and he cannot believe him when he knows first-hand that what he asserts cannot be true. While he is content to play the role of squire and to allow his master to believe in the romances of chivalry, he clearly sees the distinction between reality and fiction, even when it is blurred for others. This applies even to his seemingly quixotic belief that he will be rewarded with an island. Although this obsession seems for much of the novel a sure sign that Sancho shares at least part of Don Quijote's madness, his being granted the governorship of an 'island' in Part II (as much to the surprise of Don Quijote as to the reader) confirms that he does, in fact, possess common sense. He is not afraid to dream, but all his dreams, Dostoevsky fails to note, are grounded in reality: he only believes in things that, although improbable, could actually happen.

'A Lie is Saved by a Lie' is not only one of the the strongest pieces of evidence of any nineteenth-century Russian writer's admiration of the *Quixote*, but also clearly allows the reader to understand how Dostoevsky interpreted and engaged with Cervantes' novel. His frequent allusions to the 'great book' ('книга великая') leave the reader in little doubt of his reverence of the novel; his description of it as the 'saddest book' ('самая грустная книга') serves as further proof of his predominantly Romantic view of the work and its hero; and his transformation of the enemy forces into sinister creepy crawlies as opposed to marzipan is a clear indication of his Dostoevskian approach to Cervantine ideas. One of the most insightful passages are his descriptions of Don Quijote and, somewhat more surprisingly, Sancho: they

not only demonstrate Dostoevsky's evident fondness towards the characters, but also betray a slight misinterpretation of their relationship with fiction and reality. Unlike Dostoevsky's Don Quijote, who creates a lie to save a doubt he has about the fiction he has read, Cervantes' Don Quijote creates a lie to save a doubt he has about the reality he perceives around him. Furthermore, according to Dostoevsky, Sancho believes that the romances of chivalry are as real as his master does, but he is in fact fully aware that they are fictional, and not once does he question reality. But rather than serving as evidence for Dostoevsky's inaccurate interpretation of Cervantes' novel, as Maldonado de Guevara claims, 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie' instead demonstrates the various possible interpretations that the *Quixote* inspires, with Dostoevsky viewing Don Quijote as even madder, and Sancho as an even more dedicated disciple, than Cervantes intended them to be.

The Idiot

Dostoevsky started working on *The Idiot* late in the summer of 1867 in Geneva. The first of its four parts was published in the January and February 1868 editions of *The Russian Messenger* (*Russky vestnik*), while the final instalment was completed and sent off a year later, in January 1869, during his time in Florence.[315] The first book edition appeared in 1874 with some amendments.[316] It is the work of a writer who, despite loathing the West European environment in which he found himself and longing after his native Russia, continued to admire and embrace its literature. Although Dostoevsky never had recourse, or the desire, to venture to Spain during his European sojourn, the influence of Cervantes on *The Idiot* is irrefutable. In the nineteenth-century Russian literary canon, it is in this novel that the influence of the *Quixote* is perhaps most palpable. Although the Cervantine heritage is not directly traceable in the plot of *The*

[315] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, pp. 134, 139, 145.
[316] Victor Terras, *The Idiot: An Interpretation* (Boston, MA: Twayne Publishers, 1990), p. 19.

Idiot, it is apparent in the nature, outlook and behaviour of its protagonist, Prince Myshkin. As Gratchev summarises, 'Dostoevsky reworks and profoundly re-accentuates the character of Don Quixote' and 'appropriates it on Russian soil and creates a totally unique character—Prince Myshkin'.[317] The Prince may be unique, but he remains unquestionably the progeny of Cervantes' protagonist.

The influence of the *Quixote* on *The Idiot* is evident not only in the novel itself, particularly in the character of Prince Myshkin, but also in Dostoevsky's correspondence during the planning and early writing stages of, and in his preparatory notes for, the novel. The latter reveal that the idea of modelling his protagonist on Don Quijote occurred to the author some way into the development of his plans for the work. Although Prince Myshkin is made to be an epileptic from the first draft—an autobiographical reflection which later resonates with Don Quijote's own madness—it is only in the seventh plan that he 'becomes compassionate, forgiving, humble; he helps the fallen [Nastasya Filippovna] and astounds her with his humility and simplicity; […] He becomes the Idiot of the final version'.[318] This is in stark contrast with the first six plans, in which he was little more than 'cruel, cynical, hating, vengeful', qualities which Dostoevsky would, in his final version, give 'to the world, and more specifically to Rogozhin, Gania, Lebedev'.[319] He becomes a good man in the seventh plan, and in the eighth, as shall be discussed, starts to be compared with Don Quijote.

There are naturally still differences between Don Quijote and Prince Myshkin in this final draft: the former is in his fifties while the latter is in his twenties; the former leaves home to travel around Spain while the latter returns from Switzerland to St Petersburg; the former believes he is a knight errant and perceives everyone and everything around him through the lens of the romances of chivalry, while the latter is bestowed with hyper-perceptivity bordering

[317] Gratchev, *The Polyphonic World of Cervantes and Dostoevsky*, p. xv.
[318] *The Notebooks for the Idiot*, ed. by Edward Wasiolek, trans. by Katharine Strelsky (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 12.
[319] *The Notebooks for the Idiot*, p. 16.

on omniscience, for example in his correct assertion that Rogozhin might marry Nastasya Filippovna, 'and a week later, perhaps, cut her throat' (43) ('а чрез неделю, пожалуй, и зарезал бы ее') (VIII: 32). But Prince Myshkin is not a direct imitation of Cervantes' hero, and such stylistic variations are necessary for a modernised, Russianised, and ultimately Dostoevskian Don Quijote.

Dostoevsky's intentions to create a positive character are first seen in a letter to Apollon Maikov on 12 January 1868, almost half a year after first starting to work on *The Idiot*:

> For a long time one idea has tormented me, but I was afraid to turn it into a novel because it was too difficult and I am not ready for it, even though it is very tempting and I love it. The idea is this: to *depict a completely beautiful figure*. In my opinion there can be nothing more difficult than this, especially nowadays.
>
> Давно уже мучила меня одна мысль, но я боялся из нее сделать роман, потому что мысль слишком трудная и я к ней не приготовлен, хотя мысль вполне соблазнительная и я люблю ее. Идея эта – *изобразить вполне прекрасного человека*. Труднее этого, по-моему, быть ничего не может, в наше время особенно. (XXVIII.ii: 240–41)

On the following day, 13 January 1868, he wrote a letter to his niece, Sofia Alexandrovna Ivanova, in which he elaborated on his previous letter to Maikov. It is here that the reader finds the first allusion to the *Quixote* in relation to *The Idiot*:

> Then about three weeks ago […] I set to work on another novel and started working day and night. The idea for the novel is an old favourite of mine, but it is so difficult that for a long time I did not dare to tackle it, and if I have done so now it was only because I was in a near desperate position. The main idea for the novel is to portray a positively beautiful person. There is nothing more difficult than this in the world, especially nowadays. All writers, not only ours, but even all European ones, who have attempted to depict the *positively* beautiful have always given up because it is an immense task. The beautiful is an ideal, but an ideal which, whether ours or that of civilised Europe, is far from being realised. There is only one positively beautiful figure on earth—Christ—so the appearance of this immeasurably, infinitely beautiful figure is already in itself, of course, an infinite miracle […] I shall mention only that of all the beautiful figures in Christian literature Don Quijote is the most complete. But he is

> beautiful only because he is at the same time comical. Dickens' Pickwick (an infinitely weaker idea than Don Quijote, but nevertheless a tremendous one) is also comical and is successful only for this reason. Compassion appears towards a beautiful man who is ridiculed and who does not know his own worth—that is, sympathy is aroused in the reader. This ability to stimulate compassion is the secret to humour.
>
> Тогда я, недели три тому назад […] принялся за другой роман и стал работать день и ночь. Идея романа – моя старинная и любимая, но до того трудная, что я долго не смел браться за нее, а если взялся теперь, то решительно потому, что был в положении чуть не отчаянном. Главная мысль романа – изобразить положительно прекрасного человека. Труднее этого нет ничего на свете, а особенно теперь. Все писатели, не только наши, но даже все европейские, кто только ни брался, за изображение *положительно* прекрасного, – всегда пасовал. Потому что это задача безмерная. Прекрасное есть идеал, а идеал – ни наш, ни цивилизованной Европы еще далеко не выработался. На свете есть одно только положительно прекрасное лицо – Христос, так что явление этого безмерно, бесконечно прекрасного лица уж конечно есть бесконечное чудо. [...] Упомяну только, что из прекрасных лиц в литературе христианской стоит всего законченнее Дон Кихот. Но он прекрасен единственно потому, что в то же время и смешон. Пиквик Диккенса (бесконечно слабейшая мысль, чем Дон Кихот; но все-таки огромная) тоже смешон и тем только и берет. Является сострадание к осмеянному и не знающему себе цены прекрасному – а, стало быть, является симпатия и в читателе. Это возбуждение сострадания есть тайна юмора. (XXVIII.ii: 251)

Dostoevsky's intention to create a 'positively beautiful' character, together with the difficulty in fulfilling it, is revealed in these letters. But the phenomenon was not unique to Dostoevsky. In a letter of 12 August 1866 to Sofia Nikitenko, Goncharov described his intention for Raisky in his novel *The Precipice* (*Obryv*, 1869) to be a man 'of honest, good and sympathetic character, an idealist of the highest level, fighting for his whole life, seeking truth, finding lies at every step' ('честной, доброй, симпатичной натуры, в высшей степени идеалиста, всю жизнь борющегося, ищущего правды, встречающего ложь на каждом шагу'), but who was 'finally to lose interest and fall into apathy' ('окончательно охлаждающегося и впадающего в апатию'), a transformation seen both in Don Quijote and Prince Myshkin. That Cervantes' hero was on Goncharov's mind during his creative process, just as he was for

Dostoevsky, is seen in the writer's comments later on in the letter on the difficulty of developing Raisky's character:

> Shakespeare created Hamlet, and Cervantes [created] Don Quijote—and these two giants have devoured almost everything comic and tragic in human nature. And we, pygmies, cannot even handle our own ideas, and for that reason we are reduced to only making hints.
>
> Шекспир создал Гамлета — да Сервантес — Дон-Кихота — и эти два гиганта поглотили в себе почти все, что есть комического и трагического в человеческой природе. А мы, пигмеи, не сладим с своими идеями — и оттого у нас есть только намеки.[320]

Despite the challenge facing the novelists, Terras observes that Dostoevsky found some success: 'each of [his] major novels features at least one character like Prince Myshkin of *The Idiot* whose inner world is paradisaically pure.'[321] This is predominantly true of Dostoevsky's later works and characters, such as Bishop Tikhon in *The Possessed* (1872) and Father Zosima and Alexei Karamazov in *The Brothers Karamazov* (1880). Development of the idea can also be observed before *The Idiot*, such as in the character of Sonya in *Crime and Punishment* (1866), who, despite being forced into prostitution to support her family, is imbued with a Christian spirit which leads to Raskolnikov's moral regeneration at the end of the novel. Although Dostoevsky pondered the idea for some time, it was only in *The Idiot* that he decided to focus his attention on the creation and development of a 'positively beautiful' character who would serve as the driving force behind the novel.

The letter to Dostoevsky's niece clarifies his reliance on two sources behind his 'positively beautiful' figure: Christ and Don Quijote. His comment that 'there is only one positively beautiful figure on earth—Christ', suggests his awareness that his own character would, despite his best efforts, not quite be able to rival Christ's moral perfection. It is probably

---

[320] Goncharov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, VIII, p. 366
[321] Terras, *The Idiot*, p. 4.

for this reason that he also considered 'beautiful figures in Christian literature': as Allan Trueblood notes, the name of Don Quijote's alter ego, Alonso Quijano 'The Good', 'might well go into Russian as "prekrasnii" ["beautiful"]'.[322] Dostoevsky's belief in the near Christ-like nature of Don Quijote is in alignment with the Romantic view of Cervantes' hero as a figure of moral beauty, whose quest to right wrongs, succour the poor, and fight on behalf of his love, of his ideal, Dulcinea, is nothing but admirable, an interpretation that comes to the fore on numerous occasions in his *Diary of a Writer*. Because of Dostoevsky's Romantic view, however, he misses a crucial element of Don Quijote's religiosity: its irony. As Charles Presburg points out, Cervantes' hero:

> […] is fully bound up with romances of chivalry, which makes [him] a negative example of secular and pernicious reading. On numerous occasions, the protagonist claims to make a religious vocation of knight-errantry. His devotions to Dulcinea are a blasphemous parody of authentic Christian worship, and he never once attends Mass.[323]

Although Dostoevsky's Romantic and religious approach blinds him to Don Quijote's paradoxically blasphemous religiosity, he still does not call Don Quijote a 'complete' or 'perfect' ('законченный') figure of Christian literature, but rather only 'more complete' or 'more perfect' than all others ('всего законченнее').[324] By making this distinction Dostoevsky demonstrates that he is aware of the gulf between Cervantes' hero and Christ. This is probably due not only to the former's madness, but also to an inherent trait: he is not entirely altruistic. He may endeavour to do good deeds in the name of God, but his aim to win 'incredible fame throughout the universe' ('fama increíble por todo el universo') (I.XXI.173–74/254) contradicts Christ's beliefs and behaviours. This lack of sincere altruism is the main factor keeping Don Quijote away from pure goodness. In the case of Prince Myshkin, it is his doubts.

---

[322] Trueblood, 'Dostoevski and Cervantes', p. 88.
[323] Charles D. Presberg, *Adventures in Paradox: Don Quixote and the Western Tradition* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), p. 202.
[324] In the full translation above this is simplified to 'the most complete'.

He usually sees the good in everyone, like Christ and Don Quijote, but on one occasion, contemplating the character of Rogozhin, he chastises himself for his unchristian thought:

> Did Rogozhin have a weapon made to order… he had… but… was it certain that Rogozhin would kill? The prince shuddered suddenly. 'Is it not a crime, is it not an act of baseness on my part to make such a hypothesis so cynically and openly?' he exclaimed, and a flush of shame suffused his entire face. (267)
>
> Разве у Рогожина по рисунку заказанный инструмент... у него... но... разве решено, что Рогожин убьет?! вздрогнул вдруг князь. «Не преступление ли, не низость ли с моей стороны так цинически-откровенно сделать такое предположение!» — вскричал он, и краска стыда залила разом лицо его. (VIII: 190)

As unchristian as this suspicion may be, it turns out to be justified only several pages later in the novel.

Another even more crucial distinction which Dostoevsky outlines between Christ and Don Quijote is the latter's comicality: he 'is beautiful only because he is at the same time comical'. However, despite using Don Quijote as a source, and despite asserting that his beauty lies in his comicality, 'Dostoevsky did not consciously conceive Myshkin in a humorous light'.[325] There are two reasons why Prince Myshkin cannot avoid being humorous. Firstly, he is based on perhaps the most comical character in world literature—even a Romantic interpretation, although it would downplay Don Quijote's comedic potential, could not negate it entirely. Secondly, following Dostoevsky's comment on Cervantes' hero, if Prince Myshkin is intended to be beautiful, then he must also be, at least to some extent, comical. Furthermore, both are bestowed with enough compassion-evoking moments which he considers 'the secret to humour'.

[325] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, p. 141.

Further allusions to Don Quijote's comicality, as well as the ambiguity regarding that of Prince Myshkin, can be seen in one of Dostoevsky's entries to his notebooks to *The Idiot* dated 21 March 1868:

> How to make the figure of the hero charming to the reader?
> If Don Quixote and Pickwick as virtuous characters are charming to the reader and were successful, then it is because they are comical.
> The hero of the novel, the Prince, if he is not comical, then he has another charming characteristic: he is !innocent!
>
> Чем сделать лицо героя симпатичным читателю?
> Если Дон-Кихот и Пиквик, как добродетельные лица симпатичны читателю и удались, так это тем что они смешны.
> Герой романа Князь если не смешон, то иметь другую симпатичную черту: он !невинен! (IX: 239)

The main idea of the note is similar to that of his letters to Sofia and Maikov. He again mentions the comical nature of Don Quijote and considers this a key reason for his success as a character. His comment that 'the Prince, if he is not comical, then he has another charming characteristic: he is innocent!', repeats the idea that he did not intend to make Prince Myshkin humorous, but rather intended to focus on his 'невинность', which can be translated as 'innocence', 'guilelessness', or even 'virginity'. It also appears to be an attempt to differentiate Prince Myshkin from Don Quijote: the former, the note suggests, is innocent, the latter is not; the latter is comical, the former is not. With his remark Dostoevsky fails to realise, however, that a crucial part of Don Quijote's character—his humour—stems from his innocence, and that a crucial part of Prince Myshkin's character—his innocence—leads to his comedic potential. Here the reader can consider the examples of Don Quijote innocently and humorously mistaking two prostitutes for noblewomen (I.II), or of Prince Myshkin's naïve and amusing pride in replicating the signature of Abbot Pafnuty for the Yepanchin family. It thus becomes

clear that comedy and innocence are not, as Dostoevsky suggests, mutually exclusive, but are rather symbiotic qualities in both protagonists.

It is true, however, that Don Quijote is more overtly comedic than Prince Myshkin, and that Prince Myshkin possesses a greater sense of innocence than Don Quijote. In his very appearance Cervantes' hero provides a source of laughter: he wears armour and a homemade helmet and rides on his scrawny nag. But Prince Myshkin's appearance, albeit somewhat more orthodox, is also not safe from derision. While travelling from Switzerland to St Petersburg in the middle of November, he wears a 'thick sleeveless cloak with an enormous hood, of the kind often used in winter, in such far-off places as Switzerland or northern Italy' (6) ('довольно широкий и толстый плащ без рукавов и с огромным капюшоном, точь-в-точь как употребляют часто дорожные, по зимам, где-нибудь далеко за границей, в Швейцарии или, например, в Северной Италии') (VIII: 6), instead of a fur coat. Rogozhin cannot help but ask him, with a mixture of schadenfreude and mockery: 'Chilly?' (6) ('Зябко?') (VIII: 6). Even when he changes his attire on his return to St Petersburg from Moscow, there is still something not quite right:

> […] all his clothes were different […] were cut too fashionably […] and in addition they were worn by a man who had no interest in such things at all, so that on a close look at the prince, someone rather too fond of a chuckle might perhaps have found something to smile about. (223)
>
> […] всё платье было другое […] слишком уж сшито было по моде […] и, сверх того, на человека, нисколько этим не интересующегося, так что при внимательном взгляде на князя слишком большой охотник посмеяться, может быть, и нашел бы, чему улыбнуться. (VIII: 155)

In these examples the reader also observes a sense of innocence and childlike ignorance, as neither character is aware of how to dress appropriately. Prince Myshkin's innocence is yet more visible when he laughs at the prospect of having to fight a duel for holding back the arm of an unnamed officer about to hit Nastasya Filippovna. By contrast, Don Quijote readily

engages in such duels; however, this is not an indicator of a lack of personal innocence or goodness, but rather a consequence of his belief that he is a knight errant. Furthermore, although he could be considered guilty in his liberation of the galley slaves, his action is completed innocently in the belief that 'there is a God in heaven who does not neglect to punish the wicked and reward the virtuous' ('Dios hay en el cielo, que no se descuida de castigar al malo ni de premiar al bueno') (II.XXII.183/267). He believes that the liberation is morally and religiously right, and from these two perspectives acts as innocently and guilelessly as Prince Myshkin when faced with a duel.

Comedy is so inherent in the *Quixote* and *The Idiot* that it even appears, among a range of other themes and ideas, in Dostoevsky's second reference to Cervantes' novel in a note from 8 September 1868, in which he comments on the Prince's Christ-like nature:

> 'Do you agree, Prince?'
> 'No, I do not agree.'
> Each blade of grass, each step, Christ. The inspired speech of the Prince (Don Quixote and the acorn). 'To the health of the sun'.
>
> — Согласны вы, Князь?
> — Нет, не согласен.
> Всякая травка, всякий шаг, Христос. Вдохновенная речь Князя (Дон-Кихот и желудь). «За здоровье солнца». (IX: 277)

The complete note contains a number of characters in addition to Prince Myshkin—Yevgeny Pavlovich, Ippolit, Ptitsyn and Ganya—and it is therefore not certain whom Dostoevsky pictured asking the Prince the question. But the answer is more important. By containing a reference to both Christ and Don Quijote it suggests once more that Prince Myshkin is a composite of both figures.[326] Yet more revealing is the comment, 'The inspired speech of the Prince (Don Quixote and the acorn)', a reference to Don Quijote's speech on the Golden Age

[326] Wasiolek suggests that 'Each blade of grass, step, Christ', is a continuation of the Prince's speech. *The Notebooks for the Idiot*, p. 236.

which he pronounces while dining with a group of goatherds. The remark highlights a link between the nature of types of speech of Prince Myshkin and of Don Quijote, which are often lengthy, inappropriate, and met with laughter and/or bewilderment. In the case of Don Quijote, his audience, the goatherds, 'listened without uttering a word, bemused and bewildered' ('sin respondelle palabra, embobados y suspensos, le estuvieron escuchando') (I.XI.86/135). The speech and its reception can be compared with Prince Myshkin's discourse on capital punishment in France to General Yepanchin's valet, who 'could not but feel that what was completely appropriate between one man and another was completely inappropriate between a guest and a *manservant*' (23) ('не мог не почувствовать что-то, что совершенно прилично человеку с человеком и совершенно неприлично гостю с *человеком*') (VIII: 18). Just as Don Quijote speaks with the goatherds as equals, so too does Prince Myshkin with the valet. A comparison can also be made to his discourse at the Yepanchin's soirée. Just like Don Quijote and his interactions with the Duke and Duchess, Prince Myshkin reveres the aristocratic guests and fails to notice that 'all this sincerity and nobility, wit and lofty personal dignity were, perhaps, merely a splendid artistic manufacture' ('всё это простосердечие и благородство, остроумие и высокое собственное достоинство есть, может быть, только великолепная художественная выделка') and that '[m]ost of the guests, in spite of their imposing external appearance, were even rather empty people' (622) ('[б]ольшинство гостей состояло даже, несмотря на внушающую наружность, из довольно пустых людей') (VIII: 441). His speech, meanwhile, has been described by Hingley as 'an exuberant onslaught on Roman Catholicism' which 'ends with an appeal for the regeneration of humanity and by the Russian idea, the Russian God and the Russian Christ'.[327] The reactions of all three audiences are similar: Don Quijote's Ovidian rhetoric, his heartfelt praise of the past and his sombre chastisement of 'these detestable times of ours' ('estos nuestros detestables siglos')

[327] Hingley, *Dostoyevsky*, p. 143.

(I.XI.85/135) are met by the goatherds' bewilderment, just as Prince Myshkin's discussion of the death penalty is met with the valet's perplexity, and his passionate discourse, inappropriate in a civilised drawing room, is met with astonishment, indignation, and confusion:

> In the ladies' corner he was being viewed as a madman, and Belokonskaya confessed later that 'one more minute and she would have wanted to run away'. The 'elderly gentlemen' were almost dumbfounded at first […] (637)
>
> В дамском углу смотрели на него как на помешавшегося, а Белоконская призналась потом, что «еще минуту, и она уже хотела спасаться». «Старички» почти потерялись от первого изумления […] (VIII: 453)

Yet more amusing than the audience's reaction to Prince Myshkin's speech is the ensuing chaos that surrounds his breaking of the Yepanchins' Chinese vase. He thus not only shares Don Quijote's tendency for inappropriate harangues, but also a certain element of destructiveness, for example the knight errant's lacerations of the wineskins, which in his somnolence he believes are a giant (I.XXXV). It is also important to note that all of Don Quijote's speeches and destructive behaviour are motivated by his illness—his madness. Similarly, Prince Myshkin's anti-Catholic speech and his shattering of the vase occur in the stage preceding an epileptic fit. Thus, in mentioning Don Quijote's speech on the acorns in his note, a whole plethora of connections between the two protagonists can be made: the inappropriate and therefore comical nature of their speeches; their egalitarianism with the lower classes and their reverence of the aristocracy; the bewildered reactions of their listeners; their destructive tendencies; and their illnesses.

In addition to Dostoevsky's letters and notes, *The Idiot* itself also contains direct references to both the *Quixote* and its eponymous hero which indicate Prince Myshkin's Cervantine heritage. Both occur in the second part of the novel. The first concerns Aglaya Yepanchina's behaviour with a letter received from Prince Myshkin, some three months after his departure to Moscow from St Petersburg:

> […] with a strange, mocking smile she threw the letter into her writing desk. The next day, she took it out and put it into a thick book with a strong binding […] And only a week later she happened to notice what book it was. It was Don Quixote. Aglaya burst into peals of laughter – for no reason that is known. (221)

> […] с насмешливою и странною улыбкой кинула письмо в свой столик. Назавтра опять вынула и заложила в одну толстую, переплетенную в крепкий корешок книгу […] И уж только чрез неделю случилось ей разглядеть, какая была это книга. Это был «Дон-Кихот Ламанчский». Аглая ужасно расхохоталась — неизвестно чему. (VIII: 157)

There can be no doubt that Aglaya's choice of the *Quixote* is purely coincidental: it took her a week to realise the comic irony of placing the letter of a man she considers ridiculous in a novel whose protagonist is widely considered one of the most, if not the most, ridiculous in literature. Holl, meanwhile, suggests that Aglaya's choice of novel may not have been a coincidence:

> Dostoevsky's interest in unconscious motivation […] invites the speculation that Aglaya's choice, at least sub-consciously, was not accidental, i.e., she may subliminally have seen the titles of her books as she quickly reached out to choose one from the shelf, and chose *Don Quixote* on purpose, but without conscious realisation.[328]

Whether coincidental or subliminally intentional, the reference is the first in the novel that explicitly draws the reader's attention to Prince Myshkin's Quijote-like nature. Yet more revealing is the second reference. On the veranda in Lebedev's dacha in Pavlovsk, where Prince Myshkin is staying, young Kolya mocks Aglaya by reminding her that:

> A month ago you were looking through *Don Quixote* and exclaimed those words, that there was nothing better than the 'poor knight'. I don't know who you were talking about then: Don Quixote or Yevgeny Pavlych, or someone else, but you were talking about someone, and it was a long conversation… (288)

[328] Holl, '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel', p. 151.

> Месяц назад вы «Дон-Кихота» перебирали и воскликнули эти слова, что нет лучше «рыцаря бедного». Не знаю, про кого вы тогда говорили: про Дон-Кихота, или про Евгения Павлыча, или еще про одно лицо, но только про кого-то говорили, и разговор шел длинный... (VIII: 205)

Prince Shch. explains that the subject of the 'poor knight' was first raised in a conversation regarding what subject Adelaida, Aglaya's older sister, should paint next, and that the figure stems from 'a strange Russian poem' (289) ('одно странное русское стихотворение') (VIII: 206)—which, as is later revealed, was written by Pushkin. What Kolya does not realise is that the 'poor knight' in this instance is a reference to Prince Myshkin, and the latter thus becomes a composite of Pushkin's serious knight and Cervantes' ridiculous one. Aglaya continues the Myshkin-Quijote-poor knight comparison when she explains, in a tone of concealed mockery at the beginning, that in the present conversation there is no nonsense, just 'the most profound respect' ('глубочайшее уважение'):

> […] because that poem directly portrays a man who is capable of having an ideal, and in the second place, having set himself his ideal, of believing in it, and believing in it, blindly devoting the whole of his life to it. In our time, that doesn't always happen. The poem doesn't actually say what the "poor knight's" ideal is, but it's clear that it's some kind of radiant image, an "image of pure beauty," and the lovesick knight even wears a rosary round his neck instead of a scarf. It's true that there's some kind of obscure, enigmatic device, the letters A.N.B., which he inscribes on his shield…"
>
> 'A.N.D.' Kolya corrected.[329]
>
> 'Well, I say A.N.B., and that's what I meant to say […] Whatever it was, it's clear that by now it was all the same to this "poor knight" who his lady was and what she did. It was enough that he chose her and believed in her 'pure beauty', and then worshipped her for ever; that was its merit, that even if later she became a thief, he would still be bound to believe in her and break a lance for her pure beauty. It seems that the poet wanted to unite in one extreme image the whole enormous concept of medieval chivalrous platonic love in a pure and lofty knight; of course, all that is an ideal. In the 'poor knight' this emotion has reached its ultimate degree, asceticism; it must be admitted that to be capable of such an emotion signifies a great deal and that such emotions leave behind them a deep mark and one that is from one point of view

[329] Although Kolya attempts to correct Aglaya, he is still mistaken. The correct version, in the original poem, is 'A.M.D.', which stands for 'Ave, Mater Dei' ('Hail, Mother of God'). The error is present in various Russian editions of *The Idiot* and preserved in the English translation.

most praiseworthy, not to mention Don Quixote. The ‘poor knight’ is Don Quixote, but a serious, not a comical one. At first I didn’t understand this, and laughed, but now I love the ‘poor knight’, and, more than that, admire his exploits.’

Thus did Aglaya conclude and, looking at her, it was actually hard to know whether she was serious or laughing. (290–91)

[…] потому, что в стихах этих прямо изображен человек, способный иметь идеал, во-вторых, раз поставив себе идеал, поверить ему, а поверив, слепо отдать ему всю свою жизнь. Это не всегда в нашем веке случается. Там, в стихах этих, не сказано, в чем, собственно, состоял идеал «рыцаря бедного», но видно, что это был какой-то светлый образ, «образ чистой красоты», и влюбленный рыцарь вместо шарфа даже четки себе повязал на шею. Правда, есть еще там какой-то темный, недоговоренный девиз, буквы А.Н.Б., которые он начертал на щите своем…

— А.Н.Д., — поправил Коля.

— А я говорю А.Н.Б., и так хочу говорить […] как бы то ни было, а ясное дело, что этому «бедному рыцарю» уже всё равно стало: кто бы ни была и что бы ни сделала его дама. Довольно того, что он ее выбрал и поверил ее «чистой красоте», а затем уже преклонился пред нею навеки; в том-то и заслуга, что если б она потом хоть воровкой была, то он все-таки должен был ей верить и за ее чистую красоту копья ломать. Поэту хотелось, кажется, совокупить в один чрезвычайный образ всё огромное понятие средневековой рыцарской платонической любви какого-нибудь чистого и высокого рыцаря; разумеется, всё это идеал. В «рыцаре же бедном» это чувство дошло уже до последней степени, до аскетизма; надо признаться, что способность к такому чувству много обозначает и что такие чувства оставляют по себе черту глубокую и весьма, с одной стороны, похвальную, не говоря уже о Дон-Кихоте. «Рыцарь бедный» — тот же Дон-Кихот, но только серьезный, а не комический. Я сначала не понимала и смеялась, а теперь люблю «рыцаря бедного», а главное, уважаю его подвиги.

Так кончила Аглая, и, глядя на нее, даже трудно было поверить, серьезно она говорит или смеется. (VIII: 207)

One of the key ideas in this speech is the ‘blind devotion’ of the poor knight, and by extension of Don Quijote and Prince Myshkin. Although the ‘poem doesn’t actually say what the “poor knight’s” ideal is’, Aglaya is aware that it is ‘some kind of radiant image, an “image of pure beauty”’, just as it is with Don Quijote and his ideal: Dulcinea. As this is all a veiled reference to Prince Myshkin, it means that his ideal must also be an ‘image of pure beauty’. Aglaya implies this when she changes the initials inscribed on the knight’s shield from ‘A.M.D.’ (‘Ave,

Mater Dei') to 'A.N.B.', where the replacement of the final two initials with 'N.B.' is a hint towards the ideal to whom she believes Prince Myshkin is devoted: Nastasya Filippovna Barashkova. Later on, when she recites the poem, she makes an even more blatant substitution: 'during her recitation, Aglaya had taken the liberty of altering the letters [*A.M.D.*] to *N.F.B.*' (294) ('во время чтения Аглая позволила себе перементь буквы *A.M.D.* в буквы *Н.Ф.Б.*') (VIII: 209). As Terras suggests:

> The reading by Aglaya of the ballad about the knight who fell in love with the Virgin and died 'silent, sad, bereft of reason' […] with the initials A.M.D. […] replaced by N.F.B. […] advances the plot of the novel as it reveals that Aglaya is jealous of Nastasya Filippovna and foreshadows Myshkin's fate.[330]

By choosing a poem with a religious theme—the poor knight's devotion to the Virgin—Dostoevsky is once more drawing attention to Christ as a source behind the character of Prince Myshkin. By choosing a poem with a knight as its subject, meanwhile, he is also drawing attention to another source for his protagonist: Don Quijote.

Allusions to Don Quijote and comparisons between Pushkin's knight, Cervantes' knight errant, and Dostoevsky's prince, continue throughout the speech. In Aglaya's assertion that 'it's clear that by now it was all the same to this "poor knight" who his lady was and what she did', there is an unequivocal association with Don Quijote and his decision to base Dulcinea on Aldonza Lorenzo. He explains his decision thus: 'for what I want of Dulcinea del Toboso, she is as good as the most exalted princess in the world' ('por lo que yo quiero a Dulcinea del Toboso, tanto vale como la más alta princesa de la tierra') (I.XXV.216/311). It does not matter to him that she is a peasant girl, in the same way that it does not matter to Prince Myshkin that Nastasya Filippovna is scorned by much of society—for example when General Ivolgin calls her a 'shameless "camellia"' (148) ('бесстыдная камелия') (VIII: 107)—for Totsky's

[330] Terras, *The Idiot*, p. 37.

exploitation of her in her youth. The Prince, however, holds the opposite view, and openly declares to her at her birthday soirée: 'Everything about you is perfection' (164) ('В вас всё совершенство') (VIII: 118). Perhaps most surprising about this announcement is the fact that this is only the second time that he has met Nastasya Filippovna, having fallen in love with her the moment he sees her portrait. This is not unlike Don Quijote's choice of Aldonza: he admits to Sancho that 'in the twelve years I have loved her […] I have not seen her as many as four times' ('en doce años que ha que la quiero […] no la he visto cuatro veces') (I.XXV.214/309). As surprising as their choices seem to those gathered at the birthday soirée and to Sancho respectively, Prince Myshkin and Don Quijote are completely devoted to their ideals. The words that Prince Myshkin utters to Nastasya Filippovna contain the same sentiment as those of Don Quijote regarding Dulcinea: 'I love you, [Nastasya Filippovna]. I'll die for you, Nastasya Filippovna… I won't let anyone say a word against you' (192) ('Я вас... Настасья Филипповна... люблю. Я умру за вас, Настасья Филипповна... Я никому не позволю про вас слова сказать') (VIII: 138). In contrast to other members of society, Prince Myshkin 'perceives in Nastasya the perfection of an essential "beauty" that transcends the "fallenness" of her temporal condition'.[331] As with Don Quijote and Dulcinea/Aldonza, it is only the Prince who is able to see the 'true beauty' of his ideal. While society looks down upon Nastasya for her 'fallenness' and Aldonza for her lowly status, it is possible that these two qualities augment the protagonists' devotion to their respective ideals: they see in them a soul that they can spiritually ennoble and/or resurrect. Furthermore, Aglaya is correct in her assertion that the type of love felt by Prince Myshkin is a 'medieval chivalrous platonic love in a pure and lofty knight'. The love he feels for Nastasya Filippovna, in spite of her sheer beauty, is entirely chaste, and is supported by the earlier admission of his virginity to Rogozhin: 'I don't have any experience of women at all' (17) ('я ведь […] даже совсем женщин не знаю') (VIII: 14).

[331] Ziolkowski, *The Sanctification of Don Quixote*, p. 138.

Don Quijote's love for Dulcinea/Aldonza is also nothing but pure. Although the reader is unaware of Alonso Quijano's life before his transformation into Don Quijote, his chastity during his time as a knight errant; his comment to Maritornes about his hand, '[untouched] by that of any woman' ('a quien no ha tocado otra de mujer alguna') (I.XLIII.407/556); and the lack of information about any progeny, all lead the reader to speculate about his virginity.

While Aglaya is correct in her assertion that Prince Myshkin loves Nastasya Filippovna with a chaste love, there is one further important nuance. As he reveals to Rogozhin: 'I don't love her with love, but with pity' (244) ('я ее «не любовью люблю, а жалостью»') (VIII: 173). Don Quijote's love for Dulcinea/Aldonza could be similarly interpreted. While there can be little doubt that his primary reason for choosing Aldonza is simply the need for a figure to whom to dedicate his knightly attention and victories, he could have chosen someone of a higher position, even a woman of the lowest rung of nobility, like himself. Although the main reason Cervantes has Don Quijote choose Aldonza is the comic potential such a choice brings to the text, it can also be considered a result of his general love for all of humanity and the compassion he feels for the lower classes. A similar consideration can be applied to Prince Myshkin: he feels compassion for Nastasya Filippovna, and loves her as the representative, as Turkevich calls it, of 'abused humanity'.[332] It is in the same way that he loves Marie, the consumptive in Switzerland: he feels compassion not only towards her physical plight, but also towards her emotional turmoil at the hands of the villagers for her own 'fallen' status. The main difference between Nastasya Filippovna and Marie, however, is that Prince Myshkin believes that he can save the former from the torments with which she persecutes herself.

In her assessment of the ideal of the 'poor knight', Aglaya fails to realise one crucial difference between both Pushkin's knight and Dostoevsky's prince: the former has only one ideal to whom he directs his love (Mary, mother of God), while Prince Myshkin has two

[332] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 128.

(Nastasya Filippovna and Aglaya herself). Don Quijote, meanwhile, seems to be in an intermediate position: he loves Dulcinea, who is imaginary, but she is based on the real Aldonza Lorenzo—they are simultaneously two different people and one and the same person. Turkevich's suggestion that 'in Myshkin's eyes, Aglaya represents the "elevated concept of Pure Beauty" and Nastasya Filippovna, human potentiality for attaining this beauty',[333] can thus be extrapolated to Don Quijote: in his eyes, Dulcinea represents the 'elevated concept of Pure Beauty', and Aldonza Lorenzo, 'human potentiality for attaining this beauty'. Like Don Quijote, Prince Myshkin is ultimately unable to attain either of his ideals—despite the fact that, in his case, both love him. This suggests not only Prince Myshkin's impotence, comparable with Turgenev's Rudin in his relationship with Natal'ya, but also the untranslatability and unsuitability of his love in the modern world.

Aglaya, concluding her speech in a much more serious tone than the one in which she started, clarifies that the '"poor knight" is Don Quixote, but a serious, not a comical one'. While Prince Myshkin's 'altruistic gestures of mercy', particularly towards Nastasya Filippovna, can be 'regarded as an idiot's follies, just as Don Quijote's combats of mercy were believed to be a lunatic's escapades',[334] Aglaya can only perceive his serious attitude and the strength of the faith of his ideal. Her comment that '[a]t first I didn't understand this, and laughed, but now I love the "poor knight", and, more than that, admire his exploits' is applicable both to Prince Myshkin and Don Quijote: upon first glance or interaction, laughter is the natural response, but upon further interaction and communication they have the potential to evoke admiration. In her praise of Prince Myshkin's, and therefore Don Quijote's, devotion to and exploits in honour of his ideal, she reflects the author's voice for perhaps the only time in the novel: not only does it betray his Romantic view of Don Quijote, but it also contains veiled criticism of the idleness

[333] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 129.
[334] Ibid., p. 129.

of contemporary society and its inability to act with any fervour, conviction, or usefulness. This is an idea which arises time and again in Turgenev's fiction and also in his speech, *Hamlet and Don Quixote*. Although the relationship between Dostoevsky and Turgenev was, in general, acrimonious, it seems that their admiration of Don Quijote's (almost) unwavering faith to his ideal, of his enthusiasm, and of his readiness to act, was their main, if not their only, shared belief.[335]

Further intertextual analysis of *The Idiot* and the *Quixote* reveals three additional significant typological similarities between the protagonists. The first major affinity, which has briefly been alluded to, is the mental states (that is, the respective ailments) of each protagonist. For Don Quijote, it is his madness; for Prince Myshkin, it is his epilepsy.[336] Although the latter's ailment was originally based on Dostoevsky's own epilepsy, it is important to note that it is the only trait to have survived from the coarse and depraved Prince Myshkin of the first draft. The retention of this one characteristic in the final draft—when all others have been abandoned, reallocated, or inverted—together with the numerous references to Don Quijote, suggests that Dostoevsky came to view Prince Myshkin's epilepsy as comparable to the knight errant's madness rather than merely an intentionally autobiographical feature.

While Don Quijote's mental derangement is self-evident—he believes he is a medieval knight errant—Prince Myshkin's requires more clarification: although epilepsy is often superficially regarded a physical illness, it also affects the mind, and the sufferer is often left in a state of drowsiness and confusion after a seizure. As the prince explains to General Yepanchin: '[t]he frequent attacks of his illness had made him a complete idiot (the prince

[335] Dostoevsky returned from exile only several weeks before Turgenev gave his famous speech. According to Joseph Frank, it is 'not likely that he would have missed the occasion. […] Whether or not Dostoevsky was present in the audience, there is no doubt that he thoroughly absorbed the essay, whose ideas left significant traces on his own thinking'. See Joseph Frank, *Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation 1860–1865* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), p. 11.

[336] Prince Myshkin is not Dostoevsky's only epileptic character: consider also Kirillov in *The Possessed* and Smerdyakov in *The Brothers Karamazov*.

actually used the word "idiot"' (33) ('[ч]астые припадки его болезни сделали из него совсем почти идиота [князь так и сказал «идиота»]') (VIII: 25). Don Quijote is considered mad, and therefore ridiculous and even idiotic; Prince Myshkin, meanwhile, is considered an idiot, and therefore ridiculous and even mad.[337] Although Dostoevsky's character is not bestowed with a mental derangement to the same extent as Cervantes' hero, it is nevertheless an integral part of his character configuration and the main trait that unites the two characters.

Their respective ailments make Don Quijote and Prince Myshkin act according to ideas they would not normally possess in a healthy state. In the case of Don Quijote, a sane and healthy man would not, for example, insist on the release of caged lions for him to battle to prove his courage (II.XVII). In the case of Prince Myshkin, convinced that Rogozhin is following his and Nastasya Filippovna's movements, he develops the idea to see once more '"those eyes of earlier on", in order to be finally convinced that he could not fail to encounter them *there*, outside this house' (270) ('«давешние глаза», чтоб окончательно убедиться, что он непременно встретит их *там*, у этого дома') (VIII: 192). Paranoia and the subsequent pursuit of a 'sudden idea' (270) ('внезапная идея') (VIII: 192) are not usual characteristics of the Prince, and he is aware of their origin: 'Yes, his illness was returning, there was no doubt of it; perhaps he would not avoid a fit today. It was because of the fit that all this darkness had fallen, because of the fit that he had the "idea"!' (268) ('Да, болезнь его возвращается, это несомненно; может быть, припадок с ним будет непременно сегодня. Чрез припадок и весь этот мрак, чрез припадок и «идея»!') (VIII: 191). Just as Don Quijote, mad, wants to prove his courage, so too does Prince Myshkin, pre-epileptic fit, want to prove Rogozhin's stalking of him. The speech of both characters is also affected by their ailments: Don Quijote speaks with an archaic loquacity which bemuses the contemporary listener, while

[337] Consider Prince Myshkin's aforementioned speech at the Yepanchin's soirée in which 'he was being viewed as a madman' (637) ('смотрели на него как на помешавшегося') (VIII: 453).

Prince Myshkin speaks with a simplicity that has the same effect. For example, speaking with the valet, his speech is described as 'very simple; but the simpler it was, the more absurd did it become' (23) ('самый простой; но чем он был проще, тем и становился […] нелепее') (VIII: 18). Even though the prince is in full possession of his mental faculties during this conversation, his simplicity, and therefore absurdity, is the result of the 'frequent attacks of his illness' in his youth.

A parallel also arises in the causes of Don Quijote's descent into madness and Prince Myshkin's epileptic fits: a desire to escape from reality. In the case of Cervantes' protagonist, Turkevich explains that 'he lives in a dream world and justifies actual, undeniable fiascos by fantastic explanations involving giants, enchanters, and so forth, or he simply refuses to recognise them as failures'.[338] On a simpler, motivational level, it could even be argued that his original descent into madness stems not from reading too many books of chivalry, but from the ennui of his environment which he strives to escape through his reading. Prince Myshkin, the modernised and Russianised Don Quijote, is unable—unlike Dostoevsky's knight errant in 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie'—to resort to enchanters to sustain him. Instead, he has an epileptic fit at the moments he most wishes to escape reality: just before Rogozhin is about to strike him with a knife, and just after his embarrassment of breaking the vase at the Yepanchins' soirée.

But while Don Quijote is typically considered mad and Prince Myshkin idiotic by their fellow characters, these interpretations, like those of Gogol''s Chichikov, are in fact not so easily defined. In the case of Don Quijote, when he speaks about the romances of chivalry, his language is archaic, high-flown and almost incomprehensible, and there can be little doubt about his madness. When he speaks about other matters, however, his speech seems eloquent, educated and, most importantly, sane. One key example is his extolling the virtues of arms over letters which he does so articulately that he almost convinces his companions at the inn of his

[338] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 127.

sanity: 'Don Quixote was developing his arguments in such an orderly and lucid way that for the time being none of those listening to him could believe that he was a madman' ('De tal manera y por tan buenos términos iba prosiguiendo en su plática don Quijote, que obligó a que por entonces ninguno de los que escuchándole estaban le tuviese por loco') (I.XXXVII.355/393). A similar paradox occurs in Dostoevsky's novel, but with idiocy as opposed to madness. The theme stretches throughout the course of the novel, from Ganya's exclamation in Part I—'And where did I get the notion earlier that you're an idiot? You notice things that others would never notice' (141) ('И с чего я взял давеча, что вы идиот! Вы замечаете то, чего другие никогда не заметят') (VIII: 102)—through to Yevgeny Pavlovich's comment in Part IV:

> I do not agree, and am even indignant, when anyone—oh, whoever it may be—calls you an idiot; you are too intelligent for such an appellation; but you are strange enough not to be like everyone else, you will admit. (675–76)
>
> Я не согласен, и даже в негодовании, когда вас, — ну там кто-нибудь, — называют идиотом; вы слишком умны для такого названия; но вы и настолько странны, чтобы не быть, как все люди, согласитесь сами. (VIII: 481)

As Peace observes, there is scarcely a character 'who at some stage in the novel does not brand [Prince Myshkin] as an idiot'; however, one by one they are 'forced to the realisation that he has an intelligence which no idiot could possibly possess'.[339] In this way the paradox of the intelligent idiot is presented throughout *The Idiot,* just as the paradox of the sane madman is presented throughout the *Quixote*.

The second significant typological similarity is the heroes' desire to help others but failure to do so—a key trait present in a number of Turgenev's protagonists. Both have the potential to make a positive impact but are ultimately ineffectual. Their names are suggestive

[339] Richard A. Peace, *Dostoyevsky: An Examination of the Major Novels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), p. 60.

of this contradiction. 'Lev Nikolayevich Myshkin', for example, suggests the ferocity and strength of a lion ('лев' = 'lev'), but the ineffectiveness of a small mouse ('мышка' = 'myshka').[340] In the case of Don Quijote, while his title 'Don' and later moniker, 'Knight of the Lions', suggest bravery and potential, in reality he possesses little of the former (despite his best attempts to prove otherwise, as in the scene with the lions), and even less of the latter. 'Quijote', meanwhile, means 'thigh armour'—not particularly representative of valour and potential—while 'de la Mancha' refers not only to a place in Spain, but also to a 'stain' ('mancha'). Both characters are not, however, simply ineffectual, like Turgenev's protagonists, but inadvertently and naively make matters significantly worse. As has been seen, in the *Quixote* this is most apparent in the hero's failed succour of Andrés from his master's beatings (I.IV; I.XXXI).[341] In *The Idiot,* Dostoevsky intended to make his redeemed, final Prince Myshkin a positive influence on other characters. As he explains in a note:

> He restores Nastasya Filippovna and influences Rogozhin. He leads Aglaya towards human goodness, and leads the General's wife almost to madness in her attachment to the Prince and her adoration of him.
>
> The strong influence on Rogozhin and on his re-education […]
>
> Adelaida – unspoken love.
>
> Он восстановляет Н<астасью> Ф<илипповну> и действует влиянием на Рогожина. Доводит Аглаю до человечности, Генеральшу до безумия доводит в привязанности к Князю и обожании его.
>
> Сильнее действие на Рогожина и на перевоспитание его […]
>
> Аделаида – немая любовь. (IX: 252)

The note seems to contain echoes of Don Quijote who, despite inadvertently causing Andrés more affliction, nevertheless brings light and happiness to many of those whom he encounters. This is particularly the case for Sancho, whose tears while beseeching his master not to pass away at the end of the novel (II.XXIV) define a character whose life has been greatly touched

[340] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 126.
[341] See pp. 166–68, 184–85.

by Cervantes' hero. Dostoevsky does not quite achieve this level of success with Prince Myshkin, however, despite the positive intentions and qualities he bestows upon him. As Murray Krieger concludes, it is the novel's protagonist 'who continually drove Nastasya into Rogozhin's murderous hands and who at the same time whipped Rogozhin into the frenzy needed to turn homicidal'. As for Aglaya, 'Myshkin has destroyed her, has converted her childlike idealism into fraudulent and decadent romanticism, and has brought her incipient demonism into the open'.[342] Succumbing to nihilism, she marries a swindling Polish count and converts to Catholicism—a demise possibly of equal severity, in the eyes of the anti-nihilist and Russian Orthodox Dostoevsky, to Rogozhin's murder of Nastasya Filippovna.[343]

Prince Myshkin is not the first character in Russian literature who is actively based on Don Quijote and who, despite his best intentions, inadvertently brings death and destruction to those he strives to help. The first clear borrowing of the character trait first appears in Prince Odoevsky's incomplete 1838 dramatic poem, 'Segeliel, or Don Quixote of the Nineteenth Century' ('Segeliel, ili Don-Kikhot XIX stoletiya').[344] The poem concerns Segeliel, a fallen angel who accompanies Lucifer in his expulsion from Paradise, and whose overwhelming sense of compassion and hope for the latter's repentance lead to his banishment to earth. Like Don Quijote he strives to eliminate evil and to help others, but his first attempt ends in disaster: in indicating to a young shepherd the path to retrieve his lost animals, he fails to realise that there is quicksand in the way, which causes the deaths of both the shepherd and his father who attempts to save him. Turkevich's observation that Odoevsky, like Cervantes, was 'attracted by the character of the dreamer, a crusader in conflict with society' and 'interested in

[342] Murray Krieger, *The Tragic Vision: Variations on a Theme in Literary Interpretation* (New York: Hold, Reinhart and Winston, 1960), p. 219.
[343] Prince Myshkin later reflects the voice of Dostoevsky when he says that 'Catholicism is the same thing as an unchristian faith!' (633) ('Католичество — всё равно что вера нехристианская!') (VIII: 450).
[344] The originally published fragments of the poem have been unavailable to the present writer. The most comprehensive account of the work can be found in P. N. Sakulin, *Iz istorii russkogo idealizma: kniaz' V. F. Odoevskii, myslitel'-pisatel'*, 2 vols (Moscow: Izd. M. i S. Sabashnikovykh, 1913), II, 51–68.

representing idealism co-existent with reality'[345] is also applicable to Dostoevsky. Given Odoevsky's prominence among nineteenth-century Russian literary, philosophical and circles—as well as his invitation in 1845 for Dostoevsky to visit him[346]—it is probable that Dostoevsky would have been familiar with the poem.

In *The Idiot* the downfall of prominent characters caused by Prince Myshkin's influence alludes back to Dostoevsky's comment in his letter to his niece about the difficulty in portraying a 'positively beautiful person'. His notebook entry, 'Who is he? A terrible villain or a mysterious ideal?' ('Кто он? Страшный злодей или таинственный идеал?') (IX: 195), reflects this constant struggle even while planning his last draft and developing the final version of Prince Myshkin. While Dostoevsky strove to make his character 'positively beautiful,' Krieger's interpretation, with its focus on the depths to which Prince Myshkin has dragged Nastasya Filippovna, Rogozhin and Aglaya, suggests that the Russian author did not succeed in his endeavour. Wasiolek, meanwhile, is somewhat more sympathetic: 'We can grant that the Idiot is ineffectual, that the world he leaves is no better and perhaps worse, that by his nature he places a moral burden upon those about him. We can grant all this and still have our beautiful Idiot.'[347] Whatever interpretation the reader adopts, it is difficult to deny that Prince Myshkin, like Don Quijote, endeavours to bring positive change to those around him. It is in this intention that their ultimate goodness, their ultimate 'beauty', is manifested. Any negative consequences are merely the result, generally, of their ineffectiveness, and, more specifically, of their inappropriateness in certain situations, and serve as an extension of the gulf between each protagonist and Christ.

The third and final point of comparison (at the same time a point of convergence and divergence between the *Quixote* and *The Idiot*) concerns the endings of the novels.

[345] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 31.
[346] Letter of 16 November 1845, from Dostoevsky to his brother Mikhail (XXVIII.i: 115).
[347] *The Notebooks for the Idiot*, p. 15.

Superficially they are very different: Don Quijote regains his sanity, while Prince Myshkin descends into a complete state of idiocy; Don Quijote is taken back to his home in a village in La Mancha, while Prince Myshkin is taken away from his homeland to a clinic in Switzerland; Don Quijote dies, while Prince Myshkin lives. The main similarity lies in the fact that Dostoevsky's hero, having lost all his mental capacity, suffers a fate that is akin to death: permanently mentally deranged, he no longer lives in a way that is of benefit either to himself or to others. An affinity lies in the reasons behind each character's demise: their idealism 'cannot withstand the battering of reality'.[348] Don Quijote's death is the culmination of a disillusionment that begins with his inability to see Dulcinea in the coarse peasant girl (II.X) and ends with his defeat at the hands of the Knight of the White Moon (II.LXIV). Prince Myshkin's mental 'death', meanwhile, is the culmination of a disillusionment that begins with Nastasya Filippovna's rejection of him for Rogozhin and ends with the latter's murder of her. For both, the final blow is the realisation of their failure: Don Quijote fails in his quest to restore chivalry to the world and to make it a better place; Prince Myshkin fails in his quest to restore beauty to the world, which he hoped to do by leading Nastasya Filippovna and Rogozhin out of their quagmire and down the path of virtue. Both characters spend the novel striving towards their ideal, towards the bettering of humankind; when their dream is wrenched from them, they have nothing left to live for, and as a result suffer either physical or mental death. The key difference lies in their legacy: Don Quijote has positively touched those he cared about, particularly his loyal disciple, Sancho; Prince Myshkin, meanwhile, has led those he cared about—Nastasya Filippovna, Rogozhin and Aglaya—to their demise.

As this chapter demonstrates, there can be little doubt that Dostoevsky was greatly inspired by Cervantes' *Quixote*. The evidence can be found throughout the Russian author's *oeuvre*, from direct references to the *Quixote* and its protagonist in his letters and notebooks,

[348] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 129.

Diary of a Writer and *The Idiot*, to intertextual and typological affinities found in his fiction. In this first category (paraliterature), the reader finds references that demonstrate that the *Quixote* was not only on Dostoevsky's mind during his creation of *The Idiot*, but also in two other fictional works (*The Possessed* and *A Raw Youth*) and in his discursive *Diary of a Writer*, in which he compares European royalists and Russian politicians to Cervantes' knight errant, and even creates his own brief imitation of the novel. In the second category (fiction), the reader finds intertextual evidence that demonstrates that Don Quijote was not just a passing thought for Dostoevsky while planning and creating *The Idiot*, but became reincarnated in Prince Myshkin: they are both nearly 'completely beautiful' characters, but possess the occasional flaw; they evoke compassion; they are, to differing extents, both comical and innocent; they are socially unaware, demonstrate their lack of social boundaries in their inappropriate speech and their egalitarianism with the lower classes, and are ultimately out of place in the societies in which they find themselves; their love is akin to faith and is fuelled by compassion; their appearance is ridiculous; they are both ill, and their illnesses present paradoxes (mad/sane; idiot/intelligent); and the loss of their idealism leads to their demise.

The aims of this chapter have been twofold: the first, to demonstrate that Cervantes and his *Quixote* played a significant role in Dostoevsky's literary career, and to assess its scope; the second, to explore *how* Dostoevsky received and interpreted Cervantes' hero, and how this is manifested in his works. Even though Dostoevsky is widely regarded as a Realist writer, his view of Don Quijote resonates for the most part with the Romantic perspective. Although the Romantic movement generally subsided in Russia in the 1830s, the outlook was retained by proponents of Slavophilism, which 'united a Romantic belief in Russia's superiority to Europe with an ultra-conservative admiration for the Orthodox Church'.[349] It is true that Dostoevsky

[349] Richard Freeborn, 'Introduction' to *Home of the Gentry*, by I. S. Turgenev (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), pp. 7–16 (p. 9).

admitted that Don Quijote was a comical figure, but he never focuses on his comicality. His attention is instead drawn towards his admirable, Romantic traits, particularly his steadfast devotion to his ideal—a theme which Turgenev also focuses on in his speech, *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, presented seven years before Dostoevsky started working on *The Idiot*. It remains paradoxical to consider, however, that, of all the nineteenth-century Russian writers, it is perhaps Dostoevsky—the fervent Slavophile who viewed western Europe with contempt and who showed no interest in Spanish culture—who most greatly admired and was most visibly influenced by the *Quixote* in the creation of both his essays and fiction.

CONCLUSION

There can be little doubt concerning the popularity of Cervantes in nineteenth-century Russia. Following the introduction of the *Quixote* into Russia during the reign of Peter the Great, there appeared a large number of translations and adaptations of the Spanish novel between 1769 and the turn of the twentieth century. But while the popularity of Cervantes' masterpiece is to be expected given its universal acclaim, somewhat more surprising is the wide awareness of his other works. This is particularly the case for the *Exemplary Tales*: during the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries various Russian translations of individual texts from the collection appeared, the first of which ('The Two Damsels') was published in 1763, five years before the first Russian adaptation of the *Quixote*. Furthermore, Pushkin and Gogol''s allusions to certain stories, as well as to the collection as a whole, serve as further evidence for their renown at the time.

The rise in interest in Cervantes in early nineteenth-century Russia coincided both with a general increase in fascination towards Western European, and particularly Spanish, culture, together with a desire among many writers to create a national prose literature. Writers like Pushkin and Gogol' not only built on the prose foundations of eighteenth-century writers like Chulkov, Fyodor Emin and Matvei Komarov,[350] but also turned to European sources, like Cervantes' works, to help develop their *oeuvres*—and, by extension, the Russian novel tradition. Because of their focus on literary experimentation and narrative development, Pushkin and Gogol' relied mostly on the various technical devices and features popularised by Cervantes in the creation of their literature. The most apparent among these was their use of parody in their reworking of various sources in order to create something new—a device which runs throughout the core of the *Quixote*. Others include framed narration, multivoicedness, the

[350] David Gasperetti, *The Rise of the Russian Novel: Carnival, Stylization, and Mockery of the West* (DeKalb, GA: Northern Illinois University Press, 1998). The entire monograph focuses on these three authors.

quixotic principle and, in the case of Gogol', the road chronotope. Given that these devices are common in world literature, and particularly in the embryonic stages of a nation's prose literature, it cannot be said that these features are a direct borrowing from Cervantes. However, given Pushkin and Gogol''s familiarity with the *Quixote* and some of Cervantes' *Tales*, it is probable that both authors would have appreciated the Spaniard's manipulation of such devices. Much the same can be said of the presence in their works of various themes prominent in Cervantes' *oeuvre*, such as gypsy life in Pushkin's *The Gypsies* and Cervantes' 'The Little Gypsy Girl', or madness in Gogol''s 'Diary of a Madman' and Cervantes' 'Dialogue of the Dogs' and, of course, *Don Quixote*. While such themes were common in literature, the abundance of overlapping ideas and motifs in these works suggests a more direct response to Cervantes in their narrative endeavours.

Despite the focus on narrative devices and features, early nineteenth-century writers also considered the nature of Don Quijote and created characters based on their respective interpretations of Cervantes' knight errant. In Pushkin's 'The Captain's Daughter' Shvabrin compares Grinev to Cervantes' hero, while in Gogol''s *Dead Souls* Kostanzhoglo does the same with Koshkaryov. But during this period such considerations and typological borrowings were generally minimal, and even here they are reserved to drafts and do not feature in the final versions of the texts. While attention during the first half of the nineteenth century was directed more towards the development of prose forms (consider Pushkin and Gogol''s narrative poems, short story collections, 'novels in verse' and 'poemas' in prose) and less towards the character of Don Quijote, this was inverted in the second half of the century following the more secure establishment of the Russian novel tradition by authors such as Goncharov, Turgenev, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. Writers were now more concerned with the nature of the Russian literary hero, and as a result interest in both the *Exemplary Tales* and in Cervantes' creative talent made way for typological considerations of the Spanish protagonist.

Discussion of Don Quijote's character in the second half of the century was so widespread that writers no longer made isolated observations on the subject, but dedicated entire non-fiction pieces to it, such as Turgenev's speech *Hamlet and Don Quixote* and Dostoevsky's essay 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie'. But it also became integral to the development of their fictional characters, with Turgenev and Dostoevsky, for example, attempting to include elements of the knight errant's nature in their own protagonists, namely Rudin and Prince Myshkin. Neither is a pure Don Quijote figure, however: Rudin is also a Hamlet (albeit by accident), while Prince Myshkin is also a Christ-like figure. But rather than detracting from the writers' intention of using Don Quijote as a source for their characters, these dual identities are instead representative of the tendencies in both writers' *oeuvres* as a whole.

While the shift in focus from formal and structural devices towards character typology is apparent, trends in attitudes towards the character of Don Quijote are less clear-cut or concrete. It is possible to make some generalisations: Enlightenment readers in the eighteenth century viewed Don Quijote as a humorous but not too serious figure; Romantic readers in the first half of the nineteenth century viewed Cervantes' knight errant as a noble and admirable figure fighting for justice and for his ideals, and frequently spoke of him in a complimentary fashion; and Realist readers (and particularly Westernisers) in the second half of the century viewed him as an impractical eccentric, and occasionally used his name as an insult. But, as the four authors chosen for this study demonstrate, there are exceptions to these rules.

Although both Pushkin and Gogol' reveal their Romantic tendencies in their praise of Cervantes' imagination and literary talent, their attitudes towards Don Quijote differ significantly: Pushkin viewed the knight errant in a typically Romantic fashion as a noble hero worthy of praise, but not immune from derision, while Gogol', in keeping with his own pessimism—and foreshadowing later critics—viewed him as an impractical eccentric. But it is Turgenev's and Dostoevsky's interpretations that offer perhaps the biggest surprise. Although

both writers originally regarded Don Quijote as a risible character (consider Turgenev's 'Belinsky's Message to Dostoevsky' and Dostoevsky's *A Novel in Nine Letters*, written only a year apart, in 1846 and 1847 respectively), they also shifted their perceptions in their maturity to view Cervantes' knight errant as a Romantic hero. While it is not unusual that an author should change his perception of the *Quixote* and its protagonist, considering the wide range of interpretations the novel evokes, what is surprising in this instance is that both writers—despite their acrimonious relationship with one another and their positions very much on opposing ends of the political and ideological spectrum (Turgenev being a liberal Westerner and Dostoevsky a conservative Slavophile)—should have interpreted Don Quijote in the exact same way, first as the object of ridicule and satire and later as an honourable and laudable figure.

In the case of Turgenev it is yet more surprising that, despite his liberal tendencies, he did not view Don Quijote in the same way as did his fellow (albeit more fervent) Westerners, like Herzen, Pisarev and Dobrolyubov. This suggests that, while the ideologies, philosophies and norms of a society can, and often do, have an impact on a reader's perception of a literary work or figure, each interpretation ultimately depends on the individual in question. While these examples demonstrate that there was a general movement away from the ennobled, Romantic view of Don Quijote towards the more sceptical, Realist view of him, there were clear exceptions. Bloom is correct in his assertion that 'no two readers ever seem to read the same *Don Quixote*':[351] even in the case of Turgenev's and Dostoevsky's superficially similar interpretations, a significant discrepancy lies in the former's admiration of the protagonist for his enthusiasm and eagerness to act, and the latter's for his innocence and Christian spirit.

[351] Harold Bloom, 'Cervantes: The Play of the World', in *Cervantes' Don Quixote*, ed. by Harold Bloom (Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House Publishers, 2001), pp. 145–60 (p. 146).

As has been mentioned, the Enlightenment tendency towards viewing Don Quijote as a comical figure shifted in the nineteenth century: it was now common for Russian readers and writers to downplay the comedic aspect of Cervantes' novel and hero and focus instead on more serious interpretations, whether idealistically Romantic or pessimistically Realist. While it is true that Pushkin and Gogol' particularly use humour in their own works, there is no indication in their references to suggest that they viewed Cervantes' novel as predominantly a funny work. In the second half of the century, although Turgenev and Dostoevsky acknowledge the humorous nature of Don Quijote in *Hamlet and Don Quixote* and 'A Lie is Saved by a Lie', in both texts this is only mentioned briefly without much discussion. But despite their acknowledgement of this trait, neither author completely succeeds in imbuing their respective Quijote-based characters with this quality: there is little comedy about Rudin, the superfluous man, while even in the intentionally ridiculous Prince Myshkin Dostoevsky does not quite hit the mark, probably due to the Christ-like aura of the character and/or the crushing darkness at the end of the novel. Given the apparent inability of nineteenth-century Russian writers to grasp fully the humour of the *Quixote* and the comic warmth with which Cervantes imbues his protagonist, it should not be surprising that the trait is not repeated in their protagonists. There is no hero that evokes the same innocent laughter that Don Quijote does, a phenomenon that appears to be intertwined with another tendency across the majority of protagonists of the period, whether they were inspired by Don Quijote or not: none are particularly likeable.

But it was not only Don Quijote's comicality that was, if not considerably misunderstood, then at least significantly downplayed, during the nineteenth century—the same applies to Sancho Panza. As with the protagonist's humorous nature, there are no references or clear allusions to Sancho in the works of Pushkin or Gogol', but they make an appearance in those of Turgenev and Dostoevsky. Once more, however, the observations are relatively superficial, as though acknowledging that Don Quijote's squire plays an integral role

in the novel, but not quite recognising what exactly it is. Turgenev suggests that Sancho is the representative of the masses, devoted to Don Quijote, while Dostoevsky, although correct in his understanding of the character's admiration of his master and his common sense, errs somewhat in his assertion that Sancho shares, at least in part, the knight's madness. Frustratingly, neither writer provides much more information regarding their views. Furthermore, both fail to recognise significant nuances in Sancho's character and, more curiously, in his relationship with his master. Sancho is not quite as devoted to Don Quijote as Turgenev and Dostoevsky seem to think—if he were, then he would probably not leave his master for his governorship of the 'island' (II.XLIV), nor would he pin him down to the ground in frustration (II.LX).[352] Their relationship is not one based, as Turgenev and Dostoevsky suggest, on devotion *per se,* but on friendship. It is not simply one of master and squire, of nobleman and peasant, but of friend and friend. Sancho's friendship towards Don Quijote is completely reciprocated by the knight errant who, although he plays the role of master, nevertheless treats Sancho with patience, respect and fondness, and misses him when he leaves for his governorship (II.XLIV). Turkevich suggests that the 'best explanation for Sancho's lack of success seems to lie in the fact that his prototype was simply not to be encountered in Russian society in the nineteenth century'.[353] This is possible: the Russian peasant, bound to serfdom, did not possess the same spirit of adventure, or the same freedom of speech with his or her masters, as Sancho does with Don Quijote. In this context it should not be surprising that the Russian writer struggled to understand the character and role of Sancho and thereby fail to transpose him onto Russian soil. Although Turgenev attempted to do so in Rudin's comparison of himself and Basistov with Don Quijote and Sancho, this endeavour fails for two reasons: neither Russian character is particularly likeable and, despite Basistov's fondness for Rudin,

[352] Edwin Williamson, 'The Power-Struggle between Don Quixote and Sancho: Four Crises in the Development of the Narrative', *Bulletin of Spanish Studies,* 84.7 (2007), 837–58.
[353] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 224.

the protagonist makes clear his disregard for the tutor throughout the novel. Gogol' found more success with Petrushka and Selifan who, if not particularly likeable, are at least somewhat comical, and are not afraid to disrespect their master on occasion with humorous effect. A glimpse of Don Quijote's reciprocity of Sancho's friendship could also be seen in Prince Myshkin's interaction with the Yepanchins' valet. However, although he speaks with him on equal terms, a Don Quijote-Sancho relationship cannot be suggested here, not only because the valet never reappears in the work, but also because he serves the Yepanchins, not Prince Myshkin.

Even scarcer than considerations of Don Quijote's humour or of Sancho's character are those of Dulcinea. Although Pushkin alludes to Don Quijote's beloved in Grinev's love for and protection of Masha Mironova, and even in Onegin's eventual love towards the unattainable Tat'yana, there are no direct references. In Gogol''s works there is an absence of even veiled references, representative of the general lack of positive and/or strong female characters throughout his *oeuvre*. Once more Turgenev and Dostoevsky refer to Dulcinea more than their predecessors, but their ideas are underdeveloped: they correctly assert Don Quijote's chaste love for the imaginary Dulcinea, but refer to her only briefly in a Romantic fashion as the embodiment of his wider faith and ideals, of which she is but a part. With the possible exception of Prince Myshkin's chaste and idealistic love for Aglaya and Nastas'ya Filippovna, there is little to suggest the presence of Dulcinea in the nineteenth-century Russian novel. But there is one related trend that appears in Russian prose literature of the century which seems to be a distant echo of the *Quixote*: like Don Quijote, very few protagonists (and, indeed, none of those discussed in this study) successfully win the women of their ideals. Just as Cervantes makes Dulcinea unavailable to Don Quijote, so too do Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky make their heroines unavailable to their male protagonists.

It would be during the Russian Symbolist movement, at the start of the twentieth century, that considerations of Dulcinea would briefly gain momentum. During this time she was no longer considered merely an abstract ideal, but often a tangible character. The image of Don Quijote appears on a number of occasions in the *oeuvre* of Symbolist poet Fyodor Sologub, who, according to Turkevich, frequently draws on the 'transformation of Aldonza into Dulcinea to express his own credo.' She explains that for Sologub Dulcinea is 'the symbol of Beauty for whom man searches […] He searches for her in the earthly realm and what he mistakes for Dulcinea turns out to be a common Aldonza'.[354] The dichotomy is touched upon in a number of his works, such as his drama *The Triumph of Death* (*Pobeda smerti,* c. 1907), in whose prologue Aldonza and Dulcinea appear as characters, and his essay 'The Demons of Poets' ('Demony poetov', 1907), in which he describes Don Quijote as a lyrical poet who understands the need to ennoble the ordinary Aldonza by transforming her into Dulcinea. But his discussion of the knight errant's beloved is perhaps most striking in his untitled 1922 poem, often referred to by its opening line, 'Don Quijote does not choose his paths…' ('Дон-Кихот путей не выбирает...'). Here the idea of the transformation of Aldonza into Dulcinea is removed, and focus rests on an apparently real Dulcinea. In her belief that Don Quijote has been wounded and will not recover, Dulcinea 'tasted eternal sleep' ('вкусила вечный сон'). While doubt, disillusionment and defeat eventually cause Cervantes' Don Quijote to return to sanity and forget his madness-induced love for Dulcinea, Sologub's knight errant never strays from his convictions—not even, apparently, when the source of his faith has been wrenched from him. When he follows her coffin, the poet cries 'What do mockery and abuse matter to him!' ('Что ему глумленья и хула!').[355] Despite the ridicule he faces, he never falls into doubt, and remains forever a knight devoted to his ideal.

[354] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 179.
[355] Fedor Sologub, *Stikhotvoreniia* (St Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000), p. 465.

Another creative reworking of the ending of the *Quixote*, particularly regarding Don Quijote's fate and his attitude towards Dulcinea, appears in perhaps the most famous Cervantes-inspired Russian work of the twentieth century: Mikhail Bulgakov's 1936 dramatic adaptation of the novel. As was common in theatrical reworkings of famous novels in the Soviet period, although Bulgakov uses the *Quixote* as his source, he does not hesitate to take creative liberties.[356] Given the need to condense Cervantes' novel into a play, there is little surprise that so many scenes and characters should have been cut or reduced. However, there are two key characters who take on a greater role: Aldonza and Sansón Carrasco. In the case of Aldonza, who never physically appears in Cervantes' novel, she appears on stage twice in Bulgakov's play. This is in keeping with the early twentieth-century tendency of expanding Aldonza's role in order to highlight the discrepancy between her real status and Dulcinea's imaginary and idealised one. In the case of Sansón Carrasco, the expansion of his character is twofold. The first example of this can be seen in the romantic relationship that Bulgakov creates between him and Don Quijote's niece Antonia, which Peter Doyle suggests was probably created 'as a contrast to Don Quixote's illusory love for Dulcinea […] motivated by the theatrical needs of the dramatization and as being in keeping with the spirit of Cervantes'.[357] The second example is seen in the nature of his defeat of Don Quijote. In Bulgakov's version this occurs at the ducal palace. As Margarita Marinova suggests, when Don Quijote clashes with the educated and upper classes he begins 'to lose control over his identity'. On a more symbolic level, 'the relationship between Carrasco and Don Quixote introduces a theme of vital importance to the author of *The Master and Margarita*: the betrayal of a fellow

[356] Anatoly Lunacharsky and Georgy Chulkov similarly take numerous creative liberties in their adaptations of Cervantes' novel for the stage. In his 1922 adaptation Lunacharsky uses the themes in the *Quixote* for his own portrayal of the Russian social revolution and interprets Cervantes' hero as a symbol of the intelligentsia, while in Chulkov's 1935 version he focuses on social equality and contrasts the ethical and philosophical outlook of the hero with the rationalism of Sansón Carrasco. For more discussion of these two plays, see Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, pp. 196–97.

[357] Peter Doyle, 'Bulgakov and Cervantes', *The Modern Language Review*, 78.4 (1983), 869–77 (p. 871).

intellectual'. That said, it is worth nothing that Sansón Carrasco defeats Don Quijote not out of revenge, as he does in Cervantes' *Don Quixote,* but out of compassion: he conquers him because he does not want him to remain a source of entertainment for the Duke and Duchess.[358]

Bulgakov's adaptation of the *Quixote* is commonly considered among the most tragic for its 'atmosphere of melancholic pessimism' which becomes most striking at the end of the play.[359] There is clear pathos in Cervantes' ending: Don Quijote is defeated by Sansón Carrasco and agrees to return to his village for a year, but he still refuses to deny his love for Dulcinea; he only does so later when he finally regains his sanity having returned home. But Bulgakov takes this pathos a step further. In his adaptation, Don Quijote also refuses to deny that Dulcinea is the most beautiful maiden in the world, but this is only until he becomes frightened by the 'cold and cruel gaze' ('взор холоден и жесток') of the Knight of the White Moon. Despite Sancho beseeching his master to cling on to his ideal, his fear of Sansón Carrasco causes him to reconsider: 'I have suddenly come to think that Dulcinea does not exist on earth at all! No, she does not exist!' ('мне вдруг стало казаться, что Дульсинеи вовсе нет на свете! Да, ее нет!').[360] That Sansón Carrasco's threatening glance was enough for Don Quijote to admit the non-existence of his beloved reflects two ideas. The first is Bulgakov's Romantic downplaying of Don Quijote's madness throughout his adaptation—for example, while Cervantes' Sancho comments on Don Quijote's sanity, Bulgakov's focuses more on his master's well-being.[361] The second is Bulgakov's own personal struggles. The difficulty with which his knight errant accepts the non-existence of his beloved, of his ideal, reflects the writer's own disillusionment with literary society: he developed the play while struggling with not being able to write as he

[358] Margarita Marinova, 'Introduction' to *Don Kikhot: A Dramatic Adaptation*, by Mikhail Bulgakov, ed. and trans. by Margarita Marinova and Scott Pollard, pp. ix- xxxvii (New York, NY: The Modern Language Association of America, 2014), pp. xxvii, xxxi.
[359] J. A. E. Curtis, *Bulgakov's Last Decade: The Writer as a Hero* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 196.
[360] Mikhail Bulgakov, *Sobranie sochinenii v desiati tomakh*, ed. by Viktor Petelin, 10 vols (Moscow: Golos, 1995–2000), VIII, 239.
[361] Marinova, 'Introduction', p. xxv.

pleased, aware that his literary career was already at an end. As Marinova suggests, the end of Bulgakov's play shows that 'the true artist'—that is, any man with imagination—'can never find a place for himself in Soviet life. Death is the only way out […] A life of normalcy has nothing of value to offer the artist.'[362] In this light, Julie Curtis is correct in her assessment of the play as 'a tragedy depicting the failure of idealism',[363] with its ending serving to highlight the playwright's disillusionment in a society where conformity is rewarded and imagination, individuality and idealism are punished.

Although the *Quixote* was still enjoyed in the twentieth century, responses to the novel and its author were far less widespread in Russian literature than during the preceding century. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, the nineteenth century was the Golden Age of Russian literature: writers were zealously experimenting with form, genre and character types, and looked towards West European sources with both curiosity and admiration in their quest to develop their own national literature. Secondly, the twentieth century was dominated by the Soviet regime which, after a short period of relative literary openness, imposed Socialist Realism as state policy on writers from 1934. This is reflected in the aforementioned works of Sologub and Bulgakov: the former was free to draw extensively on the *Quixote* in his creative works, while the latter was restricted to a dramatic adaptation of the novel. It is true that Bulgakov mentions the *Quixote* in his *Master and Margarita*, but these references are in passing and reveal nothing of his reception of the novel or its impact on his masterpiece. However, while fictional responses to Cervantes declined during the twentieth century, the reverse is true of literary criticism, and the period welcomed a growing number of serious scholarly works on the Spaniard and his *oeuvre*. As a result, even though Cervantes was not as prominent a source in Russian creative literature in the twentieth century as he was in the

[362] Marinova, 'Introduction', p. xxxi.
[363] Curtis, *Bulgakov's Last Decade*, p. 196.

previous one, Turkevich is correct in her assertion that, 'by the end of the nineteenth century the average Russian knew much more about Cervantes than his grandfather did.'[364]

The twentieth-century tendency to view Don Quijote as a serious, but idealistic figure owes much to the preceding century when Don Quijote ceased being considered little more than a comical character and was transformed into either a Romantic hero devoted to his ideals, or, later, an impractical eccentric struggling to leave a positive mark on the world. Even though not all Russian writers were particularly fond of the character Cervantes created (such as Gogol', and plenty of other littérateurs particularly in the latter half of the nineteenth century), they nevertheless admired the *Quixote* as a literary masterpiece and respected the talents of its creator, whether for his dexterity in narrative experimentation or for his creation of an intriguing and complex literary type that could be moulded for their own purposes.

In the context of the development of the nineteenth-century Russian prose tradition, Bloom's observation that 'all novels since *Don Quixote* rewrite Cervantes' universal masterpiece, even when they are quite unaware of it', is particularly fitting.[365] Although Cervantes was by no means the only writer to help shape the Russian canon (the reader can easily consider a range of Classical, Western European and native Russian sources in this respect), it is difficult to dispute that the Spaniard left a firm and broad-sweeping mark on the tradition, visible in the various themes, devices and character types that feature across the narrative genres that developed during this period of literary growth in Russia. Pushkin, Gogol', Turgenev and Dostoevsky are not only correct to count Cervantes among the world's greatest and most influential writers, but they are also not exaggerating when they place his name towards the top of their lists of literary pioneers who, having inspired generations of authors, played a key role in the rise of the Russian novel.

---

[364] Turkevich, *Cervantes in Russia*, p. 137.
[365] Harold Bloom, *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (New York. NY: Riverhead Books, 1995), p. 441.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Cervantes

Cervantes, Miguel de, *Don Quijote de La Mancha*, ed. by Francisco Rico, 2 vols (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 2004)

———. *Don Kikhot Lamanchskii*, trans. by Konstantin Masal'skii (St Petersburg: V tip. izd. A. Pliushara, 1838)

———. *Don Quixote*, trans. by John Rutherford (London: Penguin, 2003)

———. *Exemplary Stories*, trans. by Lesley Lipson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

———. *L'ingénieux hidalgo don Quichotte de la Manche*, trans. by Louis Viardot, 2 vols (Paris: J.-J. Dubochet et Compagnie, 1836–37)

———. *Novelas ejemplares*, ed. by Harry Sieber, 2 vols (Madrid: Cátedra, 1994–95)

Pushkin

Pushkin, Alexander Sergeevich, *Pis'ma*, ed. by Lev Borisovich Modzalevskii, 3 vols (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1926)

———. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich, 17 vols (Leningrad: Akademia nauk, 1937–59)

———. *The Queen of Spades and Other Stories*, trans. by Alan Myers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

Gogol'

Gogol', Nikolai Vasilievich, *Dead Souls*, trans. by Robert Maguire (Herts: Wordsworth Classics, 2010)

———. *Hanz Kuechelgarten, Leaving the Theater and Other Works: Early Writings, Essays, Book Reviews and Letters*, trans. by Ronald Meyer (London: The Overlook Press; Duckworth Publishers, 2013).

———. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by Vasilii Vasil'evich Gippius, 14 vols (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1937–52)

Turgenev

Turgenev, Ivan, *First Love and Other Stories*, trans. by Richard Freeborn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

———. *Ivan Tourguéneff d'après sa correspondance avec ses amis français*, ed. by E. Halpérine-Kaminsky (Paris: E. Fasquelle, 1901)

———. *Lettres à Madame Viardot*, ed. by E. Halpérine-Kaminsky (Paris: Charpentier, 1907)

———. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem: v dvadtsati vos'mi tomakh*, ed. by M. P. Alekseev, 28 vols (Sochineniia: 15 vols; Pis'ma: 13 vols) (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960–68)
———. *Rudin*, trans. by Richard Freeborn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975)

Dostoevsky

Dolinin, A. S., ed., 'F. M. Dostoevskii v rabote nad romanom "Podrostok"', *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo*, 77 (1965), entire volume
Dostoevsky, Fyodor, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii: v 30-ti tomakh*, ed. by V. G. Bazanov, 30 vols (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972–90)
———. *The Diary of a Writer*, trans. by Boris Brasol, 2 vols (London: Cassell, 1949)
———. *The Idiot*, trans. by David McDuff (London: Penguin, 2004)
Konshina, E. N., ed., *Zapisnye tetradi F. M. Dostoevskogo* (Moscow: Academia, 1935)
Rozenblium, L. M., 'Neizdannyi Dostoevskii: zapisnye knigi i tetradi 1860–1881 gg', *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo*, 83 (1971), entire volume
Wasiolek, Edward, ed., *The Notebooks for the Idiot*, trans. by Katharine Strelsky (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1967)
———. *The Notebooks for The Possessed*, trans. by Victor Terras (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1968)
———. *The Notebooks for A Raw Youth*, trans. by Victor Terras (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1969)

Secondary materials

Alekseev, Mikhail, *Russkaia kul'tura i romanskii mir*, (Leningrad: Nauka, 1985)
———. 'Turgenev i ispanskie pisateli', *Literaturnyi Kritik*, 11 (1938), 136–44
Annenkov, P. V., 'N. V. Gogol' v Rime letom 1841 goda', in *Gogol' v vospominaniiakh sovremennikov*, ed. by S. Mashinskii (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1952), pp. 230–316
———. *Vospominaniia i kriticheskie ocherki: sobranie statei i zametok, 1849–1868 gg*, 3 vols (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1971)
Ardila, J. A. G, *Cervantes en Inglaterra: el Quijote en los albores de la novela británica* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2006)
———. *Cervantes en Inglaterra: el Quijote y la novela inglesa del siglo XVIII* (Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá, 2014)
———. *The Cervantean Heritage: Reception and Influence of Cervantes in Britain* (London: Legenda, 2009)
Asoyan, A. A., 'Zametki o dantovskikh motivakh u Belinskogo i Gogol'ia', in *Dantovskie chteniia*, ed. by V. P. Gauduk (Moscow: Nauka, 1985), pp. 104–19
Ascunce Arrieta, José Ángel. *Los Quijotes del Quijote: historia de una aventura creativa*. Kassel: Reichenberger, 1997

Auerbach, Erich, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. by Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003)

Austen, Jane. *Emma* (London: Penguin, 2012)

Avalle-Arce, Juan Bautisa, *Don Quijote como forma de vida* (Madrid: Castalia, 1976)

Bagno, V. E. *Dar osobennyi: Khudozhestvennyi perevod v istorii russkoi kul'tury* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2016)

———. *Dorogami 'Don Kikhota'*, (Moscow: Kniga, 1988)

———. 'Dostoevskii o "Don Kikhote" Servantesa', in *Dostoevskii: materialy i issledovaniia*, ed. by V. G. Bazanov, 19 vols (Leningrad: Nauka, 1978–), iii, 126–35

———. 'El Quijote en los borradores de "El Idiota" de Dostoievski', *Anales Cervantinos*, 32 (1994), 265–70

———. *El Quijote vivido por los rusos* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1995)

———. *Rossiia i Ispaniia: obshchaia granitsa* (St Petersburg: Nauka, 2006)

Bakhtin, Mikhail. M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. by Michael Holquist, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981)

———. *Voprosy literatury i estetiki: issledovaniia raznykh let* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1975)

Barrio, José Manuel, and María José Crespo Allué, *La huella de Cervantes y del Quijote en la cultura anglosajon*a (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 2007)

Bayley, John, 'Introduction', in A. S. Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003), pp. ix–xlviii

Belinskii, V. G., *Sobranie sochinenii*, 9 vols (Moscow: Khudozh. lit, 1976–82)

Bethea, David, and Sergei Davydov, 'Pushkin's Life', in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. by Andrew Kahn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 11–25

Bloom, Harold, *A Map of Misreading* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1975)

———. 'Cervantes: The Play of the World', in *Cervantes' Don Quixote*, ed. by Harold Bloom (Philadelphia, PA: Chelsea House Publishers, 2001), pp. 145–60

———. 'Introduction', in Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, trans. by Edith Grossman (London: Vintage, 2005), pp. xxi–xxxv

———. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975)

———. *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (New York, NY: Riverhead Books, 1995)

Boborykin, Petr, *Turgenev doma i za granitsei* (Moscow: Mul'timediynoe izdatel'stvo Strel'bitskogo, 2018)

Bocharov, Sergei Georgievich, 'O kompozitsii "Don-Kikhota"', in *Servantes i vsermirnaia literatura*, ed. by N. I. Balashov and others (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), pp. 86–111

Briggs, A. D. P., 'Fallibility and Perfection in the Works of Alexander Pushkin', in *Problems of Russian Romanticism*, ed. by Robert Reid (Aldershot: Gower, 1986), pp. 25–48

———. 'Introduction', in A. S. Pushkin, *Evgenii Onegin = Eugene Onegin* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2000), pp. vii–xx

———. 'Introduction', in A. S. Pushkin, *Povesti pokoinogo Ivana Petrovicha Belkina = Tales of the Late Ivan Petrovich Belkin* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1991), pp. xi–xxvi

Bron', T. I., 'Ispanskie tsitaty u Turgeneva', in *Turgenevskii sbornik: materialy k polnomu sobraniiu sochinenii i pisem I. S. Turgeneva*, ed. by M. P. Alekseev, 5 vols (Moscow: Nauka, 1964–69), i, pp. 303–12

Bulgakov, Mikhail, *Sobranie sochinenii v desiati tomakh*, ed. by Viktor Petelin, 10 vols (Moscow: Golos, 1995–2000)

Buranok, O. M., 'Russkii Servantes: nachalo osvoeniia', *Zdanie. Ponimanie. Umenie*, 2 (2006), 177–80

Byron, William, *Cervantes: A Biography* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978)

Caballero, Ernesto, *Don Quijote ante el mundo* (Puerto Rico: Inter American University Press, 1979)

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro, *The prodigious magician = El mágico prodigioso*, ed. and trans. by Bruce W. Wardropper (Potomac, MD: Studia Humanitatis, 1982)

Canavaggio, Jean, *Don Quijote, del libro al mito*, trans. by Mauro Armiño (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 2006)

Carnegie, David, and Gary Taylor, eds, *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespere, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Cascardi, Anthony J., *The Bounds of Reason: Cervantes, Dostoevsky, Flaubert* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986)

———. ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Cervantes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Castro, Américo, *An Idea of History: Selected Essays of Américo Castro*, ed. and trans. by Stephen Gilman and Edmund L. King (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1977)

Chernyshevskii, N. G., *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by B. P. Koz'min and others, 16 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1947–53)

Close, Anthony J., 'Sancho Panza: Wise Fool', *The Modern Language Review*, 68, no. 2 (1973), 344–57

———. *The Romantic Approach to 'Don Quixote': A Critical History of the Romantic Tradition in Quixote Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)

Cornell, N., ed., *The Routledge Companion to Russian Literature* (London: Routledge, 2001)

Crooks, Esther Josephine, *The Influence of Cervantes in France in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1931)

Curtis, J. A. E., *Bulgakov's Last Decade: The Writer as a Hero* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)

Danilevskii, N. Y., *Rossiia i Evropa* (St Petersburg: Tip. Brat. Panteleevykh, 1889)

de Grazia, Margreta, and Stanley Wells, eds, *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Debreczeny, Paul, *The Other Pushkin: A Study of Alexander Pushkin's Prose Fiction* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1983)

Derzhavin, K. N., 'Crítica cervantina en Rusia', *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, 94 (1929), 215–38

———. 'Zaniatiia Pushkina ispanskim iazykom', *Slavia*, 13 (1934), 114–20

Djermanovic, Tamara, 'Dostoyevski y Don Quijote: poética y estética de una ilusión', *Anales Cervantinos*, 47 (2015), 9–24

Dobroliubov, N. A., *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by D. B. Bursov and others, 9 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1961–64)

Dolinin, A. S., 'Pushkin and Gogol': On the Question of their Personal Relations', *Soviet Studies in Literature*, 23, nos 3–4 (1987), 117–136

Doyle, Peter, 'Bulgakov and Cervantes', *The Modern Language Review*, 78, no. 4 (1983), 869–77

Dudley, Edward J., *The Endless Text: Don Quixote and the Hermeneutics of Romance* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1997)

Durán, Manuel, and Fay R. Rogg, *Fighting Windmills: Encounters with Don Quixote* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006)

Earle, Peter G., 'In and Out of Time (Cervantes, Dostoevsky, Borges)', *Hispanic Review*, 1 (2003), 1–13

Eckart, Gabriele, and Meg H. Brown, *Shifting Viewpoints: Cervantes in Twentieth-Century and Early Twenty-First-Century Literature Written in German* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013)

Eikhenbaum, Boris, 'How Gogol's "Overcoat" is Made', in *Gogol's Overcoat: An Anthology of Critical Essays*, ed. by Elizabeth Trahan (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1982), pp. 21–36

Elistratova, A. A, *Nikolai Gogol and the West European Novel*, trans. by Christopher English (Moscow: Raduga Publishers, 1984)

Fanger, Donald, *The Creation of Nikolai Gogol* (London: Belknap Press, 1979)

Feijoo, Luis Iglesias, 'Secretos y supercherías en una comedia de Lope de Vega: "El gran duque de Moscovia"', *Hipogrifo*, 5, no. 1 (2017), 277–91

Fernández-Morera, Darío, and Michael Hanke, *Cervantes in the English-Speaking World: New Essays* (Kassel: Reichenberger, 2005)

Finer, Emily, 'Eugene Onegin (Pushkin and Sterne): Translated from the Russian by Emily Finer', *Comparative Critical Studies*, 1, no. 1–2 (2004), 171–93

Forsyth, James, 'Pisarev, Belinsky and Yevgeniy Onegin', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 48, no. 111 (1970), 163–80

Frank, Joseph, *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976)

———. *Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation 1860–1865* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986)

Freeborn, Richard, 'Introduction', in I. S. Turgenev, *Home of the Gentry* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), pp. 7–16

———. 'Introduction', in I. S. Turgenev, *Rudin* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975), pp. 7–23

———. *Turgenev: The Novelist's Novelist: A Study* (London: Oxford University Press, 1960)

Garrard, John, 'Introduction: The Rise of the Novel in Russia', in *The Russian Novel from Pushkin to Pasternak*, ed. by John Garrard (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 1–29

Gasperetti, David, *The Rise of the Russian Novel: Carnival, Stylization, and Mockery of the West* (DeKalb, GA: Northern Illinois University Press, 1998)

Gippius, Vasilii Vasil'evich, *Gogol*, ed. and trans. by Robert Maguire (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1981)

———. *N. V. Gogol' v pis'makh i vospominaniiakh* (Moscow: Federatsiia, 1931)

Goncharov, Ivan, *Sobranie sochinenii*, ed. by A. Rybasov, 8 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1952–55)

Gratchev, Slav N., 'Don Quixote in Russia in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: The Problem of Perception and Interpretation', *South Atlantic Review*, 81, no. 4 (2016), 107–26

———. *The Polyphonic World of Cervantes and Dostoevsky* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2017)

Griffiths, Frederick T., and Stanley J. Rabinowitz, *Novel Epics: Gogol, Dostoevsky, and National Narrative* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990)

Gukasova, A. G., *Boldinskii period v tvorchestve A. S. Pushkina* (Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1973)

Gustafson, Richard F., 'The Suffering Usurper: Gogol's "Diary of a Madman"', *Slavic and East European Journal*, 9 (1965): 268–80

Herzen, Aleksandr, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*, ed. by M. K. Lemke, 22 vols (St Petersburg: Gos. izd-vo, 1919–25)

Hingley, Ronald, *Dostoyevsky: His Life and Work* (London: P. Elek, 1978)

Holl, Bruce T., '"Don Quixote" and the Russian Novel: A Comparative Analysis', unpublished doctoral thesis (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1992)

———. 'Gogol's Captain Kopeikin and Cervantes' Captive Captain: A Case of Metaparody', *Russian Review*, 55, no. 4 (1996), 681–91.

Jauss, Hans Robert, *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982)

Johnson, Carroll B., *Don Quixote: The Quest for Modern Fiction* (Boston, MA: Twayne Publishers, 1990)

Jones, Malcolm V., and Robin Feuer Miller, eds, *The Cambridge Companion to the Classic Russian Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Jones, R. O., *The Golden Age: Prose and Poetry: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Ernest Benn, 1971)

Kahn, Andrew, 'Introduction', in A. S. Pushkin, *The Queen of Spades and Other Stories*, trans. by Alan Myers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. vii–xlviii

Karlinsky, Simon, 'A Hollow Shape: The Philosophical Tales of Prince Vladimir Odoevsky', *Studies in Romanticism*, 5, no. 3 (1966), 169–82

———. *The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992)

Kaspryk, Andrew, 'Gogol's Poprishchin in "The Diary of a Madman"', *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, 29.3–4 (1995), 315–29

Kel'in, F. V., 'Introduction' to Miguel de Cervantes, *Nazidatel'nye novelly*, trans. by B. A. Krzhevskii (Moscow: Academia, 1935), pp. vii–xlvii

Kodjak, Andrej, *Pushkin's I. P. Belkin* (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1979)

Kovalev, V. A., 'O "prikrashennosti" izobrazhenia naroda v "Zapiski okhotnika" I. S. Turgeneva', in *Voprosy izucheniia russkoi literatury XI–XX vekov*, ed. by B. P. Gorodetskii (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1958), pp. 156–67

Krieger, Murray, *The Tragic Vision: Variations on a Theme in Literary Interpretation* (New York, NY: Hold, Reinhart and Winston, 1960)

Lavrov, Petr, ‘I. S. Turgenev i razvitie russkogo obshchestva’, *Vestnik narodnoi voli*, 2 (1884), 69–149

Levin, Harry, *Grounds for Comparison* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972)

Levitt, Marcus, ‘Evgenii Onegin’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. by Andrew Kahn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 41–56

Lindstrom, Thaïs S., *Nikolay Gogol* (New York, NY: Twayne Publishers, 1974)

Liubimova, E. N., ‘Servantes i Turgenev’, in *Servantes i vsemirnaia literatura*, ed. by N. I. Balashov, and others (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), pp. 181–96

L’vov, A, *Gamlet i Don-Kikhot i mnenie o nikh I. S. Turgeneva* (St Petersburg: V tip. L. Demisa, 1862)

Madariaga, Salvador de., *Guía del lector del ‘Quijote’: ensayo psicológico sobre el ‘Quijote’* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1943)

Maguire, Robert, *Exploring Gogol* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994)

———. ed., *Gogol from the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974)

Maikov, L. N., *Rasskazy Nartova o Petre Velikom* (St Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk, 1891)

Maldonado de Guevara, Francisco, ‘Dostoievski y el “Quijote”’, *Anales Cervantinos*, 2 (1953), 367–75

Malkiel, Yakov, ‘Cervantes in Nineteenth-Century Russia’, *Comparative Literature*, 3, no. 4 (1951), 310–29

Mancing, Howard, ‘Don Quixote: Coming to America’, in *Cervantes y su mundo*, ed. by Kurt Reichenberger, and others, 6 vols (Kassel: Reichenberger, 2005), iii, pp. 397–418

Marinova, Margarita, ‘Introduction’ to *Don Kikhot: A Dramatic Adaptation*, by Mikhail Bulgakov, ed. and trans. by Margarita Marinova and Scott Pollard (New York, NY: The Modern Language Association of America, 2014), pp. ix- xxxvii

Márquez Villanueva, Francisco, *Personajes y temas del Quijote* (Madrid: Taurus, 1975)

McKendrick, Melveena, *Cervantes* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1980)

Mirsky, D. S., *A History of Russian Literature: From the Earliest Times to the Death of Dostoyevsky (1881)* (London: G. Routledge, 1927)

Moeller-Sally, Stephen, *Gogol’s Afterlife: The Evolution of a Classic in Imperial and Soviet Russia* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2002)

Monforte Dupret, Roberto, ‘Ecos cervantinos en la obra literaria de N. V. Gógol’, *Esclavistica Complutense*, 7 (2005), 7–18

Montero Díaz, Santiago, ‘Cervantes en Turgenief y Dostoyevsky’, *Revista de Estudios Políticos* (Madrid), 15 (1946), 111–42

Morson, Gary Saul, ‘Parody, History, Metaparody’, in *Rethinking Bakhtin*, ed. by Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1989), pp. 63–86

Murillo, Louis A., *A Critical Introduction to ‘Don Quixote’* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988)

Nabokov, Vladimir, *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse*, 4 vols (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964)

———. ‘Pushkin and Gannibal’, *Encounter*, 19, no. 1 (1962), 11–27

Nelson, Jr., Lowry, ed., *Cervantes: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969)

Pardo, Pedro Javier, 'Tobias Smollett's *Humphry Clinker* and the Cervantine Tradition in Eighteenth-Century England', in *Cervantes in the English Speaking World: New Essays*, ed. by Darío Fernández-Morera and Michael Hanke (Kassel: Reichenberger, 2005), pp. 81–106

Pardo Bazán, Emilia, *La revolución y la novela en Rusia* (Madrid: M. Tello, 1887)

Parr, James A., *Don Quixote: An Anatomy of Subversive Discourse* (Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1988)

Peace, Richard A., *Dostoyevsky: An Examination of the Major Novels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971)

———. 'The Logic of Madness: Gogol''s *Zapiski sumasshedshego*', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, 9 (1976), 28–45

Pisarev, D. I., *Sochineniia D. I. Pisareva: polnoe sobranie v shesti tomakh*, 6 vols (St Petersburg: F. Pavlenkov, 1901)

Portugalov, Mikhail Veniaminovich, *Po Turgenevskim mestam* (Moscow: T-vo V. V. Dumnov, 1924)

———. *Turgeniana: stat'i, ocherki i bibliografiia* (Orel: Orlovskoe otd-nie Gosizdata, 1922)

Predmore, Richard L., *Cervantes* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1973)

———. *The World of 'Don Quixote'* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967)

Presberg, Charles D., *Adventures in Paradox: Don Quixote and the Western Tradition* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001)

Prjevalinsky Ferrer, Olga, 'Las almas muertas de Gogol y Don Quijote', *Cuadernos de literatura (Revista general de las letras)*, 8 (1950), 201–14

Pujals, Esteban, 'Proyección de Cervantes en la literatura rusa', *Revista nacional de educación*, 11, no. 101 (1951), 22–37

Pym, Richard J., *The Gypsies of Early Modern Spain, 1425–1783* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Radishchev, Aleksandr Nikolaevich, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii A. N. Radishcheva*, ed. by V. V. Kallash, 2 vols (Moscow: Izd. V. M. Sablina, 1907)

Randall, Dale B. J., and Jackson C. Boswell, *Cervantes in Seventeenth-Century England: The Tapestry Turned* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

Reyfman, Irina, 'Prose Fiction', in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. by Andrew Kahn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 90–104.

Riley, E. C., *Cervantes's Theory of the Novel* (Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1992)

———. *Don Quixote* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986)

Rosenkranz, I. L., 'I. S. Turgenev i ispanskaia literatura', *Slavia: časopis pro slovanskou filologii*, 6 (1927–1928), 609–12

Russell, P. E., *Cervantes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985)

———. '"Don Quixote" as a Funny Book', *The Modern Languages Review*, 64.2 (1969), 312–26

Sakulin, P. N., *Iz istorii russkogo idealizma: kniaz' V. F. Odoevskii, myslitel'-pisatel'*, 2 vols (Moscow: Izd. M. i S. Sabashnikovykh, 1913)

Schapiro, Leonard, *Turgenev: His Life and Times* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978)

Seeley, Frank Friedeberg, *Turgenev: A Reading of his Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

Serrano Plaja, A., *'Magic' Realism in Cervantes: Don Quixote as seen through Tom Sawyer and The Idiot*, trans. by Robert S. Rudder (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970)

Shenrok, V. I., *Materialy dlia biografii Gogolia*, 4 vols (Moscow: Tip. A. I. Mamontova, 1892)

Shklovskii, Viktor, *Khod konia* (Moscow-Berlin: Gelikon, 1923)

———. *Theory of Prose*, trans. by Benjamin Sher (Elmwood Park, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990)

Shtakenshneider, Elena Andreevna, *Dnevnik i zapiski: 1854–1886* (Moscow: Akademia, 1934)

Smirnova-Rosset, A. O., *Zapiski A. O. Smirnovoi: iz zapisnykh knizhek 1826–1845 gg* (St Petersburg: Tip. M. Merkusheva, 1895–97)

———. *Zapiski, dnevnik, vospominaniia, pis'ma* (Moscow: Federatsiia, 1929)

Sologub, Fedor, *Stikhotvoreniia* (St Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000)

Stepanian, Karen, *Dostoevskii i Servantes: dialog v bol'shom vremeni* (Moscow: Iazyki Slavianskoi Kul'tury, 2013)

Terras, Victor, *The Idiot: An Interpretation* (Boston, MA: Twayne Publishers, 1990)

Thompson, Colin, 'Eutrapelia and Exemplarity', in *A Companion to Cervantes's Novelas Ejemplares*, ed. by Stephen Boyd (Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2010), pp. 261–82

Tolstoi, Leo, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 91 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1928–64)

Trahan, Elizabeth Welt, *Gogol's 'Overcoat': An Anthology of Critical Essays* (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1982)

Trediakovskii, V. K., *Sochineniia Tred'iakovskogo*, 3 vols in 8 (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1994)

Troyat, Henri, *Gogol: The Biography of a Divided Soul* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1974)

———. *Turgenev*, trans. by Nancy Amphoux (London: Allison & Busby, 1989)

Trueblood, Allan, 'Dostoevski and Cervantes', *Inti. Revista de Literatura Hispánica*, 45 (1997), 85–94

Turkevich, Ludmilla Buketoff, *Cervantes in Russia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950)

Turner, Harriet S., and Adelaida López de Martínez, eds, *The Cambridge Companion to the Spanish Novel: From 1600 to Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Veselovskii, Aleksei Nikolaievich, *Etiudy i kharakteristiki* (Moscow: Tipo-litogr. t-va I.N. Kushnerev i ko, 1894)

———. *Zapadnoe vliianie v novoi russkoi literature* (Moscow: 4-e dop. izd., 1910)

Viardot, Louis, 'Notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de Cervantès', in *L'ingénieux hidalgo don Quichotte de la Manche*, by Miguel de Cervantes, 2 vols (Paris: J.-J. Dubochet et Compagnie, 1836–37), i, 1–48

———. *Les nouvelles de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra* (Paris: Hachette, 1838)

Viazemskii, Petr Andreevich, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii kniazia P. A. Viazemskogo v 12 tomakh*, 12 vols (St Petersburg: Izd. grafa S. D. Sheremeteva, 1878–96)

Vinogradov, V. V., *Stil' Pushkina* (Moscow: Ogiz, Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1941)

Vogüé, Eugène-Melchior, *Le Roman Russe* (Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1886)

Wachtel, Michael, ‘Pushkin’s Long Poems and the Epic Impulse’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Pushkin*, ed. by Andrew Kahn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 75–89

Waddington, Patrick, ‘Introduction’, in I. S. Turgenev, *Rudin* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1994), pp. 9–45

Wanner, Adrian, *Baudelaire in Russia* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1996)

Weiner, Jack, and Evelynne Meyerson, ‘*La Gitanilla* de Cervantes y *Tsigane* de Pushkin’ *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 17.1–2 (1963–64), 82–87

Williamson, Edwin, *The Halfway House of Fiction: Don Quixote and Arthurian Romance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984)

———. ‘The Power-Struggle between Don Quixote and Sancho: Four Crises in the Development of the Narrative’, *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, 84, no. 7 (2007), 837–58

Wolff, Tatiana, *Pushkin on Literature* (London: Athlone Press, 1986)

Woodward, James B., *Gogol’s* Dead Souls (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978)

Zhukovskii, V. A., *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v dvadtsati tomakh*, 20 vols (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul’tury, 1999–)

———. *Sobranie sochinenii v chetyrekh tomakh*, 4 vols (Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1959–60)

Ziolkowski, Eric J., *The Sanctification of Don Quixote* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991)

Zviguilsky, A., ‘Tourguénev et l’Espagne’, *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, 33 (1959), 50–79