

Samuel Richardson's Presence and Absence in Spain

Eterio Pajares Infante
Universidad del País Vasco

ABSTRACT

This paper is an attempt to illustrate Richardsonian influence in eighteenth century Spain, as well as his very surprising absence among several men of letters. Their silence, not to be interpreted as ignorance, is difficult to explain, given the literary leadership exercised by some of these in Spain. An overall view is given of the Spanish translations which people knew and the adaptations and imitations based on this English writer's novels and translated into Spanish. Still unknown translators of Richardson's works into Spanish are brought to light, as well as the possible Richardsonian influences on eighteenth century Spanish literature.

Introduction

The part played by English culture and thought during the Enlightenment in Europe is being vindicated today. It was then that the Anglo-Saxon culture gained preponderance, influencing, more than any other country, the cultural development of the continent. The names Pope, Milton, Young, Bacon, Newton, Locke, Addison, Goldsmith and Richardson must be familiar to any erudite person. The last decades of the seventeenth century and those of the early eighteenth century were practically fruitless for the narrative genre, which, in its modern concept was established mainly by Richardson and Fielding. France was unable to lead in this field and figures such as Voltaire, Rousseau and Diderot recognized the pre-eminence of the English authors to whom they were indebted. It was the age of "Anglomania." Richardson's novels had a special appeal, which lay in the unusual literary genre he used—the letter—and because his works were able to satisfy the sentimental expectations of a middle class who felt tired of the monotony of life and eager for new impressions.

Although Lord Holland's statement "without Pamela we should not know what to read or say" (Jusserand 414) might seem exaggerated to us, at least, it shows us the impact that Richardson's sentimental novels had on his contemporaries. In their day, those novels were

of great literary relish, for it was the age of sentiment, moral and religion. These are the characteristics of his works, combining the practical moral of puritanism with doses of sentimentalism and idealism. Richardson was the creator of the novel based on the lives of the English, and the first author to take his subject matter not from the classics or from history but from real life. He was a great observer and analyst of the individual. He was called "the father of the analytical novel." Walter Scott said that nobody before him had been able to explore the human heart so deeply. In general, he was very favourably praised, and had admirers and imitators throughout Europe. In the nineteenth century, however, popular support started to ebb and his novels were no longer being read. In the twentieth century there has been an awakening of interest in the psychological aspects of his works, and to some degree, in the use of the epistolary style.

Together with England, France was to be Richardson's great protector. His novels were quickly translated into French, and from France they spread to the rest of Europe where they were frequently the source of adaptation and imitation in various literary genres. Spain was no exception in the introduction of English culture. Nowadays we know that, in spite of censorship, the great literati were aware of the best English works. It is important to recognize the decisive part played by the French language as a stepping stone between English and Spanish. Very few of our educated men had learnt English and the means of communication was always through the translation of culture from French. Not all that was produced in the eighteenth century was translated into Spanish, but fortunately, among the works translated was an important selection of what were, undoubtedly, the best European novels of the time.

Translations and Adaptations

In November 1740, the first part of *Pamela* was published in England, followed a few months later by the second part. It was very well received by the English public. Only five editions came out. In 1741 it was translated into French for the first time; in 1742 into Dutch and German; in the following year into Danish; in 1744 into Italian and in 1787 into Russian. What happened to the Spanish version? The first complete translation of *Pamela* into Spanish was finished in 1794, the same year in which *Clarissa* was also translated. Both works were already known in Spain in their original versions but mainly in their French versions.

1794 was the year in which the translation into Spanish of Richardson's three novels began. Censorship stopped *Sir Charles Grandison* from being published before 1798 (Pajares "Primeros traductores" 184-88). This delay is a fact that we have to consider when assessing Richardson's work in this country. *Pamela* appeared in Spain fifty-three years after its appearance in French. People were already familiar with the basic plot of the novel through the odd performances and publications based on Goldoni's adaptations. It was published in four volumes with a total of eight tomes. The second-rate Presbyterian writer Ignacio García Malo was responsible for this translation. Loyal to the currents of his century, and inspired by the motto "to teach is to delight," he followed the already expurgated version of the French abbé. It is understood that the translation is "corregida

y acomodada á nuestras costumbres," which prepares us, from the start, for dealing with a version, by no means faithful to the original. However, we should recognize that this practice was frequent in those days. Prévost, who provided the model on which the Hispanic translator based his work, did likewise and his version of *Pamela* was the second most widely read novel in France.

The additions and omissions made by the translator were so significant that they distorted many essential aspects of the novel, depriving it of the simplicity, ingenuousness and spontaneity of the original text. Most of the omissions made by the Spanish translator, "helped" by censorship are to be found in those paragraphs and pages containing religious references to the Catholic Church, which did not suit the translator's way of thinking. Political opinions were also "reasonably" omitted. Similarly, there were other important omissions, which according to the translator, were due to the fact that the English author did not respect the correct norms of conduct. This translator's aggravated zeal is to blame for the novel's loss of credibility, authenticity and beauty in its Spanish version. Serious as the omissions may be, the additions are of no less importance. Some of them vary the novel's textual contents to a greater or lesser degree, whilst others arise without any referential basis to the text supposedly being translated. Unfortunately, these are not the only alterations to be found; some errors are made, the verse is not respected, and there is a constant variation of the English novelist's rhythm and style. The translator is more concerned about morality than faithfulness and precision in the reproduction of linguistic elements. Nevertheless, it must be said that his prose is in general harmonious and elegant, and for this reason, even in the present century, the translation *Pamela Andrews, o la virtud recompensada* has been praised (Fernández Montesinos 274-75). In 1799 a second edition, *Pamela Andrews, o la virtud premiada*, was published. This edition, which is understood to be "corregida por el traductor," was, in fact, a reprint of the first edition. He only changed spelling, leaving the remainder identical. García Malo was urged by economic problems to request H. M. Government that the publication of this translation should be assigned to the Royal Press. His request was granted. There have been two new Spanish publications of *Pamela* in the twentieth century.¹ They only include the incomplete first part, since in those versions the novel ends when Pamela and MB get married. These versions are not, in fact, new, merely a revision of the eighteenth century translations, bringing up to date the obsolete words and spelling.

In spite of the French influence in which our eighteenth century was steeped, it was a company of Italian actors who introduced Pamela to the Spanish public in 1761, performing the adaptation by Goldoni, *Pamela nubile* in Barcelona (see Rogers). The famous writer of farse Ramón de la Cruz translated Goldoni's version in 1762, and although it was published anonymously, it was performed in Sevilla under the title: *La bella Pamela Inglesa* or, simply, *La Pamela*. This adaptation was received warmly by the public, judging from the successive performances in Spain over the years to follow until the end of the century. In addition to *Pamela nubile*, Goldoni wrote another one-act dramatic version to be performed in Barcelona under the title *Pamela Maritata*. From the various Italian versions of *Pamela*, several more or less free adaptations or translations were written, including an opera and a song. It is surprising that none of the French dramatic versions of this novel were translated into Spanish. This fact can only be

understood taking into account the enormous success that this Italian's comedies had in France too.

Clarissa Harlowe is, unquestionably, Richardson's most perfect book and among the greatest universal literary works. This realistic, sensitive, analytical, sentimental and social novel was admired by all European intellectuals. The combination of sensitive and sentimental elements, the practice of virtue and social justice, the character analysis and the reality of life in that period, is what makes this work unique. With regard to the epistolary genre, the work signified a considerable improvement on the previous novel.

The Spanish version of *Clarissa*, was also late in being published; forty-seven years after being published in English, and forty-two years after the first French version. Initially the plan was to publish it in twelve volumes but finally, urged by the author, it was published in eleven volumes. It was also translated from French. Fortunately, the translator's model was the best French version by Pierre Le Tourneur. The work was translated by José Marcos Gutiérrez, a legal expert, who lacked any previous literary experience, except for a piece of work he translated from Italian that same year 1794. His version is therefore more faithful. The Spanish translator was as fortunate as his French equal. In spite of the fact that the present critics recognize that Le Tourneur's translation was much better and more faithful than Prévot's version, preference has always been given to the latter. I have no knowledge of any negative criticism of the translation into Spanish of *Pamela*. However, in my opinion, the translation of *Clarissa* was too harshly censured. Mor de Fuentes ventured to say that "[a]quel tesoro de moral práctica, aquella peregrina Clarissa, por desgracia harto difusa aún en inglés, se hace en el bárbaro castellano que le cupo, tan desabrida e intragable, que ni el paladar más novelero será capaz de pasarlo" (*La Serafina* I: 202-203). There were undeniable errors in his version; his style did not equal that of the translator of *Pamela*, but he achieved a stronger sense of harmony throughout the work as a whole, with greater respect for the original in his translation.

There were few significant additions in *Clara Harlowe*, and Gutiérrez's only perceptible defect lay in his failure to work methodically, probably due to his inexperience. The greatest mistake of this translator was the mutilation of four hundred pages of the original text. Censorship could have been a great factor in this, but, besides, he took it upon himself to mutilate the novel's last volumes. Fatigue, after translating such a lengthy work, together with certain criticism he received, was the obvious cause of his actions. The undeniable result was to hinder and limit the readers' chances of exercising critical judgment on the book. Nevertheless, some of his efforts were commendable. In certain areas of the work he tried to translate each verse exactly as in the original version, he adhered to the use of colloquial language, and one senses a greater degree of veracity than in *Pamela*. His version of the proverbs, which are a major difficulty in translation, is in general correct. This work, however, was aimed at a more select public, thus explaining some of the negative criticism it received. In 1829, a second version appeared, which was also said to be corrected and revised. It was the same as the 1794 version, with minor spelling changes. There were two new editions of both translations of *Clarissa*: one in 1827, printed by Ackerman in London, and the other in 1829, by the American book traders in Paris.

Three theatrical adaptations of *Clara Harlowe* in Spanish are known to exist: one written in 1846 by Ayguals de Izco and Ramón de Navarrete based on the French versions,

and a play in three acts, in verse, published in 1804, the author of which was Antonio Marqués Espejo. He based his theatrical adaptation on the French drama by Née de la Rochelle, but it must be pointed out that this is the only work from amongst those that appeared in Spanish in which there is some contribution from the writer himself. Approximately 25% of Marqués Espejo's drama is original. In my opinion, it may even be said that the Spanish author slightly improved the French drama. Likewise, the prose adaptations from this novel, by Jules Janin and Mme. le Prince de Beaumont were translated into Spanish.

The History of Sir Charles Grandison, undoubtedly the least accepted of Richardson's novels, despite enjoying the admiration of select minority circles, made a difficult appearance in Spain. A military man, Fermín de Argumosa, had translated it in 1794, but on his request that it be published, the all powerful censors wrongly thwarted him, in the work's final stages, without any convincing explanation. Paradoxically, it was to have been the first of the English author's novels to be published in Spanish. E. T. D. T. was to be responsible for its extremely late appearance in 1798. The character hidden behind the cryptonym mentioned is none other than José Marcos Gutiérrez himself, who, in collusion with the censors and overriding Argumosa's rights and interests, was to quash the translation of this novel. Rather than Prévost, Gutiérrez chose the Frenchman, Le Tourner as his model for the translation of *Clarissa* since he was the more faithful. The preface of this novel boasts of this. Shortly afterwards, his preference came to lie with the Abbé, when he realised that his version of *Grandison* was the worst that he had done and that it constituted an affront against the very ethics of translation. In his version frequent abuse of the original as well as numerous omissions are to be found.

A second edition of *Grandison* was brought out in 1824. This work was not adapted for the stage in Spanish. The advertisement published on 13th August, 1804 in the *Diario de Madrid* alluding to a possible dramatised version by *Sir Charles Grandison* seems erroneous, perhaps referring to Diderot's comedy, *Le Père de Famille* or to the Italian comedy by Goldini, *La Buona figliuola*, both based on Richardson's novel. Berquin's prose adaptation, *El Pequeño Grandison* was translated, by Segunda Martínez de Robles and it was published in Madrid in 1834. Richardson's works came to be known in Spain at least twenty-five years later than in the rest of Europe. This fact should be explained from the perspective of cultural politics of that period, when governmental and religious censorship obstructed the circulation of certain works.

Richardson in the Spanish Culture

As I have already pointed out, the English author and his work were known in Spain, although opinions differed considerably among men of letters. Nobody's praise for Richardson could have been higher than that of Juan Andrés,² the expelled Jesuit, only comparable with that of Diderot, the most Richardsonian of the well-known European authors. Richardson's novels were greatly appreciated by this outstanding, erudite Spaniard, whose views of them were constantly used by those contemporaries who supported or praised Richardson's novels. It may seem that this religious Spaniard's

judgment was, at times, rather excessive, but as no one would deny, it was sincere and the result of reflective reading. Independently of fashion and moral criteria, most of his observations continue to be valid. Andrés was the pillar of those who had formerly praised Richardson's work in Spain. His critical opinions acted as endorsement guaranteeing the quality of the novels. This is what may be understood from the prologues preceding the Spanish version of each of the novels written in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. In all of them, several pages were dedicated to setting forth the favourable opinion of the then famous Jesuit on Richardson's novels. Likewise, newspapers of that period such as *El Memorial Literario*, the *Diario de Madrid*, or the *Gazeta*, supported the advertisements for the sale of these books, with reviews which include some of the favourable criticisms with regard to Juan Andrés (Urzainqui). Many others read Richardson: Arteaga, Sempere y Guarinos, José Luis Munárriz, Jovellanos, Moratín (son), Cadalso, Olavide, Montegón, Mor, Trigueros, etc., although their assessment was null or limited, to say the least. Their silence, not to be interpreted as ignorance, is difficult to explain, given the literary leadership exercised by some of these in Spain.

The attitude shown by Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos is, indeed, very surprising, not so much for what he said as for what he failed to say. The stance taken by this learned man with regard to Richardson was not free of contradictions. He not only spoke English but was often in touch with English customs and culture. He gave an English grammar book to King John, received the *Gazeta* and very frequently catalogues from London, which were supplied by the consul Jardines. On one occasion the bill for English books mounted, to the far from negligible sum for that period, of 155 pounds. He was in the habit of writing to several important English figures and at bed time he read the works of authors including: Gibbon, Payne, Townsend, Locke, Young, Smith, Cook and Goldsmith. He never referred, however, to the works of Samuel Richardson either among those he read or those he recommended reading. Another consideration is the stance he took on the English language, which is also ambivalent. He deemed it useful for his pupils from the Instituto de Gijón rather than Latin, a dead language. However, he excluded it from his plan for the education of the Spanish nobility and upper classes, substituting it with Latin. Despite the insight he possessed with regard to the future in other aspects, he failed to see the importance this language would have in the socioeconomic and political world.

We also know that *Clarissa* was used as a translation text for students learning English at the Instituto of Gijón. Jovellanos himself, as he wrote in his diaries, was to collaborate in the task of teaching and correcting them (*Obras* III). In the censorship report which he sent to the Board rejecting the comedy *Les confidences d'une jolie femme* (*Obras* L: 535-36), he claimed that very few works of that kind could not be considered harmful or a danger to customs, with the exception of Richardson's novels for their moral virtues. In my opinion, it is more than likely that Jovellanos was acquainted with the three novels in English. It could not be otherwise in a man who was up to date with the best and most famous productions of the day, their being essentially French and English, and even less, in a man who knew how to make such good use of the sensitivity, style and Richardson's characters in his drama *El delincuente honrado*.

The stance adopted by Leandro Fernández de Moratín is equally strange. I mention him here despite failure to find any reference of his to the Englishman, and because of my

great surprise at such an omission, and the possible link with Jovellanos, Cadalso, Meléndez and others, who kept silent about Richardson's work, in particular, and anything sentimental, in general. To me, what does seem unlikely, in spite of a lack of documents to prove the contrary, is his ignorance of Richardson. We know that Moratín saw Goldoni in Paris in 1787. Logically, they spoke of their role as writers. Don Leandro admired this dramatist, and among other things, he brought out the success of the Italian comedies in Spain. Goldoni was not only attracted by Richardson but was also influenced by him, and adapted *Pamela* for the stage. Nothing of this, however, was reflected in his writing or later on, in their epistolary correspondence. But what he did refer to in his compilation of works adapted for the stage in the eighteenth century is *La Pamela*, the 1st and 2nd part. It is also beyond doubt that he knew the work of father Juan Andrés, and it is even likely that he visited him in Mantua. If he knew his literary critical work, how could he fail to feel curiosity about the writer who was most highly praised, and read the novels to which Andrés as well as Diderot dedicated their best epithets? In his *Apuntaciones sueltas de Inglaterra*, Moratín mentioned, among others, Fielding, enemy and friend of the author of *Clarissa*, and I believe that, in that period, due fundamentally to the controversy between them, it was impossible to know one without reference to the other. Furthermore, at that time, Richardson was more famous than Fielding. Why, then, did he not mention him? Meléndez Valdés's attitude and that of other poets from the Salamancan school cannot be understood, albeit simply because of affinities in feeling. The only possible reason for such an oversight could be the existence of a pact headed by Jovellanos, denying the sentimentalist genre in Spain their support, in order not to take people's minds off the fundamental changes that he desired for his country.

One man who did not keep his silence was Lista, who knew how to praise the author of *Clarissa*, although he did recognize that fashion was responsible for his appearance and practical disappearance. According to one of his best critics, Juretschke, Lista was up to date with the modern novel. He disliked Rousseau's works for their excessively theoretical nature, "le atraía más la novela inglesa de Fielding y Richardson. Su entusiasmo por el tono sentimental y didáctico-virtuoso le hace preferir al autor de la *Pamela*" (Juretschke 267). Lista had a knowledge of English and we may presume that he would have read Richardson's novels in the same language. Juretschke, however, with the support of Blanco White, a friend of Lista's, told him that he would always fall back on French translations, whenever possible. Lista repeated on several occasions, however, that he had a knowledge of English and, in addition to the free adaptation he did of Richardson's poem *To wisdom*, he translated Bowring's Russian poetry and wrote a review of Lord Holland's book. A series of his articles was published in a Cádiz newspaper, brought together in *Ensayos literarios y críticos*. They revealed in Lista a new facet concerning the Englishman he admired so much; that is, his awareness of the fact that things had changed, and that what seemed acceptable and accepted the day before, was less so the day after. He was of the opinion that those who intended to revive sentimentalism did not succeed, because the sentimentalists were no longer believed. Logically, this was written already well into the nineteenth century. He made many allusions to Richardson's novels and although acknowledging they were out of fashion, he always praised them. In the fight against "moral monstrosities" committed by some romantic dramatists, he remembered

how they had fallen into the opposite extreme, portraying the heroes of novels better than they really were. Given the choice between the two extremes, Lista opted for Richardson's characters.

There is evidence to show that many other literati of the age knew Richardson's work: Olive, Húmara, Valladares, Cosca, Marqués Espejo, Ayguals de Izco y Navarrete. Nineteenth century criticism, however, virtually ignored this fact. Only Alcalá Galiano was to speak his own mind of the good and bad points of the Englishman's novels, acknowledging how unjustly the author had been overlooked in that century. Menéndez Pelayo's harsh judgment of the "unorthodox" century, which featured so strongly in later criticism, was by no means informative about Richardson. Menéndez Pelayo in his *Historia de las ideas estéticas en España* regarded those who bravely supported sentimental literature as passionate fanatics. He himself merely recorded that Richardson was a novelist and portraitist of human behaviour.

The rebirth of interest in knowing more about the eighteenth century, marks the moment in time when contemporary criticism did in fact offer valuable information concerning Richardson's introduction in European culture in general, and in part, Spanish culture. The hispanists Coe, Shaw and McClelland made the most notable assessments, with regard to both the value of this writer's novels, and his introduction into the Hispanic culture. Coe, in his article "Richardson in Spain" offers an interesting informative study, albeit since surpassed, on the presence of Samuel Richardson in Spain. It reveals how this author's novels were originally introduced in our country, along with some of the performances, in Spanish theatres, of the adaptations made of his novels. Dr. Shaw, in "The Influence of *Clarissa Harlowe* on Mor de Fuentes's *La Serafina*" points out a whole series of influences which exist between the novels of Richardson and Mor. Two other articles, "A Sixteenth Century *Pamela*: Gabriel Harvey's *A Noble Mans Sute to a Cuntrie Maide*" and "*Clarissa Harlowe*: A Revaluation," offer interesting information. In the first, we are shown a precedent in this narrative by the poet Harvey which could have inspired Richardson. In the second, Dr. Shaw vindicates the English author's best novel emphasising the work's numerous qualities. Although some are arguable, in my opinion, McClelland establishes, in *Spanish Drama of Pathos, 1750-1808* certain influences that Richardson's novels exerted on second rate Spanish authors, such as Rodríguez de Arellano in *El Domingo*; Zabala in *La Justina* and in *Las Víctimas del amor*; Valladares in *La Leandra*; Mor de Fuentes in *La Serafina* and Francisco de Tójar in *La Filósofa por amor*. Others, like Andioc, Peers, Glendinning, Effrosh and Sebold, were to offer isolated details which vary in their degree of interest. Some Spanish critics like Julián Sánchez, María Socorro Suárez, Fernández Montesinos, Aguilar Piñal, Paula de Demerson, and Caso González also discussed some of the consequences of Richardson's work on Spanish culture.

Richardson in the Contemporary Spanish Press

The eighteenth century Spanish press and that of the first half of the nineteenth century spread word of Richardson's work, using Andrés's criticism as their fundamental pillar.

The sale of Richardson's novels was advertised in Spain as were the performances of comedies and dramas based on his works for the theatre.³ The great similarity between certain press articles and the prefaces of the novels in Spain leads us to believe that the reviews sent to the newspapers were actually written by the translators or editors of the books themselves. There are also independent articles in which Richardson's three novels are commended more often than they are condemned. The adaptation of *Pamela* was to feature in the newspapers most frequently during the last two decades of the eighteenth century and the first of the nineteenth century. This was due to the fact that what was being advertised was the work's performance in some court theatre or the sale of loose copies. Goldoni's adaptation apart, and our attention focussed on Richardson's own novels, we can prove beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the year in which this novelist's works reached a peak in news coverage in the Spanish press was 1794. This can be explained because, although the translations were very late to appear in Spain, these were preceded by considerable fame already won by the author himself. Another contributory factor was that Goldoni's comedy and the French translations of the novels in question were already in fairly wide circulation throughout our country, thus paving the way for the appearance of Richardson's novels in Spanish. Finally, we must remember that 1794 was, in theory, the year of the first Spanish edition of each of the three novels. In reality, this is true only in the case of two: *Pamela* and *Clarissa*. The other, *Grandison*, which was to have been brought out simultaneously by Fermín de Argumosa, was delayed another four years, and then by the translator of *Clarissa*. Despite not being published that year, however, the initial presentation and the advertisement for subscription did appear in the press. 1846 was marked by the resurgence of Richardson in France, and strange as it may seem, in Spain also. Three news items involving Richardson appeared in the press, about Janin's adaptation of *Clarissa*, the performances of Marqués de Espejo's play *Clara Harlowe* and the translations by Izco and Navarette.

Summary of Influences

Richardson's work was not only a source of inspiration and imitation, but also the origin of a whole series of borrowed material and reciprocal influences. His influence on authors like Rousseau, Goethe, Goldoni, Voltaire, Musset, Beaumarchais, Diderot, Gellert, Lessing, Wieland and Jane Austen among others, was common knowledge, unlike the fact, which was even denied, that this novelist influenced what was produced in Spain in that period. All influences were attributed to *La Nouvelle Héloïse* and to a lesser extent, the *Werther*. The contrastive study of these works, the proof that Richardson was a very important source for the Genevan writer in his sentimental novel, as he was less so, for Goethe, and the analysis of several works of Spanish Literature, reveal the debt payable by some Spanish authors to the English novelist.

The influence of *Clarissa Harlowe* on Jovellanos's *El delincuente* seems more than likely. Very possibly, the portrayal of sentiments, the sentimentalism, the attainment of virtue, certain borrowed characters and even the awareness of the theme of sorrow, which are to be found in Jovino's drama, may be attributed to Richardson.

Cadalso also borrows several characters. Thus Solaya and Florinda have a lot in common with Clarissa, Rodrigo with Lovelace, Hadrio and his sons with the Harlowe boys. The subject of conflict between family honour and the respect of individuality, which is so accurately analyzed in the Englishman's novel, is taken up by Cadalso in his tragedy *Solaya*. The sentimental spirit which pervades the Spaniard's works, so unusual in Spanish literature, originates in Richardson's narrative. Some trace of this influence exists in the *Cartas marruecas* although substantial evidence is hard to find.

The influence on *La Serafina* by Mor de Fuentes is, if one might say so, more apparent, alluding to the Englishman's novels and even quoting the text of *Clarissa* (see Shaw "Influence of *Clarissa Harlowe*"). The characters with the greatest appeal to Mor were those created by Richardson, in particular, Lovelace, on whom Alfonso is based. Another series of secondary characters also inspired those created by Mor. The opening argument of *Grandison*, with the Pollexfen's abduction of Harriet and her subsequent rescue by Sir Charles, is lifted by Mor and used in his novel, with Serafina being assaulted by robbers and saved by Alfonso.

Montegón's *Eusebio y Eudoxia* contains a great deal of material lifted from Richardson's work (Pajares "Influencias"). There is character imitation: Hardyl and Leocadia are based on Clarissa and Pamela respectively. Situations are imitated: in *Eusebio* there is a kidnapping with the object of a forced marriage identical to that found in *Grandison*. The story of Lord Hams and Nancy is the same as that of MB and Pamela. The second part of *Pamela* and that of *Eusebio* share many similarities. The sentiment, the themes of sorrow, feminism and virtue reflected in Montegón's novels are rooted in Richardson's work.

The English novelist's influence on Olavide is equally unmistakeable, to be seen clearly in his six short novels written in old age (Pajares "Influencia"). Olavide's aims are moral and social, writing his novels as guides to behaviour for the improvement of human relations. As in Richardson's case, he prefers female characters and he defends the woman's cause. His concept of virtue and his assessment of religion are very similar to those of the English writer. Some of his characters such as Rufina and Paulina identify, as do Pamela and Clarissa, with physical virginity. He imitates Richardson's characters. Paulina is an accurate mirror image of Pamela, Dombal of Lovelace and Cipriana of Mrs Sinclair. He conceives the letter as an element of action in *Paulina and Sabina*. The sentimentality and sensitivity with which these novels are loaded also clearly follow the style of Richardson. According to his own declaration, Zavala y Zamora based *Las víctimas del amor*, *Ana y Sindham* on an English novel, which in my opinion was *Clarissa*. Ana comes to the same tragic end as Richardson's heroine and her father bears a similarity with Mr. Harlowe. There are similarities with *Pamela* such as, for example an unequal marriage and the fact that one of the novel's characters is called Pamela. The sentimental and sensitive spirit of this drama, the importance given to virtue and religion equally prove the debt owed to the English novelist. There are other possible influences, although rather less certain, in *La filósofa por amor*; *Ramiro, conde de Lucena*; and *El huérfano inglés*.

The survival of Samuel Richardson's work in Spain throughout more than half a century bore its fruit, in the form of the works discussed. The response received was somewhat weaker than it was in France, and possibly Italy and Germany, but it did leave

permanent marks which steered the course of certain attitudes and behaviour in the tastes and preferences of the Spanish public.

Notes

1. Both published by Editorial Planeta in 1961 and 1984 respectively.

2. *Dell'origine, progressi e stato attuale d'ogni letteratura* (Parma, 1782). His brother Carlos translated it into Spanish and Sancha published it in 10 volumes (1784-1799). This work was set as a textbook for the Reales Estudios in Madrid. Despite its popularity, to my knowledge no modern editions have been published. However, many publications appeared in the 18th century. In the library of the Theology Faculty of the Diocesan Seminary in Vitoria, the work both in Italian and Spanish is on record and in the Cultural Centre, also in Vitoria, the complete Spanish translation is kept.

3. Only for illustrative purposes and to avoid making this essay too long, I quote the advertisements I know to have appeared in the *Diario de Madrid*: 1784: February; 1790: February (three); 1794: February, June, July, September, October (two) and November; 1796: June and September; 1798: May. The year in which the most advertisements, reviews and criticism appeared was 1846; there were no less than seventeen allusions to Richardson's works and the adaptations discussed here. The detailed commentary of May 1978 is of great interest. It stands out for its easy and ironic style, the result of the cold reception which the first Spanish edition of *La Historia del Caballero Carlos Grandison* was obtaining.

Works Cited

- Aguilar Piñal, Francisco. *Bibliografía de autores españoles del siglo XVIII*. Vol. 1. Madrid: C. S. I. C., 1981.
- _____. *Cartelera prerromántica sevillana: años 1800-1836*. Madrid: C. S. I. C., 1968.
- Alcalá Galiano, Antonio. *Historia de la literatura española, francesa, inglesa e italiana en el siglo XVIII*. Madrid, 1844.
- Andioc, René. *Teatro y sociedad en el Madrid del siglo XVIII*. Valencia: Castalia, 1976.
- Caso González, José. "El delincuente honrado: drama sentimental." *Archivum* 14 (1964): 103-33.
- Coe, A. M. "Richardson in Spain." *Hispanic Review*, 3.18 (1935): 56-63.
- Demerson, Paula de. *Esbozo de biblioteca de la juventud ilustrada (1740-1808)*. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 1976.
- Effrosh, S. H. "English Influence on Eighteenth Century Spanish Literature." Unpublished doctoral thesis. Columbia University, 1962.
- Fernández Montesinos, J. *Introducción a una historia de la novela en España en el siglo XIX. Seguida del esbozo de una bibliografía española de traducciones de novelas (1800-1850)*. Madrid: Castalia, 1972.
- Glendinning, Nigel. *La literatura española del siglo XVIII y sus fuentes extranjeras*. Oviedo, 1968.
- Jovellanos, Gaspar Melchor de. *Obras de Don Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos*. Madrid: B. A. E., 1956.
- Juretschke, H. *Vida, obra y pensamiento de Alberto Lista*. Madrid: C. S. I. C., 1951.

- Jusserand, J. J. *The English Novel in the Time of Shakespeare*. London, 1901.
- McLelland, I. L. *Spanish Drama of Pathos 1750-1808*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1970.
- Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelino. *Historia de las ideas estéticas en España*. Madrid: C. S. I. C., 1974.
- Mor de Fuentes, José. *La Serafina*. Madrid, 1807.
- Pajares, E. "Influencias de la narrativa lacrimosa inglesa en *Eusebio* y *Eudoxia* de Montegón" *Bulletin Hispanique* 93.2 (1991): 353-64.
- _____. "Aportaciones de la Dra. Shaw a la historiografía literaria richardsoniana." *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata*. Universidad de Oviedo, 1991. II: 194-204.
- _____. "Influencia de la narrativa lacrimosa europea en las novelas cortas de Olavide." *Archivum* 39 (1992): 383-92.
- _____. "Primeros traductores españoles de Samuel Richardson." *Fidus Interpres: Actas de las Primeras Jornadas Nacionales de Historia de la Traducción*. Eds. J. C. Santoyo, et al. Universidad de León, 1989. 184-88.
- Peers, A. E. "Minor English Influences on Spanish Romanticism." *Revue Hispanique* 62.141 (1924): 440-58.
- Rogers, P. P. *Goldoni in Spain*. Oberlin, 1941.
- Sánchez, Julián. "Presencia e influencia de la literatura inglesa en la España del siglo XVIII." Unpublished doctoral thesis. Universidad de Salamanca, 1982.
- Sebold, Russell P. *Descubrimiento y fronteras del neoclasicismo español*. Madrid, Cátedra: 1985.
- Shaw, Patricia. "Sixteenth Century *Pamela*: Gabriel Harvey's *A Noble Man Suite to a Cuntry Maide*." *Homenaje a Esteban Pujals Fontrodona*. Universidad de Oviedo, 1981. [373]-[89].
- _____. "The Influence of *Clarissa Harlowe* on Mor de Fuentes' *La Serafina*." *Actas del IX Congreso de AEDEAN*. Murcia: AEDEAN, 1986. 135-44.
- _____. "*Clarissa Harlowe*: A Revaluation." *Analecta Malacitana* 2.1 (1979): 27-48.
- Socorro Suárez, María. "La novela inglesa en España: últimas décadas del siglo XVIII." *Actas del II Congreso de AEDEAN*. Valencia: AEDEAN, 1978. 67-72.
- Urzainqui, I. "Anuncios y reseñas de traducciones de obras inglesas en la prensa española del siglo XVIII." *Homenaje a J. B. Buylla*. Universidad de Oviedo, 1988. 313-32.