A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BYRON AND PUSHKIN WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO DON JUAN AND EVGENY ONEGIN

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Timothy F. Fadipe, B. A.
Denton, Texas

December, 1975
Abstract

Fadipe, Timothy Folorunsho, "A Comparative Study of Byron and Pushkin with Special Attention to Don Juan and Evgeny Onegin." Master of Arts (English), December, 1975, 128 pp., bibliography, 58 titles.

This thesis examines the major works of two outstanding European poets, Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin, with a view to estimating the extent of their literary and personal affinity.

The study begins with a survey of biographical highlights which are relevant to the interpretation of the works of the two poets.

Next, the thesis demonstrates that Byron's "Oriental Tales" and Pushkin's "Southern Poems," as well as their major works, play a prominent role in the comparison of their poetic characterizations.

In the examination of style, attention is limited to Byron's Don Juan and Pushkin's Evgeny Onegin, since they are regarded as the masterpieces of their respective authors. An appraisal of the continuing fame of both poets closes the study.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. PARALLELS IN THE BIOGRAPHIES OF LORD BYRON AND ALEXANDER PUSHKIN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. CHARACTERIZATION</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. ANALOGOUS STYLISTIC FEATURES IN DON JUAN AND EVGENY ONEGIN</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. THE CONTINUING FAME OF BYRON AND PUSHKIN</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF SOURCES CONSULTED</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

PARALLELS IN THE BIOGRAPHIES OF LORD BYRON AND ALEXANDER PUSHKIN

That the life and work of Lord Byron has been a noteworthy influence in the poetry of Alexander Sergeyevich Pushkin is not a new find in the literary world. This fact has been known by many literary scholars for a long time. On the influence of Byron on Pushkin, Peter L. Thorslev, Jr., has said, "In far-off Russia, writing within a few years of Byron's death, Pushkin became an avowed disciple of Byron, and Russia's first national poet. His Boris Godunov (1829) is certainly a remorseful Gothic Villain-Hero, and Eugene Onegin (1837) is a direct descendant of Childe Harold or Manfred." Brief references similar to that of Thorslev on the similarities between the two poets are common. But as far as I know, an extensive comparison of these two great literary artists--Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin--has never been undertaken by any English or American authors.

This thesis, therefore, sets out to make an intensive examination of some of both poets' major works with a view to sort out some of the specific common literary traits as well as life experiences. The study will not necessarily limit itself to discussing parallels between Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin. Points of divergence in their lives and
in their works worthy of note will receive due consideration.

In this introductory chapter, a detailed recapitulation of the biography of either Lord Byron or of Alexander Pushkin is not intended. Rather, an attempt will be made at a concise discussion of selected identical phenomena in the lives of these two great poets. In the selection of incidents for discussion, preference will be given to those events in their lives the knowledge of which is vital to the interpretations of some of their memorable works.

Leslie Marchand, expressing the need to know something about Lord Byron's life in order to enjoy or be able to interpret Byron's poetry, said in his preface to Byron: A Biography, "I think the facts of Byron's life which have recently come to light will tend to confirm the view that he was in his poetry even more autobiographical than he has been supposed. . . ."² Edward E. Bostetter, who seems to be more positive and more emphatic than Marchand on the interdependence of Byron's biography and Byron's poetry, further said, "As an artist, Byron has only recently been taken seriously as he deserves. For one thing, to separate his work from his life and personality is, as we have seen, almost impossible; too often therefore, the poetry is discussed simply as illustration of the life."³

Though to a lesser degree, this act of self-portrayal in artistic creations can be seen in Pushkin also. In his celebrated masterpiece, Evgeny Onegin, Pushkin clearly portrayed himself. As to how much of Pushkin was reflected in Evgeny
Onegin, Avraham Yarmolinsky wrote, "In no other piece did he write himself down so fully, nor did any other exhibit his genius so comprehensively and effectively." And Alexandra Fredericks had earlier remarked on the protagonist of Evgeny Onegin, "Onegin is partly Pushkin himself, the superfluous man, the well-intentioned, gifted, somewhat corrupted gentleman of too much leisure."

While it may not be difficult to explain the why and wherefore of some of the parallels in the biographies and works of Lord Byron and those of Pushkin, it may not be easy to explain some other such parallels. Why Lord Byron, born in London, and Alexander Pushkin, born in Moscow, should share somewhat similar origins, upbringing, and even certain innate tendencies which will be discussed later in this chapter seems to me to be an act of providence. According to Samuel Cross and Ernest Simmons, "There were psychological reasons behind the literary influence of Byron, for during his exile in the south Pushkin tended to identify himself with the positive personality of the English poet. There was a passing similarity in their fates. . . . Under such circumstances it was easy for Pushkin to slip into a Byronic pose, for there was much in the real and legendary Byron that strongly appealed to him. . . . He was altogether too powerful a genius to be a mere imitator or follower of anyone." In the latter part of the book they reiterated this idea: "When Pushkin became acquainted with Byron's work through his friends, the Raevskis, he was already
in a state of mind ripe for Byronic suggestion. Temperamentally he was by no means alien to the poet of *Don Juan*. They shared a naive pride of birth, a love of liberty, the solace of love and pleasure in exile, a predisposition to melancholy and a resentment against the injustice of society."

Both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin descended from noble families. Unlike most of their descendants (George Gordon Byron and Alexander Pushkin in particular), the great-grandfathers of these two poets seem to have been faithful royalists, perhaps because they owed their nobility to their respective monarchs. "A later Sir John Byron, a faithful though not very successful general of Charles I, was created Baron Byron of Rochdale in the county of Lancaster on October 24, 1643," said Marchand. In Pushkin's case, his great-grandfather was said to owe his rise to nobility to Peter the Great.

Unfortunately, by the time both poets were born, their respective ancestral material properties as well as the popularity of their families had greatly degenerated. David Magarshack said of Pushkin, "Their family owned many estates which by the time of Pushkin's birth had fallen into decay."

Of Newstead Abbey, the seat of the Byrons for centuries, Charles Skinner Matthews wrote in a letter to his sister, "Though sadly fallen to decay, it is still completely an abbey, and most part of it is still standing in the same state as when it was first built . . . but every part of the house displays neglect and decay save those which the present Lord has lately fitted
Except for a brief period when his poetry brought him fortune, Pushkin was constantly in the red throughout his lifetime, and when he died he left an outstanding debt still to be paid.

The decayed noble background of these poets had a significant effect upon their lives and their works.

The memory of their noble ancestors generated ego and pride in them. They grew up to realize that by birth they were aristocrats. At the same time they realized that they were distressingly deficient in material wealth commensurate with their status in society, although Byron did, of course, eventually become quite wealthy. They were not prepared to bend down or to compromise their decaying nobility with the new rising lords who also controlled the economy of the state. The result was a conflict between the poor old lords and the wealthy new lords. The former group identified their interests with those of the proletariat, inciting them against the new wealthy lords. Many of the impoverished aristocrats became radicals and self-appointed spokesmen of the poor and the underprivileged partly, at least, as a form of protest at their own condition. Christopher Caudwell wrote, "Byron is most successful as a mocker--as a Don Juan. On the one hand to be cynical, to mock at the farce of human existence, on the other hand to be sentimental, and complain of the way in which the existing society has tortured one's magnificent capabilities--
that is the essence of Byronism. It represents the demoralization in the ranks of the aristocracy as much as a rebellion against aristocracy." Pushkin seemed to be even more antagonistic to the new upstart aristocrats than his contemporary. Magarshack wrote that "He was sorry to see the old Russian noble families wiped out or falling, like his own, into decay, and becoming, like himself, an object of derision among recently ennobled men of obscure origin and even among some idle buffoons." The cynicism, pessimism, radicalism, and realism which figure clearly in the works of these great poets, when carefully considered, may not be unrelated to the feelings of illusion and disillusion resulting from their noble birth.

Both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin are said to have been very sensitive to personal insult. Among other possible reasons, I believe that the awareness of their degenerating nobility was one of the contributory factors. It was mortifying to both of them for people to show disrespect to their aristocratic ancestry. Bostetter said of Byron that "Partly because he had inherited the title unexpectedly after a childhood of poverty and neglect, he never felt at ease in his rank and he paraded it with insolent and sometimes ludicrous ostentation. His behavior toward those who failed to show proper deference was childishly rude." Another life experience common to Lord Byron and Pushkin was poor upbringing. Why both of them should have lacked proper upbringing I would again believe is attributable to fate rather
than to imitation. It may be argued that their poor upbringing was an inevitable consequence of comparative poverty, but that argument would elicit the objection that proper upbringing has little or nothing to do with poverty or affluence; it all depends on the personality of the parents and their attitudes towards the child.

Alexander Pushkin lacked parental affection in his childhood; it appears that he was loved neither by his mother nor by his father. Walter Vickery said that "He seems to have been awkward and unprepossessing, his mother's least favorite child."\(^\text{14}\) And Professor V. Kirpotin, much earlier, had said that "Pushkin's parents led an aimless, fashionable life. They took little interest in the child. The bringing up of little 'Sasha' was left in the hands of the servants and of ever-changing and always fatuous foreign tutors."\(^\text{15}\) This lack of parental affection during his infancy continued to affect Pushkin and his works even after he became an adult. When he was exiled from St. Petersburg to the south, he was to carry a letter to his new superior from the Foreign Minister. In the letter, the Foreign Minister wrote as follows: "Beset with sorrows and troubles throughout his early childhood, young Pushkin left home without regret. His heart, devoid of filial affection, could know no passion but that of independence. . . ."\(^\text{16}\) Even after he grew up there was no good relationship between him and his father. Vickery said that "The father had never held a very firm place in Pushkin's affections; one of the older Pushkin's chief
failings was his extreme stinginess towards his children."\(^{17}\)

Lord Byron also lacked paternal affection, for the obvious reason that his father, who was seldom at home in any case, died when his son was three and one-half years old.\(^{18}\) The responsibility of bringing him up as a child fell solely on his mother, Mrs. Byron. Although she became angry with him frequently, the fact remains that she excessively indulged him at times. Marchand said that "It is a mistake to suppose that Byron was not happy in Aberdeen. Except for an occasional flareup, his mother treated him indulgently, and allowed him much freedom."\(^{19}\) There are some evidences to show that Lord Byron in his childhood days was mischievous. A story was told of one of his pranks when he was at Banff on a visit to his grandmother. One day, to frighten his mother and his aunt Abercromby, he dressed a pillow in his clothes and threw it out the window, "and when at the aunt's insistence he was punished, he butted her like a goat for meddling."\(^{20}\)

Perhaps it may be reasonable to argue that the insubordination, the inability to discipline himself, and the egotism which manifested themselves in Byron's adulthood had their roots in too much laxity and poor upbringing in his childhood. Such weaknesses did not only affect him adversely; some of them even proved tragic. He could, perhaps, have been a greater poet if he had submitted himself to the academic discipline of Cambridge and had cleanly graduated. His defiant sexual promiscuity had a ruinous effect not only on his reputation but on his character.
His melancholy, ennui, and feelings of guilt might have been intensified by the feeling of occasional unpopularity with and rejection by the society of that time.

Besides their rebelliousness, another noteworthy parallel in the lives of both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin is that while still young boys they inherited their ancestral estates by the death of their respective great uncles. In addition to the landed property of Newstead Abbey, Lord Byron inherited his old family title, thus becoming the sixth baron in his ancestral lineage. Even though their ancient wealth and material properties had greatly dwindled by the time these young poets became lords, their inheritances still ushered in some dramatic changes in the lives of both men.

Lord Byron was ten years old when his great uncle died on May 21, 1798, and the young Byron became the Sixth Baron Byron of Rochdale. The effect on the life of Lord Byron was immediate. John Cam Hobhouse recorded that "Byron himself told me that he was sent for by the master of the school who gave him some cake and wine and told him that his paternal great uncle was dead and he was now a lord--Byron added that the little treat and respectful manner of the master gave him at once high notions of his new dignity." Mrs. Byron was so over-enthusiastic about his peerage that her son asked her "whether she perceived any difference in him since he had been made a lord, as he perceived none himself."
Pushkin did not inherit any title of honor, but it is certain that he inherited estates from his uncle, General Peter Abramovich. Details about Pushkin's inheritance of his uncle's estates and the effects it had on him have not been given in any of the sources consulted for this paper. But there is an indirect reference to the event in *Evgeny Onegin*:

Indeed, he soon received a letter  
Which told him that his uncle lay  
Too ill for hopes of getting better,  
And had his last farewells to say.  
Eugene perused the sad epistle;  
Thoughts of the future made him whistle;  
He caught the post with eager haste,  
But soon was yawning while he raced;  
He knew the task would sorely try him  
For (as I've said) there he must sit  
And fawn and play the hypocrite.  
But when he comes they notify him  
His uncle's in his coffin laid:  
His death to nature has been paid.

\[
\text{(E.O. I.52,53)}
\]

It is an interesting coincidence that both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin were not diligent students during their school days, though they both were talented with superintelligence. Simmons said that "Pushkin learned with an ease that discouraged his comrades who marveled at his phenomenal memory. However, he was a lazy scholar in prescribed studies, and the
rather uniform testimony of his teachers pictures him as a brilliant boy who lacked the habit of persistent application. In those subjects he liked, such as French literature (his comrades nicknamed him 'frenchman'), he was outstanding. Despite the apparent failure to apply himself to formal studies, Pushkin was rarely idle in the Lyceum."²⁴ Like Lord Byron, he had a keen interest in history as a subject. But his interest in history did not come into the open until the middle part of his life. Cross wrote, "It was at this period that Pushkin's passion for history, stimulated by the earlier volumes of Karamzin's great work, bore fruit in the narrative fragment 'Vadim' (1822). . . ."²⁵ Some of his successful plays no doubt owe their verisimilitude to his knowledge of history. An example of such plays is Boris Godunov. As Professor Kirpotin put the case, "A painstaking study of history and a desire to keep close to the truth of the past life directed Pushkin's pen when he wrote 'Boris Godunov.'"²⁶

Lord Byron, like Pushkin, did not like rigid, regulated studies. Lord Byron wrote about himself and Robert Peel, one of his friends at Harrow, "As a Scholar, he [Peel] was greatly my superior: as a declaimer, and Actor, I was reckoned at least his equal. As a school boy out of school, I was always in scrapes, and he never; and in School he always knew his lesson, and I rarely; but when I knew it, I knew it nearly as well. In general information, history, etc., etc., I think I was his
Superior, as also of most boys of my standing."27 And Marchand said that "He [Lord Byron] had the intelligence necessary for the prescribed work, but no enthusiasm for the daily grind of lessons. . . ."28 That fact notwithstanding, Lord Byron had an extraordinary reading ability. The number of various books and journals that he claimed to have read, especially in the fields of literature and history, is staggering: "'... I have also read . . . about four thousand novels including the works of Cervantes, Fielding, Smollett, Richardson, Mackenzie, Sterne, Rabelais and Rousseau,' and he mentions Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy as 'most useful to a man who wishes to acquire the reputation of being well read' because of its 'amusing and instructive medley of quotation.'"29

Hobhouse was at first skeptical about the vast number of books Lord Byron claimed to have read. Perhaps after Hobhouse had come to recognize the honesty and frankness in his friend's life, he believed him. "As Lord Byron says he had read these volumes I am inclined to believe the fact, but it is certain he never gave any sign of this knowledge afterwards."30 But no one who has read Byron can fail to note the frequent allusions and sometimes direct references to works from several ages, character, and places. Again, when one remembers Lord Byron's strong adherence to truth throughout his life, one would not doubt his claim of having read those volumes noted above. In support of his claim he wrote, "The truth is that I read
eating, read in bed, read when no one else reads and had read all sort of reading since I was five years old."\textsuperscript{31}

Promiscuity and notoriety for love affairs in their adolescence is another parallel in the lives of Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin. His lameness notwithstanding, Lord Byron was renowned for his handsomeness. While his good looks may have been a contributory factor to the passion that many ladies felt for him, it was certainly not the only cause. I believe that other factors include his generosity, his genius, and his high social rank.

Alexander Pushkin, on the other hand, was not conventionally handsome. In fact, he was said to be very ugly. Despite his ugliness, his female conquests were said to be formidable. That many a woman fell prey to the satisfaction of his sexual urge might have been in part due to his being a genius and a spendthrift. On the appearance of Alexander Pushkin, Vickery wrote, "\ldots he was short of stature, about 5'3", and could not be described as handsome. But he was strongly drawn to the opposite sex and could, according to the accounts of his own contemporaries, exert a great deal of charm when he set out to be charming."\textsuperscript{32} Most of Pushkin's biographers concur in the opinion that the life he led in Petersburg after his graduation from the lycée was dissipated. "On attaining freedom, on his liberation from the cramping rules of the school, the youthful poet was carried away also by the society life
of the capital. He went to balls and theaters, feasted, fell in love and had several 'affairs of honor' all of which ended well.\textsuperscript{33}

But the following extract gives a better picture of the type of life he was then leading. Apart from mirroring the wantonness of such a life, the extract suggests that Pushkin, like Lord Byron, was merely conforming to the mode of life of the high society of which by birth and by his success as a poet he was a member.

Let me tell you about our fellows as behoves an historian. Everything is going on as before; the champagne, thank God, is magnificent, the actresses likewise, the one gets drunk, the other get fucked, amen, amen. That's how it should be. Yurgev [a member of the Green Lamp], thank God, is rid of the clap. I am just starting a little one; I must be thankful for that. Nikita is gambling, the air is thick with chalk! Money is strewn all over the place. Sosnitskaya [an actress] and Prince Shakhovskoy are getting fat and stupid--but I'm not in love with them--nevertheless, I did call for him to take a bow for his bad comedy and for her--for her mediocre playing. Tolstoy [Yakov Tolstoy, chairman of the Green Lamp] is sick--I shall not say what of--there are, as it is, too many claps in my letter. The Green Lamp needs snuffing badly--I am afraid it is about to go out. A pity, there's plenty of oil (i.e. our friend's champagne).\textsuperscript{34}

Like Byron, Pushkin almost ruined his own health by too much indulgence in indiscriminate love affairs. Henri Troyat wrote that "He had a huge circle of friends, frequenting princesses and prostitutes with equal assiduity and equal delight.... [He] wrote a poem in honor of Empress Elizabeth and some obscene verses on his venereal infections."\textsuperscript{35} And John Bayley said,
"After his death friends and acquaintances recollected numerous events and anecdotes of this period, most of which—like all apocryphal stories about Pushkin—could equally well be told of someone else. He certainly contracted a mild venereal disease, and during the period of treatment and convalescence wrote his first long poem, *Ruslan and Lyudmila*, which was published after his exile to the South."

In his later life, any time he cast a retrospective look toward that particular period of his life, it was with deep regret and melancholy which are given expression in some of his poems like "Remembrance."

In uncontrolled love affairs and other related abuses of the body such as drinking and gambling, it is difficult to say who outdid the other between Lord Byron and Pushkin. Both of them were believed to have descended to the low level of committing incest. Of Lord Byron Bostetter wrote, "Even today, we are likely to be so hypnotized by the details of his relations with his half-sister Augusta, his marriage and its aftermath, and his numerous other affairs that we are in danger of overlooking or dismissing him as artist." While Lord Byron was suspected of having committed incest with Augusta, his half-sister, Pushkin was alleged to have had an affair with Alexandra, his sister-in-law. According to Vickery, "But the strongest evidence to support the existence of an affair between Pushkin and Alexandra Nikolavena comes from sources whose good-will towards Pushkin cannot be doubted."
The excessive love affairs which these two poets experienced early in their lives did not only hurt them physically, as I have stated earlier; these indiscretions also seem to have rendered them incapable of understanding and experiencing true love; they completely distorted the true meaning of love in their minds. It seems, with Pushkin, that love was synonymous with sexual liaison: "First love is always a matter of sentiment: the sillier it is the more delightful memories it leaves. The second, do you see, is a matter of voluptuousness. One could push the parallel much further. But I hardly have the time to do it. My marriage to Natalia (who, parenthetically, is my one hundred thirteenth love) has been decided. . . ."39 In a letter to his sister comforting her, Lord Byron once wrote, "But really, after all (pardon me my dear sister), I feel a little inclined to laugh at you, for love, in my humble opinion, is utter nonsense, a mere jargon of compliments, romance, and deceit. . . ."40 It was obvious that during their escapades with women these poets often ran from one to another because they had come to a point where they were unable to be satisfied with one woman. When their adolescence was over and their middle age approached, both reflected on their past lives; they realized that they had been wasting their precious youth. They were very unhappy and were very anxious to change their earlier pattern of life. It should not be very surprising that both poets looked at marriage as an escape from their present dilemma. Up till now women and money had constituted the main causes
of their recurrent troubles and melancholy. Besides, both were overripe for marriage, and it is normal at that age to think of marriage as a probable solution to the problem of sex. They believed that when they were attached to their respective wives they would be able to start to lead the more settled and more respectable life of gentlemen. But this is only possible for people who are moderate in their taste for women, for people whose understanding of love has not been warped, and for people who have not been frustrated in life and are not looking at marriage as a mere means of escape.

Of Pushkin Vickery wrote, "In marriage he was seeking a remedy to the unhappiness which increasingly threatened to engulf and cripple him, an unhappiness which, though it was in himself, was aggravated by the bureaucratic harassment to which he was being subjected. He sought in marriage a new beginning. His decision to marry was a recognition of the sterility of his personal life." Marchand made a similar remark about Byron: "It seemed to him now that the only salvation, the only irrevocable road out of the scrape he had become involved in, was to marry." This wrong approach to marriage common to Lord Byron and Pushkin did not wholly account for the failure of either marriage. There were other identical contributory factors as well.

One of these factors was the incompatibility of both men with their wives. Natalia Nikolavena, Pushkin's wife, was extremely beautiful but poor and stupid. Her husband was
somewhat ugly but intelligent. In fact, Mrs. Goncharov, Pushkin's future mother-in-law, did not consent to Pushkin's first proposal of marriage to her daughter. It was after she failed to find for her daughter the type of husband she was dreaming of for her that she relaxed her opposition to Pushkin. Magarshack said, "In the spring of 1830 Pushkin received a message that Mrs. Goncharov had undergone a change of heart about his marriage to her daughter. The Moscow marriage market had obviously failed to produce the rich elderly general for whom the hearts of all the mothers of dowerless daughters yearned."\(^4^3\)

Lord Byron and Annabella Milbanke were no more compatible than Alexander Pushkin and Natalia Nikolaevna. Annabella was moderately beautiful, highly intelligent, and possessed of a large fortune. But she seems to have been too idealistic and very priggish. Marchand described her as "The only daughter of Sir Ralph Milbanke. . . . She was the apple of her parents' eye, a spoiled child but a very precocious one who had also been tutored at home and early had acquired an interest in mathematics, classical literature, and philosophy. . . ."\(^4^4\)

By contrast, Lord Byron was a man of the world and very up-to-date in the realm of fashion. He was apparently irreligious. Annabella was aware of Lord Byron's perverted feelings; hence she tentatively rejected his first proposal of marriage. She finally accepted Byron with the hope of reforming him. In other words, her acceptance of Lord Byron was with a condition.
Thus, from the outset, the marriage foundation of both couples (Lord Byron and Annabella on the one hand, Pushkin and Natalia on the other) was laid on shaky ground, and when the storm of the society was blowing against them, both of their marriages tragically collapsed.

A wrong approach to married life on the part of both poets notwithstanding, and in spite of the incompatibility of the partners in the two marriages, the unions would have perhaps lasted longer, if not for life, without the interference of parents and society. The hostile society of Alexander Pushkin finally goaded him to a duel, which proved fatal to him. Parents' interference and the hypocrisy of the society in which Byron lived forced him to a permanent separation from his wife and daughter. Lord Byron's feeling about his separation from his wife is reflected in his "Fare Thee Well."

Fare thee well! and if for ever,
Still for ever, fare thee well:
Even though unforgiving, never
'Gainst thee shall my heart rebel.

Though the world for this commend thee--
Though it smile upon the blow,
Even its praises must offend thee
Founded on another's woe:

But 'tis done--all words are idle--
Words from me are vainer still;
But the thoughts we cannot bridle
Force their way without the will.

Fare thee well! thus disunited--
Torn from every nearer tie--
Seared in heart--and lone--and blighted--
More than this I scarce can die.

(Stanzas 1, 4, 14, 15)
Love of freedom and complete self-dedication to the cause of liberty are ideologies common to Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin. Both of them seemed to have been commissioned as special crusaders in the vanguard of freedom fighters. Both of them abhorred despotism, injustice and all forms of exploitation. In their views on political freedom and other related human rights, Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin almost appear to be literary identical twins. Of Lord Byron, Andrew Rutherford said

He hated despotisms of every kind, and sympathised with peoples who were subject to the domestic or to foreign tyrants. He believed in liberty, for other men as well as for himself, and his views on the French Revolution were like those later expressed by Shelley in the preface to The Revolt of Islam: in this canto [Childe Harold's Pilgrimage, Canto III] he deprecates the worse excesses of the revolutionaries, but argues that men warped by oppression could not be expected to behave with perfect justice, and far from being appalled by their mistakes, he looks forward eagerly to another more decisive revolution. His views on war were closely related to these few basic ideas; he detested wars of conquest or aggression, or mere clashes between rival powers... But like Godwin, he approved of battles fought for liberty.46

In short, Lord Byron not only wanted every individual to be free, he also wanted each of the nations on the globe to be autonomous; he hated imperialism. Perhaps his anti-imperialistic attitude contributed to his unpopularity during his lifetime among the aristocratic class of England, for at that time most English landowners and factory-owners did not see anything wrong in excessive human exploitation. At that time, England controlled quite a few so-called colonies scattered over the
continent of Africa, and slavery was not to be abolished until nine years after Byron's death.

Despite his sincere belief in freedom, however, Byron never had any intention of renouncing his peerage and joining the ranks of the "common man." Marchand said that "Byron, though he kept a cynical reserve regarding sovereigns, enjoyed it [his aristocratic rank] in his self-forgetful moods more than he pretended." I believe that Byron in his concept of freedom did not mean that there should be absolute freedom or absolute equality among men, for these are unattainable except in theory. Throughout his life he was aware of his aristocratic class and did not hide it anywhere at any time. In fact, he was not ready to take a second place to anybody. I believe that the kind of freedom and fair-play Byron was preaching in his works was that all individuals should be allowed to enjoy the basic natural rights with which they were endowed.

If he had meant absolute freedom and absolute equality, as some of his verses appear to suggest, one could wonder why he kept pages, maids, and servants. But his relationship with those people working for him was what some oppressive lords and masters should emulate, for it was certain that he was friendly, kind, and generous to his servants and even to the large number of lower animals he was keeping.

Alexander Pushkin was not a downright revolutionist as Lord Byron was, but he certainly was a freedom fighter. Professor S. Luppol said that "Whatever Pushkin's tactics may
have been in different periods of his life—autocracy and serfdom were always regarded by him as enemies to be fought, and it was in fighting them that he met his death."\textsuperscript{48} Although he was not a member of the Decembrists, he espoused some of their aims and aspirations, and many of his liberal lyrics were readily made use of and widely distributed in manuscripts by the Decembrists. Simmons said, "To be sure, he was a poet and not a revolutionist, and it was largely as a poet that he aided the revolutionary cause."\textsuperscript{49} His early lyrical poems most frequently referred to as political and revolutionary include "Ode to Freedom," "Noel," "The Village," and "The Dagger." Some of them were so serious and provocative that the poet was sent into exile in 1820 by Alexander I, the then tsar of Russia. The powers that be in Russia in those days considered Pushkin's continued living in St. Petersburg dangerous to their own safety because of his liberal lyrical poems; hence they forced him into the south of Russia. But for the intervention of good and loyal friends, much harsher punishment would have been meted out to him.

It is commonplace to speak of Lord Byron's exile from England. There are, however, some differences between Lord Byron's exile and Pushkin's. While Lord Byron's exile was voluntary, Alexander Pushkin's was mandatory. Lord Byron decided to quit London as a reaction to the cold indifference which London society had developed towards him because of the separation between him and his wife. With the exception of
a few faithful and loyal friends such as Hobhouse, the whole of fashionable London seemed to have deserted Byron in his hour of tribulation. The British aristocrats seemed to be behind the wife. They were acting only on the information she gave them, and nobody bothered to ask for verification from Lord Byron. Sometimes they even acted contrary to her wishes and went to greater extremes than she wanted in maligning her husband. However, it is often the case that in any conflict between a man and a woman, the woman is thought to be right and is showered with sympathy. Lord Byron felt lonely while he was in the midst of the London crowd and finally called it quits.

Misfortunes, people say, are sometimes blessings in disguise. This old saying proved valid, at least for once, in the story of the exiles of both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin. The banishment of these poets from their native lands eventually proved a blessing to their great names and their memories, to their respective countries of origin and to the world at large.

Bostetter said, "The moment of exile is in Byron's life and art the moment, to use Kenneth Burke's phrase, of 'symbolic action.' It is the moment toward which the first cantos of Childe Harold and the oriental tales have led and from which the later poems take their rise. . . . In short, it is the moment which makes Byron a great poet."50 And of Pushkin Simmons wrote, "In the four years in the south of Russia, he
had seen much, thought much and experienced and felt a good
deal more. It had been a period of skepticism, of tortuous
doubts in himself and everything. But his wonderings had
been a fruitful school of life for him. Furthermore, he had
written and published much poetry during these four years.
In the south he had come of age as a man and as Russia's
greatest poet.\textsuperscript{51} Pushkin's exile had an additional advantage
in a way. "With all its discomforts," wrote Vickery, "Pushkin's
exile had one further advantage--or apparent advantage. It
kept him out of Petersburg on December 14, 1825--the day of
the abortive uprising against Alexander's successor, Nicholas
I."\textsuperscript{52} When he heard of the uprising, he decided to go to
Petersburg. A story said that he actually started to go but,
noticing some unfavorable signs on the way, he retreated. He
narrowly escaped being caught and executed along with others
partly because he was in exile and partly because he was
superstitious.

Alexander Pushkin was as superstitious as Lord Byron was,
if not more. Quite a few biographers of Pushkin have made
reference to his belief in superstition. Magarshack said
that "An incident no less revealing happened a year earlier
and illustrates another side of Pushkin's character: his
deep-seated superstitiousness, implanted in him in early
childhood chiefly by his nurse Arina. Like his heroine Tatyana,
Pushkin believed in 'dreams and fortune telling' and was worri-
ed by all sorts of 'signs and omens.' . . . Shortly before
the Decembrist revolt he was saved from disaster by the appearance of a priest and a hare which made him change his mind about going to Petersburg."\(^{53}\) According to a story, his bride ring, the Bible, and a cross fell while his matrimonial ceremony was in process. These seemed unusual to Pushkin and he was reported to have said, "These are all bad omens!"\(^{54}\)

Again when he was a young man, it was said a German lady foretold some important things that would happen to him in life. Two of them were that Pushkin would be sent into exile and that he would eventually be killed by a tall fair-haired man. Most of the predictions came true. It was said that, during his lifetime, Pushkin did not take chances with any tall fair-haired men. But, "Ironically enough," Magarshack commented, "the man who mortally wounded him in a duel was tall and fair-haired, but Pushkin was so made with jealousy and set on killing his rival that he forgot all about the fortune-teller's prophecy."\(^{55}\)

Inclination to superstitious belief affected Lord Byron's personality as well as his work. H. W. Garrod wrote, "What is the matter with Byron is that superstition shadows all his thinking. . . . The fear of himself is audible in his poetry. . . . There is, indeed, no end to the medievalism of this most modern of men. If he did not believe in God, he believed in ghosts."\(^{56}\)

This question of a belief in a deity brings us to another parallel--religion--in the lives of Lord Byron and Alexander
Pushkin. From the frequent recurrence of the word "God" with a capital "G" in their writings one might infer that both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin believed in the existence of a mighty universal God. It is most probable that they equated Fate or Destiny to this God. One thing is sure, though; Byron and his Russian counterpart were too realistic and rational to accept without question any conventional forms of worshipping God. They seemed to be quite cynical toward the man-made laws and taboos which had been integrated into all forms of worship. Lord Byron's attitudes to religious sects seem to be revealed clearly enough in the following passage: "Of Religion I know nothing, at least in its favour. We have fools in all sects and impostors in most; why should I believe mysteries no one understands, because written by men who chose to mistake madness for inspiration and style themselves Evangelicals? . . . I have lived a Deist, what I shall die I know not, however, come what may, ridens moriar."\(^5^7\) Byron's inability to attach himself to any religious sect was deeply rooted in his upbringing as a child and in some of his life experiences as an adult. Through his observation he could see man's hypocrisy in the practice of conventional orthodoxy. According to William J. Calvert, "He was suspicious of mankind's tendency to reduce everything, even Divinity, to a formula, however incongruous with or unrelated to observable realities."\(^5^8\) The question about religion was so seriously considered by him that it produced a tension in his mind. The tension was not
altogether solved till his death. In a letter to Francis Hodgson written after reading Richard Watson's *An Apology for Christianity, in a Series of Letters to Edward Gibbon*, Byron said, "I have read Watson to Gibbon. He proved nothing... but there is something pagan in me that I cannot shake off. In short I deny nothing but doubt everything."\(^{59}\)

Pushkin, like Byron, was never consistent on the question of religion. His numerous evocations of the name of God and some religious poems of his such as "The Prophet" and "Arion" would tempt the reader to take Pushkin seriously as a believer. Compare Pushkin with Milton in the following lines:

\begin{quote}
Gift in vain and gift of chance
Life, why wert thou given me?
Why have I been thus condemned
To a secret fate by thee?

Who with some strange hostile power
Summoned me from nothingness,
And disturbed my mind with doubt
Filled my soul with passion's stress?

Goal there's none before me now:
Empty heart and idle brain,
Life's monotonous roaring sound
Burdens me with endless pain.\(^{60}\)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Did I request thee, Maker, from my clay
To mold me man, did I solicit thee
From darkness to promote me, or here place
In this delicious garden? As my will
Concurred not to my being, it were but right
And equal to reduce me to my dust,
Desirous to resign and render back
All I received, unable to perform
Thy terms too hard, by which I was to hold
The good I sought not, why has thou added
The sense of endless woes? inexplicable
Thy justice seems; yet to say truth, too late
I thus contest; ...
\end{quote}

*(Paradise Lost* X.743-55)
"Gavriliada," a poem which quite a few biographers of Pushkin regarded as blasphemous, is completely antithetical in thought to the poem by him cited above. In fact, his supposed atheism is one of the offenses for which Pushkin was dismissed from his employment in the Foreign Office. The origin of that charge was in a letter he wrote to one Kuechelbecker while he was still in exile: "Reading Shakespeare and the Bible [Pushkin wrote], the Holy Sprit is sometimes to my liking, but I prefer Goethe and Shakespeare. . . . I am writing miscellaneous stanzas of a romantic poem and taking lessons in pure atheism. An Englishman . . . lives here. He is the only intelligent atheist I have met. He has written about a thousand pages to prove qu'il ne peut exister d'être intelligent Créateur et régulateur and, in passing destroyed the flimsy evidence of immortality of the soul. His philosophic system is not so consoling as it is usually thought to be but unhappily it is more plausible."

The religious ambivalence of Pushkin is well summed up in the following sentence: "Bryusov says that 'The Prophet' incarnates two ideas of the poet--the mortal fallible man, and the immortal vessel of inspiration."

Finally, Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin were internationally recognized as literary artists of no mean reputation. They were both talented with special creative ability as poets. In fact, considering their upbringing and their formal education, it could be argued that both of them, like Shakespeare, were poets who were born rather than made. Moreover,
they were not only poets; they were also playwrights and prose writers, although in the latter area Pushkin's accomplishment was greater than Byron's. They have left to mankind a valuable legacy in all these genres. Besides, the mere volume of published work of each of them is enough to make a reader marvel.

Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin lived in a transitional age, that is, the period shortly after the eighteenth-century bards had yielded the literary stage to the romantic poets. Pushkin was born in 1799, just a year after the publication of Wordsworth's and Coleridge's *Lyrical Ballads*, at which time Byron was just a young boy of ten. The famous "Preface," a kind of romantic manifesto, came out with the second edition of the *Ballads* in 1800. Romantic ideas were gaining ground both in England and on the Continent, but the old neo-classical ones were slow to expire. It was natural for Byron and Pushkin, like any other transitional figures, to share some qualities with both schools of thought.

Alexander Pushkin died unexpectedly on January 10, 1837, in a duel with an officer who was allegedly having a secret love affair with Natalia Nikolaevna Goncharova, Pushkin's wife. There were some rather mysterious circumstances surrounding Pushkin's death. An allegation of a plot to rid Russia and the Russian government of Alexander Pushkin was made by some authors. But the details of the circumstances surrounding his death are outside the scope of this paper. However, it
may be of interest to note that 1837, the year of his death, marked Queen Victoria's accession to the throne of England, and it thus marked the beginning of another literary era—the Victorian Age, which had repercussions all over Europe.

Ironically, Lord Byron never returned to England from his voluntary exile; he died in Greece in April 19, 1824, fighting for the cause of liberty.

This chapter has indicated a few areas in which Lord Byron the man and Alexander Pushkin the man were alike or, in a few cases, unalike. With the evidence presented in this chapter, it is apparent that these two great men shared many more parallel experiences than appears from a superficial examination. And if in their personalities they could be so close to each other, should we expect them to be very divergent in their literary creations? That is the question this thesis will begin to examine in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER II

CHARACTERIZATION

A discussion of characterization is nearly always necessary in an analysis of a piece of literary work or an evaluation of a literary artist; it is inevitable in a comparative study such as this one. As to whether characterization or plot takes pre-eminent place in a literary creation there is not yet a general agreement. According to Charles Child Walcutt, Aristotle asserted that plot (action) is more important than character in a literary creation. With modern critics and modern readers character is generally the foremost consideration.\(^1\) Without attempting to resolve this controversy (though I would cast my vote for the modern critics), one thing is certain: that characterization forms an indispensable part in the framework of any literary creation. Walcutt, echoing the opinion of modern critics on the place of character in a literary work, said, "But modern critics have rarely been willing to accept this dictum; they nod and pass by, for they are categorically positive that character is the axis of a serious fiction, whether it be novel or drama [I add, or a poem], and that the action turns about that character."\(^2\) And John Galsworthy, towards the end of his lecture The Creation of Character in Literature, reiterated his thesis by declaring that "Some early words in this
lecture suggested that the permanence of a novel, a play, a biography [and I add, a poem], depends on the vitality of the characters therein."³

Creating lifelike, permanent characters like Don Juan, Eugene Onegin, Childe Harold, Huckleberry Finn, Hamlet, Heathcliff, the Ancient Mariner, Satan, and a host of others is not easy. It demands special types of qualities found only in a very small number of literary artists. In his essay, "A Critical Essay on Characteristic Writings," Henry Gally has this to say on the subject:

There is no kind of polite writing that seems to require a deeper knowledge, a livelier Imagination, and a happier Turn of Expression than the characteristic [sic]. Human nature, in its various Forms and Affections, is the subject; and he who would attempt a work of this kind, with some assurance of success, must not only study other men; he has a more difficult Task to perform; he must study himself. The deep and dark recesses of the Heart must be penetrated; to discover how Nature is disguis'd into Art, and how Art puts on the appearance of Nature.

Nature, will never qualify a man to be a Writer of characters. He must be a master of the science; and be able to lead a Reader, knowingly, throu' that Labyrinth of Passions, which fill the Heart of Man and make him either a noble or a despicable creature.⁴

In the Preface to Encyclopedia of Literary Characters, imagination and rhetoric are emphasized as special qualities essential in the creation of characters: "Imagination is the stock in trade of the storyteller. The characters he creates are the vehicles by means of which he transmits his imagination and insight to audience. If he is a keen observer and
clever commentator on what he has observed, it is likely his characters will seem lifelike and identifiable and will make a lasting impression on his readers."\(^5\) Galsworthy was very reluctant to mention any special qualities or certain precise rules for creating characters; he believed that "what we know as the creative gift in literature, or indeed in any art, is more than normal power in certain people for dipping into the storehouse and fishing up the odds and ends of experience, together with a special aptitude for welding or grouping those odds and ends when they are fished up."\(^6\) However, he at last mentioned one quality essential to the creating of characters. "If one had to give the palm to a single factor in the creation of character," he said, "it would be to sly, dry humour. The sort of humour which produced the Don and Sancho, Falstaff. . . . But such quality is rather a shaping instrument than the mainspring of enduring character creation. What the mainspring itself is remains mysterious. Call it, if you will, vital spark, 'breath of life.'"\(^7\)

Summing up the opinions of these authorities on the creation of characters, one may say that to be able to create lasting characters an author, among other qualities, must possess the following: deep knowledge, lively imagination, keen observation, insight, humor, and some other indefinable natural talent that makes him a master of rhetoric. Unfortunately only a very few writers have all those qualities. Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin are among this elected few.
Both of them are keen observers of nature, realistic critics of society and of self; they both have strong imagination and penetrating insight; they are both great rhetoricians.

Ida Beth Howard stated in her "Elements of the Byronic Hero in Captain Ahab" that "An author's personality is quite naturally projected in his characters because he must experience moods and attitudes similar to those of this characters if they are to be believable." Should one very much wonder to see so much similarity between the characters created by Lord Byron and those of Alexander Pushkin since, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, the personalities of their creators were very close and since both poets shared a number of similar life experiences? The heroes of Lord Byron and those of Alexander Pushkin share some common characteristics generally associated with the Noble Outlaw prototype; they share physical attributes, personality traits, and attitudes toward life and love. In fact, the heroes of Pushkin's so-called "Southern Poems" and that of Evgeny Onegin are almost perfect Byronic heroes; they are disenchanted men of the world, contemptuous of their fellows, prodigious and mysterious, solitary and compassionate, remote and exotic. I do not intend to go into a mere listing of the characteristics of the Byronic hero in this chapter, nor do I have any new thing to say about him (for the subject has been treated definitely by great and respected scholars like Peter L. Thorslev, Jr.); all that I intend to do is to show some specific ways in which
Alexander Pushkin was like Lord Byron in his modes of character creation and to discuss a few dominant traits which the characters of Alexander Pushkin shared with the characters of Lord Byron.

Quite a few of Alexander Pushkin's heroes have their counterparts among the major creations of Lord Byron. The captive, the hero of Alexander Pushkin's *The Captive of the Caucasus*, in many specific ways resembles Lord Byron's Conrad, the hero of *The Corsair*. Evgeny, the hero of Pushkin's *Evgeny Onegin*, appears to be almost the twin brother of Byron's Don Juan. Aleko, the hero of Pushkin's *The Gypsies*, or Girey, hero of Pushkin's *The Fountain of Bakhchisaray*, could fairly be matched with Byron's Giaour, hero of *The Giaour*. Satan, in Pushkin's *Gabriliad*, although he is not the protagonist of the poem, takes after Lord Byron's Cain, the protagonist of the play *Cain*. The Byronic elements noticeable in the characterization of Alexander Pushkin are not limited to his heroes only; in their attitudes to love, among other things, some of his heroines resemble those of Lord Byron.

It must be admitted here that the preceding comparison of the poems and heroes of Alexander Pushkin with those of Lord Byron is somewhat arbitrary, tending towards oversimplification. In fact, some of the character traits to be discussed later in this chapter cut across some of the major works of both poets. Evgeny in some respects is like Don Juan; in some other respects he is like Childe Harold. In his jealousy...
and vindictiveness Aleko resembles the Giaour, but he is also like Manfred in his search for meaning and in his contempt for urban society.

Before discussing some specific Byronic traits noticeable among the creations of Alexander Pushkin, I must emphasize that Pushkin was not merely aping Byron in character creation; some traits generally associated with the Byronic hero prototype could be found in such early works as *Ruslan and Ludmilla*, which was the first successful narrative poem of Alexander Pushkin, written before he came into contact with the works of Lord Byron and Byron's enthusiasts. The love between Ruslan and Ludmilla is romantic; it is as passionate as the love between Conrad and Medora. Ludmilla, refusing to succumb to all the enticement of Chernomore, the magician who had captured her, sounds like Gulinare in the following lines:

Away, from love, in bondage  
I desire not to remain alive.  
O thou, whose passionate homage  
Hath me of all my joy deprived,  
Know thy ruthless power Ludmilla both defy;  
Ludmilla knows how to die.\(^9\)

(R. and L., p. 54)

Both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin have a tendency to autobiographize; to a considerable extent, they portray themselves in their most important heroes. Almost the whole of the first canto of *Don Juan*, except a few stanzas assigned to personal comment, is devoted to Juan's pedigree and his early life experience. One only needs to know the bare elements of Lord Byron's biography to be able to recognize at once how
autobiographical the following stanzas are:

His mother was a learned lady, famed  
For every branch of every science known--  
In every Christian language ever named,  
With virtues equalled by her wit alone:  
She made cleverest people quite ashamed,  
And even the good with inward envy groan,  
Finding themselves so very much exceeded,  
In their own way, by all the things that she did.  
(D.J. I.10)

He was a mortal of the careless kind,  
With no great love for learning, or the learned,  
Who chose to go where'er he had mind,  
And never dreamed his lady was concerned;  
The world as usual, wickedly inclined  
To see a kingdom or a house o'erturned,  
Whispered he had a mistress, some say two.  
But for domestic quarrels one will do.  
(D.J. I.19)

'T is pity learned virgins ever wed  
With persons of no sort of education,  
Or gentlemen, who, though well born and bred,  
Grow tired of scientific conversation:  
I don't choose to say much upon this head,  
I am a plain man, and in a single station,  
But--Oh! ye lords of ladies intellectual,  
Inform us truly, have they not hen-pecked you all?  
(D.J. I.22)

A little curly-headed, good-for-nothing,  
And mischief-making monkey from his birth;  
His parents ne'er agreed except in doting  
Upon the most unquiet imp on earth;  
Instead of quarrelling, had they been but both in  
Their senses, they'd have sent young master forth  
To school, or had him soundly whipped at home,  
To teach him manners for the time to come.  
(D.J. I.25)

In Ernest J. Simmons' Pushkin, a brief reference is made to the similarity between Onegin and Pushkin: "Eugene is the typical young dandy of the period. With a superficial Frenchified education, he plunges into the dissipations of fashionable Petersburg society, leading a life similar to Pushkin's
during his first sojourn in the capital."\textsuperscript{10} The death of Pushkin's uncle, his acquisition of Boldino estate, his father's noble status and spendthrift habits, and his early education\textsuperscript{11} all have parallels in the life of Eugene. The following examples which, like those just cited from Byron, are more or less autobiographical, add weight to the assertion that Pushkin tends to be quite personal in parts of \textit{Evgeny Onegin}:

\begin{quote}
My uncle's shown his good intentions  
By falling desperately ill;  
His worth is proved; for inventions  
Where will you find one better still?  
He's an example, I'm averring;  
But, God, what boredom--there, unstirring,  
By day, by night, thus to be bid  
To sit beside an invalid!  
Low cunning must assist devotion  
To one who is but half alive:  
You puff his pillow and contrive  
Amusement while you mix his potion;  
You sigh, and think with furrowed brow--  
Why can't the devil take you now?  
\textit{(E.O. I.1)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
A man of rank, his worthy Father  
Would always give three balls a year;  
He lived in debt, and did not bother  
To keep his hopeless ledgers clear . . .  
\textit{(E.O. I.iii)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
All Eugene knew is past relating,  
But for one thing he had a bent,  
And I am not exaggerating  
His principal accomplishment;  
From early youth his dedication  
Was to a single occupation;  
He knew one torment, one delight  
Through empty day and idle night:  
The science of the tender passion  
That Ovid sang, that brought him here,  
And closed his turbulent career
\end{quote}
In such a brief and tragic fashion--
Ovid, who here, so far from Rome,
Found in the steppes an exile's home.

(E.O. I.viii)

The young captive's heart is wrought
With despondent thought.
To Russia leads the distant road,
Where in his ardent youth he strove
Where youthful happiness he enjoyed,
And many beautiful things did love.
There by his wild life he destroyed
Desire, hope, joy, and love;
Stern pain there he embraced
And memories of happier days
In his faded heart he encased
Experienced in life and men's ways.
He found the heart of friend
A traitor's liar.

(C.C., pp. 160-61)

As the person of Lord Byron has been recognized in Childe Harold, in Don Juan and to a lesser extent in nearly all the heroes of his Eastern tales, so has Alexander Pushkin been recognized in certain heroes of his narrative poems. The reason is that most of the major works of both poets were based partly on their actual life experiences. Commenting on the characters of Lord Byron, Alexander Pushkin wrote:

Byron threw a one-sided glance at the world and nature of humanity, then turned away from them and plunged into himself. He presented us with a phantom of himself. He created himself a second time, now under the turban of a renegade, now in the cloak of Corsair, now as a Giaour breathing his last under the schema, now finally wandering amid. . . . In the final analysis he comprehended, created and depicted a single character (namely his own); he connected everything except a few satirical sallies scattered through his works to this dark, powerful character who is so mysteriously captivating.

It is significant that both poets in some poems formally introduce their characters to the reader. Alexander Pushkin
does this in Evgeny Onegin and in The Bronze Horseman, and Lord Byron does it at least in Childe Harold's Pilgrimage and Don Juan.

I want a hero; an uncommon want,

I'll therefore take our ancient friend Don Juan--
We all have seen him, in the pantomime,
Sent to the Devil somewhat ere his time.  

(D.J. I.1)

Like Don Juan, Yevgeny and Onegin are introduced to the reader by their creator as follows:

'T was when that young Yevgeny came
Home from a party—I am going
To call our hero by that name, . . .

(B.H. I.10-12)

You knew Ruslan and fair Ludmilla;
For this new hero prithee feel a
Like fellowship, as I regale
You, readers, with another tale:
Onegin, meet him, born and nourished
Where Old Neva's gray waters flow . . .

(E.O. I.2)

Sometimes Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin confront readers with youthful and inexperienced heroes at the beginning of some of their narratives. Some of them, under the nose of the reader, grow up to become mature and responsible men as they gain experience with the passage of time. Don Juan is about sixteen years old at the beginning of Byron's poem and still under the guidance of his mother. At the end, when he is in London society, he has become an independent, handsome gentleman, attractive to many ladies of the upper class: "Daughters admired his dress, and pious mothers /
Inquired his income, and if he had brothers" (D.J. XI.48).

Childe Harold is introduced to the reader as a carefree and almost irresponsible youth:

Whilome in Albion's isle there dwelt a youth,
Who ne in Virtue's way did take delight
But spent his days in riot most uncouth
And vexed with mirth the drowsy ear of Night.
Ah me! in sooth he was a shameless wight,
Sore given to revel, and ungodly glee
Few earthly things found favour in his sight
Save concubines and carnal companie
And flaunting wassailers of high and low degree.

(C.H.P. I.2)

By the time the narrative has progressed to the third canto, considerable time has elapsed, and the pilgrim has changed as well:

Yet time, who changes all, had altered him
In soul and aspect as in age: years steal
Fire from the mind as vigour from the limb
And life's enchanted cup but sparkles near the brim.

(C.H.P. III.8)

Pushkin's Onegin is eighteen years old at the commencement of Evgeny Onegin: "Observe his closet wall, and gage /
Thereby our eighteen-year-old sage" (E.O. I.23), and he is already thirty by the middle of the work--"Shall I be thirty presently?" (E.O. VII.44).

However, some of Pushkin's heroes as well as Byron's never have the opportunity to grow to manhood before they meet their tragic ends. Yevgeny in The Bronze Horseman and Conrad in The Corsair, for instance, unavoidably die too young. In this connection, it is perhaps significant that when Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin realize that they are becoming older,
they often cast a retrospective and deeply regretful look toward their misspent past, bemoaning the wastefulness of their youth. Almost at the same moment they try to foresee the prospect of the future; unfortunately the future, to them, appears as hopeless as the past, if not more so:

By new desires I am enchanted,  
New sorrows come, my heart to fret  
The hopes of old will not be granted  
The olden sorrows I regret.  
Ah, dreams! where has your sweetness vanished?  
Where's youth (the rhyme comes glibly) banished?  
Quite withered now in very truth?  
Can the sad thought with which I flirted  
In elegiac mood, at last  
Be fact, and can my spring be past  
(As I in jest so oft asserted)?  
Will it no more return to me?  

(E.O. VI.44)

But now at thirty years my hair is grey.  
(I wonder what it will be like at forty?  
I thought of a peruke the other day--)  
My heart is not much greener, and, in short, I  
Have squandered my whole summer while t'was May,  
And feel no more the spirit to retort; I  
Have spent my whole life, both interest and principal  
And deem not, what I deemed--my soul invincible.  

(D.J. I.213)

Both poets dread the loss of youth, hope, and heroic endeavor—a fate that Yergeny and Conrad escape through premature death.

Other heroes of Byron and Pushkin, however, do not find this escape, and must somehow live on. The dawn of old age makes these hitherto carefree, almost reckless heroes of Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin become seriously meditative. The failure, and in some cases, the wrongdoings of their past life haunt them; the gloomy future overwhelms them; yet they would go on. They will not give up even though they do not see any
visible end to their internal strife. In fact, they often exhibit prodigious strength and a kind of defiance to fate in bearing their suffering. During their struggle, death at times appears to be a more rational and easier exit from their agonizing lives, yet they would not commit suicide solely to escape further agony:

Why should we shrink from what we cannot shun?  
Each hath its pang, but feeble sufferers groan  
With brain-born dreams of Evil all their own.  

(C.H.P. II.7)

His emotion hidden in his heart remained unread:  
There was hidden his regret  
On his countenance naught was reflected,  
On his high forehead no thought could be detected.  
They marveled, the wild Cherkess  
At his bravery, so reckless.  
His young life they did spare;  
Among themselves in whispers they did say  
They were proud of their prey.  

(C.C., p. 170)

If, however, death should happen to come in the process, they would embrace it. They believe that to die young is a special favor from fate: "Whom the gods love die young, was said of yore / And many deaths do they escape by this" (D.J. IV.12). After Lensky, the young potential poet in Evgeny Onegin, has died in the duel between him and Eugene, the hero says of the deceased:

He might have learned that life was shabby  
At bottom, and, too bored to think,  
Have been content to eat and drink,  
Had gout at forty, fat and flabby; . . .  

(E.O. VI.38-39)

The prolonged suffering and the passionate verbalization of their predicament naturally demand sympathy for Byron's and
Pushkin's characters, their faults notwithstanding. These traits particularly contribute to making them pathetically tragic heroes.

Fate is a strong determinant in the characterizations of Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin. Just as these authors attribute some unfortunate happenings in their personal lives to fate, so they seem to have made most of their major characters puppets in the hand of an almighty but mysterious fate. In many instances, the heroes of these authors acknowledge their own faults, but at the same time they believe that their flaws and the consequent suffering were preordained. William Gerard, in his essay Byron Re-Studied in His Dramas, has compared the characterization of Shakespeare with that of Lord Byron thus: "Shakespeare begins simply from the characters and develops them ethically and dramatically up to the catastrophe. Byron is entranced, first and foremost, with destiny, and traces her vacillating purpose down into the actions of the vacillating Dipsychus-man, who only after he has played the puppet to those eddying of fate has time to exhibit dramatic individual traits." What is said of Lord Byron here could be said, though to a lesser degree, of Alexander Pushkin. There are numerous passages in the poems of both Lord Byron and of Alexander Pushkin which portray their heroes' similar attitudes to fate:

The captive tenderly her raising
Thus addressed the unfortunate
"Do not cry. I, too, was aggrieved by fate,
I, too, experienced the woe
Of a tortured heart: mutual love
I did not know.
I loved alone and suffered alone.
I wither here like a smoky flame,
Forgotten on a desert plain
Away from native shores here I die.
And this valley is predestined
As my tomb, wherein my corpse will lie;
And these chains on my exiled bones
Will rust amid these mountain stones.

(C.C., p. 174)

The star which rules thy destiny
Was ruled, ere earth began, by me:
It was a world as fresh and fair
As e'er revolved round sun in air;
Its course was free and regular,
Space bosomed not a lovelier star.
The hour arrived--and it became
A wandering mass of shapeless flame
A pathless comet and a curse,
The menace of the Universe,
Still rolling on with innate force,
Without a sphere, without a course,
A bright deformity on high,
The monster of the upper sky!
And thou! beneath its influence born--
Thou worm, whom I obey and scorn--

(Manfred I.i.110-25)

Just as Manfred exiles himself from a society to which he
cannot or will not conform, so Aleko in Pushkin's The Gypsies
is an exile because he cannot adjust to the gypsies' mode
of life:

But he to the concern of [our] poor life
Never could accustom himself;
He wandered, withered, pale,
He used to say that an angry God
Was punishing him for a transgression . . .
He waited for deliverance to come.

(T.G., 11. 202-07)

Like Lord Byron's, most of the heroes of Alexander
Pushkin are not only lovers of freedom, they are seekers of
freedom and happiness. They seem to prefer a dry crust with liberty to a king's luxury with chains. In their search for freedom these heroes are sometimes placed in a natural primitive environment. To them the corruption, the conformity, the pollution, and the hypocrisy of the metroplex societies like Petersburg and London are intolerable. Having experienced disappointment in these societies and therefore feeling an unwillingness to conform to their dictates, some of the heroes of these two authors take delight in nature, where they believe pure life and perfect freedom still abound. The heroes of Alexander Pushkin seem to be more preoccupied with individual freedom than those of Lord Byron. Perhaps the fact that the former was himself a victim of political oppression throughout his short life makes the difference. Ratimir, one of the three rival knights in Ruslan and Ludmilla (although later in the poem he acts contrary to his statement), expresses a yearning for the simple life:

"My friend," the fisherman replied,
My soul of military glory is long tired,
'Tis but a vain and ruinous ghost
All craving for bloody wars I lost;
Innocent diversion, trust
Thou my word, love and tranquil grove
On this unperturbed site of the earth
Are now to me a hundred times more worth:
I will pay no more
Tribute to the madness of war.
With true happiness am I blessed.

(R. and L., p. 92)

The Caucasian Captive describes the simple life of a Cherkess in the following lines:
While the Cherkess in his father's place
With peaceful household stays
Coal smouldering in ashes
In cold and rainy days . . .
A belated and lonely arrival strays . . .
Dismounting from his horse
Tired from the road,
He timidly steps into his abode.
The courteous master of the house
With friendly greeting doth bring
Red wine in fragrant vase to drink.
The traveller in the smoky hovel doth stay,
Peaceful sleep enjoying till the break of day.
And, at approaching morning,
Leaves the shelter of his hospitable night-lodging.
(C.C., p. 168)

Answering a question as to whether he did not regret giving up the people of his homeland and cities, Aleko replied,

What is there to regret? If you knew,
If you could imagine
The servitude of stifling towns!
There people in throngs behind a barrier
Do not breathe the morning cool,
Nor the vernal perfume of meadows;
Of love they are ashamed, thought they persecute,
They trade their freedom,
Bow their heads before idols
And ask for money and for chain.
What have I given up? The heart-stir of betrayals,
The verdict of preconceived opinions,
The mob's mindless hue and cry,
Or glittering vice.
(T.G., pp. 150-63)

The following stanza portrays Lord Byron's admiration for restful countrysides:

Ne city's towers pollute the lovely view;
Unseen is Yanina, though not remote,
Veiled by the screen of hills, here men are few
Scanty the hamlet, rare the lonely cot:
But, peering down each precipice, the goat
Browseth; and, pensive o'er his scattered flock,
The little sheperd in his white capote
Doth lean his boyish form along the rock,
Or in his cave awaits the Tempest's short-lived shock.
(C.H.P. II. 52)
Lord Byron sees urban society as not only less pleasing than country life, but morally inferior as well. He must have shocked the people of London when in *Don Juan* he "told it like it was":

> But how shall I relate in other cantos  
> Of what befell our hero in the land,  
> Which 't is the common cry and lie to vaunt as  
> A moral country? But I hold my hand--  
> For I disdain to write an Atlantis;  
> But 't is as well at once to understand,  
> You are not a moral people, and you know it,  
> Without the aid of so sincere a poet.  
> *(D.J. XI.86)*

Another aspect of characterization shared by both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin is that in some cases their heroes are representatives of the society in which they live. This aspect is evident in the works which they wrote when they became mature poets and playwrights. That *Don Juan*, *Childe Harold IV*, *Evgeny Onegin*, and *The Bronze Horseman* revealed the full maturity of their respective authors is a common agreement among most critics.

According to John Bayley, a respected authority on Pushkin, "An earlier generation of liberals saw Yevgeny's protest as ... symbolic of the Decembrist uprising: 'voiceless and will-less' Russia crying out that it was 'even now' going to settle its own fate; and all historical and ideological interpretations of the poem echo the original insight of Belinsky that its tragedy resides in the conflict between the individual and the collective will." Bayley's idea seems to be supported by the following opinion of Walter Vickery: "Evgeny is the
prototype in Russian literature of a series of characters (found in the works of Gogol, Dostoyevsky and others) rendered mad by the oppressive atmosphere of the 'unnatural' city of the north. But it was not merely acute power of social observation that enabled Pushkin to depict this emerging type—the victim of the indifferent metropolis—for Pushkin was himself a victim of Petersburg. And in Evgeny there is a great deal of Pushkin."

Of the reality of Juan as social being, Elizabeth Boyd has said, "But Byron's Juan is neither a diabolical monster, nor a Faustian superman, nor even a blithe rascal like the conventional picaro. He is an ordinary human boy, whose adventures, though spectacular and bloody, are thoroughly mundane."

Ronald Bottrall is more specific and more comprehensive in his description of Don Juan. Comparing Juan with Henry Fielding's Tom Jones, he mentions almost all the aspects of Juan's personality in the following passage: "In both Tom Jones and Don Juan, the natural man who acts according to impulse is contrasted with the hypocrite, or the hypocritical society, which acts according to convention. The antithesis is between conduct and inclination or intention. In both, evil in the hero is mainly sexual; or at worst, anything vaguely against the social usage; but the evil of society is seen as a fundamental and rooted inability to be honest and truthful, or to care for the individual human life."

Sometimes we see Byron's and Pushkin's heroes acting contrary to social norms, as in the case of Manfred; or they may
be pouring abuses and insults on whosoever symbolizes power and authority in their land, as in the case of Yevgeny. They may be completely cynical and skeptical about life in general, as in the case of Onegin, or they may isolate themselves from the civilized but corrupt society of man in pursuit of freedom and happiness in primitive societies and nature, as in the case of Harold; nevertheless, together they represent a certain group of discontented young people not only of the nineteenth century, but also of the following one.

For example, Wole Soyinka, "Africa's most sophisticated playwright," who is also a radical, seems to be too idealistic for Nigerian society. Contemptuous of the present norms in Nigeria, he, like some of the heroes of Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin, is now in an exile, except that his is from a relatively natural society to a highly sophisticated one. His latest play, Madmen and Specialists, was exceedingly distasteful to the Nigerian society. According to a recent review, "The greatest driving force behind this play, however, is not the subject of war in its stark waste but the passionate realism of a religious a-political system that breeds its own bloody and ritualistic destruction." Soyinka sounds like Lord Byron in the following sentence: "I address this book to the people to whom it belongs, not to the new élite, not to that broad stratum of privileged slaves who prop up the marble palaces of today's tyrants." Another example of romantic rebellion in the twentieth century is the group of young Americans called
"hippies." In their case, they tend to be fed up with the sophisticated norms of the present-day American tradition and try to experiment with a more natural life. Theirs are the voices of social criticism, proletarianism, idealism and realism.

Some scholars have remarked the passiveness of certain protagonists of Lord Byron, particularly Childe Harold, Manfred, and Juan. Like those of Lord Byron, all Alexander Pushkin's heroes that I know of, except Ruslan, are equally passive, if not more so. The general passiveness of some of Pushkin's characters has not eluded the keen eyes of some careful scholars. Walter Vickery remarks, "In their general lack of dynamism Pushkin's heroes come closer to the nebulous and passive figure of Childe Harold than to either the Giaour or Conrad." To Elizabeth Boyd only Childe Harold is passive; she implies that Juan is active: "Childe Harold is a passive contemplative travelogue; Don Juan is the travels of a man of action." If Boyd means that Juan is a man of action in comparison with Harold, then she is right. But when we consider Juan's role against the whole background of the poem, we would hesitate to accept the idea of Juan as a man of action as Boyd has suggested. Although John Bayley seems to have gone to the other extreme, he appears to have a better general impression of Lord Byron's major characters: "Without their verse medium Byron's heroes could hardly exist." At first hearing this statement may sound like a sweeping generalization; but when we compare Juan,
Childe Harold, and even Manfred with such purposeful characters as Shelley's Prometheus, Keats's Isabel, Coleridge's Mariner, or Wordsworth's Michael, we may be inclined to agree with Bayley. Like Childe Harold and Juan, Pushkin's Onegin and Yevgeny are almost completely eclipsed by the voice of the author-narrator. The voices of the titular heroes, except on a few occasions, are relegated to the background by frequent digression, philosophizing, and moralizing on the part of the authors. Certain beneficial effects of digression notwithstanding, it seems to have rendered Pushkin's Onegin and Byron's Juan in particular relatively impotent as heroes. Even the so-called passionate heroes of the "Eastern Tales" of Lord Byron and those of the so-called "Southern Poems" of Alexander Pushkin lack the pervasive dynamism of Shakespearean tragic heroes. Except for his farewell scene with Medora before the battle and his role in the battle itself, Conrad could be viewed as a somewhat passive hero. Likewise, the Giaour is not impressive as an active hero except in the confession scene. Pushkin's Aleko and the Captive seem not to be as dynamic as their respective heroines.

A discussion of the heroes of Lord Byron and of Alexander Pushkin would appear incomplete without expatiating on their attitude to love. Like Lord Byron's heroes, nearly all Alexander Pushkin's heroes are beset with the problem of love. It is significant that each of Pushkin's heroes is matched with a heroine. Ruslan is matched with Ludmilla, Yevgeny with Parasha,
Aleko with Zemfira, the Captive with the Circassian Maid, Gabrial with Maria, Onegin with Tatyana, and Lenski with Olga.

Although Alexander Pushkin, unlike Lord Byron, does not often give the physical description of his heroes, he manages to suggest that they are handsome enough to attract the attention of the ladies who happen to come into contact with them. The details of the first meeting of Aleko with Zemfira are not given, but there is an implication that it is Zemfira who played the dominant role in their coming together. She introduced Aleko to her old father as follows:

"My father," says the maiden,  
"I am bringing a guest, behind the mound  
In the wasteland I found him  
And called him to the camp for the night.  
He wants to be a gypsy like us;  
He is pursued by the law,  
But I will be his love.  
His name is Aleko--he  
Is ready to follow me everywhere."

(T.G., 11. 43-50)

Of the whole lot of Pushkin's heroes, Ruslan is the only one that promises to be a good and devoted husband. He does not involve himself in any other liaison besides the one between himself and Ludmilla. His only problem is how to conquer other rivals who also want her. With a strong determination, perseverance, and valor he overcomes all rivals and other difficulties to win Ludmilla at last. Ruslan does not have much in his personality to share with the Byronic hero. He is also quite distinct from the heroes of the "Southern Poems" of Pushkin. The reason is that Ruslan and Ludmilla, the first
successful long poem of Alexander Pushkin, was written before the author knew anything about Byron.

Aleko, the Caucasian Captive, and Girey--the heroes of The Gypsies, The Caucasian Captive, and The Fountain of Bakhchisaray respectively--are more or less Pushkin's recreations of Lord Byron's Giaour and Conrad. Pushkin's Aleko is as passionate, overpossessive, jealous, and vindictive as Lord Byron's Giaour. The Giaour justified his murder of Hassan, who was his rival for the love of Leila, in the following lines:

Yet did he but what I had done
Had she been false to more than one
Faithless to him, he gave the blow;
But true to me, I laid him low;
Howe'er deserved her doom might be,
Her treachery was truth to me;
To me she gave her heart, that all
Which tyranny can ne'er enthrall;
And I, alas! too late to save!
Yet all I then could give, I gave,
'Twas some relief, our foe a grave.

(The Giaour, 11. 1062-72)

The old man in The Gypsies should have taken warning when Aleko told him the form his reaction to an unfaithful wife would take:

I am not like that. No, I will not without contest
Renounce my rights!
Or at least I will enjoy revenge.
Oh, no! If over the bottomless depth of the sea
I found [my] enemy asleep,
I swear, even there my foot
Would not spare the villain;
In to the waves of the sea, unblanching
Would I thrust him, helpless as he was;
The sudden horror of his waking,
With savage laughter I would upbraid,
And long would the rushing sound of his fall
Make me laugh and exult.

(T.G. 11., 418-30)
Aleko, however, goes one step further than the Giaour in carrying out his revenge. He not only murders the new young lover of Zemfira; he kills Zemfira as well. Byron's heroes seem to have much more compassion for womenfolk than do the heroes of Alexander Pushkin. The Captive whom the Circassian Maid loves and helps to escape makes no attempt to save the young lady when she throws herself into the deep but fast-running Circassian river behind him. Some critics have accused Pushkin of indifference to women. The following is part of his defense against this charge in the case of the Circassian girl: ". . . Some people may be vexed that the captive did not dive into the river to pull out my Circassian girl. Well, you just try it! I have swum in Caucasian streams. You can easily drown without finding a damn thing! My captive is an intelligent and sensible fellow. He is not in love with the Circassian girl, he did right not to drown himself." As is indicated in this defense, it seems that this un-Byronic character trait is deliberate on the part of Pushkin. Whether his explanation is veritable or not is a question that we need not investigate in this study.

Worthy of mention is the fact that a few of Alexander Pushkin's major characters, like Lord Byron's, draw a line between love and marriage. Certainly, Lord Byron has made much more clear than Pushkin has done the distinction between love and matrimony. Normally, he should be expected to illustrate this distinction better than Pushkin could by virtue of
his wider experience of women, his greater exposure to different kinds of people, and his more extensive reading and higher formal education. In *Don Juan* alone there are abundant examples of Byron's views on this particular issue. Julia and Juan, in the first canto of *Don Juan*, are bound together by love while she and Alfonso are merely tied together by matrimony. In the fourteenth canto, Lord Byron leaves us in no doubt that fair Adeline is bound to Lord Henry only by the cord of wedlock; she is pining for love. What she misses in her husband she wants to find in Juan, who has what Henry lacks—sexual passion. After Lord Byron has established the image of Lord Henry as an important, honorable man in the society, he describes this lack as follows:

Still there was something wanting, as I've said--
That undefinable "je ne sçais quoi,"
Which, for what I know, may of yore have led
To Homer's Iliad, since it drew to Troy
The Greek Eve, Helen, from the Spartan's bed;
Though on the whole, no doubt, the Dardan boy
Was much inferior to King Menelaus:--
But thus it is some women will betray us.
(D.J. XIV.72)

There is one conspicuous example in Pushkin's *Evgeny Onegin* where the author seems to draw the distinction between love and marriage. His treatment of the subject, however, is less cynical than Byron's—at least as far as the woman's role is concerned. Pushkin shows us that although Tatyana is married to a prince, her love is for Onegin. In secret, she confesses to Onegin that she loves him but has married somebody else, and thus has missed her chance of happiness forever:
... And happiness, before it glided
Away for ever, was so near. ...
But now my fate is quite decided.
I was in too much haste, I fear;
My mother coaxed and wept, the sequel
You know; besides, all lots were equal
To hapless Tanya . . . Well, and so
I married. Now, I beg you, go.
I know your heart; I need not tremble.
Because your honor and your pride
Must in this matter be your guide
I love you (shy should I dissemble?)
But I became another's wife;
I shall be true to him through life. (E.O. VIII.47)

In this instance Alexander Pushkin, in his treatment of romantic lovers, is different from Lord Byron and other romantic writers like Emily Brontë and D. H. Lawrence. Catherine, reunited with the long-absent Heathcliff, was once again from head to toe in love with him in defiance of Edgar's unfavorable reaction. Lady Chatterly was making up in secret for what she missed in her husband. Tatyana, unlike Byron's coy London belles, freely confesses her passion for Onegin; yet she plans to remain completely faithful to her husband.

Clearly Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin through their creations have told us much about love; virtually all their characters experience one form of love or another. This fact notwithstanding, it is very hard for us to describe precisely what either of them means by love; in each case it seems to have many dimensions. But whatever makes up the constituents of Alexander Pushkin's and Lord Byron's ideal love, it cannot exist apart from physical appeal and strong passion. Complimenting Lord Byron upon his deep and vast knowledge about love,
Elizabeth Boyd remarked, "He had much to say upon love—first love, pure natural love, impure selfish love, and hypocrisies of fashionable love, love in marriage without love—and upon the effect of love in the lives of women and careers of men."^25

There are varieties among the heroines of Lord Byron. Boyd has discerned at least two major groups. On the one hand there are those "women in a state of nature, like Haidee"; on the other, there are those "whose bondage to society damages more or less their natural goodness and calls out in them their worse natures."^26 As the heroines of Lord Byron differ from one another, so do those of Alexander Pushkin, and in roughly the same way. The glaring differences between Zemfira, the Circassian Maid, and Zarema on the one side and Tatyana, Maria, Mary, and Parasha on the other can hardly elude the reader. The former group are more passionate than the latter. Under close examination, it will appear that there are some traits common to several of the major female characters of Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin. Some of these common traits include attitudes toward love, nature, and fate.

Passionate love is one of the strong common traits shared by almost all the heroines of Lord Byron and those of Alexander Pushkin. According to Elizabeth Boyd, Lord Byron "in Don Juan assigns as woman's ruling passion the need to love and to be loved."^27 Medora, Julia, Haidée, Zemfira, Zarema, the Circassian Maid, and Tatyana, to name a few of the best known heroines of both poets, are all intensely romantic in their love affairs.
Tatyana, in a letter confessing her passionate love for Onegin, wrote

Why did you come to visit us?
Here in this village unfrequented
Not knowing you, I would not thus
Have learned how hearts can be tormented . . .

I might (who knows?) have grown contented.
My girlish dreams forever stilled,
And found a partner in another,
And been a faithful wife and mother,
And loved the duties well fulfilled.

Another! . . . No, I could have given
My heart to one, and one alone!
It was decreed . . . the will of Heaven
Ordains it so: I am your own.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

. . . God on high
Has sent you, and I shall be leaning
On your protection till I die . . .
(E.O. III.31)

Disappointed in this one man she loves, she could never love again. Byron's heroic characters, though characteristically more violent than those of Pushkin, share with the latter an extremist position in affairs of the heart. Gulnare of Byron's The Corsair killed Seyd to free herself and Conrad, her lover, from Seyd's captivity.

And he was free!--and she for him had given
Her all on earth and more than all in heaven!

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

She raised her eye, her only answer there;
At once she sought and sunk in his embrace:
If he had driven her from that resting place,
His had been more or less than mortal heart,
But--good or ill--it bade her not depart.
(T.C. III.17)

Numerous other examples could be cited to show the passionate
nature of Byron's and Pushkin's heroines. The above two passages, however, will serve as representative specimens of such speeches.

Another trait shared by a few of the heroines of the two poets is a special feeling for nature. The few who share this trait may be called children of nature. Often they are found in a country environment rather than in metropoles. Among these characters, Byron's Haidée and Pushkin's Tatyana and the Circassian Maid stand prominent. They are pure, innocent, plain, raw, and young; they are almost all virtue and are embodiments of native energy. Although it may be transitory and prove fatal, theirs is an ideal love. The following lines reveal the naturalness of the love between Haidée and Juan:

What was it made them thus exempt from care?
Young innate feelings all have felt below,
Which perish in the rest, but in them were
Inherent--what we mortals call romantic
And always envy, though we deem it frantic.

This is in others a factitious state,
An opium den of too much youth and reading,
But was in them their nature or their fate:
No novels e'er had set their young heart bleeding,
For Haidée's knowledge was by no means great,
And Juan was a boy of saintly breeding;
So there was no reason for their loves
More than for those of nightingales or doves.

(D.J. IV.18-19)

The preceding passage seems to be echoed in the following lines on Tatyana:

Why is Tatyana an offender?
Is it because she cannot deem
Deceit exists, but clings with tender
Simplicity to her young dream?
Is it because her love is artless,
And she not knowing men are heartless,
Obey her feelings sans demur?
Or because Heaven gifted her
With fiery imagination,
With rebel will and lively mind
And with a heart for love designed,
A spirit brooking no dictation?
And can you not forgive, if she
Shows passion's volatility?

(E.O. III.24)

Several female characters of Lord Byron and of Alexander
Pushkin seem to be fated to tragic ends. Byron's Hai'dée, Gul-
nare, Medora, Julia, and Leila, like Pushkin's Zemfira, Zarema,
the Circassian Maid, and Tatyana, end their lives tragically.
In many cases they are victims of circumstances or fate. They
often appear to be sacrificial lambs for the naiveté or imper-
fection of their heroes. They always pay too dearly for their
innate goodness, their simplicity, their plainness, and their
passion. The reader is moved to exclaim, "What an irony of
life! Why should the wicked prosper and the good suffer?"
Commenting on the fate of such characters, Lord Byron was very
right when he said that

The World was not for them--nor the World's art
For beings passionate as Sappho's song;
Love was born with them--in them, so intense,
It was their very spirit--not a sense.

They should have lived together deep in woods,
Unseen as sings the nightingale; they were
Unfit to mix in these thick solitudes
Called social, haunts of Hate, and Vice, and Care:
How lonely every freeborn creature broods!
The sweetest song-birds nestle in a pair
The eagle soars alone; the gull and crow
Flock o'er their carrion, just like men below.

(D.J. IV.27-28)
Byron's viewpoint is echoed in straightforward prose in an analogy made by Christopher Gillie in his discussion of the novels of Jane Austen: "Society is a game, into which characters are born as players. If he plays the game by the rules, the character becomes its slave, although whether he awakens to the fact will depend on his endowments. But to break the rules is to be sent off the field; this might seem romantic but is actually sordid." Some of the heroines of Lord Byron and of Alexander Pushkin "break the rules"; hence, most of them are prematurely "sent off the field." The poet leaves the reader filled with pity, but with little hope for any change in the ruthless way of the world.

As in most of Lord Byron's narratives, the minor characters of Alexander Pushkin are relatively few; and their roles, except in Evgeny Onegin and Ruslan and Ludmilla, are not prominent. In Evgeny Onegin, the minor characters who seem to play important roles include Lensky and Olga. Walter Vickery is of the opinion that "No discussion of Evgeny Onegin can be complete without mention of an important secondary character--Lensky." His assertion is backed up by the following reasoning: "Yet Lensky, like Onegin represents a facet of the author's emotional experience of life: Lensky's naive idealism was something which Pushkin himself had at times experienced and with which, in spite of his irony, he could still sympathize."

Olga is the younger sister of Tatyana. Physically, she is superior to and more attractive than her sister. Her beauty
can be imagined from the following description:

As grateful as a kiss, as simple
As Lensky's life that knew no guile,
Was gentle Olga—in her dimple
One saw the cheerful morning smile,
Her sky-blue eyes, her cheeks like roses,
Her flaxen hair, her graceful poses,
Her voice, were such as they portray
In all the novels of the day.
There was a time when the portrayal
Was one that I found exquisite,
But now I am fed up with it;
And I shall speak, if you allow,
About her older sister now.

(E.O. II.23)

Unlike Tatyana, Olga is not a deep, serious character; she is
the "carefree, lively" type. Her temperament has received
more emphasis from scholars than her attractiveness. According
to John Bayley,

Pushkin's first idea was to return Olga, so to
speak, to the commonplace love story from which he
claims to have borrowed her. She was to visit Lensky's
grave and shed tears over it, like Charlotte over
Werther's in the engraving famous throughout Europe,
before allowing herself to be led off by the broad-
shouldered Uhlan who is her new admirer. Pushkin
retains her as his own character, in the final text,
by making her consistent—she does not visit the
grave. As her incomprehension of his feelings made
Lensky feel himself still beloved, so—after his
death—it removes all thought of him from her head. 31

As scanty as they are, one or two other minor characters
of Alexander Pushkin are comparable to some of Lord Byron's.
Although temperamentally different, the Old Man in The Gypsies,
Zemfira's father, is comparable to Lambro, the pirate in Don
Juan. Both of them seem to play a similar role—the doting
father of a young lady who is in love. Both of them seem to
symbolize the public spokesman for a particular society.
Boyd comments on the nature of Lambro: "Headlong passion in a natural state of innocence collides with the cruel passion of Lambro, who typifies the barbaric civilization of the Orient."

After Aleko had murdered the new young lover of his wife and also the wife as well, the old man sorrowfully but calmly told Aleko to

Leaves us, prideful man!
We are savages; we have no laws,
We do not torture, do not put (men) to death--
We have no need of blood and groans--
But live with a murderer we will not...
You were not born for the life of the wild,
You for yourself alone crave freedom;
Dreadful will be your voice for us:
We are timid and good of soul,
You are fierce and bold--leave us then;
Farewell, may peace be with you.
(T.G., 11.511-21)

A person may have the impression that the old man was speaking not for himself alone, but for the whole community of the gypsies of which he was a member.

Alexander Pushkin's nurse in Evgeny Onegin is roughly comparable to Lord Byron's maid in Don Juan. The nurse of Tatyana is as dutiful and loyal to her mistress as Julia's maid is to hers. Both of them are protective and trusty. Both of them play significant roles in the unsuccessful love affairs of their respective mistresses. Julia's maid helps to hide Juan for a while. But for her, Juan and Julia might have been caught in the act of lovemaking, and Juan's escape would have been hard to imagine. The grandson of the nurse in Evgeny Onegin carries Tatyana's love letter to Onegin. It is against society's norms
for a lady to propose love to a man; it should be the other way around. The nurse never lets out the secret of the letter. Besides, she stays with her young mistress during her emotional disturbance occasioned by her love for Onegin and her disappointment in him.

Finally, both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin make use of the supernatural element in their characterization. Examples of supernatural elements abound in Lord Byron’s *Manfred* and in Alexander Pushkin's *Ruslan and Ludmilla*. Lord Byron employs a supernatural element to explore the unknown. Manfred, in his pursuit of fulfillment, wrongfully seeks the aid of the supernatural. The supernatural power in *Ruslan and Ludmilla* is used for both good and evil ends. Largely, it is used for man's selfish purposes; however, the good triumphs over the evil at the end.

Lord Byron has long distinguished himself as a unique creator of character; his Harold and Juan are thought by some to be as universal as any of Shakespeare's heroes. I strongly believe that Alexander Pushkin approaches Byron's stature in the art of characterization, though his works have suffered some neglect outside of Russia. Perhaps in the near future, when more and more people will become acquainted with the creations of this great Russian poet, he too will emerge, like Lord Byron, as one of the greatest international poets the world has produced, a position that he has long had among serious students of comparative literature. His masterpiece,
Evgeny Onegin, is as popular with those who read Russian as Don Juan is with readers of English over the world. My hope in the continuous emergence of Alexander Pushkin as one of the world's great writers is based on my belief in what Byron said in Don Juan:

Besides, my Muse by no means deals in fiction
She gathers a repertory of facts
Of course with some reserve and slight restriction,
But mostly sings of human things and acts--
And that's one cause she meets with contradiction;
For too much truth, at first sight ne'er attracts;
And were her object only what's called Glory,
With more ease, too she'd tell a different story.  
(D.J. XIV.13)

Just as many of the incidents and characters of Lord Byron are based on fact and on the truth of human nature, so are those of Alexander Pushkin.

With this we come to consider the third dimension of this comparative study--the modes of expression of both poets.
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CHAPTER III

ANALOGOUS STYLISTIC FEATURES IN
DON JUAN AND EVGENY ONEGIN

Literary style, or, to be more precise, the analysis of literary style, tends not to be a favorite topic of discussion among college undergraduates or even among some university graduates, irrespective of their major fields of study. The reason for this is not far to seek: theme and characterization, as aspects of literature, lend themselves to discussion easier than does style. Most people can grasp and describe the substance and the personae in a literary piece with less difficulty than they can describe the manner of writing of an author. Indeed, it is only a comparatively few people unusually sensitive to language who concern themselves greatly with style; average readers are rather concerned with events and characters. Furthermore, the analysis of literary style has become so complicated that most readers would be reluctant to dabble in it. In attempting to discuss the styles in Don Juan and Evgeny Onegin, the writer of this paper is not necessarily pretending to have acquired some special skills for stylistic analysis. Rather the motive came from the realization that style, as an integral component of literature, is simply too important to be neglected in a comparative investigation such as this.
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Opinions on the meaning of literary style are as divergent as suggestions for its analysis. David Watson Rannie believes that it is almost hopeless to try to find a precise definition of style which will be satisfactory to everybody. "So seldom has such clearness of meaning been sought for highterto, that it is probably hopeless to make a definition which will satisfy everybody. Everybody has his or her own notion of style, and inevitably, therefore, his or her own notion as to the proper words in which to clothe it."\(^1\)

According to Bennison Gray, several attempts to solve the problem of style have, instead, further complicated it: "Few problems in literary scholarship continue to generate so much endeavor and so much conflict as the problem of style. Even conferences are called to attempt to answer the questions: What is style? How can we study it? There is no shortage of answers, but unfortunately, increasing efforts to solve the problem have only created a proliferation of approaches."\(^2\)

To illustrate his point, Gray mentions an interdisciplinary conference held in 1958. The conference, which was to "explore the possibility of finding a common basis for discussing" and understanding the characteristics of style in language, was well-attended by "a cross-section of leaders in a wide variety of disciplines."\(^3\) According to one of the eminent scholars who attended the conference, René Wellek, "the conference has not been a success . . . if its purpose was to establish a common language and to throw light on its professed central
topic, the problem of style and particularly of style in literature and method of analysing style."^4

Notwithstanding the present-day conflicting opinions about the definition and the analysis of literary style, the futility of some past efforts to establish a common language for treating it, and the pessimistic views of critics like Rannie on future endeavors concerning the problem of style, people continue to make efforts in order to find a solution to the problem of literary style. Perhaps a time will come when their efforts will be rewarded. Perhaps from the continued conflicting approaches, a pattern that would be acceptable to most people might evolve.

Just as scholars have not agreed on a definition of literary style, neither have they agreed on a specific criterion for analyzing it; most of them, however, have recognized the importance of studying literary style for the purpose of understanding literature. Edgar V. Roberts believes that stylistic analysis is "a dependable means of evaluating literature."^5

Joseph Strelka, in the preface to Patterns of Literary Style, asserts that "Sainte-Beuve's famous remark that the only thing immortal in literature is style stands as one of the prime testimonials to the importance of style analysis in literary criticism."^6 In the same preface, Strelka, in support of his views, cites several other authorities, among them F. W. Beason, Georges Buffon, and Damaso Alonso, who have expressed similar opinions. It may be noted that even Rannie,
some of whose remarks on the discussion of style have been seen to be rather discouraging, has announced that "When we think of all that literary expression is and means, we shall come to see that the study of style is really the study of literature itself; and that only by understanding style, by distinguishing its processes and methods, and taking note of its failure and triumphs, can we know literature." \(^7\) One can hardly exhaust the list of writers who have expressed their thoughts on the importance of developing the ability to observe and anatomize the styles of literary artists. To continue to mention them would amount to mere cataloguing, which perhaps might be burdensome to the reader. The few that have been cited will serve as representatives. Besides, it is not the aim of this chapter to survey all the general theories and methodologies of style; it is to compare the styles of two outstanding Romantic poets—Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin.

It is noteworthy to observe that among others, two different schools of thought on the analysis of style stand prominently: there are the linguists who believe in the quantitative or scientific analysis of style, and there are literary scholars who insist on the traditional analysis of style. In its comparison of the style of Alexander Pushkin with that of Lord Byron, this paper does not take the way of the linguistic quantitative approach; the comparison is based on personal observation of the modes of expression of the two poets. In short, the comparison will be somewhat subjective.
Unlike the previous ones, this chapter will limit its focus to Lord Byron's *Don Juan* and Alexander Pushkin's *Evgeny Onegin* as the texts to be used in the comparison. It is a commonplace that as *Don Juan* is generally acknowledged as the best work of Lord Byron, so *Evgeny Onegin* has, by majority opinion, been acclaimed as the greatest production of Alexander Pushkin. It is very probable that a disinterested description of the styles of these "novels in verse" is likely to reflect the true expressive abilities of the authors. Another reason for choosing *Don Juan* and *Evgeny Onegin* as the only texts for comparison is that these two narrative poems in many respects resemble each other. Quite a few scholars have noted the strong influence of *Don Juan* on *Evgeny Onegin*. Perhaps Henry Gifford does not mean to run down the great Russian poet nor to underrate his greatest work in the following statement; but he does call Pushkin's originality in question: "*Eugene Onegin* abounds in parody of literary forms and the attitudes they express; . . . but Pushkin is a master of 'imitation' as well as parody."8 In this connection, we will do well to note the following assertion of Gray: "Good works should be good works regardless of whether or not they are imitative."9 Vickery seems to be more moderate and objective than Gifford in expressing his opinion on the affinity between *Don Juan* and *Evgeny Onegin*: "Actually, the stimulus to the writing of *Evgeny Onegin* came from another novel in verse: Byron's *Don Juan*, or rather from the first two cantos, which started Pushkin on his way."10
Pushkin was reported to have written to a fellow poet, P. A. Vyazemsky, as follows: "I am writing, not a novel but a novel in verse. . . . It's in the genre of Don Juan."\(^{11}\)

Edgar Roberts' concise remark about style, that it "is concerned with diction, phrases, sentences, and sound and rhythm--...,\(^{12}\) will serve as guide in the description of the styles in Don Juan and in Evgeny Onegin throughout this chapter.

One of the first things that would impress a reader of Evgeny Onegin and Don Juan is the control of the authors over their subject matter. According to Roberts, "the study of style should aim toward a description of the writer's ability to control his words to serve his needs."\(^{13}\) A reading of the poems in question would certainly show the reader that Alexander Pushkin and Lord Byron adapt their words to suit not only the occasions but also their characters. Examples of such adaptation abound in the two poems. Examine the following stanzas from Evgeny Onegin and Don Juan:

(A) You wrote me. There is no use seeking
To disavow it now. I read,
A pure love's innocent effusion;
Your candor filled me with confusion;
I read a shy confiding word,
And feelings, long quiescent, stirred;
I would not praise you, but sincerely
I would require sincerity;
You may expect no less from me;
Your frank avowal touched me nearly.
Hear my confession, then, I pray
And you shall judge me as you may, . . .

(E.O. IV.12)
(B) Then I was younger, maybe better, 
Onegin, and I loved you; Well? 
How did you take my girlish letter? 
Your heart responded how? Pray, tell! 
Most harshly: there was no disguising 
Your scorn. You did not find surprising 
The plain girl's love? Why, even now, 
I freeze--good God!--recalling how 
You came and lectured me so coldly-- 
Your look that made my spirit sink! 
But for that sermon do not think 
I blame you . . . for you acted boldly, 
Indeed, you played a noble role: 
I thank you from my inmost soul. 
(E.O. VIII.43)

(C) "I cannot sleep, nurse; it is stifling! 
Open the window; come, sit here." 
"What ails you, Tanya?" "Oh, it's trifling, 
I'm bored; tell me a story, dear." 
"A story?" asked the good old woman, 
"Of maids and creatures superhuman? 
Ah, yes, I knew such old wives' tales, 
But I grow old, and memory fails; 
How said it is to be forgetting! 
I've fallen on black days, my dear-- 
I lose the thread, my mind's not clear 
It is no wonder I am fretting . . ." 
"But, nurse, you still can tell me of 
Your own young days. Were you in love?" 
(E.O. III.17)

(D) Was it for this that no Cortejo e'er 
I yet have chosen from out the youth of Seville? 
Is it for this I scarce went anywhere, 
Except to bull-fights, mass, play, rout, and revel? 
Is it for this, whate'er my suitors were, 
I favor'd none--nay, was almost uncivil? 
Is it for this that General Count O'Reilly, 
Who took Algiers, declares I used him vilely? 
(D.J. I.148)

(E) Advancing to the nearest dinner tray, 
Tapping the shoulder of the highest guest, 
With a peculiar smile, which, by the way, 
Boded no good, whatever it express'd, 
He ask'd the meaning of this holiday; 
The vinous Greek to whom he had addressed 
His question, much too merry to divine 
The questioner, fill'd up a glass of wine. 
(D.J. III.42)
And without turning his facetious head,  
Over his shoulder, with a Bacchant air,  
Presented the o'erflowing cup, and said,  
'Talking's dry work, I have no time to spare.'  
A second hiccup'd, 'Our old master's dead,  
You'd better ask our mistress who's his heir.'  
'Our mistress! quoth a third: Our mistress!--pooh!--  
You mean our master--not the old, but new.'  
(D.J. III.43)

'I know not,' quoth the fellow, 'who or what  
He is, nor whence he came--and little care;  
But this I know, that this roast capon's fat,  
And that good wine ne'er wash'd down better fare;  
And if you are not satisfied with that  
Direct your questions to my neighbour there;  
He'll answer for better or for worse,  
For none likes more to hear himself converse.  
(D.J. III.45)

The first stanza is part of the oral reply of Onegin to Tatyana's love letter. If the stanza shows nothing else, it reveals Onegin's apparent indifference to Tatyana, who was all in love with him. It also reveals Onegin's feeling of superiority over the country girl Tatyana. Take note of his urbane detachment in the lines "You wrote me. There is no use seeking / To disavow it now. . . . / Your frank avowal touched me nearly." The sentences in the stanza are smooth and well-formed. The stanza, unlike the three other examples below it, does not reflect any genuine emotional disturbance on the part of the speaker.

Example (B), spoken by Tatyana to Onegin, contains quite a number of short phrases, question marks, exclamation marks, dashes, and dots. The sentences seem incoherent and unrelated. What all these devices suggest is that the speaker is perhaps a little disturbed emotionally.
Example (C) shows two characters. Through their speech we can easily infer their conditions. The speech of the resigned, worldly-wise nurse is smoother and more coherent than that of the youthful, impulsive Tatyana.

Turning to Don Juan, we see in example (D) a striking illustration of Lord Byron's ability to adapt his language to match various episodes and characters. The rhetorical questions and the effective repetition in the passage give the reader a clear insight into the dramatic situation. Passages like these stand prominently as examples of variations to the mode of strict narrative and make the reading of the whole poem less boring. The dramatic effect of many of these passages in Don Juan, especially those in conversational form like example (D), is enhanced by a degree of comic effect. Examples (E), (F) and (G) contain the description of Haidee's party and the sudden return of her father, who was deemed to have been dead. Lambro is serious, but the reveling guests at the party are not. This mixture of seriousness and triviality is typical of merry-making, where people eat, drink and converse. The episode demonstrates expert control of situation and language on the part of the author.

Considering the variety of characters in Don Juan--Julia, the maid, the drunken guests at Haidee's dinner party, Haidee, Juan, Lambro, Lady Adeline, and a host of others, who at various occasions express themselves, I am tempted to conclude that Lord Byron has greater power to adapt his language
to suit situations and characters than Alexander Pushkin, since I find fewer specific adaptations of language to character in Evgeny Onegin than in Don Juan.

Scattered throughout Evgeny Onegin are some graphic impressive descriptions of certain events. The same thing is true of Don Juan. Consider how engrossing the descriptions of the following events are:

... Then buzzing, all sit down to dine.

Awhile all conversation ceases; They chew. The pleasant prandial chink Of plates and silverware increases, The touching glasses chime and clink. The feast goes on, but soon thereafter The room grows loud with talk and laughter And none can hear his neighbor speak, They chortle, argue, shout and squeak. And while they all are in high feather, The door swings wide, and Lensky's here, Onegin too. "At last, oh, dear," The hostess cries. Guests squeeze together Move plates and chairs with ready glee, And seat the two friends hastily. (E.O. V.28-29)

They look upon each other, and their eyes Gleam in the moonlight; and her white arm clasps Round Juan's head, and his around her lies Half buried in the tresses which it grasps; She sits upon his knee, and drinks his sighs, He hers, until they end in broken gasps; And thus they form a group that's quite antique, Half naked, loving, natural, and Greek. (D.J. II.194)

The first stanza is Pushkin's description of Tatyana's birthday feast. The description is so vivid and detailed that one would almost imagine oneself actually seeing or hearing the guests as they eat and talk. A device which seems to have particularly contributed to the richness of this description is
the appropriate use of onomatopoeia. The words "chink" in the second line and "chime" and "clink" in the fourth seem to reproduce the familiar sounds of crockery at a feast. "Buzzing" and "chortle" represent accurately the sounds of human prattling and loud chuckling. Alexander Pushkin is particularly skilful in the use of onomatopoeia.

The second stanza is Byron's recreation of Juan and Haideé at their first love-making in a cave overlooking the ocean. This description of Byron's is as highly charged with emotion as the event he is describing. Again, Lord Byron seems to have more of these breath-stifling descriptions in his Don Juan than Alexander Pushkin has in his Evgeny Onegin.

Lord Byron's style in Don Juan seems to defy any precise definition; sometimes it is simple; other times it is complex. Elizabeth Boyd noted that "'The style of Don Juan' is a somewhat inexact phrase, for the most obvious quality of the poem is its variety, its multiplicity of styles, or, more accurately, of tones." Compare the following two stanzas from Don Juan:

Poor Julia's heart was in an awkward state;
She felt it going, and resolved to make
The noblest efforts for herself and mate,
For Honor's, Pride's, Religion's, Virtue's sake:
Her resolutions were most truly great,
And almost might have made a Tarquin quake;
She prayed the Virgin Mary for her grace,
As being the best judge of a lady's case.

(D.J. I.75)

It was not envy--Adeline had none;
Her place was far beyond it, and her mind:
It was not scorn--which could not light on one
Whose greatest fault was leaving few to find:
It was not jealousy, I think--but shun
Following the ignes fatui of Mankind:
It was not--but 'tis easier, alas!
To say what it was not than what it was.
(D.J. XV.54)

The first stanza above appears to be more lucid and smoother than the second. The use of dashes and subordinate clauses in the second stanza tends to make the reading somehow jerky. Byron's technique here calls for caution on the part of the reader attempting an analysis of the poet's style. For example, the words "... but shun / Following the ignes fatui of Mankind" must be read with a slight change of tone, since they express a tongue-in-cheek comment on the author's own practice. It must be noted that although the use of dashes has impeded smooth flow of the lines in this particular stanza, as it may in many other stanzas of the poem, it has also aided comprehension by accurately conveying a feeling of uncertainty or skepticism on the part of the author or his characters.

Although the stylistic devices in Evgeny Onegin are as varied as those of Don Juan, Pushkin's poem gives an impression of being much more lucid than Lord Byron's Don Juan, mainly because Pushkin's work is more purely narrative. John Bayley has remarked that "the diction of Pushkin's poetry is a complex and specialised field of study, but even the foreign amateur can get the feel of the aesthetic processes involved, and can become aware of when and in what spirit Pushkin uses a Church Slavonic word, a Gallicism, and a direct and down-to-earth colloquial construction, or the syntax and vocabulary of
received poetic diction." It appears that Bayley's opinion is based on his reading of the works of the poet in the original editions. Nevertheless, what he has said may be applied to any good translation of the work since the characteristics of the style in the original work are bound to be reflected to some extent in a faithful translation of it. The lucidity and conciseness of Alexander Pushkin are well illustrated in the following stanza from Evgeny Onegin:

Since infancy her only pleasure
Was reverie; she wreathed with dream
The placid course of rustic leisure;
Her tender fingers sewed no seam,
Nor was she found with head inclining
O'er her embroidery, designing
In colored silks a pattern fit
To make a guest exclaim at it.
The will to rule is seen thus early:
The child while still at play prepares
For all her future social cares
And the polite world's hurly-burly,
And tells her doll with anxious thought
The maxims her mamma has taught.

(E.O. II.26)

In numerous stanzas of Evgeny Onegin, Alexander Pushkin, like Lord Byron in Don Juan, has made use of certain figures of speech which are sure to create images in the mind of the reader. Note the contrast between the lively spring and the living ghost of the poetic voice in the following stanza of Onegin:

Ah, spring, fair spring, the lovers' season,
How sad I find you! How you flood
My soul with dreams that challenge reason,
And with strange languor fill my blood!
My stricken heart cries out and fails me
When once the breath of spring assails me,
Although its touch be soft as fleece,
While I lie lapped in rural peace!
Is it that I was born to languish,
And all that sparkles, triumphs, sings,
Is alien to my breast, and brings
No gift but weariness and anguish
To one whose soul has perished, and
Who sees the dark on every hand?
(E.O. VII.2)

In this particular stanza, a person can point out several figures of speech and rhetorical devices. Prominent among them is the apostrophe in the first line—"Ah, spring, fair spring." This is followed by a metaphor in the second line—"How you flood / My soul with dreams that challenge reason." 
"My stricken heart cries out and fails me" is a personification. "Although its touch be soft as fleece" contains a simile. There are other figures of speech in this particular stanza; those mentioned above are only the most prominent ones. Besides the images which these figures of speech help to create, they greatly enliven the passages where they occur and thereby save the whole poem from monotony and dullness.

For purposes of comparison the following stanza, which is as fully packed with images as the one cited from Evgeny Onegin (if not more so), is taken from Don Juan:

Between two worlds life hovers like a star,
'Twixt night and morn, upon the horizon's verge.
How little do we know that which we are!
How less what we may be! The eternal surge
Of time and tide rolls on, and bears afar
Our bubbles; as the old burst, new emerge,
Lash'd from the foam of ages, while the graves
Of empires heave but like some passing waves.
(D.J. XV.99)

All the figures of speech in this stanza need not be enumerated; most of them are obvious enough. However, it seems to
contain a lexical ambiguity as far as the meaning of one of the images is concerned: "The eternal surge / Of time and tide rolls on, and bears afar / Our bubbles; as the old burst, new emerge." Certainly, with these two lines Lord Byron has recreated life as an endless series of waves following one another like the ocean waves which are a common sight at beaches. "The eternal surge / Of time and tide" (waves) may be deemed to represent also calendar years in the life of human beings, for there is no end to them and they follow one another in quick succession, as do the ocean waves. Now, what do "Our bubbles" stand for in actual life according to the context? Can they represent successive generations of human beings, the old yielding place to the new? Or can they be deemed to stand for human problems, human aspirations and endeavors, human successes and failures? The ambiguity lies precisely in "and bears afar / Our bubbles; as the old burst, new emerge." For there is no end, it is believed, to a man's problems, aspirations, successes, and failures. Neither is there any end to human generations. It is not that this lexical ambiguity has obscured the intended meaning, nor that it has created serious confusion. Rather, it has enriched the meaning and has enlarged the dimension of the imagery.

It appears that Lord Byron's metaphors and images are more abundant and much more vigorous than Alexander Pushkin's. Consider the following stanza, which appears to be the counterpart of the aforementioned stanza. The stanza below is taken
from *Evgeny Onegin*:

Alas! by God's strange will we must
Behold each generation flourish,
And watch life's furrows briefly nourish
The perishable human crop,
Which ripens fairly, but to drop;
And where one falls, another surges...
The race of men recks nothing, save
Its reckless growth: into the grave
The grandfathers it promptly urges.
Our time will come when it is due,
Our grandchildren evict us too.

(E.O. II.38)

One of the factors accountable for the variety and strength of Lord Byron's metaphors is that he seems to have a wider range of lexical items to choose from for his metaphors than Alexander Pushkin has. While the metaphors of Lord Byron tend to revolve around sea, mountain, fire, spring, autumn, planetary bodies, Biblical stories, and animals, those of Alexander Pushkin are limited to the planetary bodies, meadow, wind, fire, flower, seasons, and tempest. In the introduction to *The Byronic Byron* Gilbert Phelps explains the nature and the effects of Lord Byron's metaphors:

Within these extended metaphors, the smaller ones, if we look at them in isolation, often seem trite and vulgar; but caught up in the greater wholes to which they belong their defects somehow do not seem so noticeable. In the stanzas describing the battlefield of Waterloo in Canto III of *Childe Harold*, for example, rhetorical expressions like "Earthquake's spoil" for the French dead who, like Napoleon's hopes, are "sepulchred below"; strike one as forced and stale, but within the total image of the battle (which is in its turn part of Byron's overall vision of chaos and anarchy) they play their part and even contribute by their very stridency to the general cacophony.

Regardless of the negative criticism of some professional
critics, profound and captivating figures of speech abound in Don Juan for humble readers. A definitive listing of them (to say nothing of a full analysis) not only would fill very many pages of a book, it would also take a considerable length of time to accomplish; this is an endeavor that is outside the scope of this paper.

Evgeny Onegin as a "novel in verse" is made up of eight chapters. Each chapter consists of between forty and fifty-four stanzas, and each stanza is made up of fourteen lines. The purpose of this breakdown is to give the reader who may not have read the poem an insight into its length and structure. The fact that Alexander Pushkin was a genius in the art of versification has been acknowledged by some reputable critics. According to Bayley, "Pushkin is unique among great writers, and particularly writers of his own age, in his attitude to literary forms."¹⁷ In the opinion of Ernest J. Simmons, Evgeny Onegin "is composed with easy spontaneity in intricately rhymed fourteen line stanzas of a sustained perfection which in itself is the highest art."¹⁸ Vickery has described the major characteristics of a stanza from Evgeny Onegin in the following paragraph:

A detailed analysis of the characteristics of the "Onegin" stanza lies beyond the scope of this discussion. But the following points, briefly noted, may be of interest: (1) The "Onegin" stanza is written in four-foot iambics, still Pushkin's preferred meter at the time of the writing, and alternates between masculine and feminine rhyme, that is, eight- and nine-syllable lines. (2) The rhyme scheme is as follows (small letters for
masculine and capital letters for feminine rhymes): Ab-AbCCddEffEgg. (3) Evgeny Onegin was one of the first and one of the few occasions on which Pushkin used a regular stanzaic arrangement for anything beyond a lyric or short poem—the idea being most probably suggested to him by Byron's use of the Italian ottava rima in Beppo and Don Juan. (4) Although fourteen lines naturally call to mind the sonnet, the "Onegin" stanza is basically new—the final rhymed couplet, which lends itself so well to the epigrammatic or bathetic ending, being probably also suggested by Byron and, in general, the ottava rima with its similar home-striking final couplet.19

One problem that would baffle many readers is to imagine how the author of such a long poem has been able to balance a delicate and intricate rhyme scheme with an almost perfect uniformity in the length of the lines. In the physical and technical aspects of poetic composition, Alexander Pushkin seems to surpass Lord Byron. A glance at both Don Juan and Evgeny Onegin is enough to convince a reader of this opinion. This does not mean that Lord Byron's Don Juan is seriously wanting in poetic physical arrangement; if his lines are not uniformly regular, at least he has employed a definite rhyme scheme called ottava rima. As Phelps has put it, "If Byron was not the kind of artist who goes in for carefully chiselled details that does not mean that he was not an artist at all. Recent research, in fact, has thoroughly discounted the old idea (encouraged by Byron himself, who liked to pretend that he was a mere aristocratic dilettante) that he did not take pains with his work."20 According to Boyd, when the first two cantos of Don Juan were about to be published, the adverse
criticisms of John Murray's circle and those of Lord Byron's friends like John Cam Hobhouse were directed not so much toward the poetry of the work as toward its morals: "But it irked him that all the criticisms were directed at the 'morality' of the poem, while nothing but high praise was expressed for its poetry." Ignoring most of the adverse criticism and the discouragement, Lord Byron stubbornly continued with his writing of the poem, and that is why we have Don Juan at all.

Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin have made use of quite a number of similar poetical devices in their respective novels in verse. This fact partially explains the strong affinity between Don Juan and Evgeny Onegin. In a study such as this, a person could hardly mention and treat all such literary devices without straining the patience of the reader. Henceforth, discussion in this paper will focus on those few of them that are too conspicuous to bypass without comment.

Anaphora is one of the many poetical and rhetorical devices used effectively by both Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin. Of several examples, the following are cited here because of their striking similarity:

Of secret treasures found in hidden vales,
Of wonderful replies from Arab jokers,
Of charms to make good gold and cure bad ails,
Of rocks bewitched that open to the knockers,
Of magic ladies who, by one sole act, . . .
(D.J. III.34)

Of foreign history and Russian,
Of prejudice's ancient yoke,
Of good and evil, and of science,
Of destiny and its defiance,
Of that dread mystery, the grave; . . .
(E.O. XX.14)
Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin sound alike in their mock invocations to the Muse. Lord Byron calls on the Muse several times in *Don Juan*, always in a facetious vein: "Chaste Muse!" (*D.J.* II.7), "Hail, Muse! et cetera" (*D.J.* III.1). The following invocation by Pushkin seems at first glance to be not only more elaborate but more reverent than those in *Don Juan*, but the closing lines reveal a whimsical note akin to Byron's:

```
. . . O hover thou above
My labors—bless them with thy beauty.
Thou epic Muse! Upon my way
Be thou my staff, nor let me stray.
Enough. Though late, I've done my duty,
To classicism doffed my hat:
Here's the exordium. That's that!
(E.O. VII.55)
```

Another special poetic device which catches the attention of the reader in *Don Juan* and which appears also in *Evgeny Onegin* is formal cataloguing in a more or less whimsical vein. Lord Byron's list is more international and more interdisciplinary in outlook than that of Alexander Pushkin. While the list of Pushkin is confined to Russian and French writers, Lord Byron's contains personalities from Britain, France, Portugal, and Greece, and they are from various branches of knowledge: war, politics, and philosophy. Pushkin's list includes Fonvizin, Knyazhnin, Semyonova, Ozerov, Corneille, Shakovskoy, and Diderot (*E.O.* I.18). That of Lord Byron, though too long to enumerate, includes the following principal figures: Wolfe, Prince Ferdinand, Buonaparte, Danton, Condorcet, Nelson, and a host of others (*D.J.* I.2-4). According to Lloyd Jeffrey,
this practice of formal cataloguing does not originate from Lord Byron himself; it is "another feature of the Homeric epos burlesqued in Don Juan,"\textsuperscript{22} and a manifestation of Lord Byron's familiarity with the \textit{Iliad}. Similarly, Pushkin's use of the device probably derives from his knowledge of the classics and is not evidence of Byronic influence.

An element of style which can hardly elude a reader of either \textit{Don Juan} or \textit{Evgeny Onegin} is ironical humor. According to Edward E. Bostetter, "Byron achieves much of this effect by the remarkable range of tones in which he expresses himself: from despair to outrage, to defiance, to hope, to stoicism, and resignation, and finally to amused contemplation."\textsuperscript{23} William J. Calvert argues that "there is a unity of tone, gained, if not by uniformity, by a consistent return to the note of humor. When the author grows too metaphysical, quite forgets 'this poem's merely quizzical, and deviates into matters rather dry,' he brings himself back to earth with single stroke of his pen, and resumes his gaiety."\textsuperscript{24}

In the following stanza, to note one of innumerable examples, Lord Byron has created a memorable humorous effect by playing on the word "fifty," at the same time emphasizing the incongruity in the marriage between Julia, who was twenty-three years old, and Don Alfonso, who was fifty:

\begin{quote}
When people say, "I've told you FIFTY times\footnote{When people say, "I've told you FIFTY times" They mean to scold, and very often do; When poets say, "I've written FIFTY rhymes," They make you dread that they'll recite them too;}\footnote{When people say, "I've told you FIFTY times" They mean to scold, and very often do; When poets say, "I've written FIFTY rhymes," They make you dread that they'll recite them too;}\footnote{When people say, "I've told you FIFTY times" They mean to scold, and very often do; When poets say, "I've written FIFTY rhymes," They make you dread that they'll recite them too;}
\end{quote}
In gangs of FIFTY, thieves commit their crimes;  
At FIFTY love for love is rare, 'tis true  
But then, no doubt, it equally as true is,  
A good deal may be bought for FIFTY Louis.  
(D.J. I.108)

Alexander Pushkin, like Lord Byron, constantly injects his writings with humor. As in Byron's case, many examples could be given. The following passage, where the poet comments wryly on the relationship between serf and master, illustrates as well as any other the ironic quality of Pushkin's humor:

The country round about was still,  
Save for the chorus on the hill  
Where maids sang to keep from cheating  
The masters of the berry-crop.  
They dared not let their voices drop:  
For if they sing, they can't be eating  
(A shrewd command that perfectly  
Proves rustic ingenuity).  
(E.O. III.39)

_Evgeny Onegin_ and _Don Juan_ resemble each other in their methods of narration. In each poem, the double role of the poet as both narrator and protagonist has been recognized by critics. Some scholars have commented extensively on this style of narration, which Bayley has termed "the authorial presence." Following is Vickery's assessment of the role of the author-narrator's poetic personality in _Evgeny Onegin:_

"But over, above, and beyond the plot there is another, higher element: the author-narrator's poetic personality. The author-narrator's personality is not simply one of several component elements; rather it is a presence which binds together all other component elements, which pervades the entire work and which gives it a whole new focus, a whole new dimension."
And of *Don Juan* Boyd stated that "If Anacharsis Cloots is, at least in part, the original of Byron's Don Juan, we recognize immediately that Byron divided the suggestions inherent in him between Juan and himself. The outward facts and circumstances he left to his hero, and the opinions he retained for his own expression." The presence of the author's personality makes itself felt especially through digressions, mock apologies, and chatty conversations which permeate both poems.

There are numerous examples of digression in both *Don Juan* and *Evgeny Onegin*. They vary in length from a few lines to several or even many stanzas. For example, the story that is left off in chapter one, stanza one of *Evgeny Onegin* is not picked up again until stanza fifty-two of the same chapter. Pushkin's digressions are, however, less numerous, as well as less notorious, than Byron's. After a prolonged and elaborate digression, Lord Byron jokingly remarks:

```
But let me to my story: I must own,
If I have any fault, it is digression,
Leaving my people to proceed alone,
While I soliloquise beyond expression;
But these are my addresses from the throne,
Which put off business to the ensuing session:--
Forgetting each omission is a loss to
The world, not quite so great as Ariosto.
(D.J. III.96)
```

In neither poem are the digressions as completely unrelated to the story as the preceding apology of Lord Byron might suggest to people who are not yet familiar with *Don Juan*. Indeed, these digressions are often the cream of each poem. Sometimes they contain serious philosophy, logic, or analogy; some other
times they are stuffed with amusing trivialities, or with attacks on some personalities, institutions, or governments. There is some agreement among critics that Lord Byron's asides collectively form an integral part of *Don Juan*. William Calvert's is one of the favorable comments on the role digressions play in the whole framework of the poem:

The digressions, however, are but part of the business. Byron had never been thoroughly at home when pursuing a rigid scheme, and his bent had been always to break away from the fetters of design. For long his muse had 'admired digression' particularly at genial moments. In the plan of the whole, digressions are the humor of it. He digresses because he has much to say; because his poem is a criticism of life. But he also digresses to relieve a situation, to show that things are not so serious as they seem, or that there are other things worth talking about, or that the real subject of the poem is Byron and what Byron thinks, not the miscellaneous adventures of Juan.\(^{28}\)

The satire in *Don Juan* can hardly be overlooked in this chapter without creating a serious gap in a discussion of the style of Byron's novel in verse. Indeed, Lord Byron himself said in a letter to John Murray that "*Don Juan* will be known by and bye, for what it is intended--a Satire on abuses of the present state of society, and not an eulogy of vice..."\(^{29}\)

As has been pointed out by Calvert, Lord Byron's satire is different from John Dryden's, Alexander Pope's or Charles Churchill's because generally it is almost devoid of malice or bitterness; "its basis is not so much indignation as cynicism."\(^{30}\)

Lord Byron used all the poetic devices at his command in order to make his satire effective. To name a few, allusion,
metaphor, verbal and dramatic irony, and name-calling feature prominently. Generally, his satire is mixed with humor, although his ultimate purpose is likely to be serious. Consider the following stanza, which ostensibly is about Lambro, the pirate; but in actual fact, Lord Byron is indirectly attacking the system of tariff and taxation and the exorbitant lawyer's fees in England at that time:

Let not his mode of raising cash seem strange,
Although he fleeced the flags of every nation,
For into a Prime Minister but change
His title, and 'tis nothing but taxation;
But he, more modest, took an humbler range
Of Life, and in an honester vocation
Pursued o'er the high seas his watery journey,
And merely practised as a sea-attorney.  
(D.J. III.14)

As Jeffrey has pointed out, "Byron is not basically a frivolous poet, indifferent to the state of the world; and satirical bitterness appears when he exhorts the goddesses of poetry to help him sustain so weighty a subject as the King, George IV."³¹

In the following lines Lord Byron seems to be chastising the King of England for his probable indifference to the poor starving Irish, who were then plagued with the problem of locusts:

Bear it, ye Muses, on your brightest wing!
Howe'er the mighty locust Desolation,
Strip your green fields and to your harvests cling,
Gaunt famine never shall approach the throne--
Though Ireland starve, great George weighs twenty stone.  
(D.J. VIII.126)

Lord Byron sounds rather harsh at times in his satire. This is particularly manifested in his attitudes to some of his critics:
Dogs, or men!—for I flatter you in saying
That ye are dogs—your betters far—ye may
Read, or read not, what I am now essaying
To show ye what ye are in every way.
As little as the moon stops for the baying
Of wolves, will the bright Muse withdraw one ray
from out her skies—then howl your idle wrath!
While she still silvers o'er your gloomy path.

(D.J. VII.7)

Unlike *Don Juan*, *Evgeny Onegin* is not saturated with satire. Although Pushkin's castigation of the fashionable world in *Evgeny Onegin* has the force of satire, it does not really exhibit specific satirical techniques, except rarely. The poem seldom concerns itself with mirroring the specific abuses in society in the trenchant, purposeful manner of *Don Juan*. For example, it is evident that Alexander Pushkin does not like duelling, but he does not use the indirection of satire to condemn it; instead, he uses direct irony to show his indignation:

'Tis pleasant with a wicked sally
To make a man feel like an ass,
To see him, baited, turn and rally,
And glance, unwilling, in the glass,
Ashamed to own his every feature;
"Tis yet more pleasant if the creature
Should howl absurdly: "It is I!"
And yet more pleasant, on the sly
To make his noble coffin ready:
A proper distance to allow,
Then aiming at his pallid brow,
To hold the pistol straight and steady;
But yet the pleasure's dulled if he
Is launched into eternity.

(E.O. VI.33)

The parlor hums with conversation,
In which Tatyana ought to share
She thinks, but it is sheer vexation
To hear the vulgar chatter there.
Such people with each day grow duller,
Their very slander has no color;
And every query, every tale,
Their news, their gossip—all are stale.
The hours go by: they do not waken;
No witty thought occurs, no word
Even by accident is heard
Whereby the mind or heart is shaken.
Oh, empty world! Oh, stupid folk
Who neither crack nor are a joke!
(E.O. VII.48)

They take her to the club for dances.
The rooms are thronged and hot and gay.
The blare, the lights, the shining glances,
The couples as they whirl away,
The lovely ladies' filmy dresses,
The balcony where such a press is
The young and hopeful brides to be
Confound the senses suddenly.
Here dandies now in the ascendant
Show off their impudence, their vests,
Their monocles that rake the guests.
And here hussars on leave, resplendent
And thunderous, flock eagerly
They come, they conquer and they flee.
(E.O. VII.51)

In spite of some similarities noticeable in the styles
of Don Juan and Evgeny Onegin, each work is unique in its own
expression. Each work has its own special features which help
to distinguish it from all other literary works. According to
Gray, "What is individual about a work or a writer or a period
is that we can distinguish it from other works, other writers,
other periods."34 This particular statement applies to Don
Juan more than to Evgeny Onegin. Among others, humor, satire,
wealth of figure of speech, elaborate digression and frequent
allusions, stand out as some of the hallmarks of Don Juan. In
Evgeny Onegin, elegance, balance, intricate rhyme scheme and
notable epigrams immediately strike one as some of its characteristics.
This paper does not pretend to have dealt exhaustively with the styles of *Don Juan* and *Evgeny Onegin*. All the statements made in this chapter concerning the styles of these two great works of art are somewhat subjective, although—-it is hoped—-not altogether so. The discussion has by and large been centered upon the highlights of stylistic elements in the two poems because it would hardly be possible to deal with every detail of style in these two poems. As Raymond Chapman has wisely put it, "Literary style is not something to be described by a few salient characteristics; but careful study of literary texts will show that literary stylistics is a viable study." When all is said, "The whole of expression, the whole of style cannot be analysed or explained."35
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CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION:
THE CONTINUING FAME OF BYRON AND PUSHKIN

Over a century and a half after his death, peoples all over the world are still reading and discussing the poems of Lord Byron. Like Shakespeare's, his major works have been translated into many tongues: French, German, Italian, Spanish, and a number of others. On the basis of international reputation, he is often thought to be not only the greatest English romantic poet but also the greatest of all the English writers, irrespective of periods, except Shakespeare. According to Northrop Frye, "Byron has probably had more influence outside England than any other English poet except Shakespeare. . . . From the painting of Delacroix to the music of Berlioz, from the poetry of Pushkin to the philosophy of Nietzsche, the spell of Byron is everywhere."¹ The remark of William Phillips about the criticism of Lord Byron in France holds anywhere Byron is being studied: "From the first appearance of Byron's works in France to the present time, there have been two varieties of French criticism concerning them: the first, antipathetic, and relatively small and unimportant; the second, sympathetic, and constituting by far the large and more important division. There seems to have been no in-between group among the critics of Byron in France."²
Up to this time, opinions have differed as much on Byron as a man as on his stature as a poet. Very recently Paul West asserted that "To try excluding the man is eventually to discover that little of the poetry can stand alone and, if it is made to, seems like fragments from the hands of various pasticheurs." But John Jump's opinion of Lord Byron and Byron's poetry counters that of West. Jump is of the opinion that "Byron's reputation was more than merely British. It spread rapidly over the whole of Europe and throughout the English-speaking world. Musset was his disciple in France, Pushkin in Russia. During the nineteenth century, at least forty-one translations of one or more cantos of Childe Harold's Pilgrimage appeared in no fewer than ten different languages, and as many as thirty-four translations of Manfred in twelve different languages. These two works inspired compositions by Berlioz, Schumann, and Tchaikovsky. Painters, too, took subjects from them and from other poems of Byron." Comparatively negative opinions like that of West about the rather narrowly personal nature of Lord Byron's poetry are becoming scarcer and scarcer. It is possible that a time will soon come when all students of Lord Byron throughout the world will be unanimous in recognizing him as the greatest romantic poet, as Shakespeare has been crowned as the greatest Renaissance literary artist.

A question might be asked as to whether some changes might occur in the future which would be likely to depreciate
the waxing reputation of Lord Byron. In view of recent opinions about him, one would be more inclined to say "No" rather than "Yes." One of the reasons Shakespeare continues to enjoy his crown as the king of playwrights three centuries after his death is that his themes are universal: love, honor, passion, and reason, among others. It is not likely that Lord Byron would suffer any depreciation in the future because his themes—which include love, freedom, war, nature, immortality, morality, hypocrisy, religion, and truth—are no less universal than those of Shakespeare. They occur and recur in the human interactions in all human societies throughout the length and breadth of the earth.

Another factor that is likely to make Lord Byron's poetry everlasting is truth. One of the things most critics concede to him is his close adherence to truth in whatever he writes, at least during his mature period. If it is accepted that truth can withstand all sorts of trials and tests of life, then the perpetual reputation of Lord Byron should not for a moment be doubted.

Don Juan, not to mention the legendary Byronic hero which he developed to perfection in Childe Harold, Manfred, Lara, and Conrad, appears to have cut a permanent image for the man who created them. Like Milton's Satan or Shakespeare's Hamlet, these characters of Lord Byron stand prominently in the gallery of literary heroes because they represent certain facets of Man anywhere.
Because Byron's reputation as a world poet is much more firmly established than that of Pushkin, the latter figure must claim more of our attention in this chapter.

According to Ernest J. Simmons, Pushkin was once "with unfairness enthusiastically hailed as the 'Russian Byron'" by some critics. It is not known exactly why Simmons believes that it is unfair for critics to "hail" Pushkin as the "Russian Byron." If the intention of the critics was to accord Alexander Pushkin in Russia a pre-eminent status similar to Lord Byron's in England, there is nothing unfair in that tribute. But if they intended to hail him as merely a good imitator of Byron, indeed, they are unfair to him.

That Alexander Pushkin is Russia's greatest poet is now becoming a commonplace among critics. Referring to Pushkin, Janko Lavrin remarked that "his supremacy in Russian poetry, from Lemonosov onwards, remains unchallenged." In the words of George Rapall Noyes, "Every nation is the best judge of its own literature. The Russian nation has pronounced Pushkin its greatest poet, and it is right beyond question, if by poet one means--as is generally the case--a writer of verse." Many more examples of scholars who have attested to the pre-eminent position accorded Alexander Pushkin as a poet in Russia could be cited. As Noyes has remarked, the Russians regard Pushkin as their greatest poet. This fact has been demonstrated in their attitudes toward Pushkin and Pushkin's poems. As has been observed by Bayley, "a Russian absorbs Pushkin in
adolescence before reading the novelists. . . ." It is not only the youths of Russia who read Pushkin; all educated Russians, irrespective of age and sex, read him, and many of them even commit some of his works to memory. For example, Madame Lydia Gromyko, the wife of the Russian Ambassador to the United States, when asked to choose her favorite Christmas reading at a Christmas party in 1944, chose two stanzas from Evgeny Onegin, part of which is reproduced below:

Yuletide they duly celebrated
As custom bade: with charm and spell
The maid would gleefully foretell
To the young ladies what was fated,
And promise them each year again
A soldier spouse and a campaign.

(E.O. V.4)

Walter Arndt has a good summary of the attitudes of Russians toward Pushkin's poetry: "Pushkin enjoys in his country a veneration comparable to that accorded to Goethe in Germany and Mickiewicz in Poland--with the immense difference that, generation after generation, young people read him spontaneously and quote him with love and pride--and at great length. I have yet to meet the schoolboy in U.S.S.R. who would lump Pushkin with trig and M-L (Marxism-Leninism) among the 'Ughs' of the school curriculum."

His achievement in two closely interwoven areas--language and literature--are responsible for Pushkin's reputation among his countrymen. He has been credited with making unforgettable contributions to the development of the modern Russian language as well as to Russian literature.
During the time of N. Karamzin, V. Zhukovsky, and K. Batyushkov, the immediate predecessors of Alexander Pushkin, "the standardised speech of the gentry . . . became the undisputed literary language of Russia." As is usually the case in any nation, the language of the gentry is always limited to a few privileged nationals; so it was in Russia before Pushkin. The great masses of common people who did not belong to "literary 'society' of literary salons, of 'chamber' literature . . . or drawing-rooms" did not have access to the literature of their land at that time.

In his own time, Alexander Pushkin, like William Wordsworth, revolutionized the literary language in Russia. To meet the need of the great majority of Russians, he adopted the people's language as the medium of expression. Thus he carried literature from the cult of the Russian élite to the people at large. Consider the following account of Lavrin: "Apart from obliterating the former distinction between the 'high' and 'low' genres, Pushkin democratised the literary language itself by grafting upon it the idioms and the accent of the people." It should not be assumed that this was an easy task; on the contrary, it takes geniuses like Pushkin and Wordsworth to set durable patterns for literary expression. In order to accomplish his aim, Alexander Pushkin had to undertake an intensive study of the history of Russian language, he had to make a close observation of the contemporaneous spoken language, and he had to "set himself to master 'dialects' and
mould a single national language."\textsuperscript{14}

By adopting the people's language as the standard for expressing thought, Pushkin effected a change in the history of Russian literature. Its impact on the Russian literature and Russian people is aptly described by Nikolai Chernyshevsky in the following passage: "It was through Pushkin . . . that literary culture penetrated to thousands of men, whereas before him only a handful of people took any interest in it at all. He was the first among us to raise literature to a signified function, vital for the whole of our nation, whereas before him it was--as a periodical aptly put it--but a pleasant and useful pastime for a narrow circle of dilettanti. He was the first poet to occupy in the eyes of the whole of Russia that high and incontestable position which, in each country, belongs but to a truly great poet."\textsuperscript{15}

The second important factor that seems to have permanently entrenched the reputation of Alexander Pushkin in his country is his contribution to evolving a new brand of literature--realism. As has been mentioned earlier, his reform in language made literature comprehensible to every literate person. Besides this, he made other significant contributions to the development of literature in Russia. He laid the foundation for the modern Russian literature upon which the later great novelists like Ivan Turgenev, Feodor Dostoevsky, and even Leo Tolstoy based their works:
Pushkin's influence on the subsequent development of modern Russian literature, of which he was the founder, was not confined to suggestion of a new vocabulary, of poetic motifs, themes, and characters. Neither was it confined to the rendering of examples of art as embodied in the harmony of his poetry nor to the artistic rendering of his broad realistic conception of the world and people.

Pushkin possessed a great fund of social-philosophical ideas which fructified Russian literature throughout a century.16

However, the fact remains that in spite of his immense contributions to the development of the modern Russian language and modern Russian literature, in spite of his unquestionably pre-eminent position as the greatest Russian poet, and in spite of his enduring reputation in the Soviet Union, Pushkin is comparatively little known outside the borders of his own country. In the case of Alexander Pushkin, the old biblical expression that "A prophet is not without honor, but in his own country"17 is reversed; he is highly honored in his own country and among his own people, but he is hardly regarded by the general reading public beyond the frontiers of Russia.

Some reasons have been advanced for Pushkin's obscurity and neglect in the world beyond Russia, but the most important ones rest upon the fact that there have been relatively few Russian scholars in either Europe or the United States until the recent past. Another reason is that Pushkin's poems have some peculiar characteristics which make their accurate translation into English almost an impossible task for English
scholars, their knowledge of Russian notwithstanding. Simmons' explanation on this point appears to be the most comprehensive and satisfactory:

It is not difficult to understand why Pushkin is so little known to peoples outside of Russia. The chief obstacle, of course, is translation. In most cases the substance of the poems may be easily rendered into a foreign language, and a skilful translator may catch something of the loose dress and ornament. But the style, "Pushkin's language," defies duplication. A classicist in style, his final product gives the impression of the utmost economy of effort. But in reality his striking effects are achieved by the most subtle arrangement of words and metrical patterns. The connotative or suggestive element is difficult to capture within the prescribed limits of the form without violating the sense. Very few of the fairly numerous translations of Pushkin into English have caught anything of this characteristic flavor of the original.18

In this respect Alexander Pushkin is different from Lord Byron whose fame, in the words of Noyes, "Even today . . . is greater abroad than at home, where his particular brand of cussedness has gone out of fashion."19 In the same essay Noyes raises the following question about Pushkin: "Is he a man who has appealed in the past, or who will appeal in the future, to generations of men in other lands than Russia, to men of average cultivation as well as to special students of literature, even as he appeals now, one hundred years after his death, to his fellow-countrymen of all classes, despite the profound changes in the political, social and economic ideals of Russian people during that hundred years?"20 Certainly this question seems to be too involved to be answered completely in this work; hence the only part of it to which an answer will be
hazarded is whether Pushkin is a man "who will appeal in the future, to generations of men in other lands than Russia."

In 1937, one hundred years after the death of Pushkin, his centenary was celebrated as a great national event in Russia. Indeed, this celebration is altogether antithetical to the obscure and mean funeral the government of Russia accorded his remains in 1837. At that time, attendants to his burial were restricted, and he was buried close to his mother on his own estate. The following conversation between a woman and a peasant may give the reader an insight into how poor a funeral the then Russian Tsar and his henchmen accorded Pushkin's body in 1837:

"What is this," a woman asked one of the peasants who was idly staring at the box.
"God knows what!" he answered. "You see, someone killed Pushkin—they are whisking him away in a bast mat and straw, may God forgive them, like a dog!"

Certainly, the celebration of Pushkin's centenary in 1937 appears to be a landmark in his growing reputation. Since that year more accurate translations of Pushkin have increased, and much more literature about his life and works has been published. In short, it seems that Alexander Pushkin has started to enjoy a slow but steady growth of foreign reputation. The following are only a few of the works which have done much to "dispel the darkness of that age when so few had knowledge of Pushkin's real standing": 22  *Centennial Essays for Pushkin*, edited by Samuel H. Cross and Ernest J. Simmons (1937); *Pushkin:
A Collection of Articles and Essays on the Great Russian Poet (1939); Pushkin, by Ernest J. Simmons (1937); The Poems, Prose and Plays of Pushkin, edited by Avraham Yarmolinsky (1936); Pushkin and Russian Literature, by Janko Lavrin (1948); Pushkin Threefold by Walter Arndt (1972). There is little doubt, if scholars continue with their investigations on Pushkin and about his work, that his reputation abroad will continue to increase.

There are some specific reasons for assuming that with more and more publications about him and his works Pushkin's external reputation will gradually spread throughout the world. First, the assumption is based on the conviction that some of Pushkin's works contain themes of universal appeal: love, freedom, government, civilization, and nature. Pushkin's works are not as deficient in sustained energy and depth as Noyes seems to have suggested in the conclusion of his essay: "Finally the question recurs: Is Pushkin the greatest writer, as well as the greatest writer of verse, whom Russia has produced? I think not. Pushkin had perfection of form,... But vigor of thought, poetic imagination in the creation of characters, moral insight into human problems, came to him only by fits and starts." Contrary to the assertion of Noyes, some eminent scholars of Pushkin like Simmons have recognized the profundity of theme and characterization in some of Pushkin's works. Simmons' opinion of The Bronze Horseman readily comes to mind as an example: "Its tragic theme is the opposition
between the rights of the individual and the all-powerful, despotic empire, typified by the statue of Peter the Great. The pitiful citizen Eugene has no more right to question the will of the bronze figure than had the toiling masses who gave their lives that Peter's great city might exist."24 And according to Kirpotin, "The theme of Boris Godunov is the theme of the people and government and the idea which the poet wanted to express in this tragedy is the idea that a government is strong only through the support of the public popular opinion."25

If these two themes are carefully considered, it will be seen that they were not more important when Pushkin wrote them over two hundred years ago than they are today. In all the democratic world today, and in other parts that are striving toward democracy, the will of the people and public opinion is a strong force to reckon with. Some of the poems of Alexander Pushkin like the "Ode to Liberty," "The Dagger," "To Chaadaev," "Freedom's Sower in Wilderness," "Arion," and a host of other lyrics in which the dominant theme is freedom could readily find fertile soil in many states of the so-called "third world"--Africa, where some dictators in army uniform have regrettably forcibly placed themselves above the will of the people, and where public opinion has been silenced with the severest brutality imaginable. In a journal called Transition George Mangakis, a Greek, was reported to have declared that "When a dictatorship is imposed on your country,
the very first thing you feel, the very first day--and it is a feeling that has a totally spontaneous immediacy, free from all mental elaboration--the first feeling is humiliation. You are being deprived of the right to consider yourself worthy of responsibility for your own life and destiny."26 In those African countries where pseudo-dictatorship is the rule of the day, many of Alexander Pushkin's works about freedom, as well as Lord Byron's, would be a delicious food for thought for the nationals who are able to realize that their intrinsic individual rights have been forcibly taken away from them.

Secondly, although the complete works of Alexander Pushkin have not been translated into many languages, at least, according to Bayley, "the whole of his work has been translated and widely read" in Germany.27 Much of it has been translated into English, and Pushkin is gradually becoming well-known in England and in the United States. Some of his work has been translated into French, too. If Alexander Pushkin's works in their entirety have not been translated and widely read in as many foreign languages as Byron's, they enjoy good audiences in at least two different tongues--Russian and German.

Among his characters, Onegin, Tatyana, Aleko, Yevgeny, Ruslan, and Ludmila are likely to attain literary immortality. By far the most popular of them all is Onegin, both within and beyond the frontiers of Russia. The reason for this is that Onegin is a powerful caricature of a certain class in nineteenth-century Russia and is one of the most original
creations of Pushkin. If Onegin is the most popular, Yevgeny appears to be the most tragic. His is the tragedy of the common man crushed by forces he could not manage. Aleko seems to be the most sophisticated of them all. Suffering from ennui, he seeks refuge in nature like Wordsworth's Wanderer or Lord Byron's Manfred. Ruslan and Ludmila might be regarded as the most romantic characters of Pushkin. These two must be very attractive to teenagers everywhere on the globe. These characters appear to be made of flesh and blood; they are so human that they are likely to endure forever as living witnesses to the greatness of their author.

Comparing Alexander Pushkin's quantity of work with Lord Byron's, one quickly realizes that the total production of Lord Byron is much more voluminous than Pushkin's. But if the life of Pushkin and the conditions under which he was writing his works are considered, his whole production will hardly be passed over as inadequate or insubstantial. Unlike Lord Byron, Alexander Pushkin was neither a free man nor a free poet in the actual sense of freedom. He happened to be born into a somewhat barbaric society where to hold a view contrary to that of the powers that be meant bondage for an individual, where freedom of expression was denied everybody, and where the bard was expected to sing the praises of the tyrant. Lord Byron was free to write whatever he wanted to write; he could travel to wherever he was pleased without spies hunting him about. His works were not at any time of his life
subjected to any humiliating censorship. The reverse was the case with Alexander Pushkin: he was restricted, he was exiled, he was humiliated, he was constantly being hunted about by uncountable spies—his father was the most servile of all fathers in the world; he agreed to be a spy on his own son. His works were constantly censored, not because they were poor artistically, but, in most cases, because the Tsar of Russia felt his horse gored by them. Simmons summarizes the hard life of this prodigious Russian poet thus: "Pushkin's life had been an endless discord between his inner spiritual being and the external facts of existence. All the events of his life contrived to wear him down physically and emotionally and to break the wings of his genius. The freedom that was so necessary for his creative spirit was denied him. Exile, police surveillance, government interference, and adverse material circumstances continually obstructed his efforts." Under similar conditions, it would take a genius like him to produce as much as Pushkin did. Had he been free to write what he wanted, perhaps he would have bequeathed the world a much greater literary legacy than he had done before his premature death. According to Vickery in the Death of a Poet, Pushkin had the ability to conceal his emotions—"The mask of cynicism to cover the genuinely felt emotion was a device with which Pushkin was familiar. . . ." Perhaps he developed this ability as a defensive mechanism against the persecution and censorship of the then almighty Tsar of Russia.
The enduring influence of Lord Byron and of Alexander Pushkin on humanity is not limited to literature alone; it has spread into other disciplines, particularly music and painting. Some of the world's greatest musicians and painters are said to have been inspired for their masterpieces by some of the poems of these two great European poets. W. E. Henley mentions a few of the world's great artists that have been directly inspired by Lord Byron: "Berlioz went to him for the material of his Harold en Italie, his Corsaire overture, and his Episode. Delacroix painted the Barque de Don Juan from him, with the Massacre de Scio, the Marino Faliero, the Combat du Giaour et du pacha, and many a notable picture more." Omitted from the list of Henley, but very important, is Isaac Nathan, who is said to have transformed a group of lyrics of Lord Byron called "Hebrew Melodies" into songs that are still sung even today. "The Hebrew Melodies are a selection from the favorite Airs which are still sung on the religious ceremonies of the Jews." V. Ferman wrote a long essay on the influence of Alexander Pushkin on Russian music, painting, and ballet. It has been remarked that his works are easily adaptable to the opera. Indeed a great number of Pushkin's poems have been set to music. Included in the most important Russian operas are Modest Moussorgsky's Boris Godunov, Fedor Glinka's Ruslan and Ludmilla, and Peter Chaikovsky's Eugene Onegin, Mazeppa, and The Queen of Spades, all of which are derived from Pushkin's works. In the words of V. Ferman,
"The tremendous richness and variety of Pushkin's poetry secured for him a lasting place in Russian music. Composers of most varied tendencies and artistic inclinations were able to take themes according to their taste from ever-fresh sources of Pushkin's poetry. Pushkin's poetry is so varied and many-sided that to this day only some of its aspects have found their reflection in Russian music. Thus Pushkin's philosophical lyrics and prose are reflected in music to an incomparably lesser extent than his love lyrics, his epic poems and drama."

In the course of this investigation, it has been discovered that although Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin have much in common, in some ways they are quite unlike one another. They have been found to be superficially alike in the history of their origins, upbringing, attitudes, and emotions. But as similarity is not absolute identity, there are points in all these human traits wherein the poets have been found to be either slightly different or even poles apart because of disparities in rank and in the degree of personal freedom within their respective societies. For example, both poets believed in the freedom of Man as an individual and as a group. But they seem to be different in their approaches to achieving freedom. As is evident by his speech in the English Parliament on the frame-breakers debate, and by his role in the Greek war for freedom against the Turks, Lord Byron seemed to have directly involved himself in the war against oppression. He believed in action and in winning freedom at all costs. Pushkin,
on the other hand, did not present himself as a downright revolutionist; he was a friend of revolutionists. As has been mentioned earlier, he was not a Decembrist, but his poetry encouraged and supported Decembrism.

Despite the much-belabored likeness between these two poets, there are some striking differences between them, some of which may be briefly reiterated here. In style, Alexander Pushkin is elegant and fine; Lord Byron is blunt and powerful. In attitudes toward life, Alexander Pushkin is by and large optimistic in spite of all odds; Lord Byron is almost altogether pessimistic. In characterization, Alexander Pushkin seems to have created a more varied group of characters than Lord Byron.

Much has been written on the influence of Lord Byron's works on Pushkin. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that Alexander Pushkin was a genius and a great world poet in his own right. It has been found that the influence of Lord Byron on Pushkin is mainly noticeable on what might be considered as the middle stage in the literary career of Pushkin. The early stage seems to be completely devoid of Byronic influence, while the late stage normally exhibits a certain degree of it. Some of his greatest works, such as Boris Godunov, seem independent of Byronic influence. Perhaps the close similarity between Lord Byron and Alexander Pushkin is not wholly due to Byron's direct influence on Pushkin; part of it may be attributable to some earlier great writers like Voltaire, Ariosto,
and some others whose works happened to be important models for both Byron and Pushkin. Finally, from all evidence available to this study, it is conjectured that because of his contribution, first to the Russian culture, and then to humanity as a whole, Alexander Pushkin, like Chaucer, Dante, Goethe, Shakespeare, and especially Lord Byron, will long be remembered as one of the foremost poets the world has ever produced. Alexander Blok, one of the most outstanding modern Russian poets, was reported to have recorded in his diary the following extract, which is perhaps suitable for the conclusion of this thesis: "From whatever point of view we appraise Pushkin, whether as a man, as a public figure, as a friend of the monarchy, as a friend of the Decembrists, as a slave of passions [I add, or as an imitator], all this pales before one thing: Pushkin the poet."33
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