#09

GALDÓS, ETXEITA, RIZAL – MADRID, MUNDAKA, MANILA: ON COLONIAL DISAVOWAL AND (POST) IMPERIAL ARTICULATIONS OF THE HISPANIC PACIFIC-ATLANTIC

Joseba Gabilondo
Michigan State University
joseba@joseba.net

Recommended citation || GABILONDO, Joseba (2013): "Galdós, Etxeita, Rizal – Madrid, Mundaka, Manila: On Colonial Disavowal and (Post) Imperial Articulations of the Hispanic Pacific-Atlantic" [online article], *452ºF. Electronic journal of theory of literature and comparative literature*, 9, 13-41, [Consulted on: dd/mm/aa], < http://www.452f.com/pdf/numero09/09_452f-mono-joseba-gabilondo-orgnl.pdf>
Ilustration || Albert Masias
Article || Upon Request | Published on: 07/2013

452°F

Abstract || This article traces the articulation of "colonial disavowal" in the works of Pérez Galdós (*Fortunata y Jacinta*), José Manuel Etxeita (*Josetxo*) and José Rizal (*Noli me tangere*) in order to map out a Hispanic Atlantic-Pacific defined by the self-effacing quality of the Pacific space. The article centers on the Hispanic Pacific and its disavowal, as it is articulated through references to Manila in all three novels, in order to show how it is the central sight from which colonial disavowal can be studied in all three literary traditions while decentering and fragmenting any Spanish or Hispanist appropriation of Spanish imperialist history. The article concludes that a new global and post-Hispanist articulation of the Hispanic Pacific must be deployed in order to use its self-effacing character against nationalist realities such as the Spanish, the Filipino, or the Basque, so that a different trans-post-colonial history is written against the nationalist Hispanic/ Hispanist grain.

Keywords || Galdós | Etxeita | Rizal | Manila | Rearticulations of the Hispanic Pacific-Atlantic | Colonial Disavowal.

> The bullion [of silver coming from the Americas] flowed out of Spain to England, France, and the Low Countries for purchase of manufactured goods unavailable in Castile. From English, French, Flemish or Dutch ports Spanish pesos were transshipped through the Baltic or Murmansk into Scandinavia or Russia and traded for furs. In Russia... [silver] went southeastward along the Volga into the Caspian Sea to Persia, where it was sent overland or by sea to Asia. Spanish American bullion also flowed out of Spain through the Mediterranean and eastward by land and water routes to the Levant. India procured its American silver by means of traffic from Suez through the Red Sea and into the Indian Ocean, overland from the eastern end of the Mediterranean through Turkey and Persia to the Black Sea, and finally into the Indian Ocean, or directly from Europe on ships rounding the Cape of Good Hope following the route discovered by Vasco da Gama. The latter way was also used by Portuguese, Dutch, and English ships to carry Spanish American treasure directly to Asian ports to exchange for Asian goods. *Lastly and long ignored* American silver found its way to the Orient by way of the Pacific route from Acapulco to Manila.
>
> Frank, *Reorient*, 141 (my emphasis).

0. Introduction

At a point in which Iberian studies are recovering some currency as a way to refashion the field (Resina 2009, 2013), I believe there are more productive ways to rethink geopolitically the field without reifying it, which is ultimately what Iberian studies might end up doing, by disguising the centrality of the Spanish state behind a larger and more multicultural scenario[1]. The political fantasy of a multicultural Peninsula, rather than challenging a post-imperial Spanish state, would further legitimize the latter's status as the Law/Big Other (Lacan, 1966) that regulates the Iberian symbolic field, so that such a Big Other would end up generating a multitude of smaller "Spanish states" (Galicia, Basque Country...) in a confederation that would simply derive its meaning and location from the post-imperial Spanish state itself —thus ultimately creating de facto a "Greater Spain," i.e. the radical opposite of a multicultural Peninsula.

A better form of resituating the field of study, without reverting back to the post-imperial Spanish state as the Big Other that ultimately regulates Peninsular and Iberian studies, is to trace geopolitical formations that defy what could be called the "Spanish symbolic order." The Spanish symbolic order would be constituted by any cultural formation fashioned as geopolitical—be it Basque, Equatorial Guinean, or exilic—that is subjected, turned into a subject, by the unacknowledged or secret, imperialist, obscene desire to become the subject of the post-imperial Spanish state: it becomes the subject of the *State*. What is obscene about this subjection/subjectification is that such a geopolitical formation also becomes the othered object of the State and, therefore, becomes a split subject, a barred subject, which can only identify with itself as its othered object. Any

NOTES

1 | I would like to thank Edorta Jiménez for dropping causally in a conversation about the Basque-Philippine connection, something that for me became a revelation. I also would like to thank all the graduate students who, since 2000, had to endure my primitive post/imperial/colonial reading of Galdós's canonical novel *Fortunata y Jacint*a. They have refined it with their questions and insights and are ultimately responsible for whatever merit such an analysis might have.

proposal for a Basque, Guinean or Galician culture, history, and institutionalization that does not question historically the Spanish symbolic order and its Big Other (the post-imperial State) will continue to be subjected to the Spanish state and ultimately defined as Spanish.

If I keep referring to the all-too-well-known "Spain" as "post-imperial Spanish state" is precisely to reinstate its historicity, as well as the historical traumatic violence that founds it: not the Napoleonic wars and the so-called "War of Independence" (1808-1814), but rather *the colonial loss* triggered by the original "Wars of Independence" fought in Latin America at the beginning (1810-1825) and end (1898) of the 19th century —a historic trauma further complicated by the simultaneous process of orientalization that post-imperial Spain undergoes ("Africa begins in the Pyrenees") and for which it compensates for with different imperialist engagements in Africa (1860, etc.). As Alda Blanco states: "Así nuestra tarea es la de (re) inscribir en la narrativa histórica acerca del siglo XIX lo que en su día era evidente: que el Estado español estaba configurado a modo de imperio (Ministerio de Ultramar, Consejo de Filipinas, etc.) y que, por lo tanto, España era una nación imperial" (2012: 25).

More recently, Spain became the largest investor in Latin America in 1990s (Casilda Béjar) and Latin America became the point of origin of the largest migration to Spain. After the economic crisis of 2008, and although there are no definitive numbers yet, Spanish capitalism continued to invest in Latin America, even though the Spanish economy was in dire straits. As Guinot Aguado and Vakulenko state:

> While the 2008 global economic crisis prompted a downturn in Ibero-American profits and the debt crisis negatively impacted the European market, Latin America retained its dynamic economic activities by remaining an attractive venue for foreign investments. During the second wave of foreign direct investments, Spanish companies consolidated their positions in the Latin American market by strengthening their former economic ties while simultaneously significantly increasing their investments in the region. Hence, Spain's direct investments in Latin America soared from €45 billion in 2007 to €116 billion in 2010. (2012)

If this Spanish globalization and expansion over Latin America is taken seriously, many important questions arise: is this a new form of Spanish imperialism or neoimperialism? And if so, then how to re-read Spanish history at least since 1825, when the decline of the Spanish empire already forces Spain to take the path of the nation-state, thus, leaving behind its imperial status? In other words, following Blanco's revision of the imperialist Spain of the turn of century, do we have to revise the idea of Spain as a nation-state—or failed nation-state—and rethink the last two hundred years once again in imperialist terms? In short, did not the empire ever go away? Is this the uncanny return of the imperial ghost?

Although Paul Gilroy's disregard for both Africa and Latin America in his study of the black Atlantic (1993) already shows the difficulties of any Atlantic approach, I believe it is still worthwhile reexamining Spain from an Atlantic (and Pacific) framework, as Hispanic Atlantic-Pacific, rather than as nationally Spanish. An Atlantic-Pacific approach to Spanish culture could create a new critical standpoint from which to think what I have labeled above "the uncanny return of the imperial ghost." Such an approach has even more relevance when it comes to 19th-century Spain, for this century is when Spain seemingly loses its transoceanic dimension and becomes national. In short, the Spanish 19th century, more than ever, represents the battle ground to redefine to redefine 21st-century Spain. If anybody already feels tempted to cry foul by denouncing my critical-historical maneuver as teleological or metanarrative, taboo words in contemporary cultural criticism, it will suffice me to say that we already live under another teleological-metanarrative, that of Spain as the national subject of a non-interrupted history that begins somewhere in 1808-14 and, until 2010 at least, had experienced a very "healthy" neoimperialist rebirth in globalization.

Therefore the following is an attempt to theorize a non-binomial space, which does not either revert back to a Peninsular/Iberian space and, rather, opens other spaces, subjects, and desires that cannot be incorporated into the symbolic order of the post-imperial Spanish state and, rather, might offer a transoceanic dimension which contains a new definition of the Pacific-Atlantic Hispanic that defies any Spanish symbolic order.

In order to do so, I will resort to the canonical "founders" of the modern Spanish, Filipino, and Basque novels, respectively, in order to open a space that is not Filipino, Basque, or Spanish and thus defies any othering effect by the post-imperial Spanish state. José Rizal (1861-1896) and Benito Pérez Galdós (1843-1920) require no presentation. However, Jose Manuel Etxeita (1842-1915) might require an introduction. Let me begin by hypotesizing that although there is no historical record, Etxeita and Rizal most likely met on the streets of Manila. Etxeita was the last mayor of Manila. After 1898, he returned to his native Mundaka, a small village in the Basque province of Bizkaia and began to write novels in Basque. Although there are another 4 texts, written in the 19th century in Basque, which could be considered novels, Etxeita writes one of the first (if not the first) modern novels in 1909, *Josetxo* (*Little Joe*), which will then be followed by a more costume-like (costumbrista) novel, *Jaioterri maitia* (1910, *Beloved Homeland*), and will end up shaping the Basque narrative of the first half of the 20th century.

What eventually will become the *costumbrista* or costume narrative of the 20th century, from Txomin Agirre's canonical *Garoa* (*Fern*, 1907-1912) to Orixe's *Euskaldunak* (*The Basques*, 1950), and will later even

hauntingly shape the narratives of canonical writers such as Bernardo Atxaga and Kirmen Uribe, finds a non-costumbrista origin in Etxeita's Basque novels, which only become successfully *costumbrista* in their attempt to erase, to rewrite, their transoceanic locus of enunciation. Etxeita's novels are precisely the narrative of their own transoceanic erasure, and more specifically the erasure of the Hispanic Pacific.

Below, I will show how this erasure of a transoceanic geography and politics can be defined as "colonial disavowal" and is the central structure that organizes the canonical novels not only of Etxeita, but of all three writers. Colonial disavowal responds to the Freudian logic (1949) of «yes, but just the same» whereby reality is avowed but simultaneously disavowed as fantasy (*Verleugnung*). In this context, colonial disavowal has to do with colonial loss and the fantasies organized in order to disavow that loss ("yes, I lost the colony, but just the same, I have not lost the colony").

The longer section dedicated to Galdós does not denote its "greater importance," but rather the limited knowledge of most Hispanists in areas such as Basque and Filipino studies—itself ultimately a result or effect of colonial disavowal, which therefore requires further rectification and rewriting in future analyses.

1. Galdós

Below, I will tackle the most canonical text of 19th-century Spanish literary texts and, moreover, I will carry out a somewhat traditional textual reading. I am referring to Benito Pérez Galdós's *Fortunata y Jacinta* (1886-87). I do not think there is a better way to illustrate the excitement and the urgency of revisiting this century's culture. In order to situate Galdós, it is important to remember that, at a moment in which illiteracy still was rampant in Spain (61% for men, 81% for women), as Labanyi reminds us: "from the publication of his first novel in 1870 to his death in 1920, Galdós sold some 1,700.000 volumes… averaging 35,000 volumes a year over his fifty year career" (Labanyi, 8). In short, it is not an exaggeration to state that Galdós consolidates the Spanish novel as a national institution: as a production written and consumed in Spanish language—since the Spanish translation of French and British novels had already achieved these levels earlier. More theoretically, I would like to claim that Galdós's literature constitutes the first commodity in which the Spanish market is consolidated as national, for this commodity, unlike most others, allows the Spanish reading public to imagine itself as a national market of producers and consumers—a phenomenon of which Galdós's literature shows awareness and also problematizes self-reflectively through allegory.

Fortunata and Jacinta (1886-87), to this day, remains a critical challenge. When entering the novel and descending from the upper-middle classes of the introductory part to the lower classes of the end, critics, and readers alike, go through the same experience the characters of the novel undergo when they meet Fortunata, the main female character; an experience I would like to call "engulfment" in the specific sense elaborated by Anne McClintock in her *Imperial Leather* (1995) to discuss colonial encounters. In the fourth and final part of the novel, when the readers begin to glimpse the subaltern worlds of Madrid and, at the very end, arrive at Fortunata's lair, where she is dying, they become engulfed, trapped, in the powerful but enigmatic end of the novel. The subaltern space of Fortunata's apartment becomes an experience of horror, confusion, and abjection, even for the author himself, for he experiences a representational crisis that challenges even his own narrative unreliability. Following the author, critics and readers have only repeated this drama of confusion and trauma, without realizing the colonial nature of the encounter—hence the *colonial disavowal* that gives a non-colonial-imperialist meaning to the novel[2].

1.1 Criticism and National Engulfment

So far feminism and Marxism have been the most productive critical approaches to Spanish naturalism, which my analysis follows. However, the lack of attention paid to imperialism/colonialism by these approaches has had the unwarranted effect of enforcing the nationalist hegemony to which *Fortunata and Jacinta*, as well as naturalism in general, responds in the first place. As a result of this unacknowledged nationalist disavowal of imperialism/colonialism—henceforth colonial disavowal—so far feminism and Marxism have reified the character of Fortunata as a national subject who stands either for or against a feminist or working-class reality that ought to define a truly historical Spain. I believe this colonial disavowal is the origin of the critical engulfment in which most critics have ended.

Critics such as Catherine Jagoe attempt to rescue Fortunata, and more generally the narrative structure of the novel, as a «proto-feminist» subject and discourse respectively. As she concludes: "Beneath the overtly middle-class and patriarchal value system of the narrative lies a proto-feminist statement. *Fortunata y Jacinta* subversively critiques the exploitative power of middle-class men such as Juanito and lends its ambivalent support to a heroine who appropriates and radically redefines the ideal of the *ángel del hogar*" (1994: 119). Fortunata's proto-feminism is questionable in the sense that her goal is to embrace the ideal of bourgeois domesticity («angel of the house»), and make it acceptable in her subalternity. Yet, this very same subaltern status makes it impossible for her to articulate a

NOTES

2 | If the Spanish and European imperialist experience of the late 19th century is brought into focus, suddenly, Fortunata takes a very Conradian quality. As we will see, she is central to the imperialist Spanish experience and, yet, she remains simply a domestic simulacrum of the colonial subject: after all she is a national «savage,» not a colonial one. Furthermore, she is the possessor of the ultimate secret of the Spanish imperialist experience: Kurtz's «the horror, the horror,» is transformed here in the enigmatic «soy un ángel, soy un ángel» (2004: 643). Although Labanyi (2000) and Sinnegan (1992) have made passing-by references to a colonial connection, it remains to be seen why a colonialist reading would have productive effects. After all, Catherine Jagoe warns us that "Women characters in Galdós's novels are widely read as allegories of 19th-century Spain, 'her' self, oppressed by the ancient regime and the Church and, in later works such as… *Fortunata y Jacinta*, turning from the traditionally sanctioned embrace of marital-monarchical authority to pursue new freedoms with a lover-republic" (56). What follows constitutes a first approach. Against the critical grain, I use the cheapest version of *Fortunata y Jacinta* (Edimat) for all references, as I have past and future graduate students as potential readers in mind.

middle-class ideal of domesticity. After all, the character of Fortunata is concerned not as much with the issue of proto-feminism, framed in a national Spanish context, but rather with one of female subalternity, which exceeds that nationalist framework. In short, Fortunata's subalternity establishes a political difference, which cannot be reduced to a nationalist feminist discourse[3]. On the opposite side of the feminist spectrum, critics such as Lou Charnon-Deutsch conclude that the fact that "women like… Fortunata end tragically while their partners in adultery emerge unscathed, not only reaffirms the double standard of conduct in sexual relations, it reveals what Tanner in *Adultery in the Novel* sees as the undisguised anxiety for establishing and maintaining order so prevalent in the bourgeois novel" (1990: 159). More generally, Charnon-Deutsch concludes that "these women also embody the 19th-century confrontation that pits the unbounded, uncontainable, forbidden self in a losing battle with the socially defined and confined self" (1990: 162). Yet, even in this formulation, aware of the limits of the naturalist discourse, the bourgeois "unbounded uncontainable forbidden self" does not have a bourgeois exterior, i.e., does not allow for a subaltern exteriority, such as Fortunata's; the exterior remains middle-class internal individual selfhood.

In a similar manner, John Sinnigen has read Fortunata as a representative of the working class, so that she becomes the narrative embodiment of a working-class revolution that never makes its appearance in the text. After introducing Fortunata as "the 'working-class woman'," who "stands in contraposition to the vast array of bourgeois and petty bourgeois characters who try to control her" (1992: 117), Sinnigen hails the working class hero Fortunata as "the most powerful agent of the novel," that is, an agent for historical change because "she achieves self-fulfillment through a negation of bourgeois conventions" (1992: 133). Yet at the end, Sinnegen concludes that "the resolution offered by Fortunata's 'idea' of the differences between the working class and the bourgeoisie can only be a potential solution to the problems of society" (1992: 136); after all there is no class struggle or revolution in the novel. Yet, Fortunata cannot represent or stand for the working class. The only direct references to the working class appear at the beginning of the text, when the newly married bourgeois couple, Juanito and Jacinta, travels to Barcelona in their honeymoon[4]. But when they return to Madrid, the working class disappears and Galdós's costumbrista vein, instead, concentrates in capturing all sorts of subaltern groups and individuals, including Fortunata. On the opposite side of the spectrum, Carlos Blanco Aguinaga criticizes the novel for its bourgeois ideology[5]. Blanco Aguinaga concludes: "A diversos niveles, pues, lo que *Fortunata y Jacinta* nos hace vivir intensamente es la unidad dialéctica indestructible del ser humano en cuanto particular (o privado) y su tipicidad sociohistórica (que es, en última instancia, su determinación de clase)… la dialéctica persona-historia-clase

NOTES

3 | Such subaltern difference does not have a discourse of its own (2004: 599). At any given time Fortunata appropriates catholic and bourgeois discourses (honradez, 2004: 552; virtud, 2004: 550, etc.) in order to signify, unsuccessfully, her new historical positionality.

4 | After a deserted Zaragoza, they visit Barcelona and, there, they witness, in awestruck reaction, the Barcelonan working class—women workers in a factory, to be more precise. Jacinta actually identifies with these women.

5 | He concludes that Fortunata "no solo ha internalizado los aspectos esenciales de la ideología dominante, sino que ha sido la productora de un nuevo Delfín… para el mantenimiento del orden clasista" (1978: 84).

corresponde rigurosamente a la dialéctica ficción-no ficción" (1978: 92). Yet, Blanco Aguinaga does not establish the working class status of Fortunata and therefore she escapes "su determinación de clase" and ultimately any traditional Marxist understanding of historical dialectics. Fortunata is elsewhere in the non-political space of subalternity[6].

Only Jo Labanyi, from a cultural-studies approach, encompassing both Marxism and feminism, makes the nationalist function of the state explicit in her analysis and, thus, points to the fact that there are spaces and subject positions, which the State and its nationalist ideology cannot control, but Galdós represents in his novels. As she states: "[H]ere Galdós is not just criticizing marriage as an institution, but signaling the gap between sign and signified that occurs when the centralized nation-State attempts to subject all forms of private as well as public life to legal codification" (2000: 207). When Labanyi concludes that realism problematizes the relation between reality and representation by blurring them, thus bringing the reader's attention to its unreliability, she does open a critical space to think gender and subalternity, although she does not elaborate it[7]. I believe that, in this respect, an Atlantic-Pacific Hispanic approach centered on colonial disavowal, in this respect, allows us to think this non-bourgeois/non-class exteriority embodied by Fortunata.

1.2 Fortunata and the Real

A Lacanian reading of the imperialist/colonial dimensions of *Fortunata and Jacinta* might be helpful to impinge upon the specific nationalist and hegemonic articulations of the protagonist, Fortunata, the novel itself, and ultimately Spanish naturalism[8]. It is more productive if Fortunata's position is not reduced to some positive and nationalist space defined by either the presence or absence of proto-feminist or working-class consciousness, and, instead, her position is kept in its irreducible and negative female subaltern nature. One could tentatively assume that Fortunata stands for the other: in this case, the other of both Spanish and north European imperialism and nationalism. At the same time, and as it is the case with most subaltern positions that signify otherness, Fortunata contains an irreducible and traumatic kernel that stands for the Real—the Real of a Spanish/European symbolic order. In the novel, Fortunata returns repeatedly as the marker of a real and irreducible subaltern position that is traumatic to the Spanish naturalist order and the nationalist symbolic order of Restoration Spain—hence her irrepresentable negativity.

If this initial hypothesis is accepted, then, it is more productive to trace all the signifiers and names that Galdós gathers around Fortunata in order to pinpoint, not her meaning, but rather the symbolic, historical, and political order that makes her position traumatic, negative, and irreducible. Once this analysis is performed, it appears

NOTES

6 | In that respect, Fortunata is not even a prostitute, as several critics have suggested, for there is no capitalist transaction and economy at the core of her relationship with the different men with whom she lives. Hers is a pre-capitalist way of survival—a subaltern way of life.

7 | "Realism problematizes the relationship between representation and reality, not—as in modernism—by insisting on the difference between the two, but by blurring the boundary between them while at the same time making it clear that representation is unreliable. This, I would argue, is more disturbing" (2000: 208).

8 | Furthermore, the hysterical and emotional outbreaks experienced by most male characters who encounter Fortunata at the end—Maxi her husband, Ido de la Iglesia, Ballester the pharmacist—bear witness to the power of this subjective and epistemological shuttering provoked by Fortunata. Even Juanito Santa Cruz, Fortunata's bourgeois lover, does not escape her destructive effect: he is exiled by his wife, Jacinta, from the heart of the bourgeois house—the order to which he always returned after each excursion in Fortunata's subaltern world of darkness (2004: 647)—after the latter woman receives a child from the former.

clear that the novel, and naturalism more generally, emerges as a failing imperialist discourse that needs to repeat itself in order to perform, in a nationalist fashion, the suppression of its subaltern trauma: Fortunata herself. As John Kronik demonstrates (1985), Fortunata is met by six different characters that attempt to shape and mold her so that she fits the social order of the Restoration: Maximiliano, Nicolás, Doña Lupe, Mauricia, Guillermina, and Ballester. Yet, this repeated performance of endowing Fortunata with a social positive identity fails every time, hence the need for repeating the performance. Yet, these six repetitions yield a very specific, although unsuccessful, discourse about Fortunata, which is the one that can and should be studied in its failure, in its negativity.

First of all, Fortunata is presented as the embodiment of Nature, an overwhelming natural body that, unlike its female upper-class counterparts, keeps reproducing itself with unquestionable power and force. Fortunata is unstoppable reproduction, from love to children. Galdós presents Fortunata's love for her bourgeois lover, Juanito Santa Cruz, as unmediated and unconditional. As she herself declares, this love is a matter of luck and fate; she has no control over it. Her characterization as woman responds to a general anxiety, prevalent in Spain, towards the subaltern classes that threaten with endless reproduction as ultimate and most powerful form of political agency and resistance. However, as the metaphorical descriptive structure of Fortunata-as-nature fails to control her, her reactions are characterized through a complicated metaphorical discourse of bestiality: from "bird" to "tiger" (464), Fortunata is described as uncontrollable nature in motion.

In short, Galdós narrates the colonial experience of "nature"—the jungle and its animals—at the heart of Spanish imperialist darkness: the subaltern Madrid[9]. Furthermore, Nature is also always referred to as people. These «natural people» are also presented as a block, a stone block, a pure shapeless matter that, at the same time, needs molding by the upper-classes (2004: 314, 464). The people-block has to be shaped in such a way that its uncanny tendency to reproduce itself to the point of jeopardizing society's foundations is neutralized. In that respect, Fortunata is not only Nature—the colonial landscape with its animals—but also the colonial subject: the savage. Galdós and several characters refer to Fortunata and her child as savage (2004: 50, 126, 151, 153, 200, 243, 252, 294, 376, 471). As Guillermina tells Fortunata: "Usted no tiene sentido moral; usted no puede tener nunca principios, porque es anterior a la civilización; usted es un salvaje y pertenece de lleno a los pueblos primitivos" (464). In this way, the Spanish people, with Fortunata at their center, constitute the ultimate natural colonial savage that, in its uncanny and irreducible power to exceed the Spanish state and its order, needs to be molded and civilized according to the new national culture of

NOTES

9 | Children are mentioned as "caníbales" (2004: 110).

the bourgeoisie, so that the former's traumatic nature is overcome. Even Fortunata herself appropriates this colonial discourse and concludes that "Pueblo nací y pueblo soy; quiero decir, ordinariota y salvaje" (2004: 376). As Labanyi explains: "*Fortunata y Jacinta*, in constructing Fortunata as a 'savage' and superior breeder, takes the form of a miscegenation narrative: that is, a colonially conceived blueprint for the nation based on the 'improvement of the race' through the white man's fertilization of the 'native' female" (2000: 192).

In a further geopolitical expansion of this metaphorical colonialist discourse, «the people» are reduced to the subaltern classes of Madrid, the capital of Spain, and, ironically enough, they also become the *natural* repository of the Spanish nation and its identity. As Galdós states "[E]l pueblo posee las verdades grandes y en bloque" (2004: 464). It is precisely at this point that the working class of Catalonia, Asturias, and the Basque Country, as well as the rural classes of the rest of the Peninsula, disappear from the novel or are condensed into the heart of darkness of subaltern Madrid: the Spanish people are only the subaltern classes of Madrid. This condensation helps nationalize the Madridian subaltern classes as the quintessential repository of Spanish national history, culture, and politics. This is a rather important and new reorganization of national identity and hegemony, for till that point only the north-European romantic discourse had located Spanish identity in the field of colonialism, through the rhetoric of Orientalism (Andalusia and «gypsy»/Roma culture).

Therefore, Fortunata and "the people" are approached first through an imperialist rhetoric of colonialism, but at the same time, they are also redefined according to a nationalist rhetoric of authenticity, in a confusing and repetitive performance of failed social representations. Yet, if both discourses, the colonial and the national, are deployed simultaneously, a double pattern of colonialist discourse emerges, which simultaneously avows and disavows colonialism. On the one hand, the bourgeois discourse of naturalism contemplates the castizo essence of the Spanish nation from a colonialist point of view that situates the subaltern classes outside the Spanish nation and within the field of European imperialism. On the other, when the naturalist bourgeois discourse identifies with the castizo subaltern essence of the Spanish nation, it is also identifying with the only groups who are exterior to the bourgeois-nationalist order, as they become markers, the signifiers, left from an older time, a non-nationalist period, when Spain was not a nation-state but an Atlantic-Pacific empire. In short, Fortunata and" the people" become the traumatic reminder of the contradiction that lies at the heart of the Restoration. The Spanish bourgeoisie of the Restoration emerges from an older Spanish imperialist history in Latin America and Eastern Asia, already in decadence, and yet, it attempts to refashion itself as a new national empire similar to Britain or France expanding over Africa and South

Asia, which, at the same time, orientalizes Spain and places it on the position of colonial/colonized subject. Naturalism resorts to female subalternity as the marker that signifies these two contradictory positions or identities (colonizer/colonized), while presenting this irreducible imperialist/colonialist contradiction as the essence of a new identity that is both Spanish and national. Fortunata stands as the allegory of the new Spanish nation but also the non-allegorical, traumatic kernel of a Spanish crisis that is both Atlantic-Pacific and colonial.

1.3 Imperialist Allegories: Manila Shawl vs. Frock Coat

The above representational disavowal of colonialism comes into focus, in its full Atlantic-Pacific Hispanic dimension, if the representations of an older Spanish imperialist logic, presented in the novel, are also analyzed. The opening chapters of the first part of the novel narrate the genealogy of two families: the Santa Cruz and the Arnaiz. However, under the simple story of two upper-middle-class families, Galdós narrates a sophisticated story of imperialist decline and rebirth. He counter-poses both families, the Arnaiz and the Santa Cruz, as two genealogies that illustrate the decline of imperialist Spain and the rise of north-European imperialism. The object around which this story is narrated is fashion. As the fashion of the «mantón de Manila,» or Manila shawl, a "obra nacional de arte," and traded by the Arnaiz family, decays, the reader witnesses the history of the decadence of one of the major routes of Spanish imperialist trade. It spans from China, through the Philippines and Mexico, to Spain, but flounders under the weight of the new British commerce from Asia, which travels, instead, through the Suez channel.

At the same time, the new route that goes from Paris to Madrid comes to define the rise and success of the Arnaiz family and, by extension, the new predominance of north European fashion, culture, and modernity in Spain. This cultural imperialism, allegorized through fashion, is defined in the novel as "el imperio de la levita" (2004: 25, the empire of the frock coat) and no longer as "el imperio de los colorines" (2004: 24 the empire of colors, referring to the Manila shawl)[10]. The contrast between the colorful Manila shawl and the serious sobriety of the frock coat also becomes an allegory of the fate of both imperialisms, Spanish and north European. While the Spanish lower classes hold on to the Manila shawl, the middle and upper-middle classes abandon it, in order to embrace the new sober Parisian fashion.

> El género de China decaía visiblemente. Las galeras aceleradas iban trayendo a Madrid cada día con más presteza las novedades parisienses, y se apuntaba la invasión lenta y tiránica de los medios colores que pretenden ser signo de cultura. La sociedad española empezaba a presumir de seria; es decir, a vestirse lúgubremente, y el alegre imperio de los colorines se derrumbaba de un modo indudable. Como se habían ido las capas rojas, se fueron los pañuelos de Manila. La aristocracia

NOTES

10 | The Santa Cruz family traded in national clothing, soldier's clothing, which escapes the flux of fashion. Yet this national economy is presented as in suspension, since Baldomero Arnaiz has already retired by then. The fact that Juanito Santa Cruz takes Aurora as the new lover is central, for the latter trades in "novedades" and "ropa interior" from Paris and, at the same time, represents the new "working" woman "not to be trusted."

> los decía con desdén a la clase media, y esta, que también quería ser aristócrata, entregábalos al pueblo, último y fiel adepto de los matices vivos. Aquel encanto de los ojos, aquel prodigio de color, remedo de la naturaleza sonriente, encendida por el sol de Mediodía, empezó a perder terreno, aunque el pueblo, con instinto de colorista y poeta, defendía la prenda española como defendió el parque de Monteleón y los reductos de Zaragoza. Poco a poco iba cayendo el chal de los hombros de las mujeres hermosas, porque la sociedad se empeñaba en parecer grave, y para ser grave nada mejor que envolverse en tintas de tristeza. Estamos bajo la influencia del Norte de Europa, y ese ladito Norte nos impone los grises que toma de su ahumado cielo. (2004: 24)

In a first moment when Galdós narrates the history of fashion in Spain, he deploys a geopolitical discourse of Spanish colonial nostalgia whereby the subaltern classes are described as the last and only repository of decadent Spanish colonialism. In this context, Fortunata emerges as the ultimate embodiment of this decadent Spanish colonialism: desirable yet outside the national Spanish bourgeois order, which has identified with north-European colonialism, and whose main embodiment in the novel is Juanito Santa Cruz. Therefore, the romance between Fortunata and Juanito is ultimately a colonialist romance of nostalgia, desire, and control between a decadent Spanish colonialism, on the one hand, and a rising north European (French and British) colonialism, on the other—thus exceeding the colonial scenario of miscenegation pointed out by Labanyi. However, colonialism's imbrication in the novel, and in Spanish naturalism altogether, is much more intricate and widespread than the allegorical reference to fashion might suggest at first. It extends to the commodity of literature as well, that is, to the naturalist novel, so that *Fortunata y Jacinta* allegorizes its own position, in this Atlantic-Pacific overlap of colonialist crisis and expansion.

1.4 Unreliable Narrators, Polyphony, Café Culture and the New Public Sphere

In the third part of the novel, as the upper and middle-classes have been already presented and dealt with in the first two, there is a long and almost *costumbrista*-like introduction to café culture in the novel, which is followed by the «romance» between Evaristo Feijoo and Fortunata. This third part, transitional and abject as it is, in its intermediate position between middle and subaltern classes, is paramount to understanding the way in which the disavowal of colonialism is structured by the Galdósian discourse: this part responds to a structure of *mise-en-abyme*.

At the very beginning of the first part, when Juanito Santa Cruz's mercurial education is narrated by Galdós, he takes pleasure explaining Juanito's bibliophile phase (2004: 8). Juanito reads voraciously philosophy, religion, and geography. He also engages

in discussions about power differences between the Brahmanic and the despotic regimes of the Orient. This Orientalist fever seems a youth trend that, once is overcome, disappears without a trace. However, in the third part of the novel, when café culture is introduced, Orientalism makes a very subtle but central reappearance. Most of the discussions of the café are circumscribed to four areas: small talk, religion, politics, and economics. This discourse, which is predominantly public and restricted to men, rescues the Orientalist discourse learnt by Juanito Santa Cruz at the beginning of the novel. In the cafés, the political and economic situation of Spain is discussed alongside major European issues. However, this general discussion is always intertwined with religious and philosophical discourses where the Orientalist and comparative logic, inclusive of other religious, economic, and philosophical systems, is central (2004: 499, 625). In other words, the discussions of the café are very much infused by north European imperialist discourse—which historically orientalizes and feminizes Spain, as in the case of *Carmen* (Merimée, 1845).

Café culture is also a (male) democratic institution in the sense that any male listener is authorized by the café structure to learn and share his own knowledge. As a result, café culture, in its masculine democratic structure, allows any man to re-center himself at the core of an imperialist discourse and, from that imperialist central position, to exert his universal opinion on Spain, Europe, the Orient, and universal history. In other words, café culture erases all class and political differences—with the exception of gender—and allows any male subject to claim a universal and imperialist position of power in order to apply his knowledge to the world. Evidently, the Foucaultian effect of the café structure of power/knowledge lies on the fact that, outside the café, most geopolitical and class differences are reinstated so that the café transcends or sublimates the north European imperialist world-order in which Spain is a decadent empire. Thus, at the center of café culture, the colonial struggle and imbalance described by Galdós at the beginning of the novel, through his exposition of fashion (Manila/Paris), is neutralized. As a result, the act of talking itself becomes a moment of *jouissance* or speech pleasure whereby discursive universality is achieved and differences are transcended; everybody gets to play imperialist.

However, if café culture is eminently oral and thus encompasses a wide array of discursive practices—traditional stories, rhetorics, academic knowledge, Orientalism, storytelling, gossip, jokes, retorts, etc.—it appears that café discourse is as complex as Galdós's own naturalist discourse; they are both polyphonic. After all, Galdós too cannibalizes most genres, oral and written, in a complex polyphony: realism, romanticism, costume literature, naturalism, melodrama, dialectology, etc. However, if the opening remarks of each chapter are analyzed in detail, what seems to be a coincidence between

café culture and Galdós's naturalism turns out to be intrinsic. As the opening sentence of chapter 3 of part 3 most clearly shows, «Me ha contado Jacinta que una noche llegó a tal grado su irritación…» (2004: 361), Galdós implicates himself in the action and scene of the narrative. In other words, what at first sight seems to be a naturalist imperfection on Galdós's part (to include himself in the story as knowing the characters) turns out to be a direct effect of café culture, which is where all stories are told. In other words, Galdós adopts a polyphonic café-culture structure for his novel, which then also reaches the domestic sphere of the bourgeois home (hence the above reference to Jacinta, a woman) as well as the other transitional space between the public and the private: the "tertulia" of the retail shop.

The ultimate consequence of including the novel within café-culture seems to be the fact that the novel is a polyphonic, universalist discourse where, on the one hand, imperialism/colonialism is discussed and dealt with at many levels and, on the other, it is also neutralized. In short, talking as much as reading become forms of imperialist jouissance *qua* nationalist discourse.

The insertion of the encounter between Evaristo Feijoo and Fortunata, immediately following the description of café culture, is also crucial in this respect. Feijoo is the only male character with whom Fortunata talks and exchanges stories. At the same time Feijoo is the only lover who is not intent in transforming Fortunata in a social type or model, unlike Santa Cruz or Maxi. However, Feijoo provides Fortunata with a discourse on morals that are neither catholic nor bourgeois, since he emphasizes appearances above any ethical content. His discourse is internalized by Fortunata and, at that point, she begins to use the domestic bourgeois discourse of domesticity (the angel of the house; Aldaraca, 1991) for her own purposes. At that point, she has «an idea,» and although the idea is not explained by the character or the narrator, it represents the beginning of her own subjective agency and consciousness: she no longer represents the subaltern subject without a voice. If this is so, Feijoo's presence is a *mise-en-abyme* of Galdós's authorial voice. On the one hand, Feijoo, as a retired military, is the only one to confess having experienced desire for colonial subjects (he falls in love with a Polynesian woman in the Pacific; he has also been in Cuba and the Philippines). On the other, Feijoo is the intradiegetic subject that gives voice to Fortunata the same way that Galdós does at the extradiegetic level. Furthermore, both Feijoo and Galdós are the only two character/subjects who do not reduce Fortunata to a social model and instead accept her subaltern status. Feijoo's generous and understanding presence in cafés, ultimately, would represent Galdós's own inscription in café culture from which he would ultimately write his novel. Furthermore, Feijoo's behavior towards Fortunata resembles that of Galdós towards his Jewish lover Concha Ruth Morell, which would

further emphasize the subaltern and colonial nature of Fortunata.

Café culture is, thus, the allegorical rendering of the polyphony/heteroglossia of the novel itself as Spain's bourgeoisie's double colonial discourse (Hispanic Atlantic-Pacific/North European Oriental) while performing its double colonial disavowal through Fortunata (she embodies the bygone empire; she is the new colonial salvage).

1.5 Spanish Nationalism, Imperialism and the Hispanic Atlantic

After this consideration of Atlantic Hispanic imperialism, now I can address the original question of Fortunata's identity[11]. Fortunata represents an object of desire as well as a site of trauma for the new upper and middle-classes of the Spanish Restoration. She embodies both a bygone Spanish colonialism, whose only trace remains in Spanish subaltern culture and the situation of the Spanish bourgeoisie vis-à-vis north European imperialism. This desire-trauma places the middle and upper-middle classes in a nationalist position, which nevertheless is impossible to suture or signify as full self-evident identity, for it is the result of colonial disavowal.

Fortunata articulates a nationalist hegemony for the benefit of the Spanish middle and upper-middle classes, which ultimately benefit from and suffer the new organization of north European colonialism. On the one hand, the bourgeoisie occupies the position of north European colonialism, while desiring Fortunata as a bygone Spanish colonial subject. On the other hand, Fortunata is the kernel of the decadence of Spanish colonialism, the Hispanic Real, which cannot be reduced to the symbolic order of north-European colonialism. When she claims «soy un angel» and does not confess her sins before dying, she claims to have an irreducible but clear place within the new north European colonial/imperial order and discourse where bourgeois domesticity becomes central while, at the same time, signifying her subaltern excess—the traumatic reminder of a colonial Spain in crisis. The final dislodgement between the signifier and the signified, in its realistic doubling and doubt, so reminiscent of Don Quixote's, is what holds the Restoration together and makes of literature, and of the naturalist novel in particular, the ultimate sign of its identity and crisis[12].

If throughout the first two halves of the 19th century, romanticism, costume literature, melodrama, and other similar discourses attempt to represent this traumatic kernel that defines the Hispanic Atlantic-Pacific as still an exterior other (from *Don Álvaro*, 1835, to *Las mujeres españolas, americanas y lusitanas pintadas por sí mismas,* 1880-82), beginning in the Restoration, with naturalism, this kernel is internalized and repressed as national, under the guise of the female subaltern, and thus keeps returning as the uncanny, as the ghost of empire. If this is so, the Spanish state fails to organize

NOTES

11 | "The coexistence in Restoration Spain of the pre-modern and the modern… degeneration is caused by backwardness and progress in combination" (Labanyi, 2000: 204).

12 | At the end, Fortunata's embodiment of the new Spanish Restoration is irreducible to any nationalist Spanish discourse but, precisely because of its resistance, also organizes and legitimizes such nationalist discourse: Fortunata reproduces and gives birth to a boy whereas neither Jacinta nor Juanito Santa Cruz reproduce capital or nature. The incorporation of Fortunata's son to the household of the Santa Cruz family does not eliminate the problem. When Fortunata dies, her son becomes the uncanny element, the kernel of Spanish history, which a Spanish bourgeoisie identified with north-European imperialism cannot eliminate and furthermore needs in order to legitimize itself as national. The change in gender from woman to man, from mother to son, is probably the only way in which the Real is symbolized or incorporated at the bourgeois hegemonic discourse. "El pituso" becomes the first national subject of this foundational fiction of Spanish nationalism, if you allow me Doris Sommer's coinage. Spanish subaltern women and, by hegemonic association, all women, just as all subaltern classes, are exiled from the Spanish nationalist project after the latter have "given birth" to it—after becoming the subject of nationalist reproduction.

itself as nation-state or, in Blanco's words, as an imperialist nation-state even in the Restoration as it is haunted by colonial disavowal. The important critical task now is to map out or to undertake an archaeology of this colonial Atlantic-Pacific trauma that haunts Hispanic subjects and writers since, at least, the Restoration.

2. Etxeita: A Post-Colonialist-Imperialist Reading of Basque Literature

Most, if not all Basque histories of literature and culture, assume that literature takes place in the Basque Country and responds to an internal *nationalist* logic that leads from Carlism and Foralism (*fuerismo*) to nationalism at the end of the 19th century. However, the origins of modern Basque literature are post-colonial-imperial and they respond to «colonial disavowal,» which I have elaborated for Abadia and the floral games elsewhere (2003).

In 1837, the founder of modern Basque literature, the Irish-born Antoine Thompson d'Abbadie, also known in Basque as Anton Abadia, left his home in the French Basque Country, (the northern Basque Country), and set out to discover the sources of the Nile. After claiming that he had discovered the so-called sources of the Nile, he returned to Paris in 1848 where he was welcomed with great acclaim and was named member of the Academy of the Sciences in 1862, of which he became president in 1892. However, after his British counterparts proved that his claim to the discovery was not correct, he redirected his attention to the Basque Country and, among other activities, he organized the first floral games in 1853, ahead of the Catalan (1859) and Galician (1861) games. Although he continued with his geological and linguistic research, his interest in Basque culture gained a more central and affective place in his activities. In the floral games, poets and improvisers (*bertsolari*) from the northern and southern Basque Country met for the first time. As a result, Abadia consolidated a new political idea, originally articulated in 1836 with Agustin Xaho ("zazpi uskal herrietako uskalduner"): the national Basque country as the unity of the seven Basque-speaking provinces, ahead of the ideas of Sabino Arana, the founder of the Basque Nationalist Party. This understanding of the Basque Country as seven provinces still constitutes the hegemonic geo-political ideology of contemporary Basque nationalism.

What appears clearly from Abadia's writings is that the floral games respond to colonial disavowal. For Abbadie, the Basques become the fantastic compensation of a disavowed colonial trauma. The Basques are not the Nile; they are not African, but just the same. At the core of modern Basque literature, there is a fantastic disavowal of a colonial

scenario that takes place elsewhere, in Africa. As a famous quote mentioned by Gaston Darboux reveals, Abadia had an anthropological and colonial understanding of the Basques: «Nous autres Basques, nous sommes un secret, nous ne ressemblons pas aux autres peuples, fiers de leurs origines et pleins de traditions nationales. Si nous avons un fondateur, un premier aïeul, c'est Adam» (1908: xxxvi).

Abadia's colonial articulation of the Basque Country, although influential, did not take place in a vacuum. As Jon Juaristi states, in the aftermath of the first Carlist War (1833-1839) and throughout the 19th century, the most attractive element of the Basque Country was its "Arcadian" character, i.e. its colonial and yet domestic-internal character. This led to the creation of a Basque touristic economy, which was central till industrialization began in Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa in the 1890s:

> El País Vasco se convirtió así en la utopía de la España conservadora. La burguesía isabelina descubrió Vasconia como una tierra de paisajes verdes y costumbres patriarcales, muy adecuada para pasar el verano... Los vascos, que, como he dicho, habitaban un país pobre en recursos, intuyeron pronto que los pocos de que disponían —*montes, playas, manantiales, lengua y costumbres misteriosas*— podían ser razonablemente aplicados a la explotación de una nueva fuente de riquezas que sustituiría con ventaja a la deficitaria agricultura y a la siempre insegura protoindustria del hierro: *turismo*.
>
> En esto, los vascofranceses tomaron la delantera. Las gentes distinguidas de París comenzaron a acudir a las playas vascas en los primeros años del siglo XIX (fue el mismísimo emperador Napoleón quien inauguró, en junio de 1808, la primera temporada de baños en la playa de Biarritz)... a comienzos de la Restauración europea, aristócratas ingleses y franceses se hicieron construir elegantes mansiones en Biarritz y otros pueblos de la costa vasca. (1997: 60-1, my emphasis).

At the end of the 19th century, French writers such as Pierre Loti or Basque authors who relocated in Madrid, such as Antonio Trueba, further consolidated this intra-colonial or touristic otherness of the Basque Country for the newly acquired touristic tastes of the French and Spanish bourgeoisies. Loti went as far as to orientalize the Basque Country, after Hugo's example (Gabilondo, 2008: 155-156).

In this context, nationalist Basque literary history (Lasagabaster, 2002: 89-92; Aldekoa, 2004: 116-27) has proposed that the Basque novel begins at the turn of the century with Domingo Agirre, who published *Kresala* (*Salt Water*, 1902-1905) and *Garoa* (*Fern* 1907-1912); Jose Manuel Etxeita appears as a secondary novelist without a clearly defined style. Although most critics agree that the two novelists' works can be framed in the costume literature genre (*costumbrismo*), they have overlooked their differences. Both novelists articulate a continuation of the colonial representation of the Basque Country, now in the form of costumbrismo, and both writers articulate colonial

disavowal at the core of their novels, i.e. at the "origin" of the modern Basque novel. However, this disavowal takes its clearest form in Etxeita's novels, not Agirre's, so that in order to understand the beginning of the Basque novel, one must read both authors against each other. Although I will give a more detailed account of Etxeita's biography later on, it will suffice to remember for the time being that, unlike Agirre who was a priest in a small coastal Basque town, Etxeita made his fortune in the Philippines as Mayor of Manila and President of its Chamber of Commerce. Thus, the Basque novel begins precisely with the performance of a traumatic colonial disavowal that emerges at the intersection of the novels of Agirre and Etxeita.

Agirre's *Seawater* is a costumbrista novel, but it draws its language and content from the oral tradition of storytelling. Centered on the fishing village of Arranondo, some of the shipwrecks and storms narrated by the novel derive from oral tradition. As Iñaki Aldekoa states,

> "Kitolis" (cap. XI), quizá el capítulo más conmovedor de todos, cuenta la lucha agónica que mantiene el protagonista de la narración—que ha visto cómo han ido sucumbiendo uno a uno todos sus compañeros de naufragio, incluido su propio hijo—contra la adversidad de las olas y el frío de la noche. "Kitolis" funciona como un relato autónomo dentro de la trama de la novela, que manifiesta por lo demás una urdimbre endeble y sosa, sostenida apenas por un tenue hilo narrativo en torno a la pareja de Mañaxi y Anjel. (2004: 120)

Although, structurally, Aldekoa has isolated the only story that defies *costumbrista* logic, the novel contains more micro-narratives originating outside *costumbrismo* in popular storytelling.

In *Fern*, instead, oral tradition is superseded and replaced with a more rigid narrative and language, which describe the Basque farmstead, isolated in the mountains, in the most ideologically charged way. The farmstead represents the political imaginary of Basque nationalism, which, nevertheless, amounts to a continuation rather than a break with the earlier colonialist tradition (some of *Fern*'s plots are borrowed from Loti).

This difference between Agirre's two novels is essential because the coast is a liminal space, a border between land and sea, empire and colony, which, therefore, is a reminder of Basque colonial/imperial history. The mountain, instead, signifies a further disavowal of such a history, but, at the same time, represents a more fantastic re-presentation of that disavowal, whereby the only form of colonialism is no longer historical but *representational*: the Basques are represented as the mysterious indigenous people of Europe, an original Europe outside history—and therefore outside Spanish colonial history; hence its non-historical, representational nature. Here *costumbrismo* coincides with the colonialist touristic discourse

I described earlier: hence its non-historical, representational nature.

Seawater, thus, contains historical characters such as the *indiano*—the returning immigrant from the Americas— who is represented as villain in order to contain and disavow the colonial/imperial history of the Basque Country. As Aldekoa states:

> La defensa de la religión, el euskera y el patriotismo son su corolario [of *Seawater*'s worldview]. Sin embargo, esta concepción del mundo que busca el regazo de la tradición sufrirá el empuje destructor del presente en forma *de indianos que han perdido la fe y la lengua patrias* y los "mamarrachos" y tipos indeseables con bigote que luchan por salir de la ignorancia o por mejorar su situación y perturban la armonía idílica del país con sus blasfemias, irreligiosidad, racionalismo, ilustración, elecciones y socialismo. (2004:118-19)

It is against both the working class gathered around Bilbao and the immigrants returning from the Americas that Agirre attempts to write a *costumbrista* novel that isolates the fishing community of Arranondo and, ultimately, pushes him to move away from the coastal Basque Country to the more isolated representation of the Basque mountains and farmstead. The indiano, usually a man, represents a double threat: he is the poor fisher who leaves the idyllic "colonial" representation of the small Basque village and, by "working" in the "historical" colonies, returns stereotypically rich, thus becoming a *historical* uncanny reminder, in reverse, of the *representational* colonialism that goes on in Agirre's novels and, more generally, in Basque *costumbrismo*.

Opposite Agirre, Etxeita wrote semi-autobiographical novels that precisely emphasized the emigrant: his own life history, as he sailed as a pilot and became a rich *indiano* in the Philippines before returning to Mundaka, his hometown. Yet, in Etxeita's novels, historical colonialism is disavowed. More specifically Etxeita disavows his own biographical colonial history; he disavows the story of the *indiano* who has returned as a result of the colonial wars of independence in the Philippines. As a result, and counter Agirre's novels, Etxeita carries out colonial disavowal by refashioning the imperialist *indiano* not as colonizer, but as colonial/colonized subject. Etxeita's *indianos* are poor native Basques who migrate to colonial lands to seek fortune and always return to the Basque Country to complete and give meaning to their Basque and, thus, colonial subject position. Therefore Etxeita's biographical colonial space par excellence, the Philippines, is always mentioned marginally and, instead, is replaced by a post-colonial Latin America where Basque-Spanish colonialism has been historically superseded since 1825. Moreover, in Etxeita's stories no reference is made to economic exploitation, oppression, or any form of violence that might be associated with colonialism. His *indianos* earn their fortune directly from working the land—although they always become ranch owners who exploit native labor

force; the latter is always mentioned indirectly. In short, post/colonial exploitation is substituted with the ideology of the individual Basque farmstead owner who works the land by himself, even in the Americas.

When analyzing Etxeita's *Josetxo*, Kortazar captures well the non-costumbrista geography of the novel, derived from the colonial disavowal of the Philippines, and the compensatory or fantastic representation of a post-colonial Latin America:

> Espazioaren tratamendua ez da manikeoa, beste idazle kostunbristek ohi dutenez, esperientziari loturikoa da. *Dena dela, norberaren lurraren goraipamena egiten da, nostalgia nagusitzen delarik espazioaren tratamenduan*.
>
> Nobela sentimentalak agintzen duen moduan, konfliktorik eza izango da nobelaren alde narratiborik ahulena; ekintzen tratamenduan ere maiz erabili izan da Jaungoikoaren izena ekintzen eragile gisa. (2013, my emphasis)

Therefore, Agirre and Etxeita's novels have to be read as two sides of the same process of colonial disavowal of the Basque Country and its involvement in Spanish (and French) imperialism. Etxeita disavows *historical colonialism* (his own involvement in the Philippines) whereas Agirre disavows *representational colonialism* (the touristic/nativists representation of the Basque Country).

The above two strategies of colonial disavowal are even more complex if Etxeita's entire biography is taken into consideration. In 1886, while still in Manila, Etxeita published his first novel in Spanish in that city: a short fictionalized version of his biography, entitled *Amoríos de Juana y Manuel y lo que es la madre a pesar de los pesares*. This novel still contained direct references to Manila and Filipino sailors. Yet, he wrote this first novel before Agirre began his career as novelist in the Basque Country in 1898 with a historical novel (*Auñamendiko Lorea* / *The Flower of the Pyrenees*). Agirre wrote *Seawater* in serialized form between 1902-1905 in a Basque journal, that is to say, in the post-colonial aftermath of *The Desastre* of 1898. In that very same year, Etxeita returned to his hometown and, eleven years later, in 1909 he wrote his first novel in Basque about the life of a sailor, that is, a more fictionalized version of his earlier Spanish semi-autobiography: *Josetxo* (*Little Joe*). Thus, Etxeita wrote *Josetxo* (1909) after Agirre's second novel about a Basque fishing village, *Seawater* (1902-1905).

As Etxeita shifted from Spanish to the "colonial" Basque language in his second novel, references to the Philippines became more liminal and were pushed into the past —the past of the hero's father. Moreover, *Josetxo*'s longer text made room for subplots that question and ultimately further assert the hero's Basque (colonial) origin. As Agirre wrote his third novel, *Fern*, between 1907 and 1912,

Etxeita wrote a more idealized-costumbrista novel in 1910: *Jaioterri maitia* (*Beloved Homeland*), which no longer makes reference to his imperialist past in the Philippines thus completing his colonial disavowal, while rendering the Basque migrant into a fully ahistorical, representational colonial subject: the novel takes places in the mountains, in a village called Ardibaso. Instead of the Philippines, Mexico becomes the new site of colonial disavowal: three couples from Ardibaso migrate to Mexico, make their fortunes, and return to the village, without ever interacting in a meaningful way with any Mexican character. The three couples only deal with each other and other Basque emigrants in what can only be called a "Mexican Ardibaso" (mostly located in Veracruz). In short, even the Mexican postcolonial space becomes fully Basquized in order to disavow fully colonialism/ imperialism: Mexico is not the Basque Country, but just the same.

In order to understand the full extent of Etxeita's disavowal of historical colonialism, it is important to resort to this very colonial history and, more specifically, to the colonial history of the Basques in the Philippines. After sixty years of monopolistic activity (1728-1785) in Venezuela, the Real Compañía Guipuzcoana de Caracas, a Basque colonialist monopoly, lost its hold of the Venezuelan market, due in part to its exploitative and abusive methods, and found itself looking for other monopolist markets. As Marciano de Borja explains in his *The Basques in the Philippines*, the Spanish monarchy granted the same company the colonial market of the Philippines and so the Real Compañía de Filipinas was born in 1785 (2005: 66-74), which did not compete with the «Galeón de Acapulco» as it took the Eastern route through Cape of Good Hope.. As a result, Basque colonialist history took root in the Philippines. Although this company ended in 1837, the Basque presence among the local Spanish elite grew. A Basque, Antonio Ayala, founded and expanded, with other German and Spanish partners, what became the Ayala Corporation—still today the largest company in the Philippines (De Borja, 2005: 124-27). Moreover, and as Etxeita's biography confirms, another Basque company, Olana, Larrinaga and Co., ran the only shipping route from England to the Philippines. Historically, the Basque elite had a central position in Manila and, more generally, in the colony at large. As I will explain later when analyzing Rizal's work, it is important to emphasize that this elite was recognized as distinctively Basque (the Spanish colonizer of the Philippines was also Basque, Lope de Legazpi).

Etxeita's biography is central to the above history of Basque colonialism. He became a sea captain at the age of 20 and started to work for the Basque shipping company located in Liverpool, Olana, Larrinaga and Co, which ran the route between Liverpool and Manila. Etxeita eventually settled down as the agent of the company in Manila and later was promoted to the position of president. After gaining membership in several advisory boards in Manila, he also became the president of

the local chamber of commerce and finally the mayor of the capital. He lived in Manila for 16 years. In 1898, he returned to his hometown Mundaka where he spent the rest of his life (Kortazar, 1999: 8).

As I stated earlier, it is only after Etxeita left the Philippines in 1898 and settled in his native Mundaka, that he began to write in Basque (*Josetxo* 1909; *Jaioterri maitia* 1910; *Au, ori ta bestia* 1913). Therefore the switch to Basque language, to the local indigenous language—to his own Basque "Tagalog," as it were—is the crucial linguistic and literary device that allows Etxeita to perform his maneuver of colonial disavowal. *Josetxo* borrows from his earlier fictionalized biography in Spanish, but it becomes fully fictional in a very crucial element: the haunting absence of the Philippines, which only emerges at the very end of the novel to complete precisely a post-imperial-colonial fantasy of «yes but just the same»: the hero's unknown father appears at the end to give him a Basque paternity and, with the fortune that the father made in the Philippines, also endow the son with a new (petty) bourgeois lineage.

Josetxo is an *indiano* novel and fantasy. The protagonist, Josetxo, is snatched by gypsies and grows poor with his adoptive family in Mundaka. Due to his great abilities and good disposition, he becomes captain of a ship and owner of a small fortune by age twenty. Due to a shipwreck, he ends up in Argentina and after striking a filial relationship with a rich Basque hacienda owner, he becomes the overseer of the hacienda and several years later, returns as the richest man of Mundaka. Finally, he marries his childhood sweetheart, who has suffered and resisted for years all the attempts made by her evil parents to marry her to other men who were richer than Josetxo and had a well-established origin in the village.

The sentimental subplot, based on his own life, and which already appeared in his first semi-autobiographic novel in Spanish, further emphasizes colonial disavowal. Josetxo, unlike Etxeita, is a boy kidnapped and abandoned by a "gypsy" woman; thus his origins and Basque filiation are put into question by the novel. Against the opposition of Josetxo's adoptive family who wants to marry him to a richer girl, Josetxo's girlfriend, Eladi, awaits faithfully his return as he navigates and endures shipwrecks throughout the world. After a long absence Josetxo returns, now rich, and marries Eladi. In short, colonial disavowal also takes an emotional and affective turn, as Josetxo marries the right «colonial» woman, a Basque woman who is even bound by blood—she is his cousin. Here, semi-incestuous relationships further emphasize colonial disavowal, as the love between both heroes is thickened by blood. In *Amoríos de Juana y Manuel,* at the end of the novel, the mother supplants the girlfriend as the final emotional instance of colonial disavowal: Josetxo ultimately returns to his mother.

In Josetxo, the protagonist, as captain and *indiano*, travels throughout the entire Atlantic: from New Found Land, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Argentina to Ireland, England, and France. Liverpool, the headquarters of the shipping company for which Etxeita worked in the Philippines, is only mentioned once accidentally and the Philippines are completely absent. In the last chapter of the novel, when the «devilish gypsy woman» confesses her abduction, Josetxo finally meets his biological family. His father turns out to be rich as a result of his work for the Spanish crown in the Philippines.

> Mutikoau ostu orduko, illebi lenago, joan zan bere aitta Manilara, an españarrak erebillen gudura: amak naibagez beterik egin ebazan alegiñak Josetxo billatuten alde guztietatik, baña ezin izaeban idoro. Aittak, arik bosgarren urtean artu eban *Koronel* esaten eutsen agipidea: amaittu zan gudua, ta urtebete garrenean itxi eutsan gudulari izateari, ta geratu zan illaroko sari onaz, da diru apur bat esku-artean ebala.
>
> Manilan egon zan arte, usmau eban, gauza batzuen salerosiaz, irabazi leitekeala polito dirua, ta asi zan salerosietan, eukan diruaz. Ogetabi urtetan egon zan Manilan, da etxeratu zan erdi makalik, baña diru askogaz: etxean, urtebetean jarri zan gizon ederra. (1909: 201)

Therefore, the Philippines, so central to Etxeita's life and fictionalized autobiography written in Spanish, appear marginally in *Josetxo* at the end, and only to clarify Josetxo's «true Basque origins.» In short, the complete *indiano* fantasy of rugs to riches requires that its scenario becomes strictly Atlantic and post-colonial (independent Latin American republics), so that its Pacific dimension is disavowed. In other words, Etxeita's own colonial experience in the Pacific is disavowed to create the perfect post-colonial-imperial fantasy that gives back the *indiano* his true Basque origin and identity. His is an identity that could only be regained by having it written in the «true» indigenous, colonial language, Basque, a "colonial" language that Etxeita used to perform his colonial disavowal of the Philippines.

To complete his colonial disavowal and erase the Philippines from his narrative, that is, in order to disavow colonial history, Etxeita resorts in his last novel to the pastoral Basque Country of farmsteads isolated by mountains (*Beloved Motherland,* 1910), following Agirre's lead (*Fern*, 1907-1912). Yet, Agirre's pastoral rendition of the farmstead is haunted by a colonial representation derived from a more modern colonialism, Abadia's colonial disavowal of Africa, which is a non-Hispanic north-European type of colonialism. Therefore, Agirre and Etxeita attempt to disavow *historical colonialism* (Hispanic colonialism in the Americas and the Philippines) but end up embracing *representational colonialism* (19th century European colonialism in Africa as expanded to the Basque Country by anthropology and tourism). The Basque novel begins, thus, at the end of the 19th

century in a double colonial geography (Africa / the Americas and the Philippines), a double colonial history (the Hispanic, the north-European). By performing historical colonial disavowal, the Basque novel ends up creating a new form, a "unique" Basque form of novel based on representational colonialism: those idyllic subjects, severed from history and modernity, who live in farmsteads surrounded by mountains. Ironically enough, this type of novel represents a now double colonial disavowal. This unique Basque form of the novel, the narrative of a double colonial disavowal, seems once again to confirm Basque ahistorical exceptionalism. Ironically enough, there is nothing Basque about it: it is through disavowal that this literary form acquires its most important feature: its Basque negativity. It becomes Basque by denying the history of colonialism and, by doing so, by denying its own history. The only historical aspect left is the history of the disavowing representation itself: the history of disavowal.

3. Colonial Disavowal in the Philippines

What follows would require a study of its own, and therefore it only serves as the coda, or the beginning, of a new history of colonial disavowal in the colonies, in the Philippines. In this context, Rizal's *Noli me tangere*, the Filipino national novel, is simply a starting point.

In order to understand the way Rizal disavows his own colonial condition in his novel, it is important to notice that he thematizes the Basque origin of the protagonist, Ibarra, when the latter meets one of the victims—Elias—of his defunct great grandfather, Eibarramendia. Elias questions Ibarra about his origins:

> Was your family acquainted with don Pedro Eibarramendia?
> "I should say so» answered Ibarra, as he opened a chest and took out a bundle of papers «he was my great grandfather»
> Your great grandfather Ibarramendia? again asked Elias with changed and livid features.
> "Yes» replied Ibarra absently «we shortened the surname: it was too long»
> "Was he a Basque?» demanded Elias, approaching him.
> "Yes, a Basque—but what's the matter? asked Ibarra in surprise
> ... don Pedro Eibarramendia was the villain who falsely accused my grandfather and cased all our misfortunes. (1912: 418)

It is not a coincidence if Rizal made his alter ego in the novel a Filipino of Basque origin. Even Rizal, an intellectual who was conflicted about the process of independence, resorts to colonial disavowal. The Basques, as one of the Spanish colonial elites in the Philippines, who also are "colonial subjects" of their own who antecede the formation of Castilian/Spanish imperialism, represent a blind spot, a traumatic point where colonialism can be both avowed and disavowed by identification. The

Basque elite in Manila represent the colonizer but also the Basque history of colonialism-as-native-subjects of the Spanish empire.

Yet, Rizal's colonial disavowal in the Philippines had a very different effect from the one I have analyzed in Galdós and Etxeita. As Vicente Rafael states:

> Speaking Castilian and seeking to assimilate as Spanish citizens, Filipino nationalists were instead regarded as *foreigners* and thieves by crowds in Spain and colonial authorities in the Philippines. Taking on that *foreignness*, they threatened to return it to its *source*. Rizal saw that such exchanges might well lead to uncontrollable violence. Usurping the law, nationalist vengeance threatened *to replace the terror of colonial rule with its own.* Rizal thus called for the sublimation of vengeance into sacrifice at the end of his book. (2005: 66, my emphasis)

What Rafael denominates "sublimation into sacrifice" represents a form of colonial disavowal that Rizal performs by identifying with a foreigner who is also a native: the Basque Ibarra. Although Rizal's work and life have been appropriated by Filipino nationalist historiography (the national hero), colonial disavowal leads to an uncanny space (or no-space) that refuses foreclosure and becomes a reminder of the traumatic history of colonialism. The Basque Ibarra, because of his genealogy, occupies such a position and continues to embody Rizal's colonial disavowal. On the one hand he is the native capable of «uncontrollable violence.» On the other, he desires to assimilate to the colonial project but is unable to do so and remains foreigner. As Rafael concludes,

> This is, in a way, Rizal's 'crime' as well. He leaves behind *foreign* traces that cannot be fully *domesticated*. These stories release remainders that cannot be accounted for and can hardly be taken up for nationalist uses. They deposit a surplus of pleasure that is also a source of befuddlement and thereby eludes domestication. They thus keep open still other lines of interpretation past those that lead to revolution, counterrevolution, and collaboration. (2005: 95, my emphasis)

Rizal's Basque Ibarra, perhaps, is the most central trace of a foreignness that cannot be assimilated to Filipino nationalist discourse and yet keeps open other lines of interpretation that demand a Hispanic Atlantic-Pacific as the locus of its colonial dis/avowal.

4. On the Disappearance of the Pacific Colonial

As Frank's opening quote in this article makes clear, the Hispanic Pacific, unlike the Atlantic, is a space that, from its beginning, is represented as secondary, supplemental; ultimately it becomes a self-effacing space both for postcolonial states, such as the Philippines, as well as for post-imperial states such as Spain or

spaces of dominated nationalism such as the Basque Country. As Robert R. Ellis writes, the Hispanic Pacific, which had in the Philippines its epicenter, was an in-between space that defied the division between East and West, Orientalism and Occidentalism:

> When writing about Asia, early modern Spanish writers tend not to depict a unified geographical and cultural space but rather nations [...] Within Spanish experience and discourse, however, all of these regions were united through the Philippines, the base of Spanish operations in the entire western Pacific. [...] the early modern Spanish writers I discuss all travelled westward to Asia, passing through Mexico and stopping in Manila, even when the Philippines was not their final Asian destination. Both administratively as well as conceptually, Spain regarded the Philippines as the *westernmost* extension of its vast American empire rather than a discrete Asian colony. (2012: 17-18, my emphasis)

Later on, with the Real Compañía de Filipinas, the colony became the easternmost point of the new route through the Cape of Good Hope. Yet, precisely because of its self-effacing quality, as both the westernmost and easternmost location of Spanish colonialism, it also becomes the central sight from which colonial disavowal can be studied while decentering and fragmenting any Hispanist appropriation of a Spanish imperialist history. As it is now narrated by Spanish historiography, 19th-century Spanish history leads, without any breaks, from the War of Independence against Napoleon (1808-1814) to a Spanish nationalist formation and literary culture in The Restoration (1872-1910). This historiographic account is able to disavow Spanish colonial history and representation and, thus, retroactively assimilate and recenter a geography that is not centrally Hispanic. Thus a new global and post-Hispanist articulation of the Hispanic Pacific must be deployed against itself, in order to use its self-effacing character against nationalist realities such as the Spanish, the Filipino, or the Basque, or even "the Hispanic Atlantic," so that a different history is written against the nationalist Hispanic grain in a trans-post-colonial-oceanic fashion reminiscent of the complex geography that Frank delineated in the initial quote of this article but in which Manila still remains the last post of Spanish imperialism.

Works Cited

AGUIRRE, T. (1898): *Aunamendiko Lorea*. Klasikoen Gordailua. http://klasikoak.armiarma.com.

AGUIRRE, T. (1906): *Kresala*. Klasikoen Gordailua. http://klasikoak.armiarma.com.

AGUIRRE, T. (1912): *Garoa*. Klasikoen Gordailua. http://klasikoak.armiarma.com.

ALDARACA, B. (1991): *El Ángel del Hogar: Galdós and the Idegology of Domesticity in Spain*. Chapel Hill, NC: North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures.

ALDEKOA, I. (2004): *Historia de la literatura vasca*. San Sebastian: Erein.

BLANCO AGUINAGA, C. (1978): *La historia y el texto literario: 3 novelas de Galdós*. Madrid: Nuestra Cultura.

BLANCO, A. (2012): *Cultura y conciencia imperial en la España del siglo XIX.* Valencia: Publicacions de la Universitat de València.

DE BORJA, M. (2005): *Basques in the Philippines.* Reno: University of Nevada Press.

CASILDA BÉJAR, R. (2002): *La década dorada. Economía e inversiones españolas en América Latina 1990-2000*. Madrid: Universidad de Alcalá.

CHARMON-DEUTSCH, L. (1990): *Gender and Representation: Women in Spanish Realist Fiction*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

CONRAD, J. (2000): *Joseph Conrad: Heart of Darkness*. New York: Columbia University Press.

DARBOUX, G. (1908) : "Notice historique sur Antoine d'Abbadie." *Mémoires de l'Académie des sciences de l'Institut de France.* Vol. 50. Paris: Gautheir-Villars. i-xlii

ELLIS, R. (2012): *They Need Nothing: Hispanic-Asian Encounters of the Colonial Period*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

ETXEITA, J. M. (2003): Una Aproximación a la biografía de José Manuel de Etxeita. Y Los amoríos de Juana y Manuel. Urdaibai: Urdaibai Txatxi.

ETXEITA, J. M. (1909): *Josetxo*. Klasikoen Gordailua, http://klasikoak.armiarma.com.

ETXEITA, J. M. (1910): *Jaioterri maitia*. Klasikoen Gordailua, http://klasikoak.armiarma.com.

ETXEITA, J. M. (1913): *Au, ori ta bestia*. Klasikoen Gordailua, http://klasikoak.armiarma.com.

FRANK, A.G. (1998): *Reorient*: *Global Economy in the Asian Age.* Berkeley : University of California Press.

FREUD, S. (1949): *An Outline of Psycho-Analysis.* New York: Norton and Co.

GABILONDO, J. (2008): "Imagining the Basques: Dual Otherness from European Imperialism to American Globalization." *Revista Internacional de Estudios Vascos: Imagining The Basques. Foreign Views of the Basque Country*. Eds. Jeremy MacClancy and Santiago Leoné. Monograph 2 145-173.

GABILONDO, J. (2003): "Euskal literatura modernoaren sorrera postkolonial eta gayaz. Anton Abbadieren ekarpena birpentsatuz." In . Arkotxa, A. and Otegi, L. eds. *Euskal gramatikari eta literaturari buruzko ikerketak XXI. mendearen atarianIker* 14.2, 81-88.

GILMAN, S. (1981): *Galdós and the Art of the European Novel: 1867-1887*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

GILROY, P. (1993): *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

GUINOT AGUADO, M. and VAKULENKO, D. (2012): "Spanish Entreprises Need Latin America for Economic Expansion." 8-6-2012. *Council on Hemispheri Affairs*. http://www.coha.org/18472/. 3-23-2013

JAGOE, C. (1994): «The Angel in Mind: Rereading Fortunata y Jacinta.» In *Ambiguous Angels: Gender in the Novels of Galdós*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 102-119.

JUARISTI, J. (1997): *El bucle melancólico. Historias de nacionalistas vascos*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
KORTAZAR, J. (1979): «Notas sobre la novela de José Manuel Etxeita (1842-1915)». *FLV*, 33, 551-557.
KORTAZAR, J. (1999): *Jose Manuel Etxeita*. Bilbo: BBK Fundazioa.
KORTAZAR, J. (2008): "Jose Manuel Etxeitaren (1842-1915) nortasun analisia, bere gutunen bidez." *RIEV*, 53-2, 475-505.
KORTAZAR, J. (2013): "Josecho (1909)." *Euskal Literaturaren Hiztegia*. EHU-Euskara Institutua. http://ehu.es/ehg/literatura/?p=710. 3-11-2013.
KRONIK, J. (1985): "Feijoo and the Fabrication of Fortunata." In Goldman, P.E. ed. *Conflicting Realities: Four Readings of a Chapter by Pérez Galdós: (Fortunata y Jacinta, Part III, Chapter IV)*. London: Támesis. 39-72.
LEBANYI, J. (2000): *Gender and Modernization in the Spanish Realist Novel*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
LEBANYI, J. ed. (1992): *Galdós*. London: Longman.
LACAN, J. (1966): *Ecrits*. Paris: Seuil.
LACAN, J. (1975) : *Le séminaire. Livre XX. Encore*. Paris: Seuil.
LASAGABASTER, J.M. (2002): *Las literaturas de los vascos*. Donostia: Universidad de Deusto.
MCCLINTOCK, A. (1995): *Imperial Leather: Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest*. New York : Routledge.
MERIMÉE, P. (1996) : *Carmen*. Paris: Librairie générale française.
MÚGICA, G. (1915): «Don José Manuel de Echeita». *Euskal Esnalea*, 50-56.
ORTEGA, J. (2003): "Post-teoría y estudios transatlánticos." *Iberoamericana* 3.9, 109-117.
PÉREZ GALDÓS, B. (2004): *Fortunata y Jacinta*: *Dos historias de casadas*. Madrid: Edimat.
RAFAEL, V. (2005): *The Promise of the Foreign: Nationalism and the Techniques of Translation in the Spanish Philippines*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
RESINA, J.R. (2009): *Del hispanismo a los estudios ibéricos. Una propuesta federativa para el ámbito cultural.* Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
RESINA, J.R. (2013). *Iberian Modalities: A Relational Approach to the Study of Culture in the Iberian Peninsula,* Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.
RIZAL, J. (1912): *The Social Cancer: A Complete English Version of Noli Me Tangere from the Spanish of José Rizal*. New York: World Book Co.
SINNIGEN, J. (1992): «Individual, Class and Society in Fortunata and Jacinta.» In Labanyi. *(1992):* 116-39.
SINNIGEN, J. (1996): Sexo y política: lecturas *galdosianas*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre.
SOMMER, D. (1991): *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.