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ABSTRACT

Judy, Lauren Gabrielle (M.A., Comparative Literature)

Looking Back and Thinking Forward: Bildungsroman, Boarding Schools and National Identity in Dickens’ *David Copperfield* and Arguedas’ *Los ríos profundos*

Thesis directed by Associate Professor Leila G. Gómez

In literature and society, boarding schools provide a key venue for the education of a country’s youth in terms of both general academic lessons but also the social structure and societal norms of the countries in which the young people reside. Such institutions’ purpose and goals thus often align with the central aims of the state: the creation, strengthening or wider dispersion of national identity as well as civic and social norms. In short, the boarding school provides a setting conducive to the proliferation of a unified national consciousness as well as other lessons relating to class, gender and society within a particular country’s social context.

Bildungsromane are novels that demonstrate formation of a young person’s worldview. When set in boarding schools, these stories clearly explicate the structures, values, goals and, occasionally, the troubles of the broader country. In Charles Dickens’ *David Copperfield* and José María Arguedas’ *Los ríos profundos*, the young, male protagonists gain exposure to their respective country’s organizations and values only to subvert these same paradigms. While both books are examples of Bildungsromane, in the process of subverting the ideals of national identity and social structure they also complicate the central tenets of the genre as well. The protagonists’ moral and intellectual developments lead them to make rational yet individualistic decisions that serve to separate them from rather than uniting them with the majority of their respective compatriots. Through the application of literary and critical theory to the selected texts, this paper will examine how questions of class, politics, culture and even gender confound and ultimately undermine the accepted ideas of the unified Bildung and, ultimately, the nation.
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Chapter I - Introduction: Waking up on the Couch

“All happy families are alike; each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.”

Leo Tolstoy, Anna Karenina

Leo Tolstoy’s novel Anna Karenina begins by introducing a family in disarray: the husband has cheated on his wife with their former governess, the wife will not leave her room, the children run wild and key members of the family’s household staff are planning their escapes to less hostile locales. With his servants heading for the hills and his children “running all over the house as if lost,” Stiva Oblonsky, the novel’s errant husband, wakes up one day on the couch to which he has been banished. Upon remembering his predicament, he attempts to recapture the last instants of a dream (Tolstoy 1). Unable to resume or even to recall his previously blissful state with any precision, Oblonsky arises with a sigh and begins to plan a way out of his current dilemma. In so doing, the prince participated in a uniquely poignant activity that reverberates within many populations’ histories and stories and one that continues to resonate today: the awakening of an individual, a community or a broader society to the realization of its own unique and, to borrow from Tolstoy, “unhappy” chaos (1).

For Charles Dickens and José María Arguedas’ 19th Century England and 20th Century Perú looked a lot like the Oblonsky’s house. Despite disparate causes, these countries faced comparative circumstances: political and social leaders dealt with external matters while ignoring domestic strife, community managers and members banished themselves to their metaphorical rooms where they concerned themselves primarily with their own affairs and disadvantaged populations resided in perpetually uneasy states thus adding to pervasive contexts
of social unrest. Like the prince, neither writer could ignore the troubling social dynamics they perceived within their societies for very long. Demographic, anthropological and sociological data alongside these authors’ non-fictional and fictional writings demonstrate the varied dimensions of societal chaos perceived by Dickens and Arguedas.

**Snapshot: London, England (Mid 19th Century)**

Statistics show that between 1800 and 1900, the British population grew and changed significantly. In 1850, 52% of the British population lived in urban areas while, by 1900, 72% of the population lived in the cities (London in the 19th Century). London was by far the country’s biggest city and had of one of the largest population growth rates. In 1800 slightly over 1 million people lived within the city limits and, by 1900, 4.14 million people lived in London (London in the 19th Century). Additionally, at the beginning of the century “there were no railways… no telegrams, no telephones, no gas, no electric-light, no 'penny post', and no… Metropolitan Police” (London Statistics). However, by 1900 all of these things had arrived.

Despite such advancements, decades of work by a virtual army of social scientists has shown the extreme socio-economic stratification of London society and has revealed the devastating living conditions for the working lower classes. Much of the analysis completed since the 1800s has synthesized newspaper, census and other demographic data in order to provide a picture of England and particularly London in the 19th century. From these sources, it is evident that, by 1880, a century’s worth of industrialization and London’s status as a port city had made it attractive to many “unskilled workers reliant on irregular work” (Kaelble 112). Prior to a similar study completed in 1848, finding and financing housing had already been a substantial challenge especially for the London’s working class – a diverse group that included everyone from “impoverished people, casual labourers, skilled workers and even white-collar
workers” (111). Studies have shown that the influx of population in combination with “the expansion of port facilities that squeezed out residential districts, street widening; the spread of business districts; better investment opportunities in fields other than the building of housing; and finally, the low insecure wages of the working class” led to huge housing disparities (111). This, in turn, caused rents to rise so that workers had to spend a significantly higher portion of their income on their rent by the late 19th century (111).\footnote{Stedman Jones’ research demonstrates that in 1848, people spent on average 14-21% of their income on rent. By 1887, people were paying between 21-30% (111).} Moreover, this population appears to have been paying more for less in terms of the space one was able to rent for the same amount of currency (120). Additional economic studies have related housing shortages and increasing rent prices to elevated crime and mortality rates due to the lower living standards and lack of stable employment.

Curiously, at least for comparative demographic scholars, London’s poverty stratified and separated social groups that unified in other European cities such as Paris (Crossick 60). Artists did not have the same economic incentives to unite in London as they did in Paris. As a result, demographers and social inequality scholars see them as “de-radicalised and conservative” (60-130). Thus, while populations remained highly stratified, England evaded the nearly constant upheaval that characterized France in the 19th century.

Other interesting statistical data includes the rising emigration rate so that “In 1815, less than 2,000 people left the British Isles… by the late 1840s and early ‘50s more than a quarter of a million [250,000] emigrants were leaving in single years” (Briggs 388). Some reasons for this major change involve the “improvement in both land transportation and steam shipping, which made travel to the colonies cheaper than before” and also the fact that the de facto exportation of “problematic” members of British society to colonies, especially Australia, provided other
alternatives for dealing with crime and social complications (Moore 7-8).

Like Dickens, social scientists concerned themselves with the realities of London by observing it and using their quantitative discoveries to understand and, occasionally, to suggest social or urban policy changes to better the situation. Their processes relied greatly on observation and calculations in order to approximate as best as possible the quantitative realities of the population under consideration. Social scientists then presented their findings within their own community and to the broader public. Interestingly, due to the seemingly objective nature of these projects, the final product itself often, and perhaps unfairly, evades labeling as a performance.  

Snapshot: Perú

The observational practice of demography pre-dates the Spanish colonization of Perú. Indigenous groups living in the central region of the Andean zone before the Incan and then the Spanish conquests coded both “statistical and narrative information” about their empires through systems of knotted cords called khipus (Urton 1-2). Today, fewer than 600 of these strings exist and decoding them or even understanding what they actually are provides a substantial philosophical and rhetorical challenge (3-4). The Spanish conquerors and administrators

---

2 In reading observational documents that aim to describe occurrences with the “scientific” distance of objectivity, it becomes obvious that such authors usually utilize rhetorical strategies that do permit documents from the scientific discourses to be read as types of rhetorical performance, however objective.

3 Urton points to two basic schools of thoughts regarding the khipu. Some scholars, he notes, believe that they were mnemonic devices used to help one khipukamayuq recall information whereas other researchers think that they worked as a kind of writing. He argues that in fact they probably combined the two methods (3-4). Philosophically, however, they remain a challenge as writing is usually thought to require some type of (generally symbolic or pictorial) script and these “devices” as Urton calls them do not have a script. For more information, please see Gary Urton’s Signs of the Inka Khipu: Binary coding in the Andean Knotted-string Records and Sara Castro-Klaren’s “Memory and ‘Writing’ in the Andes” in A Companion to Latin American Literature and Culture.
utilized the information to take over the administration of the area upon the defeat of the Inca (1-2). However, besides basic facts the literature of the Spanish colonization gives few details about the process of decoding.

At any rate, following the Spanish conquest, the conquistadores attempted to explore and understand the peoples and lands they now possessed. In the process, they too produced many documents detailing the region’s landscape and infrastructure and linguistic practices in the region that would become Perú. Intermarriages, interracial sexual encounters between the Spaniards, the indigenous populations and the African slaves brought to the region allowed for the emergence of new ethnic groups. A late 19th century British demographic analysis estimated the population of Perú as more than 2.6 million people, 52% of this population was indigenous, 23% was mixed race, slightly more than 20% were “Spaniards, Negroes, [and] Chinese,” according to this study “Europeans” (a group that pointedly excluded Spaniards) comprised only 2% and overwhelmingly consisted of Italians and Germans (562-564).

While demographically, the indigenous groups and mestizos comprise the vast majority of the Peruvian population, due to centuries of oppression both groups and their many subgroups exercised very little political power throughout the country’s history. Part of the Spanish conquest involved the management and administration of the colony through strict social stratification with European-born Spaniards dominating all the other groups and the indigenous

---

4 While containing many factual flaws, the letters, histories, chronicles and other rhetorical forms produced by men such as Francisco Pizarro and Pedro de Cieza de Leon provide a clearly imperial perspective on the newly-acquired territories. This narrative was augmented quickly by the introduction of mestizo or indigenous writers such as “El Inca” Garcilaso de la Vega and Guaman Poma.

5 Culturally, Peruvians breakdown the mestizo category much further depending on the ancestry of an individual as well as their socio-economic status, clothing and so forth. For example, in Los ríos profundos Ernesto talks about his rich uncle’s servant who is a cholo – an indigenous person who dresses like the white Peruvians.
comprising the lowest rung of the social ladder. This domination included a strong and systematic attack on the Ameri-Indian culture (Hart 6). Starting with the mandated destruction of the khipus in the late 16th century, the Spanish attack on indigenous culture involved the destruction of indigenous musical instruments, religious iconography, festivals and dances (6). At one point in the late 18th century, Quechua was outlawed and Spanish language texts that even hinted of approbation for indigenous cultural practices were banned.\footnote{Such was the case of “El Inca” Garcilaso’s text \textit{Comentarios Reales}, which extol the virtues of Catholicism.} The language and indeed the culture evaded complete annihilation; however, much was lost in the period of colonization and afterwards when the belated effects of the colonial era – namely the cultural suppression of all things indigenous – continued.\footnote{Stephen Hart provides a concise exploration of Quechuan culture and summarizes additional scholarship on this point in his chapter entitled “Quechua runasimi” in \textit{A Companion to Latin American Literature} (6-8).} By the mid-20th century Peruvian anthropologists, cultural and literary scholars began to explore the rich cultural legacy and contributions of the indigenous populations.

The work of Peruvian social scientists demonstrates the way in which anthropology, demography and even rhetorical and literary studies may be utilized to understand a complex Peruvian social milieu. These scholars utilize observation and, often, reclamation in order to begin, to continue or to enrich projects regarding culture in Perú. The anthropological and cultural studies projects completed by researchers including José María Arguedas and Edmundo Bendezú Aybar thus attempt to present realities of Peruvian culture in ways that commemorate, rather than erase, the contribution of indigenous populations.

**Crossing Lines: Dickens and Arguedas**

While Charles Dickens and José María Arguedas lived very different lives as the later analysis of
their biographies will demonstrate, it is their shared commitment to their respective societies that grants their non-fictional and fictional writings a shared project. As authors, these men used their periodical articles (Dickens), anthropological studies (Arguedas) and fiction (Dickens) to explore the previously explicated social dynamics and introduce them into their country’s broader social consciousnesses.\textsuperscript{8} To this end, they both created written projects that outlived them and that detailed, with some degrees of apparent objectivity, the demographic, anthropological and sociological positions of their societies. Dickens published a weekly journal called \textit{Household Words}, which dealt with the realities of 19\textsuperscript{th} century British life, as part of his broader project. He also published folios of his journalistic societal observations, which he took from his time working with the poorest and most destitute members of his society. As an anthropologist by profession and training, Arguedas published prolifically on questions of cultural anthropology and sociological concerns in his Perú. He ran the country’s Museo de la Cultura Perúana and its Museo de Historia for several years and was the chair of the sociology department in the Universidad Agraria (Pinilla 44). In their literary projects, neither author ever wandered far from the topic of his country’s social dynamics. As a result, both writers’ works demonstrate a clearly hybridic rhetorical strategy that incorporates both the distance of the journalist or the anthropologist and the explorations of interiority most closely connected with artistic and literary works.

In \textit{David Copperfield} and \textit{Los ríos profundos}, Dickens and Arguedas respectively use the Bildungsroman, or the novel of youthful development and apprenticeship, as a literary vehicle through which they could simultaneously explore the complicated dynamics of their own

\textsuperscript{8} Categorizing the written works of both authors as runasimi, the Quechua understanding of verbal arts, a broad category that involves poetry, prose and song (Hart 7), allows for the inclusion of their non-literary writings along with their famous works of fiction.
societies and educate their audiences about the disconcerting realities of their respective countries (Buckley 13). As the following chapters will show, by using this malleable yet highly formulaic literary practice, both writers were able to discuss with significant depth the explicit realities of their societies and ultimately subvert not only the challenging social structures they describe but also the literary form itself. In Dickens’ *David Copperfield* and Arguedas’ *Ríos Profundos*, the young, male protagonists gain exposure to their respective country’s structures and values only to ultimately subvert these same ideals. The novels’ protagonists’ moral and intellectual development leads these characters to make rational yet individualistic decisions that serve to separate them from rather than solidifying them with the majority of their respective countrymen. In light of these developments, questions of class, politics, culture and even gender confound and ultimately undermine the accepted ideas of the unified Bildung and, ultimately, the nation.
Chapter II – Looking Back:

History, Theory and Form of the Bildungsroman

Before engaging directly with Dickens’ and Arguedas’ novels, it will be useful to establish a common idiom through which these books may be examined. To these ends, literary history and literary and critical theory drawn from Western and non-Western analytical traditions provide the basis for a standardized approach within this comparative project. Such a lens will be useful not only in exploring these highly-differentiated books but also because the Bildungsroman, or the novel of formation, itself often frustrates literary and cultural scholars who attempt to delineate its historical, theoretical, structural and thematic evolution. Certainly, the philosophy or form of a particular work of Bildungsroman from a specific era such as either of the texts considered here is intricately connected to a literary history, which contextualized its development.

Analyzing the form through the examination of its historical trajectory, its guiding theories and the intellectual climates that promoted its success provides a deeper reading of the way in which the genre evolved. Such a process also demonstrates how Bildungsromane allow vastly different literary and cultural traditions to adopt and adapt it in such a way as to emphasize the subtle yet fascinating common themes of self and its relation to society.

History of the Bildungsroman

Even at its inception in late 18th century, the literary form of the Bildungsroman existed within a volatile nexus between intellectual development and political unrest. It emerged when German Enlightenment writers combined the “concept of Bildung and the theory of the novel (der Roman)” (Kontje 1). The synthesis of the two words did not occur until the late 19th century (Buckley 12-13). Nonetheless, at the beginning of the form’s popularity, critics noted that
categorizing books such as Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* and Christoph Martin Wieland’s *Gesichte des Agathon* [The Story of Agathon] allowed them a certain level of credibility in the burgeoning literary marketplace at a time when “suspicion of the reading habit grew among church and state authorities” (1). Even at this early stage of the genre’s existence, it was an uneasy union of concepts as both ideas predate their synthesized union and bear the baggage of significant semantic ambiguity in their original context and language and even more so through translation. Because current scholars of the Bildungsroman genre demonstrate a certain level of unease with the term, it is useful to examine the volatile uncertainties that exist at the core of the genre’s name.

The word Bildung has been used in various forms since antiquity (Kontje 1). The term itself contains dual meanings, referring simultaneously to “both the external form or appearance of an individual… and to the process of giving form” (1). It is possibly because of the word’s inherent ambiguity that religious and mystical circles most often utilized the phrase. By the early 18th century, religious philosophers equated Bildung with “God’s active transformation of the passive Christian” and thus Bildung was something that happened to an individual as a result of spiritual forces acted upon him (1). In pre-Enlightenment thought, individuals existed in a passive (and perhaps inescapable) state of constant deformity (Entbildung) in complete binary contrast with God’s state of perfection (Gebildung) (1). By the late 18th century, Enlightenment writers including Johann Goethe and Christoph Marin Wieland, reappropriated the idea of the Bildung. The concept shifted so that “organic imagery of natural growth replaces a model of divine intervention” (2). Bildung – an idea with a dual semantic meaning and thus a high level of inherent ambiguity – thus evolved greatly in the decades immediately preceding its portrayal in Goethe’s novel. Moreover, this understanding reveals two key dynamics that framed the
intellectual discourses at the birth of the Bildungsroman novel. First, divine intervention no longer accounted for the trajectory of an individual’s life or development. Kontje goes so far as to suggest that this naturalizing process made it so that by the late 18th century “God no longer stands apart from the world but becomes a force of nature” (2). This idea subtly emphasizes a second important factor in that while God may become a force of nature, humans do not gain the power previously ascribed to the divine. Rather, the individual can be understood similarly as a force of nature in that he does not necessarily gain personal agency in regards to his own personal development but rather matured as the result of organic processes as well. While these processes no longer resulted from divine intervention or manipulation they are thus not fully grounded in an individual’s agency or as the result of a person’s decisions either. In short, God no longer determines the course of an individual’s life and development but neither does the individual bear the brunt of the responsibility upon their own shoulders. It is within this delicately and perhaps even paradoxically balanced paradigm that literary authors, such as Goethe, began to explore the paradox of individual development sans full agency.

While the concept of Bildung evolved over the course of the 18th century, so the theory of the novel (der Roman) also developed. Early understandings of the novel as a literary form focus largely on novels as objects existing within a culture. Such analysis examines the production of the form and their rapid proliferation within society. Kontje suggests that the sudden ubiquity of the Roman in the late 18th century caused high levels of angst for religious and state authorities that viewed the evolution suspiciously (Kontje 1). At any rate, philosophically, German novels and the contemporary understanding of them contextualize the complexities framing the emergence of the Bildungsroman as a form. The theoretical difficulties of defining the Bildungsroman form are evident in almost every scholarly attempt to explore the
work. Certainly understanding the ambiguities and societal context from which the form emerged allows scholars to see that the union of the concept of Bildung with its own dual meanings and the form of the Roman which bore the weight of its own social stigma did not allow the form to emerge tranquilly or in a way that could be understood without inherent disagreement later. While this certainly did not impede many authors’ adaptation and eventual distortion of the form, before examining its adoption by such authors it is imperative to consider some theoretical considerations that were present in the history of the form itself. First, as many scholarly investigations into the genre clearly demonstrate, the emergence of the form in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century substantially predates both the naming and critical understanding of the genre (Buckley 13).\footnote{Buckley comments that “…whatever its structural weaknesses or ambiguity of tone, \textit{Wilhelm Meister} has established itself in literary history as the prototype of the Bildungsroman. Though that term was not in common usage until quite late in the nineteenth century, the genre was already popular in German among the romantics and in England by the time of the early Victorians” (12-13). Thus the popular form predates the critical understanding and definition of it.} Thus, the idea of a neatly defined, original Bildungsroman is theoretically complicated by the fact that the original texts were only understood as the genre’s foundational works well after they had been adopted and, importantly, adapted by other writers. The temporal gap between the inception of the form and the understanding of the genre thus introduces a second theoretical challenge of generic definition. If the genre is defined only after it has been adopted by writers from other national canons with their own nuanced understandings of individuals’ roles and responsibilities in their own development, then defining the genre requires the construction or even the imposition of normative understandings on an increasingly robust literary body.

Despite the challenges inherent in the definition of the Bildungsroman as a literary genre, critical scholars cannot ignore the fact that a certain type of novel emerged from the late 18\textsuperscript{th}
century and most literary scholars point to Johann Goethe’s late 18th century novel *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* as the first Bildungsroman (Moretti 3, Buckley 12, Castle 3, etc.).

The genre can thus be understood as a dynamic, somewhat inclusive body with certain links to the politics and social dynamics that utilize and produce it. This ambiguity and generic inclusivity allowed the form to evolve and lead to other alternatives to the Bildungsroman including the *Entwicklungsroman* (a novel of a “young man’s general growth rather than his specific quest for self-culture”), the *Erziehungseroman* (a type of novel that emphasized a youth’s formal education or professional training) and the *Künstlerroman* (which dealt specifically with the development of the artist) (Buckley 13). This generalized subject matter also allowed the form to travel beyond the German language.

At the beginning of the 19th century, British poets and writers also explored youth and the development of an individual’s character from new perspectives. Keats and Wordsworth certainly use their poetry to delineate the development of the artistic temperament and frequently cite experiences of their own youth as formative within their works (Buckley 1-6). Jane Austen also frequently dealt with popular themes of youth and development of personality in her texts (18). While for largely formal reasons these works are not considered part of early British Bildungsroman corpus, they certainly prepared English readers for the arrival of the Bildungsroman form. Thus, by the mid-19th century, the Bildungsroman genre had become popular throughout continental Europe and even England.

In 1824, Thomas Carlyle translated *Wilhelm Meister* into English (12). While the Bildungsroman as a genre had yet to be named, Carlyle understood the text’s complex

---

10 The vast majority of scholars examining Bildungsroman cite Goethe’s book as the original Bildungsroman text. However, Todd Kontje consistently equates Christoph Martin Wieland’s *Gesichte des Agathon* [The Story of Agathon] (1766-1767), which predates Goethe’s book by several years as the genre’s other foundational text.
ambiguities and asked rhetorically in his introduction to the text “whether this is a light, airy sketch of the development of a man… or is nothing more than a bungled piece of patchwork, presenting in the shape of a novel much that should have been suppressed entirely, or at least given out by way of lecture” (Buckley 12 from Carlyle’s Introduction to the 1824 translation of Goethe’s text). At any rate, British authors, like their German counterparts, have strongly identified with the form, adopted it and adapted it since the mid-19th century. Charles Dickens is widely recognized for his use of the form but is certainly not the only British writer of his time or the years after to do so. George Eliot, Samuel Butler and Thomas Hardy all utilized the form. In general, these mid-19th century writers embraced it in order to explore not only the way individuals developed but also and sometimes tangentially in order to demonstrate the ways in which societal changes, including the rapid industrialization of cities such as London, changed the lives of even the society’s youngest members.

Later modernist writers including Wilde and Joyce noticeably adapted the Bildungsroman form in ways that accommodate for the presence of vast abstractions and uncertainties that appear fully absent from the earlier Bildungsroman texts. These subsequent British writers often scorned the realist aesthetic that had only a few decades earlier allowed for the production of many Bildungsroman texts. For example, in his exploration of art’s role in society entitled “The Decay of Lying” Wilde goes so far as to accuse his realist predecessors of making “bad art” largely because of their attempts to represent life as it actually was in their works (Wilde 793). Wilde accused the realists of being perpetually outmoded when he stated that “Life goes faster than realism” (794). Wilde and later generations of British writers consciously avoided representationality in their work. Thus, the modernist Bildungsroman emerged simultaneously and problematically so as to eschew representation for abstraction and centering of the self and
the society for profound or at least pervasive decentering (Castle 29). Nonetheless, these later
texts, which can include Wilde’s *Pictures of Dorian Gray*, Woolf’s *Virginia Dalloway* and
Joyce’s *Ulysses* among many others, remain part of the form’s historical evolution and represent
ways in which authors continued to use the form in the 20th century.

Because of its fundamental structure and compelling themes that will be discussed at
greater length later, the Bildungsroman form was adopted in other parts of the world. In France,
the Bildungsroman never attained the same popularity as it would in England; however, as
Gregory Castle notes, Stendhal “deserves attention as an anticipation of later developments in the
genre, especially the increase in autobiographical self-consciousness and the sharpening of focus
on the motivation of the hero” (Castle 14). Thus, while the form itself failed to appeal or gain
much of an audience in France, the few works that do exist emphasize the way the genre would
develop abroad. In the United States, the 19th century Bildungsroman includes canonical
highlights such as Mark Twain’s *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* and much later J.D.
Salinger’s *The Catcher in the Rye*.

Outside of the Western canon, the Bildungsroman has provided an interesting opportunity
for cultural and societal exploration. Here again, the adaptive form of the genre allows writers
from the margins of the literary world a form through which they can represent their own unique
experiences. In Latin America, the Bildungsroman became especially popular in the 20th
Century for precisely these reasons (Doub 1). While various readings of the genre exist, Doub
notes that it is because of the ambiguities that “the novel of formation has… evolved in such a
way that it now incorporates forms that address the complexities of race, class, gender, and
sexuality in a contemporary, postcolonial world” (2). To this end, writers from areas including Latin America began to engage with the form at precisely the moment when European and even U.S. writers struggled to deal with the problems of using a pre-20th century form to deal with abstractions of modernity. This disconnect is limited largely to Bildungsroman texts as writers over the same period in Latin America certainly utilized ambiguity and abstraction in other sorts of texts. In José María Arguedas’ books Yawar Fiesta and El zorro de arriba y el zorro de abajo (The Fox from Above and the Fox from Below), for example, the author shifts between various narrative perspectives and creates disjointed, complex and highly ambiguous narratives similar to those used by Virginia Woolf and other modernist writers. However, his Los ríos profundos (Deep Rivers) that follows a substantially more unified first-person narrative of self-development in keeping with the style of the 19th Century realists.

Theory and Philosophies of the Bildungsroman Genre

As the previous section demonstrates, cultural phenomena such as the Enlightenment, Urbanization and Industrialization affected the audiences for which Bildungsroman novels were written. Bildungsroman novels have provided their audiences a way of reading and thus understanding such rapid shifts in the world around them whether social, cultural, political or economic. Art, according to Wilde, teaches us to understand a world that is inherently imitative of Art (Wilde 794). However, the theory behind the Bildungsroman which allowed for abstraction and inclusivity from the genre’s onset similarly evolved over the course of the 19th and 20th century and provided an intellectual impetus for the writers interested in using the form.

---

11 As the form evolved over time it is interesting to consider that the Bildungsroman influences or provides a structure through which certain films may be read as well. Certainly these cannot be understood as Bildungsroman as the structure is limited to novels; however films such as Claudia Llosa’s Madeinusa, Lucia Puenzo’s XXY and many others certainly treat common themes relating to the cultivation of the self albeit through a different medium.
The Bildungsroman was understood to be something different and important even before the genre had the benefits of a name. Thus, the philosophy and subsequent critical understanding of it bears significance when examining the works at hand. Understanding evolving conceptualizations of the self matters as these philosophies show up in the Bildungsromane; simultaneously, 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} Century critical theory allows for the construction of theoretical frameworks that enhance our understanding of the works. The task remains to balance the philosophies that informed the works of writers including Goethe, Dickens, Woolf and Arguedas with contemporary understandings of these values.

For Goethe and early writers, the Bildungsroman existed at a nexus between deeply held Enlightenment ideas relating to self and Bild and the formal innovation of the novel at a specific cultural instance. Theory, form and external realities merged in an intricate way, even at the form’s inception. It was propelled by the writers’ interest in exploring what Keats called the “space of life between [child- and adulthood] in which the soul is in a ferment, the character undecided, the way of life uncertain, the ambition thick-sighted…” (Buckley 1). In light of this, the Bildungsroman emerges as something different in the oeuvre of the first writers who would use it. They will go on to herald the romantic figures of literature; however, the manner in which they explore these spaces in between remains to be read as a form in which ambiguities and decisions are made. Audience reaction clearly demonstrates that these aesthetic decisions grated on early Bildungsroman readers with translators in the mid-19th century undecided as to what the form was but also feeling the need to make judgments about the characters as well. Carlyle describes Wilhelm Meister as “a milksop, whom with all his gifts it takes an effort to avoid despising” (10). These early Bildungsroman characters thus did not widely appeal to audiences: yet something kept audiences reading and allowed the form to survive historical periods with
vastly different aesthetic demands. How could one form could survive and flourish in Romantic, Realist and Modernist aesthetic? One possible solution to this question is the fact that each of these writers explores a common temporal moment within their own aesthetic. It is also possible that the solution has something to do with evolving understandings of self that framed each writer’s exploration. The basic idea of Bildung as it was understood at the end of the 18th century has already been undertaken. However, understanding ideas of self-cultivation, the beautiful soul and even Nietzsche’s later philosophy of the self beyond the self can perhaps explain the persistence and evolution of the form in deeper ways.

Goethe and other late 18th Century German writers wrote from a social context that valued self-cultivation above “money, power and pleasure” (Bruford vii). According to Bruford, these ideas required a great deal of inwardness, reflection and contemplation – ideals that would resonate strongly with later Romantic writers who would adopt them over the course of the early 19th century (vii). Moreover, in its earlier, very cultural-centric position in Germany, the idea of self-cultivation connected quite closely with ethical norms. To engage fully within a self-cultivation project inevitably would lead to one’s perfecting or at least materially bettering oneself (Bruford vii-viii). Moreover, the advancement of the self or many selves was seen by philosophers such as Schiller as critical not only to the lives of individuals, but, on a much broader scale, German society as a whole (Moretti 31). Schiller did not suggest that perfection should be the ultimate aim but rather notes that “the exertion of individual talents certainly produces extraordinary men, but only their even tempering makes full and happy men” (31). Thus, while the form of the Bildungsroman could appear and sometimes was used didactically, in fact it was conceived as a type of literary negotiation between the banal and the romantic. Certainly, some writers within the genre used the form to codify manners and social norms;
however, the way in which they did so varied greatly and ranged from gentle suggestions of ways of living to more didactic approaches.

In the 19th century, social and artistic tensions fluctuated between explorations of the ideal and the banal. While earlier Romantic writers invoked ironic detachment and the evolving perspective of the “hero” or poet as part and parcel of an evolving social figure (Buckley 8), later Realist writers were far more interested in crafting accurate portrayals of life as it occurred or was experienced. As noted previously, modernist critics including Oscar Wilde largely panned their realist predecessors for producing simplistic texts rather than attempting to create more complicated and compelling artistic truths. However, this criticism seems unfair and largely ignores concepts of the self that emerged within realist texts from the 19th century that attempted to explore subjective understandings and experiences of the self and the self’s position in society. The Realist writers’ aesthetic productions and experiments demonstrate the rich cultural and philosophical ideas that these writers would explore even in seemingly simplistic plots. Evolving understandings and constructions of self emerge distinctly and were utilized at least in subtle manners within Bildungsroman texts by writers including Dickens.

19th Century writers’ exploration of the self and its relation to society range from openly geopolitical texts such as Charles Dickens *A Tale of Two Cities* to those that portray the development of a specific literary figure in rigidly peripheral and solitary settings. Charlotte Bronte’s *Jane Eyre* and Gustave Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary* provide examples of two key works from the British and French canons respectively that explore the development of ideas, understandings and sensorial experiences of the self. These texts concern themselves with the development of their titular character’s understanding of self and questions of ethics and social values. A great deal of scholarship has been produced that examines these characters in terms of
their individual ethical developments as well as their relation to their societies. The comparison of *Jane Eyre* with *Madame Bovary* emphasizes the importance of these evolving understandings of self as portrayed by the Realist writers. While the vast portion of both books deals with challenges of adulthood, readers are either told or shown the great importance of schooling and the characters’ childhood development in ways that solidly establish prior experiences as important to the development of their characters. Here the difference between the texts is very clear. In *Jane Eyre*, Charlotte Bronte provides the account of Jane’s education at the now-infamous Lowood Institution, a parochial boarding school that engaged heavily in the moral education of its pupils through pedagogical methods that incorporated corporal, social and emotional elements. In contrast, while Gustave Flaubert also demonstrates that Emma Bovary’s childhood education mattered, he does not present it directly for his readers but rather alludes to its basic tenets in such a way as to allow readers’ to fill in the blanks with assumptions and prejudices regarding her education specifically and certain approaches to educating women in general at the time. Specifically, when Charles Bovary’s mother begins to investigate the young woman her son passes much of his time with she discovers that Emma Rouault was educated at the Ursaline convent where she “had received what is called a ‘good education,’ and so knew dancing, geography, drawing, how to embroider and play the piano. That was the last straw.” (Flaubert 16). The elder Madame Bovary thus understands, as the audience is guided through allusion, that such an education has well prepared Emma to capture her son’s interest but do little else. Interestingly, this paragraph introduces Emma’s poor education contrasts both in size and scope with that which Charles Bovary received. Rhetorically, Flaubert dedicates an entire chapter to Charles’ education and his lackluster performance as a young student demonstrating that even though he will receive enough schooling to prepare him for his profession as a doctor,
his performance and critical engagement with the process is lacking.

A second dynamic that emerges from the comparison of Jane Eyre and Emma Bovary involves the evolution and negotiation of each text’s narrative “I.” Both texts portray the moral and social consciousnesses of comparably aged young women who live and love in their respective country’s peripheries. However, the literary portrayals of these societies differ greatly in the way Bronte and Flaubert present these narrated identities. *Jane Eyre* is told through the narrated first-person account. In terms of basic literary technique, this allows Bronte to build suspense and create a dramatic narrative largely because of the things that Jane, and consequently her readers, do not know or understand. In the incident with Bertha, Rochester’s wife, the reader cannot know any more than Jane does about the cause of the mysterious incidents within the home. Similarly, as she develops relationships with all of the other characters, they can seem deeper than they are portrayed; however, the reader’s entire knowledge of them is largely subjective and dependent upon the perspective and development provided through Jane’s relationship with them. In contrast, Flaubert solves the issue of subjectivity by creating a hybrid narrative style in which Emma’s self is engaged with by the reader sometimes from within her own troubled mind and sometimes outside of it. Flaubert’s creation of free indirect speech, or “style indirect libre, erlebete Rede,” functions as “an alternative to both direct and indirect discourse” and thus allows the direct to “directly represent, rather than present or report, consciousness with no implication of internal speech” (Brinton 363). Flaubert allows readers to drift in and out of his character’s equivalently fluid consciousness. He avoids direct expression of self (for example that which appears in Jane Eyre’s simple demonstrative declarations) or a fully indirect descriptive project in which the actions, perceptions and emotions of such a character are described omnisciently. Instead, Flaubert’s text represents the
consciousness through his use of the third person, past tense that allows for both authorial
presence and omniscience in the telling of a story that has already occurred without sacrificing
the charter’s “own expressive and emotive language… [and thus presenting] the range or depth
of a character’s consciousness” (364). This revolution in narrative style allowed later writers to
further develop narrative fragmentation while dealing the fact that society itself and the social
institutions that established and safeguarded social norms in previous centuries continually
frayed over the course of the 19th century in ways that could only be understood later. Flaubert’s
narrative style anticipates this fracturing and permitted subsequent authors, from the avant-garde
to the popular, the ability to experiment with narrated selves in meaningful ways.

As the comparison of *Jane Eyre* and *Madame Bovary* demonstrates, 19th century realist
literature explored the ways in which a person’s character developed through literary exploration
of the self. It was in this context that mid-19th century Bildungsroman continued to evolve. In
this literary atmosphere, self-cultivation (or in Emma Bovary’s case the lack-thereof) could lead
to potentially happy individuals such as those Schiller describes as being of robust character but
not belonging to a romanticized class of elite existence. In short, Jane Eyre’s unwavering
commitment to the development of her character allows Charlotte Bronte to grant Jane a happy
reunion with Edward Rochester and the financial independence that permits the union to proceed
with the requisite material comforts. However, Jane does not attain any title of nobility or other
type of external blessing that would elevate her beyond the middle class. Self-cultivation,
especially that portrayed within 19th century literature therefore occurs within a set of informal,
democratic and economic limits. Individuals are encouraged through books such as *Jane Eyre*
and *David Copperfield* to aspire to intellectual, social and, perhaps most importantly, ethical and
moral successes. However, the rewards of such personal efforts are not overly romanticized or
overstated. One may see in the fates of these same books’ lesser characters (and that of other figures such as Emma Bovary) that self-cultivation might not lead to a happy, successful and economically wealthy ever after but it certainly allows those with cultivated characters the ability to avoid punishments such as death, abject poverty or banishment to places such as Australia. Representations of the self and society’s relationship to such representations mattered a great deal in considering the contexts from which Bildungsromane books emerged. By the mid-19th century, audiences and authors engaged consistently with texts that understood selves through negotiation with complex externalities. As a result, titular characters from Jane Eyre to David Copperfield to Madame Bovary may be read as literary manifestations of societal debates relating to not only perceptions of the self in a pre-Freudian world but also to relations between self and society. To this end, it is crucial to understand that the author played a key role as presenter of such negotiations. The author existed as the creator behind the narrated and seemingly simple first-person accounts such as those existing within *David Copperfield* and *Jane Eyre* but also *Madame Bovary*. Certainly, in both sets of texts, the author’s function and power differs greatly. In the first two texts, the author is obscured by the creation of colorful and comprehensive literary characters that tell “their” stories from first-person vantage points. The author’s role in the story is hidden by the way the story is told. *Madame Bovary* complicates the author’s relation to society. Someone other than Emma Bovary is clearly representing a series of events of which the book’s titular character would have varied levels understanding or knowledge. The author-function is thus exposed as a guiding force for understanding.

Because of the dynamic role of the author in literary production, when examining Bildungsromane and novels of individual development it is crucial to consider two key underlying questions relating to the author’s involvement with their texts. The first involves the
utilization of author’s experiences and biographical data within texts. Readers of the Bildungsromane from the late 18th century to the 21st, often comment about the fact that these books’ contain characters who are not necessarily sympathetic or likeable but with whose development they (the reader) easily identifies (Buckley 10-11). Literary scholars thus seek out the sources for such complicated relationships between reader and text and often find solace, or at least a few answers, in explorations of authorial involvement and biography within these texts. In some cases, they do so with perceivable levels of authorial blessing. For example, in examining Dickens’ *David Copperfield* literary critics demonstrate the many interviews and letters Dickens wrote in which the author cited his close connection to the text, which he seems to feel more strongly than with others. In one letter, he states, “I am within three pages of the shore; and am strangely divided, as usual in such cases, between sorrow and joy. Oh my dear Forster, if I were to say half of what Copperfield makes me feel tonight, how strangely, even to you, I should be turned inside out! I seem to be sending some part of myself into that Shadowy World” (31). Later scholarship including Buckley’s would demonstrate that this shadowy truth connected with the unfinished autobiography that Dickens never published yet in which many clear, rhetorical and situational facts emerge that equate the author’s experiences and specifically his time working at a blacking-warehouse to David Copperfield’s childhood time at Murdstone and Grinby’s (31). Thus, literary scholars utilize research about the author’s life to validate the text’s exploration of London and citing Dickens’ childhood education and employment (31-32). However, such biographical projects merit concern as they can certainly be taken too far. In examining biography in order to validate a text, such critical scholarship can inadvertently “read into” a text ideas and understandings that were unintentional and that belie, complicate or even potentially invalidate the actual purpose and function of the main text itself. Authorial biography
and the Bildungsromane novel need to be considered carefully. In this form specifically, it is sometimes extremely difficult to extricate the author from their literary creation. The literary figures are not represented embodiments of their author but rather demand close reading as literary figures solely. They can provide indexes through which readers may approach the societal contexts that produced them; however, such projects demand scrupulous approaches.

A second theoretical element that emerges from the contrast of authorial involvement in their texts involves each author’s construction of the lector ideal or the ideal reader, one who the author engages in terms of their knowledge, interest or sympathy through a text’s explicit and implicit rhetorical strategies. This theme is synthesized in Konfeld’s article “Allusion: An Israeli Perspective” as she explores Hrushovski’s definitions of implicit and explicit poetics (Kronfeld 317). According to her reading of his theory, explicit poetics are those with “stated rhetorical requirements” and thus contrast with implicit poetics or those in which meaning and norms are “embedded in the individual works” (317). While sharing a highly dialectical and potentially binary relationship, Kronfeld demonstrates the similar historical trajectory shared by these ideas. Explicit poetics may be seen in the various writing manuals that provide set rhetorical guidelines such as those followed by Hebrew poets writing before the Spanish Inquisition. For these writers, the norms imposed on writing at this time “emphas[ized]…] linguistic embellishment and the separation of form and content” in such a way as to give birth to a form of poetry known as shibbuts which is described by the author as “decorative and semantically neutral” (317). Explicit poetics therefore concerns itself with the unambiguous yet dynamic literary forms that are analyzable across a historic trajectory. Moreover, as Kronfeld’s own use of examples demonstrates, these forms may be viewed in conjunction with the historical era in which they were produced or framed. In contrast to explicit poetics, implicit poetics deals with ambiguity,
allusion and volatile meanings (317). Language and rhetorical devices are not pre-supposed or pre-determined by form but rather come from a range of choices and aesthetic considerations (317). The author further explains the explicit and implicit poetic binary relative to the reading of sacred texts. According to Kronfeld, the difference between the implicit and explicit poetics may be understood accessed through the metaphor the relationship between the “theory and practice of biblical allusion” in which one, the theoretical, retains a certain level of semantic purpose that must be examined carefully and the quotidian practice which, in the Jewish tradition, has actual manifestations throughout public and private life (317).

Examining a text through its use of explicit poetics implies and underscores a range of understandings that may be applied to a text. Form is key. Semantic understandings may still be understood as relative to form but the structure, the development of meaning within a narrative or poetic structure and the unambiguous elements of a work provide the basis for understanding and interpretation. Explicit poetics thus links meaning directly to text that must be understood as part of a historic event and experience. Approaching a text by considering its explicit poetics does not necessarily limit critical questions to simple, superficial elements. Rather, the examination of a text’s explicit elements calls into question previously established assumptions relating to a text. As a simplistic example, when readers consider the English canon and the works of its celebrated figures such as William Shakespeare or John Milton few people stop to question why such canonical luminaries chose to write in English when in fact this question is certainly much more interesting in light of the fact that the educated literati of their times certainly had access to other languages including Latin, Greek, French and so forth. Understanding language as a choice introduces an element of authority or play that such authors certainly understood in their own works. In the 19th and 20th centuries and specifically in
colonial and post-colonial societies the selection of a language for fiction was certainly a conscious selection on the part of many bi- and multi-lingual writers. In Latin America, a region with a particularly complex linguistic history, the selection of a pre-Columbian, indigenous language such as Quechua (Perú), Aymara (Bolivia) or Nahuatal (Mexico) for writing allowed writers to incorporate indigenous aesthetics into their works while demonstrating that they (the author) had some level of familiarity with the cultures and languages they utilized. These languages each have their own distinct histories, syntax and even coding systems so that colonizing projects, whether at the hands of the Spanish, the Portuguese, the British or the French, all imposed not only a foreign language but a foreign manner of communicating through the imposition of a letter-based, visual system. This project was part of the colonial conquest of peoples who had previously utilized other means of communicating including tactile devices such as the Incan khipus. Often, colonial projects aimed to exterminate the indigenous languages and normalize communication in the colonizer’s language and linguistic coding system. In attempting to do so, the colonial projects thus attempted to manipulate how the past could be understood (Castro-Klaren “Memory and Writing in the Andes” 107). However, these languages survived somehow and although not immediately popular with the independence movements, they survived into the 20th century when indigenist writers such as José María Arguedas and others consciously utilized indigenous language and syntax as part of their own

---

12 Quechua was originally codified not through writing but rather through a system of knots tied on strings called khipus orquipus (Heggarty Quechua Language and Linguistics). As such, the Quechua language’s value for the written word differs significantly from that of the romance and Germanic languages’ reverence for the written word. This is not to imply that Quechua speakers devalued poetry and stories but rather to emphasize that the Incan empire used codified Quechua principally for business and organizational purposes. Relative to its European counterparts, less is known about the origins and uses of pre-Colonial Quechua, however an increasing body of scholarship has demonstrated that the quipus were used similarly to the written languages for the codification of stories, poems and songs from the oral tradition. Most of the remaining quipus detail business transactions.
aesthetic and political projects. While these writers often transposed indigenous sounds into the Roman alphabet, their projects highlight pre-existing forms of language which thus suggest alternate understandings of literacy and memory while allowing for “the possibility of considering other modes of encoding knowledge and memory, such as the khipu, keros (drinking vessels)... dance, ritual and even architecture” (107).

Extricating the explicit from the implicit in a specific author’s particular poetics demonstrates the great ambiguity and volatility inherent in implicit poetics as well. Implicit poetics deals with meanings obscured through or by form. It is the existence of a category of knowledge that is implied yet not spoken (through writing) that teases scholars into producing more and more research of possible meanings of the author’s intent. These extractive readings range from theoretically informed examinations to overly biographical readings of the works. In either case, an often well-meaning researcher takes externally gathered data or knowledge about the author’s life and applies it to their reading of the text. Interacting with the implicit thus somehow impels or at least inspires this individual to treat a text as a treasure trove replete with hidden, obscured meaning and value. The researcher is likely to surface from their investigation with new claims about an author that in fact have little explicit connection to the text itself.

Bildungsroman texts often tempt readers to engage in biographical readings for a variety of reasons. One explanation for the proliferation of such approaches is the seemingly straightforward prose pre-modernist Bildungsromane utilize. Such emphasis on the overt, the descriptive and even the complete ability of a reader to engage with and thus understand a character’s self and society appears to tempt over-anxious readers to seek implicit meaning in order to engage more fully with seemingly straightforward texts. The pre-modernist Bildungsromane engage in rhetorical strategies that merit attention for
their constructed audience; however, even the modernist and later audiences are constructed within their respective texts’ rhetorical strategy.

In his book *Lector in Fabula*, Umberto Eco examines the intricately balanced relationship between author and reader. Eco concisely demonstrates the way in which texts exist as part of a defined and determinative communicative process, consisting of “un Emittente, un Messagio e un Destinatario” and often resulting in the gradual manifestation of the sender and the receiver through the utilization of syntactical structures that indicate the existence and, eventually, the nature of these individuals (Eco 53). The message, whether it is in the form of a novel or any other rhetorical text, contains various markers that point to these individuals’ existence including, most often in non-English texts, the use of verbs that denote their subject or object even when the marking subject or object pronoun is absent. Such subtleties contained in a text’s linguistic makeup certainly may be seen as part of the text’s implicit poetics. For Eco, this relationship, however subtly established or carried out, emerges because of the gradual manifestation of the author within his or her own text (53-54). Such a manifestation occurs in a variety of ways from the utilization of a noticeable and differentiated authorial style which “che può essere anche un idioletto testuale, o di corpus, o di epoca storico” to the enunciation of the “puro ruolo attanziale” through the utterance of the personal pronoun “I” in direct connection with the author or as the “occorrenza illocutiva” or that contained within grammatical forms (88). At

---

13 This text has yet to be translated into English. The original (Italian) version and the Spanish translation have both been consulted.

14 Trans: “a Sender, a Message and a Receiver” (LGJ). Note: All translations marked as LGJ have been completed by the author, additional translators will be cited as necessary.

15 Trans: can be a textual idiolectic either from the corpus or from the historic epoch. LGJ

16 Trans: purely actantial role

17 Trans: illocutionary occurrence. LGJ
any rate, the author emerges in Eco’s theory as part of a text’s rhetorical strategy. This understanding of the authorial self and the relationship between the creator of a text, the resulting work and subsequent audiences permits close readings of texts in which authors and authorial intent is contained within the works.

Umberto Eco’s idea of the authorial presence and its relationship with an implied reader works best in monolingual and monocultural contexts; however his theory complements ideas of transculturation and relating to the construction of alternative (or minor) literatures from critics outside of the Western linguistic paradigm. In their explorations of cultural interchanges, Angel Rama and Martin Lienhard both demonstrate the impact economic and political power has in determining the outcomes of cultural interchanges (Rama 32; Lienhard 133-134). As Lienhard demonstrates it was initially supposed that cultural influence followed a linear trajectory in which the colonizer gave culture to the colonized in a processes of acculturation (Lienhard 133). Fernando Ortiz and Ángel Rama demonstrated through their explorations of economic and aesthetic interchanges in fact occur as part of transculturational exchanges that influence both cultures (Ortiz 86; Rama 32-40). The problematic core of these interchanges for Lienhard is the fact that “En la América Latina, el marco socio-político de los procesos de interacción entre la cultura de los sectores hegemónicos y la de las subsociedades indígenas, mestizas o populares, se caracteriza en mayor o menor grado por una evidente asimetría…” (Lienhard 135).18 This asymmetry of cultural understanding and production leads to the emergence of so-called “alternative literatures” which, for Lienhard, are produced from the cultural periphery and construct their own approach to the historical and social realities (135).

18 Trans.: In Latin America, the socio-political frame of the processes of interaction between culture of the hegemonic sectors and that of the indigenous, mestizo or popular subsocieties is characterized to major and minor degree by an evident asymmetry. (LGJ)
These alternative literatures while often maintaining their own aesthetic simultaneously invoke or even create the alternative reader – someone with the specialized ability to understand not only a specialized vocabulary, for example the hybrid linguistic framework that Arguedas utilizes, but also the nuanced influence this biculturality performs when it appears in, for example, quechuized Spanish. In this example and many of the others that Lienhard uses, literature is responsible for the creation of hierarchical relationships between such figures as the missionary and the Indian while alternative literatures demonstrate the deeper complexities of interchanges between cultures and create readers and audiences that are capable of understanding them. This may be a pragmatic and economic decision but it also has democratic consequences, for example, Arguedas published his poetry only in Quechua while his novels utilize a hybrid linguistic form and, as such, his Spanish-language readers are occasionally introduced to at least some of Quechua’s linguistic realities (150). At any rate, these alternative literatures and the writers and thinkers that produce and read them are rarely the cultural norm. They are often rejected from canonical inclusion or pedagogical attention because of their linguistic inaccessibility in ways that demonstrate “una interiorización del colonialismo lingüístico” (152). For the alternative writers in Latin America and elsewhere the writing in the alternative mode permits them an escape from such interiorizations so that, while they may “live in a language that is not their own” the alternate path chosen by Arguedas and Kafka permits them to write through hybrid linguistic and formal innovations (Deleuze and Guattari 1453).

19 Trans.: an interiorization of the linguistic colonialism. (LGJ)

20 Lienhard’s conceptualization of alternative writers and alternative literatures bears much similarity to Deleuze and Guattari’s discussion of the “minor literature” and its constraints as facing Prague’s Jewish writers, including Kafka. Three particular points of similarity emerge in: 1) the politicization of everything in the minor/alternative literature; 2) the unshakeable collectivity of it; and 3) the broad understanding that in such dynamic contexts “literature is the people’s concern” (Kafka via Deleuze and Guattari 1452).
Certainly all writing must proceed with caution in order to avoid elevating the author to an existence such as that of a mythicized deity without which a text must be understood as wholly incomplete and fundamentally unknowable as argued by Barthes in his article “Death of the Author.” Barthes ultimately concludes that the “the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author.” While Michel Foucault later examines the remaining Author-functions performed within a text, it is actually Umberto Eco’s analysis of the author as a construct from the text that provides the means for analyzing the author of a text utilizing the materials contained within the work (Barthes 1322). As an author’s rhetorical strategies emerge clearly from a text itself it is possible to read through (rather than into) a text for the meaning and social repercussions it may contain. When such a hybrid philosophical lens is applied to works of Bildungsroman, dynamic ideas of self and person emerge from the texts that are connected to the historical context in which the books were written but also tied to and indicative of the text’s reader – whether historical or modern. Here again, Eco explains a complex dynamic as resulting from rhetorical devices, philosophies and strategies. Each text, according to Eco, contains a “lector modelo” or an ideal reader who can connect in meaningful ways with the message and for which the rhetorical strategies will evoke the intended results (89). The theoretical implications of explicit and implicit poetics manifest themselves in terms of both the author as textual construct and the reader as identified or identifying within the rhetorical choices or strategies of a text. Language and dialect choices are subtle indicators that can speak volumes when examined closely rather than taken as assumptions. For example, José María Arguedas utilizes a hybrid language that melds Spanish and Quechua in highly conspicuous ways in his texts and thus creates a language that does not actually exist in reality (Vargas Llosa “A Bullfight in the Andes” 38). As such Arguedas’ literary works that engage in this rhetorical strategies indicate the
existence of both an author with the capacity to speak and manipulate meaning through his distortion of grammatical forms but also indicate a readership that must exist with the ability to understand such rhetorical choices.\(^2\)

Perhaps one of the reasons that the Bildungsromane persists as a form involves the fact that even when used didactically as some 19\(^{th}\) century writers certainly did and abstractly as 20\(^{th}\) century writers also could, it never identified one particular model of reader but rather engaged more dynamically with all readers. Even though the Bildungsroman and Realist literature seemed to exist at a fortuitous and mutually beneficial moment in which a popular aesthetic and a pre-existing (although post-understood) form met, writers could move on through other extremely differentiated aesthetics without fully abandoning the form. As many critical works show us, the form outlived the Realist movement for many reasons. One of the most interesting is the inherent tension between a plot’s formal, pre-prescribed activities and the less-prescribed yet increasingly utilized introspective processes which are often found within Bildungsroman texts. Because the Bildungsroman concerns itself so greatly with both of these sometimes-conflicting dynamics, subsequent writers and cultures could use it as well. In the British canon, this demonstrates how a traditional form could thrive in both Realist and modernist literary schemes. Moreover, as Yolanda Doub suggests in her close reading of Buckley’s text, even the mid-19\(^{th}\) century European Bildungsromane examined complicated ideas of self and society. She notes that in these books “we also see the crisis of the individual, who has lost the traditional means of connecting with past generation and incorporating into society as the rituals of agricultural, feudal society are replaced by industry”(3). In some ways, these introspective understandings of societal crisis anticipate crises of self and society that would drive modernist

\(^2\) This challenge is further complicated when Arguedas’ texts are translated into English and Quechua words are left in their original language, italicized and thus highlighted as different.
philosophies and literature in the early 20th centuries. This conflict, which was so strongly present in the European Bildungsromane, also reappears in other cultures’ use of the form. However, as Doub reminds and warns her audience, such understandings may have driven the European form but they cannot be applied fully to Latin American writings because of varied linguistic and cultural norms as well as the high levels of cultural hybridity that must be considered when exploring literary and cultural productions from the region.

**Formal Considerations of the Bildungsroman**

In considering the historical and philosophical contexts from which the Bildungsroman developed and emerged, it becomes apparent that, while the form certainly fit well within the European realist movements of the 18th and 19th century, it is not merely an unyielding cultural relic but something much more interesting and dynamic. It is highly advantageous to examine the form’s specific technical elements and stylistic tendencies as somewhat malleable parts of a specific tradition. In some ways, these formal and functional considerations provide the clearest possible definition of what the Bildungsroman actually is and therefore demonstrate how the form permitted its own utilization and even subversion by writers from such a broad range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Jerome Buckley argues that this particular literary form connects to the temporal moment human between youth and adulthood (Buckley 1). For his argument, the progressive space is framed as a common period, recognizable to a wide variety of individuals, at least if they grow up to one day belong to the middle class. As mentioned previously, the English model for Bildungsroman generalized these differences. In English and Peruvian traditions, the form is recognized as a flexible and inclusive form contrary to specifically the Germanic tradition in which consistent subcategorization as mentioned previously in this chapter. For Buckley this
cultural difference is due to the fact that in England…the pursuit of self-culture has hardly ever been so deliberate or programmatic, and the process of education, though schooling may play a major role in it, has seldom begun or ended with prescribed courses of study” and moreover the protagonist regularly emerges from the self-cultivation process as “an artist of sorts, a prose writer like David Copperfield… a poet like Stephen Dedalus, an artisan and aspiring intellectual like Hardy’s Jude, a painter like Lawrence’s Paul Morel…” (13).

Thus, the British and, as we will see, the Latin American Bildungsroman accommodate a variety of nuances in the development of their protagonists without needing additional sub-categorization in order to understand or accommodate individual’s differences. At any rate, such tales are often presented from the first- or third- person perspective. Later within the modernist aesthetic, some versions of the form such as The Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man incorporated a fragmentary perspective allowing for the introduction of abstraction and/or stream of consciousness but ultimately continue to follow the trajectory of an individual’s development.

Whatever the voice, Buckley’s reading of the British Bildungsroman allows him to view the basic outlines of “a typical Bildungsroman plot and so determine the principle characteristics of the genre” (Buckley 17). He recognizes and indicates the basic elements of the form in a way that establishes this sort of novel as based upon the common characteristics and trajectories

---

22 The recognition of other categories of Bildungsroman novels, specifically the Erziehungsroman, which deals principally with the school-based education of a young person, may actually shed light on the existence and development of the school institution in non-Germanic settings. However, because English- and Spanish-language canons have resisted further categorization little scholarship exists which demarcates the particular importance of schools in individuals’ development. The conspicuous absence of deeper discussions of schools generally and the boarding school in particular is curious in the otherwise rich body of critical research around the form as these institutions appear often within the literature.
shared by its main characters and thus permits a formal identification of Bildungsroman novels as based upon key plot elements. First, formal analyses of the genre universally acknowledge the protagonist as the crucial piece of the form. When introduced, this character is usually “a child of some sensibility” who starts his life in some peripheral space of his society (Buckley 17). This person is identifiably sensitive and representative of a “symbolic youth epitomized in mobility and interiority” (Moretti 5). The child is almost always aware of at least some of the limitations, specifically “social and intellectual” in nature that stem from or otherwise relate to his origin (17).

The plot progresses along an, at least superficially, simplistic trajectory which usually presents the protagonist’s development chronologically. Most often, these initial constrictions are presented to the reader as part of a family conflict and thus establish early on a distinct separation between the protagonist and his immediate society. The major source of this early conflict is often the character’s father or father figure who are often largely hostile and antagonistic to the development of the young man (17). Despite familial conflicts, the education of the young person often begins rudimentarily while he remains living with his family in a peripheral village or small city. He may even begin formal schooling while in this peripheral setting (17). However, the protagonist, like the hero from classic literature, must leave home in order for his “real” education to begin. As Buckley notes:

[The protagonist] sometimes at a quite early age, leaves the repressive atmosphere of home (and also the relative innocence), to make his way independently in the city… [where] his real “education” begins, not only his preparation for a career but also – and often more importantly – his direct experience of urban life. (17)

In the urban setting, the protagonist meets a variety of characters whose differences from himself
become part of his education about the state of his society. Additionally, during the character’s youth, he engages with life lessons relating to not only friendship and interpersonal hardships outside of the family setting but also at least one but more often two “love affairs or sexual encounters” that cause him to reconsider or reevaluate his values (17). At this point, especially in the British Bildungsroman novels, the protagonist often returns home or reengages with his original community and in that setting his differentiation from his original society is quite clearly established. His successful integration with urban society appears in his assimilation of values and understandings that appear foreign when contrasted with his own family or community. Moreover, this culture of urbanity often leaves the protagonist with marked success – whether demonstrated by enhanced economic circumstances or perceptible changes in his own behavior especially towards the home-based characters that initially challenged or threatened him.

The traditional plot arc as outlined by Buckley is certainly not completely followed in all Bildungsroman novels; however most books of the genre do follow some if not all of the markers as they portray the development of their respective protagonists. Specific settings and plot points thus emerge with special relevance or meaning for the characters. In terms of identifiable spaces, these stories often start with the protagonists’ recollections of their earliest experiences at home. Scholars often talk about the evolution of the meaning and perception of home over the course of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. It is thus quite interesting to note that Bildungsroman often establish home as a “private haven” before contrasting it with the corrupting space of the city and thus establish the home as the stable space before it becomes “a counterpoint to both public life and the continually changing sensory environment of industrial society” (Salmi 73). For the book’s principle character, this initial space of home is thus quickly problematized. It is not simply a “refuge where the private self could hide when the occasion warranted” but rather an ambiguously alien
and alienating space in which his differences are established as social liabilities (73). As a result, even in mid-19th century British texts such as *David Copperfield* or *Great Expectations*, which famously studied for their narrative clarity and stability, the seeds of fragmentation and alienation are sown.

The home site, which is an early setting and subject in most Bildungsroman novels, is subtly established as existing within a notably peripheral social space. In British novels, this often means setting the story’s beginning in a small town or village at some distance from London (Buckley 17). The periphery is often presented as a somewhat idyllic space characterized by its slow pace and general lack of sophistication - although other social values can be highlighted and in fact the periphery does not necessarily receive fully negative or cynical critical consideration on the part of the protagonist. Interestingly, while the protagonist or narrative voice often describes the home itself through the inclusion of many details while the village or town in which it resides often appears somewhat more nebulously. Nonetheless, the idea of the peripheral town or village although ambiguous appears consistently within the Bildungsroman genre and merits attention for the way in which it contrasts both with the home and with the idea of the industrial social center – the central city.

The third key space that is defined within the Bildungsroman is typically, as Buckley notes, an urban center to which the protagonist is drawn. This space is characterized by chaos, bustle and a certain level of economic and social diversity. The main character often reacts to this chaos and commotion through a combination of intrigue and anxiety. The protagonist slowly begins to explore and delineate the social spaces and situations he encounters. Through maturity and chronological encounters with external spaces, the city, which originally appears as something of an immense and overwhelming entirety, is gradually broken down into shops,
boardinghouses, warehouses and other key settings are demarcated.

Boarding schools provide an understudied yet common location that the protagonist must navigate and understand. In many novels, boarding schools provide a key venue for the education of a country’s youth in terms of both general academic lessons but also, perhaps more importantly, its social structure and societal norms. The purpose and goals of such schools thus often align with the central aims of both the Bildungsroman as a genre and the state in which they are written: the creation, strengthening or wider dispersion of central ideas relating to civic and social norms including the development of a national identity. In short, boarding schools provide a setting that is conducive to the proliferation of a unified social conscience as well as other lessons relating to class and society of a particular country. Novels of Bildungsroman that pass through the boarding school setting often demonstrate clearly the way in which external social structures, values, goals and challenges appear are experienced by and then represented by the youth who live and learn within them. The administrative and social structures within the school ready the young men to assimilate into their own societies. The power structure of these schools – as administered by teachers, principles, school benefactors and so on – may be despotic or kind, fair or inequitable, etc. but they certainly are designed to be obeyed. More interestingly, while the schools’ administrators or teachers provide structure or the semblance thereof, the students themselves often self-organize in fascinating ways. Even young children in the boarding school setting are highly aware of class, economic, social and racial distinctions that could divide them over the course of their shared boarding school experience and, potentially, throughout their lifetimes, as both *Los ríos profundos* and *David Copperfield* demonstrate.

The temporal and spatial considerations of the Bildungsroman often emerge as the protagonist travels between his society’s periphery and center. Peripheral and central spaces are
defined in terms of their direct connection to each other via a road, river or other form of byway. The main character’s (usually solitary) travels from place to place in a way that establishes his perspective on the journey and thus makes the journey part of a directional interaction with the landscape: he travels to the center (or later returns to the periphery) through the landscape. Later in the city, such movement is consistently horizontal in that the main character might travel from one space to another but he often notes his disconnect in this city as his walks through it occasionally exchange directionality for exploration. The city and its chaotic, often poorly organized streets, invite a protagonist to wander around aimlessly rather than purposefully navigate his existence. In fact, he may at some point be impelled to do so for economic or social reasons.

It must be noted that when the earliest Bildungsroman gained critical attention, scholars assumed that protagonists would always be male (Buckely 12). Many reasons exist for the assumed masculinity of Bildungsroman protagonists. Certainly, the fact that Goethe’s Wilhelm Meister was male provides one reason, but it is admittedly simplistic. It is perhaps more notable that texts within this genre were expected to contain a specific ending in which the protagonist ascended to his place within the working, yet refined, middle class. In the 19th century, such an expectation inherently excluded women as such social successes were denied to them. Especially in the 18th and 19th centuries, women’s self-cultivation certainly looked much different relative to men’s and led to highly differentiated ends that strict, early readings of the Bildungsroman disallowed. Later scholarship accounted for this differentiation, as well as varied definitions of social integration and life success, and therefore allowed for the exploration of women’s Bildungsromane. New inclusive definitions permitted new understandings of key canonical texts such as Jane Austen’s Mansfield Park, Charlotte Bronte’s Jane Eyre and George
Eliot’s *Middlemarch* (McWilliams 17). In their seminal text *The Madwomen in the Attic*, Gilbert and Gubar argue vehemently for the reading of *Jane Eyre* as a “distinctively female Bildungsroman” because of its gendered trajectory and conclusion (339).

Rediscoveries of women’s Bildungsromane aside, conventional values and considerations within the plot structure are tied to traditional gender roles, and that the standard plot was most concerned with the development of a young man as he undergoes a process through which he became a productive member of society. For many Bildungsroman writers, a successful assimilation of a young man into his society involved his gaining of a formal education, a career, a wife and a family and thus becoming a leader in his own life. Assimilation for the Bildungsroman protagonist is implicitly connected to citizenship and social participation, rights denied to many women until the early 20th century. Paths to assimilation and success depended largely on acceptance and transmission of patriarchal values and the enactment of personal agency – understandings and values that necessarily excluded women for most of the 19th century, in which their disenfranchisement demonstrates one basic level of their own inability to develop into a fully socially integrated person.

Particularly since the 1970s, inclusive readings of Bildungsromane have permitted research into a wide variety of stories excluded by the more limited earlier understandings of the

23 It is crucial to note that Buckley’s seminal exploration of the Bildungsroman is based entirely on the author’s close reading of Bildungsromane from Dickens to Joyce that treat principally the evolution of male protagonists. A variety of literary scholars have since completed studies that include female protagonists; however, this paper, like Buckley’s, will focus largely on two male characters. Later research will develop this section in order to account for women’s portrayals and experiences of development as presented in this genre.

24 Gilbert and Gubar note correctly that Jane encounters the traditional obstacles to development grappled with almost universally by the genre’s masculine protagonists: she is orphaned, oppressed by the remaining family members, neglected at her boarding school, and challenged when she leaves the institution yet still manages to achieve the “fantasy” of “mature freedom.” For the authors, the “distinctively female” aspects of the novel reside in Jane’s necessary opposition to the patriarchal character of the limits imposed upon her (Gilbert and Gubar 339).
genre. The structure of the text allows an author to develop his or her character and plot in the context of realistic social, spatial and temporal conditions. As such, some authors utilize the standard, seemingly simplistic form for a broad range of semantic and even aesthetic purposes. Such texts may then be used to explore the social conditions of the societies and class characteristics that frame (and are framed by) within the principle characters’ perspectives. Time and place are not simple, static elements in Bildungsromane but act as dynamic elements engaged with subjectively, both on the part of the author and the protagonists they create. Analysis of the texts’ most seemingly concrete elements, including established personal places such as the home and social institutions such as the boarding school, reveals a great deal about respective societies’ values, goals and concerns. Especially in the turbulent 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, these settings gained high levels of symbolic meaning that were occasionally manipulated for explicitly political ends. However, while ideas of family, home and community have been manipulated in the past from the highest echelons of society, as a close reading of Charles Dickens’ \textit{David Copperfield} and José María Arguedas’ \textit{Los ríos profundos} will show, the meaning of such spaces and ideas are ultimately negotiated by the individual.
Chapter III – Accounting for the Past:

Contextualizing *David Copperfield* and *Los ríos profundos* (EK Working)

On the surface, the comparative analysis of two seemingly disparate texts as Charles Dicken’s *David Copperfield*, which was published in serial between 1849 and 1850 in London, England and José María Arguedas’ *Los ríos profundos*, which was originally published in Perú in 1958, begs many questions of scholastic and critical value. The two books were written and published on separate continents, in different languages, by authors with wholly disparate backgrounds, politics and social circumstances. Moreover, the texts are temporally separated by more than a century’s worth of political, social, intellectual and aesthetic developments. Despite these monumental differences, both books are clearly examples of Bildungsroman and utilize many of the form’s standard techniques and developments to reach oddly resonant and comparable conclusions. Putting the texts and the critical scholarship about them in dialogue through comparative processes ultimately permits deeper explorations of both books as instances of cultural exploration.

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, a rich canon of critical scholarship exists that explores the Bildungsroman; at the same time, prior scholarship has proven invaluably helpful in the examination of Dickens’ and Arguedas’ texts. Read together Buckley’s *Seasons of Youth*, Moretti’s *The Way of the World: The Bildungsroman in European Culture*, Castle’s *Reading the Modernist Bildungsroman*, Kushigan’s more recent *Reconstructing Childhood: Strategies of Reading for Culture and Gender in the Spanish American Bildungsroman* and Yolanda Doub’s *Journeys of Formation: The Spanish American Bildungsroman* demonstrate the interconnectedness of works of the genre and its adoption and adaptation by writers from many
national and even trans-national traditional. These critical works provide conceptual frameworks that bridge cultural gaps between texts but because of their scope often gloss or ignore elements clearly suggested when distinct stories are put into direct dialogue with each other. Comparing the canons, social milieus and lives of the authors highlights the existence of social projects that merit comparison and suggests reconsiderations of the potential societal functions of literature that transcend linguistic and cultural paradigms. By examining and thus accounting for canonical and authorial similarities and differences in the texts’ backgrounds allows for a more conceptually balanced comparison of literary analysis in terms of plot and character development.

**Canonical Contexts**

*David Copperfield* and *Los ríos profundos* originate from the national canons of Britain and Perú, which are highly dissimilar, a fact due principally their distinct historical developments. The identifiable British canon dates back to the Middle Ages and evolved through the centuries as it fed on the conquests of the empire for both literary subjects and aesthetic enormity. Words, ideas and stories that inspired some of the world’s most famous writers including William Shakespeare, John Milton, Charles Dickens as well as Virginia Woolf and her contemporaries were plundered from distant lands and brought into the empire. In contrast, the Peruvian canon was characterized by the imposition of the Spanish empire (and the Spanish language) on the region of Latin America and specifically within the Andean zone. Even after the area that is modern-day Perú freed itself from the empire in the early 1820s, the country faced decades of turbulence as regional, national and pan-national arrangements were tried and failed.

Like the British Empire from which it originates, the British literary canon is widely acknowledged, if tacitly, as the hegemon for literary studies. The empire and the canon both are responsible for establishing paradigms with which most other countries and literary corpuses
must contend or, at least, acknowledge. Certainly, British writers created or adapted literary forms, strategies, styles, subjects and other tropes, trends and motifs in such a way as to establish or permit the continuation of its dominance. A particular side effect of this literary “anti-conquest” involves the apparent unity of canon—a myth perpetuated through centuries of canonical pedagogy that has only recently opened itself for reconsideration. In contrast, the Peruvian canon, with its much shorter history of independence and the general sense of national disunity that frames Perú’s cultural productions, lacks even the semblance of such a unison and historic trajectory. Moreover, the Peruvian corpus lacks the international readership of its British counterpart. Even today, few Peruvian writers have achieved international acclaim or even translation whereas English writers maintain a high level of international fame. The Peruvian canon appears largely peripheral in the broader world of literary studies as dominated by its British equivalent. Nonetheless, this understanding of each boy’s relative position allows the strengths and weaknesses of both to emerge for closer consideration. Particularly, exploring the limitations of canonical pedagogy both within and between canons demonstrates the subalternization of voices from both. Just as reading the contributions of minorities and individuals from outside of the traditional paradigm (ie: white, heterosexual, Christian males) of the national literary bodies permits a more comprehensive and diverse understanding of the cultures so too will reading peripheral literatures permit a more inclusive understanding of

25 The idea of the “anti-conquest” comes from Mary Louise Pratt who defines it as a relational, “Utopian, innocent vision of European global authority” in contrast with previous centuries’ methods of “conquest, conversion, territorial appropriation and enslavement” (Pratt 38). It is the author’s contention that literature operates as part of this project as it establishes through a variety of strategies (including the rhetorical, but also the economic and the social) a set of imperial norms that other canons acknowledge, incorporate or against which they react.

26 Some recently renewed interest in Latin American writers certainly may be attributed to the Peruvian writer Mario Vargas Llosa’s receipt of the 2011 Nobel Prize in literature but even this award is part of a Eurocentric paradigm and moreover brings attention to a broad regional body of works without necessarily highlighting specifically Peruvian books.
literature in general. Thus, while the relative strengths and positions of the British and Peruvian canons present a substantial barrier of incompatibility and incomparability when examining the following works, the project itself allows for a more nuanced discussion of literature as an art form.

One question that emerges upon the comparison of texts between canons is that of literary legitimacy. Over the previous decades, British literary studies have permitted increasingly inclusive readings of texts from previously excluded or banned sources. While laudable, this project begs certain questions: What is the value of reading a banned text if most British citizens living when it was written were unable or disinclined to do so? What is the value of reading a text written by a woman (or other minority) if it received little critical attention at the time? If texts were not popular or widely read, what is their real value? Moreover, why should such works be included in canonical reading and pedagogy?

While the field of literary studies has found some answers to these questions, the fact remains that the British canon is in a more advanced phase of such debates than many other societies. In contrast, the Peruvian canon has perpetually faced complex limitations that writers and scholars have attempted to address in both their writings and critical scholarship. A key issue for consideration in these debates for the Peruvian canon is a question of origin and origination. Like many citizens of post-colonial societies, Peruvians try to go around or look back past the colonial period in order to find or legitimate their own current states of affairs. For the Peruvian canon, this is especially difficult as the pre-conquest runasimi traditions were not text-based at all or even scripted, the vast majority of the khipu devices were destroyed, and thus pre-conquest “texts” remain “illegible.” Additionally since Quechua and indigenous cultural practices were outlawed, it remains highly difficult to point to a universally acknowledged origin
for Peruvian literature. Questions of origination and later restorations of the oral tradition highlight the fact that the period of colonization had major effects on the culture and its practices. Acknowledging this fact begs the question of whether modern indigenous “writings” whether utilizing the alphabet or some other form of record can be legitimately Peruvian despite centuries of suppression and mutation given the political occurrences in the region. Furthermore, attempts to find the “legitimate” Peruvian canon must contend with the fact that the conquest was a highly rhetorical and literary process: certainly the military conquest created existential problems of survival but the invasion of the alphabet and written texts imposed new senses of memory and understanding on peoples as well (Cummins 95; Castro-Klaren “Memory and Writing in the Andes” 107-108). This also invokes the question of whether the texts of the conquistadors and their colonial projects comprise part of a Peruvian canon as well. This challenge is further complicated by the fact that within a generation after the conquistadors, mestizos and even indigenous writers wrote texts. Should these be considered Peruvian? Are they then the first “legitimate” Peruvian writings? On a similar note, the writings of the independence and post-independence people were largely reminiscent of the styles under colonization: can they be considered Peruvian? What place do mestizos, indigenous writers or those from other ethnicities (for example those of other European, African, and/or Asian descent) have in the Peruvian canon?

In Perú, such considerations are especially complicated due to the long history of social stratification based on not only racial heritage but also economic class, living situation (i.e. whether one lives and writes from within the city or the countryside), and even clothes or lifestyle. In this diverse cultural milieu, the search for an “authentic” Peruvian literature certainly thus provides many challenges. The Peruvian political philosopher and journalist José
Carlos Mariátegui, whose contributions to Peruvian culture will be considered more fully below, weighed in on the question of canonical legitimacy frequently. In one particular discussion, he lauded the works of Ricardo Palma, a Limeño, whose writings of Peruvian history blended fact and fiction and could thus be (dis)owned by scholars from both fields (Mariátegui *Siete Ensayos* 259). Mariátegui argued the canonical inclusion of Palma’s seminal yet largely traditional *Tradiciones peruanas* largely because of Palma’s its reconstructive nature and the light such a project sheds on colonial psychology through its “realismo burlón y… fantasía irreverente y sátrica” (Mariátegui *Siete ensayos* 259). Thus through the reappropriation and even the searching out an era’s alternative authors allows for later generations to explore both lesser read but possibly fascinating books and authors as well as the traditionally read and taught writers such as Palma. These questions are not necessarily unique to post-colonial nations that seek to establish themselves apart from their colonial oppressors however they are certainly challenges that the well-established and imperial British canon never faced.

Finally, while the Bildungsroman literary form was initially an important part of an undeniably European tradition informed heavily by Enlightenment philosophies and understandings of self, the form has been adopted and adapted by canonical and alternative writers from other traditions in order to tell unique stories. Thus while the form is initially European it is through the form that uniquely “othered” stories may be told. Close readings of canonical and alternative texts demonstrates the limitations of strict adherence to canonical reading lists at the expense of alternative fictions from authors from a wider variety of social backgrounds. This is largely because the canon was initially established (through publication and pedagogy) by a more limited section of the population. Widening perspective on any canon (from the British to the Peruvian) permits a better understanding of the cultures such works
Comparative Social Moments

Despite considerations of the many differences between these countries, it bears noting that *David Copperfield* and *Los ríos profundos* were written while their societies faced comparably vicarious social dynamics. An interesting parallel linking mid-19th Century England and mid-20th Century Perú involves unstable and socially exclusive growth in some economic sectors. Such instability often provokes social unrest.

Politically, by the 19th Century, England had become more stable relative to previous centuries, largely due to the power sharing that occurred under the auspices of the constitutional monarchy. Internationally, the British Empire was still one of the world’s greatest imperial powers at the time despite having lost the United States a little more than half a century prior. The Empire was beginning to show signs of strain but by mid-19th century global geopolitical standards, it existed as a powerful hegemonic force. Domestically, the stability, riches and administrative philosophies of empire influenced government perceptions of and approaches to the large variety of social and economic challenges that faced the increasingly industrialized and urban population. Industrialization provided many new sources of jobs that promised employment and financial security for the lower classes thus prompting individuals to leave agrarian livelihoods for London and other urban centers in which industrialization occurred. Thus, the radical shift from agrarian to industrial domestic production necessitated an equally fundamental change in the living situations of the English multitude.

These rapid social changes invited not only sociological and political consideration but also literary representation and definition. 19th century European literature takes such societal transformations and demonstrates their aesthetic and cultural repercussions. This can be seen in
the works of French writers such as Balzac and Baudelaire who guided their readers through the changing urban landscapes of their countries. In England, Dickens too was “not simply walking but writing ‘London’, which means he is writing about London and, by writing, creating London” (Tambling 1). By representing the everyday and the familiar in his works, Dickens suggested ways to interact with the space – similar in comparison to the projects of painters and journalists that, in their attempts to preserve particular scenes and instances for posterity often added greatly to current understandings of their subjects, be they rivers, cities or people. Dickens’ success was so widely understood that by the late 19th century it was difficult to engage with certain elements of London life without acknowledging that they were “Dickensian” (1-2). His readers at the time noted his ability to talk about the disconnect within London society; however later readers and critics note that they often do so without realizing that the unifying thread is often provided by the socially mobile protagonist and his friends and neighbors (2). It is, perhaps, this unique perspective that allows critics such as Harold Bloom to read through Dickens’ fiction and journalistic writings in order to construct colorful pictures of the author himself so that “[Dickens] seems instead to be a character in a great drama, unwritten only because no Victorian Shakespeare was there to compose it” (Bloom “Introduction” 2). The great drama that Bloom identifies is Dickens’ London – a space that resists totalization and is replete with colorful characters and unforgottably bleak houses, shops and schools. Ultimately, this allows his texts in particular to speak of an “urban realism” connected to a historical time but represented in literature that it also rejects the limits of time (Sicher xviii).

Despite its highly differentiated political and historical trajectory, Perú arrived at a comparably volatile state in its economic development by the 1950s. By the mid-1950s, political instability in Perú had been held off by the imposition of a conservative, oligarchical government
that looked favorably upon the successes of Franco in Spain and negatively upon the indigenous peoples of Perú (Starn et al 269). The stability in Perú thus appeared quite differently from that of mid-19th century England, however was actually similar to England in that, during the Industrial Revolution and “under an apparently still surface, the new forces of mass communication and the market – along with the state’s own measures of modernization through highways and schools – drew majorities more firmly into national life” (269). Nonetheless, this historical period’s dominant economic and technological changes brought “great migrations” from the rural areas of Perú into the cities including specifically Lima, which was considered “the symbol of oligarchical power and creole pride” (269). The rapid urbanization of the port cities led to challenges related not only to urban planning, reminiscent of many European capitals urban nightmares in the 19th century, but also with distinct and highly instable intercommunity, interracial and interclass dynamics. In his poem “A Nuestro Padre Creador Túpac Amaru: Himno Canción,” (To Our Father Creator Túpac Amaru: A Hymn Song) José María Arguedas summarized this, saying

Somos miles de millares, aquí, ahora. Estamos juntos; nos/ hemos congregado
pueblo por pueblo, nombre por nombre, y estamos/ apretando a esta inmensa
ciudad que nos odiaba, que nos despreciaba como/ a excremento de caballos.\textsuperscript{28}

Certainly, this level of disgust as so easily perceived by the indigenous and rural poor upon entering cities such as Lima is reminiscent of the class and urban of mid-19th century London. In

\textsuperscript{27} Certainly, such changes modernized cities but Perú’s population remained largely agrarian and rural.

\textsuperscript{28} Trans: We are thousands upon thousands, here, now, We are together; we/ have gathered pueblo by pueblo, name by name, and we are squeezing this immense city that hated us, that despised us like/the excrement of horses.
both these cities, the changes of the country appeared most distinctly within the capital city.  

The influx of the Quechua-speaking poor with largely of mestizo- and indigenous-heritages to Perú’s larger cities additionally appeared in the works of writers and poets such as Arguedas. However, this same changing population dynamic had already provided material for other writers including the influential José Carlos Mariátegui whose works and ideas influenced literary, cultural and critical scholars including José María Arguedas, Fernando Ortiz and Angel Rama. Mariátegui published his text 7 ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana in 1928 and, in these essays, present his nuanced and quasi-Marxist reading of the changing Peruvian dynamic (Galindo and Grados XL-XLI). As one example, Mariátegui’s exploration of the trajectory of Peruvian history and culture divided it into three basic categories – the colonial, the cosmopolitan and the national – and then complicated this by invoking the “entrecruzamiento” between categories, styles and periods (Villanueva 180-181). He defined the “national literature” period as cotemporaneous with the indigenismo social movement that, in turn, related to the indigenous populations urbanization.  

Mariátegui, Arguedas and other writers concerned with the changing social dynamics certainly diverged in opinions at various times. However, the resultant literature from the indigenist era of Peruvian history provides a deep perspective into Peruvian realities and complexities, similar to the body of works produced by Dickens and his counterparts that deal with social changes in London.

---

29 Importantly, the dynamic of urbanization in Lima between 1940 and 1960 had significant social and cultural repercussions (Kokotovic 170). Politically, Lima was the country’s capital and the main center from which cultural production emerged. The country’s main newspapers, museums, and publications came from Lima. However, in contrast Cusco has always acted as another type of capital within the country. Cusco was also more comfortable integrating or at least acknowledging indigenous contributions to or influence of the urban space (178-179).

30 Trans: Crossover. (LGJ)

31 Mariátegui is best known for his attempts to combine indigenous social thought with socialist ideas. His 7 ensayos demonstrates the values of social collectivity in both philosophies.
The Authors’ Lives & Works

Both writers’ works demonstrate their concern for their respective societies’ volatility and the underlying social difficulties, and furthermore both authors made professions out of considering these things not only from the literary lens but also through journalism (Dickens) and academic work (Arguedas). Inarguably, therefore, both authors made careers for themselves out of this dynamic. The biographies of these writers demonstrate that this connection was not merely professional and intellectual but, for both writers, indicative of experiential understandings of and connections to these social dynamics. Both authors share some similar life experiences and, at the apex of their writing careers, wrote from surprisingly similar intellectual and social spaces.

Charles Dickens was born in 1812, the second child and eldest son of John Dickens who worked as a clerk for the Navy Pay Office in the English city of Sommerset at the time of Charles’ birth (Allen 3). The family grew quickly and moved various times, ultimately landing in various bustling and industrial neighborhoods of London (4). In later correspondence, Charles Dickens indicated that the colorful people he met because of his childhood travels influenced many of his literary characters and provided the inspiration for many of his plots (5).

Similarly, José María Arguedas’ childhood was also characterized by familial instability. Arguedas was born in the Peruvian city of Andahuaylas the second son of Victor Manuel Arguedas Arellano, who was employed as a lawyer and notary (Pinilla 37). The family moved about as Victor Arguedas took various jobs as a lawyer and eventually a judge (37). Following the death of José’s mother in 1914, Victor remarried a wealthy landowning woman and settled in the city of Puquio with two of his three sons by his first wife (37). Shortly thereafter, the sons were sent to live with their stepmother in San Juan de Lucanas where their father visited his family on weekends (37-38). Their childhood was chaotic not only because of its instability but
because of the stepmother’s maltreatment of the Arguedas sons. During the week while her husband was absent, José and his elder brother Aristedes were consigned to the servants’ quarters where the family’s indigenous staff largely raised both boys and taught them the Quechuan language and culture. Like Dickens who underwent a variety of social and economic difficulties in his childhood, José María Arguedas was similarly influenced by these trying childhood events.

Both writers leaned on their personal histories to provide inspiration for their works. While it is difficult and perhaps even pointless to attempt to demonstrate concretely where each author drew the line between creating a fictional reality based upon their lives and representing their actual lives through the mask of a fictitious persona, linguistic, syntactic, semantic and other rhetorical choices color each text with the its author’s perspective and experiences. This is discernibly the case with José María who grew up speaking Quechua so that he was as comfortable with the indigenous language as he was with his first-language of Spanish. Arguedas’ work often received great critical attention because of the large indigenous influence that is easily perceived in his use of Quechuan syntax, semantics and vocabulary (Aldrich 129; Castro-Klaren 46).  

In comparison, Dickens utilized regional accents, vocabulary and class-based syntax in his work to differentiate his characters from each other and to act as subtle markers of class and origin that his British audience would easily understand (Mugglestone 95).

Despite both authors’ manipulation of language and/or accent, the result is significantly

---

32 Arguedas’ poetry was almost entirely in Quechua and he had considered writing his other literary works in the indigenous language as well but was dissuaded by the Mexican revolutionary Moises Sáenz who informed him such literature had no chance as literary vehicles in the Americas of [their] times” (Murra “Introduction” X). Instead of writing in Quechua, Arguedas then created a hybrid language of his own (Rama 239-240; Vargas Llosa “A Bullfight in the Andes” 38). Towards the end of his life, he expressed regret over this decision (Murra “Introduction” X).
different. Dickens utilized difference to represent alternative lives and lifestyles in his society. In contrast, Arguedas’ literature creates a specialized alternative reader with the capacity to think bilingually and to read Quechua occasionally without the assistance of Spanish footnotes. Consequently, Dickens’ language represents something that already exists while Arguedas’ searches for someone with a particular linguistic and even cultural ability like his own.

Both writers were keenly aware of the societal changes going on around them and the distinct impact such volatility imposed upon the poorest and most-often excluded members of their societies. The authors utilized many of their writings in order to focus their society’s attentions upon the world around them. As Dickens wrote

To interest and affect the general mind in behalf of anything that is clearly wrong – to stimulate and rouse the public soul to a compassionate or indignant feeling that it must not be – without obtruding any pet theory of cause or cure, and so throwing off allies as they spring up – I believe to be one of Fiction’s highest uses. And this is the use to which I try to turn it. (Dickens in an 1854 letter to Henry Carey as quoted in Slater 363, emphasis my own).

For Dickens, fiction provided a way of interesting, affecting and educating the general populace. In contrast, Arguedas’ project was much more complicated. His non-fiction works clearly examine the social complexities of a bicultural existence in a heavily segregated society. His works demonstrate the clear lines between populations but, especially in Los ríos profundos, in subtle ways that depend upon close readings of his brief descriptions of social dynamic and the village’s physical and social geography. For example, Ernesto describes the placement of the village of Abancay as boxed in by the large haciendas that own even the distant mountains and his discussion provides Arguedas a vehicle through which he alludes cleverly to the domination
of European understandings of land ownership on the very peaks that by indigenous belief could not possibly be owned by humans.

Both authors’ Bildungsromane clearly delineate and explore the social situations of their societies from the perspective of a first-person narrator. Each author constructs a world from within the perspective of a young man who must come of age during challenging times and with little social support. As a result, each novel engages with not only the way in which an individual comes to understand himself but also how that self engages with the world and its difficulties, of which he has a particular knowledge. Specifically, this character must do so in context of their family situation, which, as we shall see, is not necessarily limited to traditional understandings of family or home spaces. However, he must also do so within the context of the boarding school - an institution that represents the societal power structure each boy must confront upon his graduation.
Chapter IV – Writing Forward:

David & Ernesto’s Developing Selves in Context

Unique and strongly defined central characters narrate both *David Copperfield* and *Los ríos profundos*. Each text presents a constructed world to its readers through the subjective lens of a principle character. Certainly, the construction of a first-person narrative for fictitious characters presents some level of theoretical difficulties for both the author and the audience. Where the “I” of the author ends and the self of a narrated protagonist begins provides a tempting question that merits great critical attention. The authors of both texts considered here certainly engaged closely with their characters; however, their comments on this question of authorial and character boundaries demonstrate that they too lack a complete understanding of the relationship between themselves and their narrating characters. This allows the narrating selves of both texts to emerge as dynamic and compelling characters who engage with their worlds analytically yet subjectively, intimately yet connectedly, humbly yet powerfully, frankly yet with an eye for abstraction.

**David: A Self within Limits**

In the introductory paragraph of *The Personal History, Experience and Observations of David Copperfield the Younger of Blunderstone Rookery, which He Never Meant to Be Published on Any Account*, Mr. Copperfield introduces himself to his reader in such a way as to invite many textual and critical questions regarding the self that will be narrating the novel’s subsequent 714 pages. He memorably ponders

> Whether I shall turn out to be the hero of my own life, or whether that station will be held by anybody else, these pages must show. To begin my life with the
beginning of my life, I record that I was born (as I have been informed and believe) on a Friday, at twelve o’clock at night. It was remarked that the clock began to strike, and I began to cry, simultaneously. (15).

This simple opening paragraph creates varieties of narrative tension that impel readers forward through David’s exploration of the facts of his birth that quickly follow. In so doing, the novel’s rhetorical strategy is brilliantly simple. This approach begins, in fact, before the text itself with the title page establishing a reluctant narrator who “never meant to publish” and other extradiegetic “tricks of the trade” (Mansell 267). He opens his narrative with a simply worded yet highly rhetorical question and from there proceeds to sketch the captivating details of his birth. For readers and scholars considering Dickens, this endows the story with a particular sort of timelessness and universality. Virginia Woolf notes poignantly “perhaps no person living… can remember reading David Copperfield for the first time… [as books like David Copperfield] are not books, but stories communicated by word of mouth in those tender years when fact and fiction merge, and thus belong to the memories and myths of life, and not to its esthetic experience” (Woolf, “David Copperfield” 75). With little other knowledge of Dickens’ style or any understanding of the cultural significance of the hour, the birth of a titular character at an auspicious time triggers the imagination of even a more reluctant reader. Dickens creates a momentum in this paragraph that drives interest in the development of his plot structure; however, on a much more philosophical level, he also creates a critical tension between David’s own critical understanding of his life and the details and events that will comprise it. From the very beginning of this novel, the reader is part of a much more compelling exploration and critical project than that which a simplistic, plot-based reading of this book in particular allows.

Through the novel’s famous first line, David simultaneously introduces himself to the
reader and invites them to question his own role not only in the text they are about to read (although he does that) but also and more profoundly in his own life. For rigid adherents of the realist Bildungsroman, this poses a large problem. Bildungsromane treat the development of a self that will grow up in such a way to ensure their ensuing union with their society and this eventual assimilation often provides the climax of the novel. A Bildungsroman has a protagonist but a hero is something conceptually quite different.\textsuperscript{33} Moreover, audiences in mid-19\textsuperscript{th} Century London had survived the era of the Romantic hero thus begging the question: what place does a hero - if that is what David will end up being - have in a mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century, realist novel?

In this introduction, Dickens plays with the tension between the mythic mode (more appropriate to earlier Romantic texts and readerly sensibilities) and the realist depiction and exploration of life. Certainly, David is an individual whose origins echo with the potentiality of the mythic: he was born at the exact stroke of midnight, on a Friday, etc. But the presentation of these facts is performed in a straightforward manner that complicates their interpretation. From his rhetorical questioning of his role in his own life to the presentation of the basic facts of his birth, this paragraph certainly deals with both a life’s greatest uncertainty and its most basic unknowable facts. Some critics have situated David with other “determinedly unheroic” protagonists such as Jane Eyre and Arthur Pendennis, all of whom “call into question conventional notions of literary ‘heroism’” (Herst “David Copperfield and the Emergence of the Homeless Hero” 40). Individuals are certainly all born but lack the conscious memories which would potentially enable them to recall one of life’s universally shared experiences: its beginning. In this paragraph, David’s straightforward prose almost fully conceals the fact he and his text

\textsuperscript{33} Although, as shown in Chapter II, the trajectory for the two and even the understanding of the Bildungsroman protagonist itself are linked in terms of their literary history and mutual development.
will consider some of the life’s greatest questions.

David presents himself as a type of negotiation with the Romantic selves that characterized earlier British and Bildungsroman texts. He may end up being a hero-type (and certainly that debate provides a theme or at least an undercurrent that exists within this novel) but if so he is one characterized by an uncertainty of existence and clarity of experience dissimilar from the dramatized heroes that would have acted as his literary and aesthetic forbearers.\(^\text{34}\)

Perhaps, David is negotiating his a modern sense of self relative to the pre-existing, romanticized narrative of self that exists in earlier literary works. He must experience himself within his own context and the paradigm of the hero may or may not serve as a way in which he can make sense of the self he finds, the society that contextualizes it and the modernity with which he must contend. This then becomes the context that frames his development, at times limiting, at times challenging but at all times providing the backdrop against which his journey of self-formation must take place.

In the Bildungsroman, the earliest stages of the main character’s development are often replete with potential limitations that certainly would hinder if not fully impede the progress of a lesser person. The early chapters of *David Copperfield* demonstrate clearly many such challenges. Certainly the biographical details of David’s life are woven together in such a way as to appear as both trials to and motivations for his development. As mentioned previously, this is often done through the interruptions by “the adult narrator… [who] interrupts his story as to emphasize from the outset the lasting ‘inheritance’ of this phase of childhood” (Morris 68). In

considering the biographical details and early childhood experiences of young Copperfield, it is interesting to note the way they constantly allow for dual readings. Just as David negotiates the terms of existence for himself as a realist protagonist in a society informed by romantic understandings of heroism, so the details of his life demonstrate an equivalent balance of societal forces and instances of individual (albeit very youthful) agency.

In the first chapter of the novel, Dickens presents the facts of David’s birth as a type of biographical hearsay – in the fashion fitting young children. As mentioned previously, Dickens hooks his reader through the dialectical tension David’s rhetorical musings on the realities of his life and the somewhat mythical occurrences that framed its beginning. This first chapter thus contains events David would have had no consciousness of – his birth at midnight, his mother’s general mental and physical weakness, the presence of his paternal aunt – the inimitable Miss Betsey, the frenzied doctor, etc. Interestingly, these colorful, initial stories are told quite simply and seem straightforward and unchallengeable while simultaneously representative of a “retrospective search for meaning” (Golden 88). This contrasts almost completely with the narrative shift of the second chapter in which David’s young consciousness begins to emerge. The second chapter presents things as David remembers them and characterizes them through sensorial descriptions of color, shape and size. The challenge here is that the entire book is a work of memory – an older David is writing this story as he remembers it. As such, even though he may remember experiencing certain events in such a way when he was a child by the time he has reached adulthood with the requisite communication and storytelling skills it is nearly impossible for his more mature understandings not to inform his prose when recalling even his first memories. Thus, the recalling of his first memories of place is characterized by colors and sensations while his remembrances of people, and specifically his mother and Peggotty, their
servant, are informed by his later experiences of them. To clarify, at the beginning of Chapter II (entitled importantly “I Observe”), David states “the first objects to assume a distinct presence… as I look far bank into the blank of my infancy, are my mother with her pretty hair and youthful shape, and Peggotty with no shape at all…”(24). His memory has thus objectified the first elements (in this case people) active within it. As objects, David characterizes the people by their formal iterations thus the older, narrating David introduces subjective and relative understandings into his perception of his primary caretakers.\(^{35}\) His mother is described without color but rather generally in terms of her “pretty hair and youthful face” and thus is at least initially almost impossible to picture due to a lack of identifying details. However, if David’s mother is characterized now by her physical and mental weakness (as presented in chapter 1) and her lack of describable or at least communicable traits then Peggotty, as her inverse is constructed through the absence of shape or color. In describing Peggotty as having “no shape at all” the character not only contrasts completely with David’s mother is presented from the very beginning as an ungendered object.\(^{36}\) Here however, Charles Dickens is not necessarily attempting to create a misogynist picture of a matriarchal homestead but is in fact performing a much more complicated rhetorical act. He is attempting to demonstrate through his literature the inherent instability of human memory. This part of the novel thus becomes a crucial rhetorical act in the construction of the Bildungsroman as it underscores the subjectivity inherent in the

\(^{35}\) A great deal of scholarship exists that demonstrates the objectification and infantilization of Dora, David’s “child-wife,” but, curiously, few texts discuss similar strategies of objectification with his mother and Peggotty in these initial chapters despite their clear presence in the rhetoric David uses to introduce these characters.

\(^{36}\) It is perhaps because of this objectification and separation of Peggotty, who will emerge as the “true mother” for David that critics such as Patricia Ingham can clearly delineate between legal or birth mothers and “true mothers.” She notes “the legal status of wife and mother, then, is seen as a disqualification for ‘true’ motherhood; and the same point is made about the physical act of producing offspring” (Ingham 117). Here a nuance of Victorian culture – the inability to link sex acts with family – appears as a subtle element of David’s own life.
Bildungsroman novel. Dickens certainly clarifies the problem a few lines into the second chapter when he has David mention that his memory of a specific moment “may be fancy” but that, in David’s opinion, some young children have a excellent observational skills that ultimately allow them to engage with their memories without losing the childlike wonder with which they first experienced the world (24). Here, subjectivity is underscored and more importantly linked to an individual’s early childhood. Young David may lack the ability to editorialize the events of this epoch of his but elder David can and will eventually fill in some of the blanks.

By engaging with his early life as a narrative and now, through his writing of it, as a text, the adult, writer David can pick and choose not only the experiences he would have his reader know but the way he presents them as part of his journey of development and in the process highlights the “necessity of a fictionalizing project” in writing “from memory” (Loschnigg 297). He attempts to present things in what appears to be a chronological order of his recall – starting with the shapes of his mother and Peggoty, both of which it should be noted do gain in graphic definition and clarity as David grows – but also through his interactions with space. Space and society in the early chapters of David’s Bildungsroman are very much linked. David is born into an untraditional, yet not unfamiliar (for 19th century readers), family order. The majority of the first two chapters in his book deal with the matriarchal social and spatial home into which David is born. The realities of this are presented (again through hearsay) in Chapter 1 where David’s weak mother, the subservient and ever loyal Peggoty and the indomitable Miss Betsey provide the key defining characters. Certainly, men are around but even the doctor who delivers David lacks authority and even appears scared of Miss Betsey. Thus, David is born to a chaotic, women-centered society. It is thus natural that his first memories would be of the women (As
mentioned above) and the house in which they lived. The audience learns early on that David’s father died months prior to his birth and only a few details of his life are made known to David. Thus the space of men, at least very early in David’s life, is entirely outside the home. It is key that the second and third physical locations that David remembers are those characterized by male presences - specifically, the graveyard where his father is buried and the church where David’s mother eventually meets the cruel Mr. Murdstone (26-28). Of these spaces, David’s memory of the graveyard is tinted with vivid colors and sensations that connect it to the supernatural, a linkage that emerges when he describes it saying “There is nothing half so green that I know anywhere, as the grass of that churchyard; nothing half so shady as its trees; nothing half so quiet as its tombstones” (26). Despite containing the most sensorially vivid descriptors, the one paragraph that briefly describes the resting-place of his father is almost entirely devoid of human contact with the exception of David’s narration. As such, this paragraph contrasts specifically and directly with the subsequent examination of the space of the church. The church setting is most directly characterized as masculine through the interplay of the male characters therein. The nameless clergyman and youthful parishioner are juxtaposed with the genderless Peggotty. David’s mother passes briefly as a shadow against this backdrop of austere masculinity. It is thus fitting that she meets Mr. Murdstone within the institutional confines of the church and later brings the institution home through her marriage to him.

From the beginning of his tale, David’s tale is replete with social limitations. As he begins to understand his own place in his life, he thus always posits himself both rhetorically and through representation actually in relation to the people in his society and the spaces in which they interact. The book’s initial section demonstrates clearly his subjective experience of both the individuals within his life and the spaces in which they interact. Gender, class, profession
and social structures (which at this point in the novel consists of the interaction of power dynamics between the previously mentioned categories) certainly exist and the elder narrating David is aware of the interplay between these things. Certainly, David spends the majority of the first two chapters within the context of a matriarchal society, however flawed that society might be it was one that he experienced comfortably and lovingly. However, as Mr. Murdstone enters the story, he preys upon the weaknesses of that social structure – namely David’s mother’s mental, emotional and physical insecurities and Peggotty’s subservient social position that disallows her to protest in any real way. As such, the introduction of Mr. Murdstone functions as the imposition of a new male-centric power structure in the lives of the Copperfield family so as to establish a strong, unified and somewhat sexualized idea of masculinity which David will eventually reject (Crawford 163). Certainly, even in the best of scenarios, such a drastic social change in the life of a young child would invite some level of discomfort; however, Murdstone’s cruelty invites and provokes David’s entire refusal to accept the new social order imposed upon his life. The beginning of David’s life is demonstrated as less than ideal for the development of David but rather characterized by the harsh realities of not one but two less than ideal social structures. David must then leave home not only in the physical sense but, as he will learn later, in a much more philosophically profound way since the power structures that framed his earliest moments were such obvious and abysmal failures.

Ernesto: The Fragmented Self and Collective Identities

Scholars of Latin American literature widely acknowledge Arguedas’ *Los ríos profundos*’ importance as “un libro mayor” or even “una obra maestro”37 in contemporary regional literature for a variety of reasons (Larco 11; Ribyero 67). It has been lauded for: attempting to bridge the

37 Trans: Great book/Master work
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cultural gap between mainstream and indigenous cultures (Vargas Llosa “Afterward” 235-237), bilingual and cultural practices (Rama 241-245), simultaneously mythological and realist approaches to literature (Merino 158) and even in readings of feminism and gender in Latin American literature (Castro-Klaren “Crimen y Castigo”). Like many of Arguedas’ works, Los ríos profundos defies easy definition or categorization despite containing a variety of important cultural themes. More recently, books by Julia Kushigan and Yoland Doub have attempted to read the Bildungsroman canon and have thus discovered a reappropriation of the European form in Los ríos profundos as a clear work of Latin American Bildungsroman. These two books added greatly to understandings of the literary form’s Latin American iteration. However, because both books attempt to look past or through individual works of Bildungsroman to view broader themes of culture and gender (Kushigan) and the importance of travel in Bildungsroman (Doub), Los ríos profundos has the misfortune of appearing as something of a pit stop in these authors’ journeys to other discussions. As such, Arguedas’ Bildungsroman has still failed to receive the concentrated critical scholarship due to such a complex, hybridic form. Comparing and contrasting Arguedas’ book with Dickens’ demonstrates how both authors attempt to subvert the challenges within their own cultures while negotiating understandings of self and society.

In contrast to the clear introduction of David as a unified, albeit occasionally problematized narrator, José María Arguedas presents Los ríos profundos’ Ernesto in a much more fragmented way. Like David, Ernesto will provide the first-person perspective and the narrative “I” through which the novel’s subjectively understood events will be presented. In the

---

38 Doub’s exploration of Los ríos profundos is particularly well structured and certainly incorporates much of the scholarship available about the book. However, it is curious that in her book on the importance of travel in Peruvian narrative, she chooses to focus so intently on the period in which Ernesto is most stable and pays somewhat less attention to the time he spends on the road.
first paragraphs of the book, Ernesto emerges as a rhetorical complexity rather than a fully formed and functioning narrator. As a narrator, he reveals his name and other pertinent biographical details slowly and only after introducing other key characters and social constructs within and against which he interacts. This dynamic is further complicated as the narrator negotiates between two cultural paradigms: the class-based reality that prepares him for life as a gentleman and the indigenous reality that prepares him for life in opposition to the suppressive forces. Larco notes that because of this duality, there is a constant instability of perspective in Arguedas: “[el] sentía como indio, pero sentía acaso con igual fuerza la distancia que lo separaba del indio” (Larco “Prólogo” 9). As a result of this rhetorical decision, Ernesto appears as a much more fragmentary character relative to his British counterpart and it is Ernesto’s unstable definition or acknowledgement of a unique self in some ways mirrors the social instabilities that he encounters. While David’s narrative attempts to obscure elements that could allow readers to question his reliability as a narrator (particularly his discussion of events of which he could have no actual knowledge), Ernesto’s fragmentary perspective is highlighted throughout his narrative. David and Ernesto fight the temporal disconnect that separates the narrators’ present from the things they describe. In both cases, the narrators presumably understand the importance of the specific incidents they present as part of a larger and completed story, and thus, they structure their stories chronologically while allowing for sporadic interruptions of the time flow.

39 He felt like an Indian, but he also felt with equal force the distance that separated him from the Indian. (LGJ)

40 Arguedas’ use of fragmentation in the presentation of Ernesto’s story earned him sharp criticism from Mario Vargas Llosa, who at one point noted what he believed to be structural flaws in Arguedas’ Rio profundos and particularly a shift from the first to the third person in Chapter 5 and in other descriptive passages. In comparing Ernesto to other Bildungsroman protagonists with penchants for description, this critique bears little accuracy as the most observant of such protagonists sometimes drift to less personal, observational perspectives that allow them to represent their surroundings without needing to utilize personal pronouns to do so.
Understanding the use of interruption in Ernesto’s Bildungsroman contextualizes the introduction of Ernesto himself. Ernesto uses the personal pronoun marking the first-person speaker in the book’s third paragraph only after presenting two other characters that function as human interruptions for his own personal developments. The audience first meets Ernesto’s uncle, who is understood to be a rich landowner from Cuzco. The reader learns a great deal about this uncle’s appearance, life and social interactions, which are of essential to the chapter titled “El Viejo.”

This paragraph presents these details through a third person viewpoint that subjectively colors the audience’s perceptions of the character. For example, the chapter begins by stating “Infundía respeto, a pesar de su anticuada y sucia apariencia. Las personas principales del Cuzco lo saludaban seriamente” (203). Later, once the first-person perspective emerges, the latent subjectivity and opinions contained within this passage may be connected to the perceptions and understandings of the narrator. Initially, however, the subject of the paragraph and, indeed, the chapter itself is an individual who is presented with subtle negativity. Arguedas manipulates the subjectivity through his syntactical choices in connecting the character with the qualifying adjectives of “anticuada y sucia” and through his description of the man’s social interactions. Thus, already in the initial paragraph, the narrative suggests the element of tension – “linguistic, political, economic – which, with the weight of history, steeps the novel in conflict” (Kushigan 137).

The text’s second paragraph introduces Ernesto’s father and contains subtle allusions to the existence of a first person narrator. After introducing “El Viejo,” Ernesto immediately

---

41 The Old Man (LGJ)

42 He inspired respect, in spite of his old-fashioned and dirty appearance. The important people of Cuzco greeted him courteously. (FB)

43 Antiquated and dirty. (LGJ)
provides his father’s subjective understanding of him: “Mi padre lo odiaba.” With this simple statement, the audience gains a vast amount of pertinent information. First, someone narrates or will narrate the impending tale. Even though the speaker has yet to be identified and the text has yet to utilize verbs containing or conveying the personal voice, the use of the possessive pronoun alludes to the existence of some principal voice. Additionally, from this sentence, the father emerges as a character of some importance to the tale: he is a principal player in a social, cultural and philosophical, conflict.

The presentation of the first chapter’s key characters highlights the prevailing social structure in which Ernesto exists. Through the narrator’s presentation of these characters, the audience comes to see his understanding of the conflict and its broader social implications. Moreover, both the father and the uncle emerge as polarizing figures within Ernesto’s young life, at least over the course of the book’s first chapter. These principal figures emerge as opposed in their physical appearances and in their entire worldview – a matter of no little importance in a work of Bildungsroman. Here the audience is introduced to two men who have the potential to serve as the model of adulthood and masculinity for Ernesto, but neither man’s life yet serves as a complete, imitable example for the boy. At the same time, while his father fails to act as a role model, it should be noted that Ernesto’s respect and admiration for his father rarely waivers. The conflict between these two characters drives the plot within the first chapter and creates a dialectical tension representative of broader Peruvian debates regarding social values and cultural norms (Kushigan 137-138).

Ernesto’s uncle is rich, although he does not dress the part. He owns land outside of the city and a large house in Cuzco, replete with tenants and servants who manage his estate. The

---

44 My father hated him. (LGJ)
uncle is acknowledged, if not respected, by the city’s religious officials, who cannot avoid noticing his piety as he conspicuously kneels at every church door (203, 211). At home, however, he is stingy even with his relatives. He demonstrates this parsimony by relegating Ernesto and his father to second-rate accommodations and remaining highly ignorant of the plight of his workers, the indigenous pongos – field workers brought to the city by the landowners to work for a year without wages (205). In contrast, Ernesto’s father is a clerk and traveling lawyer. He lacks the extreme wealth of the uncle and, more importantly, the social stability that a home (or homes, in the case of the uncle) potentially provides. In context of the city of Cuzco, the father is known only by his son, but in his son’s representation, he emerges as a man of integrity who refuses to sleep in the bed provided by the uncle because of the insult inherent in the offering of sub-par accommodations to one’s relatives. Furthermore, perhaps because of his lack of land or maybe because of a more reticent personality, Ernesto’s father appears as a much less conspicuous and even less defined a character, compared to both the uncle and, increasingly, his own son.

Over the course of the initial chapter, Ernesto emerges as a sensitive narrator who is a part of a larger yet internally inharmonious social structure characterized by the disagreement between his father and his uncle. This conflict drives the tension of the chapter, but the intra-class skirmish and debate surrounding it inherently excludes many members of the society, as Ernesto’s own perspective demonstrates. Ernesto, like the uncle’s servants, is most often to be found following first his father and then his uncle and his father around Cuzco (Ortega 52). As such, he is relegated to a physical, if not a social, space occupied by the uncle’s nameless servants. This fact does not bother Ernesto so much but allows him the space and time to observe the social interactions among his uncle, his father, the Cusquenian society and the
broader city of Cuzco. His observational prowess will guide his exploration of his own society over the course of the book and allow him to evolve somewhat radically as a self and a member of his own society. These observational and intuitive skills are fundamental to the boy’s character and are developed and practiced throughout this book. Ernesto is far more interested in representing his social milieu than he is in presenting the key details of his own life. It takes three paragraphs for him to introduce himself as a fully separate individual, and even when he does finally utter the “I” that represents a unique individual, he must do so in the context of his social structure. His rhetorical introduction of himself thus allows for a variety of readings. On one hand, he presents himself in a social trajectory from the most external (a hated, distant relative) through an intermediary (a respected, if distant, father with whom he shares a complex and highly nuanced relationship) to the self with its own perspectives, sensibilities and concern.

The absence, at least initially, of key facts that define a traditional narrator such as David Copperfield appears somewhat vexing in *Los ríos profundos*, because it generally operates from a straightforward narrative mode, especially compared to José María Arguedas’ other books in which narrative fragmentation allows for the presentation of many characters’ and even social groups’ perceptions and concerns. This narrative approach generally serves José María Arguedas quite well, enabling him to present a variety of information and perspectives without sacrificing plot development. Thus, in contrast to his other books and particularly *Yawar Fiesta* and *Zorro de arriba*, the decision to utilize a first-person narrator here allows him to establish a more unified perception although whether he can sustain the choice without sacrificing the opportunity to incorporate a plurality of perspectives and events remains to be seen. Nonetheless, certain details about the narrator do rise to the surface: he is 14 years old at the beginning of the story, he has had a difficult childhood separated from his family and now travels at least temporarily
with his father. He, like David Copperfield specifically and Bildungsromane protagonists more generally, retains the personal capacity to observe and report the things that happen to him in highly analytical and personal ways. For both narrators, this capacity for observation enables them to present stories of their personal evolution while simultaneously representing the social structures or milieu in which the affairs within the stories occur. For Ernesto, the self is negotiated initially against the paradigm of an interpersonal conflict between his father and uncle. Ernesto’s own sensibility regarding his relationship to his uncle initially is certainly prejudiced by his father’s dislike of the uncle but is quickly fortified by Ernesto’s own observations on the uncle’s treatment of him and his father, the servants and other members of the community.

Despite only spending a short period of time in the large city of Cuzco, Ernesto observes his surroundings intelligently and enthusiastically. He derives the terms and manner of looking at the city from a variety of sources and understandings and cites them accordingly. His father grew up in Cuzco and over the course of their travels told his son about the city and “los palacios y templos, y de las plazas…” so that the stories of stationary, urban Cuzco became ingrained in his childhood journeys. He also observes, sometimes directly and sometimes tangentially, the city’s historical connotations. Ernesto had clearly learned of the Inca who had established and inhabited the city as their capital before the Spanish conquest of Latin America in the 15th and 16th centuries. He demonstrates his understanding of this element of the city’s history in his description of both indigenous sites and Spanish or colonial spaces as well.

One important cultural factor that Ernesto considers emerges in his description of the Inca walls. In Cuzco, many of the colonial residences as well as religious and political buildings built by the Spaniards during the period of colonial rule were built on top of destroyed Incan buildings and integrate the remaining parts (the lowest walls) into the architecture of the colonial
project. The city as a colonial project thus rests on the stones crafted by the Inca. For Ernesto, his understanding of this concept infuses his exploration of the space itself. He cannot wait to walk down the streets looking at lower walls for their value outside of the colonial project. While at one point his father notes that the Spanish certainly needed the stones made by the Inca, in fact the practicality of such a statement is lost in Ernesto’s highly personal and spiritual connection to the city itself. For him, in one particularly compelling passage, the walls speak. The stones are each alive, with their own meaning and history and Ernesto begins to feel a highly personal and poignant relationship with the space. He notes that his father, who is walking with him, has no idea about the overwhelming spiritual encounter his son is having. In another episode of that chapter, Ernesto leaves Cuzco’s impressive main cathedral only to be awestruck by the terrace (built of Incan rock) and is moved to pray. Ernesto thus emerges from the text in a manner quite similar to David – he is highly aware of the realities of his life and the social structures that frame it but he is simultaneously drawn to consider and explore a mythical side of life in a way that is highly personal and distinctly his. In the end however, Ernesto is only a tourist passing, briefly, through Cuzco. While he has spiritual moments, none of them are strong enough to compel him to stay in that city. “Cuzco” as Doub points out “… has changed irrevocably since the Conquest and provides no refuge for the boy, whose task will then be to find a center for himself” (Doub 46).

**Unstable Social Structures**

At the beginning of both novels, the protagonists establish themselves within their own societies. They appear as sensitive, observant young men. Both narrators acknowledge, if only tacitly, the temporal gap between an event which they present and the moment of the telling. Thus in both texts the initial chapters establish a narrative foundation in terms of both the style of telling (and
the difficulties inherent to the first-person account of details), the personal traits of the characters that will, ultimately, allow them to become integrated yet leading members of their societies and finally the initial challenges against which they must react.

David’s social situation deteriorates over the course of the second chapter of his book and leading up to his mother’s marriage to Mr. Murdstone. Dickens utilizes dramatic irony and a particular sort of mythical trope while he manipulates the situation so that the audience receives hints of Murdstone’s character before it reveals itself to Mrs. Copperfield (Chesterton C. XII). One day, before the marriage, Murdstone takes David on an outing. After selling her on the idea, Murdstone rides off with David who had doubted his character initially but whose interest in boats encouraged him to go. Murdstone changes the destination however and ends up taking David to a pub where his friends and he share many laughs at David’s expense and discuss his mother in negative terms. The theme of knowing and not knowing emerges strongly here in a place of tall, “somber” and malevolent giants (Chesterton C. XII). David establishes himself in opposition to Murdstone early on but, throughout this one adventure, must talk about jokes and innuendos that would go over the head of a young person. Dickens allows David to be ignorant of the meaning of the jokes but highly sensitive to the implications of people laughing at him. Almost from his introduction, therefore, Murdstone emerges as the type of person who lies, misrepresents, laughs at others’ expense, etc. Intellectually he is certainly capable of strategic thought in his wooing of Mrs. Copperfield but also in his wit and debauchery at David’s expense. All of these elements underscore the relationship between David and his step-father-to-be. Moreover they provide the elements against which David must rebel and the challenge that he must overcome over the course of the novel. The challenge of overcoming a bad childhood is thus established as a key trope for the novel.
Ernesto understands his childhood in a more complex manner relative to David and certainly one reason for this could be his more advanced age at the beginning of the novel. Even at the novel’s outset, the audience learns that Ernesto had undergone hardships at the hands of family members who relegated him to the kitchen. Moreover, despite traveling with his father early on in the book it is also made very apparent that his father’s work has often separated him from Ernesto and thus Ernesto is somehow profoundly disconnected with his father. It is perhaps this deeper and more profound disconnection that enables him to connect with the Quechua speaking servants whose songs, vocabulary and worldview shape Ernesto’s story. On a more fundamental level, before the story Ernesto has proven capable of surviving challenging situations and emerging as a stronger and more intelligent individual afterwards. Arguedas utilizes Ernesto’s prior knowledge and difficult life experiences to justify his character’s knowledge of Quechua as well as indigenous customs. As such, the author allows these early experiences to engrain themselves within Ernesto’s character. Thus, as a somewhat more traditional Bildungsroman protagonist, the difficulties of his early life provide him the tools for later character formation in such a way as to ultimately determine his connection to society, although even by the end this process remains incomplete as Ernesto never finds a way to balance or “come to terms” with this duality (Spitta 149-151). Finally, Ernesto’s relationship with his father is complicated by several factors. It is obvious from the introduction that Ernesto sides with his father and presents to the reader his father’s opinion of the old man, which he later justifies through his own relationship with his uncle. However, his relationship with his father cannot be characterized as very warm or giving either as he is characterized by his bad temper towards the uncle and his disconnect from Ernesto. Even though he has clearly influenced Ernesto’s life and has in the past told him stories of Cuzco, when Ernesto engages with the city
himself his father fails to notice his son’s strong relationship with the city or personal development while he is there. He thus seems distracted and almost uncaring about the plight of his son. Certainly, this tale lacks the physical abuse that David suffered at the hands of his stepfather but Ernesto too lacks a strong, caring father figure and thus his own rebellion – necessary to the development of a Bildungsroman plot – also depends upon the initial rejection of the paternal paradigm and its accompanying value system characterized by distraction and indifference.

**Away to School**

Both protagonists begin their books in precarious situations. They live on distinct edges of their own society both geographically and socially. *David Copperfield* begins in a household displaced somewhat from both the town and whatever larger society it could provide. His mother’s status as a widow separates her, David and, assumedly, Peggoty from interacting easily with other members of their immediate society. This disconnect is highlighted in the only social scene before Murdstone’s arrival, a scene that occurs in a church wherein David’s isolation from other children his own age is highlighted as he interacts with an antagonistic boy around his own age. *David Copperfield’s* initial setting is thus more pastoral than social. The isolation of childhood and rural society allows for a tranquil opening to the book, which is quickly marred by the presence of an increasingly aggressive figure in Murdstone. In contrast, *Los ríos profundos* begins in an important Peruvian urban center; however, Ernesto engages with this space as a well-informed tourist. The conflict between his land-owning uncle and his itinerant father highlights one aspect of Ernesto’s socially precarious position: the tenuous state of his biological family within Peruvian society. However, as Ernesto acutely observes his surroundings, his gaze picks up many aspects of his society’s biculturality – the same aspects that balance precariously
throughout the text and in actual Peruvian society. The intermixing of social groups in culturally
significant physical locations whose meanings differ depending upon the social group
considering them. Cuzco, like Ernesto’s family, is on edge, built upon different social values
that intermix with the potential to erupt.

Separation from family provides an important element of the Bildungsroman as it allows
for and encourages the protagonist’s development free of paternal interference, which generally
acts as the first of many barriers to the young man’s ability to independently achieve personal
development of any real sort. The first part of the Bildungsroman cycle for young protagonists
most often demonstrates simultaneously his capacity for self-analysis, observational acumen and
intellectual but more importantly social potential while developing its portrayal of the challenges
in his immediate social circle which is often figured in the character of the father. Escape
becomes necessary. Events then transpire that force the young man out into the world. For some
Bildungsroman, this expulsion routes the child to a workplace or an apprenticeship of some sort.
In many others however the immediate or at least more-permanent destination for the exiled
youth involves a boarding school.

In the Bildungsroman, boarding schools serve a wide variety of functions. First, they are
institutions in which social power dynamics are clearly delineated. On one level, each school
has its own established hierarchy of staff. The head of the school is often somehow removed
from the institution itself. He is often an individual with interests outside the school that take or
keep him away for long stretches of time. His presence is nonetheless essential and often
presented in terms of extremes: he may be extremely cruel, kind, rich, disinterested, moral, etc.
Teachers often provide the next, more present characters in this power structure. Certainly,
teachers interact more frequently with their students than do administrative officials; however,
they are often characterized as the opposite of the administrative staff. For example, a cruel teacher is countered by a benevolent benefactor or vice versa. Additional staff members may also interact with the students but they rarely play critical roles. The formal power structure of the boarding school as an institution generally emerges quite quickly once the protagonist finds himself away at school. Additionally, within the physical confines of the boarding school, less formal social groups exist. At first glance or upon the protagonist’s first awareness of these groups, they appear as little more than the common social cliques of children. However, they actually bear much greater significance in the lives of the characters, the plots of the books and most importantly in the way these microcosmic representations of the broader society invoke the national constitutions and values in which the boarding school exists. To this ends, it is important to note that the groups usually pre-date the protagonist’s presence within the boarding school. The protagonist engages with them though often, at least initially, as a social outcast, a position from which he observes the dynamics of the groups. He often picks out the social leader with little hesitation, the weakest member of the group next, and so forth. The protagonist’s understanding of the boarding school is determined and most often characterized by his interaction with his own peers. Friendships, rivalries, games and arguments reveal pertinent social dynamics. These events further the plot and permit the protagonist’s perspective to sharpen and expand. Moreover, and most interesting is the way that these social groups mirror the national society external to the school. While the school often appears as a somewhat isolated physical location, each of the students comes into it with a certain amount of social prestige or baggage. Even in boarding schools attended by poorest of citizens, the slight elevation of a child because of his family background permits him to claim a certain level of social prestige. Class and access to even a few physical resources including money, food, books,
chalkboards, toys, etc. serve to differentiate the students in terms of their social class outside of the school. In later Bildungsromane and even within some 19th century examples, race, gender and even sexuality further complicate social interactions. Even the dullest of pupils in these schools often has the chance to demonstrate his or (eventually) her understanding of such distinctions and the normative social rules they dictate.

A second key aspect of the board school emerges in the consideration of the schools as somewhat closed, mini-universes. Especially in the 19th Century Bildungsromane, the boarding school appears as a sort of prison, a physical building or compound in which the students must remain with only occasional days of freedom or visits home (which as we remember is generally not a vacation but a period in which the characters’ development is highlighted in contrast to their family’s sameness). While going to school itself often provides a much-needed escape for the protagonist, the institution is largely dichotomous with the home space. Austere, walled, cold schools contrast directly with a more romantic, idyllic or pastoral home. Nonetheless, whether the family is rich, poor or somewhere in between, the intellectual and social rigidity therein makes school a necessary and interesting escape for Bildungsromane protagonists. The schools are often located in or on the periphery of cities. The bustling society external to the school often contrasts with the rigid and well-understood social structures (both formal and informal) within it. In this way, especially in the 19th century, boarding schools appear as isolated islands in ambiguously broad social seas. They may be seen as protecting their young inhabitants from the threatening crowds that terrorized 19th century society. In 20th century works, children often leave the institution more frequently but, generally, such outings serve most directly to establish or further the construction of the boarding school as a rigid institution.
containing a representative portion of the population.\footnote{This is particularly the case in 20\textsuperscript{th} century Bildungsromane that are set, even temporarily, in boarding schools such as J.D. Salinger’s \textit{Catcher in the Rye}.} Through such contrasts, the boarding school and the local or national government begin to bare certain structural similarities just as the social group within the school reflects the organization of social classes outside the walls of the school.

Finally, boarding schools initially provide the protagonists a new landscape to consider replete with their own challenges. Due to their keen observational prowess, the boarding school (and even the journey to it) presents a new setting to the young men that must be described in detail and in an organized manner. Classrooms, dining rooms, dormitories or bedrooms and play areas are quickly established and described. These settings are established quickly so that they may provide the backdrop against which the human drama and constant negotiation of social status may be negotiated. Specifically, the classroom(s), dining room and the chapel (when present) act as spaces in which the formal power structure of the school dominates – although the informal never disappears. Classroom pranks and debates allow the exterior, informal relationships surface, often negatively, in a formal setting. The protagonist often spends a great deal of time describing these settings as part of his framing of the social structures that occur within them. Spatial differentiations allow provide delineations between the formal structure of the school system and the informal social hierarchies with which the students must contend. Often one or both of these systems continues to work antagonistically to the protagonist’s happiness and even mental health. The introduction of the character to the boarding school ranges from the inconspicuous to the cruel allowing him the opportunity to observe his surroundings subjectively.

Within the Bildungsroman, the protagonist often engages with the boarding school during
a key phase of his development. As he moves from the socially constructed institution of the family to the institutionalized space of education, his separation from the previous familial constraints permits him a certain level of intellectual freedom; yet he often does so in relative isolation. In a way, even when socializing within the boarding school, the protagonist is disconnected – he is in an isolated space within a city and cut off from his actual family. At some point during his formal education, he may return home or gain exposure to the external society. This often happens when school has become particularly unbearable or a family event or emergency has called him home. Movement between spaces then allows him time and context to reflect upon his growth and progress up to that point. He then often returns to the boarding school where he eventually masters the social politics of his scholastically based society. During this process, he often assimilates and takes on the social values espoused by the institution. While such lessons and values are rarely treated explicitly in the novels, they are assumed to propel him toward his later external successes as he is, upon graduation, a gentleman prepared for some sort of societal leadership.

Finally, it should be noted that formal education – a process through which an individual gains the vskills, such as knowledge of reading, mathematics, history and so forth, necessary to functioning within society – provides only a minor theme of the Bildungsroman. Certainly, self-cultivation requires literacy but the authors of these books are often much more interested in cultural competence, integration and a more subtle sense of cultural literacy. The authors may discuss lessons relating to these values; however, the institutions’ pedagogical approaches actually receive considerably little attention in these books. Formal education and the (often) rigid institution that provides it may be read in these books as assumptions. The reader presumes that children will be learning writing, math, and so on. In this way, the separation between the
formal and the informal in these works mirrors the break between the state and society. State provides a context, a structure and an assumed framework within which society exists. The boarding school acts as a prototype of the “protective shell” (to borrow Kant’s metaphor) that certainly could limit a society but most often is ignored or accepted under the guise of social stability and often-national myth.

*David Copperfield* and *Los ríos profundos* provide examples of Bildungsromane in which the boarding school functions traditionally. In both books studied here, it is established in the reader’s mind as an educating and therefore normalizing institution and as a solution to specific difficulties that the protagonist and/or his family faces. For both children, the boarding school provides a certain stability that was lacking in their private lives with their own families. In examining the role of the boarding school in both texts it is crucial to examine at least briefly the pre-boarding or even the pre-formal education phase of the protagonists’ lives as it is out of this prior phase, often characterized by instability and even abuse, that the boarding school emerges. Examining the school and the way in which each text demonstrates it as a new highly structured yet largely social space, demonstrates how formal and informal school and social structures frame the lives of the children. Moreover, they do so in such a way as to require these young men to act with, through or against the institution during their school days and even later in their lives.

*David Goes to School*

As demonstrated previously, David begins his life in a largely maternal and pastoral village on the periphery of English society. Even the tranquil, quasi-idyllic setting of the first two chapters of the novel contains hints of underlying social troubles and inequalities. For example, while David is too young to remember the details presented within the first chapter (C. 1 “I am Born”)
and admits an initial fault in his own memory in the second (C. 2 “I Observe”), the elder narrating David fills in certain blanks specifically relegating the otherwise highly-admirable character of Peggotty the housekeeper to an ungendered existence in the servant class while elevating his mother because of her gentility and meekness. The strength and ungendering of one particular character contrasts nearly completely with the perceived “weakness” or resignation and feminization of the other while both females must ultimately negotiate a difficult existence under the Murdstones’ tyranny. David subtly creates a binary of power between the women that welds these characteristics firmly in his introduction of them. Much scholarship and even readerly interest glosses this initial issue as it is quickly replaced by a more existential and violent threat to David particularly but, in a subtler way and ultimately more fatally, to his mother and their home.

David’s life is characterized by instability even before his birth. As incidents transpire throughout his childhood and specifically before he leaves for school, David becomes increasingly nostalgic for his dead father, ultimately finding solace in his deceased father’s escapist adventure books. Biological family may be further understood as unstable in the initial chapter when David’s dynamic Aunt Betsey storms out of the house after he has the audacity to be born male. His mother is initially described as feminine and terrified: of her upcoming motherhood, her own servant, her sister-in-law and so forth. Even with biological family members there is, at least initially, no firm relationship to be counted upon either due to the death, absence or weakness of individuals who could potentially act as support for young David. A subsequent and underexamined element of instability in David’s life is class-based. Certainly,

46 Tambling suggests that “guilt” functions in several of Dickens’ texts to “[make] the ego side with the patriarchy, so that for the male it enforces masculinity” (Tambling 41). This manipulation of guilt also subjects women to supporting the paradigm as they too are indicted in the violence that occurs within the household despite the fact that they, too, are its victims.
due to the death of David’s father, his mother and Peggotty are left to run the household by themselves. This allows the two women to develop a much closer relationship than tradition would dictate between women in the social relationship of employer to employee. This provides one example in which Dickens demonstrates the potential of allegiance between the classes but it simultaneously allows for continued instability in David’s life. David is frequently confused in the second chapter and onwards about how to relate to Peggotty, and his initial reading of her as an ungendered character certainly propels this confusion. However, like his mother he shares a warm and close relationship with Peggotty. Somewhat ironically it is this relationship with Peggotty, and later with her family, that propels him to travel within England to visit them at various points of the novel. This second instability, or the instability of class, is never fully fixed in the story, as David “never feels certain that he belongs among gentle[man]… [and] fears that servants other social inferiors can see through his pretenses to that estate” (Bossche 174).

Neither of these earlier instabilities really threaten David’s potential for a healthy and happy childhood. However, with the introduction of the Murdstones and the imposition of a rigid, male, hierarchical social structure in his home life, David is placed in an almost life-threatening situation. Thus, the instability in David’s life that the boarding school corrects exists most notably and most directly in the figures of the diabolic Mr. Murdstone and his equally if not more sociopathic sister, Jane. Even during his courtship of David’s mother, Mr. Murdstone treats David poorly, alternately ignoring, deceiving and even deriding him in public. This violent and abusive mistreatment enters the home in a nightmarish fashion that leaves David little opportunity for any real escape.

47 This fact recalls Ernesto’s inability to connect fully with any social group in Los ríos profundos. However shaky Ernesto’s claims to acceptance in either group, he rarely acknowledges such fears of being “found out” that poignantly terrify David.
The first chapters of David’s story reveal the inherent instability of his family structures. He is born into an untraditional family comprised of a mother and her friendly servant. David’s first real travels take him to visit Peggotty’s family, which is composed of her brother, his adopted and yet un-biologically-related niece and nephew (Little Em’ly and Ham) and eventually her own husband. After this journey, and perhaps proving Thomas Wolfe’s idea that one can’t go home again, when David and Peggotty do return, home has become an existentially threatening place due to his mother’s marriage with Murdstone. Family is thus not set up as a stable or stabilizing unit.

Despite the faults of home and the untraditional families found throughout Dickens’ texts, it is the home that acts as the first of the three sites of David’s formal education. Boarding school is initially introduced by the Murdstones as an answer to the question of what to do with David. Moreover it is partially in these discussions that David’s mother’s subservience and submission to their requests emerges so clearly. However, the time comes for David’s education to begin and as the parental figures (in this case the Murdstones and David’s mother) had failed to send him, David’s mother acts as his first formal teacher. His scholastic fate uncertain, “[he] learnt lessons at home” (55). The corrosive family dynamic quickly encroaches upon David’s learning:

Shall I ever forget those lessons! They were presided over nominally by my mother, but really by Mr. Murdstone and his sister, who were always present and found them a favourable occasion for giving my mother lessons in that miscalled

---

firmness,\textsuperscript{49} which was the bane of both our lives. I believe I was kept at home, for
that purpose. I had been apt enough to learn, and willing enough, when my
mother and I had lived alone together. (Dickens 56)

David then goes on to recall with notable clarity the lessons he learned from his mother and how he quickly picked up new material. It is only with the introduction of the Murdstones’ abusive and nagging pedagogical style, David’s potential as a scholar diminished drastically so that, as he recalls, “the natural result of this treatment… was to make me sullen, dull, and dogged” in his studies and increasingly “shut out and alienated” from his mother (57). Education, as Chesterton suggests, is part of the “dregs” of David’s early life (Chesterton); however, it is in this moment that David, like many Bildungsroman protagonists, finds a way of escaping through individual engagement with an external world. Specifically, for David, this involves the reading of his father’s books, which range from Tom Jones to Don Quixote to Robinson Crusoe. In reading he thus finds an intellectual pursuit that “kept alive [his] fancy” all the while providing him room to develop as an individual apart from the constraints of his immediate society (Chesterton). Through reading, David finds a hope of salvation from his present state. By casting the Murdstones as the villains in each of the tales he reads, David finds solace in the consistent victory of the hero in these tales, a role that even in the beginning of his own tale he is reluctant to claim for his own life.\textsuperscript{50} Finally, in this initial educational experience with his mother, David

\textsuperscript{49} The Murdstones often contend that David’s mother should act more firmly towards him and Peggotty and thus assume a more clearly delineated, higher power position in the family hierarchy relative to the younger and/or socially inferior household members.

\textsuperscript{50} Some evidence exists that by the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century, people were starting to equate abuse with educational underperformance. While formal studies had yet to be completed, this was certainly a familiar theme in works such as Dickens and the actual life it attempted to represent. For more information see Morris, Robert John. “Reading the Wills: A Window on Family and Property” in \textit{Men, Women and Property in England: 1780-1870}. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
demonstrates again the difficulties of memory in his own writings. He clearly recalls with heartbreaking precision the violence and the emotional trauma of an abusive stepfather. At the same time and in the same paragraph he recalls that such abusive encounters were most often the result of his forgetting sentences, paragraphs and pages of his lessons. The constant threat of verbal and physical abuse impeded his ability to recall and thus perform his education while promising him the abuse that he so feared. The violent episodes and cruel rhetoric from Mr. and Miss Murdstone respectively thus demonstrate how David’s initial formal education occurred within a particularly violent and aggressive social structure that impeded his ability to learn. Moreover, the point of his education here is lacking. Due to the earlier discussions of boarding school, homeschooling for David was never assumed to be the only education he would receive by any involved. In two particularly telling sentences, David demonstrates his awareness of a more sinister point to this education. His mother, stepfather and aunt had agreed to his being sent to boarding school; yet he remained at home so that his schooling could be hijacked by the Murdstones to educate his mother as to the new social organization within the home. If this is the case and David’s own assumption may be believed, then David’s presence was certainly always a dilemma for the social structure the Murdstones were attempting to enact. They created a clearly hierarchical power structure in which Mr. Murdstone was the head, his active sister acting in his behalf and his new wife, David’s mother, is also part of the dominant power structure that required the subservience of the lower classes: servants and the like. David could not be elevated to the Murdstone’s structure because he was unlike them and his sensitive nature (like that of his mother) disallowed him to act with the cruelty required of those interested in participating in such a structure.

David’s second instance of formal education takes place in a traditional boarding school
in London, which is quite a distance from his home but nonetheless mirrors the violence and rigid, patriarchal social structure he had already endured at home. After a particularly brutal encounter with his stepfather, David is sent away to school where he encounters similarly sadistic and, this time, institutionalized threats and violence (Hobsbaum 119). Salem House, the boarding school where David spends the next portion of his education, operates on two levels. Formally, a headmaster and various other master instructors oversee the hierarchical administration of the school. Informally, while still mostly in the setting of the school, the students organize themselves into a hierarchical social structure as well that mirrors the previously introduced social arrangements. Both organizations respect similar rules and operate under similar understandings of social order, class and values. Every inhabitant of both tiers of life is inherently broken: “the boys are low-spirited, the second master is shabby and epileptic, the first master has a wig, the porter, Tungay, has a wooden leg…” and so forth (119). Thus, though rigidly structured, the very elements of the structure contain flaws.

The school’s formal structure is represented most clearly in the alternately neglecting and violent figures of Mr. Creakle and Mr. Mell, the school’s headmaster and David’s principle teacher respectively. Creakle establishes himself as the head of the school’s formal structure through his domination of David. He had clearly been informed of David’s previous encounters with his stepfather, which Creakle uses against him in the attempts to publicly shame David into a place of submission and subservience. Mell is also clearly inferior in social status and formal position to Creakle and is humbled into silent subservience in the school. Dickens demonstrates that the main reason for Mell’s inferiority is his lower class background: David witnesses the evidence of Mell’s economic situation frequently. Mell and David stop to visit Mell’s mother while en route to Salem House, in an episode that humanizes an otherwise nearly silent character.
This brief glimpse into Mell’s life, and another involving the repair of his boots, highlights the fact that even though he is an educator Mell cannot afford to keep his mother or himself in a better situation.

The formal structure of the school is administered throughout the setting. The school is described as old, decrepit and rusty and thus creates or at least perpetuates the nightmarish British boarding school trope. David describes the scene of the schoolroom as

…the most forlorn and desolate place [he] had ever seen… a long room with three long rows of desks, and six of forms, and bristling all around with pegs for hats and slates. Scraps of old copybooks and exercises, litter the dirty floor… There is a strange unwholesome smell upon the room, like mildewed corduroys, sweet apples wanting air, and rotten books.

In describing the room and indeed in some previous glimpses of London, it is apparent that leaving his family allows David more opportunity to view his surroundings. Additionally, his difficulties of memory have at least temporarily abated and he is now free to remember not only the violence or emotional traumas of his past but also the more mundane elements of his setting. At any rate, the boarding school now provides the backdrop of David’s first individual explorations out in the world. Its teachers act as part of the institution and the school’s decrepit setting mirrors their own wretched and largely self-obsessed existence.

The informal society formed by the school’s students mirrors the hierarchy found in the school structure itself, David’s and presumably the other boys’ homes and by extension the broader British society. When David enters the school, the students are on holiday and so he spends a month observing the schoolyard and the evidence of the students who normally inhabit it. In examining a door in which several students have carved their names, David creates a
picture in his mind of children who he assume will continue abusing him upon their return. He is thus happily surprised when the abusing is merely occasionally vicious teasing and most treat him as friends.

The social structure created by the boys is hierarchical and is headed by J. Steerforth who the students revere as “a great scholar… very good looking, and at least half-a-dozen years” older than David (81). Steerforth conducts himself as the school’s aristocrat and it does ultimately become clear that he is from a family of higher social class. Other students also defer to him and his judgment and it is only after he interviews David that David is allowed to enter the company of the schoolchildren. David also notes that Steerforth conducts himself well with the one eligible young lady in their company, Miss Creakle, who has the unfortunate luck to be the headmaster’s daughter. Steerforth initially appears to provide a solution to David’s predicament with the school’s authority. He also allows David to tell him stories (and thus participate in a sort of informal internship that will prepare him for his career as a writer), and ultimately for David’s sense of powerlessness in facing the world from his position in the lower-class of his society (Morris 72; Jeffers 78).  

The interaction between the formal and informal power structures within the school is characterized by violence in both directions. The headmaster and other teachers regularly beat the students. While David is initially targeted for his newness, they finally leave him alone to abuse Traddles, a pudgy young boy who often takes the fall for Steerforth or other students or just simply provides the teachers a victim to target. The boys including David appreciate Traddles for this but recognize him as a social inferior because of his inability to evade these

---

51 Morris suggests that both David and Em’ly view Steerforth as a solution to their powerlessness (Morris 72). It is Em’ly’s relationship with Steerforth that leads to her downfall but it is also David, Em’ly’s and their other family members’ objectification of Steerforth that allowed his base character to go unnoticed.
attacks. The social class structure of the students is dominated by Steerforth and it is his social position via his family that allows him to evade Creakle’s abuse but also provides him the opportunity to mete out violence upon the faculty members and thus subvert the traditionally hierarchical relationship between the school’s formal structure and its informal student organization. This occurs most dramatically in the instance when Steerforth has Mell fired for being poor. In a largely class-based altercation between Steerforth and Mell, the student calls the teacher a beggar, an epithet to be avoided. When questioned by the headmaster, Steerforth reveals what David had told him about Steerforth’s mother living in a poor house and Mell is consequently fired. Thus, class based aggression allows Steerforth to dominate a teacher’s position.

Like many Bildungsroman protagonists, David comes to understand and assimilate to the social structure of his boarding school. It is precisely at this point that he returns home for a holiday with his family. Serendipitously, he passes at least one day at home alone with his mother, Peggotty and his new half-brother. Travel serves as an interlude allowing the spaces and experiences of unified settings (the boarding school, home, and so forth) to be understood in contrast of distance and time. Things are rarely as David leaves them when he returns and thus travel plays another interesting role in limiting his quick perception of certain events. Some examples include his mother’s marriage, hidden from him by his first trip to Peggotty’s house, pregnancy and thus any hints of her sexuality, which is hidden from him by his time at school and the journey between places, and so forth. Throughout the novel, travel with acquaintances allows for positive occurrences such as Peggotty’s engagement to Barkis, the stagecoach driver, while David’s solitary travels often leave him vulnerable to theft and ridicule at the hands of those who easily take advantage of his naiveté. Finally, travelling customarily brings David to a
place or an instance in which he is named or renamed. It is on a journey that he is first referred
to by his stepfather’s surname of Murdstone and in his later trip to see his aunt he gains her
married name of Trotwood. Nicknames are also doled out quite frequently to mark other
milestones of his education and development.

In the Bildungsroman, travel to home is often utilized to demonstrate the way in which a
characters have developed from their initial status in their own society and now are able to either
fully assimilate into their home space or are so well educated and/or employed that they may
now assume a position of dominance (albeit softly executed dominance) in their home society.
For David, this is not the case with his journey home from boarding school. He is united at least
briefly with his family and spends a peaceful day with them but he is still isolated from the
Murdstones and so he returns to school, unsuccessful in a way. Unable to integrate in his home
society, he has already failed his mission as a Bildungsroman protagonist. Here Dickens
subverts the expectation for this protagonist in such a way as to highlight David’s own personal
development that disallows him to fully integrate within an abusive hierarchical paradigm.

David faces two other periods of formal development during which he receives both
training in a trade and, finally, the opportunity to return for formal education. The first occurs
when, after returning to school, he is recalled home a few months later for his mother and
brother’s funeral. After this, David remains at home where he is largely ignored by the
Murdstones. They do send him back to London to work “on his own account” in the cellars
owned by the Murdstones (137). Thus, at the tender age of 10, David is alone in the world and
working to pay for his own life. In some ways, this period of David’s life allows for an informal
education into the ways of the working class in industrial London. He sees first hand the
difficulties of surviving on an excruciatingly small income with no family ties to protect him
from the realities of this life. The structure of such an existence is dominated by the economic necessities of work. David observes a lot as he wanders the streets of London, unable to afford lunch but taking in the workings of the city. His informal education continues when he leases a room with the Micawber family, which represents perhaps the only nuclear family unit in the text. Micawber presents himself as well spoken but makes only bad financial decisions, which lead to his lands himself in debtor’s prison. Despite this reality, the family, like many of the people from the lower class who enter David’s life, treat him with only kindness and charity. Money and work provide the organizing principles that guide the period of David’s informal education. During his time at the run down warehouse and with the Micawbers, David learns of his own ability to act independently. Certainly, in this position, he is free from the previously limiting institutions of school and family. However, his independence comes with a great price – he is forced to navigate streets, wharves and warehouses that are decrepit, frightening and full of “rats which ‘rise up’ (literally, and as ghosts, and as sickening memories, with the power to make the person vomit, and as elements of what must be repressed from social existence)” (Tambling Going Astray 124). David lives and works in “that other London”, associated closely with lower-class workers and residents, prisons and blacking-factories (125). Miraculously, David survives the streets of London and manages to escape and to find his Aunt Betsey.

David’s final foray into formal education occurs in an untraditional, hybrid boarding school setting. Due to his aunt’s connection, he finds a place at a well-reputed and well-run boarding school that happens to lack space to take on any boarder. David ends up renting a room from his aunt’s lawyer and thus attends a boarding school without actually boarding there for the evenings and weekends. This final school mirrors the structure but sheds the tone of Salem House. It is well led by the benevolent Dr. Strong who, with his wife, takes David in and
educates him so that he may ultimately graduate from the school. The formal structure of this last school is thus characterized by benevolence and grace. Finally, in an enabling environment, David begins to thrive and graduates at the top of his class. The elder David looks back on his schooling in Chapter XVIII “A Retrospect” and totalizes these last experiences not relative to his academic achievements, although he does hint at his increasing scholarship. Rather, David reflects upon the young women and the flirtations he has during his time at Dr. Strong’s school. Overall, these relationships are of only fleeting importance for David although they do provide a glimpse of his gentlemanly and extracurricular education. Through subtext, it is possible that Misses Shepherd and Larkin represent David’s first sexual attractions to women. However, short of demonstrating his own prowess with waltzing and acquiring the appropriate attire for courtship these relationships are not the mark of his development of any real romantic goals or conquests.

Women play significant albeit highly difficult roles in 19th century Bildungsromane. Marriage itself often represents an end for these novels as, through marriage and family, a young man may be assumed to have taken his rightful place as a member of society and perpetuator of the social paradigm into which he has fully assimilated himself. Traditionally, these young men first have a failed romantic encounter or even sexual conquest before finding the redemptive relationship or meeting a proper woman with the power to redeem him and thus permit him entrance into gentile society (Buckley 38-40). David has three encounters with female characters that demonstrate his development relative to (young) women.

The first non-familial female love of David’s life is Peggotty’s niece Little Em’ly. He meets her when he is quite young but still feels quite drawn to her initially because of her beauty, shyness and gentle treatment of David. He admits, “of course I was in love with little Em’ly. I
am sure I loved that baby quite as truly, quite as tenderly, with greater purity and more disinterestedness than can enter in the best love of a later time of life, high and ennobling as it is” (Dickens 44). The elder narrating David thus recalls her with a romantic nostalgia for a lost whole. External to the brief childhood connection between David and Little Em’ly, Emily comes to represent the poor, fallen woman in the novel. This is perhaps one key reason that Dickens never allows her to appear again as a potential romantic partner for David after they both reach an appropriate age. Like David, Emily also had aspirations to a life that was impossible in her home setting. David hints at Emily’s own desire to move up in the social world (Morris 72). She becomes engaged to Ham but runs off with Steerforth who ultimately tires of her and abandons her in Italy. Steerforth’s class attracted her despite his increasingly vulgar character. He simulated character but, after charming everyone, left only damage and ruined reputations in his wake. Ultimately, Emily and Mr. Peggotty leave for Australia where Steerforth’s decisions and Emily’s reputation will not have preceded them.

David engages more completely in his second romantic relationship with Dora, who later becomes his wife. David courts her traditionally and thinks of her in the elevated manner of a romantic:

She was more than human to me. She was a Fairy, a Sylph, I don’t know what she was – any thing that no one ever saw, and everything that everybody ever wanted.

I was swallowed up in an abyss of love in an instant. There was no pausing on the brink; no looking down, or looking back; I was gone, headlong, before I had the sense to say a word to her.

From the beginning of their relationship, David elevates Dora to a level of incomprehensibility and inaccessibility. While objectifying her, he casts her into the category of the sublime in that
Dora the person must be known as a thing to be had or the object of nostalgia. She is part of a higher social class that David is closer than ever to joining when they meet. However, reality does invade their romance after they have married and she fails to be able to assist her husband with the practical necessities of life. David thus makes a romantic mistake, but because it was a mistake of marriage rather than a sexual escapade such as Steerforth had completed, Dickens grants David a reprieve and Dora dies a fittingly romantic death.

David’s redemptive love comes fittingly in the form of Agnes, the daughter of his aunt’s lawyer, who he meets when he stays with the family while attending his final school. While Dora was the image of perfection, Agnes may be read as the embodiment of the perfect (female) character. Her virtue, wisdom, sense and practicality separate her entirely from the other young women David courts and yet he never feels the same romantic compulsion to court her. After the death of his wife Dora, Ham, Steerforth and the Micawbers and the Peggotty’s fortuitous escapes to Australia, David escapes the “shock” of the changes and discomforts of his life and roams Europe, romantically considering the loss of not only the individuals but their potential as heroic or romantic figures. He contemplates suicide and is only brought back from this edge by Agnes’ consistent and ultimately redemptive love (Marcus 90). It is with and because of her that he has the chance not to restore himself to society, for truly he never was fully integrated within any one social hierarchy but rather travels between them throughout the book. At the same time, the restoration to himself and to a unified existence with normalized values and ethics does not adhere strictly with expected social norms. To this ends, Dickens resists calling Agnes the hero to which David alludes at the beginning of his story and leaves the tale with the ambiguity of an important, unanswered question: who is the hero of David’s life? The question of a hero in a realist tale appears somewhat extrinsic to the more realistic Bildungsroman form. Certainly,
protagonists in this type of novel are expected to be fallible and develop over the course of their lives but can someone imperfect aspire to being a hero? In fact, David does not seem to achieve hero-hood in his own life. When reflecting upon the death of Steerforth, who at one point of the novel does appear to be the chosen one for hero-status in the lives of all the main characters, David notes “I mourned for him who might have won the love and admiration of thousands, as he had won mine long ago” (Dickens 677). Steerforth had the potential to gain such respect as to position himself as a popular leader who might prove capable of alleviating the issues David had seen and endured throughout his life. However, Steerforth fails as most of the patriarchs do in this novel. The hero thus does not come in the form of some friend of David’s. Neither does David achieve any major heroic feat. He is certainly present when many difficulties are resolved but is rarely the key individual responsible for creatively acknowledging or fixing problems such as Emily’s reputation or restoration to her own family. The hero of this Bildungsroman, if it can be said to have one, thus must be Agnes as she enacts and embodies consistently and perfectly the values and understandings to which David must aspire. Her letter saves him from suicide thus allowing her to succeed where male characters had failed. Certainly, Mr. Peggotty saves Emily’s reputation by absconding with her to Australia but in this act of salvation Agnes triumphs where the others had failed.

Dickens subverts many social hierarchies within his novel but, in creating a tale containing a female hero, he ultimately subverts the Bildung process by placing an external character (and female!) in this key role. As a hero, Agnes lacks the feminizing and unheroic traits of meekness and reservation: when she fails or declines to act it is out of a more courtly

restraint than uncertainty or insecurity. David realizes her value in his own social milieu and ultimately finds a companionship with her that connects him not to the rest of society but to a happy family unit. This distinction is cemented at the end of the novel when David reflects on nearly all of his acquaintances and posits the idea that “when society is the name for … hollow gentlemen and ladies… and when its breeding is professed indifference to everything that can advance or retard mankind, I think we must have lost ourselves in that same Desert of Sahara, and had better find our way out” (727). Society as a totalized and joinable unit is thus not the answer for the protagonist in David’s story, but rather the finding of one’s self and, from there, the finding of a way out of apathy and disconnection. This is by no means the standard end for a Bildungsroman protagonist but rather a somewhat revolutionary call for individual responsibility and critical engagement with society.

Ernesto Settles In

While the first chapter of Los ríos profundos establishes Ernesto and his father’s relationship in contrast to their extended family and specifically “el viejo,” the second chapter “Los viajes” deals more closely with the bond between father and son. Ernesto’s understanding of this relationship and arguably his own relationship with the broader world is strongly situated in his father, who, due to his profession and temperament, is an peripatetic wanderer. The journeys and Ernesto’s father’s inability to establish himself permanently in any one city solidifies transience and impermanence as defining characteristics of Ernesto’s childhood. He addresses this saying

Mi padre no pudo encontrar nunca dónde fijar su residencia; fue un abogado de

---

53 The concept of family is complicated in this novel as it most concisely includes only Ernesto and his father. The mother is conspicuously absent and distant relatives maintain their distance in terms both geographical and social.
provincias, inestable y errante. Con él conocí más de doscientos pueblos. Temía a
los valles cálidos y sólo pasaba por ellos como viajero; se quedaba vivir algún
tiempo en los pueblos de clima templado: Pampas, Huaytará, Coracora, Puquio,
Andahuaylas, Yauyos, Cangallo… Siempre junto a un río pequeño, sin bosques,
con grandes piedras lúcidas y peces menudos[…] Pero mi padre decidía irse de un
pueblo a otro, cuando las montañas, los caminos, los campos de juego, el lugar
donde duermen los pájaros, cuando los detalles del pueblo empezaban a formar
parte de la memoria.54 (223).

This lengthy passage demonstrates a subtle ambivalence towards this itinerant lifestyle.
Learning the city provided him ample opportunities to contemplate the people, customs and
landscapes that naturally drew his gaze.55 At the same time, his rhetorical choices in describing
this setting invite consideration. For example, in describing his father as “inestable” Ernesto
selects a word with two meanings. It may signify unstable in the traditional sense but is also
often translated as unsettled.56 By comparing the author’s editorial decisions within this passage
(although it must be noted not with the choice of the word inestable) over the course of

54 My father could never find a place to settle down; he was a lawyer of the provinces, unstable
and wandering. With him I came to know more than 200 villages. He feared the hot valleys and
only passed through them as a traveler; he remained longer in the towns with mild climates:
Pampas, Huaytara, Coracora, Puquio, Andahualyas, Yauyos, Cangallo… Always next to a small
river, without trees, with large, magnificent rocks and small fish […] But my father decided to
leave one city after another when the mountains, the streets, the playing fields, the place where
the birds slept, when the details were starting to form part of a memory. (LGJ)

55 Here, the Spanish verb conocer (to learn or to meet) is used and, as such, slightly colors
Ernesto’s engagement with the city.

56 Frances Horning Barraclough, Arguedas’ principle English-language translator suggests
Editorial del Congreso del Perú and edited by Carmen Maria Pinilla Cisneros, the caretaker of
the José María Arguedas collection in the Central Library of the Catholic University of Perú,
demonstrates that Arguedas himself may have had an ambivalent sense of this passage in
particular.
subsequent editions of this book, it is clear that the author edited his word choice over time in order to highlight certain aspects (Arguedas “Notas” 436-447). For example, the cities named contain largely indigenous populations and were, in the 1948 edition of the text, referred to as the “las capitales de provincia india.” The names themselves are certainly clues to the indigenous nature of these cities; however, it is the editorial decision to remove the explicit naming of them as such that serves to make ambiguous the significance of certain elements of the passage and may actually be read as an instance in which Arguedas invokes the alternative reader.

Despite his subtle ambivalence towards his family’s transience, Ernesto is deeply committed to describing his father’s understanding of and interactions with the pueblos they encounter. In truth, it is the father’ opinions and perspectives that dominate, however subtly, the first three chapters of Ernesto’s story. At the same time, the character only emerges because of Ernesto’s gaze and thus, though important to his, the father appears largely as a passive rhetorical subject in these same pages. The father’s leaving of his son Abancay is a serious change. He selected the town as the ultimate destination for their untraditional family’s “peregrinaje” but shortly after, he must leave again when he finds employment working for a somewhat mysterious stranger in the village of Chalhuanca, some 100+ kilometers from Abancay. The father’s employer intends to sue a large hacienda owner who, it must be assumed, is taking advantage of people in the area. This gentleman is well dressed but speaks Quechua, signifying that he, like Ernesto and his father, occupies a space within Peruvian society in which he must negotiate an identity between that of the Spanish influence and indigenous roots. Ultimately, they plan for Ernesto to move to Chalhuanca with his father, although the details

---

57 Capitals of the Indian province.

58 Pilgrimage. (LGJ).
under which this may occur are not defined.

Ernesto begins his boarding school education prior to his father’s finding employment in a distant, unfamiliar village. Nonetheless, while briefly noting his own situation, Ernesto says “Yo estaba matriculado en el Colegio y dormía en el internado. Comprendí que mi padre se marcharía. Después de varios años de viajado juntos, yo debía quedarme; y él se iría solo” (Arguedas 233, emphasis my own). Even at the time of this difficult separation of father from son, Ernesto’s focus remains squarely on his father and he only includes the pertinent details of his own life change (starting school) and the implications of his foreknowledge relative to his father’s situation. This fact is highlighted throughout the chapter when the father’s work situation and imminent departure provide not only the plot developments but act as the subject of the chapter. It is importantly only after the complete departure of Ernesto’s father that the boy can talk freely about his own situation: a somewhat curious dynamic given his penchant for observation as established in Cuzco.

Upon the departure of his father, Ernesto begins describing his surroundings. For him, the process of placing himself or, perhaps more succinctly, acknowledging the situation of the city and school in which he resides, involves exploring and understanding not only the geography and maps of these spaces but also the way in which people act and interact within them. Food, festivals and customs thus work alongside descriptions of place to create a social and physical geography within the text. Abancay is a tiny town but one that does support a variety of restaurants and chicherías (bars serving chicha) and in this way, Abancay emerges from the text as a displaced center of sorts. As Doub notes, Ernesto was unable to settle himself

59 I was matriculated in the high school and slept in the boarding school. I knew that my father would be leaving. After several years of traveling together, I would have to stay; and he would be going on alone. (LGJ)
in any real way in Cuzco – the city considered by the Inca as center of the universe, while spiritual to Ernesto failed to feel like a place he could make into any sort of permanent home (Doub 46). Unlike Cuzco, Abancay maintained a mostly indigenous population; however, due to the encroachment of the haciendas (plantations owned by the wealthy/white residents), the city “está cercado por las tierras de la hacienda Patibamba. Y todo el valle, de sur a norte, de una cima a la otra, pertenece a las haciendas” (238). The city of Abancay thus exists at the center of lands and mountains that are owned by a privileged class whose lifestyle is grander in both quality and quantity relative to the inhabitants of the village. The basic understanding of the populated center as the container of wealth and culture is subverted with the wealthy and demonized landowners, who spend most of their time on the periphery, engaging rarely with the center (46-47). For the reader and Ernesto, Abancay presents another example of a failed center – one in which a hybrid identity could play out but due to the region’s socioeconomic power structure fails to permit such a life. It is merely another empty center sharply contrasting with the beautiful landscapes beyond.

Ernesto’s boarding school occupies an odd and hybrid space in the city of Abancay.

---

In symbolic terms, the mountains as seen from the city represent the persistent class-based truth of a social system in which ownership of lands and resources abides with only certain members of a society. Here again exists an instance of duality in which the landowners’ understanding of ownership relates to a certain, colonial tradition while the underlying object (in this case a mountain and previously the Incan walls and rocks) retains a different cultural significance and relates to a different understanding of possession and ownership. Under Incan administration, land was cultivated communally but not owned by an individual or even the Incan empire. Walter Mignolo notes that unlike capitalism in which “land is private property,” and Marxism in which “land cannot be private property… but it is the property of the state given to the community,” for indigenous groups land “cannot be property at all” (Mignolo 18-19). Products of the land may be bought, sold or traded; however land itself is not a commodity (19). Arguedas explored the complexity of property rights in his university thesis Las comunidades de España y del Perú in which he demonstrates that communal ownership was respected and even protected by state institutions in Spain (Arguedas Comunidades 94).
Because the local clergy operates it, it occasionally provides a destination for the rich hacienda owners who come to visit the town. Ernesto begins to describe his school in the light of these visits but demonstrates that even when the landowners visited, it was clear that their only goal was to meet with the Rector. “Cruzando el patio” he says “sin mirar a nadie” and with this basic description, Ernesto begins to establish the space of the school without providing any direct description. Through the denial of a constituting gaze, the children attending the school are relegated to subaltern positions by their community’s wealthy landowners as their existence is ignored and implicitly devalued. While the children gazed upon the celebrities of their community so that “parecía que nombraran a las grandes estrellas” (241), the power structure of the school (encapsulated in the solitary official figure of the rector) appears to function initially at the whim and bequest of the landowners. Certainly, through his sermons, the Rector’s political and social views emerge clearly but never in ways that would threaten the established hierarchy in which the landowners and their interests dominate. He hates the Chileans, preaches violence and duty and explicitly praises the landowners, saying “que ellos eran el fundamento de la patria, los pilares que sostenían su riqueza” (241). The school thus fulfills a variety of functions and acts as a hybrid institution and meeting place for the community’s elites – a fact that educates the boys informally and extracurricularly.

The boarding school and the priests operate from the periphery of Ernesto’s story for the majority of the book and the school’s official spaces – the classrooms, chapel and dining hall – or the areas in which formal learning occurs are almost fully ignored in the text. The Rector

62 Crossing the patio without looking at anyone. (LGJ)
63 It seemed that they were naming the biggest stars. (LGJ)
64 …that they were the foundation of the homeland, the pillars of its wealth. (LGJ)
exercises little control over the boys although his authority is respected by the children (who do mostly as he says) and much more by the larger Abacayan society. The Rector’s role in Ernesto’s life evolves over the course of the novel as situations external to the school deteriorate. Additional staff includes Brother Miguel a younger priest of the order who interacts most directly with the boys, often stopping fights; however his race and specifically his African heritage limit his authority and lead to increasingly heated confrontations with several of the school bullies. Additional voiceless priests also comprise the official structure of the school and are assisted by several servants and staff who rarely actively matter to Ernesto’s story. One exception to this is a mentally handicapped woman, la opa, who works in the kitchen. Ernesto notes that she is definitely not of indigenous descent, but rather light haired and white-faced. She is ultimately a sex object for the older boys in the school but also, very possibly for the Rector. Ernesto rarely describes any actual lesson taught by the priests to the students; however, they are often demonstrated as interacting with the children by stopping fights and whenever they notice protecting the weaker children from harassment at the hands of the elders. This same protection rarely extends to the woman although it is practiced generally towards the indigenous peoples of Abancay.

The school itself consists of the dormitory, chapel, classrooms (although they are rarely mentioned or described), the priests’ quarters, the kitchen, dining room and various courtyards. These spaces are less rigidly constrictive in Los ríos profundos and often the children are found playing in fields or, in the case of Ernesto, exploring the wilderness outside of the city. This open campus mentality does not insinuate a lack of social order; however, it does create an atmosphere of greater flexibility and even volatility, especially when contrasted with the rigid boarding school as found in David Copperfield.
Society and social structure among the students provides Ernesto plenty of opportunities to observe and comment upon the workings of society. Within the confines of the school society, yet outside of the institution’s walls the children as a group are often found playing war-games, a traditional activity for young men. The children sort themselves into groups with one “playing” the Peruvians and the other the Chileans. Because the outcome of such a game was pre-ordained (“los ‘Perúanos’ siempre debian ganar”) by both the children and their parochial schooling, the Peruvian team was comprised largely of the school champions and their friends. This militaristic introduction to the school children immediately demonstrates the role of power dynamics within the social group. The Peruvian team was comprised of the school heroes not only because they were the most popular young men but moreover because “obedeciamos las ordenes que ellos daban y teniamos que aceptar la classificacion que ellos hacian” (245). Social structure and national identity are thus established and invoked within a common children’s game; however as Ernesto quickly notices these divisions are based upon popularity and strength of the school’s more vicious students and all of these elements are tied to both physical realities as well as social constructions.

In introducing his readers to the social structure of the boarding school, Ernesto demonstrates how clearly the social values of the broader society enter into the schoolyard. Ernesto himself is constructed through his wanderings and his encounters with both indigenous society in Abancay but also in his explorations of nature and his surroundings. His distant father provides him no social status to speak of besides the ability to attend school and the impetus to reside there. Añuco exemplifies another such leader among the children despite his sociopathic approach to this position. Like Steerforth, Añuco comes from a bourgeois background with a

65 We would obey the order that they gave us and had to accept the (classification/teams) that they made. (LGJ)
long history in the area. He had personally mastered the gentlemanly arts and “tocaba el piano, cantaba, y era galante con las hijas y las esposas de los terratenientes” (245).\(^6\) Despite this simulation of civility, manners and breeding, Añuco is his father’s illegitimate son. His connection to the landed nobility in the region is widely recognized but highly troubling for him. Ernesto notes that “A pesar de su absoluta pobreza, el Añuco era distinguido en el colegio” (247).\(^6\) Añuco negotiates his identity, enjoying the power of his assumed aristocracy (or distinction) but simultaneously claiming that he is fully reliant on the charity of the priests. Thus, while born into a community that fails to claim him fully, Añuco remains part of the social elite. However, he has an individual has realized the economy of constructing a more romantic identity in which he fits himself into the role of the alienated and independent hero. Despite this fundamental disconnection, Añuco actually participates in one of the text’s most symbolically important relationships. Añuco aligns himself with the school brute, Lleras, so as to ultimately secure his position as the dominant figure in the social atmosphere of the school. The relationship between the boys unites one’s place as a (fallen) aristocrat and the dumb, brute strength of the other. Ernesto describes him saying “Lleras era el estudiante más tardo del colegio; no conocía bien su origen, y los Padres lo protegían. Había repetido tres veces el primer año de media, pero era el más fuerte, y nadie en el pueblo dejaba de temerle… Era altanero, hosco, abusivo y caprichoso” (247).\(^6\) Añuco begins to manipulate Lleras early in the text and easily secures his empty-headed yet brutal loyalty. Other, older students recognize the physical power

\(^{6}\) …playing the piano, singing and he was gallant with the landowners’ daughters and wives. (LGJ)

\(^{6}\) Although he was penniless, Añuco was an aristocrat at school. (FHB) Note: Barraclough’s translation here potentially editorializes the idea of such distinction.

\(^{6}\) Lleras was the dullest student in the school; his origin was obscure and he was a Ward of the priests. He had repeated the ninth grade three times, but was the strongest boy in school, and the townspeople never lost their fear of him… He was arrogant, sullen, abusive and moody. (FHB)
of the pair and thus they gain social power through the fear and avoidance of others who assume their physical inferiority.

Antero provides a friend, at least initially, for Ernesto and also acts as a foil to Añuco. Antero appears to be like Ernesto initially or at least provides someone that Ernesto may relate to; however, after learning that his friend is preparing himself to be the lord of one of the haciendas, the friendship falters (Doub 46). Ernesto thus chooses to separate himself from someone who will maintain the status quo.

The boarding school’s power structure shapes itself around the cruel, aggressive and brutal dominance of Añuco and Lleras. The boys regularly alienate all of the other students but are especially cruel to those occupying the other end of the social spectrum. This is especially true in the case of Palacios (sometimes called by the diminutive nickname Palacitos). In many respects, Palacios is the inverse of Añuco: he is the son of an assimilated, well-to-do Indian from the Andean high-country. The father “era un hombre alto, vestido con traje de mestizo, usaba corbata,y polainas. Visitaba su hijo todos los meses… [y cuando se iba] Dejaba valiosos obsequios para el Director y para los otros frailes” (251). Thus, while Añuco is acknowledged by the landowners despite his dubious heritage, Palacitos is ignored entirely. Añuco is penniless and completely cut off from his family while Palacitos is visited regularly by his father who unabashedly flaunts his wealth. Nonetheless, despite displays of familial wealth and assimilation, Ernesto notes that Palacios “era el único alumno del Colegio que procedía de un ayllu de indios” (250). Moreover, he speaks Spanish poorly and struggles with both his lessons and also with

---

69 … was a tall man, dressed with the clothes of the mestizo, he used a tie and (leather leggings). He visited his son every month and when he left, he left expensive gifts for the Rector and the other priests. (LGJ and in parentheses (FHB)).

70 … he was the only student who came from one of the indian ayllus. (LGJ)
the social structure of the school. He begs his father to permit him to return home but is forced to stay in the abusive situation. In one particularly grotesque exercise of power, Añuco and Lleras attempt to force Palacitos into a sexual encounter with the mentally-disabled woman. In this scene, a hypothetical but horrendous confluence of social and physical powers converge as they assert their dominance at the combined expense of both the handicapped woman and the Indian boy. Even though she escapes this incident, Palacitos is not nearly so lucky. When saved by the priests, however, it is not the potential rape he complains of but rather the collective violence he feared from Añuco and Lleras. Thus, the woman remains unprotected and condemned to future harassment and abuse at the hands of the children.

The cruel and distinct way that Añuco and Lleras terrorize their societies often provides the subject of Ernesto’s story. However, when the other children emerge from the shadows of the tyrants who prey upon them they still manage to have their own adventures. These quieter scenes subtly demonstrate Ernesto’s personal development. Other, minor characters emerge and Ernesto develops friendships with them. These characters and Ernesto as well occupy intermediate positions within the power structure of their society but are generally and simply characterized as a somewhat diverse group of young men from different backgrounds and with different skills. They may be read as representative of Peruvian civil society attempting to survive and even thrive despite the threat of violence.

Ernesto frequently leaves the school to explore the other parts of the town and the mountains and lands around it. Over the course of these journeys, he tends to favor the poorer, Indian areas of town as he finds them more interesting and lively. He travels within these groups but at least initially maintains an observatory distance. This distance is interrupted when one of his friends asks Ernesto to write a letter for him to a girl he has fallen in love with but has yet to
Ernesto notes that

Consideré siempre a las señoritas como seres lejanos, en Abancay y en todos los
pueblos. Las temía, huía de ellas; aunque las adoraba en la imagen de algunos
personajes de los pocos cuentos y novelas que pude leer. No eran de mi mundo.
Centelleaban en otro cielo. (272)\(^7\)

Ernesto understands romantic love as a relationship with an image, a daguerreotype given to him
in books and stories. This one dimensionality and lack of actual connection of any sort, let alone
a sexual connection, has thus far sufficed for him and despite his pride in his ability to complete
the task for which he is hired he has no actual experience and relatively little enticement, at least
this far into his story. The one encounter that inspires Ernesto romantically stemmed from a
fleeting and chance meeting with a young, white woman he encountered while travelling with his
father. Ernesto idolizes and thus inherently objectifies this nameless girl and turns her into an
attainable image. While he spends little time actually chasing the image and less attempting to
know the girl, he utilizes his awareness of the temporal and spatial distance between her and
himself as the inspiration for the love letter he will write for his friend. This initial romantic
relationship, if it may be called that, is very similar to David’s relationship with Dora. By
reducing a person to the position of an attainable object, Ernesto inspires himself to achieve more
in his life and uses the highly romantic condition of alienation from that object to inspire his
literary work.

The initial relationship between Ernesto and the woman he saw is exceptionally brief but
yet retains an importance for him. Like David, Ernesto also engages in a later and more

\(^7\) I always considered the girls as distant beings, in Abancay and in all of the towns. I feared
them, ran away from them; although I adored them in the image of some characters in the few
stories and novels I could read. They were not part of my world. They sparkled in another sky.
meaningful relationship with a different woman. Following Ernesto’s attempt to help his friend with the love letter, he witnesses an insurrection as the (mostly Indian) women from the town revolt against the government’s monopoly on salt. In this scene, the political and social tensions that underscore the previous chapters emerge clearly and violently. Ernesto is describing the mostly female protestors when he sees, at the center of the protest, Doña Felipa, the owner of a chichería. His description of her is almost sensual and thus representative of a first, albeit still voyeuristic relationship. He says

su monillo azul, adornado de Cintas de terciopelo y de piñes, era de seda y relucía.

La cinta del sombrero brillaba, aun en la sombra… La mujer tenía cara ancha, toda picada de viruelas; su busto gordo, levantado como una trinchera, se movía; era visible, desde lejos, su ritmo de fuelle, a causa de la respiración honda.

Hablaba en quechua. Las ces suavísimas del dulce quechua de Abancay sólo parecían ahora notas de contraste, especialmente escogidas, para que fuera más duro el golpe de los sonidos guturales que alcanzaban a todas las paredes de la plaza. (290).

In this section, characterized by harsh contrasts, Ernesto describes Doña Felipa in harsh yet quas-sensual terms. Thus Ernesto’s first (pseudo)sexual encounter is harsh and connected to the uprising itself. This uprising is empowering to women and the figure of Doña Felipa is often read by scholars as “[la encarnación de] la promesa de una cultura emergente” (Sanguinetti-

---

72 A bar selling chicha, a popular corn-based alcohol in the Andes.

73 … her blue silk bodice, trimmed with beads and velvet ribbons shimmered. The ribbon on her hat shone even in the shade… The woman had a full face covered with smallpox scars. Her plump bosom, rising like a rampart, was moving; its bellows-like rhythm, from her deep breathing, could be seen from afar. She was speaking in Quechua. The soft c’s of the sweet Quechua of Abancay now seemed to have been chosen especially as notes of contrast to make the guttural sounds that carried to all the walls of the square, harsher. (FHB and LGJ).
Serrano 104). Ernesto leaves the square and the town with the protestors and thus, like David, engages with the real world as a crucial aspect of his personal development.

Like David, after a meaningful encounter with the real world, Ernesto returns to the boarding school but at this point he has changed and grown so that the pettiness of childhood squabbles now matters less to him than the things he has seen outside of the school. While David only fully embraces these lessons after wandering through Europe and contemplating a romantic suicide, Ernesto understands that he too must eventually leave the structured society in which he resides. He does not finish in school, nor does his personal exploration and route of self-discovery prepare him to take a place in society that will further the pre-existing social norms. Rather, Ernesto couples the lessons he has learned about the injustices and literal ills of his society with his formal abilities to write and express himself. He never fully integrates with society but over the course of the book it becomes apparent that no one character (or the social group that they come from) fully owns or drives society. Rather the dynamic here emphasizes the fluidity of power and understanding in a highly complex national, social setting.

The boarding school in *Los ríos profundos* provides a setting in which Ernesto cultivates himself. Like David Copperfield, he observes the social system within his school and additionally of the Abacayan society. He is drawn into the insurrection because of his personal (and even sexual) desires and needs: two distinct issues in his life that cannot be solved within the confines of the structured and heterosexually normative school environment. Ernesto never succeeds as obviously as David in gaining social power in his school but his consistent ability to come and go from the institution and his nuanced understanding of the people who live outside of the school certainly create the impression in the reader’s mind that he has a social freedom similar to David’s. Because of the parochial nature of the boarding school in this story, the
institution appears at least somewhat more humane and personal. The principle authority figures, including the Rector and Brother Miguel are largely sympathetic and even, occasionally, helpful to Ernesto and the indigenous women’s causes despite their inauspicious beginning sermons and overt allegiance to the landowners who presumably finance the school and the ministers’ other projects. When Doña Felipa appeals to the Rector’s sense of justice, he understands her plight and later warns her to escape. The burgeoning social uprising thus emerges in the text as Ernesto presents it to us. He lacks a totalizing vision of it and resists the temptation to present a didactic rational for the events of the book. In fact, his concern resides almost entirely in the inequalities and the effects of a highly socially, economically, politically and philosophically stratified society. In the realization that this represents the society for which he must prepare himself, Ernesto ultimately has no other option than to utilize his formal skills and his informal knowledge in order to fight against the unjust system. In this way, Ernesto breaks from the tradition and established plan for young men from his social and economic class and thus subverts not only the expected social norms but also the traditional ending for a Bildungsroman protagonist. Lacking a cohesive society and obligated to resist the current social structure due to his social insight and personal integrity (skills connected directly to the process of self development), Ernesto also subverts the formulaic conclusion of the Bildungsroman while utilizing the same skills developed throughout the process. Ultimately this subversion of integration as conclusion highlights an emerging individual subject, at least within Arguedas’ text.

Alternate Social Models

Los ríos profundos hints at distant ideas of nationality somehow displaced from the lives of the protagonists. These young men are relocated and disconnected from their families and
particularly their fathers who are separated from them by time, space and even mortality. Moreover, both Dickens and Arguedas avoided providing their protagonists, at least immediately, with easily identifiable or ready surrogate fathers who could step in and guide these young men to adulthood. Rather, the paths they must both walk are solitary and replete with difficult and trying obstacles.

Dickens eventually gives David a “second childhood” complete with a loving, albeit still untraditional family structure (Chesterton “Traveler”). After escaping his indentured service in the bowels of London, David attempts to find his Aunt Betsey. Like David, Betsey is also a survivor of domestic abuse and as a result has acquired a strength that is off-putting and out of place in context to David’s life with his mother but provides exactly the strength and (perhaps most importantly) the financial and social support he needs to succeed in the rest of his education. She connects him with Dr. Strong and his school and helps establish him there. In contrast to David’s previous schools, Dr. Strong’s institution seems a sort of utopia – at least initially. Dickens provides few details of David’s studies or acquaintances but the audience does come to learn of his academic and social successes at this institution. Moreover and most importantly, David gains a variety of surrogate parents from this transaction. Aunt Betsey helps him financially. Mr. Wickfield provides him a home (and, in due time, a wife in his daughter Agnes). Mr. Dick provides him the keys through which he selects his own profession and Dr. Strong gives him a surrogate, if idealized father.

Prior to his matriculation to Strong’s school, David had known only bad men in positions of any authority. Almost every male he had encountered had abused him, from his stepfather to the wait staff at a local inn to his employers. Men with less authority who attempted any sort of kindness were unable to help him because of their lower social statuses. Mr. Micawber and Mr.
Mell for example never truly abused him but because they could not control their own lives, they certainly were unable to help David. Dr. Strong operates entirely differently. He is in a position of structural power (as head of the school) and social power as well, as his kindness and gentility are widely respected. He and his wife are welcomed into the homes of the elite in their community and act as gentlepeople there. The students acknowledge the “doctor [as] the idol of the school” whose generosity was famous and whose intelligence is marked by his attempt to write a dictionary (206).

Language is a key tool for both the good and the bad men of David’s life. Virginia Carmichael astutely notes that “with the exception of Mr. Peggoty and Ham, every man with whom David feels friendship or hostility or identity is someone explicitly practicing a particular relationship to language in an attempt to master his world” (Carmichael 212, emphasis my own). The stylings vary greatly from Micawber’s “bombastic language and unnecessary letters” to Mr. Dick’s “compulsive writing” to Strong’s “continual delimiting of meaning in the Dictionary” to Uriah’s constant “perver[sion] of meaning” (212-213). In this way, David succeeds past all of the men in his life as he completes a book that negotiates and contains all of the other linguistic practices. By writing, he ultimately dominates the discourse.

While David sings the praises of Dr. Strong, his mastery of his own rhetoric contains the subtle awareness of the cost such a life had for the doctor. David remarks that his kindness would make him a target “outside his own domain” of the compliant and loving community (206). Even within that setting, he is constantly threatened because of the infidelity of his wife. While the text only hints at the relationship between Mrs. Strong and her cousin, Jack Maldon, this relationship is the cause of tension in the Strong’s marriage and in the rest of the community’s ability to interact with her. Communal reactions to Annie’s assumed infidelities
range from David’s disapproving understanding to Uriah Heep’s snide derision. Ultimately, these issues work themselves out mostly in the background in that Annie, unlike all of the other “fallen” characters, is not banished to Australia but is allowed to stay because of her own struggle to remain moral and also as a reward to her inscrutable husband. In this way, Dr. Strong teaches David by example how to be a husband and a good man. He models for David the ideal patriarch at the head of his portion of a patriarchal community; it is because of his charity and goodness that he is allowed to maintain this position despite a wife of less than glorious repute and thus demonstrates that goodness and charity can be utilized to overcome an otherwise detrimental situation. David follows this example in his marriage to Dora and, like Dr. Strong, finds the flaws particularly in treating his wife like a child-bride. While Dora is unable to step up and enact any sense of agency, Agnes provides a partner for him to whom he can relate on a more even plane. Thus, in the end David finds a communal balance that allows him to create a stable home and family of his own and, most importantly, the time and conclusion from which he will write his story. It is impossible to argue that David fully overthrows the patriarchal paradigm from which he eventually escapes; however, he does negotiate a space for himself that allows him to view his world compassionately and elevate a woman to the role of hero in his life.

Arguedas also allows Ernesto to relate to one of the men of his acquaintance as a surrogate father figure. Father Linares, the school’s rector, evolves over the course of the book and his relationship with Ernesto likewise develops along a comparable trajectory. Initially he is only as a distant figure, aligned closely with the landowners and a rigid part of the social hierarchy (King 118). Moreover, his presence and utilization of Spanish to teach and preach “is a deeply troubling experience because for Ernesto to learn from Spanish-speaking priests and his classmates means to forget, or worse, to scorn the life of those who raised him” (Echevarría 160).
When Ernesto returns to the school after joining the chicheras’ insurrection, the rector beats him severely and scorns him for being part of the “indiada, confundida por el demonio”74 (Arguedas 307). Even after learning that the Indian women had called for him to come and witness the fact that the landowners and the government salt-dispensaries had been hoarding salt for the landowners’ cows, the rector still maintains that their actions had been theft. He takes Ernesto with him to a major hacienda where he, as their curate, sternly lectures the workers who had accepted the salt. He says in Quechua to the gathered workers “Yo soy tu hermano, humilde como tú; como tú, tierno y digno de amor, peón de Patibamba, hermanito… [pero] el robo es la maldición del alma; el que roba o recibe lo robado en condenado se convierte en condenado que no encuentra reposo…”75 and with this maintains the social hierarchy while relating to the Quechua speaking audience as a brother – a term and understanding that is well respected among Quechua speaking populations.

This moment resonates powerfully for Ernesto as he witnesses the language he loves used against people he cares for and whom he believes the Rector addresses somewhat unfairly. Rather than reacting completely against the Rector, Ernesto begins to forge an uneasy alliance with him. The Rector is the person who has the knowledge of words and how to use them to evoke such strong reactions from people and Ernesto. Father Linares is thus the antithesis to Ernesto’s own father from whom he learned “extensively about the geography and towns of Perú… while traveling” and so from the Rector he learns “the pleasure of literature, of reading and writing (a lesson he incorporates to a profound degree, as denoted by the memoirs we read)”

74 Indian mob, confounded by the devil.

75 I am your brother, humble like you; like you, kind and worthy of love, a peasant of Patibamba, little brother… [but] robbery is a damnation of the soul, the person who robs or receives things that were stolen is condemned to never find rest…. (FHB)
Perhaps here Doub goes a little too far as Ernesto never seems fully in love with written literature. He certainly cultivates an ability to work with words, as evidenced by Antero’s decision to hire him to write a love letter and in his narrating of *Los ríos profundos*, but in attempting to capture or present the oral tradition of Quechua in script he inherently must complete an act of conceptual hybridity. As a younger boy, he may lack the vocabulary to discuss this exercise but in fact he directly practices what Homi Bhabha acknowledges to be the hybridic reversal of “denied knowledge,” in this case Quechua linguistic and cultural ideas, in context of a society that devalues them (Bhabha “Signs Taken for Wonders”).

By the end of the book, Abancay is a city of decay. Typhus has stricken the indigenous population and they come in droves to the church seeking final absolution. Ernesto escapes this scene and begins travels of his own into the spaces his wandering father had initially shown him. His is not a tale of assimilation but of searching for something worthy of assimilation. It is a story of profound disconnection and received some criticism that, as such, it was simply “un desengaño de orden generacional conectado con la búsqueda de la identidad” (King 415).76 *Los ríos profundos* like *David Copperfield* thus hints that rather than attempting to become a leader among men Ernesto will potentially find happiness when he joins a collective society. Unlike Dickens, Arguedas does not paint a picture of what that hypothetical unity could actually be but lets Ernesto escape into his world in search of a place where such collectivity might occur. Doub notes that it is Ernesto’s attempt to discover a lost center; Arguedas’ text demonstrates that Ernesto had felt a connection before in the kitchens and servants’ quarters and so the answer may not be a city, but some place where he can be taken in again and accepted. However, after learning the lessons from the Rector, speaking and writing excellent Spanish and writing in

---

76 A disengagement of the generational sort connected to the search of identity. (LGJ)
Quechua – an inherently transformative and distortive act – whether he can do so remains in question.

While *David Copperfield* is widely heralded as a triumph of British 19th century Bildungsroman, *Los ríos profundos* has been called an anti-Bildungsroman because of Ernesto’s failure to have a sexual experience and, more importantly, to achieve the “subjective unity” promised by a sexual encounter and/or marriage (Archibald 118). Doub points out astutely that such a “failure” cannot be acknowledged because *Los ríos profundos* suggests other versions of unity that are simply not present in the temporal period demonstrated by the novel (Doub 51). She notes that “in the mestizo context” that frames Ernesto’s life “‘autonomous subjectivity’ and ‘subjective unity’ are not valid terms; rather, we can speak of the progress made toward a more coherent sense of self” (51). It is this demonstration of progress towards a sensibility of the self and a deeper understanding of the self’s connection to broader social groups, however untraditional, that allows *David Copperfield* and *Los ríos profundos* to be put into dialogue with each other as part of a larger conversation regarding the undermining of patriarchal values in both imperial and post-colonial contexts.
Chapter V – Conclusion

The late 18th Century presented a wide variety of social, cultural, political and economic dynamics that were negotiated through revolutions, civil wars, domestic uprisings, scientific experiments and even philosophical debates. By the end of the century, the world’s major empires were growing increasingly anxious as colonies rebelled, domestic economies collapsed and scientific and industrial progress raced forward empowered by Enlightenment philosophies. In the context of the great powers’ uneasiness, new ideas emerged that impacted the way people engaged with or thought of everything from mundane quotidian happenings to the operation of the state. Historicizing this epoch allows for an integrative reading of its great potential and immense change. The intellectually rich yet socially volatile climate provided the context from which the idea of the nation and the literary form of the Bildungsroman emerged. But what exactly does national identity have to do with the Bildungsroman? It cannot be merely coincidental that a new, popular and constructed perception of collective identity (the nation) emerges cotemporally with the burgeoning in popularity of a literary form which also deals with questions of assimilation to a particular identity and cultural constructions.

This essay has attempted to show how Bildungsroman novels can provide their characters and by extension their authors and readers the opportunity to engage critically with the social values and practices that are understood as part of the larger national framework, however imaginary. Each of the protagonists considered survives their tale in a way that implies a certain level of personal success in overcoming principally social obstacles. However, the textual exploration has shown that the structure of national societies, which are mirror the rigidity of the (boarding) school systems, act as obstacles to the character’s personal happiness and thus
ultimately fail to enable or assist in the respective character’s full assimilation into their own society. National identity is dealt with explicitly, albeit briefly, in both books; but appears most concretely in the contrast of the protagonist with hostile or increasingly “othered” nations. David speaks of British national identity only when mentioning the imported goods from other nations and the export of problematic members of his own society. *Los ríos profundos* highlights a violent conceptualization of national identity initially in the guise of the priest’s patriotic diatribes that the children later incorporate into their own war games. Thus, both characters demonstrate a passive acceptance of national identity while spending little time reflecting upon it – a curious dynamic for otherwise characteristically observant and reflective narrators.

The absence of deeper considerations of national identity is especially perplexing in light of the time both children spend in boarding school. In particular, boarding schools allow for the minimization of social distinctions such as class, race and language or accent and the normalization of individuals through a common education and socialization. At least in theory, this type of school provides an ideal institutional setting in which national identity may be established or easily acquired. Identity may be learned or developed within the school and then performed in society once the boy has matriculated. In reality, both books indicate that the initially rigid structure of the school impede the protagonist’s desire to become part of any comparable paradigm. The schools represent a variety of imposed constraints upon a character’s happiness. Such restrictions, as *David Copperfield* explicitly demonstrates, limit an individual’s capacity to learn or remember basic lessons while the imaginary hierarchy that the children create and perpetuate demonstrates the inherent complexity of ‘belonging’ and ‘community’ in a social structure that depends entirely on performed identities and relationships. The protagonist must then engage with both the often-antagonistic and real power structure of his school its
equally hierarchical imagined community.

The introductory chapter of this paper demonstrated the historical trajectory and conceptual evolution of the Bildungsroman genre. These books certainly permit pedagogical readings (however light- or heavily-handled the lessons) as a literary form that is both established and narrated through a formative process in which a young man can become a productive member of his own society. Similarly, the emergence of national identity provided a new sensibility for organizing people despite differences in class, education, social background and, occasionally, language. For both the idea of nation and the Bildungsroman genre, the ultimate goal involved the education of citizens for peaceful assimilation. This is often a capitalistic or consumer-based participation within a social framework that refuses concrete portrayals and is thus explained and understood through metaphor and taught through normative educational institutions. Schools and especially those of the state-funded variety provided a channel through which such an education could occur. The endgame for these three seemingly disparate projects involved utilizing education to normalize and stabilize complex and dynamically evolving social systems and in ways that would promote (or at least allow) for the continued rule of previous “dynastic” power holders (Anderson 86; Seton-Watson 148).

Scholarship regarding the construction of national identity and its almost immediate politicization or hijacking by preexisting dynastic or charismatic figures demonstrates the complex relationship between culture, cultural production and the conceptualization of the nation. Since the late 18th century, literature, theater, art and music have been viewed as vehicles transporting ideas of shared communal values that transcended spatial and class divides while uniting people living within the confines of one or another national identity. Despite notable problems, cultural environments and the remaining linguistic cultural works they produced allow
for a nuanced reading of societal power structures and historical events. National identity theorists examine and account for the emergence of national identity as a political and even rhetorical moments and often demonstrate how the production and proliferation of normalizing values and concepts of ownership permit the idea to evolve.

20th century scholars of western political and philosophical thought have struggled intensely over the past decades to understand the emergence of the modern nation. Particularly since the 1980s, researchers including Ernest Gellner, Eric Hobsbawm, Benedict Anderson and Liah Greenfeld have led the way to the production of critical research on the emergence of the nation, the nation’s role in intellectual and social history and geopolitics. Initially the nation existed as a poorly defined yet widely accepted assumption for social science. Conversely, for the layman, nation certainly exist and possess their own national histories. Even today, people are assumed to belong to a nation by birth or assimilation. Questions such as which nation a person belongs to and how belonging may be established or denied emerge as the most important considerations for most considering national identity as such reflections contain or imply real-world consequences. At the same time, however, defining what a nation is, where the idea came from and why it appears so universally relevant are all queries that baffle or at least trouble even the most determined of scholars. Ambitious researchers reached back into classical philosophy and the etymology of the word nation but they are quickly caught up in dilemmas of function and contingency (Hobsbawm 58-59; Gellner 5-6).

Anderson’s solution to these heated debates of definition, function and proliferation resides squarely in his suggestion that at some point in the late 18th and early 19th centuries the

---

77 For example, although Anderson’s theory clearly denotes the importance of symbolic and pictorially or graphically based languages, his research falters in its lack exclusion or minimizations oral traditions.
idea of nationality became incorporated in the imaginations of individuals, allowing them to feel themselves part of a larger, often but not always, monolingual community (Anderson 4-5). As a human construct, the nation may thus be understood “by aligning it, not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with the large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which – it came into being” (12). According to his theory, the myth of the nation was perpetuated through mass media and mass cultural productions and perpetuated three specific understandings of the nation. First, each nation is limited to a specific population and space. Anderson notes “[the] nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them… has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations” (7). Secondly, the nation has sovereignty “because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm” (7). Finally and most germane to his argument is his assertion that nation is “imagined as a community, because regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived of as a deep, horizontal comradeship” (7). Anderson suggests that it is this imagined “fraternity” that allows people to kill or to die in the name of their own imagined community.

Enlightenment philosophy and scientific process framed economic, technological and even societal developments in the 19th century. In Western Europe especially, the introduction and increased utilization of new machines, mass culture and the mass production of goods furthered the myth of the unified nation at a time when doing so had domestic and international

---

78 It is somewhat troubling that Anderson ascribes sovereignty to all nations as this concept is entirely connected to a largely Euro-centric philosophical moment. Additionally in this section of his argument he speaks of the sovereignty of the nation and the sovereignty of the state interchangeably which, if accurate, would lead to vast geopolitical upheaval. For example if a nation as a unified group of people has sovereignty but lives in a state governed by a political structure that does not recognize their right to self-governance, which group actually has or may enact sovereignty? In truth, this is not a theoretical problem but one that appears often today.
political ramifications including changes for international relations.\textsuperscript{79} In some places as Anderson demonstrates this is clearly part of a cunning power grab. For example in Czarist Russia, the construction of Russian national identity as a unifying identity allowed a massively heterogeneous population to unite itself at least initially under the czars who were quick to proclaim themselves as thoroughly Russian (86). Asserting one’s national identity thus became a political move, which connected itself quickly to largely geopolitical patriotic movements. The community itself may always be a construct as no one individual could know each member of his or her national community but as an act of imagination it served to unite the individual to a larger group comprised of individuals who were presumably acting similar to the person doing the imagining.\textsuperscript{80} The nation thus, according to both Anderson and Hobsbawm is a functional myth that is occasionally coopted by political figures and state apparatuses in order to achieve specific aims. For example, in the 1960s U.S. president John F. Kennedy invoked nationalist pride and patriotic sensibilities in the so-called “space race.” Being American does not necessarily have anything to do with mathematical acumen yet the president spoke for the needs of the state apparatus calling upon the national community to do something together – namely beat the Russian national community to the moon.

Benedict Anderson’s theory allowed researchers to avoid time-consuming and frustrating debates about how the nation came to be so widely understood and respected; however his

\textsuperscript{79} The common phrase “international relations” is deceptively simple and often times in error as it deals more explicitly with interstate relations between countries.

\textsuperscript{80} Anderson suggests that individuals imagine other members of their nation doing the same things or types of things that they themselves do and thus members of the imagined community are familiar to one person even if they never meet. Interestingly, much gothic literature from the 19\textsuperscript{th} century deals with what Freud calls the *Unheimlich*, or the uncanny recognition of one’s self in another. Later literary theorists will also note that the inability of one individual to fully understand and/or explain another’s thoughts and actions inspires great fear within the original individual. Such fear or the long-term, generalized state of shock that Walter Benjamin calls *Chokerfahrung* provides a common trope especially in fin-du-siècle European literature.
methodology and understandings of conceptualizations proved particularly troubling when applied to many post-colonial situations. Latin American history and cultural studies scholars particularly questioned his methodology and familiarity with regional dynamics. In much of Central and South America, national identity built itself upon individuals’ and communities’ connection to a particular patria (Chasteen XIV). Today patria is translated to fatherland inferring an imagined biological connection with a physical space; however as many Latin American historians including John Charles Chasteen have demonstrated clearly that “most people in Spanish or Portuguese America said patria (fatherland) for the province where they were born” rather than connecting it to a larger or more inclusive construct such as a particular viceroyalty or even the empire itself (Chasteen XIV and Barman). To understand the complex emergence of national identity thus demands the consideration of several layers of meaning on regional organization and identity. Originally, pre-Columbian indigenous groups organized their empires through the collection of tribute systems. After the conquest, colonial powers sometimes utilized these same zonings, effective making it so that “indigenous ‘provinces’… carried over to the colonizer’s administrative map” (XIV).81 These provinces and the new ones created by the colonizers eventually became known as patrias. They gained their modern meaning in the midst of the post-1808 independence movements from which patrias emerged of varying sizes and “coincided, or [were] supposed to coincide, with a single nation” (XIV-XV). Nationalism provided one impetus for the definition and territorial designations of the patria; however patriotic independence movements were lead mainly by “members of the native-born white minority who sought, not to remake colonial society, but to assume control of it themselves” (XV). Demographically this meant that a small ethnic minority continued to

81 The colonizers did not always use preexisting indigenous systems. This is especially true in Brazil where such systems never existed before the colonization (XIV).
dominate “four-fifths of the [continent’s] population – the slaves, mixed-race, indigenous people[s] whose continued subjection defined those privileges,” essentially ruling over groups with little interest or incentive to “buy in” to the national model (XV).

Benedict Anderson and his critics frequently utilize economic terms in discussing the relationship between the individual and the imagined community. An individual may “own” or “have” a Peruvian/British/Chilean/French/Australian, etc. national identity or “belong to” a nation. David purchases items from distant nations and thus experiences his own national identity as part of an international commercial exchange paradigm. National identity is sold to Ernesto and his classmates from the pulpit. However, neither boy enacts his own agency to buy into the construct. For David, national identity is part of the rapidly changing social British social milieu in such a way that it may be consumed without much thought. Moreover, the rhetoric that creates national identity in the Abancay boarding school is most successful when it contrasts Peruvian national identity with Chilean national identity and thus allows the children to play out (or perform) as Peruvians or as Peruvians playing Chileans. National identity is introduced as externally hierarchical (with the explicit portrayal of being Peruvian better than being Chilean) and internally so as well (with the priest’s portrayal of the rich landowners as better than the rest of his mestizo or indigenous congregation). In both stories, national identity is not the ultimate communal identity but merely acts as one part of a hierarchical social structure that the protagonist will overcome. Biological or birth-right understandings of ownership to or by the national identity may be implicitly understood but is quickly complicated as the boys explore and come to see the many social problems of their highly stratified societies.

Much Latin American scholarship demonstrates the ways in which national identity could be co-opted by ambitious leaders attempting to engage in nation-building projects. Such
endeavors in the region were complicated not only by political strife but also by differences in language, culture and ethnicity. Anderson notes that newspapers and mass media functioned as tools that united some nations despite comparable demographic complexities (Anderson 62-63). However, while Anderson’s thesis points to newspapers and education initiatives as the source or dispersion method for this identity, this simply did not work very well in Latin America as “this ‘spread’ [of print capitalism including newspapers and novels] occurred later and had a more limited readership than in its North American counterpart” (Unzueta 123). Additionally, alternate conceptualizations of literacy and a large rural and indigenous population limited the effective communication of information from urban centers to rural areas.

While print media was more limited in Latin America, texts did travel that told stories of personal successes and domestic bliss both in printed forms but orally. Doris Sommer called the novels of this time “foundational fictions” and explains that they tell stories that became “as familiar as national anthems” and often dealt explicitly with the “affairs of state” (Sommer 4). In such texts, ultimate unity (often between lovers) provides the key driving and “mediating principle that urges the narrative forward like a promise” and thus presupposes a happy ending despite “counterproductive social constraints” (18). Stories about marriages or “coordinating love” stories were more than fiction but demonstrated the very real ways in which “marriages bridged regional, economic, and party differences during the years of national consolidation” (18). As people united despite differences, the nation emerged as a demographic reality, which provided the subject of the novels that in turn created narratives through which actual unions could follow. Stories thus provided an impetus for the emergence of the nation in very real and demographically apparent ways.

Sommer’s text insightfully examines literature as a principle vehicle for the diffusion of
ideas relating to national identity; however, in limiting her perspective to the romantic novels she considers and ignoring the Bildungsroman, she fails to account for other literary genres’ contribution to this same ends. This is an entirely forgiveable oversight given the disparity between works of Bildungsroman and the romances she invokes. While anecdotal, Sommer’s narrative consistently reminds its reader that engagement with national romances is an unforgettable event in the life of the reader while, on the contrary, as Virginia Woolf so succinctly noted, “perhaps no person living… can remember reading David Copperfield for the first time…” (Woolf as quoted in Chesterton). While both sets of books clearly merge “fact and fiction” and ultimately “belong to the memories and myths of life” (Woolf as quoted in Chesterton), they do seem to appeal to different registers of a reader’s imagination and memory so that a reader viscerally remembers their first experience with national romance but cannot recall their introduction to a national Bildungsroman.

Bildungsromane are often just as “foundational” to national literary canons as the romances Sommers explores. As David Copperfield and Los ríos profundos so clearly demonstrate, the Bildungsroman does not avoid the most difficult social woes: extreme poverty, child abuse, prostitution and even rape can be discussed through this form. It is or perhaps should be somewhat shocking then that Bildungsromane are often included in canonical reading lists as they so clearly take on such controversial and often shocking themes. Even an alternative writer like Arguedas gains inclusion to canonical pedagogy with a book like Los ríos profundos because of the way it plays to some comfortable register of the national imagination. At the same time, examining the Bildungsromane in this way demonstrates clearly a spectrum of “canonicity.” Some works of literature may be enjoyed immediately and retain their popularity as classic

---

82 Sommer’s first chapter “Irresistible Romance” deals explicitly with this element of her argument.
works of national fiction such as *David Copperfield*. Others, like *Los ríos profundos*, may never fully integrate into the canon while simultaneously meriting inclusion because something canonical *seems* to be going on within them. Other Bildungsromane may get recognized or included later for a variety of reasons. For example, *Jane Eyre* disqualified itself from immediate canonical inclusion because of its author’s gender while the sexuality and elements of impropriety within *The Catcher in the Rye* not only excluded it initially from the national canon but also got it resoundingly banned upon its publication.

Ultimately, as Fernando Unzueta notes “reading is a creative and thus variable activity, centrally involved in the complex process of the production of meaning” but one in which the “texts themselves provide directions for their own interpretation” (Unzueta 121). In their books, both Charles Dickens and José María Arguedas create highly complex and intricately balanced social contexts that their protagonists must observe in order to understand and must engage with intelligently in order to ultimately overcome the restraints they initially face. In this process, the protagonist narrates his own progress and thus guides the reader to a point of understanding of these limitations and the ability to overcome them. Relationships are highly important to such a project. Ernesto’s relationship with the indigenous uprising and David’s relationship with Agnes both require their commitment and loyalty. They create communities around them that solve or at least address the difficulties they experienced earlier in their lives. While the boarding school and the process of formal, public education fails to indoctrinate either of these children with the nationalistic or patriotic sentiments that would entice the children to imagine themselves as so thoroughly similar to other members of their national community, they do ultimately become productive citizens after subverting the hierarchical structures of their own societies.
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