ANALES GALDOSIANOS

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY,
Kingston, Ontario, Canadá

Casa-Museo Pérez Galdós

AÑO XXXIII 1998

ANALES GALDOSIANOS

AÑO XXXIII 1998

Anales Galdosianos, *en colaboración con la Asociación Internacional de Galdosistas, publica anualmente artículos, reseñas y documentos, en español o en inglés, sobre la obra de Benito Pérez Galdós y otros autores del siglo diecinueve y textos para la historia intelectual de la España de Galdós y sobre los problemas teóricos de la novela realista.*

Los manuscritos deben ser enviados en un disquete, sistema WordPerfect 5.1 o WordPerfect 6.1 Windows, [I.B.M], al que acompaña una copia en hojas de papel. Anales Galdosianos *sigue las últimas normas de documentación del* MLA Handbook.

PRECIO DE SUSCRIPCIÓN Y VENTA:

Individuos:	US $25.00
Instituciones:	US $30.00

Acogida a la franquicia postal e inscrita como correspondencia de segunda clase en la oficina de correos.

Producido por Hewson & White Printing (Kgtn) Ltd.
35 Terry Fox Drive, Kingston, ON, K7M 8N4, Canadá
I.S.S.N.: 0569-9924
Printed in Canada

ANALES GALDOSIANOS

AÑO XXXIII 1998

Fundador: Rodolfo Cardona

Directores honorarios: Rodolfo Cardona y John W. Kronik

Director: Peter Bly

Consejo de Redacción

Alicia Andreu
Middlebury College

Yolanda Arencibia
Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

Carlos Blanco Aguinaga
University of California

Brian J. Dendle
University of Kentucky

Hazel Gold
Emory University

Peter B. Goldman
Tucson

Germán Gullón
Universiteit van Amsterdam

Hans Hinterhäuser
Universität Wien

Jennifer Lowe
University of Edinburgh

Carmen Menéndez Onrubia
C.S.I.C., Madrid

Stephen Miller
Texas A & M University

Agnes Moncy
Temple University

Pedro Ortiz Armengol
Madrid

Geoffrey Ribbans
Brown University

Eamonn Rodgers
University of Strathclyde

Harriet S. Turner
University of Nebraska

Diane F. Urey
Illinois State University

J. E. Varey
University of London

James Whiston
University of Dublin

Asistente de Redacción: Paulette Bark

REDACCIÓN Y ADMINISTRACIÓN:
288 Frontenac Street
KINGSTON, Ontario,
Canadá, K7L 3S8
FAX NUMBER: (613) 530-2270
EMAIL: BLYP@Post.QueensU.CA

ÍNDICE

MONOGRAFÍA

PAUL ILIE. Fortunata's Dream: Freud and the Unconscious in Galdós 13

Prologue 13
1. Armchair Psychoanalytic Symbolism 14
2. Fortunata De-eroticized 17
3. Fortunata as "salvaje" 22
4. The Street-Wandering Dream 34
5. The Plumbing Shop 38
6. The Dwarf in the Fabric Shop 48
7. From Tavern Grill to Uncertain Directions 55
8. Music and the "Fiel Contraste" 59
9. The Traffic Jam 65
10. Street Pedlars. Final Reunion 73
Conclusion. Galdós and the Narrative Unconscious 80

RESEÑAS-ARTÍCULOS

PETER A. BLY. Choices and Consequences: Refocussing the Debate on the Meaning of *Fortunata y Jacinta* 103
JOAN OLEZA. Opciones y posiciones: a propósito del realismo/naturalismo. Un libro de S. Miller 115

RESEÑAS

MERCEDES LÓPEZ-BARALT. *Galdós, "esmeradamente corregido"*, por Enrique Miralles 131
MARY L. COFFEY. *A Sesquicentennial Tribute to Galdós 1843-1993*, ed. by Linda M. Willem 133
LILY LITVAK. *Novela e idilio en el personaje femenino de José María de Pereda*, por María Asunción Blanco de la Lama 136
WIFREDO DE RÀFOLS. *Realidad e imaginación en la obra de Pérez Galdós. Rumbos*, ed. por Julio Peñate Rivero 138
JULIO PEÑATE RIVERO. *Benito Pérez Galdós. Cuentos fantásticos*, por Alan E. Smith 140
SADI LAKHDARI. *El tiempo y los márgenes. Europa como utopía y como amenaza en la literatura española*, por Jesús Torrecilla 141
JOHN W. KRONIK. *Siguiendo los hilos: estudio de la configuración discursiva en algunas novelas españolas del siglo XIX*, por María-Paz Yáñez 144

MONOGRAFÍA

FORTUNATA'S DREAM: FREUD AND THE UNCONSCIOUS IN GALDÓS

Paul Ilie

Prologue

Does Fortunata have an unconscious that could have intrigued Galdós? The varied and often conflicting interpretations of *Fortunata y Jacinta* have been rigorous in all but one aspect, the so-called sexuality of Fortunata. This heroine has been scrutinized in the light of many contexts, from the socio-historical and moral to the psychological and narratological. But one approach that draws upon psychoanalytic symbols has enjoyed a mainstream critical status while endowing Fortunata with a dubiously erotic unconscious. This interpretation takes for its principal text the novel's longest and most complex dream, where Fortunata wanders in search of Juanito at the end of Part III (III, vii,4).* The episode has drawn frequent passing attention, and both Vernon Chamberlin and Mercedes López-Baralt have examined its details symbolically.

The dream's status of epitomizing a great literary work is summed up in the lavish praise of Caudet, who refers to

> las páginas más bellas y complejas de toda la novela. La escritura en estas páginas distorsiona la realidad, se hace visionaria, penetra el subconsciente, potencia simbólicamente los objetos cotidianos ... El estado anímico de la protagonista transforma el mundo en torno, redefiniéndolo, dándole una significación profunda. (1: 77)

The dream's significance, however, is far from being established coherently by critics. For a long dream, it is unusually episodic by classic psychoanalytical standards, for it contains numerous events, people, and objects in several spatial frames. As I will show, it functions poorly as a key to Fortunata's psyche, since it reveals nothing that the reader does not already know. It functions remarkably, however, as a narrative within the narrative, a heretofore unrecognized "internal narrative" of the kind studied by John Kronik. Nevertheless, the common response by critics is to limit discussion of the dream to a single category of erotic symbols. The result is to exclude the admittedly complex pages from any significance wider than a search for love. As Caudet phrases it:

> Toda la historia de Fortunata está aquí, en estas páginas alucinantes, resumida [...] su naturaleza erótica (los tubos, llaves y grifos); su fertilidad (el agua que éstos llevan y traen); su marginación (el Fiel Contraste, servicio público de pesas y medidas, no pesará ni medirá su caso); su quimérica e imposible relación amorosa con un señorito (que no se ha vuelto pobre). (1: 78-79)

*All quotations and references to *Fortunata y Jacinta* are followed by the corresponding Part, Chapter and section numbers, as well as the page numbers from the appropriate volume of Francisco Caudet's edition.

This summary is the unchallenged distillation of three generations of *galdosista* wisdom, an interpretation that admits of no alternative. In the current state of studies, it is virtually axiomatic that the dream about finding Juanito in the market place is fully comprehensible under Freudian assumptions that no longer need openly to be declared. The meaning, presumably, is so obvious that it is never necessary to quote Freud's writings.

If, as all agree, Fortunata's dream is a prominent episode, it would be desirable to subject it to a careful analysis, given the conclusions about her libidinal motives. Furthermore, an episode so uniquely prolonged in this most extensive of Galdós's novels may be suspected of having greater significance than that of exposing one aspect of the heroine's personality. Because Galdós studies and methodology as a rule are rigorous in other aspects, it is surprising to find tolerance for the flawed approach to sexual symbolism in *Fortunata y Jacinta*.

Stated briefly, the contested issue is that the meaning of the dream can be, and has been, routinely reduced to a few spurious sexual symbols. The love-starved Fortunata wanders the streets looking for Juanito, observes a few phallic-shaped objects, witnesses a violent event reflective of her rebellious passion, and finds the object of her desire. This plot has been regarded as the dream's true meaning, an easily discoverable latent content. But the surface story, in fact, is merely the manifest content. The evidence suggests that the entire dream points in two quite different directions. First, in Fortunata's personal dimension, her desire to reunite with Juanito is more ambivalent than has been suspected. And second, in the wider narrative dimension, the dream recapitulates most of the themes of the novel as a whole. Rather than shedding new light on Fortunata's character by means of her "unconscious," the dream illuminates Galdós's own virtuosity and makes his own unconscious a matter of speculation.

1. Armchair Psychoanalytic Symbolism

The history of critical nonchalance about symbolism in Fortunata's dream is instructive to contemplate because of its cumulative influence. In an otherwise elegant book about Galdós and the European novel, Stephen Gilman makes an astonishing statement about the celebrated dream. He says that the heroine's sighting of symbolic tubes, faucets, and hard-point pencils "will seem elementary to the latter-day amateur psychoanalysts, which Freud has made of us all" (*Galdós* 351). The presumably sexual symbols are so self-evident that armchair Freudians have no need to walk to the bookshelf to verify them in Freud's writings. This particular license to affirm without argued proof has long been a *galdosista* privilege. It is thirty-five years since Joseph Schraibman called attention to Galdós's pre-Freudian insights, and thirty years since Gilman in his 1966 article observed that Jacinta's dream of maternal love (I, viii,2) is "a remarkable Freudian dream" and that Fortunata's "equally Freudian but aggressively phallic dream" (III, vii, 4) scarcely differs in the use of sexual symbols (Gilman, "The Birth" 73). Repeating the psychoanalytic reference to this longest of the novel's dreams in 1970, Gilman prepares the way for his book's encouragement of Freudian dabblers to join kindred symbol-hunters in identifying without explicating ("The Consciousness" 63-64). Indeed, the past three decades have fortified a standard of intuitive "common knowledge" about sexual symbolism and how to recog-

nize it, in the place of argued textual evidence taken either from Galdós's own words or from those of Freud and his commentators.[1] Most recently, Geoffrey Ribbans judiciously examines the evidence for every aspect of the novel except for this dream, cited twice in passing for its "tubos," "so evidently a phallic symbol" (*Conflicts* 69, 252).

The youngest generation of *galdosistas* continues the tradition. Apropos of Fortunata's earlier dream of open doors and unbolted locks, we read most recently the complacent reassurance that "one need not have read Freud to discusss the sexual symbolism of this dream, which opens up the workings of the character's unconscious mind" (Tsuchiya, "Las Micaelas" 69). Contrary to the scholar's advice to skip Freud, a reader discovers Freud writing in 1919 that "the assertion that all dreams require a sexual interpretation [...] occurs nowhere in [...] any of the numerous editions of this book and is in obvious contradiction to other views expressed in it" (*The Interpretation* 5: 397).[2] The dream in question follows Fortunata's resistance to Juanito at the door on her wedding night (II, vii, 4), and further reflection upon its meaning suggests that the heroine's unconscious is really not at issue. She already knows consciously that to open the door to Juanito is also to open her body to him. In fact, she does open the door to him before the dream, but he is gone. At this point, when it is too late and she rushes to the window, and later when she is awake, she understands her longing very well. There is nothing deep or concealed about this knowledge that might require her to dream about it in any form, disguised or otherwise. The dream is a trivial event from a symbolist standpoint.

An exception to such undocumented opinions about Fortunata's street-wandering dream is Mercedes López-Baralt, whose confused analysis will be discussed later in this study. López-Baralt bases her superficial remarks on Freud's 1901 brochure, *On Dreams*, the abbreviated popularization of *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900).[3] Among her self-contradictions is the claim that the dream's early section disguises Fortunata's "deseo que apenas quiere confesarse a sí misma, pues está casada con Maxi y aspira a la honradez," whereas the dream's final section is nakedly intelligible by depicting "su deseado encuentro con Juanito Santa Cruz, motivado por la *pícara idea* y mencionado explícitamente" (141-42).[4] Which desire is it, erotic and shameful or moral and bold? Such ambivalence, if at all possible, is not explained, but even if it could be, the obvious factor is never mentioned: the censoring mechanism in wish-fulfilment

The most persuasive *galdosista* symbolist is Vernon Chamberlin, who relies on archetypal as well as Freudian symbols. When dealing with Maxi, his interpretation is credible, but he links it to Fortunata in ways that seem plausible only on first sight. Chamberlin's analysis will also be discussed in a more suitable context later.

Inasmuch as no one has actually reasoned through the Freudian basis of Fortunata's extended dream or any other dream, it is perplexing that some of the most respectable scholars before Chamberlin routinely accepted a symbolically sexual interpretation.[5] Granted that a psychological approach to the novel may be appealing on the historical evidence.[6] The year 1885, when Galdós began to write *Fortunata y Jacinta*, also marked Freud's arrival in Paris to study hysteria with Charcot (Ullman and Allison 18). In the same year, neurologist Luis Simarro returned to Madrid, after five years of study in Paris, to embark on therapeutic reform of mental disease. Some scholars might contend that Galdós could not have been ignorant of the issues involved therein. However, this avenue of discussion will illuminate the deranged Maxi more than the distraught Fortunata. The debates over therapy in the 1880s did not include the

psychoanalytic theories that Freud developed after 1900. The main reason for linking Galdós with Freud, consequently, must lie elsewhere.

The motive seems to be a desire to emphasize the novelist's keen insight into human nature. Not only does Galdós evince "an astonishing pre-Freudian grasp of the most enduring tenets of psychoanalysis," according to Arnold Penuel, but he also "discloses a conception of personality which is superior to Freud's and coincides with the view of man espoused by humanistic psychologists" (67). Gerald Gillespie, in his review of Schraibman's book, notes that dreams are valuable for exposing the order of psychological growth in nature and in maintaining "our contact with the hidden wellsprings of all stories, the gateway to [...] the laws of organic development" (110-11). For Ricardo López-Landy, dreams portray "una peculiar y profética realidad" that permits characters to adumbrate future events instead of the narrator doing so (224). Gilman insists that "we should admire all the more Galdós's prescience in exploring what was at that time, at least in Spain, an absolutely unknown region" (*Galdós* 351). For other scholars, Galdós's power to mediate our deepest insights into reality expands under the wider umbrella of mythical and archetypal allusions. Víctor Fuentes invokes Bachelard, Jung, and Eliade for this argument, but returns to the "concepción freudiana" whereby "manda el principio del placer inmodificado y la libertad frente a la represión," which allows Fortunata "su antídoto vital contra las renuncias diurnas impuestas por [...] la realidad establecida" (49). And, of course, Gilman again advertises that Fortunata's dream "is replete with oneiric symbols that would have interested Freud. [...] Freud would have appreciated Galdós as a novelistic precursor" (*Galdós* 352-53)

At the current moment in the history of Galdós studies, when the unfriendly critical legacy of the Generation of 98 has been nullified, there is little need to insist on the novelist's genius at every turn. Similarly, the critics' fascination with Fortunata risks ending in the same kind of strained admiration for her realistic human rendering. Is she really so complicated a woman? Regardless of whether *galdosistas* invoke Freud, they assume that her unconscious requires symbols to be intelligible. Is it heresy to suggest the contrary? Going further, is it misguided to ask whether, indeed, Fortunata possesses an unconscious that held a deep interest for Galdós, an unconscious that he would insinuate to readers through precursory Freudian dream symbolism? The answer will be negative after an examination of how Fortunata feels about herself, how others perceive her, and how the narrator presents her without focalization. She is sexually desirable but not so sexually driven as to make her unconscious an issue on this account.

The proposed examination becomes a requirement in view of the critics' persistent isolation of minor elements in the dream that carry a non-erotic import when examined in the dream's full context. Taken out of context, the "phallic" and "Freudian" texts are as follows:

se para ante el escaparate de la tienda de tubos, obedeciendo a esa rutina del instinto por la cual, cuando tenemos un encuentro feliz en determinado sitio, volvemos al propio sitio creyendo que lo tendremos por segunda vez. ¡Cuánto tubo! Llaves de bronce, grifos, y multitud de cosas para llevar y traer el agua... Detiénese allí mediano rato viendo y esperando.

[...]

Fortunata sigue y pasa junto a la taberna en cuya puerta está la gran parrilla de asar chuletas, y debajo el

enorme hogar lleno de fuego. La tal taberna tiene para ella recuerdos que le sacan tiras del corazón...
[...]
otro [individuo] que vende los lápices más fuertes del mundo (como que da con ellos tremendos picotazos en la madera sin que se les rompa la punta). (III, vii, 4; 255-57)

I shall contextualize these fragments later, but their isolation here dramatizes the falsification of Fortunata as a sexual subject (as distinct from a sexual object). It is this eroticized Fortunata that I wish to deflate next.

2. Fortunata De-eroticized

Scholars should not misunderstand the effort at de-eroticization that now follows. The sexual desire that Fortunata arouses in men does not mean that she herself primarily desires sex. Whatever physical attraction she may have felt for Juanito initially, no hint of it ever emerges. I am not saying that she does not enjoy sexual pleasure, only that Galdós does not display it because his interest lies in her deprivation of something larger than sex that includes love, of which one element is physical desire. Her three liaisons with Juanito after her marriage emphasize a sentimental love defined in terms of constancy, security, domesticity, motherhood, and desire for legitimacy—everything except eroticism. Indeed, Juanito's complaint against Fortunata is precisely that she is not seductive, that she is lacking in the arts of pleasureful erotic variety ("se me está volviendo antipática, lo mismo que la otra vez. La pobrecilla no aprende, no adelanta un solo paso en el arte de agradar; no tiene instintos de seducción, desconoce las gaterías que embelesan" [III, iii, 1; 76]). The thirst for gratification that Vernon Chamberlin finds to be sexually based is, in reality, a thirst for children.[7] As Juanito complains in a litany of reproaches, "hace días le dio por estar rezando toda la tarde ... ¿Y para qué? ... Para pedirle a Dios chiquillos ... ¡Al Demonio se le ocurre!" Her fixed idea is to bind Juanito through child-bearing, surrendering her infant for a husband; her mind holds no place for devising erotic foreplays, much less for arousing her own sexual desire with thoughts of Juanito's favours. The notion that her marriage leaves her "sexually frustrated," in Chamberlin's words, seems unwarranted.

Fortunata's all-consuming love finds its most representative summary in a textual convergence of the words "amor," "deseos," and "pasión": "ansias de amor, deseos vivísimos de normalizar su vida dentro de la pasión que la dominaba" (II, vii, 11; 713). I will argue that what Ricardo Gullón remarks is the most that can be said: "Fortunata es pura y simplemente una mujer enamorada: una pasión elemental ardiendo de su propia llama" (47). Other critics have gone further so as to make her sexual desires an accepted fact. Gilman speaks of "the force of the carnal demands" without specifying how they manifest themselves. The claim seems to justify his belief that the long dream of Part III obeys a "symbolically concealed erotic compulsion" (*Galdós* 352). Chamberlin's assertion that Fortunata has a "physical need" for "sexual satisfaction" has never been proven textually ("Poor Maxi's Windmill" 433-34). Neither Francisco Caudet's statement that Juanito "despertó el erotismo de Fortunata—erotismo que sería el motor

de su concienciación" (1: 83), nor Jo Labanyi's that "Fortunata is shown to be governed by active sexual drives" ("Introduction" 12) is based on textual evidence. The nature of the "pasión elemental ardiendo" cited by Gullón needs to be reconstructed.

Fortunata's condition as a female reveals four categories that must be kept separate: matrimony or its absence, maternity, gender role, and sexuality or eroticism. Each category imposes its own criteria for behaviour and motive. Fortunata's gender role relates to her desire to take care of Juanito and to be his social equal. A desire for maternity appears to be the drive behind any physical intimacy she may indulge in, and the "pasión elemental" constitutes the obsessive sum of both. Matrimony would be the gateway to a secure fulfilment of social gender and maternal roles. Where, finally, does this leave eroticism or sexuality per se?

Fortunata's illicit liaison carries immoral sexual connotations in the public mind, which stigmatizes such relationships. But a moment's consideration makes it clear that the erotic motive weighs heavily on the male partner and lightly on the female. Fortunata has nothing to offer Juanito besides sexual pleasure, but the reverse is not true. Juanito has much to offer that his mistress would desire besides sex, such as conversation, material comforts, mental security, and pride of social association, illegitimate though it may be.

The repeated claim that Fortunata has, in Gilman's words, an "erotic compulsion" and that, in Chamberlin's words, she lacks "sexual satisfaction" should be discarded unless it can be supported textually. Does any reader believe that if Galdós had wished to be explicit he would have shied away from ascribing physical pleasure or want of it to Fortunata? A summary of her physical traits, such as the one made by Geoffrey Ribbans, does not deny her beauty and physical desirability, but neither does it reveal any suggestion of erotic desire on her part. Neither her robust health and animal vitality nor "aquel busto estatuario" conjures libidinous associations (*Fortunata y Jacinta* 88). When critics attempt to summarize Fortunata's bodily charm they omit sexual implications because Galdós's narrator reports none. Sherman Eoff's table of physical and intellectual characteristics may be mechanical but it is comprehensive, and it is limited to "beauty, health, vigor, stable temperament, physical stamina, average intelligence" (*The Novels* 46). The perception by Pedro Ortiz Armengol is that she "es hermosa, inculta en grado sumo, crédula y sin recovecos, rápida en entregarse, generosa. A lo largo de su vida Galdós pondrá en ella dos virtudes que nos llaman la atención: su amor al trabajo y su deseo de aprender y de refinarse" (31). An essential sketch is offered by William Shoemaker: "Fortunata is never fully described, and she becomes visually real only in bits and pieces," "a brunette; with black hair and excellent teeth; black eyes, too large a mouth; slender and well built, without need of a corset; and without pretense or sham in dress" (269). This summary points to the narrative fragmentation of the heroine's physical presence, and this real fragmentation diminishes any flavour of erotic drives or pleasures. Her body never presents itself in its full sexuality at any single moment, a technique that speaks to Galdós's disinterest in this aspect of her life.[8]

It is even arguable that the narrator's shifting focus undermines a coherent image of the heroine's body. The "too large a mouth" cited by Shoemaker derives from Fortunata's own self-image in a mirror ("la boca, un poco grande, pero fresca y tan mona en la risa como en el enojo" [II, ii, 7; 506]). But in another perspective, again not the narrator's, it is "aquella boca tan linda" that Juanito describes when confessing to Jacinta (I, v, 5; 228). Then too, what should the reader understand by "aquel busto estatuario" that Villalonga extols to Juanito (I, xi, 1; 433)?

The context is his report of the stunning and seductive transformation made by Fortunata, newly returned from Paris. But how does Galdós allow his character to develop the idea of physical attractions?: "¡Vaya un cambiazo! Está guapísima, elegantísima. Chico, me quedé turulato cuando la vi" (I, xi, 1; 432). This prelude is interrupted by Jacinta's entrance. She leaves, and Villalonga continues, beginning with a first impression of "una mujer vestida con una elegancia ... ¿cómo te diré? con una elegancia improvisada." He recognizes the face and reports that she "está de rechupete." In the next breath and moving closer to her in the café, the expert approves her body: "el talle y el corsé, cuando hay dentro calidad, los arreglan los modistos fácilmente." But then words fail him: "un aire seductor, capaz de ...," and he trails off into an ellipsis soon filled by a reminder:

> Te acordarás de aquel cuerpo sin igual, de aquel busto estatuario, de esos que se dan en el pueblo y mueren en la oscuridad cuando la civilización no los busca y los *presenta*. Cuántas veces lo dijimos: "Si este busto supiera explotarse ...!" Pues ¡hala!, ya lo tienes en perfecta explotación. [...] ¡Qué líneas tan primorosas! (I, xi, 1; 433)

Not only does the passage display the male erotic mentality more than Fortunata's, but it expands on the prestige of a sexy woman's social impact more than it fantasizes aloud about her declared endowments. It is noteworthy that the term "busto" retains a verbal decorum that is out of place among these young philanderers, and that "pechos" is used more graphically in another description by Juanito. But even there he also deviates from their erotic function because his listener is his wife, who must be reassured: "criaba los palomos a sus pechos [...] se los metía en el seno, ¡y si vieras tú qué seno tan bonito! [...] Era la paloma madre de los tiernos pichoncitos [...] les cantaba canciones de nodriza" (I, v, 5; 228).[9]

The deflected erotics are typical of Galdós's practice and cannot be ignored. Perhaps the most extraordinary example of subverted sexual implications is the narrator's own description of Fortunata's body. Not only does he choose a domestic moment to present her objectively or by a zero degree focalization, but he follows that description with Maxi's quite different view of her:

> Gustaba mucho de los trabajos domésticos, y no se cansaba nunca. *Sus músculos eran de acero, y su sangre fogosa se avenía mal con la quietud.* Como pudiera, más se cuidaba de prolongar los trabajos que de abreviarlos. Planchar y lavar le agradaba en extremo, y entregábase a estas faenas con delicia y ardor, desarrollando sin cansarse la fuerza de sus puños. *Tenía las carnes duras y apretadas y la robustez se combinaba en ella con la agilidad, la gracia con la rudeza para componer la más hermosa figura de salvaje que se pudiera imaginar. Su cuerpo no necesitaba corsé para ser esbeltísimo. Vestido enorgullecía a las modistas; desnudo o a medio vestir,* cuando andaba por aquella casa tendiendo ropa en el balcón, limpiando los muebles o cargando los colchones [...] *parecía una figura de otros tiempos*; al menos, así lo pensaba Rubín, que sólo había visto belleza semejante en pinturas de amazonas o cosa tal. Otras veces le parecía mujer de la Biblia, *la Betsabée aquella del baño*, la Rebeca o la Samaritana, señoras que había visto en una obra ilustrada, y que, con ser

tan barbianas, todavía se quedaban dos dedos más abajo de la sana hermosura y de la gallardía de su amiga. (II, ii, 4; 492-93; my emphasis)

By italicizing the erotically suggestive phrases, I mark the contrast between the sexual attributes and their misplacement in a domestic scene, a move from boudoir to laundry room, so to speak. Here is a physically stunning Fortunata as Galdós conceived her yet declined to depict her in the enjoyment of her own beauty. But there is more. What is the reader to make of "parecía una figura de otros tiempos"? The peculiar phrase removes the female's reality to a mythical realm, de-eroticizing her in spite of the reference to Bathsheba and the word "barbianas." There is much to explicate in this segment of the passage that I must omit, including the choice and sequence of the Biblical women, but the positioning of a sensual Bathsheba, herself virtuous and merely the object of David's desire, in the company of the matriarchal Rebecca and the newly converted Samaritan woman results in a neutralized sensuality. Coupled with the image of bellicose Amazons, the words "belleza," "sana hermosura," and "gallardía" reach a level of piety and restraint that destroys whatever erotic nuances might remain from the earlier segment, if any existed in the first place.

Scholars have expressed surprise at Galdós's restraint in the sexual matters of *Fortunata y Jacinta*. Gilman acknowledges that "Galdós is surprisingly reserved" and that the novel is "chaste and reticent" about "the sensual recollections and libidinal longings" that mark other novels like *Lo prohibido* and Clarín's *La Regenta* (*Galdós* 352). Harriet Turner concurs that Galdós is "noted for his reticence, gives us little sexual detail," but notes that "a full range of human sexuality is nevertheless suggested" (90). But this claim is neither argued nor supported by texts. In a similarly concise assertion, Gilman finds "a self-imposed restraint [that] augments and makes us appreciate [...] the force of the carnal demands with which these consciousnesses must cope" (*Galdós* 352). Gilman believes further that the dream represents the same "symbolically concealed erotic compulsion" and that the very dream "results in 'la pícara idea'" (*Galdós* 352). This phrase refers to Fortunata's plan to surrender her child by Juanito to Jacinta in exchange for Juanito himself. But is her motive rooted in erotic desire or a wish for equal status with her rival, together with a yearning for permanence that her fidelity has nourished? The truth is that while the dream occurs at the end of Part III, the "pícara idea" crystalizes much earlier, at the end of Part II.[10] The "idea" occurs to her right after her marriage and at the time of her first reconciliation with Juanito.[11] If any "compulsion" impels her, it is the moral and domestic one that begins in the chapter titled "La restauración vencedora," where, as Gustavo Correa reviews the angry genesis, "la violenta cólera de la mujer del pueblo que, una vez más, se ve engañada por el señorito de las clases altas [...] logra rehacerse paulatinamente, a fin de dar cumplimiento a un plan que habrá de elevar su dignidad" (*Realidad* 136-37).

In all the scholarly instances cited, the erotic attributions to Fortunata are made in passing, without discussion, as a pre-established given apropos of the critic's main concern. In one significant case, the result is amusing, for Ángel Tarrío's semiological study considers the much invoked offering of a raw egg to be an "agresión erótica" instead of a fertility symbol (129). To believe that Fortunata is making a sexual overture, one would have to redefine sex appeal. How arousing can she be when the narrator chooses to describe her as having "cierta semejanza con una gallina que esponja su plumaje y se ahueca para volver luego a su volumen natural" (I, iii, 4;

182)? If Juanito's pulse races at this spectacle, a reader must wonder whether some narrative irony aims to undo the effect. This is not to disagree with John Sinnigen's remark that "Juanito explota su sexualidad [de Fortunata]," but the idea that she "representa una sexualidad femenina de clase baja que no acepta su represión" poses problems of definition ("Sexo" 59, 60). Is her sexual desire repressed, or is she free to enact a larger gender role of unstigmatized motherhood, domestic companionship, and social equality? As Sinnigen recognizes, "Fortunata no se conforma con ser el objeto eventual del volátil deseo masculino" (57).

Critics have not confined their erotic image of Fortunata to her physical presence. The act of eating signifies for Chamberlin a carnal appetite in the double sense of "carne" as flesh and meat.[12] He elaborates a study of food imagery by Sarah King, who finds sexual appetite figured in the novel through a series of culinary references.[13] Because Fortunata knows intimately several "chuleta"-eating men, Chamberlin posits a "personal identification with this kind of meat and, very significantly, the accompanying feelings, which sums up her dilemma. Since Fortunata was always a passionate woman, it is no surprise that her psyche should have recourse early on in the dream to two important symbols: *chuletas* (the form of *carne* preferred by the novel's male characters) and *fuego*. The latter symbol [...] reflects her present state of passionate desire for sexual gratification" ("A Further Consideration" 56-57).[14] The logical problem here is the step from "passionate," which she is temperamentally, to "passionate desire." In the light of the earlier discusion about her overall condition as a female motivated by the "pícara idea," it is difficult to know what words or actions might support the existence of a "desire for sexual gratification," as Chamberlin offers none. I will return to this scene of "chuletas" in section 7.

In a related vein, when Feijoo says to Fortunata, "hija, tienes un apetito modelo," Carlos Blanco Aguinaga insists that her heartiness reflects the eroticism of her actions. According to Blanco's argument, "el apetito del corazón" and Fortunata's being "encarcelada y puesta a pan y agua" cause her to feel deprived in the next chapter ("Entrar" 84-85). Granted that in Freudian analysis psychic phenomena have an erotic source—in the broad sense of sensual gratification originating in the oral stage of infancy—, this does not mean that eating is flatly sexual.[15] At any rate, the figurative "hunger of the heart" is for love, not simply sex. Blanco's further point, contrary to Chamberlin's, is that milk is the most important food symbol. But the breast-feeding context of milk, coupled with the anatomical member itself, belongs to the child's nursery, not the lovers' bedroom, as Gilman has noted.[16] The implication is that even Jacinta's dream of the "niño-hombre" at her breast signifies a repudiation of sexual pleasure in favour of child-bearing (I, viii, 2). By the same token, the allusions to Fortunata's thirst for milk and her white teeth like "leche cuajada" conflict with the primary context, which is maternal. These allusions bring the entire set of milk references into symbolic disarray as far as they relate to useful exegesis.

3. Fortunata as "salvaje"

The preceding de-erotization may arch the backs of some *galdosistas*, but it is consistent with the position that I soon shall argue, that phallic symbols have little to do with the dream of tubes, pencils, food, and fire. Several other important elements of the dream—the "camino darwinista" and the traffic jam—introduce themes of primitivism and violence that may tempt future critics to assimilate these also to Fortunata and to construe them in psychoanalytical terms. This temptation I shall discourage. At the same time, an approach that attributes uncomplimentary primitivism to Fortunata will surely elicit resistance on the part of other specialists. Nevertheless, the heroine's savagery (not just wildness) exists, although significantly not manifested in the dream. My strategy for discussing these themes while anticipating Freudians who may find them confirmed in the dream will be to deal with primitive themes in this section instead of in the later section on the dream. The resistance that I anticipate is due partly to an idealizing trend among interpreters, who, for various reasons, accept Fortunata's own self-elevation to an angelic summit. And it is precisely this elevation that runs counter to what the novel actually tells us.

The idealization of Fortunata by critics has served two purposes: to argue optimistically for the "pueblo"'s prospect of social harmony with the middle class, and to argue for the individual spiritual growth of a disadvantaged female victim.[17] For instance, Geoffrey Ribbans interprets the novel's ending optimistically: "Fortunata has now been transformed into an ideal, a free spirit [...] an angel," and whereas he does not consider her fate "tragic" in the way that Anthony Zahareas does, nonetheless, he regards it as "the tragic death of a young woman in her prime" (*Fortunata y Jacinta* 112, 116).[18] Similarly, Stephen Gilman speaks of Fortunata's "metamorphosis" "from spiritual subjection to revalidation of values," viewing its culmination in her apotheosis and salvation: "as those who witness her death observe unanimously, she ends as [...] an angel" (*Galdós* 376, 340). He adds several other idealizing asides: that "surely Fortunata would have greatly enjoyed herself" at the Prado, and also that we as readers have "loved" her "at least enough to read her 'history' to the last of so many pages" (*Galdós* 374, 377). Peter Bly goes so far as to view Fortunata as a sacrificial offering, in symbolic metonymy with the poultry shop as a slaughterhouse ("Fortunata" 104, 108). Lisa Condé cites Ballester's assertion that Fortunata "era la persona más honrada y honesta que usted puede imaginar," and she regards Guillermina's astonishment at this opinion to be as "myopic" as is the majority of Spanish society (235). Lou Charnon-Deutsch finds Fortunata "tolerant," "loving and generous" (157), "a celebration of the intensity of passion with which women are cursed and which men are blessed to inspire" (160). Other summaries of character contribute to the favourable scholarly reception of Fortunata's overall portrait.[19]

Fortunata's apotheosis has, of course, only two witnesses to affirm it: her loving friend, Ballester, who is scarcely impartial, and the deranged Maxi, who accepts Ballester's description.[20] These two people aside, the verdict is otherwise. The narrator takes no part in the differing opinions of Jacinta and Guillermina on the matter of the drubbing administered to Aurora.[21] The idea of angelic merit is Fortunata's own, manufactured when she compares her behaviour to Aurora's calumny of Jacinta, and she wins Guillermina's indignant agreement.[22]

When the dying heroine insists that she is an angel, Guillermina pacifies her cautiously: "—Ángel, sí; bueno, esa convicción me gusta—con inquietud—. Pero yo quisiera ..." And again, "—Ángel, sí; pero es preciso, hija mía, confesar la fe de Cristo." The doubt intensifies when she dies unconfessed and the priest, Nones, says: "¡Pobrecita! Dice que es ángel ... Dios lo verá ..." (IV, vi, 14; 528). If this pair are no less biased in their fashion than are Ballester and Maxi, then the reader must review independently Fortunata's "angelic" behaviour and make the judgement.

To begin with the cause of her death, it is understated by Peter Bly's remark about her character: "it cannot be said that Fortunata bears none of the blame for her fate. Her abiding weakness is her total love for Juanito, a love which dominates her whole being and blinds her to his basic character defects" (*Galdós's Novel* 113). It would be more blunt to ponder the meaning of "tragic" as meant by Zahareas and Ribbans by qualifying it in the classical sense of a flaw in character. Fortunata dies because her violent temper carries her from childbirth bed to a wrestling assault on Aurora. This impulsive lack of common sense, not to say self-control, leaves her so weakened that she precipitates the fatal haemorrhage by a second, enraged rising from bed upon learning of Aurora's rumour that the infant's father is Ballester. This fatal defect in her basic nature is unmodifiable despite the many attempts to mould her. Although "she remains inevitably the plaything of others" while alive, the fact that she is "torn between remorse and a sense of guiltlessness" (Ribbans *Fortunata y Jacinta,* 90, 91) arouses all the more pity in the light of her repeated compulsiveness. Her compulsive violence extends to a verbal reenactment that Hazel Gold finds obsessive: "Returned to her sickbed, she describes over and over her set-to with Aurora. The repetitiveness of her recitation acquires an incantatory tone: 'But she kept going back over the episode with Aurora, giving it tragic proportions, and as soon as she finished she began to tell it again'" (*The Reframing* 68).

Judging Fortunata's transformation as "angelic" fails the test of her actions in Parts III and IV. Critics have summarized her personality selectively in view of the aspects that suit their particular focus, and the result is that the total number of personal features recorded by the narrator is never cited. Nevertheless, a quantitative comparison of Fortunata's "positive" and "negative" qualities reveals a preponderance of negative ones. On the one hand, her final return home prompts the narrator to say: "Indudablemente la joven se había adecentado mucho y adquirido hábitos de señora, porque la vivienda aquella se le representaba inferior a su categoría, a sus hábitos y a sus gustos" (IV, iii, 7; 397). On the other hand, the narrator's shifting focalizations permit innumerable negative epithets: "pecadora," "anarquista," "Samaritana," "la diabla intranquila." The narrator's own "delincuente" and the neutral "la joven," "la de Rubín" also occur, but never any unfocalized epithet that carries a sympathizing nuance, with the sole, possible exception of "la infeliz joven," when she is dying.

Most damaging to Fortunata's image is a deficiency of attractive qualities—not to say "lovable" ones, in Gilman's sense of the word— either in her actions or her remarks. It may be too much to expect "redeeming" qualities of a person who scarcely has any choices in life. She does have kind feelings for Feijoo and moments of pity amidst repugnance for Maxi, but is it admirable to feel kindly because one man is a good lover and provides security while feeling disgust because another man is a bad lover even though he too provides security?[23] What about her sincerity? The much-vaunted sincerity or lack of hypocrisy that scholars cite is an ethical cat-

egory and thus subject to such concepts as integrity and moral honesty. Fortunata does not always say what she thinks, and when she does flout conventional morality, it is not because of an inner sense of integrity—she knows very well that she is sometimes wrong or perverse—but because of her unwavering belief that she is the true wife of Juanito.[24] Judged from the standpoint of a reality principle, this posture would be called obstinacy, not sincerity.

The point is not that Fortunata is a bad or unlikeable person, for it is true that she has contrite and generous moments, or that on her deathbed she forgives Juanito and Aurora, begrudgingly—gestures that do not impress José Montesinos.[25] She is flexible enough to be "moulded" temporarily, just as her reasoning powers exist for limited use, but these transitory states attest to the instability of her primitive character.[26] Likewise, her brutal frankness may be considered a virtue, but it is hardly an attractive one in human relations. Attractive qualities may be visible to Juanito when he renews their affair after her dream, responding to "Tanta ingenuidad [...] era una de las cosas que más le encantaban en ella." As for his motive for renewal, "ansiaba inmergirla [el alma] en la frescura de aquel afecto primitivo y salvaje, pura esencia de los sentimientos del pueblo rudo" (III, vii, 5; 263). But, on further reflection, it is clear that both qualities, naïveté and primitive emotionalism (the narrator does not say "amor"), are the condescending preferences of an upper-class lover. The same qualities have quite another impact in Fortunata's own social class, where people are not aware that they display delightful "ingenuidad" and where the "afecto rudo y salvaje" implies a capacity for its violent opposite, "desafecto," as the novel suggests on several occasions, other than in the personage of *Mauricia la Dura*. Of course, there is Fortunata's beauty, which, as a quality, is only skin deep, and about which I will say more later.

Before I proceed, it is important for readers to bear in mind the distinction between the particular qualities of a heroine and the pathos aroused by the general condition of which she is but one example, the condition of double standards that all women of her class experienced. It is one thing to feel sympathy, if not historical outrage, because seduced women had recourse to social respectability only by marriages that often violated their deepest sensibilities. It is another matter to judge the personality of an individual seduced woman. The fact that middle-class males could enjoy the hypocrisy of respectable adultery while females of all classes could not has little bearing on the particular psychology of one female's adultery. Thus, when Condé observes that Fortunata "offers a refreshing change from hypocrisy and superficial values" (132), we must refer to the particular mind-set of that adultery.[27] By the same token, we may share Caudet's solidarity with the underclass as he notes that Fortunata "había tenido muchas experiencias. [...] —al igual que las masas de desheredados de la sociedad española—, había empezado a vislumbrar su 'papel de subordinación teñida de marginación' [quoting historian José Jover Zamora]. Fortunata fue tomando conciencia de su papel, se rebeló y, finalmente, sucumbió" (1: 69). This compassionate social assessment does not preclude a different psychological assessment.

The word "salvaje" holds the key to Fortunata's personality. The history of this word unfolds along two narrative registers, the historical or collective register—to be examined when the dream is discussed—and the word's relevance to the heroine. Does "salvaje" mean "uncouth" or the more disturbing "uncivilized"? Does it imply a "wild" disposition or that of a "barbarian," a "savage"?[28] A mild connotation might be inferred from its use when Fortunata

first sees Juanito after her marriage, "lanzando este grito salvaje: —¡Nene! ... ¡Bendito Dios!" (II, vii, 6; 687). However, the ferocity becomes evident when Juanito twice protests, "Pero no muerdas," as he promises fidelity in the same scene. The frequent use of "salvaje" produces a frightful, cumulative portrait, beginning with the word's ambivalent effect on the description of Fortunata's physical beauty, her most admirable asset: "Tenía las carnes duras y apretadas, y la robustez se combinaba en ella con la agilidad, la gracia con la rudeza para componer la más hermosa figura de salvaje que se pudiera imaginar" (II, ii, 4; 493). Unsurprisingly, the priest, Nicolás Rubín, instructs the pre-nuptial Fortunata by censuring such beauty and the love that "es propio de hembras salvajes" (II, iv, 5; 564). More surprising is the worldly Feijoo's comparison of her previous behaviour to the uncivil rudeness of heathen times: "Hay que guardar en todo caso las santas apariencias, y tributar a la sociedad ese culto externo sin el cual volveríamos al estado salvaje" (III, iv, 10; 144). Guillermina's reaction is neither surprising nor predictable. She is so shocked by Fortunata's idea of renewing relations with Juanito that she is speechless. Significantly, the narrator must imagine what she might have said if she had possessed the aplomb: "'Usted no tiene sentido moral; usted no puede tener nunca principios, porque es anterior a la civilización; usted es una salvaje y pertenece de lleno a los pueblos primitivos'" (III, vii, 3; 251). This is what Guillermina would have uttered, reports the narrator, who himself employs the reproach. The power of this reproach resides in the unknowable. What Guillermina does not say will never be known. What the narrator invents are his own words, a third-party condemnation that he attributes to the silent woman.[29] The three usages of "salvaje" convey a rather severe judgement. In none of them does the connotation of sinfulness or immorality arise; what Fortunata represents antedates religion and ethics by reaching back to the remoteness of physical primitivity.

The same word "salvaje" issues from Fortunata's own mouth, and with the same unfavourable connotations. As a violent female ready to tear asunder her lover's marriage, she announces her project to Guillermina with "la expresión del anarquista que arroja la bomba explosiva para hacer saltar a los poderes de la tierra." Provoking the imagined response just quoted, "dio a entender Fortunata que por ella no había inconveniente en que la sociedad volviera al estado salvaje" (III, vii, 3; 250-51). What the narrator reports here had emerged previously from Fortunata's own mouth in all its pejorative meaning. The occurrence is her recital to Feijoo of earlier madcap experiences: "la cabra siempre tira al monte. Pueblo nací y pueblo soy; quiero decir, ordinariota y salvaje" (III, iv, 1; 94). Her self-knowledge will prove to be prophetic when she regresses to the street-fighting tactics of childhood in her attack on Aurora at the novel's end. In fact, she knows her own ferocity all too well, for when Juanito asks how she would respond if Maxi tried to kill him, she answers: "Me tiraba a él como una leona y le destrozaba." Her imagination then takes a cold, inhuman turn: "¿Ves cómo se coge un langostino y se le arrancan las patas, y se le retuerce el corpacho y se le saca lo que tiene dentro? Pues así" (II, vii, 7; 693-94). Obviously, the contrived analogy is Galdós's, placed in the heroine's mouth, but why would he choose such surgical details if Fortunata were merely an impulsive primitive?

Before I complete this unangelic portrait, a glance at a very different portrait by Sherman Eoff will be instructive. Eoff's highly intelligent study includes a schematic psychobiography that traces the heroine's alleged regenerative development as a series of "plateau advances" or "psychological peripetias" in which each step is psychologically dependent upon the preceding one. Thus, her desire for social respectability precedes

a stimulated conscience in regard to honesty and aversion to treacherous action; (3) competitive incentive toward moral respectability; (4) competitive incentive toward physical superiority over her rival (especially as regards the capacity for bearing children); (5) magnanimity in competition and desire for mutuality of respect; (6) a drive for equality in saintliness with her rival. (72-73)

Admittedly, "periods of frustration, relaxation, retrocession, and renewal of drives" exist, but they do not impede the "more or less gradual ascent." This version most likely gives impetus to subsequent idealizations like Gilman's, but its unexamined reference to "retrocession and renewal" undermines the whole. In order to appreciate why, the story line of Parts III and IV needs to be examined because the personality that emerges is less than pretty.

The novel invites the reader's sympathies by an initially positive profile of Fortunata. When first viewed by Juanito, she is "una mujer bonita, joven, alta" (I, iii, 4; 182), and Juanito sketches her for Jacinta as "una chica huérfana que vivía con su tía," "un animalito muy mono, una salvaje que no sabía leer ni escribir [...] ¡Aquella infeliz chica! ... Como te digo, un animal, pero buen corazón, buen corazón ... ¡pobre *nena*!" (I, v, 2; 205-06). The reader learns to beware, however, because Juanito is an unreliable informant who manipulates Jacinta by omitting some details and slanting others.[30] Part II continues the unreliable reportage, this time through Maxi's romantic eyes. A reversion to the "salvaje" motif occurs when the narrator supplements Maxi's idealist view: "Maximiliano se reía de aquella incultura rasa, tomando en serio la tarea de irla corrigiendo poco a poco. Y ella no disimulaba su barbarie" (II, ii, 1; 481-82). The lightheartedness that accompanies "incultura" collapses under the more severe "barbarie." Nevertheless, Maxi proceeds undeterred: "no ha habido princesa de cuento oriental ni dama del teatro romántico que se ofreciera a la mente de un caballero con atributos más ideales" (II, ii, 1; 481). The truth is just the opposite, as the narrator himself betrays in a neutral moment that begins the section just after Fortunata has declared to Juanito later, "Mi marido eres tú... todo lo demás ... ¡papas!" The narrator begins the new section by applying the epithet "pecadora" to the adulteress:

Ya de noche pasó Fortunata a su casa. Su marido no había llegado aún. Mientras le esperaba, la pecadora volvió a ver el espectro aquel de su perversidad; pero entonces le vio más claro, y no pudo tan fácilmente hacerle huir de su espíritu. "Me han engañado—pensaba—, me han llevado al casorio, como llevan una res al matadero, y cuando quise recordar, ya estaba degollada ... ¿Qué culpa tengo yo?" (II, vii, 7; 691).

The epithet "pecadora" until now had been employed by the narrator only when focalizing various Rubín personages.[31] The judgement was not necessarily his own. Its remarkable usage here not only removes the focalization but shifts the register. We might suppose that "pecadora" serves the indirect discourse in Fortunata's self-examination. But this cannot be the case, because she denies her guilt even as the "espectro" persists. Furthermore, three unfocalized instances later in the same section expose the narratorial epithets "la perversa," "ambos criminales," and "la delincuente." In none of these instances can the surrounding discourse be ascribed to any other viewpoint than the narrator's.[32]

The admittedly evasive and self-conscious narration of Part I seems to attenuate gradually at these moments in Part II. An important example is when Nicolás hesitates outside Fortunata's room before his terrifying lecture on adulterous conduct. His hesitation, as described by the narrator, comes as a simile, which, as a rhetorical device, cannot belong to the point of view of Nicolás: "Como el que recela penetrar en la madriguera de una bestia feroz" (II, vii, 12; 715). As Fortunata's recidivism develops in Part III, the narrator intensifies his judgements. When she scandalizes Guillermina with the declaration that a childless wife is no wife at all, the notion of criminality enters via the narrator himself: "—Es idea mía—prosiguió la otra con la inspiración de un apóstol y la audacia criminal de un anarquista" (III, vii, 2; 247). The analogizing rhetoric cannot be read as being focalized through Guillermina, and, as if to emphasize the narratorial independence, a simile follows that removes her totally from this register: "La santa la miraba con verdadero espanto. Fortunata parecía estar fuera de sí, y como el exaltado artista que no tiene conciencia de lo que dice o canta." While the "parecía" is clearly Guillermina's perception, the simile is as clearly extradiegetical. Later in the dialogue, the points of view merge: "Notaba en ella cierta exaltación insana." Nevertheless, narratorial independence continues in the next section: "En aquel momento la pecadora clavaba sus ojos en la santa" (III, vii, 3; 249).

It would require a separate article to examine every instance of unfocalized narratorial epithet and extradiegesis in order definitively to establish a clear position on this matter. Nevertheless, the examples just offered, coupled with Fortunata's actions in Parts III and IV, paint a ferocious portrait that is hardly endearing. The conversation between Fortunata and Jacinta that ends in an exchange of confidences about marriage and children has a violent sequel when Fortunata rages inwardly at losing Juanito to this woman:

> Los agravios se le revolvían en el seno, saliéndole a los labios en esa forma descomedida y grosera de las hijas del pueblo, cuando se ponen a reñir. "¡La cojo y la ... !"—decía para sí clavándose las uñas en sus propios brazos—. [...] "¡Qué cobarde soy! Con una palabra la haré caer redonda, y me tendrá un miedo tan grande que no le darán ganas de volverme a hacer preguntitas..." [...]
>
> En esto vio *que la mona* volvía ... Verla y cegarse fue todo uno. No podía darse cuenta de lo que le pasó. Obedecía a un empuje superior a su voluntad, cuando se lanzó hacia ella con la rapidez y el salto de un perro de presa. Juntáronse, chocando en mitad del angosto pasillo. La prójima le clavó sus dedos en los brazos, y Jacinta la miró aterrada, como quien está delante de una fiera. (III, vi, 5; 207-08)

When Fortunata identifies herself by name, Jacinta "lanzó un ¡ay! agudísimo, como la persona que recibe la picada de una víbora." Against the unusually taut string of animal characterizations of personality—"perro de presa," "fiera," and "víbora"—, another passage in the same scene describes the woman less personally in terms of social class: "Toda la rudeza, toda la pasión fogosa de mujer del pueblo, ardiente, sincera, ineducada, hervía en su alma, y una sugestión increíble la impulsaba a mostrarse tal como realmente era, sin disimulo hipócrita." I would suggest that when certain *galdosistas* speak with "love" of Fortunata or look kindly upon her person and fate, they are thinking of this social image, of the class type that she represents, rather than thinking of the individual personality that the narrator enlivens through animal savagery.

The pace accelerates in the eavesdropping scene when Jacinta screams, "Esta mujerzuela aquí, en esta casa ..., ¡qué afrenta! ... ¡Ladrona!" (III, vii, 3; 252). Without a word, Fortunata, "apoyando las manos en el respaldo [del sillón], agachó el cuerpo y meneó las caderas como los tigres que van a dar el salto." Only after a kinesic response do words enter her world: "—¡La ladrona eres tú ... tú!" However, verbal response is inadequate, and she resorts regressively to physical expression:

> La ira, la pasión y la grosería del pueblo se manifestaron en ella de golpe, con explosión formidable. Volvió a la niñez, a aquella época en que trabándose de palabras con alguna otra zagalona de la plazuela, se agarraban por el moño y se sacudían de firme, hasta que los mayores las separaban. No parecía ser quien era, ni debía de tener conciencia de lo que hacía. (III, vii, 3; 252)

It bears noting that the narrator alludes to a reflex action and to the probability that Fortunata is unaware of herself, so fully is she immersed in her physical instincts. However, this form of alienation does not detract from the total surrender to her animal self by the higher personality. Galdós chooses the same animalistic vocabulary for his narrator in the next scene, when the heroine returns home and "se echó en el sofá, dando un rugido. Después de revolcarse como las fieras heridas, se puso boca abajo, oprimiendo el vientre contra los muelles del sofá, y clavando los dedos en un cojín" (III, vii, 4: 254). The next day Fortunata's extensive dream brings her into the market streets of Madrid, where she observes a dwarf halfway along the Darwinian path and a tangle of coaches whose drivers hurl uncivilized epithets at one another. If the dream reflects the heroine's unconscious, then these oneiric scenes might arguably symbolize her unrecognized distancing from a primitive self that her "higher personality" represses.

I do not accept this intriguing interpretation, of my own devising, because Fortunata's conduct in Part IV displays a psychologically integrated embrace of savage egoism. The narrative begins with her ruminations over the break-up with Juanito. Her solitude and ill-humour swell to a climactic explosion against Lupe: "Fortunata tenía su interior tan tempestuoso que no pudo contenerse, y estalló con esa ira pueril que ocasiona las reyertas de mujeres en las casas de vecindad" (IV, iii, 3; 375). The narrator's deictic "esa" invites the reader to share his judgemental "ira pueril," clearly uncomplimentary. Then Fortunata quits Maxi's dwelling in the hope of a new life with her expected child, and inspecting her shabby new quarters with distaste, she thinks, "algo se me ha pegado el señorío" a belief that the narrator confirms (IV, iii, 7; 397). Cleanliness is only skin deep, however, and Fortunata's destructive instincts reawaken in the lengthy final chapter of the novel. In four separate scenes, she reaffirms the law of physical combat. Her physiological responses outnumber her mental ones when Maxi breaks the news that Juanito and Aurora are lovers. The bed-ridden Fortunata "sintió que toda la sangre se le subía al rostro, y se puso muy sofocada" (IV, vi, 4; 466). As Maxi insists on giving her "la medicina de tu conciencia," it is too abstract for her body to accept: "Fortunata sintió como un desvanecimiento, y al incorporarse se le iba la cabeza, y la habitación daba vueltas en torno suyo." Maxi continues with an "implacable frialdad" that momentarily brings her to reflect and to deny: "Recordó frases y actos, ató cabos, y ... Nada." Immediately after, "ráfagas de ira" carry her to a graphic level of verbal fury: "'Te juro que le pateo el alma más pronto que lo digo—

revolcándose en el lecho—. Esto no puede quedar así. La mato, le saco los ojos, le arranco el corazón... Que me traigan mi ropa'" (IV, vi, 4; 467-68).

The narrator continues the scene with the same vocabulary of destructive images. Maxi warns her: "Mejor castiga una consecuencia lógica que un puñal," to which her reply is to scream "furibunda, echando llamaradas de los ojos." Again, "'Irás a presidio si matas.' — 'Pues iré contenta.'" Only Maxi's last argument prevails: "¿Y tu hijito?" At this the heroine's most primal instinct takes over: "Al oír esto, Fortunata tuvo un retroceso en su salvaje idea, y cogiendo al chiquillo, que empezaba a rezongar, se lo llevó al seno" (IV, vi, 4; 469-70). According to the narrative sequence, her second thoughts are short-lived because, when next we see her, she remains "tan inquieta, que Segunda tuvo que enfadarse para impedir que se levantara, pues quería hacerlo a todo trance" (IV, vi, 5; 472). She calms down at a report of Guillermina's imminent visit, but she notices "en la cara apacible de la fundadora cierta severidad estudiada." The scene and dialogue are crucial to understanding why Fortunata apologizes for "las burradas" against Jacinta: "También a ella le pediría perdón si la viera ... Me porté mal, lo conozco. Yo no guardo rencor a nadie ... digo, no se lo guardo a ella, porque ..." they have both been duped by "una culebra, una hipocritona, que me vendía amistad ... Esto no quedará así, señora; no quedará así ..." (IV, vi, 5; 472-74).

The last phrases, a promise and a threat, reveal that Fortunata has not changed from the preceding scene with Maxi. But what of this new contrition, self-blame, and apology to Jacinta? Surely this attitude speaks in her favour and helps to justify the benevolent view toward her that traditional *galdosistas* hold. While an argument on Fortunata's behalf is certainly possible, the textual evidence and her own actions do not argue for such leniency. If her attitude is examined in the full context of the interview with Guillermina, and indeed, examined in the slow-motion detail of a director reading a film script, the same instinctive self-preservation appears with full destructive purpose. Fortunata is cornered and then menaced, first by Guillermina's perception that she does not have enough milk to nurse the infant, and second by the close scrutiny of his face, "como el numismático observa [...] una moneda antigua para averiguar si es auténtica o falsificada" (IV, vi, 5; 473). Although the verdict is affirmative and Fortunata makes her apology, the question of a wet-nurse vexes the entire interview. It is legitimate to attribute deep anxiety to the mother throughout the scene because at night she dreams that her baby is taken away by Guillermina, Jacinta, and Aurora, all wearing black masks. The dream has a second episode in which Aurora alone is the kidnapper. Fear is Fortunata's renewed justification for rising from bed in pursuit of her rival, despite Guillermina's order, "nada de arrebatos de ira, ni devaneos." The benefactress has read the heroine's mind.

So too does Ballester read the heroine's mind in the sequence that follows the next morning, for the narrator reports his observation "que una idea muy siniestra y tenaz la dominaba, y que no era fácil quitársela de la cabeza" (IV, vi, 6; 476). I have been presenting in slow motion the details of these sections of the final chapter in order to demonstrate that Galdós provides no room in the text for an angelic interpretation of Fortunata. Quite the contrary, Fortunata plays for time after Ballester warns her that the doctor fears a fatal outcome if she does not remain in bed the next week. Or perhaps she is tired after the upsetting dream:

Parecía convencida, y Ballester se fue con la impresión de haber triunfado. Tranquila estuvo toda la mañana; pero a eso del mediodía, al despertar de un sueño breve, se sintió tan vivamente acometida de ganas de salir a la calle, que no pudo sobreponerse a este ciego impulso. (IV, vi, 6; 477)

She locks in the infant with the housekeeper and carries away the key. At this point Fortunata's ego and instinct are functioning in harmony. As she plots her ambush, she thinks: "Debiera llevar algo que duela ... ¡Ah!, la llave. Es mejor que la mano del almirez. Con esto y las uñas ..., yo le juro que ..." (IV, vi, 6; 477). Despite her dizziness during the berlin-carriage ride, she ruminates "cien y cien veces" about the treachery. In front of Aurora's shop, familiar from a previous visit, she has her wits about her ("recordaba perfectamente todo"). Entering, she finds Aurora with two customers and six or seven seamstresses, and "recorriendo con mirada fugaz todas las caras" she knows she must dissimulate: "acercándose y poniendo una cara fingidamente amable; pero en la cual no era difícil ver la cruel suavidad con que algunas fieras lamen a la víctima antes de devorarla" (IV, vi, 6; 479).

As Galdós causes his narrator to revert to animal imagery, the experienced reader turns back to see what textual instances can mitigate the primitive savagery of this calculating huntress. There seem to be none. Now she patiently lulls her victim, then says:

[...] No he venido más que a traerte una cosa ...

—¡A traerme una cosa ... a mí!

—Sí, verás.

Y diciendo *verás*, hizo con el brazo derecho un raudo y enérgico movimiento, y le descargó tan de lleno la mano sobre la cara, que la otra no pudo resistir el impulso, y dando un grito, se cayó al suelo [...]

Bofetada más sonora y tremenda no se ha dado nunca. (IV, vi, 6; 479-80)

It is useful for readers to understand why they cheer (as I do) at this moment and yet need not join ranks with the Gilmans who "love" Fortunata. Here a so-called friend's treachery is receiving its just reward, but her punishment does not mean that the deliverer is a nice person. Be this as it may, the narrator has not completed the savage details:

[...] no fue posible impedir que Fortunata, empuñando su llave con la mano derecha, le descargase a la otra un martillazo en la frente; y después, con indecible rapidez y coraje, le echó ambas manos al moño y tiró con toda su fuerza. Los chillidos de Aurora se oían desde la calle. [...] Gracias que las oficialas sujetaron a la fiera en el momento en que clavaba sus garras en el pelo de la víctima, que si no, allí da cuenta de ella. Sujetada por tantas manos, Fortunata hizo esfuerzos por desasirse y seguir la gresca; pero al fin el número, que no el valor, venció su increíble pujanza. A una de las modistillas la tiró patas arriba de una manotada; a otra le puso un ojo como un tomate. Dando resoplidos, lívida y sudorosa, los ojos despidiendo llamas, Fortunata continuaba con su lengua la trágica obra que sus manos no podían realizar. (IV, vi, 6; 480)

The question must be asked as to Galdós's motives in developing the descriptive technique of this female mêlée. A major purpose is the pleasure of an action scene. The details and violence of such a scene are further justifiable by the realist aesthetic. Even so, the vivid action conveyed by "empuñando," "descargase," "martillazo," "manotada," and so forth does not obviously belong to the same lexicon as "fiera," "garras," and "patas." Accompanying the aesthetics of violence is the psychology of regressive behaviour. The motif of "salvaje" described earlier and reinforced in this section by animalist figuration accumulates here one more modicum of negative personality assessment.[33]

The intention to denigrate Fortunata's character in this scene becomes obvious in Galdós's decision to assign an improbable speech to her actions. After striking Aurora with the key, she vocalizes: "—Toma, indecente, púa, ladrona!" The chain of epithets without either a pause, exclamation point, or ellipsis barely meets the requirement of natural speech under exerting circumstances. But when she launches into a further eloquence never before displayed, the verbiage is artificially excessive.[34] Galdós uses verbal invective to overdetermine the physical violence. As if to paint in plain colours her atavistic behavior, the narrator concludes by referring to "la agresora, frenética, revertida otra vez bruscamente a las condiciones de su origen, mujer del pueblo, con toda la pasión y la grosería que el trato social había disimulado en ella" (IV, vi, 6; 481). Actually, Guillermina has the last word: she urges the mother on her return home to nurse her baby: "Abra [la puerta] pronto [...] callejera, cabra montés" (IV, vi, 7; 487).

The incident neither serves as an outlet for aggression nor brings psychological release. In a subequent scene, Fortunata "sintió ganas de coger la palmatoria y tirársela a la cabeza [de Maxi]" when he suggests that she gave her rival the victory by her "brutalidades" (IV, vi, 9; 495-96). He pitilessly reduces her to anguish and tears by predicting happiness between Aurora and Juanito, and she "hizo el ademán de coger la palmatoria." Again the reader may feel sorry for her, but a deeper compassion would seem baseless on the existing evidence. The case against her worsens when she incites Maxi to murder: "Que hagas lo que debiste hacer, matar a esa indigna, matarla ..., porque lo merece ... Yo te compro el revólver... ahora mismo ..." (IV, vi, 9; 498). She faints in bed, takes Ballester's medicine with sincere gratitude ("¡Qué bueno es usted, Segismundo! ¡Qué agradecida estoy a lo que hace por mí!"[IV, vi, 10; 500]), and agrees to be friends with him.

From this point to the end of the novel, a softening of Fortunata's hardness begins. It is true that Guillermina maintains the animalistic discourse by declaring "Entraré a ver a la fiera, y trataremos de amansarla" when the mother fiercely resists surrendering her infant to a wetnurse (IV, vi, 11; 506). But the two women have a long conversation in which "la fiera" begins her subsequent insistence on her merit with this rationalization: "Anoche me trastorné, lo conozco, se me subió la hiel a la cabeza. ¡Le tengo tanta rabia a ésa ...! Digo yo que se puede tener rabia a otra persona, desear que la maten, y sin embargo no ser una mala" (IV, vi, 11; 508). She wonders whether Jacinta wishes her dead, and the reassuring denial elevates Fortunata one degree in the reader's eyes; that is, if Jacinta holds no rancour, how can we be less forgiving? But can they become friends? she asks: "—Hija, tanto como amiga ... Eso ya es un poco fuerte—no pudiendo contener la risa—. Vamos, que no pide usted poco" (IV, vi, 11; 509). What appears as foolish ingenuity, however, turns out to be the same all-consuming egoism that blinds Fortunata to everything but her primitive obsession: "—¡Amigas! ... —repitió la diabla frunciendo las

cejas—. Por más que usted diga, no me puede ver, mayormente ahora que he tenido un hijo y ella no" (IV, vi, 11; 509-10).[35]

In favouring the softened aspect of Fortunata's personality during her final days, scholars apparently give more weight to pathos and less weight to the evidence of savage egoism under discussion. The issue is diverted by the debate over whether Feijoo's efforts to civilize Fortunata are doomed to failure, as Peter Goldman contends, or end in tragedy, as Geoffrey Ribbans holds, because the "intolerable burden" of Aurora's betrayal makes it impossible for Fortunata to "control her primitive emotions."[36] The heroine displays much love and tenderness toward her infant, but in addition to this being an expected and natural instinct, the infant is the instrument of her triumph over Jacinta. Her fear that the baby will be taken from her can move the reader in her favour. The pathos of her haemorrhage increases as it is created through Estupiñá's monologue. Another softening is her declaration, "Francamente, estoy admirada del cariño que le tengo ahora a *la mona del Cielo*" (IV, vi, 12; 512). Her relation to Guillermina seems to alter ("Fortunata miraba con expresión de gratitud a su amiga" [IV, vi, 14; 525]), but the reason is that her will is being carried out. The only clear, unselfish virtue stated by the narrator is her offer of money to Ballester ("aquel arranque de generosidad, que en ella era tan común" [IV, vi, 12; 514]).

Aside from pathos weighing more than personality, a second reason why scholars apparently are sentimental about Fortunata is that they privilege focalized remarks that extol her over the narrator's own version. Thus, the sensible Jacinta makes excuses for the heroine's assault on Aurora, even though she couches them in ambivalent terms (see note 21). Ballester's feelings, as mentioned, are biased and unreliable. The chief influence on readers, however, is Fortunata's repeated self-absorption, fed by the stubborn belief in her sanctity. As blood ebbs from her dying body, she delivers a speech about "esta bendita idea que tengo [...]. Con ella no necesito Sacramentos; [...] la voz del ángel [...] me lo dice" (IV, vi, 13; 520). No amount of persuasion by Guillermina has been able to sway her from this irrational belief. She was convinced, for instance, that she must again assault Aurora: "Si no lo hago, Dios mío, me va a ser imposible ser ángel, y no podré tener santidad" (IV, vi, 12; 515).

The theme of angelic merit is entirely of Fortunata's own fabrication. How, then, is it that most scholars have accepted the idea? The explanation lies in her gift of the baby to Jacinta. In doing so, she believes, she will ascend to her rival's level of virtue. But no objective reasoning is offered to justify such a belief, no philosophical or ethical basis that explains why a dying woman who gives her baby to a rival, having no other choice but to die in ignorance of its future, should be considered angelic or even virtuous. After all, the deed merely confirms Fortunata's irrational sense of superiority over the infertile Jacinta as well as validating her illegitimate claim on Juanito. Without a reasoned analysis of why her motherhood makes her the authentic wife, the entire narrative closure acquires another hue. Only one baffling passage by a neutral narrator might shed light on this problem:

Pero mientras la personalidad física se extinguía, la moral, concentrándose en una sola idea, se determinaba con desusado vigor y fortaleza. En aquella idea vaciaba, como en un molde, todo lo bueno que ella podía pensar y sentir; en aquella idea estampaba con sencilla fórmula el perfil más hermoso y quizás menos

humano de su carácter, para dejar tras sí una impresión clara y enérgica de él. (IV, vi, 13; 519-20)

In this contrast between body and moral character, the locutions that carry positive value judgements are "todo lo bueno que ella podía pensar y sentir," together with "hermoso." However, the phrase "perfil más hermoso y quizá menos humano de su carácter" subverts the implied virtue. The passage has an undertone of surprise, an expression that something contrary to human nature is revealed in Fortunata's character. Her idea, to will the infant in writing to Jacinta, may reflect the totality of "lo bueno" and "hermoso" that she is capable of being. But this determination is also the least human quality, precisely because she makes it "con desusado vigor y fortaleza." The narrator returns the reader to her characteristic displays of animal strength, all of which pale before the "menos humano" act of the last will and testament.

To read the final chapter, therefore, is to understand that Fortunata's self-mythification is so powerful that the narrator himself is half-convinced, until he realizes that the essence of his heroine's personality is contrary to human nature. To read is to recognize an apotheosis manufactured by focalized discourse. Fortunata dies feeling "en su cuerpo vibraciones de gozo, como si entrara alborotadamente en ella un espíritu benigno" (IV, vi, 14; 528). In contrast, the narrator maintains strict neutrality throughout the chapter by using the epithet "la joven" and by reserving the single instance "la infeliz joven" for her expiring moments. At the same time, the unattractive features of her character continue to dominate. Her thoughts are murderous and always have been so: "yo creí que matar al que nos engaña, al que nos vende, no es pecado [...]. Digo yo que se puede tener rabia a otra persona, desear que la maten, y sin embargo, no ser una mala" (IV, vi, 11; 508). She can befriend Guillermina (whereas Guillermina does not consider her a friend) because the latter serves her purpose, but those who cannot become another obsession: "la idea fija de lo antipáticos que eran los Rubín" (IV, vi, 12; 512). It needs to be asked why Fortunata finds Guillermina's bourgeois morality to be more palatable than the Rubíns'.

Most indicative of Fortunata's unmerited apotheosis to angelhood is her reflex action at the news of Aurora's rumour that Juanito is not the baby's father. The brutality of her language, by now to be expected, no longer is as revealing as her full immersion in instinctual motion: "no le fue posible contener los impulsos de levantarse. La rabia surgió terrible en su alma, y sin reparar en lo que hacía, incorporóse en el lecho [...] 'yo le he de refregar la jeta con la suela de mis botas'" (IV, vi, 12; 515).[37] She has no need for self-awareness, let alone thought. Her body springs unconsciously to readiness, then her mind calculates the method of attack, and finally conscience takes over to rationalize the project.

Scholars have traditionally looked kindly upon Fortunata in the wake of early studies of the novel's benevolent bird imagery. If early studies had focussed instead on the wild-beast imagery and the theme of savagery, it is anyone's guess what the heroine's reputation would be today. Much as I might wish, I have been unable to use the novel's own words to compose a sympathetic portrait of Fortunata. When I first studied the novel carefully, it was without the guidance of existing scholarship, which is to say without preconceptions. Then I read attentively the existing scholarship in the belief that some confirmation of my findings would emerge. None did. Her violence outweighs her dying gift. If the violent portions of the dream to be

discussed corroborate this interpretation by symbolizing Fortunata's repressed thoughts, so be it on the grounds of a loose analogy with my discussion of her primitive state of being. But I do not advocate this approach to the dream. Such an interpretation is impossible from a Freudian standpoint without the evidence of the heroine's own associations and particularly of her childhood and parents. I prefer, therefore, to construe the dream otherwise.

4. The Street-Wandering Dream

A Freudian or broadly psychoanalytic approach to Fortunata's dreams would be possible, provided the appropriate access were available. Much material about Fortunata's life lies concealed in the novel behind indirect information.[38] We know that her parents were poor; that as an orphan she grew up fighting other girls occasionally in the streets; that the aunt and uncle with whom she lived were not unprotective and provided discipline ("*yiá voy*"); that she worked as a prostitute; that she lived as a kept woman out of self-destructive spite; and that she led an escapist life of some elegance or luxury in Paris. We also have her private thoughts about what occurs in the novel, but the problem is that none of the latter material sheds light on her life as just itemized. Without her thoughts about her mother, father, childhood, shopping experiences, and sexual life, to name a few areas, attempts at interpreting dream symbolism is futile. As Freud warned, it would

> be a mistake to expect that if we had a still profounder knowledge of dream-symbolism (of the "language of dreams") we could do without asking the dreamer for his associations to the dream and go back entirely to the technique of dream-interpretation of antiquity. Quite apart from individual symbols and oscillations in the use of universal ones, one can never tell whether any particular element in the content of a dream is to be interpreted symbolically or in its proper sense, and one can be certain the *whole* content of a dream is not to be interpreted symbolically. A knowledge of dream symbolism will [...] afford the most valuable assistance to interpretation precisely at points at which the dreamer's associations are insufficient or fail altogether. (*The Interpretation* 5: 684-85)

But even if Fortunata's associations were available, what more could the dream uncover about her unconscious that would shed light on the actions and moral dilemmas discussed earlier? Analysis would reveal their etiology, would convert narrative elements into symptoms of repressed thoughts of another order entirely. Treated as a wish-fulfilment, the dream is a banal example of Fortunata's single-minded love for Juanito. She goes out looking for him and after many distractions she finds him. If this were all to the dream, it would be merely a restatement of the novel's central concern, an event too minor to occupy the extensive length of the dream.

The fact is that the dream narrative contains distractions that extend far beyond the heroine's personal unconscious, if indeed it goes that deeply. The episodes or scenes that are extrane-

ous to the drama as discussed previously swell the narrative beyond its reputedly wish-fulfilling shell. From the outdoor, spatial grid of streets and shops to the human grid of working people in dynamic encounters, the story of Fortunata stretches over a world of social history that fills out her private framework. For readers who seek to rescue the personal element from its overshadowing social drama, the best concept to use is Gustavo Correa's linkage of individual and national histories.[39] Otherwise, a study of the dream's structure and content will reveal it to orchestrate numerous themes and motifs from Parts I, II, III, and IV. Rather than a pre-Freudian dream, the passage may be interpreted as a proto-Proustian recapitulation of past time, a condensation of the narrator's own consciousness beyond that of the dreamer. One example of an analogous condensation can be found in the waking discourse. It involves the synoptic granite staircase at number 11, Cava de San Miguel, called by Harriet Turner a "metonymic spatial image" that "sums up the four parts of the story."[40] Peter Bly regards the building as "el verdadero centro geográfico y temático" of the novel ("Fortunata" 99). In the synoptic method of Turner and Bly, a single key component may radiate toward multiple meanings. By the same token, Fortunata's dream might well be regarded as the novel's central psychic repository.

The dream's lucidity is striking. Some dreams can, indeed, be as clear and rational as daylight experience. But they are either short dreams or infantile ones. This dream is long, yet it is remarkably free of confusion and vagueness, unlike the lyrical and sometimes surreal atmosphere that underlies the meaning of "dream-like" in everyday parlance. Its dramatic power derives partly from the present-tense narration. These traits cast suspicion on the dream's psychoanalytic value, for they suggest that Galdós has manipulated its contents for the purpose of augmenting its drama. Francisco Caudet pertinently reminds us that the galley proofs show that the "dos últimos párrafos iban en pretérito perfecto e indefinido" (2: 258, note a), then were changed to the present tense for greater effect, a point repeated by Mercedes López-Baralt (144-45).

One prominent yet unremarked feature of the dream is how methodically it is plotted. Like scenes in a drama, eight episodes follow one another with a lucidity that controverts the difficulty that troubled dreams present to the psychoanalyst:

Scene 1. Fortunata stops in front of a plumbing store to look at pipes and faucets. Her unfocalized thoughts precede the narrator's address to the reader about her ritualist magic thinking. Then the narrator focalizes her response to the plumbing fixtures.

Scene 2. She moves on to a fabric shop that prompts sensory and spoken reactions. Inside is a dwarf, compared to an orangutan that the narrator explains in Darwinian terms. Some street urchins stand by mocking.

Scene 3. She passes by a tavern with a blazing chop-grill. This elicits her unfocalized feelings.

Scene 4 emerges without any transitional movement from the previous scene. Fortunata sees flower kiosks. She grows indecisive about the direction in which to walk. The narrator makes a judgement about her motive.

Scene 5. She stops in front of the Fiel Contraste—the weights and measures building. She hears piano music that awakens a desire to dance. Whether she does dance is uncertain because her point of view and the narrator's grow confused.

Scene 6. In the same place, the narrator turns his attention to a traffic jam in the market triggered by a train of seven mules, the lead mule having bolted. The drivers of two delivery carts (olive oil and meat) and several leisurely coaches cause a vociferous row that does not drown out the piano music.

Scene 7. Still in the same place, street vendors (of scarves, glass-cutters, and pencils) scatter before the traffic brawl. The narrator exhibits realistic detail and Fortunata responds with amusement. She displays active movement into the eighth and final scene.

Scene 8. She spots Juanito in shabby dress. He informs her of his unemployment. She affectionately offers to work for them both. In her transition to awakening, Juanito's clothes turn fashionable, and Fortunata's optimism fades into the reality of Maxi's wardrobe in her apartment.

The prosaic quality of this dream also flies in the face of the "momentos poéticos" that José Schraibman finds occurring mainly in Galdós's oneiric episodes (163). The episodes here reach a climax of wish-fulfilment when Fortunata meets Juanito, reduced to her humble level, who, she believes, needs her. But her pedestrian march from one street event to another confirms José Montesinos's opinion that dreams are not the most interesting aspect of this novel.[41] They are uninteresting, that is, from the psychological and technical standpoints. Psychologically, this particular dream tells little more than what the heroine and the reader already know about her state of mind. There is none of the irony or distance described by Monroe Hafter that reveals more about the character than she herself can understand (233). Structurally, the dream's methodical development pales beside the exciting mental processes ingeniously depicted in comparably distressed waking moments of the novel.[42]

For these reasons, the eight-scene structure cannot support the effort by Mercedes López-Baralt to reduce the dream to two parts. She wrenches objects from their episodic sequence, joining Scene 1 ("tubos") and Scene 7 ("lápices") into a single, symbolically phallic "parte," and she calls Scene 8 a second "parte." She says the dream belongs to the category termed unintelligible by Freud, the two other categories being intelligible dreams, usually by children, and anxiety-driven dreams. She claims that the dream,

> por lo menos en su primera parte, pertenece a esta categoría: abigarrado y confuso, expresa un deseo que apenas quiere confesarse a sí misma, pues está casada con Maxi y aspira a la honradez. No le causa ansiedad pues el motivo del deseo—puramente sexual—está disfrazado, y la aparición de Juan, preterida. (141)

The critic's scheme relieves her of the burden of explaining how the intervening scenes relate to the sexual hypothesis. Further, although the dreamer is not a child, the critic admits that the so-called second part is intelligible. Finally, while outlining Freud's principles of dreamwork, she fails to explain the latent dream thoughts in relation to the manifest content. Perhaps more confusing is her attempt to identify the dream's major unifying idea:

> su deseado encuentro con Juanito Santa Cruz, motivado por la *pícara idea* y mencionado explícitamente, parece ser el tema, y es ciertamente la parte más inteligible del sueño; sin embargo, los tubos, llaves, grifos

y lápices, objetos triviales, que asoman como por azar, constituyen la clave: la obsesión por Juanito es de índole evidentemente sexual. (142)

If the meeting with Juanito is the theme, how can it be sexually charged when financial support is the basis of that meeting? López-Baralt admits that the meeting is transparently intelligible. Therefore, it does not disguise a repressed dream thought, in which case Fortunata fulfils her wish of having Juanito—not for sexual reasons, but because she is needed and she gives him moral and economic support.

I submit that the dream's structure is episodic and multipartite, not bipartite. In fact, it corresponds to a description by Freud's disciple, C. J. Jung, whose treatise, *Dreams*, is indebted to the master, while striking out in new and dissident paths. Jung likens the "average" dream to a dramatic plot, but it is obvious that a literary dream cannot be "Jungian" just on this account, because dramatic structures have existed from time immemorial.[43] In any event, Fortunata's dream is a narrative exposition composed of eight scenes that are realistically mounted. The only conceivable incongruity is a dwarf that appears in a fabric shop. Otherwise, there is no strangeness or discontinuity between scenes, nothing narrated that could not be read as an ordinary series of waking events. Fortunata walks among the people in the streets of Madrid searching for Juanito and as a spectator to various commercial events. The development or complication of plot produces a mild uncertainty as to what will happen because the events display an increasing violence. Fortunata's itinerary culminates in a decisive moment of change, when Juanito appears in the street. The dream ends with the wished-for solution "sought" by the dreamer, as Fortunata offers to take care of Juanito.

Clearly, the dream contains many more elements than are relevant to the wish-fulfilment indicated by its plot ending. Freud insists on the principle that "a dream is a conglomerate which, for purposes of investigation, must be broken up once more into fragments." He requires analysis to "disregard the apparent coherence between a dream's constituents as an unessential illusion" even though "a psychical force is at work in dreams which creates this apparent connectedness" (*The Interpretation* 5: 449). By "constituents" Freud does not only mean individual objects or things that can be understood symbolically. Larger narrative units like actions can also be symbolic (e.g., departure=death), while a sequence of events can require interpretation where symbolism is admittedly of no use even when objects are present.[44] Obviously, a mechanical conversion of objects into sexual symbols would be an ill-considered approach.

Any reader who proposes to interpret the dream must re-read the novel for references involving Fortunata that are akin to those contained in the dream. Such references include not only the so-called sexually charged "tubos," "llaves," "grifos," "chuletas," "fuego," and the strong "lápices" with an unbreakable "punta," but also "música," "carretero," "puestos ambulantes," and "invento para cortar cristal," plus a dozen other objects, events, and people that go uninterpreted by "Freudian" critics, who fixate disproportionately on the six aforementioned objects. Readers who compile such an inventory will discover an enormous network of references that unites many characters with numerous events in the novel that do not involve the heroine. Furthermore, the "Freudian" objects appear in only three of the eight scenes, and yet they have served scholars as the clues to Fortunata's "unconscious." As soon as the entire inven-

tory of objects is considered, it engulfs these clues in a wider or collective unconscious. The dream is virtually a dream about the novel itself, a condensed symbolization of Galdós's fictive project.

That six of the heroine's dreams involve Juanito is less interesting than the fact that in this particular dream he fills less than half of its duration. The alleged sexual symbols near the beginning coupled with Juanito's presence at the end provide a unifying frame of wish-fulfilment from the Freudians' standpoint. But the narrative can just as easily be interpreted to be a reductively thematic approach to Galdós's thought. What follows is a scene-by-scene commentary, with the italicized text presented sequentially, but in segments.

5. The Plumbing Shop

(Threshold)

En tal situación siente varios impulsos de salir a la calle; se levanta, se viste, pero está segura de haberse quitado la venda.

SCENE 1.

Sale, se dirige a la calle de la Magdalena, y se para ante el escaparate de la tienda de tubos, obedeciendo a esa rutina del instinto por la cual, cuando tenemos un encuentro feliz en determinado sitio, volvemos al propio sitio creyendo que lo tendremos por segunda vez. ¡Cuánto tubo! Llaves de bronce, grifos, y multitud de cosas para llevar y traer el agua... Detiénese allí mediano rato viendo y esperando.

The very threshold between reality and dream undermines the dream's autonomy. The narrator steps between the dreamer and the reader by blurring the frontier between his narrative of the waking world and the narrative of the dreamed world. He further confuses the distinction between Fortunata as the personage of the narrator's story and Fortunata as the personage of her own story. Strictly speaking, a dreamer must narrate her own story in the first person. Here Fortunata is observed in exactly the same way as she is presented in the waking narrative. By usurping her narratorial role, the novel's narrator contaminates the dream with his own comments and possibly with his own discursive order. Here, then, is a fundamental obstacle to attempting to unlock Fortunata's unconscious by Freudian or other psychoanalytical means. I shall return to this problem in the final section of this study.

The dream's ambiguous beginning excuses the critic from a systematic description of the context preceding the dream. Even if this were not the case, the stimuli and sources for dreams are both immediate and remote, so that no summary can replace the full contents of the novel as the dream's true context.[45] Freud was convinced that future research would discover an ultimately organic basis for the mental event, and, consequently, he could never overestimate

the somatic origin of dreams, which is to say, the immediate sensory events prior to dreaming. But Fortunata's post-oneiric personal associations would be required, regardless of such material conditions.[46] As Freud indicated, "the causal connection between the somatic and mental" is clearcut (*The Interpretation* 4:1).

Critics who propose a Freudian approach must remember the dictum that "dreams which can only be understood as fulfilments of wishes and which bear their meaning upon their faces without disguise are [...] mostly short and simple dreams" (*The Interpretation* 4: 126). Fortunata's dream, on the contrary, is long and manifestly indecipherable, except for her stopping hopefully before the plumbing shop at the beginning and actually finding Juanito at the end. Against this point it is arguable, using Freud's words, that "the naive dreams of healthy people actually often contain a much simpler, more perspicuous and more characteristic symbolism than those of neurotics." But even here censorship is needed. As an example, Freud cites the dream of "a girl who is not neurotic but is of a somewhat prudish and reserved character" (*The Interpretation* 5: 374). Furthermore, the censorship can work a "secondary revision," whereby dreams,

> at a superficial view, may seem faultlessly logical and reasonable; they start from a possible situation, carry it on through a chain of consistent modifications and—though far less frequently— bring it to a conclusion which causes no surprise. Dreams which are of such a kind have been subjected to a far-reaching revision by this psychical function. [...] [T]hey appear to have a meaning, but that meaning is as far removed as possible from their true significance. (*The Interpretation* 5: 490)

To return to the suggestion that Fortunata's dream is long and composed mainly of material unrelated to erotics, it is not necessarily true to say that the first and last episodes related to Juanito provide the real meaning. By all *galdosista* accounts, the ending surely fulfils her wish. Nevertheless, the dream is rambling and opaque, so that another dictum of Freud imposes itself, namely, that such dreams often mean the opposite of what their surfaces display: a "psychical force" "exercises a censorship upon this dream-wish and, by the use of that censorship, forcibly brings about a distortion in the expression of the wish" (*The Interpretation* 4: 144).[47] The sexually irrelevant episodes between the pause in front of the plumbing shop and Juanito's appearance (except for the pencils vignette) may not be the only distorted contents of the dream-thoughts. The wish that critics have been assuming may also be symbolically disguised. In any event, they have not dealt with the non-erotic episodes.

In order to appreciate this point, we must recall the circumstance earlier in the week: Fortunata's actual encounter at the plumbing shop (III, vii, 3). First, the heroine is walking "tan tranquila por la calle de la Magdalena, pensando en usted [Guillermina]." Second, she pauses before "una tienda donde hay tubos y llaves de agua." The action seems odd to her, and she wonders why she stopped: "Ni sé por qué me paré allí, pues ¿qué me importan a mí los tubos?" Next she hears Juanito's voice behind her, and the voice "me sonó aquí detrás junto a estos pelitos que tenemos donde nace la cabellera, y fue como si me entraran una aguja muy fina y muy fría. ... Me quedé helada ... volvíme... le vi... se sonreía." This startled reaction may be viewed in a negative light, and she reinforces this impression when, upon seeing Juanito, she becomes "como una estatua; me dieron ganas de llorar, de echar a correr o de no sé qué." He

asks how she is, she remains speechless, and he takes her by the hand, but "Yo retiré mi mano, y me fui sin decirle nada ... No tuve alma para seguir adelante sin mirar para atrás, y miré y le vi ... Me seguía, distante. Apresuré el paso y me metí en mi casa" (III, vii, 3; 249-50). These are the circumstances of her act of rejection. When Guillermina approves of her act, Fortunata quickly adds that, once she is at home, the idea that she is the legitimate wife overtakes her.

Why does Fortunata react so negatively? Her discouraging reaction throws new light on the manifest content of the dream episode, where the penetrating "dardo" of Juanito's voice receives a "Freudian" interpretation by López-Baralt. What Fortunata's waking discouragement suggests is that her dreamed reunion may not be a wish-fulfilment at all but just the opposite. That is, a Freudian approach would have to consider the possibility that Fortunata continues to live the moral conflict of love versus respectability and that the dream sequence prior to reuniting with Juanito represents a wish to be respectable, grounded in Guillermina's ongoing influence. I do not necessarily endorse this interpretation, but it cannot be discounted under Freud's rules until Fortunata's own associations are examined. The impossibility of doing so, of course, is the flaw in the Freudian approach to this dream. More about the dream counterpart when we reach this episode.

A related flaw in the thesis of sexual wish-fulfilment involves Fortunata's question, "¿qué me importan a mí los tubos?" The most vocal proponent of the sexual-fulfilment thesis is Vernon Chamberlin, who contends that "even if Fortunata does not know why she is interested in the 'tubos,' the reader soon perceives their phallic symbolism and the extent of her physical need" because she dreams about them ("Poor Maxi's Windmill" 433). Chamberlin does not invoke Freud, but he does insist on "ancient and archetypal symbolism" to uncover sexual meanings for water images in general and by extension for "tubos" and other aquatic conveyors.[48] His arguments raise too many problems to be accepted without further discussion.

There is, first and undeniably, support for the phallic argument in Freud's writings:

> Nor is there any difficulty in understanding how it is that the male organ can be replaced by objects from which water flows—*water-taps, watering-cans,* or *fountains*— [...]. A no less obvious aspect of the organ explains the fact that *pencils, pen-holders, nail-files, hammers,* and other *instruments* are undoubted male sexual symbols. (*The Complete Introductory Lectures* 154-55)

For this evidence to be useful, water and water pipes must be shown to be connected to Juanito as well as to Fortunata, preferably in conjunction. (The pencils will be treated in the corresponding episode later.) The connection made by Chamberlin relies chiefly on Maxi, and then, by extension, to the heroine. The argument is that Fortunata's sexual thirst is demonstrated by the presence and the absence of water imagery. Chamberlin links Maxi to the windmill that pumps water to the convent, and he associates the pump with masculine sexuality, citing Maxi's inadequacy and ambivalence when viewing the mill. He also associates the cloistered Fortunata with the inadequate reception of water in the convent. By contrast, Chamberlin notes that the windmill is in sight of Fortunata and Juanito when these lovers are reunited. Thus, "with Fortunata sexually satisfied and Maxi under no pressure to perform, we find no further mention of water until Juanito [...] breaks off the relationship" ("Poor Maxi's Windmill" 433). At this point the

heroine wanders to the Puerta del Sol, where she "se sentó en el brocal de la fuente y estuvo mirando los espumarajos del agua" (III, iii, 2; 85).

The weakness of this account is that Fortunata has just come from the Plazuela de Pontejos and its own prominent fountain, where she surveyed Juanito's house in silence without any mention of the fountain by the narrator. (In an analogous silence the enamoured Moreno observes that "El chorrear de la fuente de Pontejos es lo que se siente siempre" [IV, ii, 3; 345]). As for sitting "en el brocal de la fuente," Fortunata feels the same despair in a similar position at the end of the same chapter, on her return to the Cava de San Miguel: "Lo que sentía era como si su espíritu se asomara al brocal de la cisterna en que estaba encerrado, y desde allí divisara regiones desconocidas" (IV, iii, 7; 394). Overlooking these texts, Chamberlin goes on to contend that "water imagery becomes important again when Feijoo's old age forces Fortunata to return to her husband Maxi, with whom she once again becomes sexually frustrated" ("Poor Maxi's Windmill" 433). By this reasoning, the dream about water pipes and faucets is a natural consequence; it symbolizes "the extent of her physical need." Finally, reunited with Juanito, she "will now have emotional stability and plenty of water as well, for Juanito orders the coachman to drive them to 'el Canal.'"

The interpretation seems ingenious on the surface, but its logic is defective on several counts. First, it rests on the assumption that "the presence of water suggests the gratification of sexual desire"—Fortunata wants it, but her husband, Maxi, cannot supply it ("Poor Maxi's Windmill" 429). Here Chamberlin is thinking of "the ardent and fertile Fortunata." Presumably, he identifies the female with Mother Earth and her need for rain. But this reasoning confuses the role of reproduction with sexual desire. Federico García Lorca's Yerma is offered as an example of infertility and need for water, which her husband does not supply. However, sexual desire is absent in that relationship. Similarly, Fortunata desires to conceive a child, but this desire should be distinguished from any erotic pleasure that she may be imagined to seek. Sexuality is obviously the required condition for reproduction, but there is no evidence that sexual gratification motivates this would-be mother. Indeed, it may be said that her "ardent" desire is for Juanito's child and not for Juanito's body in its own pleasure-giving capacity.

Beyond Chamberlin's weak premise are important instances where water and Fortunata are linked without reference to sexuality, instances that, in fact, are counter-sexual regarding her behaviour. Thus, the dying Mauricia counsels her friend to repent: "Tú tampoco eres trigo limpio, y el día que hagas sábado en tu conciencia, vas a necesitar mucha agua y jabón, mucha escoba y mucho estropajo" (III, vi, 1; 175). The scene reinforces an earlier event where clean water symbolizes a reproach to Fortunata's sexual behaviour as a weapon against her lover's wife. Here the wash-buckets of the convent are filled with water as Fortunata and Mauricia pause in their labour to discuss Jacinta's childlessness:

> Mauricia dio salida al agua sucia, y Fortunata abrió el grifo para que se llenara la artesa con el agua limpia del depósito de palastro. Creeríase que aquello simbolizaba la necesidad de llevar pensamientos claros al diálogo un tanto impuro de las dos amigas. La artesa tardaba mucho en llenarse, porque el depósito tenía poca agua. (II, vi, 7; 632)

Chamberlin does not cite these events. He does make much of the water's scarcity in order to argue for Fortunata's sexual deprivation and desire. However, in doing so, he mistakes the circumstances entirely:

During the hottest days of the summer, Fortunata suffers intensely from the heat and needs water to cool and refresh herself. She opens the water faucet completely but "el gran disco que transmitía a la bomba la fuerza del viento, estaba aquel día muy perezoso, moviéndose tan sólo a ratos con indolente majestad, y el aparato, después de gemir un instante como si trabajara de mala gana, quedaba inactivo en medio del silencio del campo." (II, vi, 7; 632; "Poor Maxi's Windmill" 431)

Chamberlin omits the last sentence of this quotation ("Ganas tenían las dos recogidas de seguir charlando; pero la monja no las dejaba y quiso ver cómo aclaraban la ropa") and removes the context that allows the scene's non-sexual meaning to emerge.

This selective use of evidence extends to imprecisions that also wrongly enhance the sexual thesis. Chamberlin says that "on an even hotter day, Fortunata waits for the water but 'el disco de Parson, inmóvil, miraba a la inmensidad como una pupila cuajada y moribunda'" (II, vi, 8; 637; "Poor Maxi's Windmill" 431).[49] Unfortunately, the heroine is absent from this scene, which not only refers to the nuns in general but prepares for the next moment, when Mauricia's face "estaba tan bañado en lágrimas como si le hubiesen echado por la frente un cubo de agua" (II, vi, 8; 637-38). Later in the evening Fortunata is absent from the group of nuns who sigh briefly in relief when

El vástago de hierro chilló un instante, y las que estaban junto al estanque oyeron en lo profundo de la bomba una regurgitación tenue. El caño escupió un salivazo de agua, y todo quedó después en la misma quietud chicha y desesperante. (II, vi, 9; 643)

Quoting this passage, Chamberlin includes Fortunata among the bystanders when, in fact, she has followed Micaela to her room.

The preceding allusion to "el vástago de hierro" leads Chamberlin to another inaccuracy, this time concerning a misleading choice of words. He leaves the impression that the "tubos" of Fortunata's dream have real antecedents in the windmill motif. The example concerns the statement "a windmill whose energy serves to pump water through a pipe to the convent" ("Poor Maxi's Windmill" 429). This "pipe" is never mentioned in the narrator's description of the mechanism. The only allusion to a conveyance of water is "las arcadas del acueducto del Lozoya," seen by Maxi in the distance (II, v, 3; 602). Otherwise, what captures Maxi's attention is "el disco de la noria": "un motor de viento, sistema Parson, para noria [...]. El inmenso disco, semejante a una sombrilla japonesa a la cual se hubiera quitado la convexidad, daba vueltas sobre su eje pausada o rápidamente, según la fuerza del aire" (II, v, 3; 601). Or else, he hears "el crujir del mecanismo que transmite la energía del viento al vástago de la bomba" (II, v, 3; 602). If a phallic symbol is required, we have it here in a solid piston rod, not a hollow "tubo."

Regarding the water supply, it should be noted that Galdós designs separate chapters that view the Micaelas convent externally, from Maxi's perspective, and internally, where the point of view can shift from Fortunata to other nuns. Thus, the windmill has a separate "identity" from the water source inside the convent: whereas Fortunata's dream mentions "tubos" and "grifos," the real convent depends on a solid "vástago de hierro" and a "grifo" that controls the "caño." In this instance, the "caño" functions as an outlet for water, as a short pipe, although it can also be the word for a drain. Significantly, Galdós chooses the generic "tubo" for the dream's plumbing shop, so as to include supply and elimination. If Fortunata were truly dreaming of receiving water, the word "caño" would be the better choice. Be this as it may, the complexity of aquatic allusions in the Micaelas chapters makes their relevance to the dream a pointless undertaking and they severely distort the text.

Chamberlin's appealing but selective application of symbols rests on what might be called common knowledge. As for Maxi's ambivalence toward the windmill, he says: "Galdós here clearly draws upon the age-old association of a pump with masculine sexuality" ("Poor Maxi's Windmill" 430-31). I acknowledge that our post-Freudian age might allow this meaning intuitively in loose everyday parlance, but I do not regard it to be axiomatic in critical discourse, where written evidence of the association is desirable. Another problem is that Chamberlin does not explain the "grifos" and "llaves." The faucet is an obvious detail in the real convent where the nuns control the water, but why would Fortunata dream of controlling it? By Chamberlin's account, a reference to pumps and spouts would better symbolize her intention than the spigots.

With regard to the construction of symbols, the plumbing shop is a reality that Fortunata consciously associates with meeting Juan and resisting his advances. Is it plausible that something known consciously would be useful as the symbol of repressed feeling? The Freudian approach leads to absurdity. This interpretation raises the question as to why the heroine stopped before the plumbing shop in the first place. Since she cannot explain her action to Guillermina, are we to assume that her unconscious knowledge of phallic symbols brought her to a halt in front of the shop window for the purpose of engaging in a sexual fantasy about water pipes, a fantasy soon fulfilled by her lover's appearance? If that is the case, a different unconscious motive must prompt her to halt in the dream because now she hopes consciously to meet Juanito. In fact, some symbol other than the shop is needed to disguise the wish to meet Juanito a second time, since the dreamer already knows she met him while awake. Her knowledge makes the association shop/lover useless for symbolic purposes.

To suppose that the oneiric Fortunata has any motive at all is yet another absurdity. The reason involves the role of the narrator. When the oneiric Fortunata stops before the plumbing shop, the narrator exits the diegetic frame, indicating that she hopes to encounter Juanito a second time. The pointed shift in narrative level involves the narrator's explanation of her action. He alludes to "*esa* rutina del instinto," an extra-oneiric and metadiegetic remark addressed to the reader. This shift exposes the somewhat blurred separation between the oneiric Fortunata, the dreaming Fortunata, and the waking heroine. It also exposes the futility of applying a symbolic approach to this episode. By dreaming that she pauses before the plumbing shop, Fortunata is unaware that she is renewing an earlier scene. More precisely, the Fortunata in the dream has no previous history, no memory of meeting Juanito at the shop in waking life. This

Fortunata does not enjoy the autonomy of the Fortunata who creates her. She is the dreamer's puppet, a product of the unconscious that manufactures her. Consequently, she has lived no prior scene nor does she possess any unconscious to be unaware of.

Her lack of an unconscious is important because it betrays the contrivance that Fortunata is dreaming, whereas, in truth, the narrator is controlling this episode. The proof is that the narrator reports her motive, a motive that is impossible for the oneiric or dreamed Fortunata to know: "obedeciendo a esa rutina del instinto por la cual, cuando tenemos un encuentro feliz en determinado sitio, volvemos al propio sitio creyendo que lo tendremos segunda vez." Since the oneiric Fortunata is a newly fashioned surrogate for the heroine, she has never paused before a real plumbing shop. She is devoid of any instinctive hope that stopping now will repeat an earlier encounter with Juanito. All of this reporting belongs to the narrator's agency, as shown by the appeal to the addressee with "esa" and "tenemos." Furthermore, the reader knows the contrary, that "feliz" does not describe the accidental encounter that did occur. Nor does the surrogate Fortunata know that she will meet Juanito in the dream's final episode. But the narrator knows this, or rather Galdós knows, for he is inventing the dream and its happy ending. The reprise of the waking scene is a narratorial reprise, not a subjective one. The point of view shifts away from Fortunata, unlike the next focalized instant, when she marvels "¡Cuánto tubo!" Instead, the narrator furnishes the deictic "*esa* rutina del instinto" so as to stand outside the dream and invite the reader's complicity.

The addressee is expected to recall the earlier plumbing shop and to respond in two ways: to wonder whether the outcome will be different this time and to recognize the event as a recaptured one, an event among several previous episodes, where "tubo" is a detail now also encapsulated in this single evocation. Another such event is Mauricia's dying request to drink more sherry: "Dejó oír una voz que parecía venir, por un tubo, del sótano de la casa" (III, vi, 9; 224-25). Yet another is the domestic vignette that links Lupe's house to Fortunata's chores: "El quinqué de la cocina con el tubo ahumado y sin pantalla, iluminaba la cara gitanesca de la criada" (II, ii, 6; 501). And still another is the slum apartment where Jacinta runs an obstacle course of household appliances, including "un brasero que se estaba encendiendo, con el tubo de hierro sobre las brasas para hacer tiro" (I, ix, 2; 321).

The most telling of such episodes demonstrates why the "tubos" reference carries the generic meaning of any type of conduit rather than that of a sexual vehicle. Here the enamoured Moreno asks his physician if he can father children, "tal como estoy, con la tubería descompuesta" (IV, ii, 1; 336). The allusion is to his failing cardiac system, particularly the arteries that are wildly pumping his blood. The doctor's amused reply is that the condition does not affect his reproductive potency.

The fundamental points involve clear logic. Granted that the awakened Fortunata may have stopped at the plumbing shop out of an unconscious association of water pipes with Juanito, that association became conscious only after he appeared. Therefore, the dreaming Fortunata did not need to symbolize an association that no longer was repressed. Additionally, the novel never associates water with Juanito, except for the fountain near his house, which Fortunata does not mention anyway. Consequently, the water-and-pump theme connected with Maxi cannot be transferred to Juanito. Nor is Fortunata aware of Maxi's obsession, and so it would be impossible for her, consciously or unconsciously, to transfer these symbols to her

lover. Finally, there is the simple evidence that the dream belongs to the narrator, for he falters on the elementary point made earlier, namely, his attribution of motive to the oneiric Fortunata, who is an illusory surrogate that mirrors but does not possess the heroine's unconscious thoughts. More accurately, the symbolist critic errs by not recognizing the narrator's attribution, a gesture that is perfectly within the privilege of narration.

To dispel any lingering belief that phallic symbols drive this episode, it is instructive to observe the contrasting methods of Chamberlin and López-Baralt. The latter cites the "llaves" within a cluster of "simbolismo fálico de tubos, lápices, grifos y llaves en un ambiente seminal de humedad" (141) The cluster contaminates the plumbing items of this first scene with the "lápices" that appear six scenes later and with the wet ground that ushers in the last scene. This approach ignores the separate contexts of each item, in violation of the interpretative method followed by Freud and Jung. As for Chamberlin, he does little with the faucets and "llaves" motif, which extends to sexually irrelevant moments in the novel that are deeply embedded in its local colour and character portraits. For instance, Guillermina's energies involve an ongoing plan for an orphanage, and she proudly recites her most recent acquisitions: "Cuatro azulejos de cocina, un grifo y tres paquetitos de argollas" (I, vii, 2; 269). The reference would be a trivial detail, were it not embedded in the broader kitchen-and-pantry motif that threads among the novel's domestic scenes.[50]

Cross-threading the domestic motifs and themes are the water and the textile motifs. Both motifs belong to the historicizing register of Galdós's narrative. If the fabric motif weaves the economic history of the 1840s into the characters' lives of the 1870s by its ubiquitous reminder of their wearing apparel, the water motif connects their lives to contemporary urban history. In this light, a broader perspective for tubes and for water in general inevitably brings into view the importance of the municipal waterworks in the novel. Chamberlin himself cites as historical background the Depósito de Aguas del Lozoya and the Canal de Isabel II that Jacinta's mother recalls from 1847 and 1858. But the abundance and availability of water in Madrid, when understood in context, pertain not to sexual symbolism but larger anxieties. The fact is that aquatic imagery comprises an extensive semantic network entailing historical as well as psychological interpretations of the novel. Both drinking water and the sewage system are involved.

Innumerable references to the quality of Madrid's drinking water accentuate the novel's narrative register of social history and its depiction of the vicissitudes and achievements of the Bourbon dynasty. These instances are well known and need not be discussed. Along with supply, however, drainage also occupies a place in the semantic network. When Fortunata watches street cleaners hosing down the fallen snow into water, the event begins by evoking the cleansing respectability that she herself plans to achieve in her new "vida solitaria y tristísima" (IV, iv, 1; 409: "[una] charca cenagosa, en la cual chapoteaban los barrenderos y mangueros municipales, disolviendo la nieve con los chorros de agua y revolviéndola con el fango para echarlo todo a la alcantarilla." The event ends with a deft touch that records its novelty, as much because the street-cleaning innovation was remarkable as because it had snowed in Madrid: "Divertido era este espectáculo, sobre todo cuando restallaban los airosos surtidores de las mangas de riego, y los chicos se lanzaban a la faena, armados con tremendas escobas" (IV, iv, 2; 410). Because Chamberlin's sexual thesis does not fit this passage, he does not quote it. Yet its meaning typifies

Galdós's practice of integrating psychomoral characterization into an authentic representation of historical reality.

The heroine's witnessing of the sewer scene toward the novel's end has a mirror reversal near the novel's beginning. Now Jacinta, preoccupied with children, hears kittens in a sewer and grows meaningfully tormented:

[había] junto a la acera por la parte de la plaza una de esas hendiduras practicadas en el encintado, que se llaman *absorbederos* en el lenguaje municipal, y que sirven para dar entrada en la alcantarilla al agua de las calles. De allí, sí; de allí venían aquellos lamentos que trastornaban el alma de la Delfina. (I, vi, 4; 253)

The polar symmetry is obvious, both as to narrative structure as well as to the rivals' antithetical emotions. Less obvious, perhaps, is an appreciation of the sociohistorical aesthetics of this realist novel. A first reading normally would privilege the women's psychological predicaments, with a passing acknowledgement of the text's mimetic documentation of Madrid's streets. Further readings can have the opposite effect, namely, wonderment at the compounding, in a second description, of abundant details about sewer engineering and terminology, both attached to a wider complex of allusions to water. Whether Galdós was unconscious of this intermesh is an irrelevant issue; the consequence is a re-reading of the novel that elevates seemingly casual detail to a historicizing plane. As critics often observe in passing, the genuine protagonist of *Fortunata y Jacinta* is the city of Madrid.

The plumbing shop, in the end, resonates with notes that summon echoes from every corner of the narrative. After several careful readings, the professional critic may decide that the pattern of motifs and the psychological drama are equally significant and complementary. For instance, the water and textile motifs are not so remote from each other as first suggested. The clean slate hoped for by Fortunata, cited earlier, finds its collective counterpart in the analogy of Madrid as a "camisa desgarrada y sucia" in the 1840s; the city dreams of a future "con visiones de camisas limpias en todas las clases" (I, ii, 5; 154). Similarly, the reverse symmetry just noted repeats itself in Fortunata's dream of street wandering and Juanito's corresponding nocturnal, aimless wandering from cafe to cafe in search of the recently returned mistress (I, xi, 3). These mirror reversals are, structurally, very distant from each other.

A corresponding gulf between classes also marks these circumstances, again accompanied by aquatic imagery. Severiana's apartment, where Mauricia will expire, has "un pasillo, en el cual se veía la artesa de lavar y la entrada de la cocina" (III, vi, 1; 173-74). To this humble domicile arrives Guillermina, who scolds Severiana because the same scrub tub is "decorating" the hallway with "Ropa sucia y agua de jabón" (III, vi, 2; 181). Meanwhile, Juanito's spatially distant neighbourhood has plentiful water for servants to fetch and for the poor to peddle (I, vi, 3). Such shared references enable the lovers' polarized relationship to be expressed in class terms as well as personal ones.

Galdós was more than casually attracted by the water supply and drainage systems begun in 1847 under Bravo Murillo, the Minister of Works. As Ortiz (351) makes clear from letters and a newspaper article, Galdós was impressed with changes brought by the fresh water supply from the newly opened Canal del Lozoya. His fascination is doubly significant because it par-

ticipated in wider citizen enthusiasm for the Depósito, "del cual estaban francamente orgullosos los madrileños, pues la traída de ellas había transformado la vida de la ciudad." The first conduit, completed in 1858, gave an insufficient supply, but funds were allocated for a second conduit in 1872 "en los altos de Santa Engracia, donde aún se encuentra," a project still under construction in 1874. Ortiz traces the numerous references to water as a major current that flows through the novel. The "viajes" or "cursos" of underground waterways led to various fountains. The existence of this system underlies psychological, moral, and socioeconomic themes that emerge in association with water imagery.

In the novel, arguments over which drinking water was best—the Lozoya (Pontejos) or the Progreso (Lupe preferring the Lozoya as less salty)—leave Fortunata indifferent (IV, i, 5; 293). Lupe and Casta insist on the qualities of the waters' taste in a didactic, pretentious manner until the narrator intervenes self-consciously to the reader: "No insistiré en lo mucho que se dijo sobre este tratado de las aguas de Madrid." These details and the heroine's indifference are far from trivial, for the water that flows through the same conduits plays a significant role in non-drinking episodes central to Fortunata's hopes and despairs. The washing scene in the convent with Mauricia means, for Ortiz Armengol, a social and moral cleansing wherein the heroine's thoughts lead to "¡Un hogar honrado y tranquilo!" (II, vi, 7; 634; Ortiz Armengol 360). Appositely, the aforementioned "brocal de la cisterna" illuminates the true meaning of "brocal de la fuente," whose "espumarajos" signal not sexual but social power.[51] Fortunata's heartache informs both images, but in different dimensions. In one case, gazing into the cistern that traps her soul, Fortunata descends, psychologically, within herself to face the bleak spectacle of her isolation. In the case of the fountain, the water's abundance is easily accessible to an economic class that is entirely inaccessible to the abandoned heroine.

The economic discrepancy is made plain by Ortiz Armengol: "elegir entre la traída de la cercana plaza en cubas o la de la cañería que ya llegaba hasta la cocina" (464). There is no choice for Fortunata, who wants to clean Segunda's filthy apartment but cannot do it at her convenience: "Si tuviera agua en abundancia, se pondría al instante a lavar toda la casa; pero desde el siguiente empezaría" (IV, iii, 7; 398). The incident causes Ortiz Armengol to remark that the working class "no disponía aún de agua corriente, y que la subían a cubas parsimoniosamente los aguadores" (494). In contrast, Galdós takes every opportunity to associate a bountiful supply with the Santa Cruz family, which lives on Pontejos street facing the square of the same name, where Barbarita proudly says that "no vivía en Madrid quien no oyera por las mañanas el ruido cóncavo de las cubas de los aguadores en la fuente de Pontejos" (I, vi, 3; 246).

In conclusion, when Fortunata wonders why she had stopped before a plumbing shop, the answer is, surely, that she had no reason at all, not even an unconscious one. But Galdós did, consciously or not. The displayed artifacts are the opportunity to convoke the diverse family of related motifs from all parts of the narrative that are compressed into single notes capable of multiple resonances when named. If symbolism must be invoked, it is surely, on one hand, the disgrace of Fortunata's exclusion from the "clean" moral life of the middle class, and, on the historical level, the exposed dirty linen ("camisa sucia") of blatant economic inequity—expenditures for a water system that remained of difficult access for the poor.

6. The Dwarf in the Fabric Shop

(Transitional movement)

Después sigue hacia la plaza del Progreso.

SCENE 2

(Scene 2A) *En la calle de Barrionuevo, se detiene en la puerta de una tienda, donde hay piezas de tela desenvueltas y colgadas haciendo ondas. Fortunata las examina, y coge algunas telas entre los dedos para apreciarlas por el tacto. "¡Qué bonita es esta cretona!"*

(Scene 2B) *Dentro hay un enano, un monstruo, vestido con balandrán rojo y turbante, alimaña de transición que se ha quedado a la mitad del camino darwinista por donde los orangutanes vinieron a ser hombres. Aquel adefesio hace allí mil extravagancias para atraer a la gente, y en la calle se apelmazan los chiquillos para verle y reírse de él.*

The historicist approach to the dream will recognize this scene to be an inauguration of broad themes about class conflict that include, but also surpass, their relevance to the heroine. My suggestion is that Fortunata's dream reaches beyond her personal framework and should be interpreted within the larger social narrative that frames her. I have made preliminary reference to the dream's evocation of such themes as city life, class conflict, and modernizations in urban engineering and the textile industry. These and other fundamental issues still to be discussed impinge on more than the heroine's life: collectively, they historicize the novel. The dream compresses them into much briefer oneiric scenes and objects, while the dream's narrator portrays them by alternating the dreamer's point of view with his own.

It cannot be said that the dreaming Fortunata condenses these themes symbolically. She only dreams the scenes, and these in turn evoke the themes. She is, obviously, the orchestrator of the scenes in their composite sense of requiring somebody to visualize them as a dream. But to create visualizations is not always to create symbols. And to create both is not to understand their meanings. The waking subject alone can attempt to understand; the dreaming subject can only witness the scenes. Where the dream's constituents are, in fact, symbols, they may be construed in terms of Fortunata's personal life. I do not discount this possibility, but I would hope to see it argued more rigorously than do the arguments challenged in the present study. My own position is that where the dream's constituents bear compressed meanings relevant to the novel's wider significance, they may be regarded as encapsulated signs or semantic reductions of meanings that elsewhere in the novel receive ample and diverse treatment.

I shall argue that Scenes 2 through 7 offer far greater interest as semantic miniatures of the novel's fictional world than insights into Fortunata's unconscious desires. The narrator's allusion to the Darwinian progress of civilization, the rebellious mules, the traffic jam pitting classes against one another, the petty vendors with innovative gadgets, the government agency known as the Fiel Contraste—all of this located in Madrid's colourful streets—together provide insight into Fortunata's sexual drives only by strained, un-Freudian arguments. These same references,

however, when understood as compact narrative signs for major themes, proliferate a number of related meanings by summoning up earlier events in the waking life of numerous characters, Fortunata often among them. Again, the notion that the dream is "hers" is valid mainly insofar as somebody must dream it. But the dream also belongs to the narrator. It is in a sense the novel's dream of itself, eight oneiric scenes encompassing the narrative's entire span of principal events, some of which are not at all pertinent to the dreamer. It is fitting that the novel's principal character perceives these events and objects, because their condensed meanings, when decompressed to their full, original significance, belong to a network of ideas that inevitably impinge upon her in some way.

This theory accords with the idea of a synoptic image advanced by Turner and Bly. The "metonymic" space of the staircase at the Cava de San Miguel summarizes the four narrative parts, an idea endorsed implicitly by Goldman ("Cada peldaño"). The same synoptic phenomenon is integral to both literature and music. The recapitulative power of encapsulated signs is comparable to the solid chord that summons up several octaves—notes that resonate with multiple meaning, in this case reminiscences. Just as the famous Proustian fragrance, taste, and musical sonata summon clusters of previous events and psychological experiences, so does Galdós's dream component act as a reductive unit that can expand, having a retrospective power to retrieve and re-energize larger themes and scenes denoted by the oneiric signs.

Consequently, it is a special kind of dream that comprises the scene at the fabric shop and those that follow. The dreamer's perspective accounts for events whose meanings pertain exclusively to her only to a limited degree. If dreams condense meanings into symbols that must be decompressed to reveal those meanings fully, Fortunata's dream mounts compact signs that, when expanded, spread forth the novel's unifying concerns. Among the primary concerns is the economic and sociopolitical process represented by fabrics and the textile trade. Scene 2 depicts Fortunata examining loose pieces of cloth that hang rippling outside the store. Prior to the dream she tells Lupe the untruth that she went shopping for fabrics. Lupe sees none, and the lie is exposed. In the dream, Fortunata handles them for their texture, ignoring their colour.

In the parallel market scene earlier (I, ix, 1), the emphasis on material contact varies sharply from the detached perspectives of both Jacinta and the narrator, who are often struck by the bright colours displayed by the popular classes. Fortunata, however, has often observed Jacinta's wardrobe keenly, and most recently when sitting next to her "tocando falda con falda" prior to their confrontation (III, vi, 3; 191). Fortunata silently proposes to have a similar outfit, but her rival's elegance distances her from this aspiration: "¿Dónde se encontraría aquella tela? Seguramente era de París" (III, vi, 3; 193). Small wonder she neglected to go shopping. But her lie to Lupe conformed to her intention, for just after the clash with Jacinta she had repeated it mentally: "'lo mismito, con aquel tableado; y si encontrara tela igual...'" (III, vi, 6; 211). But the social and economic gulf between the women is too wide even in the dream. The cloth she seizes upon is the lowly "cretona," the same material used for little Adoración's apron (I, ix, 8). This portion of the dream recapitulates the double conversion of fortunes in Fortunata's real life, spanned by the novel: the first "transformación," which stupefies Juanito, from the "pañolito por la cabeza con el pico arriba y la lazada" (I, xi, 1; 434) to the silk "vestido azul elegantísimo y abrigo de terciopelo" (I, xi, 2; 438) worn on her return from Paris, the same coat that, in the second conversion, is pawned by the time Maxi meets her in Part II and now is forgotten at the end of Part III.

Galdós's attention to the details of women's clothes is so prolific as to excuse further mention. The point is that the motif holds the narrative in a tight weave that serves the larger theme of what Sinnigen calls "la reificación de las relaciones sociales" ("Sexo" 67). Turner (99) also focuses on such metaphorical clusters as clothing, the textile trade, and home decoration, all being "textual signs for mental modes of behavior" in personal taste and mass culture, each of which entails numerous episodes across the sprawling narrative. While these references certainly invade Part Four, the oneiric fabric shop plays a decisive role at the end of Part III. As Sinnigen observes, Part I is the "historia masculina de la burguesía y de cómo el dominio de la mercancía estaba separando las clases medias del pueblo." Part IV, in contrast, depicts Fortunata's generosity that permits "un nuevo compañerismo con la burguesía que había sido su enemigo" ("Sexo" 66). From a structural standpoint, the dream may be seen to support Sinnigen's idea of the narrative's "movimiento desde lo masculino hacia lo femenino," inasmuch as it is the last time that textiles play a significant role.

It is unsurprising, therefore, that the fabric shop, as a metaphor for commerce, is the scene second in importance only to the plumbing shop, the metaphor for modern engineering technology. The same scene also presents the figure of a dwarf, perhaps the most distorted and thus most puzzling element in the entire dream. The Freudian explanation is quite hopeless. Gilman writes, in passing: "Even the 'id' itself—probably this is far-fetched—appears as 'a dwarf, a little monster dressed in a red cassock and a turban, Darwin's missing link between orangutans and men' (409)" (*Galdós* 353). In a brief footnote Ribbans quotes the phrase "alimaña de transición ... camino darwinista" merely adding: "it would appear therefore to represent primitive passion" (*Conflicts* 315). Chamberlin notes parenthetically that the dwarf is "frequently symbolizing the gatekeeper of the unconscious (Cirlot 91)" ("Eroticizing" 77). He links this role to Fortunata's ability to "weigh and measure" her personal situation as she stands before the Weights and Measures building (the Fiel Contraste). However, Fortunata does not enter the shop; she merely examines fabrics outside. But even if her self-measurement were possible without entry, she would be in a preposterous situation. The dwarf guards the truth about Fortunata by standing before the fabric shop, while Fortunata stands elsewhere looking at a traffic jam. Consequently, she is able to weigh and measure her situation at another location without learning about herself by peering into the fabric shop.

A more difficult problem with the "id" theory is that self-knowledge is attributed to the dreamed Fortunata. This personage in the dream is just that, a figure manipulated by the dreamer. However, the dreaming Fortunata cannot have self-understanding either; that is why she dreams in symbols. Only the waking Fortunata can have insight into herself. As a dreamer she can manufacture symbols to disguise unconscious thoughts, while in the dream she can be a spectator to those very thoughts. But neither the dreaming subject nor her oneiric counterpart can "weigh and measure" herself in any meaningful way related to insight into the unconscious. Chamberlin's joining of separate frames of awareness creates a theatre of mirrors, with Fortunata the dreamer peering into an unintelligible dream and the oneiric Fortunata watching an intelligible event (the traffic jam) after having intelligently assessed some pieces of fabric.

Chamberlin is highly selective when citing Cirlot, who actually says that the dwarf symbol is ambivalent in meaning. Dwarves can be "the personification of those forces which remain virtually outside the orbit of consciousness. [...] For Jung, they may be regarded as the guard-

ians of the threshold of the unconscious" (91). Or else, according to Cirlot, a deformed dwarf is "a demon-dwarf who symbolizes the 'blindness of life,' or the ignorance of man." Apart from Chamberlin's selectivity, his mechanical method of consulting a dictionary of symbols bypasses the complexity of symbol analysis. Jung himself is interested in dwarves as godlike creatures, the Cabiri, who "are under the sway of childlike creative powers" (273). Alternatively, they "may represent unconscious formative powers [...] or allude to [a person's] still childish condition" (264). As another symbol, "in contradiction to the previous emphasis placed on their lowly origin in the dark [...] they are eternally striving from the depths to the heights [...] an unconscious content that struggles toward the light" (232). Four or five alternative meanings compete for attention, so that the dictionary compiler himself shares the blame for the user's arbitrary application.

With a similar lack of reasoned exposition, López-Baralt uses the dwarf to illustrate Freud's concept of condensation in dreamwork, which "convierte el sueño en un texto apretado, preñado de sentidos múltiples y contradictorios [...]. Son típicas de ésta [la condensación] las figuras compuestas de elementos que no suelen asociarse en la vigilia." From this correct account she moves to the dwarf's position halfway along the Darwinian path between orangutan and man. And from this description she concludes that the dwarf is an "hombre/animal que representa la fuerza de los instintos de la Pitusa" (141-42). This arbitrary opinion has no foundation in reasoning or in textual evidence. What does Fortunata know about Darwin that enables her to connect him to the dwarf? This is the narrator's comment, an example of why the dream does not belong entirely to Fortunata. Then too, why would a male dwarf symbolize the female "id" (as distinct from Chamberlin's unconscious)? What does sexual instinct have to do with a fabric shop? The children's laughter might be interpreted as a displacement of Fortunata's anxiety about her desires, but this too is unjustified because, according to López-Baralt, she is not anxious and openly dreams of meeting Juanito. Finally, the dwarf's activity involves extravagant huckstering, and this economic signal is remote from Fortunata's sexual instinct, unless it refers to her brief life as a prostitute, which hardly fits the context.

If we construe the dwarf from the standpoint of the narrative's dream about itself, he cannot be a mythologem of the Jungian kind because of the realistic referent, "darwinista." Darwinism in this instance, however, is evolutionary, not in the biological sense, but in the social one. First of all, he wears a turban, rather unstylish and of low taste alongside the changes in men's hats mentioned around the time of the dream. Juan Pablo Rubín buys himself a "chistera nueva," while Basilio de la Caña acquires "un sombrero de moda." The dwarf also wears a red "balandrán" or cloak-like cassock instead of the numerous, recently available "levitas y gabanes flamantes que se veían por Madrid" such as the "levita de paño fino" sported by the aforementioned Basilio (III, iv, 7; 124-25). Far from relating to Fortunata, except in class identity (the dwarf's appearance suggests an assistant rather than a shop owner), he condenses the fact that Spain's political Restoration brought change in men's clothes. More significantly, the political cause "es un fenómeno muy conocido," according to the narrator at another moment. Tailors and fabric dealers complain when business is bad, citing the lengthy time without political change. The government does not protect them, they claim, and "con sus quejas acaloran a los descontentos y azuzan a los revolucionarios" (III, iv, 7; 125).

As noted, the relation between fabric and politics frames the narrative as well as marking the rhythm of social generations and tastes. Thus, in the period after 1845 the Santa Cruz business suffers a change in which red capes and Manila shawls, singled out for mention, decline in appeal, as do bright colours in general. A generation later, the popular classes restore them. The business prospers, however, whereas the house of Arnaiz diminishes in size and fortune. Arnaiz returns from Paris with "unos adefesios que no tuvieron aceptación" (I, ii, 5; 154). These awful-looking articles are "monstrosities" in the figurative sense, deformities with regard to clothing fashion. No better symbol of this economic misfortune can be found than the dwarfish "adefesio," whose physical aspect is both a diminishment and a grotesquerie in the sense of incongruous aspect.

The colour red worn by the dwarf can likewise be understood best as condensing the novel's prominent theme of textiles. Certainly Jung construes redness in flexible ways: as the rising sun, God the Son, the life force, and the enlightened or immortal self (157, 262, 286, 235, 228, 236). One might, as an armchair symbolist, add the idea of blood. I find it harder to reconcile these possibilities than to survey the instances obviously summoned by this allusion. First, there is José Ido del Sagrario, who not only is the grotesque analogue of the dwarf ("un hombre muy flaco, de cara enfermiza y toda llena de lóbulos y carúnculas, los pelos bermejos y muy tiesos") but is equally and pathetically out of fashion: with "la ropa prehistórica y muy raída, corbata roja y deshilachada [...] [era la] estampa de miseria en traje de persona decente" (I, viii, 3; 297). Although Fortunata knows him in this guise, the description itself appears in an episode unrelated to her and remote from the dream itself. Equally important, the dwarf is in charge of a fabric shop that emblematizes the many-coloured cloth articles so emphatically detailed in this realist novel. In the same fabric bazaar mentioned earlier, Jacinta memorably examines the brilliant shawls ("naranjado," "cobalto," "verde," "amarillo") among the stands of merchandise in the Calle de Toledo, including two categories of red percal:

> el bermellón nativo, que parece rasguñar los ojos; el carmín, que tiene la acidez del vinagre [...]. ¡Oh!, el rojo abundaba tanto, que aquello parecía un pueblo que tiene la religión de la sangre. Telas rojas, arneses rojos, collarines y frontiles rojos con madroñaje arabesco. Las puertas de las tabernas también de color de sangre. Y que no son ni una ni dos. Jacinta se asustaba de ver tantas. (I, ix, 1; 317-18)

In this social context, Fortunata's famous blue shawl is out of place. Instead, it is the dying Mauricia who is associated with red, so that an entirely separate narrative destiny is invoked by the colour. The room where she lies moribund is decorated with "pedazos de damasco rojo y amarillo," while in the patio below several wicker chairs painted red are drying. The chapter is a mosaic of red allusions: a table covered with checkered "*peluche* carmesí," two picture-portraits of sergeants in "pantalón rojo, muy a lo vivo," (III, vi, 2; 186), and a "toquilla encarnada" worn by Doña Fuensanta, who ministers to the dying Mauricia (III, vi, 5; 204).

The incongruous dwarf as an "adefesio" has a second cluster of meanings, again related to the novel's theme of social class differences. The proximity of the "chiquillos" who mock him dramatizes an incongruity narrated earlier when neighbourhood pranksters ("chiquillos del Demonio") hold a mock religious procession, jumping over a bonfire and giving the scene a

"temeroso y fantástico aspecto" (III, vi, 4; 196). The mood is darker than the one in the dream, but the metonymy of slum children and monstrosity is significant because the identical word is repeated when El Pituso first appears, covered with shoe black and shocking Guillermina: "—¡El Dulce Nombre! ... —exclamó la Pacheco viendo entrar aquel adefesio, y todos los demás lanzaron una exclamación parecida" (I, ix, 3; 329). Because none of this action involves Fortunata, there is a question about why she is dreaming it. To what extent can the dreaming subject be linked to scenes and objects that do not belong to her waking life? And how subjective is a dream that evokes themes that do not belong exclusively to her private dimension?

These questions turn back to the aforementioned encapsulated signs. Both the Darwinian dwarf and the fabric shop reprise the deep sociohistorical meanings embedded in the novel. The evolutionist aspect is inescapable, although Sinnigen discusses Guillermina's epithet "savage" and "primitive stage of development" in Krausist terms of a rudimentary stage of society ("Individual" 123). Yet Galdós was familiar with the 1877 translation of *The Origin of the Species* and evokes its author in the imagery of *Miau* (Malaret 48-51). Primitive man's embryonic state of mind also relates to the much-discussed "pueblo/cantera" analogy drawn by Juanito in response to his mistress's outburst, "yo no me civilizo, ni quiero; soy siempre pueblo" (II, vii, 6; 690). Her regressive status is thrown in her face by an indignant Guillermina: "'Usted [...] es anterior a la civilización; usted es una salvaje y pertenece de lleno a los pueblos primitivos'" (III, vii, 3; 251), or so the narrator says on her behalf. The repetitive use of "salvaje," "bárbaro," and "primitivo" throughout the novel needs to be understood as "la parte ahistórica," "arcaico," and "primordial," "del ser humano" in their positively vital connotations, according to Víctor Fuentes, who, nonetheless, fits them into a Freudian picture of the heroine's unrepressed freedom (52, note 2).

To place a Krausist construction on the reference to Darwin is compatible with the organic metaphor at the root of "enano," "adefesio," and "alimaña." The Krausist current in Galdós's thought is a factor in these regressive allusions. They derive antithetically from the organic and biological metaphors that, as Teresa Toscano Liria points out, filter from Sanz del Río into the rhetoric of Cánovas, who refers to human progress in the positivist terms of the zoological evolutionary scale (95). Even Comte's evolutionist doctrine and the "evolucionismo total de Spencer" share with Galdós the same concern for progress and order. Elsewhere in the novel, Juan Pablo Rubín's pronouncements on rationalist naturalism, which interprets anarchist and Comtean ideas, exploit the same metaphor.[52] The doctrine of "la coordinación gradual de los organismos" depends upon an organic progression from vegetal to lower animal beings to the higher species. The stunted shop attendant cannot embody any such harmony, and, in fact, he foreshadows the dream's later traffic jam.

Significantly, Fortunata's dream moves from the modern plumbing shop to the dysfunctional dwarf who vainly gestures to customers. The third scene in this sequence is the brief pause before a tavern, which also fits into this regressive pattern. Here Fortunata has "recuerdos que le sacan tiras del corazón," (III, vii, 4; 256), an allusion to her love, which advocates of social order like Nicolás call "propio de hembras salvajes." Similarly, her "hermosura física [...] de Grecia y del naturalismo pagano" is to be mortified (II, iv, 5; 564-65).[53] The dwarf functions as a grotesque social mirror for Fortunata, immobilized on the civilizing path between savagery and harmonic society. Her self-description, when Juanito asks what she would do if Maxi tried

to kill him, is characteristic: "Me tiraba a él como una leona y le destrozaba" (II, vii, 7; 693). Repentfully, she repeats the epithet under Feijoo's tutelage: "¡Qué indecente he sido! [...] querer como una leona" (III, iv, 1; 91). Yet she reverts to type when chastised by Guillermina: "dio a entender Fortunata que por ella no había inconveniente en que la sociedad volviera al estado salvaje" (III, vii, 3; 250-51). I will not belabour the lexical cluster attached to the heroine throughout the novel: "madriguera," "devorar," "tigresa," "salvaje." What bears emphasis is that a wide spectrum of critics underscores the dualities of civilization/barbarism and middle class/"pueblo." But they do not implicate Fortunata, though implicated she must be, in the same evolutionary terms offered for the dwarf: "La verdadera ley es la de la sangre, o como dice Juan Pablo, la Naturaleza, y yo por la Naturaleza le he quitado a la *mona del Cielo* el puesto que ella me había quitado a mí [...]. Que me venga ahora con leyes, y verá lo que le contesto" (IV, vi, 2; 455).[54] This failure to pursue the existent civilizing path places her in the dwarf's camp. It is true that the dream exaggerates the analogy of "pueblo/cantera"—deforms it, as dreams do. But when Sinnigen links this analogy to Guillermina's epithet "anterior a la civilización [...] salvaje," he does so in the Krausist terms of a rudimentary stage of society sheltering the primitive man's embryonic state of mind ("Individual" 123). The relevance of the "camino darwinista" to this idea and to Fortunata as well as the dwarf is clear enough.

No such relevance to Fortunata can be cited for Galdós's choice of orangutans to designate the dwarf's origin. As an animal alien to the savage beasts associated with the heroine, the orangutan brings a nuance of human distortion to the scene. Its deformation functions pictorially alongside the disharmony of social existence. Accordingly, the grotesque dwarf can be understood in yet a third cluster of episodic meanings, this time fitted to the deforming consequences of economic squalor and degradation. The grotesque is cultivated in this novel in relation to realist ugliness and deformity. Again Ido appears, now in the chapter preceding the dream, recognizable for "lo desengonzado de su cuerpo, la escualidez carunculosa de su cara y el desarrollo cada vez mayor de la nuez" (III, vi, 2; 184). Inevitably, the diminutive nun, Sor Marcela, is also linked to the dwarf, despite the gender difference and her benevolent role during Fortunata's life in the convent. Her arrested physical evolution is, paradoxically, no obstacle to civilization's advanced religious institution. But if Galdós is regarded as unsympathetic to the Church, then his clinical and aesthetically studied portrait is important for stressing that Marcela has evolved no further than the dwarf in the fabric shop:

> una monja vieja, coja y casi enana, la más desdichada estampa de mujer que puede imaginarse. Su cara, que parecía de cartón, era morena, dura, chata, de tipo mongólico, los ojos expresivos y afables, como los de algunas bestias de la raza cuadrumana. Su cuerpo no tenía forma de mujer. (II, vi, 2; 613)

Not only does Marcela suffer a physically subhuman status, she personifies the degeneracy of the Spanish empire, as Ortiz Armengol implies by her nationality.[55]

These forerunners of Fortunata's dwarf are benign alongside the socially realistic forerunners showing the impact of class incompatibility. Through a vignette of brutally minute detail, Moreno encounters a blind girl and an old guitarrist: "Era horriblemente fea, andrajosa, fétida, y al cantar parecía que se le salían del casco los ojos cuajados y reventones, como los de un pez

muerto. Tenía la cara llena de cicatrices de viruelas" (IV, ii, 6; 361). More than a narrator's passing cameo, the passage points to the progressive Galdós who lingers over-zealously ("pez muerto") on the heartbreaking ravages of slum-breeding disease.[56]

Moreno is more than simply a witness. He is the agent of the Darwinist-Krausist progressivism in an escapist form. His complaints against the underclass smack of philosophical despair or, worse, bourgeois intolerance. Horrified by the "hordas de mendigos" that accost him, Moreno rails against "hombres que parecen salvajes" (III, ii, 4; 71). He sees in their cloaks "lo desmedrado de la casta" (III, ii, 4; 72). Rather than embrace the reformist platform of the social evolutionists, he exalts their concept of civilization while retreating to England: "Ni esto es país, ni esto es capital ni aquí hay civilización" (IV, ii, 3; 344). Whenever he appears in Parts III and IV, the same litany of a retrograde society crosses his lips.[57]

7. From Tavern Grill to Uncertain Directions

SCENE 3

Fortunata sigue y pasa junto a la taberna en cuya puerta está la gran parrilla de asar chuletas, y debajo el enorme hogar lleno de fuego. La tal taberna tiene para ella recuerdos que le sacan tiras del corazón...

The critics who linked food and particularly "chuletas" to Fortunata's sexual relations with Juanito were surveyed earlier in the section on the "de-eroticized" Fortunata. More will be said later about the meat-wagon episode of Scene 6. In the symbolist view, sexual appetite is imaged by culinary references, as Sarah King contends in her study of food imagery. However, she cites Jacinta rather than Fortunata in this regard. Juanito considers life to be "a juicy meal," while Jacinta's story is one of "Hunger and Insatisfaction" (82). The point is further elaborated by Vernon Chamberlin in the double entendre of the word "carne" as food and carnal appetite, employed because Galdós "understood well the important role that libidinal drives and carnal appetites play in the human life cycle" ("A Further Consideration" 58 ff).

When we assess this approach, what is pertinent to the tavern scene is the alleged symbolism itself. López-Baralt construes the grill and chops as "Fortunata como carne para el consumo de Juan" (143). This predatory attitude really characterizes Juanito's extra-marital activity, but it is hardly plausible that even so self-sacrificing a woman as Fortunata would think or dream of herself in the demeaning terms of consumable flesh. The interpretation is more appropriate to a man's dream, for the symbol mirrors male desire better than it does Fortunata's self-image. If this logic does not satisfy, a moment's consideration will make it clear that the metaphor "to be eaten" does not usually offer the subject the same pleasure as the thought "to eat." It is unlikely that Fortunata took unconscious pleasure in the thought that she was meat to be devoured by a

loving male. But even if she could think "I am a delectable body," the thought would refute Chamberlin's libido interpretation. Chamberlin adopts the same view of the "parrilla" as López-Baralt, but he separates the image into food and fire. He observes Fortunata's "personal identification with this kind of meat and, very significantly, the accompanying feelings, which sums up her dilemma" ("A Further Consideration" 56-57; see note 14). The problem with associating the veal- and pork-chop motif with Fortunata is that it relates not only to Juanito but also to Ido, Maxi, and Juan Pablo.

It is possible to speculate with Chamberlin about "her dilemma," meaning the sexual inactivity that he believes is summarized by "recuerdos que le sacan tiras del corazón." But the truth about Fortunata's so-called sexual passion is that Juanito implies otherwise in a remark cited previously: "La pobrecilla no aprende, no adelanta un solo paso en el arte de agradar; no tiene instintos de seducción, desconoce las gaterías que embelesan" (III, iii, 1; 76). Where, then, is the textual evidence for her interest in sex? The narrator concentrates on every aspect of her passion except sexual hunger; in any event, the novel nowhere associates Fortunata either with the tavern or with Juanito's "chuletas." In fact, the lovers never appear at the table in their scenes together, and their conversations about food ignore veal chops. Nor in her sexual relationship with Feijoo are "chuletas" mentioned.[58] Only in connection with Maxi are the veal chops important, once in a scene remote from carnal interest (II, ii, 8), and later when Lupe guides Fortunata's cooking (II, vii, 3). There remains an incident of biting, where Juanito protests the exuberance of Fortunata's joy in the moment of reunion. More than implying her sexual appetite, the carriage scene radiates a mood that evokes "aquel afecto primitivo y salvaje" (III, vii, 5; 263).

The fire in the grill has been interpreted in several, contradictory ways. If it symbolizes passion, there is the problem that the flat, open grill does not conform to Freud's category of hollow objects (ovens, cupboards, chests, boxes, ships, and vessels of all kinds) that represent the uterus ("*The Interpretation*" 5: 354). If the fire belongs to what Gilman terms "the infernal imagery of Fortunata's journey ('la gran parrilla,' 'el fuego,' 'blasfemia,' etc.) ... [then] she has descended into a 'hell,' which, as we now know, we all carry within us: that of the unconscious mind" (*Galdós* 354).[59] In that case, she is "in search of fulfillment and salvation," which, paradoxically, she finds: "Fortunata's self-analysis encounters the deep truth of her own passion. She emerges with her consciousness at once purged and enlarged, capable of founding the new institution of 'la pícara idea.'" Thus Gilman negates his sexual symbolism for the heroine's desire by asserting that she abandons this desire in favour of the chaste "pícara idea."

A non-contradictory alternative to these internally confused and mutually refuting interpretations exposes two levels of meaning, one narratorial and the other personal. The tavern scene exhibits details that confirm one idea of Gilman's about Fortunata's dream: "[it] was conceived artistically as a structural counterpart to Jacinta's dreamlike descent in part 1 into the social hell of the 'cuarto estado'" (*Galdós* 353-54). These homologous structures, it must be remembered, are only meaningful insofar as they condense the rival women's life context. There is no tavern in Jacinta's dream, but she is closely associated with its context. Her wider domestic dimension extends to Ido, who avidly consumes the meat chop carried to him from the kitchen by Jacinta and served with her own hand (I, viii, 4). This event in Part I and Ido's meal in a tavern together constitute the type of structure that Gilman validly identifies as a narrative

counterpart to Fortunata's dream concluding Part III. The tavern in her dream clearly recaptures Ido's sighting of the "ventorro," when he exclaims: "¡Comer de fonda!" In the "ventorro," Ido sits near "un rescoldo dentro del enorme braserón, y encima una parrilla casi tan grande como la reja de una ventana. Allí se asaban las chuletas de ternera, que con la chamusquina en tan viva lumbre, despedían un olor apetitoso" (I, ix, 4; 336). However, Fortunata cannot be associated with Ido in the context of eating. For this reason, the narrator must be given responsibility for this aspect of the dream. It is important to note that "chuletas" when actually eaten are linked to the words "ventorro" and "fonda" in Part I rather than to "taberna" in Part III. Perhaps chops also are broiling on the flaming grill in the dream, but, in fact, the reference is limited to "gran parrilla de asar chuletas." The narrative crossover from Part I is limited to the equipment, not the food. Or, to use the proto-Proustian terms that I have been proposing, the narrator revives memory of an earlier event and adapts it to a new circumstance. The dream does not belong entirely to Fortunata's mind, although the circumstance implicates her peripherally.

At the personal level of interpretation, the tavern's impact on the dreamer springs not from its equipment but from the establishment itself. The reason has been overlooked entirely. Why should a tavern and a fiery "chuleta" grill tug at the heart-strings of Fortunata? The most notable element of the tavern scene is its power to awaken unspecified memories in the heroine. Since she has never been described eating in or near any tavern, we can only speculate about her having dined in this one. The narrator does, however, use graphic detail when placing Izquierdo in the "ventorro" with Ido. Thus, the problem arises as to how Fortunata can have knowledge about an episode that is extraneous to her narrative context. Nevertheless, the discrepancy is not another Homeric nod by Galdós. The word "taberna" is used a few days before the dream when Fortunata, having attacked Jacinta, flees along the Calle de Toledo, "poniéndose en acecho en la acera de enfrente, junto a la puerta de una taberna" (III, vi, 5; 209). There she spies a coach ("berlina") passing by with Jacinta and Guillermina inside, and she imagines they are speaking about her. Undoubtedly, this pre-oneiric event, so afflicting at the time, is more plausibly the stimulus for the dreamy, vague disquietude than any meal with or hunger for Juanito.

* * *

(Transitional movement)

Entra por la Concepción Jerónima; sube después por el callejón del Verdugo

SCENE 4

a la plaza de Provincia; ve los puestos de flores, y allí duda si tirar hacia Pontejos, adonde la empuja su pícara idea, o correrse hacia la calle de Toledo. Opta por esta última dirección, sin saber por qué.

(Transitional movement)

Déjase ir por la calle Imperial,

The dream now takes respite in a meandering interlude that has tactical significance. The previous three scenes recapitulated the narrator's themes as well as the heroine's character. The events that will follow in Scenes 5, 6, and 7 will not ignore Fortunata's psychological odyssey, but their dominant activity will expose the novel's wider social and literary import. The fact that Scene 4 is preceded and followed by a transitional moment underscores the scene's own transitional quality. During this interlude Fortunata at last shows why she has taken to the streets. The reason is that her "pícara idea" cannot be fulfilled without her traversing the city's busy thoroughfares. If this were not the case, the careful naming of each street would be, apart from good realist technique, a pointless exercise for the dream's meaning.[60] The names, however, slow the pace of discourse and lengthen the reader's journey with the heroine.

And yet Fortunata's purposeful "idea" moves in a purposeless direction. The minute documentation about Madrid by Ortiz Armengol includes the information that the Calle de la Concepción Jerónima is both, historically, a somewhat short street from Atocha to Toledo, very commercial in that epoch, and also, fictively, "es donde se abre la 'platería de puntapié' que frecuenta Juanito en su época de flamenquería, cuando conquista a Fortunata" (190). As for Imperial, "baja desde la Plaza de la Provincia hasta la calle de Toledo y produce una curva muy pronunciada, encontrándose también una rinconada donde se abre el portón del edificio llamado de Fiel Contraste" (139). This roundabout direction has value for the spatial analogy that it presents with Fortunata's hesitancy in the face of the "pícara idea." The indecisive itinerary condenses the anguished confusion that had beset her in the days prior to the dream.

The events that precipitate the dream carry enough conflict to warrant the oneiric metaphor of street wandering. It is a metaphor for the heroine's uncertainty and delay. In preceding days she had confronted Jacinta and promised Guillermina to reform, only to roam the streets soon after in swiftly changing moods: from defiant confidence that she alone can have children, to contemptuous anger toward Guillermina's religiosity, to painful emptiness because she had lost Mauricia. At home and in a fever, a lethargy had filled her mind with nonsensical, horrible visions. She is so angry on the day of the dream that she fears an explosion; consequently, after lunch she ties a handkerchief around her head, pretending to have migraine, and goes to bed.

These psychological accretions build up to provoke the dream, a build-up fraught with spiritual and moral conflicts that are remote from sexual desire. This point obliges critical interpretation to seek a comprehensive plane of understanding that regards the street wandering in the dream as a panoramic holding pattern for both Fortunata and the narrator. For the heroine, a lifetime of socio-economic dead-ends converge in the oneiric streets that lead nowhere at this point. The dreamer has felt like a prisoner in waking life, spied on and revolted by Maxi's family. For the narrator, the aimless streetwalking plays another role, structural as well as thematic. It contrasts with the walk of Jacinta, "tan pensativa, que la bulla de la calle de Toledo no la distrajo de la atención que a su propio interior prestaba" (I, ix, 1; 316). Here the narrator is more self-conscious, aiming to oppose Jacinta's childless plight with the ebullient vitality of the popular classes. As she moves, she too makes no mental progress: "Recibía tan sólo la imagen borrosa de los objetos diversos que iban pasando, y lo digo así, porque era como si ella estuviese parada y la pintoresca vía se corriese delante de ella como un telón." For both women, the question is: which way? For the narrator, both scenes are an opportunity to paint the canvas of urban activity that, at these crucial moments, leaves these women detached from participation.

The dreaming Fortunata's indecision poses the question that is phrased thus by Ortiz Armengol: "¿hacia el barrio del alto comercio para mostrar su bandera en él, o bajar a sus barrios populares, a su calle de Toledo por la curva en cuesta de la calle Imperial?" (449). The choice is interesting for its implications (class confrontation vs class resignation), but the narrator does not develop them. Consequently, no decision is available to Fortunata; she shows no awareness of the alternatives and simply drifts along into Scene 5 ("Déjase ir por la calle Imperial").[61]

8. Music and the "Fiel Contraste"

SCENE 5

y se detiene frente al portal del Fiel Contraste a oír un pianito que está tocando una música muy preciosa. Éntranle ganas de bailar, y quizás baila algo: no está segura de ello.

The two salient components of Scene 5 are the Fiel Contraste building and the music. Music is the more important because Fortunata would not have stopped where she does if she had not heard music. By coincidence, the Weights and Measures Office stands where she decides to listen and perhaps dance. Can the dreamwork conspire to unite these two components in a common meaning? Yes, provided the interpreter can find the link. But little help is available from the *galdosistas* who do not seek a link, fastening their attention instead on the words "fiel contraste." As a verbal sign, Ortiz Armengol calls it a "nombre no casual en la comparación de los amores recíprocos de la moza con su Juan Santa Cruz—, mas predomina como idea principal aquello de que, dada la imposibilidad social de que ella suba hasta Juan, habría una lógica en que Juan descendiera socialmente hasta ella" (450). This view is based on the idea of the lovers' social contrast and their fidelity, or, at least, Fortunata's. The assumption, shared by Caudet, is that some balance needs to be achieved, and indeed Juanito is brought down in status at the dream's end.[62]

These critics proceed to elaborate the semantics. Ortiz Armengol affirms that "'fiel contraste' [...] significa sencillamente eso: el que existía entre la fidelidad de Fortunata a Juan y la infidelidad de Juan a Fortunata" (140). Where the balance is goes unexplained. Caudet extends the meaning to Fortunata's relation to an indifferent economic system: "su marginación (el Fiel Contraste, servicio público de pesas y medidas, no pesará ni medirá su caso); su quimérica e imposible relación amorosa con un señorito (que no se ha vuelto pobre) ..." (1: 78-79). These interpretations make sense within the novel's broader framework. They are also confirmed independently of such symbolism. Harriet Turner cites the "ethic of conciliation and compromise," and "the 'realism' of things brought into balance," that Feijoo urges upon the heroine (79). Beyond this, the dream's symbol evokes the novel's larger balances and oppositions that expose the Hegelian conception of antithesis and synthesis in Galdós's general view of contradictions in Spanish society. As Eoff points out, "the conflictive relation between the principal females is a clear-cut

example of two persons in direct oppostion [...] and yet drawing more closely together with an increasing realization of their need for each other" (*The Novels* 139-40).

These sensible observations, nevertheless, do not require a dream symbol for their validity. Symbols need to represent the dreamer's unconscious perspective, not the fictive narrator's conscious one. Thus, the Fiel Contraste cannot be interpreted as representing the repressed thought of Fortunata's changing balance in her love affair The concept of fidelity is within the heroine's grasp, and so too is class difference. However, "fiel contraste" is not just a conceptual sign but the material site of a public institution. This distinction is too sophisticated for the half-literate heroine to grasp, either unconsciously or otherwise. It is the narrator who habitually takes charge of the nuances, and it is he whom the critic must interpret.

The civic institution of the Fiel Contraste, according to the Madoz dictionary, was

> una oficina que dependía del Ayuntamiento y se encargaba "del reconocimiento y sello de pesas y medidas que deben presentar cada tercio de año los vendedores de todas clases [...] con objeto de contrastarlas y evitar los fraudes." Estaba situada esta oficina en la calle Imperial 1. (Caudet 1: 130, note 61)

From the standpoint of Fortunata and every other character, the only possible meaning that the Fiel Contraste building could have is the weighing and measuring of precious metals and merchandise. Ortiz Armengol understands the distinction between the verbal sign and the building's function, for his above-cited symbolic interpretation has little to do with the material office that

> debe su histórico nombre a haber albergado las vigilancias acerca del pesaje de monedas realizado por el funcionario llamado "fiel medidor" o "contrastador", el cual tenía por misión vigilar no se "sudara" el metal precioso quitándole limaduras o sustituyendo su interior por plomo. Este servicio extendía certificados acerca de las monedas examinadas. Este "fiel contraste" era en el siglo XIX uno más de los llamados "portales" que eran modestas galerías de venta instaladas en los portales de gran amplitud o que tenían un pequeño patio adyacente. Generalmente estos "portales" estaban especializados por oficios y así existían el portal de roperos, el de cofreros, el de zapateros, el de torneros, etc., así como éste "del peso" según nos refiere Fernández de los Ríos en su *Guía de Madrid* de 1876, pág. 697. El "portal del contraste" estaba en la Plaza Mayor, en el edificio municipal llamado "Carnicería", pero tenía comunicación interior con este portal del peso o del "fiel contraste" que daba a la mencionada calle Imperial. (139-40)

In addition to its primary meaning, Madrid inhabitants clearly thought of the place as part of the city's artisan center. In rebuttal to my analysis, it may be argued that the assortment of small crafts using the building was so motley that only the verbal sign had any significance. For instance, the narrator says that Doña Bárbara went to school on the Calle Imperial in the same building as the Fiel Contraste (I, iii, 2). But, granting this rebuttal, there is overwhelming evidence that the sign points to narratorial and thematic concerns that are independent of Fortunata's unconscious.

For one thing, the quotation given at the beginning of this section indicates that Scene 5 is spatially adjacent to the next scene alluding to the meat carrier. The narrator needs realistically to orient his contemporary reader as to which street has the traffic jam. Scene 6 begins merely with "ocurre entonces," without naming a street, so that its location requires the toponymical Fiel Contraste in order to clarify, as Ortiz Armengol says, that "el edificio municipal llamado 'Carnicería,' [...] tenía comunicación interior con este portal del peso o del 'fiel contraste.'" A more pointed token of the verbal sign's larger function is the theme of social inequality and economic imbalance that develops separately from Fortunata's private condition. Thus, Jacinta's first look at "los barrios del Sur" provokes dismay: "—¡Qué desigualdades!—decía, desflorando sin saberlo el problema social—. Unos tanto y otros tan poco. Falta equilibrio [...]. ¿Pero qué cosa sobra? ... Vaya usted a saber" (I, vii, 2; 272). The narrator shares the foreground in conveying the dismay. The same theme advances when Juanito refutes Jacinta's desire to adopt Pitusín in a speech about "la armonía del mundo" and its "grandioso mecanismo de imperfecciones, admirablemente equilibradas y combinadas" (I, x, 8; 421).[63]

Finally, the earliest allusion to the Fiel Contraste, as mentioned, concerns Doña Bárbara's conventional education. The second allusion, thus, overdetermines its social meaning in the dream episode. The Office of Weights and Measures is the guarantor of legitimate commerce. The illegitimate couple has no social right to take refuge there, and indeed Fortunata does not know in which direction to turn in order to find Juanito. His ragged appearance at the dream's end mocks the reader's knowledge of the economic reality, just as the dream mocks Fortunata as it fades away and restores his "gabán muy majo." The episode is an apt confirmation of Gustavo Correa's statement that "las instituciones sociales que encauzan el conglomerado social [...] y aun las mismas biografías individuales, se ven sujetos a [...] la relación estrecha que existe entre la vida nacional y la vida particular, dentro del perpetuo fluir de la realidad histórica" (*Realidad* 132).[64]

The dream's swerve away from individual destinies to the broad panoply of national values and social motives is most notable in the events that follow it. Although Galdós set out to write "dos historias de casadas," the suspenseful plot of Part IV cannot sustain repeated readings without yielding to a more powerful interest than how the story will end. While Fortunata reverts to her familiar instinctual type, the lives of Moreno, Ballester, and Maxi acquire new subtlety beyond the first reading. Alienated Spaniards like Moreno, who find profound incivility at all levels of national life, or like Maxi, whose spiritual fragility goes unprotected in his society, or like Ballester, the pharmacist, at once a music-lover and Moreno's protegé, all bring more thoughtful nuances to the novel than does the tale of Fortunata's final implementation of the "pícara idea." Less compelling in repeated readings of Part IV is her gift to the middle class, while those who debate whether Galdós is optimistic, sceptical, or pessimistic can ponder the implication of an ending that renders the three worthy men either ineffectual, disappointed, or dead.

The component of music and dance in Scene 5 also carries the dream away from Fortunata's alleged sexual quest. Music pervades the novel so obviously that it is pointless to insist on the encapsulating technique used by the narrator to recapitulate earlier allusions through the oneiric component. What is at stake is whether such allusions outweigh any symbolic interpretation of music as a disguise for repressed libidinous thoughts. The main point to consider is that music

and dance function as a leitmotif in this dream, recurring in Scenes 5, 6, and 8. Each scene exposes the music for a different result. Furthermore, the music that at first is identified agreeably with Fortunata is detached entirely from her sphere of interest in its second occurrence, and it acts to interfere with her interests in the third. The "pianito" catches Fortunata's attention, and apparently it pleases her because she stops to listen and because "está tocando una música muy preciosa." But in Scene 6 "el pianito sigue tocando aires populares, que parecen encender con sus acentos de pelea la sangre de toda aquella chusma." And in Scene 8 the music is still further distanced from Fortunata, as it prevents the reunited lovers from hearing each other's normal speech. These different functions and effects make it difficult to assign to the motif a single symbolic meaning. Additionally, while the music heard by the dreamer is the same, the psychoanalytical method of segmenting dreams dictates that the music be interpreted to fit each discrete context.

Vernon Chamberlin is the respected authority on the subject of music in view of his impressive study, *Galdós and Beethoven: Fortunata y Jacinta. A Symphonic Novel.* However, Chamberlin follows his own path when interpreting the oneiric music. Not only does he combine the three scenes so as to consider a unified symbol, but he makes no distinction between the music and the dance. Thus, while he correctly observes, apropos of Scene 5, that "dancing is often considered a sublimation of the sex act," he also insists that in Scene 8 "the music of the hurdy-gurdy (stimulating Fortunata's passionate desires)" continues the sublimation ("Eroticizing" 84). This argument illogically reverses the sex act, depicting its symbolic performance in the earlier scene and then showing the stimulation prior to performance in the later scene. The argument also ignores the fact that music in Scene 8 prevents the lovers from communicating with each other ("Como el pianito sigue tocando y los carreteros blasfemando, ambos tienen que alzar la voz para hacerse oír"). Stated differently, music evolves from a medium that, with dance, unites the lovers sexually, to a medium that obstructs that union. The interpretation subverts the idea that the dream progresses toward sexual fulfilment, musically symbolizing this fulfilment in Scene 5 and preventing it, to the same music, in Scene 8. Nor does Chamberlin explain why Fortunata hesitates to dance in Scene 5 and yet sublimates passionately in Scene 8.

In all accuracy, only Scene 5 refers to dance, while indicating that music plays a constructive, delightful role ("preciosa"). Here the music affects Fortunata directly. The contrary occurs in the aftermath. Music becomes increasingly strident in Scene 6, even aggressive, and it has nothing to do with the heroine, who observes its destructive effect on the crowd ("encender con sus acentos de pelea la sangre"). In Scene 8, music conspires with the noisy tumult against the united lovers' ability to converse without shouting. Thus, the dream really concerns the melody's deteriorating lyrical character, depicting the antithetical traits of harmony and turmoil. Even Chamberlin is forced to discard music's erotic role in Scene 6, despite his effort to consider music a single unit in all three scenes. Now he uses the melody playing concurrently with the cart drivers' blasphemous oaths, which he calls invocations of the Divine that fail to dispel the traffic jam; similarly, "none of the religious concepts taught to Fortunata in the convent can now help her solve her personal problems" ("Eroticizing" 83-84).

Chamberlin, nonetheless, recognizes that the dream transforms earlier scenes in the novel, noting that "this type of popular music stimulates Fortunata in her ordinary life [...] when she expresses her lack of understanding and appreciation of formal [...] drawing-room music:

'Cualquier tonadilla de los pianitos de ruedas que van por la calle le gustaba y la conmovía más'. Clearly, she prefers the beat of the streets" (IV, i, 4; 288; "Eroticizing" 83). This transformation is the kind of narrative reprise that I have sought to emphasize. During the novel's waking hours, such popular music is not confined to Fortunata's auditory range. Why, then, should the oneiric counterpart be exclusively symbolic of Fortunata's condition? True enough, she dreams of the hurdy-gurdy music, but its effect on other people is more dramatic, just as it is in waking life. When Gilman says that only Fortunata really listens, "entranced with the 'organillos' that fill the city with melody" (*Galdós* 374), he is clearly mistaken.

Significantly, "organillo" is not the term used in the dream, and this raises the problem about the nature of the "pianito" heard in Scene 5. Galdós uses six terms for the same family of instruments having different sizes and requiring slightly unequal talents: "organillo," "pianito," "pianillo de manubrio," "pianitos de ruedas," "piano," and "armonium."[65] It is Jacinta and not Fortunata whom the "organillo" affects, for she remembers, during a Wagnerian opera, her preference for its simple Italian tunes: "mientras más clarita y más de organillo mejor" (I, viii, 2; 290). What Fortunata hears is a generic "pianito" that produces readily accessible music for all "madrileños" to enjoy. To make the term more complicated, "pianito" and "piano" are synonymous in another scene, thus causing doubt as to what instrument is being played in other scenes where she is absent.[66] Its role as a leitmotif in the novel should, in principle, be lighthearted, and for this reason, while Mauricia is dying, Guillermina chases the musicians away from the street entrance downstairs, where "se había puesto un condenado pianito, tocando jotas, polkas y la *canción de la Lola*" (III, vi, 3; 188).[67] Nevertheless, whatever cheerful music may generally dominate the novel through other instruments, allusions to the "pianito" family fall short of happiness. Appositely, little joy extends to Fortunata's dream, according to the text. Although "éntranle ganas de bailar," she is doubly ambivalent about dancing. The peculiar fact is that both oneiric points of view, the narrator's and the dreamer's, report uncertainty about dancing: "y quizás baila algo; no está segura de ello." It is true that she shares with Jacinta a preference for simple melody, and when awake, she even thinks to herself: "me gusta más esta música de los pianitos de la calle que la pieza que toca Olimpia" (IV, iii, 7; 394). However, this assertion is ill-timed. It is an afterthought following a melancholy visit to the declining Feijoo, when

> pasó por junto a un pianito que tocaba aires de ópera con ritmo picante y amoroso. Esta música le llegaba al alma. Paróse un rato a oírla, y se le saltaron las lágrimas. Lo que sentía era como si su espíritu se asomara al brocal de la cisterna en que estaba encerrado, y desde allí divisara regiones desconocidas. La música aquella le retozaba en la epidermis, haciéndola estremecer con un sentimiento indefinible que no podía expresarse sino llorando. (IV, iii, 7; 394)

Given Fortunata's urge to weep, it is difficult to understand why Peter Goldman considers that the occasion causes "un arranque de éxtasis espiritual" ("Cada peldaño" 156). On the contrary, it appears that the pleasure of sentiments other than uplifting ones is what she feels when listening to the music she likes: "Cualquier tonadilla de los pianitos de ruedas que van por la calle le gustaba y la conmovía más" (than drawing-room music) (IV, i, 4; 288). The emotional quality of "conmovía," although not explicit, seems distant from the cheerfulness that stirs

people to dance. Even when a scene begins happily in music, the same music ends in depression. Thus, Fortunata converses with the ailing Feijoo while

> en la calle se situó un pianito de manubrio, tocando polkas y walses. Las del tercero [...] se pusieron a bailar, y al poco rato hicieron lo propio los del segundo de la derecha. [...] y como los chicos alborotaban tanto en la calle, la gritería era espantosa y D. Evaristo y su amiga tuvieron que callarse, mirándose y riendo. (III, iv, 5; 112)

Immediately afterward, Fortunata sits "contemplando los estragos de la degeneración senil en su fisonomía, mientras se alejaban y extinguían en la calle los picantes ritmos del baile."

In view of the evidence, the dream's "música muy preciosa" is out of character with the dreamer's waking experience and with the narrative's plane of leitmotiv. One could argue that the music's delightful quality reflects a wish-fulfilment; however, the dream itself fails to fulfil this quality in practice, first because music does not activate a clear-cut dance, and then because of its adverse impact on both crowd and lovers. As for the dreamer's uncertainty about dancing, it is understandable alongside comparable inhibitions or ambivalent experiences in her waking life. Her occasions for dancing with Juanito were pointedly disagreeable.[68] This aversion is another reason to reject the aforementioned Freudian interpretation of the dance as a sexual act. A further reason is that the sole instance where Fortunata is seen to dance at all is a chaste floor-washing frolic in the convent.[69]

Most appearances of the musical leitmotif suggest that a paradox is at work. The surface joy of music covers a denser precipitate of lingering, sad memories. In addition to the heroine's personal melancholia in associating the convent and Feijoo's ill health with dance, the general narrative plane records a nostalgic wistfulness in this regard, as instanced by the nuns' bygone pleasures recollected in their innocent dancing.[70] Equally revealing is how the querulous atmosphere of the dream in Scenes 5 and 6 is earlier paralleled at the general narrative plane by the two competitive "pianillos de manubrio" that "pusiéronle a Jacinta la cabeza como una grillera." Their tunes reach her from different streets, "armándose entre los dos una zaragata musical, como si las dos piezas se estuvieran arañando en feroz pelea con las uñas de sus notas" (I, x, 3; 393). On another street soon after, "los cansados pianitos" catch up with Jacinta, "y también allí se engarfiñaron las dos piezas, una tonadilla de la *Mascota* y la sinfonía de *Semíramis*" (I, x, 3; 394).[71] The Italian opera triumphs over the popular light operetta, but the significance is highly ambiguous.[72] The clash of cultural tastes seems to end with the victory of the upper classes. At the same time, Galdós identified the opera, *Semíramis*, with the history of the common people.[73] Although Fortunata is absent from the episode, her territory is where Jacinta hears the hurdy-gurdies. If a symmetry exists between Parts I and III in regard to the rival women's experiences—as Gilman suggests, and I concur—then Jacinta's social superiority is reasserted, given her preference for Italian opera. Nevertheless, the "pianito" motif makes it clear that Fortunata shares her rival's taste. Symbolically, they clash by way of the melodies, but they also merge into a single concept of female deprivation, regardless of social class.[74]

Whatever may be said about the novel's other musical instruments and their occasional gaiety, the varieties of crank organ and hurdy-gurdy comprise an emotionally dispirited and

agitated motif in waking life. In Fortunata's dream, the music repeats these moods faithfully.[75] Scene 5 orients music toward the emotional tenor arising from the "pianitos'" appearance during the narrative's waking discourse. The dreamed melody, as described, undergoes a deterioration of lyrical beauty that is completed in Scene 6. As we examine Scene 6, it will be useful to remember that the musical motif reappears only at the end of a chain of events altogether irrelevant to the melody's original nature. Also pertinent is the paradoxical immobility and motion in these segments of the dream. After traversing many streets, Fortunata has been motionless and will continue to stand still while witnessing the energetic movements that swirl around her. No longer will the oneiric narrative report her feelings in relation to the things and events around her, as was the case with the fabric shop, the tavern, and the pretty tune. The implication is that she surrenders her proprietary control over the dream to the narrator, who will introduce elements associated with thematic concerns reaching beyond her personal condition.

9. The Traffic Jam

SCENE 6

(Scene 6A) *Ocurre entonces una de estas obstrucciones que tan frecuentes son en las calles de Madrid. Sube un carromato de siete mulas ensartadas formando rosario. La delantera se insubordina metiéndose en la acera, y las otras toman aquello por pretexto para no tirar más.*

(Scene 6B) *El vehículo, cargado de pellejos de aceite, con un perro atado al eje, la sartén de las migas colgando por detrás, se planta, a punto que llega por detrás el carro de la carne, con los cuartos de vaca chorreando sangre, y ambos carreteros empiezan a echar por aquellas bocas las finuras de costumbre.*

(Scene 6C) *No hay medio de abrir paso, porque el rosario de mulas hace una curva, y dentro de ella es cogido un simón que baja con dos señoras. Éramos pocos... A poco llega un coche de lujo con un caballero muy gordo. Que si pasas tú, que si te apartas, que sí y que no. El carretero de la carne pone a Dios de vuelta y media. Palo a las mulas, que empiezan a respingar, y una de estas coces coge la portezuela del simón y la deshace... Gritos, leña, y el carromatero empeñado en que la cosa se arregla poniendo a Dios, a la Virgen, a la hostia y al Espíritu Santo que no hay por dónde cogerlos.*

(Scene 6D) *Y el pianito sigue tocando aires populares, que parecen encender con sus acentos de pelea la sangre de toda aquella chusma.*

Before turning to the aforementioned elements that transcend the heroine's personal domain, let me again direct comment to the musical motif. Chamberlin discards his sexual interpretation of music in Scene 5, even though he considers music to be a single unit in Scenes 5, 6, and 8. Instead, he accounts for the meaning of music in Scene 6 by assimilating it to a religious theme. He points to the music's collaboration with the wagon drivers, for its notes play concurrently with their blasphemous oaths. He says that the oaths are invocations of the Divine but that they fail to dispel the traffic jam. Similarly, "none of the religious concepts

taught to Fortunata in the convent can now help her solve her personal problems" ("Eroticizing" 83-84). The argument infers from the cart drivers' profanities a depth of religious importance comparable to Fortunata's contact with religious precepts.

Neither religion nor music seem to have much significance in Scene 6. The most striking feature of the dream discourse is that, from the scene's very beginning, the narrator asserts his independence from Fortunata. He reports "una de *estas* obstrucciones que tan frecuentes son en las calles de Madrid" (emphasis added). The knowing deictic "estas" invites the reader's complicity and takes the discourse to an extradiegetical level that exceeds Fortunata's mental horizon. The ironic "éramos pocos" is another instance that points to the narrator's judgemental comments. The traffic jam about to take place will be an entanglement that plays counterpoint to the music floating in the background. The skirmish between rival operatic melodies heard by Jacinta, cited earlier, has a parallel elsewhere in the novel, where the intertwining sounds of rival midnight bells wax and wane in the wind. This time it is Fortunata who responds to the confusion: "se entretenía la joven discurriendo que la hora de la Puerta del Sol y la hora de la Panadería se enzarzaban. Empezaba ésta, y le respondía la otra. De tal modo se confundían los toques, que [...] [l]as doce de acá y las doce de allá eran una disputa o guirigay de campanadas" (IV, iv, 2; 412). Ortiz Armengol finds in this passage a discordance of traditional and modern times, whereas Gilman observes Fortunata's ability to reconcile them; both positions are noted by Goldman, who adds that her attention is the only instance of genuine consciousness of time ("Cada peldaño" 148). These interpretative nuances converge when the text is placed against the dream's context. Fortunata has lost track of time, and her search for Juanito is at a standstill in the same street as in the previous scene. If we assume that Fortunata wishes to move on, she is deterred by a team of seven mules strung along in single file, which block the progress of a meat wagon coming behind it. Presumably, the mules arrive from the country, since they cart fresh olive oil in bulk; the driver's skillet hangs from the cart, ready for meals taken on the journey to town. A historicizing critic might interpret this blockage as a sly caricature of an agricultural economy in disharmony with the urban system of food distribution. Be this as it may, Chamberlin finds a deeper meaning in the "carromato" with its skillet and attached dog: they "form a pair with the meat wagon as the representation of another of Fortunata's options"—to remain with Maxi. Chamberlin finds it significant that dog and skillet are not integrated into the vehicle, only attached to it, just as she has never been really integrated into normal married life. Her proverbial "dog's life" is articulated by Mauricia ("Eroticizing" 79). But the critic sees the significance growing still more profound: "On a deeper, psycho-sexual level, the *sartén* (a feminine symbol according to Freud because of its roundness) is separated from the *aceite*" and thus enters the category of the "sexually and emotionally parched [...] [with Fortunata unable to obtain the] vital fluids she needs for her health and happiness" ("Eroticizing " 79-80). The intuitive nature of this judgement carries it outside the sphere of textual commentary.

The mules also seem to carry a deeper significance because they are seven in number ("siete mulas ensartadas formando rosario"). Chamberlin believes that they echo the ordeal suffered by Guillermina on "un viernes de Dolores, y las siete espadas [...] clavadas en mi corazón." By

extension, he identifies the mules with Fortunata's sorrows, which include marriage to the mule-like Maxi, who cannot have offspring ("Eroticizing" 80). The difficulty here is that if the mules are associated with Fortunata's sorrows, how can the lead mule also be associated with Maxi? Yet Chamberlin claims just that: the insubordinate lead mule resembles Maxi by its inability to reproduce. The proof is Maxi's own remark about being "atado a un carro de afectos, del cual hay que tirar" (IV, i, 1; 275). Later, Juan Pablo tells Maxi that Fortunata is dead, whereupon Maxi declares that he can go home: "Al decir esto, se insubordinaba; no quería ir por la acera, sino por el empedrado, dando manotadas y tropezando con algunos transeúntes" (IV, iii, 8; 400).

A contrasting perspective is Ortiz Armengol's note that seven is the number of men whom Fortunata lived with before marrying Maxi. However, he also counts a total of one hundred references to the number seven in the novel (520-22). Traditionally, I might add, the symbolic meanings of seven range from the idea of perfect order, a complete period or cycle, as in the seven musical notes or the days of the week, to the deadly sins and opposing virtues.[76] Chamberlin does not cite Jung's symbol of "seven" as "the highest stage of illumination," although he earlier cited Jung to explain the dwarf as gatekeeper of the unconscious (137).

The frequency of this number would seem to make its use here gratuitous, a fairy-tale cipher chosen by Galdós to enhance the fantastic dream narrative. From this standpoint, the number seven would be psychoanalytically arbitrary. Indeed, Freud warns that dreams do not carry out calculations.[77] In other words, the dreamed number seven might disguise an idea that would be counted out ("calculated") in ordinary discourse. For instance, the number eleven in the preceding chapter literally spells out the idea of an "otra restauración." In that sequence of events—where Maxi reconciles with Fortunata—the marital "restoration" evolves in eleven days, each day enumerated by the narrator who counts them separately (III, v, 2). But the dream gives no enumeration because seven has no comparable value.

The question, then, of why Fortunata should dream about seven mules is anybody's hazardous guess. For Harriet Turner, the "metaphor of harnessed mules, used to describe the arrangement of both Santa Cruz marriages, hints at the paradox of progress and regress." The two couples are "yoked together under one roof," and Barbarita "has transformed Jacinta into a kind of leash (*calza*) that ties her son to her maternal rule in the manner of a muleteer" (53). López-Baralt departs from her sexual reading by citing "la mula que se insubordina (la 'revolución' de Fortunata a través de la *pícara idea*)" (143). This interpretation is plausible, but not because it sheds light on the heroine's alleged sexual desire. On the contrary, Fortunata is rebellious on the "social" level. She does not influence other women, just like the lead mule that abandons its leadership. This crucial difference suggests a historically symbolic meaning for the number seven.

Mules are beasts of burden and, obviously, are associated with the labouring class to which Fortunata belongs. Whereas the dreaming Fortunata follows her "pícara idea" in a private, social revolt, there is no indication, either in her mind or in the plot, that any wider disorder will follow in her path. Fortunata's unconscious is hardly capable of symbolizing the complexity of this conflict: her conscious mind cannot grasp it conceptually and does not grasp it in terms any more complex than personal resentment toward Jacinta. The opposite case holds for the lead mule, whose action gives its followers "un pretexto para no tirar más." The effect is to

ensnare the middle- and upper-class carriage and eventually to cause havoc among the pedlars as well. In historical terms, the revolution did not go this far, but the seven-year period (1869-1876) covered by the novel is the fictional mirror that reflects, as scholars agree, Spain's real social turmoil. Thus, the seven-mule component in the scene has more to do with the narrative's own symbolic condensation of its social content than with Fortunata's private unconscious. Insofar as the narrative embraces both the consciousness of its collective society and each individual's separate consciousness, Fortunata's revolt is enfolded into the larger disorder.

The traffic jam is one of the dream's two longest episodes. It fuses the historical referent with the personal drama but overpowers the latter. The overall impression of entanglement reflects the narrator's much earlier observation regarding the tangled linkage of friends and relations of the Santa Cruz family: "se han ido compenetrando las clases todas, y sus miembros se introducen de una en otra, tejiendo una red espesa que amarra y solidifica la masa nacional" (I, vi 1; 240). More than a decipherable network, the tangle defies orderly metaphors:

> La mente más segura no es capaz de seguir en su laberíntico enredo las direcciones de los vástagos de este colosal árbol de linajes matritenses. Los hilos se cruzan, se pierden y reaparecen donde menos se piensa. Al cabo de mil vueltas para arriba y otras tantas para abajo, se juntan, se separan, y de su empalme o bifurcación salen nuevos enlaces, madejas y marañas nuevas. Cómo se tocan los extremos del inmenso ramaje es curioso de ver. (1, vi, 2; 245)

Readers might think that Galdós the stylist would be satisfied with "red espesa" and "laberíntico enredo," but the intertwining families encompass all strata, from cord-maker and tripe-monger to government official, Jesuit, and aristocrat. Thus, Galdós compounds the imagery with duplicates and variants: "colosal enredadera," "complicada enredadera," "un círculo muy extenso, en el cual se entremezclaban todas las jerarquías," "laberíntico enredo," "inmenso ramaje," (I, vi, 2). The entwinement goes so far as to allow a metonymic relationship between the mules in the dream and the common origin of the Arnaiz families, "descendientes del extremeño aquel de los aparejos borricales" (I, ii, 3; 137), named Trujillo, "que tuvo albardería en la calle de Toledo" (I, ii, 1; 125). When one relative receives the title of count, Arnaiz recommends his coat-of-arms should be "un frontil y una jáquima" (I, ii, 1; 126). Whether this kind of "enredadera" comforted Galdós is a matter for discussion.

In the dream, the mules embroil the working-class wagon drivers with the middle and upper classes that arrive in coaches. Implied is an enigmatic social comment that relates to the narrator's somewhat ironic statement in Part I about tangled class relations: "Esta confusión es un bien, y gracias a ella no nos aterra el contagio de la guerra social" (I, vi, 1; 240). Was Galdós entirely convinced when his narrator linked this benign opinion to the assertion,"tenemos ya en la masa de la sangre un socialismo atenuado o inofensivo"? And does the answer also apply to Scene 6?[78] The early, benign view reveals exceptions as the novel progresses. The most glaring example is the violent political free-for-all in the cafe involving Juan Pablo, several priests, a rich stock broker, an opera singer, a civil servant, and a shopkeeper (III, i, 3). Evidence also exists that Galdós associated this kind of brawl with the masses.[79] A word of caution about weak self-control comes, significantly enough, from a working-class observer, Ido, who warns: "cuando el

pueblo se desmanda, los ciudadanos se ven indefensos; [...] buena es la libertad; pero primero es vivir" (IV, v, 1; 421). This very effect occurs in the dream as the helpless pedlars and bystanders scatter before the mule.

The dream distinguishes between the uncooperative mules and their driver, between the two working-class drivers, and between the drivers on one side and the middle and upper classes on the other. In the end, the lead mule bolts into the crowd, nearly trampling one pedlar. The causes and effects among these elements make a complex set of factors for a social scientist to consider. While a bolting mule and its frustrated driver are not one and the same, the conclusion must be drawn that the working class is unable to control its energy. Nor can it control its internal relations from one working group to another. If this interpretation strays too far from the dream's relevance to Fortunata, the reason is that the text requires such an approach. The narrator clearly removes Fortunata from responsibility for this sequence of Section 6 by referring ironically to the drivers' insults: "ambos carreteros empiezan a echar por aquellas bocas las finuras de costumbre." The use of the knowing allusion "de costumbre" establishes, as does the deictic "estas" mentioned previously, a narrator-reader collusion regarding events in the dream. In this case, the narrator invites the reader to accept the allegedly universal coarseness of speech uttered by wagon and carriage drivers.

This being said, Fortunata is not entirely removed from the social embroilment. As Sherman Eoff phrases it, not only does the upper middle class "exert a punishing effect on Fortunata," but she is

> caught in a complex cross pull of social, moral, and religious forces. In the thorough portrayal of natural adjustment between individual and group standards, a broad and agitated movement is produced, in which Fortunata rises to levels above her origin, and pulls toward herself various people from higher levels. Thus, if no alteration in the total order results, at least a healthful disturbance is created. (101)

The dream represents this "cross pull," witnessed by Fortunata, by means of elaborate spatial dynamics: the unchecked "rosario de mulas hace una curva, y dentro de ella es cogido un coche de lujo."[80] Further events follow in a series of spatially expansive tableaux: the animals "empiezan a respingar"; one of "estas coces coge la portezuela del simón y la deshace"; several women pedlars "recogen su comercio a escape"; another vendor "tiene que salir a espeta perros"; concerning yet another, "la mula delantera se le va encima." Meanwhile, Fortunata laughs at the entire scene, oblivious to the politics of class struggle that ensnare her.

Is it significant that a "carromato" loaded with olive oil is blocking a "carro" loaded with blood-dripping, quartered meat? The question reverses my previous focus on the drivers of these wagons, a focus that highlighted economic issues. Chamberlin's emphasis on the merchandise is based on Fortunata's supposed view of herself "as exploitable commercial *carne*—one of the options she may be forced to consider again" ("Eroticizing" 79). In this view, she identifies herself with the meat on the tavern grill, as "a victim of male carnal appetites." The weakness of this view is that Fortunata uses similar imagery to designate the opposite of sexual exploitation. Resenting her marriage, she considers the family's scheme to be a trick: "'Me han engañado—pensaba—, me han llevado al casorio, como llevan una res al matadero, y cuando

quise recordar, ya estaba degollada ...¿Qué culpa tengo yo?'" (II, vii, 7; 691) Chamberlin cites this passage to support his theory of commercial, female flesh. My response is to consider the scene's location near the slaughterhouse, as quoted earlier: the "Fiel Contraste" communicating directly with the "Carnicería" (Ortiz Armengol 139-40). The bloody meat would seem to be an apt detail with respect to the oneiric topography as well as to literary realism. The reference is also one more symmetrical feature to Jacinta's experiences in Part I, where her outing to the marketplace offers a catalogue of food vendors and shops, including the memorable "En las carnicerías sonaban los machetazos con sorda trepidación" (I, x, 3; 395). As for applying the Freudian symbol of a coach for the female uterus, this would be impossible, since the meat wagon is an open cart (in contrast to the covered wagon bearing oil).

Other symbols occur to Chamberlin that fit his sexual theory. The fat man in a luxury carriage "may suggest phallic tumescence—something much desired by the frustrated Fortunata" ("Eroticizing" 81). The two wagons also symbolize her problems, representing the two alternatives she faces: the choice between a life with Maxi[81] or else "prostituting herself as commercial *carne*," the equivalent of commercial meat: "The first of these unhappy vehicles seems to represent Fortunata's present marriage, while the other represents her life outside of marriage [...]. She cannot remain faithful to her impotent husband; nor can she return to being on her own" ("A Further Consideration" 56-57).

At this point, we must again consider the methods that aim to produce a coherent interpretation of the dream. The ethical problem just described steers meaning in a new direction. Scene 6 abandons the principle of wish-fulfilment held dear by Freudian interpreters. The symbols now fly thick and fast at all levels of Fortunata's life and beyond. The coach with two women "is appropriate" because Fortunata had seen Jacinta and Guillermina in a carriage. Also, she wishes "in a symbolic sense, to travel as her [Jacinta's] companion" ("Eroticizing" 80). The unity of meaning in Scene 6 disperses into a plurality of possible meanings, and individual symbols dispense multiple meanings as well.

A different approach would take into account the marginal presence of the dreamer during the sequence of tableaux that dominate the scene. The arrival of coaches offers a prime example of the dream narrative as a retrospective encapsulation of the narrative's full scope and atmosphere. A blatant incongruity exists in the spectacle of "un coche de lujo con un caballero muy gordo" arriving in the market place. Is it plausible in waking life that a person of such plush means would personally go shopping? The reader's need to find symbolism may be justified, but the "coche de lujo" is not an isolated object. It arrives subsequent to the "simón que baja con dos señoras" and consequently provides a marked contrast between the wealth of ownership and the economic means to hire a cab. These upper-class characters do not belong to the workaday world; they must travel by hackney cab or private carriage to reach a neighbourhood set apart. Nor do they join in the argument, which they assign to their coachmen and the vociferous wagon drivers. In fact, the scene ends suddenly with the word "chusma," a pejorative term that, together with the renewed sound of "aires populares," lends a wholly plebeian quality to the entire sequence.[82]

Nevertheless, the difference between "simón" and "coche de lujo" is a reminder that an entire assortment of vehicles comprises one of the narrative's major motifs. Locomotion being the key to a narrative whose master protagonist is the city itself, the coach motif is essential and

necessarily inconspicuous. The numerous references to "carruaje," "coche," "simón," "coche simón," "landó," "faetón," and "berlina" are barely noticeable throughout the novel, but the reader's inadvertence is depended upon by the narrator. These signs must not distract from the episodes themselves; but without their ubiquitous, yet imperceptible, role, the personages from different neighbourhoods could not intermingle. Their arrivals and departures, the episodic shifts in location, all require transportation. The variety of names for this transportation is important for recognizing class distinctions and also as yet another token of the narrative's mimetic authenticity.

The "*simón que baja con dos señoras*" does not correspond to the "berlina" taken by Jacinta and Guillermina and glimpsed by Fortunata a few days before the dream (III, vi, 5). The carriage bears a more dignified name, in keeping with Fortunata's sense of inadequacy as she spies the two women. The pair did take a "simón" in the area later described in the dream (I, ix, 3; 332).[83] While I do not deny that the dreamed women may be the same pair, what seems significant is that their less elegant, hired "simón" contrasts with the "coche de lujo," both in turn opposed to the "carromato" and "carro." A touch of opulence is present. Elegant transportation also distinguishes the Santa Cruz family, but in a qualified way. The elder couple does not own its carriage outright, while the younger one can show off something better only intermittently: "Estaban abonados los de Santa Cruz a un landó. Se les veía en los paseos; pero su tren era de los que *no llaman la atención*. Juan solía tener por temporadas un faetón o un tílburi, que guiaba muy bien, y también tenía caballo de silla" (I, vi, 3; 248). The two-wheel tilbury, distinct from all the other four-wheelers, projects a sporting-like image because of its fair-weather, uncovered architecture. Whereas the berlin has a fixed hood, the landau is a convertible, both holding two seats. In contrast, the portly gentleman in the dream, by physical appearance, presumably very rich, arrives in his own liveried coach, distinguished from the others by the term "de lujo." Throughout the novel, the hired "simón" is the vehicle of necessity for such characters as Feijoo, Guillermina, Fortunata, and even Juanito, who hails one in order to spirit away his mistress on the day after the dream (III, vii, 5).

In weighing the proper role of the dreamed vehicles, a reasonable approach to Scene 6 would regard its overall development and emphasis. (A symbolist approach would consider whether emphasized elements are merely surface disguises. This is an irrelevant precaution under my hypothesis that the coopting narrator, not Fortunata, often is the "dreamer" and not subject to Freudian rules.) One such overview, by Ricardo Gullón, adheres to Fortunata's centrality, and nevertheless summarizes:

> Diversos vehículos forman tapón y la confusión y rémora suscitada depara oportunidad para que el amante se presente. ¿Qué significa [...] ese atasco callejero merced al cual el encuentro se produce? Pudiera interpretarse como interferencia del Destino para detener a Fortunata y obligarla a caminar despacio, dando tiempo a que Santa Cruz llegue; yo creo que estamos ante otro ejemplo de cómo Galdós intenta insertar en el sueño un elemento de verosimilitud que lo haga tolerable. (161-62)

The mimetic purpose of art combines with a view of the broad circumstances of Destiny to structure the traffic jam, albeit in relation to the heroine. The drama of wider social-class con-

flict that envelopes her is thematized by the early events of Scene 6. The later ones involving vehicles thematize the nearly unscathed condition of the upper classes. The two ladies and the gentleman disappear from the discourse as soon as their coaches complicate the traffic jam. Exactly who the shouting interlocutors are ("Que si pasas tú, que si apartas, que sí, y que no") is not clear at all. The exchange logically involves the de-luxe carriage-driver and the mule-wagon driver, with the meat-wagon driver responding impatiently. Thereafter the mule-wagon driver beats the animals, who balk, with one mule attacking the hired coach. Throughout these later events, the initiative lies with the rambunctious working class and the violent mob ("chusma"), now associated with the "acentos de pelea de sangre" borne by the popular melody.

The dream seems to enact a pure revolutionary moment that is earlier than the novel's historical ending, which is when the middle class gains control and creates a middle-class king, as Carlos Blanco Aguinaga observes and Julio Rodríguez-Puértolas repeats.[84] In the dream, not only is Juanito brought down from riches to rags but the lowly mule team stymies a portly gentleman and two middle-class women. The contrasting upper-class coaches reveal a difference in the passengers' pedigrees, so that it is no hyperbole to suggest that both the aristocracy and the industrial or mercantile gentry have been neutralized after "la delantera se insubordina" and the other mules "toman aquello por pretexto para no tirar más." Even more, the aristocracy escapes scot-free, as the mule kicks in the door of the bourgeois taxicab.

If we insist upon relating the traffic jam to the heroine's experience, the chapter preceding the dream records her shock on witnessing the street blockage caused by Mauricia's corpse lying in the street. She withdraws from the sight, while Lupe's concern for law and order overrides the sense of excitement downstairs.[85]

The more pertinent interpretation should entail Galdós's own comprehension of institutional and political order. Here, the symbolic role of carriage vehicles clashing with upstart "carros" raises the much discussed issue of Galdós's attitude toward the underclasses. Rodríguez-Puértolas concedes that Madrid at this time had only a miniscule proletariat, and that Galdós does not use this term but the more ambiguous "masa obrera." His point is that Galdós did not ignore the issue of the working class, offering a catalogue of the people who work with their hands, including bricklayers, railroad hands, sweepers, cigar makers, stone quarriers, printers, along with the working girls pitied by Jacinta (*"Fortunata y Jacinta"* 37-40). The dream, of course, alludes to the categories of shop clerks, cooks, musicians, street pedlars, coachmen, and butchers—all entirely detached from, if not pitted against, the upper classes. The relevance of these points is what Peter Bly has called Galdós's choice of an indirect, allegorical format instead of a historical novel to demonstrate "an imperfect Fortunata and the failed Liberal Spain of 1868-1876" (*Galdós's Novel* 184, 115). Is it valid to go further and agree with Blanco Aguinaga and Rodríguez-Puértolas's thesis that the novel moves parallel to history, from the liberal optimism of the popular classes to chaos to law and order, whereby public order mirrors moral order?

One clue is the figure of Moreno, treated with pathos and yet critical of Spanish society and ambivalent before Spain's filthy underclass. His private symbol for London's superiority over Madrid is the hackney carriage, with its relative comfort and solidity. Moreno's important insomniac monologue is filled with poignancy, but at the moment of maximum solitude, his mind reaches for this symbol of social elegance:

¡Qué silencio tan solemne hay ahora! El chorrear de la fuente de Pontejos, es lo que se siente siempre, y alguno que otro coche que pasa por la Puerta del Sol . . . Son los trasnochadores, que se retiran. Así iba yo en mi *cab* al salir del club de Picadilly . . . sólo que mi *cab* corría como una exhalación y estos carruajes andan poco y parece que se deshacen sobre los adoquines. (IV, ii, 3; 345)[86]

The likeable Moreno is not a full-time expatriate, but his disdain for Spanish cultural mediocrity is always manifest in spite of Galdós's sympathetic portrait. His open distaste for the idea of dying in Madrid and being carried "en esos carros tan cursis" appears in the same monologue. The narrator was more neutral when referring to "el carro humilde" that carried Mauricia's coffin, accompanied by "un triste simón" and three mourners. Ironically, at Fortunata's burial, "el lujo del carro fúnebre" contrasts with two or three "coches" (IV, vi, 16; 534).

In sum, in the debate over whether readings of *Fortunata y Jacinta* should emphasize the historical context or the private lives and universal themes of love, passion, and maternity, Scene 6 suggests that history is not just the "background" of the novel but is central to its deeper meaning. The narrative's seven-year period, like the rosary of seven mules, circles back into this scene with a violence that society's waking life keeps in check but that the narrator's dream images can release without disguise. The scene ends with the recurrence of the street-organ music, which serves as a transition to the next scene of working-class bystanders who become victims of the rebellion just described.

10. Street Pedlars. Final Reunion

SCENE 7.

Varias mujeres que tienen en la cuneta puestos ambulantes de pañuelos, recogen a escape su comercio, y lo mismo hacen los de la gran liquidación por saldo, a real y medio la pieza. *Un individuo que sobre una mesilla de tijera exhibe el gran invento para cortar cristal, tiene que salir a espeta perros; otro que vende los lápices más fuertes del mundo (como que da con ellos tremendos picotazos en la madera sin que se les rompa la punta), también recoge los bártulos, porque la mula delantera se le va encima. Fortunata mira todo esto y se ríe. El piso está húmedo y los pies se resbalan.*

Freudian critics, in their haste to connect earlier phallic symbols with the hard-pointed pencils of Scene 7, neglect Freud's own position regarding symbols mechanically applied to every situation that exhibits a "symbolic" object:

My procedure is not so convenient as the popular decoding method which translates any given piece of a dream's content by a fixed key. I, on the contrary, am prepared to find that the same piece of content may conceal a different meaning when it occurs in various people or in various contexts. (*The Interpretation* 4: 105)[87]

Chamberlin, however, believes that, when Fortunata dreams about hard pencils, "it is likely that Galdós is providing an additional insight into Fortunata's frustration and Maxi's inadequacy" ("Poor Maxi's Windmill" 433). Going further, he declares that, when the lead mule "confronts, almost gets on top of, the vendor," this is symbolic of Maxi's earlier fight with Juanito. Fortunata's laughter at the incident reflects her amusement at the idea that "the impotent Maxi might try to mount someone" ("Eroticizing" 82). Finally, Fortunata's "deeper needs" are reflected by the glass-cutting invention: "This vendor has an instrument (probably of a phallic shape) for vigorously cutting through the most difficult of problems." In a footnote, Chamberlin cites a personal conversation with a psychologist for "the insight that in women's dreams glass (as a displacement for ice, which is a congelation of moisture) often signifies sexual frustration" ("Eroticizing" 82). I have not found any documentation for this opinion in symbolist or psychoanalytic literature.

I believe that selective exegesis violates such signifying factors as dream sequence and relevant antecedents in waking life. In this case, the phallic approach moves too quickly to the pencil vendor and passes over three prior dream elements. The women cloth-pedlars are mentioned first, and their presence can only serve to give nuance to the working-class, represented until now by aggressive males. A further delay before reaching the pencil salesman is the mention of "la gran liquidación por saldo, a real y medio la pieza," the exact name of the bazaar where Jacinta's maid, Rafaela, had purchased a jewelry trinket promised to Adoración (I, x, 3; 391). Yet another delay is one more symmetrical instance to Part I: the device for cutting glass: "sobre una mesilla de tijera exhibe el gran invento para cortar cristal." Far from any sexual reference, this is an evocation of the manufacture of the "soberbia alhaja" purchased by Jacinta for Adoración: "había sido empleado el casco más valioso de un fondo de vaso" (I, x, 3; 391). The reader is hard put to claim a coincidence for the proximity of the glass-cutter and the name of the bazaar in Part I, and the same proximity in the dream. It is more probable that Galdós re-utilized material deliberately for understandable reasons of parallelism or that unconsciously these references slipped into his composition of the dream, owing to the common location in the market place. At any rate, the invention of better glass cutters and more durable pencils accords easily with other mechanical advances, such as motor pumps and plumbing pipes, that interested Galdós. They attracted him for their own ingeniousness, and they belong naturally to the fictional setting.[88] The scene ends when the pedlars scatter before the stampede of the approaching mule.

At this point the damp ground underfoot poses a legitimate interpretative point of debate. Does the sentence "El piso está húmedo y los pies se resbalan" terminate Scene 7, or does it begin Scene 8? The reference to slippery ground carries a note of either hesitant caution or disorientation. If the latter, then the next sentence follows aptly: "De repente, ¡ay!, cree que le clavan un dardo. Bajando por la calle Imperial ..." That is, Fortunata feels the slick ground beneath her, but probably looks down in order to know that it is "húmedo." Then she shifts attention from her feet, looking up in a disoriented glance that is abruptly focussed by the unexpected sighting of Juan. However, the same slippery ground also fits the immediate action of Scene 7. She is laughing as the vendors disperse before the advancing mules. Here the non-possessive form "los pies se resbalan" may be understood to include, not just Fortunata, but the observers around her as well. She is standing still in the crowd, and a moment later she will rise

on tip-toe to be seen by Juanito. Her position suggests that the vendors are dispersing in the order of farthest from the crowd to nearest. The last vendor to gather his things is the pencil pedlar, just as the lead mule is upon him. The proximity of turmoil is no longer so amusing, and it prompts the bystanders, including Fortunata, to step back and to become aware of the ground underfoot.

Whichever explanation persuades more, the sentence is a transitional one that better serves a narrator who is connecting scenes than a dreamer who represses a wish. Surely it is no coincidence that Galdós chooses the same idea of slippery ground in the same commercial neighbourhood for Jacinta's parallel journey through the streets in Part I. The dreamed version convokes the primal scene of class differences in that identical market district, where Jacinta, Guillermina, and Rafaela barely cope with el *Pituso*'s demands as they bump up against the working class: "La noche avanzaba, y el tránsito se hacía difícil por la acera estrecha, resbaladiza y húmeda, tropezando a cada instante con la gente que la invadía" (I, x, 3; 395-96). The lexical duplication seems to implicate the artist's mind more than the heroine's.

In either case, the idea of damp slipperiness excludes the sexual meaning attributed by López-Baralt and endorsed by Chamberlin. Both critics again lump together what Freud terms separate dream-segments, coordinating a few of their elements into a single unit whose "simbolismo fálico de tubos, lápices, grifos y llaves en un ambiente seminal de humedad anuncia la llegada de Juanito" (López-Baralt 141). López-Baralt does not explain the reason why the order is reversed, the ejaculation preceding the male presence. More important, she identifies "humedad" with water in a similar remark: "[En el sueño] hay la motivación esencial que Freud señala para los sueños (la sexual) y los símbolos eróticos universales, en este caso, fálicos: los objetos elongados (tubos, lápices, etc.) y seminales (las referencias al agua)."

Three errors mar this statement. First, Freud declares of slippery footing that "symbolic representations *par excellence* of masturbation are *gliding and sliding*" (*The Complete Introductory Lectures* 156). Second, Freud links the symbol of water to birth dreams, specifically phantasies about intra-utrine life and the act of birth (*The Interpretation* 5: 399-401).[89] And third, no such "universality" is posited unequivocally in Freud's theory. In the source used by López-Baralt—the 114-page "brochure" (Freud's term), *On Dreams*—Freud's abbreviated remarks do not reflect the original, full version of 1900, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, which is much more cautious and omits the idea of universality.[90] In 1909 Freud further qualified his theory with

> an express warning against over-estimating the importance of symbols in dream-interpretation, against restricting the work of translating dreams merely to translating symbols and against abandoning the technique of making use of the dreamer's associations. The two techniques of dream-interpretation must be complementary [...] but [...] the first place continues to be held by the procedure which [...] attributes a decisive significance to the comments made by the dreamer, while the translation of symbols, as I have explained it, is also at our disposal as an auxiliary method. (*The Interpretation* 5: 353, 354, 359-60)

The damp underfooting, according to further armchair Freudianism, might be interpreted so as to extend the dubious eroticism as follows: Fortunata's laughter represents energy and therefore a displaced form of passion, while her shifting feet on the slippery ground recast the

preceding dance/sexual act and now represent her progressive slipping into orgasm. More reasonably, a structural and thematic explanation would consider the recapitulative role of such events, in this case, Jacinta's symmetrical itinerary, quoted in full in an earlier discussion. Or again, in a metonymic register, the relation of moist ground and the "charca cenagosa" mentioned previously brings into a common linkage Fortunata's "primera temporada de anarquía moral" when she "llegó a creer que encenagándose mucho se vengaba de los que la habían perdido" (II, ii, 2; 486). The significance of these earlier events burgeons forth from the germinal dream reference, whose synoptic function compresses several interrelated themes into a single nuclear sign.

* * *

SCENE 8

De repente, ¡ay!, cree que le clavan un dardo. Bajando por la calle Imperial, en dirección al gran pelmazo de gente que se ha formado, viene Juanito Santa Cruz. Ella se empina sobre las puntas de los pies para verle y ser vista. Milagro fuera que no la viese. La ve al instante y se va derecho a ella. Tiembla Fortunata, y él la coge una mano preguntándole por su salud. Como el pianito sigue tocando y los carreteros blasfemando, ambos tienen que alzar la voz para hacerse oír. Al mismo tiempo Juan pone una cara muy afligida, y llevándola dentro del portal del Fiel Contraste, le dice: —Me he arruinado, chica, y para mantener a mis padres y a mi mujer, estoy trabajando de escribiente en una oficina... Pretendo una plaza de cobrador del tranvía. ¿No ves lo mal trajeado que estoy?'

Fortunata le mira, y siente un dolor tan vivo como si le dieran una puñalada. En efecto; la capa del señorito de Santa Cruz tiene un siete tremendo, y debajo de ella asoma la americana con los ribetes deshilachados, corbata mugrienta, y el cuello de la camisa de dos semanas ... Entonces ella se deja caer sobre él, y le dice con efusión cariñosa:

—Alma mía, yo trabajaré para ti; yo tengo costumbre; tú no; sé planchar, sé repasar, sé servir... tú no tienes que trabajar... yo para ti... Conque me sirvas para ir a entregar, basta... no más. Viviremos en un sotabanco, solos y tan contentos.

The final scene anecdotally executes the wish-fulfilment. Whether the surface meaning corresponds to the deeper significance is the issue. From the perspective of dreams as sexual wish-fulfilment, Fortunata began with an adult ego's dream that required symbols to disguise unconscious thoughts that waking life needs to censor. The *galdosista* symbolist critics decipher those thoughts, as reviewed. But in Scene 8, her dream ends transparently, as children's dreams do. No longer symbolic, the anecdote says plainly what any waking narrative might say. Moreover, in view of the ending, the entire dream can be understood as a transparent quest for Juanito. Fortunata is searching the streets for a sight of her lover and at last she finds him. If we set aside the contradiction of an opaque dream whose ending requires no symbolism, a contradiction remains in that Fortunata knows in advance that she desires Juanito and yet must dream symbolically about what she knows.

The question has to be asked whether Galdós needed to construct such a self-evident dream as a prelude to the real thing. This notion belittles his literary art, in my opinion. Consider two possible conditions for Fortunata. Either she is an autonomous character with a mind of her own, or she is manipulated by the implied author or by Galdós himself. Both possibilities are valid in any critical discussion of waking reality: we may choose to discuss character either as determined by the autonomous fictive world or by authorial intent. But such a choice is not available for dreams. A genuine dream, one that belongs to the dreamer's unconscious, requires an autonomous character. And yet substantial events in Fortunata's dream hold no meaning for her life. As indicated at many junctures, symbolist critics have ignored certain events, and I have demonstrated that such events were irrelevant to the dreamer, if not altogether beyond her personal knowledge. The only conclusion I can draw is that portions of the dream do not belong to the autonomous character but are controlled by the narrator, if not the author himself. Otherwise, what plausible reason would an autonomous Fortunata need to dream and symbolize what she already knows, namely, that she wants to be permanently and exclusively Juanito's beloved? If this reflects her conscious state of mind, why would her unconscious go to the trouble of disguising it and then permit it to be unambiguously displayed in a childish happy ending?

My position regarding these doubts is that Fortunata does not control the dream entirely, and that the so-called happy ending involves not sexual reunion nor even a higher loving relationship but rather a facet of the heroine's personality that receives little notice and that entails the socio-historical theme that I have been explicating. Before I elaborate, let me turn to the existing critical interpretation of Scene 8.

López-Baralt rushes to reinforce the phallic interpretation by citing Fortunata's transfixed impression at the first glimpse of Juanito: "De repente, ¡ay!, cree que le clavan un dardo." However, this reaction is separated by seven intervening non-erotic scenes. Not only do the circumstances change, but the image of penetration is a commonplace among Galdós's forceful usages in other contexts.[91] The method adopted by López-Baralt follows one of the two conventional methods of oneirocriticism, as it was called from Artemidorus of Daldis's time (second century A.D.) to the nineteenth century. Both were repudiated by Freud. One method replaced the contents of the whole with an analogous content that is intelligible. The other method decoded dreams as a form of cryptography by means of a dream-book of symbols and meanings. The second method serves López-Baralt despite Freud's assertion that nothing guarantees the trustworthiness of the dream-book and that "the symbolic method is restricted in its application and incapable of being laid down on general lines" (*The Interpretation* 4: 99-100). Ignoring this admonition, López-Baralt connects discontinuous scenes, especially the first, seventh, and eighth, while mechanically construing images of penetration as objects of phallic desire. Freud prescribes the more cautious, fragmented method, as mentioned several times earlier and meriting full quotation:

> The essence of the decoding procedure, however, lies in the fact that the work of interpretation is not brought to bear on the dream as a whole but on each portion of the dream's content independently, as though the dream were a geological conglomerate in which each fragment of rock required a separate assessment. (*The Interpretation* 4: 99)

López-Baralt claims further that the penetrating "dardo" belongs to the same sexual paradigm as the pencils, tubes, and piercing metaphors (143). The claim is not only without authority, but Freud deals extensively with the problem of sensory data "remembered" in dreams, as in this instance where Fortunata seems to repeat her waking perception of Juanito's piercing voice at the plumbing shop ("una aguja muy fina y muy fría" [III, vii, 3; 249]). The "dardo" felt on sighting Juanito in the dream becomes the earlier "aguja" by some mnemonic transformation. Freud points out that waking acts of memory are regressive movements that halt at the mnemonic images. They do not produce "a hallucinatory revival of the *perceptual* images. Why is it otherwise in dreams?" The answer is that a sensory remembrance such as Fortunata's "dardo/(aguja)" does not carry the same meaning that it did in the waking state. Granted that she was titillated by her lover's unexpected voice in actual life ("aguja"), the dreamed version ("dardo") cannot bear the same meaning because it is determined by condensation in the dream-work. The dreamed sensory experience is like any other idea that is altered in the dream. Indeed, "psychical intensity coincides with psychical *value*":

> the most intense elements are also the most important ones—those which form the centre-point of the dream-thoughts. We know it is true, that these are precisely elements which, on account of the censorship, cannot as a rule make their way into the content of the dream; nevertheless, it might well be that their immediate derivatives which represent them in the dream might bear a higher degree of intensity, without necessarily on that account forming the centre of the dream. But this expectation too is disappointed by a comparative study of dreams [...]. The intensity of elements in the one has no relation to the intensity of the elements in the other: the fact is that a complete "transvaluation of all psychical values" [in Nietzsche's phrase] takes place between the material of the dream-thoughts and the dream. A direct derivative of what occupies a dominating position in the dream-thoughts can often only be discovered precisely in some transitory element of the dream which is quite overshadowed by more powerful images. (*The Interpretation* 4: 330) [92]

Let me now return to my suggestion that the ending has more to do with the narrator's control over the compressed social theme than with the dreamer's unconscious wish for a loving reunion, a wish that the dream itself suddenly and lucidly exposes. The narrator's thematic reduction and recapitulation within the dream was demonstrated for separate fragments of each scene. Looking now at the overall dream for components where Fortunata fits into that thematization, we find the salient tendency to be her severe moral hesitation about reuniting with Juanito, together with her social motivation in the "pícara idea." It should not be forgotten that, just prior to the dream, she is under the renunciatory influence of Guillermina's admonition that she reform her attitudes. She has also rejected Juanito's advances at the plumbing shop. As a result, her feelings at the dreamed tavern evoke the frustration and inadequacy felt when, near a real tavern, she saw Jacinta and Guillermina. The dream marks the debate as to which way to turn, back to Juanito or toward another solution. Initially, her street journey has momentum because "la empuja la pícara idea," what Gilman calls the purging creation of an "institution," her social revolt for the sake of class dignity. At the Fiel Contraste, which safe-

guards legitimate commerce, she does not know which way will lead to resolving her social status. She is uncertain about dancing, her progress is deterred by a popular revolt, and she laughs at the spectacle of affliction among her companions in class inequality. These events comprise the problematics of ambivalent social awareness.

The conclusion to be drawn is that the last thing Fortunata wants or needs is sexual gratification with Juanito. This overview fits with the circumstances that immediately precede the dream and that precipitate it. After Fortunata's marriage to Maxi, her psychological world does not include sexual hunger: her early thoughts concerning permanent relations with Juanito soon turn to the "pícara idea." Her desire is projected into a future domesticity with their child and not into an immediate need for sexual gratification. This concern is reflected in her anxiety, fear, nervous hysteria, and lethargy, all unfolded in such major scenes as Juanito at the door on her wedding night, the confrontation with Jacinta in Guillermina's house, and her sense of abandon when Mauricia dies. Throughout, her need for self-respect, self-satisfaction and justification, as well as her sense of inadequacy and her need for companionship and social acceptance, together plausibly extinguish any remaining energy reserved for sexual initiative. As always, she is the object of Juanito's active desire.

No critic has raised the possibility that the dream may mean the opposite of its manifest wish-fulfilment. That is, the reunion with Juanito is not what is wished but just the opposite or something quite different. The *galdosista* Freudians who so quickly evoke sexual symbolism fail to evoke the concept of reversal, a fundamental principle in dream theory and a frequent operation in dream-work.[93] In this light, Fortunata may be interpreted as struggling against a renewed, illicit life with Juanito. The struggle conforms with numerous virtue-oriented circumstances that arise during the week prior to her dream. The evidence that supports an interpretation through reversal concerns a little-noted aspect of the heroine's psychological extremism, one that also belongs to the immediate conditions that precipitate the dream.

By dreaming that Juanito is totally humbled, Fortunata exhibits a subtle trait of character that deserves greater attention. She seems unable or unwilling to give of herself altruistically without first witnessing the total abjection of the other person. This uncomplimentary trait appears several days before the dream when she experiences

> aquellos deseos de virtud sublime que a ratos surgían como flor de un minuto, criada por la emulación. La emulación o la manía imitativa eran lo que determinaba la idea de que si su marido se ponía muy malo, muy malo, ella sería la maravilla del mundo por el esmero en asistirle y cuidarle. Mas para que el triunfo fuese completo era menester que a Maxi le entrase una enfermedad asquerosa, repugnante y pestífera, de esas que ahuyentan hasta a los más allegados. Ella, entonces, daría pruebas de ser tan ángel como otra cualquiera, y tendría alma, paciencia, valor y estómago para todo. (III, vi, 8; 221)

This fantasy intensifies the desired illness, with Fortunata wallowing in its details so as to augment their opposite virtues in the would-be benefactress. Short of this extreme, Fortunata is safe from the fantasized commitment. She may comfortably persist in her ambivalence to Maxi and in her general moral wavering between desired virtue and actual wickedness in thought,

directed toward Jacinta as well as toward her husband. Dreaming of Juanito's debased condition obeys the same process of self-exaltation at the expense of the other's hardship. The concealed springs of this perverse mechanism involve resentment and undeclared vengefulness. Juanito's pattern of favour and neglect cannot be suffered with equanimity. But Fortunata's love, while apparently steadfast in periods of neglect, coexists with a natural need for relief. She redirects her resentment toward Jacinta and Maxi, but it gains open expression in the dream, when she may at once degrade and punish her lover while also affirming her love and, more important, her capacity to be as virtuous as her rival.[94]

Aside from this, the final scene is no different from a normal narrative about waking reality. Straightforward, without imagery, its only oneiric quality is the incongruous shabbiness of Juanito's appearance and the corresponding fall from economic grace. In this respect, Fortunata completes the narrator's oneiric theme of social reversal. She sides with the upstart coachmen in the sense of facing the helpless upper classes, but she differs from them by her constructive role in volunteering economic support. Thereafter the discourse needs a device that will indicate its termination and the commencement of the normal waking discourse.

* * *

(Transition to awakening)

Entonces empieza a ver que las casas y el cielo se desvanecen, y Juan no está ya de capa sino con un gabán muy majo. Edificios y carros se van, y en su lugar ve Fortunata algo que conoce muy bien, la ropa de Maxi, colgada de una percha [...]; luego ve la cama, va reconociendo pedazo a pedazo su alcoba. (III, vii, 4; 258)

This opening of the eyes and the gradual realization of true sensory perception are psychologically well crafted. They are not, however, as subtle as several other moments that depict inner mental activity, as indicated in note 42.

Conclusion. Galdós and the Narrative Unconscious

Nothing in the preceding discussion is intended to deny that Fortunata's dream partly reflects her own preoccupations. For that matter, much (though not all) of the novel bears upon her condition, and for this reason I have linked many of the dream's constituents to her thoughts and actions in their more ample context. This process has entailed, in the study's early sections, a distinction between love and sexuality, based on an understanding of how love generates themes more fundamental to the novel than sexuality. A dream as long as this one, occurring when it does on the threshold of Part IV, plausibly reflects the novel's climactic idea, which has

been gestating prior to the dream and will be actualized incompletely after it. The "pícara idea" is the gift of the infant to Jacinta in return for winning Juanito and socio-moral integration into his world. Sexual desire seems an improbable way to represent Fortunata's wish to realize that idea. Love, however, is an eminently probable way. Sherman Eoff has written that the story of Fortunata, from a moral viewpoint, "is fundamentally one of regeneration," a process carrying with it "the reactivated virtues of courage, loyalty to friends, sincerity, and selflessness in love," in short, "a new movement of values" (119). This idea of selflessness fits badly with my view of the heroine as an unappealing primitive, but the idea categorically excludes sexual desire as her underlying motive. If the virtues enumerated by Eoff epitomize the essential Fortunata, then eroticism is not the key to unlocking the dream's resolution, where Juanito is sustained economically and sentimentally by a selfless Fortunata.

Nevertheless, the dream's immediate antecedents also play a role in its gestation. Eoff mentions Fortunata's "loyalty to friends." The plural seems odd since she has only one friend, Mauricia, but this woman, indeed, presages the dream's finale. In a sequence of episodes that affect Fortunata's thinking prior to the dream itself, the order of their development anticipates the dream's indecisive progress. First, Mauricia's dying advice to her friend is that she repent of all her sins except for her love, which she must cultivate completely (III, vi, 1; 180). But moments later her advice is more exclusive, omitting love: "Arrepiéntete de todo, chica, pero de todo [...] tú no sabes bien lo malas que somos" (III, vi, 2; 187). The same night Mauricia omits all talk of love for Juanito, urging instead that Fortunata forgive Jacinta and join her, Mauricia, in death: "Se me arranca el alma de verte penando . . . con un hombre que no quieres . . . ¡qué traspaso! Chavala querida, muérete y vente conmigo" (III, vi, 4; 200). Also on this night, the fabric motif begins. Jacinta's clothes impress Fortunata's "inspección fisgona"—her hat, her coat ("era perfecto. [...] Hizo propósito de encargarse el suyo exactamente igual"), and especially her skirt: "Y la falda, ¡qué elegante! ¿Dónde se encontraría aquella tela?" (III, vi, 3; 193). If Mauricia had influenced her thinking, the effect has passed. The next day, Fortunata meets her rival and unleashes her silent savagery, openly negating her friend's advice. Her fury toward Maxi also explodes inwardly that night. The day after, Fortunata reviews the confrontation: "iba de las cosas más sutiles a las más triviales. 'Me tengo que hacer una falda enteramente igual a la que llevaba ella . . . lo mismito, lo mismito, con aquel tableado; y si encontrara tela igual'" (III, vi, 6; 211). The three-day series of events, from the standpoint of the approaching dream, positions the fabric motif at the center of a new conflict. The conciliatory advice that Fortunata should abandon thought of Juanito struggles against her contrary instinct to affirm herself before Jacinta and to equal her rival symbolically by means of clothing.

These events anticipate the dreamed fabric shop, but other events in the sequence also determine certain contents. By the fourth day after Mauricia's advice, Fortunata has grown calm enough to experience "una lástima profunda [...] [que] refrescaba el cariño fraternal" (III, vi, 7; 215) toward Maxi that had begun to fade, and at the end of the evening her "compasión" awakens "deseos de virtud sublime" (III, vi, 8; 221). Thereafter, a number of days pass, about which the narrator is vague, resulting in a Homeric slip by Galdós that affects the dream. The couple wake up the next day, the fifth day after Mauricia's advice, when Maxi's irate temper flares, until "llegó día," when his violence is extreme and continues for an unspecified length: "Por las noches el lobo se trocaba en cordero. [...] Por las mañanas lo mejor era no hacerle caso

[...]. Una noche ..." (III, vi, 8; 222-23). The relative domestic quiescence makes little room for thoughts of Juanito and perhaps enough room for Mauricia's advice to incubate. The dream's tranquil, almost indifferent pace in quest of Juanito (assuming it is a quest) may derive from this interim respite. Despite the clear impression of many days elapsing, the chapter's next section begins, "Doña Lupe la invitó [a Fortunata], dos días después de la tarde del choque con Jacinta, a volver a visitar a Mauricia" (III, vi, 9; 223). On this day, Mauricia dies.

Evidently, Galdós, in preparing for the dream, wished to return to the vacillating thoughts and motifs that surfaced prior to the undefined short period just mentioned. Curiously, the precise days of the week become unclear.[95] On the day after Mauricia's death, Guillermina confronts Fortunata about her affair, asking why, if it has ended, she still resents Jacinta. Saying nothing, Fortunata experiences "la representación ideal que de sus propias acciones y sentimientos tenía aquella infeliz en su espíritu [...] [y que] resplandecía como un foco de luz" (III, vi, 10; 233). With virtue affirmed in the abstract, she concretizes it several days later, a Thursday, by resisting Juanito in a chance meeting at the plumbing shop. The timing is important. She meets him on that day and on the following day reports the encounter to Guillermina. Later the same day, she tells Lupe that she has been to the fabric shop. And then she has the dream, which condenses these discordant feelings of jealousy, virtue, and inadequacy.

Because Fortunata is aware of these feelings, she cannot represss them. How, then, can any further latent content exist beneath the manifest dream anecdote? There is little likelihood, and for this reason I have sought meaning elsewhere. In particular, Fortunata has no need to repress and then symbolize her sentiments for Juanito. Since they are not part of the mental processes excluded from consciousness, no defensive activity by the ego is necessary in a symbolic dream (Brenner 150). Latent material in dreams has two sources: the immediate adult experience, already discussed, and the dreamer's childhood, of which the narrator reveals nothing. A vague reference to her fighting as a girl is a rare detail that adds nothing new to her already recognizable adult regressions. We may speculate that her resolve to have a single mate bespeaks a traditional, female, Catholic upbringing, where child-bearing, not pleasure, justifies conjugal relations. The miniscule basis for further speculation indicates that Galdós could not have been interested in his heroine's unconscious. His texts bar the reader from access because they are empty of information. The alternative interpretations offered earlier in this study do not need to rely on symbolism, Freudian or other. And yet, Galdós's genius is often cited for his Freudian-like prescience. The reasoning is that his insight into character, his intuitive understanding of the human heart, his empathetic imagination—these faculties permitted him to devise literary situations and motives that evoke genuinely possible, real-life human experience. Accordingly, such genius must extend to the authenticity of his characters' dreams. The assumption is that Galdós, as the creator of Fortunata, had access to her unconscious and could supply the symbols that represent its contents. More accurately, Galdós fashioned whatever unconscious Fortunata has, although he never openly described it. In this view, he must have devised symbols that disguise its contents.

The insuperable problem from a psychoanalytic standpoint is that Fortunata does not tell the dream herself. The narrator speaks for her, representing her unspoken representation of the dream were she actually to narrate it. But who is to say that the narrator does not cloud the discourse with his own words and sentence order? Whether narrator and author are one and the

same matters very little for this circumstance. Only a narratological purist would insist that the third-person narrator, independently of the author, has his own genius and insight into the human heart. Even then, the narrator's unconscious must be considered. And what environmental referent could be invoked in that case, if not Galdós himself? Ultimately, we must conclude that both the narrator and Fortunata are the author's fantasy, emerging from his own thought process. What she says, thinks, and dreams has been sifted through the author's language, thoughts, and fantasies. Indeed, Fortunata might be analyzed for clues to Galdós's own personality. Further, if anybody's unconscious might be plumbed by means of Fortunata's oneiric symbols, it is Galdós's unconscious. I do not advocate this avenue, although a reasonable project would be to explore the relation between the artist's id and his ego and how the one communicates to the other. Those who follow this avenue, however, are advised that "the distance between the narrative account and instinctual conflicts in the narrator" poses a problem.[96]

A more prudent strategy would involve biography less and multidiegetical strata more. It would also involve the textual interstices that may be termed "metadiegetical." Such a study might uncover patterns in the author's works where unfocalized and focalized judgements coincide, and where the unfocalized ones across a number of novels display significant similarities. Two examples taken from a single novel, *Fortunata y Jacinta*, will explain this. When Nicolás pauses outside Fortunata's room (before lecturing her on adultery), the narrator describes his irresolution as "Como el que recela penetrar en la madriguera de una bestia feroz" (II, vii, 12; 715). As a simile, "madriguera" arguably represents the narrator's choice of term and, therefore, what he believes: that Fortunata is a ferocious beast. But let us grant that "madriguera" merely focalizes Nicolás's belief and nothing else. However, if the narrator employed a similar term, it would clearly suggest a subliminal identification with Nicolás. This is exactly what happens. After the cleric threatens Fortunata with eternal damnation, the narrator says: "No se sabe si este procedimiento del terror hizo su efecto, porque Fortunata no contestó nada. La expresión de sus sentimientos acerca del tremendo anatema perdióse en la oscuridad de aquella caverna" (II, vii, 12; 716). The omniscient narrator abdicates his responsibility to reveal whether the savage beast was tamed and, therefore, not so savage. Whether he is playing coy games with the reader or fostering moral ambiguity is an unresolved issue. Is his abdication designed to shore up Fortunata's virtue or to comment ironically on Nicolás's spiritual blindness as he gropes for a chair? These questions are valid, but they ignore the odd metonymy of "madriguera" and "caverna." The narrator may be suspected here, of siding with Nicolás although he rarely does elsewhere. Prior to this moment, the heroine's location was called an "escondite," and this word in context lacks any connotation of wild animals. "Escondite" is compatible with a cavern's darkness, but it is incompatible with the dangerous lair that is later implied in "madriguera," even though Fortunata may be in fearful retreat. The location, in fact, is "el cuarto de la ropa," and this objective correlative gives the measure of its moral value from diverse perpectives. The semantic progression moves from "cuarto" to "escondite" to "madriguera" to "caverna," but only "caverna" is unambiguously associated with the narrator's viewpoint. Is it not peculiar that he should adopt the same vocabulary as the cleric, who views Fortunata as a wild beast? Here, then, is an unreliable narrative that displays a conscious narrator's hesitation to offer a moral judgement (is she moved by the sermon?), while he also displays a slip into the negative vocabulary of Nicolás's viewpoint. Galdós may have been conscious or unconscious of the slip while

composing, but, either way, his position is exposed.

If the evidence for this interpretation does not suffice, there is more. The famous analogy of the "pueblo" with a rock quarry, concurred in by narrator and characters alike—as noted above in section 6—, migrates to Fortunata herself. In her own words, she exhibits a self-identification with a rough stone: "Las señoras Micaelas me desbastaron, y mi marido y doña Lupe me pasaron la piedra pómez, sacándome un poco de lustre" (IV, iv, 1; 409). Surely this striking analogy belongs to the narrator's mind above all, for it would be a peculiar coincidence if it could find its way into so many minds unaided by a higher consciousness. Said differently, Fortunata's consciousness is not really her own, and here it betrays unwittingly its submission to control by the narrator, and ultimately, by the author.

It is a dubious counter-argument to protest that an unreliable narrator makes impossible any decision about his beliefs. Unreliability is not the same as untruth-saying. The problem is to know when his observations are true and when, as in *Fortunata y Jacinta,* he plays games with the reader, speaks ironically, changes positions, or even contradicts himself. Galdós's narrator is unreliable in the sense that he is unpredictable and speaks in different registers. But within a given register, he may be consistent and, therefore, entirely reliable and truthful. To support the idea of Fortunata as "salvaje," outlined in section 3 of this study, I cited focalized epithets. I pointed out that while the narrator is primarily neutral, he rarely voices a sympathizing epithet. In the case of her being an "anarquista," the narrator's objectivity is indisputable, because he places this trait among others in Fortunata's rapidly changing moods.[97]

Fortunata's manifest dream condenses, not its own latent content, but the narrator's mental embrace of the contents of his entire story. The dream, as a nocturnal interlude, adds weight to Vernon Chamberlin's analogy between this novel and a Beethoven symphony. The dream passage toward the end of the third "movement" recapitulates past phrases or themes and announces other themes to come. It is a synoptic overview of the novel that perhaps means more to its author than to its readers. This idea is comprehensible in psychoanalytic terms, for wherever artistic creation is studied for its unconscious aspect, what stands exposed is the idea of a reading public (Kris 60). The author's unconscious becomes a factor at this point.

The complex relationship of artist and public has several aspects, but the pertinent one is why Fortunata's dream becomes the occasion for a thematic and narrative synopsis. The writer replaces the reader by judging his creation as a stranger while writing. Approval (or dissatisfaction), revision, and private jokes are constant factors in the creative process. In this light, the insertion of Fortunata's dream acts beyond its necessary role in narrative. Its unabashed episodic simplicity betrays the author's deliberate control of his craft, for he indulges in none of the lyricism that he can display elsewhere. The dream's length, detail, and occasional digression display a conscious review of the novel's every motif and idea that can be associated with the immediate dream contents. Certain of those contents (the dwarf, the glass cutter, the pencils) cannot easily be inserted into the chain of Fortunata's psychical experiences. The dream exhibits, instead, Galdós's mastery, what Shoemaker calls his "obvious delight" in digression. More, the passage is Galdós's exultation in virtuosity, a discharge of psychic energy that validates his ego autonomy. The channel from here to his id, the wellspring of his genius, is an appropriate Freudian path to seek out, if anyone wishes to follow it. The blueprint for such a path would need to be painstaking and three-dimensional; however, I would not draft it by using only one novel.

In the end, the dream furnishes the reader with a blueprint of the novel itself, a condensed symbolization of Galdós's fictive project. This project includes, but also surpasses, the heroine's psychology and destiny. The title itself, *Fortunata y Jacinta*, indicates the narrative scope: encompassing each woman in her socio-historical context. In order for the dream or blueprint to symbolize this context in condensed form, there can be no ordinary Freudian concept of symbol and control of the dream. Some of the symbols belong to Fortunata's private sphere—her mind and immediate social life—but they also call up events or themes whose significance is unrelated to Eros. Most non-personal constituents can be called symbolic in the sense that they summon events whose larger significance relates to thematic issues (class relations, social progress, moral conduct) or to motifs that structure the narrative (water, textiles, music, coaches).

The dream is embedded in a surrounding narrative, and, in fact, is an interior narrative of a special kind. Instead of recounting limited events within the larger narrative, the dream recounts much of the larger narrative in condensed, symbolic form. "Symbols," then, are to be understood as compact signs that the reader expands by means of recollection, with the result that major unifying concerns of the novel spread before the reader in retrospection. These condensed narrative signs standing for broader themes and motifs proliferate related meanings: they summon earlier issues and circumstances in the waking life of the characters. Thus, the objects dreamed by Fortunata that critics heretofore have interpreted sexually serve to convoke kindred motifs and themes from all sectors of the novel. The dream operates by a process of compression, like single notes that, when struck, resonate with multiple vibrations and echoes.

Just as condensation is the mechanism in the Freudian concept of dreaming, the term "encapsulation" has been used in this study for designating the dream's semantic reductions that receive ample treatment in the novel's waking life. My position has been that the various scenes of Fortunata's dream are semantic miniatures of the novel's fictional universe. This position may be associated with critics like Sinnigen, Turner, Kronik, and Goldman, who, each in an individual way, have suggested a synecdochical perspective for interpretation. Where a narrative unit summarizes, duplicates, parallels, or miniaturizes the entirety, there Galdós has invested discourse with meaning beyond its immediate confines. Comparably, in Fortunata's dream, a recapitulative power of encapsulated signs revives memory of earlier events or clusters of psychological experience, which the oneiric circumstance transforms or modifies.

This synoptic operation in the dream allows a single constituent to radiate multiple meanings in what I have called a proto-Proustian retrieval of past time. Components of Fortunata's dream are reductive units, compressed signs that are expandable by their retrospective power to evoke thematized socio-historical and moral concerns. The process reasserts the narrator's own consciousness beyond that of the dreamer. In this sense, the dream also belongs to the narrator. He controls the historicizing and structural registers that pertain to Fortunata's personal life by context alone. The full dream, however, encompasses most of the novel's principal concerns, and indeed, the collective consciousness of the depicted society. Therefore, when decompressed to its full meaning, the dream restores Fortunata to the novel's broad network of registers.

University of Southern California

NOTES

[1] Pedro Ortiz Armengol cites Gilman ("The Consciousness" 64-65) and adds: "Galdós no sólo fue un precursor de Freud sino que es un descubridor o inventor de zonas de psicoanálisis" (447).

[2] Freud believed somewhat differently in 1909 but tended toward this same view in spite of that: "The more one is concerned with the solution of dreams, the more one is driven to recognize that the majority of the dreams of adults deal with sexual material and give expression to erotic wishes. A judgement on this point can be formed only by those who really analyse dreams, that is to say, who make their way through their manifest content to the latent dream-thoughts, and never by those who are satisfied with making a note of the manifest content alone. [...] In interpreting dreams we should never forget the significance of sexual complexes, though we should also, of course, avoid the exaggeration of attributing exclusive importance to them" (*The Interpretation* 5: 396). Further, the "dream-work is doing nothing original in making substitutions [...]. The imagination's pre-occupation with the subject's own body is by no means peculiar to dreams [...]. Nor [...] is a house the only circle of ideas employed for symbolizing the body. [...] It is true that I know patients who have retained an architectural symbolism for the body and the genitals. [...] [E]very gateway stands for one of the bodily orifices (a 'hole'), every water-pipe is a reminder of the urinary apparatus, and so on. But the circle of ideas centering round plant-life or the kitchen may just as readily be chosen to conceal sexual images" (*The Interpretation* 5: 345-46). In other words, Freud is saying that sexual content is not self-evident through symbols, that the same symbol can either signify or signify otherwise. Symbols may not be interpreted willy-nilly by the therapist; they require the dreamer's hard work. To return to Fortunata's open doors, Freud reports a dream by a man led by his wife to "a little house with closed doors," where she "pushed the door open; I then slipped quickly and easily into the inside of a court which rose in an incline." Freud adds that "penetrating into narrow spaces and opening closed doors are among the commonest sexual symbols" (*The Interpretation* 5:397). But this meaning must be elicited from the dreamer by the therapist; it belongs to the latent content as yet incomprehensible to the dreamer, who cannot confront it directly. Fortunata, in contrast, initially hesitates and dreams precisely because she confronts her desire in waking life.

[3] Most crucial, the brochure, *On Dreams*, omits the lengthy final chapter, "The Psychology of the Dream-Processes," which relates the study of dreams to "the whole structure and functioning of the human mind," as translator James Strachey remarks (8).

[4] Perhaps the wildest claim by López-Baralt is that Mauricia la Dura's attempted theft of the Host is "una metáfora de violación en la que la tantas veces descrita como masculina Mauricia desflora no sólo a la iglesia, sino al mismo sagrario que contiene la custodia" (138).

[5] William Shoemaker follows Schraibman and Gilman in inscribing Freud's importance for understanding the erotic anxiety symbolized by the doors and bolts: Fortunata's wedding night dream "embodies both her fears and her desire: the opening of doors with their useless bolts and the transparent partitions with men coming through symbolizing the female genital organ and the sexual act, as Schraibman has pointed out" (269). Shoemaker cites Gilman on tubes and pencils, saying that they "may also" symbolize sexuality, but he is not specific as to which: the organ or the act. Ignacio Elizalde cites the same source to point out the "simbolismo premonitorio" of Maxi's dream of opening doors and men passing through walls: "También ha sido interpretado de acuerdo con las teorías de Freud, con una simbología sexual. Las puertas serían el órgano sexual femenino y los hombres entrando en la habitación representarían el acto sexual" (39). Omitting the name Freud, Francisco Caudet notes that the dream, among other things "está cargado de significados eróticos (los tubos) y vitales anunciadores de vida (el agua que los tubos llevan y traen)" (2: 257, note 104). Vernon Chamberlin embraces the approach at length, and Ricardo Gullón, while also avoiding the term "Freudian," acknowledges that "al nivel actual de nuestros conocimientos podemos dar por recibido la creencia de que en el sueño se revela un mundo secreto, un mundo actuante de alguna manera sobre el cotidiano" (150).

[6] Galdós's knowledge of psychiatry through Dr. Luis Simarro, a disciple of the same Charcot with whom Freud studied, is demonstrated by Joan C. Ullman and George Allison, who also take the first steps toward analyzing Galdós himself. They further apply Freud's principles to Maximiliano Rubín's psychosomatic neuroses and final psychotic condition. Their article does not deal with the kind of pathology that makes Freud's writings relevant here.

[7] Given Chamberlin's premises, his argument is well documented and fairly persuasive. He contends that "the presence of water suggests the gratification of sexual desire" for both Maxi and Fortunata at diverse moments and that her thirst for Juanito is symbolized by the tubes and other aquatic references. In the latter respect, a footnote adds: "Now she desires not only sexual satisfaction, but, more importantly, to have a child" ("Poor Maxi's Windmill" 429, 434).

[8] The feebleness of Fortunata's sexual portrait, even when she is a sexual object, may be observed in the list offered by Arencibia and Escobar (42-43): Villalonga's "está de rechupete" (I, xi, 1; 433); Nicolás Rubín's "Es una mujer ... hasta allí" (II, i, 6; 573); "Maximiliano contemplaba como un bobo aquellos ojos, aquel entrecejo incomparable y aquella nariz perfecta" (II, i, 3; 465); Feijoo's progressive inadequacy as she "se iba poniendo tan lucida de carnes, tan guapa y hermosota" (III, iv, 4; 104); and Fortunata's self-assessment in the mirror: "La tez era una preciosidad por su pureza mate y su transparencia y tono de marfil recién labrado; la boca, un poco grande, pero fresca [...] 'los dientes [...] como pedacitos de leche cuajada [...] lo mejor que tengo es el entrecejo'" (II, ii, 7; 506).

[9] When Juanito takes up with Aurora, his new preference is noteworthy, for she is "de esas que a un color anémico unen cierta robustez fofa y lozanía de carnes incoloras. Su pecho era desproporcionadamente abultado, su cuello corto, las caderas y el talle bien torneados, y las costuras de las mangas parecían próximas a reventar por causa de la gordura creciente de los brazos. La cabeza era bonita, de poco pelo y muy bien arreglada" (IV, i, 4; 288). The motif of breasts in this novel takes a varied vocabulary that demonstrates Galdós's frankness when he chooses: "los que chupan el seno de sus madres" (I, vi, 3; 251); "sentía sobre su seno un contacto caliente y una boca que la chupaba" (I, viii, 2; 289); "la mano en el pecho [...] cabezadas contra el seno" (I, viii, 2; 290); "aquel busto estatuario" (I, xi, 1; 433); Lupe's "arrogante busto" (II, ii, 9; 519); "el busto era hermoso, aunque ..." (II, iii, 5; 532); "A doña Lupe le faltaba un pecho, por amputación" (II, iii, 5; 540); Fortunata sucks an orange after fighting with Jacinta: "apretándola como aprietan los chicos la teta" (III, vi, 6; 211); "el pecho de algodón" (IV, i, 6; 301); "chillidos del heredero [...] que estaba pidiendo la teta" (IV, vi, 2; 456); "en pechos de nodriza" (IV, vi, 11; 506); "el hijito pidió y tomó el pecho" (IV, vi, 12; 516); "apencó con la teta artificial" (IV, vi, 13; 517). A comparably frank allusiveness does not exist for Fortunata.

[10] In her own subsequent words, "que conste [...] que una servidora es la madre del heredero, y que sin una servidora no tendrían nieto. Ésta es mi idea, la idea que vengo criando aquí, desde hace tantísimo tiempo, empollándola hasta que ha salido, como sale el pajarito del cascarón" (IV, vi, 2; 455).

[11] It is then that she declares "Una gran idea; verás. Le voy a proponer un trato a tu mujer. [...] Yo le cedo a ella un hijo tuyo y ella me cede a mí su marido" (II, vii, 7; 695).

[12] In Chamberlin's view, Galdós "understood well the important role that libidinal drives and carnal appetites play in the human life cycle." His understanding of psycho-sexual force "presented through a sustained use of the double entendre inherent in the word *carne* and carnal appetites" enriches many characters ("A Further Consideration" 58-59). This armchair shorthand obscures the distinction that Freud makes between sexual instinct and the instinct to eat. Freud importantly conceives the libido on an analogy with hunger, both instincts originating at the maternal breast: "the child brings along into the world germs of sexual activity and [...] even while taking nourishment, it at the same time also enjoys a sexual gratification which it then seeks again to procure for itself through the familiar activity of 'thumbsucking'" ("The Transformation" 621). Also: "The fact of sexual need in man and animal is expressed in biology by the assumption of a 'sexual instinct.' This instinct is made analogous to the instinct of taking nourishment, and to hunger. The sexual expression corresponding to hunger not being found colloquially, science uses the expression, 'libido'" ("The Sexual Aberrations" 553). And finally: "Let

me [...] introduce the concept of 'libido.' On the exact analogy of 'hunger,' we use 'libido' as the name of the force (in this case that of the sexual instinct, as in the case of hunger that of the nutritive instinct) by which the instinct manifests itself. [...] [W]hen children fall asleep after being sated at the breast, they show an expression of blissful satisfaction which will be repeated later in life after the experience of a sexual orgasm" (*The Complete Introductory Lectures* 313).

[13] King observes Juanito's attitude to be "life as a juicy meal," while Jacinta's story is one of "Hunger and Insatisfaction" (80, 82).

[14] Freud's only discussions of fire involve infantile anxieties related to bed-wetting and sensory impingements on sleep. Fire is not construed as passion (*The Interpretation* 5: 395, 509-10, 533-35, 570-71).

[15] There seems to be no discussion of appetite, food, or eating in either *The Interpretation of Dreams, Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex,* or *The Complete Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Hunger dreams are reported among children, and the concept of libido is drawn on the analogy with hunger, that is, traced to the instinct of taking nourishment. The infant enjoys sexual gratification when sated at the breast. To jump from these principles to the veal-chop image in Fortunata's dream without benefit of depth association is, as Freud repeatedly warned, to ignore the special nature of dream-thought transcription: "it is not a word-for-word or a sign-for-sign translation; nor is it a selection made according to fixed rules—as though one were to reproduce only the consonants in a word and to leave out the vowels; nor is it what might be described as a representative selection—one element being invariably chosen to take the place of several; it is something different and far more complicated" (*The Complete Introductory Lectures* 173).

[16] Apopos of Jacinta's dream, Gilman observes that "the obsessive role played by breasts and nursing in [Galdós's] presentation of the feminine consciousness [...] constitutes the foundation of the whole" ("Feminine" 64).

[17] John Sinnigen believes that "hay un movimiento desde lo masculino hacia lo feminino," whereby Part I is a "historia masculina de la burguesía y de cómo el dominio de la mercancía estaba separando las clases medias del pueblo, la cuarta parte es la historia de Fortunata [...] y su generosidad permite un nuevo compañerismo con la burguesía que había sido su enemigo." Parallel to the collective level of optimistic closure, the individual level reveals an equally favoured Fortunata, who has a "sueño lleno de imágenes fálicas en el cual realiza su deseo de encontrar a Juanito arruinado para que ella pueda mantenerle [...]. El sueño afirma el poder de la mujer, los papeles se han trastocado y la parte activa es femenina" ("Sexo" 66, 63). As for idealization, Pedro Ortiz Armengol sees her as a highly cultivated courtesan when Maxi proposes to redeem and marry her: "hetaira sorprendida y maravillada, que no entiende nada" (320).

[18] Zahareas modulates Fortunata's violence so as to advance his thesis that her death is a tragedy more important to the novel than her much evoked angelic condition: "a sus inclinaciones apasionadas y a su aparente falta de inhibiciones, ella misma contrapone un deseo auténtico de paz, orden y dignidad [...]. Un bien vital simplemente anula el otro. Su carencia de inhibiciones no le deja hacer en el teatro de la sociedad un papel decente" (116).

[19] A typical summary is that of Ortiz Armengol: Fortunata "es hermosa, inculta en grado sumo, crédula y sin recovecos, rápida en entregarse, generosa. A lo largo de su vida Galdós pondrá en ella dos virtudes que nos llaman la atención: su amor al trabajo y su deseo de aprender y de refinarse. Lo que significa que Galdós veía así al arquetipo de mujer española" (31).

[20] Ballester cannot give particulars of Fortunata's allurement because he does not understand it himself: "¡calcule usted qué atracción ejercía sobre mí! Me tengo por hombre de seso, y sin embargo, yo me iba derecho al abismo. Tenía para mí esa mujer un poder sugestivo que no puedo explicarle; se me metió en la cabeza la idea de que era un ángel, sí, ángel disfrazado, como si dijéramos, vestido de máscara para espantar a los tontos, y no me habrían arrancado esta idea todos los sabios del mundo" (IV, vi, 16; 536). His earlier effusion over her beauty while she sleeps, influenced by his medicine, is an ambivalent muddle: "He aquí una mujer que hoy no vale nada moralmente, y que valdría mucho, si reventara ese maldito

Santa Cruz, que la tiene *sugestionada* ...¡Lástima de corazón echado a los perros ...!" (IV, vi, 10; 500). Peter Goldman affirms in a footnote that "La Fortunata de Ballester, del lector y de Galdós es, de veras, 'honrada y honesta.'" As for Maxi, Goldman dismisses his opinion ("no vale") while upholding Ballester's with reservation, namely that Fortunata is "un ángel *a su manera*. [...] Si era de veras un ángel, era también ángel exterminador [...] [con] poderes peligrosos" ("El trabajo digestivo" 309-10). Goldman's remarks about the dangerous drug personified in Fortunata ("Feijoo and the Failed Revolution") are elaborated by Estrella Molina (111,113).

[21] Jacinta is ambivalent about her own admiration because she recognizes its moral deficiency despite her indignant sense of vindication: "'lo que hizo ayer me parece muy bien hecho. Dios me perdone esta barbaridad que voy a decir: creo que con la justiciada de ayer, esa picarona ha redimido parte de sus culpas. Ella será todo lo mala que se quiera; pero valiente lo es. Todas debemos hacer lo mismo.' La santa no respondió, porque dentro de la iglesia no gustaba de tratar ciertos asuntos de reconocida profanidad; pero cuando salían [...] tomó el brazo de su amiguita, diciéndole: —Bueno estuvo el lance, bueno. ¡Qué par de alhajas!" (IV, vi, 10; 504). Later, Guillermina learns about Aurora's slander of Jacinta, and when asked by Fortunata "'¿no merecía el morrazo que le di con la llave por afrentar a nuestra amiguita? ... ¿No lo merecía? Claro que sí.' Guillermina estaba confusa; no sabía si aprobar o desaprobar" (IV, vi, 11; 510).

[22] "Usted no puede figurarse lo mala que es—con la mayor buena fe—. Aquí donde usted me ve, *yo*, al lado de ella, soy un ángel. — Lo creo—sonriendo. No nos ocupemos de esas miserias. ... ¡Jacinta faltar!" (IV, vi, 11; 510).

[23] The existence of sexual relations between Feijoo and Fortunata is an issue for a different study. As for Maxi, at one anguished moment he begs pitifully on his knees for his wife to tell him the truth about whether Juanito is her lover. Fortunata lies with "mentiras de esas que inspiran viva compasión al que las dice y consuelan poco al que las oye. Echábalas de sí como enfermera que administra la inútil medicina del agonizante." A little while later, "La compasión venció a la delincuente y se mostró tan afable aquella tarde y noche, que Maximiliano hubo de tranquilizarse" (II, vii, 9; 701).

[24] Fortunata's ambivalence about herself offers a profound study in the following double-edged self-analysis to Feijoo: "Perdone usted si hablo mal. Soy muy ordinaria. Es mi ser natural; y como a los que me querían afinar y hacerme honrada les di con su honradez en los hocicos... ¡Qué ingrata, ¿verdad? ¡Qué indecente he sido! Todo por querer más de lo que es debido, por querer como una leona" (III, vi, 1; 91).

[25] "En su primitivismo, ella no entendía de estas cosas [arrepentimientos, redención, purificación]. Su alma pagana sólo comprendía que el amor todo lo justifica" (234). As to her forgiving Juanito, the narrator says: "aquel perdón era de los fáciles, porque el amor andaba de por medio" (IV, vi, 14; 526).

[26] An important show of rational conscience occurs when Fortunata debates whether to ask Jacinta's pardon for "el intento que tuvo de arañarle la cara, ¡qué barbaridad!" "Empezó a prevalecer la afirmativa," but further conjecture persuades her that the lady would not deign to engage with her. This conclusion, plus her insistence that maternity alone legitimizes a marriage, maintains her psychological and social isolation.

[27] Condé's argument for a feminist consciousness in Galdós concedes that for Fortunata "the basis of adultery is distinct from Juanito's in view of the lack of a normal marital relationship with her legal husband, and her belief that in fact Juanito is her true husband in any case. This is, of course, a form of moral justification which Juanito cannot begin to profess" (141). Readers like Condé find in Fortunata positive qualities like "independence and *honradez*" (145) without making inquiry into the validity of the "belief" that motivates the one and sustains the other.

[28] In the mythical dimension studied by Víctor Fuentes, "salvaje" and "bárbaro" are construed as "arcaico," "primordial"— "la parte ahistórica" and positively vital (52, note 2). Blanco Aguinaga, linking Fortunata with the "pueblo," writes that "mucho se habla en la primera parte de la ignorancia y el salvajismo del pueblo," but he defines these terms as a lack of "education," which for him is the major issue ("Entrar" 63).

[29] On the unreliable narrator whom every *galdosista* has recognized to be a hindrance to knowing

Galdós's probable thoughts, Lisa Condé speaks of the "ambiguity of the total perspective. [...] [T]he degree of distancing and objectivity is not always easy to determine." Nevertheless, she adds that Galdós was "susceptible to the same prejudices and perhaps vested interests of his gender and class" (137).

[30] José Montesinos cites the narrator regarding the unreliable portrayals by Juanito to Jacinta: "'densas nubes de retórica y dialéctica, mimos, chistes y zaragatas,'" and adds, "mezcla de mentiras, verdades a medias, subterfugios, marrullerías, labia graciosa, que compone los discursos suasorios de Juanito" (222).

[31] Estrella Molina, in her modest reader's guide to the novel, emphasizes Galdós's attitude of "desdoblamiento" regarding Fortunata: "transmite una corriente de simpatía" and also "no vacila en aplicarle epítetos despectivos, aunque siempre a través del tamiz de una fina ironía" (74). There is no such irony, however, as will be seen.

[32] "Mientras comieron, Fortunata contemplaba a su marido, más que en la realidad, en sí misma, y de este examen surgía un tedio abrumador, y la antipatía de marras, pero tan agrandada, tanto, que ya no cabía más. Y la perversa no trató de combatir aquel sentimiento; se recreaba en él como en una monstruosidad que tiene algo de seductora" (II, vii, 7; 691). The narrator's adverse judgement is overdetermined by the metaphor "monstruosidad," an unlikely comparison for her. Having used "espectro" earlier for a haunting annoyance, she would not now intensify the same idea because the annoyance has become a pleasure, and one that is perverse in the narrator's eyes. The second example also shows a shifting register: "Ya estaba acordado que tendría plaza en el establecimiento. Aunque sus ausencias eran *seguras*, ambos criminales determinaron poner el nido más lejos. En tanto, Patricia hacía lo que le daba la gana" (II, vii, 7; 692). Here the lovers' point of view appears in "*seguras*," whereas the narrator's appears objectively in "criminales." This contrasts with the clearly subjective viewpoint of Juanito elsewhere: "se escurría gallardamente, dejando a salvo, hasta donde era posible en aquel criminal coloquio, la personalidad sagrada de su mujer" (II, vii, 7; 695). Then too, the narrator can find no terms other than "la chulita" and "la prójima" in the scene where Fortunata tearfully listens to Evaristo's emotional prediction of his forthcoming death (III, iv, 9). Finally, the best example of the narrator's impartial opinion contrasts directly with the focalized angelhood invented by Ballester and Maxi and accepted by critics. It is the disapproval italicized in contrasting extremes: "A Fortunata le repugnaba *la moral despótica de doña Lupe*, en la cual entreveía más soberbia que rectitud [...]. No se conformaba esto con *las ideas absolutas de la joven criminal.* Ella quería para sus actos la absolución completa o la completa condenación" (IV, i, 6; 299).

[33] Peter Bly notices that Galdós likens Fortunata's voice to a sharp weapon: "Su chillido 'Yiá voy' es como el sonido de 'una hoja de acero al deslizarse sobre otra' (p. 41). El símil contribuye a reforzar la imagen central del número 11 como un castillo de leyendas, tal vez sugiriendo un duelo entre caballeros por el amor de Fortunata, mas las idea de la muerte es inherente a la comparación" ("Fortunata" 106). As the voice-weapon is Fortunata's, logic does not allow her to be a bystander in any duel. More to the point is the murderous allusion, which conforms with her intentions toward Aurora. Indeed, Bly interprets the building in terms of a slaughterhouse or temple of sacrifice, although for another purpose.

[34] The improbable mixture of invective and religious allusion, despite several appropriate pauses, is contrived and out of character: "—Eso— para que vuelvas, so tunante, a meter tus dedos en el plato ajeno ... Embustera, timadora, comedianta, que eres capaz de engañar al Verbo Divino. ¡Lástima de agua del bautismo la que te echaron! Tramposa, chalana ... Te pateo la cara, aunque me deshonre las suelas de las botas" (IV, vi, 6; 480).

[35] Galdós suggests his intention to distance everyone from Fortunata's obsession by having Guillermina implicate a third party in her amusement. She calls to Ballester: "Entre usted si quiere divertirse, pues esto es una comedia. Su amiga de usted está por conquistar. ¡Qué ideas tiene! Por cierto que yo le voy a traer al Padre Nones. Tenemos que darle una limpia buena" (VI, vi, 11; 510). The clerical severity of this passage may, of course, put off many readers and send them to the heroine's side.

[36] Ribbans attempts to refute Goldman's thesis concerning "the failed revolution" ("Feijoo" 84). The "slight hold" of religion on Fortunata, despite the meditative moments in the convent, has also been pointed out by Whiston ("The Maturation" 76).

[37] Beyond these negative qualities stands the core factor that discredits Fortunata's redemption: her refusal to acknowledge Guillermina's order to renounce "aquel disparate de que el matrimonio, cuando no hay hijos, no vale. [...] [R]econozca usted que semejante idea era un error diabólico" (IV, vi, 14; 527). "Diabolical" or not, to renounce this principle would be to make the gift of her baby worthless.

[38] Galdós deliberately "separated his heroine from her wretched biography and amplified her as the creature of the consciousness of the other characters," argues Gilman. He notes that Fortunata's self-consciousness has no adequate language to express it, as indicated in the scene where she regards herself in a mirror. Gilman's point is that the "deeper intention of Galdós's reluctance to paint her portrait" is his turn against the naturalist novel and a return to the Cervantine novel of consciousness ("The Consciousness" 56-57). I accept this insight quite readily, but, contradictorily, it blocks the Freudian approached espoused by Gilman.

[39] "[U]na constante relación entre trama novelesca e historia nacional [...]. Esta relación cobra especial importancia en los cambios morales de los personajes, en los momentos en que su personalidad más íntima se halla sujeta a poderosas convulsiones interiores. En tales casos, la historia nacional muestra un parecido asombroso a las borrascas padecidas por el individuo dentro de su propia vida" (*Realidad* 130).

[40] On this staircase Fortunata first encounters her future lover early in Part I, and, at the end of Part IV, sit members of diverse social classes, Guillermina, Ballester, Maxi, Izquierdo, and Segunda, awaiting Fortunata on the steps in descending order. The staircase "sums up the four parts of the story, owned by Moreno-Isla, inherited by Guillermina, administered by Estupiñá and inhabited by Fortunata" (Turner 33).

[41] While agreeing with Gilman that "we should admire all the more Galdós's prescience in exploring what was at that time, at least in Spain, an absolutely unknown region" (*Galdós* 351), I side with Montesinos in his view that Fortunata's dreams "son de significación obvia. [...] [S]ueña con lo que quisiera tener" in contrast to the more complex ones in *Miau* or *Ángel Guerra* (271).

[42] I think of instances such as the comparison of waking thoughts with "las mutaciones de cuadros disolventes" (III, iv, 7; 121), or when "El trabajo de su cerebro era una calenturienta y dolorosa mezcla de las funciones del juicio y de la memoria, revolviéndose con desorden y alumbrándose unas a otras con aquella claridad de relámpago que a cada instante despedían" (IV, iii, 1; 368).

[43] Jung writes: "there are a great many 'average' dreams in which a definite structure can be perceived, not unlike that of a drama. For instance, the dream begins with a statement of place [...]. In the second phase comes the development of the plot [...]. The third phase brings the culmination of *peripeteia*. Here something decisive happens or something changes completely. [...] The fourth and last phase is the *lysis*, the solution or result produced by the dream-work" (80-81).

[44] Most of the case-history dreams interpreted by Freud are not submitted to a blatant method of object-into-symbol. To take a single instance, a dreamer reported a bicycle, a dog, sitting on a step, and grinning old ladies. Freud writes: "Symbols are of little help here" (*The Complete Introductory Lectures* 187).

[45] Freud deals specifically with the problem of "the exclusiveness of the claims of the day immediately preceding the dream." He inclines towards emphasizing the events of the "dream-day" with this proviso: "Dreams can select their material from any part of the dreamer's life, provided only that there is a train of thought linking the experience of the dream-day (the 'recent' impressions) with the earlier ones" (*The Interpretation* 4: 166, 169).

[46] Earlier in the week of the dream Fortunata had tearfully witnessed the removal of her dead friend, Mauricia, to the hearse. Later that day she and Guillermina visited a blacksmith's shop, chatting about high food prices along the way (III, vi, 11). One day before her dream she told Guillermina about meeting Juan in front of "una tienda donde hay tubos y llaves de agua ... Ni sé por qué me paré allí, pues ¿qué me importan a mí los tubos?" (III, vii, 3; 249). Moments later she suffered the traumatic encounter with Jacinta, and that evening she fell into a "penoso letargo." She was also feeling trapped in the apartment and spied on, as if in a jail, telling the inquisitive Lupe that she had shopped for fabric. The next day

"la embriaguez aquella" returned. She tied a bandage around her head, faking a migraine in order to be left alone, and fell asleep.

[47] Freud asks why "dreams have a preference for taking up unimportant details of waking life" and concludes that "our dream-thoughts are dominated by the same material that has occupied us during the day and we only bother to dream of things which have given us cause for reflection in the daytime" (*The Interpretation* 4: 174).

[48] For aquatic symbolism and the female psyche, Chamberlin relies on Gaston Bachelard's *L'Eau et les rêves* (Paris, 1942). Pedro Ortiz Armengol, however, is brief and blunt: "La tienda de tubos muestra un signo fálico; las llaves del paso del agua, también" (447).

[49] The motor was invented by Charles Algernon Parsons in 1884 (Ortiz Armengol 351).

[50] The "llaves" allusion has a double meaning in the frequently commented theme of freedom or its lack. Ortiz Armengol notes how important the key is in the final episodes, as a defensive weapon in Lupe's apartment when Fortunata hides from Maxi and as an offensive weapon to lock out Guillermina and others who want her baby when she is away (519). Keys are held by Sor Marcela in Part II, by Lupe, and finally by Fortunata in Part IV. Caudet notes that they "abren un proceso de autoconocimiento y liberación; abren las puertas de la autoafirmación, de la rebeldía y de la muerte" (I: 613, note 80).

[51] Peter Goldman does not find sexual symbolism in the fountain scene, which he contrasts with the cistern. In the former, "sí que [Fortunata] se veía o en una cisterna o en un abismo" and from then on she "está ascendiendo la escalera socio-económica de la vida." The cistern, however, coincides with music, so that Fortunata experiences "un arranque de éxtasis espiritual" ("Cada peldaño" 156). I do not believe that the text sustains this interpretation. For the full text and discussion, see section 8 of this study.

[52] Juan Pablo declares: "La anarquía absoluta produce el orden verdadero, el orden racional y propiamente humano. Las sociedades, claro, tienen sus edades como las personas: hay sociedades que están mamando, sociedades que andan a gatas, sociedades pollas, sociedades jóvenes, y por fin, las maduras y dueñas de sí; sociedades con barbas, en una palabra, y también con algunas canas" (III, i, 6; 42).

[53] Coincidentally, Montesinos observes: "En su primitivismo, ella no entendía de estas cosas [arrepentimientos, redención, purificación]. Su alma pagana sólo comprendía que el amor todo lo justifica" (234).

[54] Fortunata's monologue continues in another vein: "Pero no, no le guardo rencor; ahora que he ganado el pleito y está ella debajo, la perdono; yo soy así." This testimony to her mercurial character should be separated from the question of the world view that she affirms. Whether she is fundamentally virtuous or otherwise, she redefines the existing value system with an anarchic deliberation that threatens "civilization" as defined by the personages who employ the word.

[55] Ortiz Armengol (357) sees in "su aplastada cara japonesa" a Philippine with Malay features, capable of "poniendo una cara tan fea como la de esos fetiches monstruosos de las idolatrías malayas" (II, vi, 4; 620-21). While the narrator calls her "enana" (II, vi, 8; 636), Mauricia teases her tenderly: "Cojita graciosa, enanita remonona" (II, vi, 3; 615), and her tolerance when the nuns wish to dance must be remembered in relation to Fortunata's ambivalent impulse to dance in the dream.

[56] Another vignette, again focalized through Moreno, revels in unadorned gory detail: "un hombre cubierto de andrajos, y que andaba con un pie y una muleta; la otra pierna era un miembro repugnante, el muslo hinchado y cubierto de costras, el pie colgando, seco, informe y sanguinolento" (IV, ii, 3; 344).

[57] However appealing Moreno may be as a cosmopolite, his utterances make it appear that Fortunata's dwarf is ubiquitous: "este salvajismo es lo que me tiene a *mí* enfermo. No se puede vivir aquí" (IV, ii, 1; 332); "esta pícara raza [...] una falta de civilización" (IV, ii, 2; 337).

[58] Much to Juanito's distaste, his mistress likes plain food: "¡Ah, si viera usted lo furioso que se ponía cuando le decía yo que me gusta un guisado de falda y pechos como los que se comen en los bodegones! Pues nada; que tenía que esconderme para comer a mi gusto" (III, iv, 1; 94). As for the affair with Feijoo, the lovers allude only to "judías estofadas a estiló de taberna" and "guisotes y fritangas" (III, iv, 4; 104; 106).

[59] In a footnote, Gilman cites Mircea Eliade's comparison of psychoanalysis to the myth of "initiatory descents into hell" where "ghosts" and "monsters" are encountered (*The Sacred and the Profane* [New York, 1961] 208). The concept of hell as a terrifying place of punishment is incompatible with the unconscious, which banishes guilt and punishment. Whatever Eliade means by hell (nightmare? pain? chaos?), Gilman does not work out a detailed analogy beyond the quoted phrases, for he appears to suggest that Jacinta does not descend into her unconscious but into a "social hell," which negates Eliade's idea. As for Fortunata, "her own passion" is a hell. This may be true, insofar as she lives in mental anguish, but how can it be a descent into "the deeper truth of her own passion" if she already knows this truth all too painfully?

[60] For instance, Ortiz Armengol (449) informs us that the Plaza de Provincia is very near the Callejuela de la Fresa and the Plaza de Santa Cruz, a fact of historical interest but without visible relevance to the historical meaning of the novel.

[61] "La calle que ya conocemos y su rinconada del Fiel Contraste. Presenciamos escenas de [...] violencia más bien larvada" (Ortiz Armengol 449).

[62] Caudet observes that the Fiel Contraste "simboliza aquí la quimérica idea de un conseguido equilibrio social. Porque si Fortunata no puede ascender, se hace descender socialmente a Juanito. Así, sería posible la estabilidad de las relaciones amorosas entre Juanito/Fortunata. Pero, es evidente, sólo en la imaginación de Fortunata cabe una tal nivelación" (2: 357, note 105).

[63] This is not to deny that Fortunata is excluded from the theme: when she returns to Maxi, she adjusts well to peaceful life: "conociendo que el trabajo le ayudaba a sostenerse en aquel equilibrio, sin balances de dicha, pero también sin penas, el corazón adormecido y aplanado, como bajo la acción de un bálsamo emoliente" (III, v, 4; 169).

[64] En ninguna otra novela [...] han de aparecer, de una manera más sistemática e intensa, la fuerza y el dinamismo del transformismo social que constituye uno de los pilares fundamentales del realismo galdosiano. [...] [L]a realidad aparece en este mundo novelesco como una entidad que se halla en perpetuo movimiento, y que se desplaza constantemente hacia nuevas concreciones. [...] [L]os objetos que nos rodean, como el medio en que se mueven los personajes, las instituciones sociales que encauzan el conglomerado social [...] y aun las mismas biografías individuales, se ven sujetos al ritmo del cambio de la transformación. Tal movimiento de interno dinamismo se halla acentuado, además, por la relación estrecha que existe entre la vida nacional y la vida particular, dentro del perpetuo fluir de la realidad histórica" (Correa *Realidad*, 132).

[65] The English equivalents are "hand organ," "crank organ," "hurdy-gurdy," "barrel-organ," "melodeon," "and harmonium." While these instruments range in melodic power from modest to humble, they all produce music by the action of a revolving cylinder studded with pegs on a series of valves that admit air from a bellows to a set of pipes. Galdós elects the spelling "armonium" instead of the common "armonio," in keeping with the cloistered setting when the nuns lull Mauricia with "un *armonium*" playing "unos ritonellos muy cursis" and "inocentes romanzas" (II, vi, 8; 639). The nuns' instrument functions by means of bellows pumped by the feet.

[66] Guillermina disperses musicians with "un condenado pianito, tocando jotas" that is heard receding down the street: "el piano tuvo que salir pitando, y sus arpegios y trinos se oían después perdidos y revueltos, como si alguien estuviera barriendo sus notas por la calle de Toledo abajo" (III, vi, 3; 188). Elsewhere, in a cafe, Feijoo and Maxi listen as "sonó el piano [...] y empezó la tocata, que era de piano y violín. La música, los aplausos, las voces y el murmullo constante del café formaban un run-rún tan insoportable, que el buen D. Evaristo creyó que se le iba la cabeza" (III, iv, 8; 135-36). It is unclear whether this "piano" is like Olimpia's standard concert piano or is the same "piano" played by the blind man who joins Juan Pablo's tertulia and plays "piezas de ópera y de zarzuelas francesas como una máquina, con ejecución fácil, aunque incorrecta, sin gusto ni sentimiento" (III, i, 6; 41). This piano may be as primitive as the "pianito" heard by Fortunata in the streets, awake and dreaming.

[67] Chamberlin observes a rare departure from Galdós's adoption of Beethoven's structural plan in

Mauricia's death scene, which has no musical pattern that corresponds with the *Eroica*, for Galdós is aware that music is inappropriate (*Galdós and Beethoven* 84-85).

[68] When Feijoo asks if she likes "bailes de máscara," she replies that she did when alone in Barcelona, but less so later with Juan or a girlfriend because the mask made her face hot: "Pueblo nací y pueblo soy; quiero decir, ordinariota y salvaje" (III, iv, 1; 94).

[69] A less erotic Fortunata is difficult to imagine: "Gustábale calzarse en el pie derecho el grueso escobillón, y arrastrando el paño con el izquierdo, andar de un lado para otro en la vasta pieza, con paso de baile o de patinación, puesta la mano en la cintura y ejercitando en grata gimnasia todos los músculos hasta sudar copiosamente, ponerse la cara como un pavo y sentir unos dulcísimos retozos de alegría por todo el cuerpo" (II, vi, 1; 607).

[70] On rare occasions, the nuns were permitted to "bailar una chispita, con decencia se entiende, al son de aquellas músicas populares. ¡Cuántas memorias evocadas, cuántas sensaciones reverdecidas en aquellos poquitos compases y vueltas de las pobres reclusas! ¡Qué recuerdo tan vivo de las polkas bailadas con horteras en el salón de la Alhambra, de tarde, levantando mucho polvo del piso, las manos muy sudadas y chupando caramelos revenidos!" (II, vi, 4; 620).

[71] The passage continues with the same imagistic verve: "Estuvieron batiéndose con ferocidad, a distancia como de treinta pasos, tirándose de los pelos, dándose dentelladas y cayendo juntas en la mezcla inarmónica de sus propios sonidos. Al fin venció *Semíramis*, que resonaba orgullosa marcando sus nobles acentos, mientras se extinguían las notas de su rival, gimiendo cada vez más lejos, confundidas con el tumulto de la calle" (I, x, 3; 394).

[72] According to Ortiz Armengol, the operetta, "La Mascota," by Edmond Audran was a wild success at this time and became a classic in music halls until 1914: "En España se hizo popular muy pronto y se prodigó en pianolas y organillos" (282).

[73] Galdós's interpretations of *Semíramis* in 1865 give contradictory views of whether it depicts popular history. In an article on this opera he states: "no se busque en ella—en su batuta [de Rossini]—la tierna pasión de Bellini y Donizetti, que son los poetas de la música. Rossini tiene más del historiador que del poeta. La música [...] de *Semíramis* es la historia de un pueblo." "Su estilo es el de la tragedia griega. Elevación, afectos expresados con acentos ficticios, pero grandiosos; sencillez, cierta tranquilidad mezclada de pavor son sus principales caracteres." But in his article on *Guillermo Tell* in the same year, he refers to "la admirable trilogía formada por *Semíramis, Moisés* y *Otello*, es decir, la tragedia oriental antihistórica, heroica, bárbara, digámoslo así, el drama bíblico impregnado de religiosa grandeza, de sublimidad homérica" (Pérez Vidal 61, 64). Compare these views with the taste of the contemporary Bécquer: "[*Semíramis*] no ha satisfecho al público sino a medias [debido a su] falta de armonía en el conjunto [...]. [N]o logró entusiasmar al público por completo, parte, porque el abuso del género exclusivamente dramático de las modernas partituras ha hecho que le parezca insípido todo aquello en que predomina por igual, o quizá lleva ventaja lo que es puramente arte, y causa maravilla a lo que es sentimiento y conmueve" (1157-58).

[74] Ortiz Armengol believes that it is no accident that "en un momento grave de la acción" when Jacinta hopes to find a son on the street at Christmas, she hears "un andante patético de 'Semíramis' contra la polca de la obrilla del bulevar." [...] "[Es] otro ejemplo de que todo lo que en la novela aparece es una cifra, una síntesis de la vida y los saberes de Galdós, que está volcándose en una obra que es resumen de todo lo que es y ha vivido" (280).

[75] In the convent, music played by "los flauteados de un harmonium tañido candorosamente [...] sonaba a zarzuela sentimental" (II, v, 1; 593-94).

[76] J. E. Cirlot (233) cites a number of nineteenth-century occult sources for these and other meanings.

[77] Numbers in the dream-thoughts "can serve as allusions to matter that cannot be represented in any other way. In this respect the dream-work treats numbers as a medium to express its purpose in precisely the same way as it treats any other idea, including proper names and speeches that occur recognizably as verbal presentations" (*The Interpretation* 5: 418).

[78] See Montesinos on Galdós's "tirade" explaining Spanish socialism: "La novela será la de una nueva generación hecha en el desorden." Apropos of historical events, Montesinos recounts "la inquietud cantonal, la paviada, el golpe de Sagunto, que van definiendo la temporalidad de la obra" (215).

[79] The simile of a blacksmith's forge describes the noisy passion of Madrid's cafe colloquy: "una atmósfera espesa y sofocante que se podía mascar, y un ensordecedor ruido de colmena; bulla y ambiente, que soportan sin molestia los madrileños, como los herreros el calor y estrépito de una fragua" (III, iv, 8; 132).

[80] No religious innuendo can be drawn from the rosary image, whose spatial nuance attracted Galdós enough to repeat the image in a landscaping passage where space plays a singular role: "El paisaje es ancho y hermoso [...]. Fortunata vio largo rosario de coches como culebra que avanzaba ondeando" (III, vii, 5; 260-61).

[81] Chamberlin writes: "Significantly, the dog and the skillet are tied to, but not integrated into, the vehicle. Because of Maxi's impotence, Fortunata has never really been integrated into normal married life" ("Eroticizing" 79).

[82] Julio Rodríguez-Puértolas uses the term "populacho" to refer to the "Lumpenproletariat" ("*Fortunata y Jacinta*" 47). He distinguishes opinions about the "pueblo" voiced directly by the author-narrator from those voiced by the characters. Most significant is the coincidental agreement of three characters and the author-narrator regarding the famous stone quarry comparison, which Rodríguez-Puértolas calls a well-intentioned mythifying populism ("*Fortunata y Jacinta*" 52-53).

[83] A curious exception to this terminology is the interchangeable use of "coche" and "berlina" when Fortunata travels to see Aurora and mulls over the latter's affair with Juanito (IV, vi, 6).

[84] Rodríguez-Puértolas asserts Galdós's scepticism about any social revolution or republicanism. The middle class triumphs, Fortunata is destroyed, her child is assimilated into the middle class: "lejos de ser el niño representación simbólica de una síntesis armónica, no es sino ejemplificación final del control de la burguesía sobre *el presente* y también sobre *el futuro* de altos y bajos." Rodríguez-Puértolas reminds us that "la avasalladora burguesía maneja también a otros niveles interiores [...] formados por elementos desclasados" like the victims, Estupiñá and Juan Pablo Rubín ("*Fortunata y Jacinta*" 58; 31-32).

[85] From the balcony Lupe observes: "qué multitud se va reuniendo. Como que los coches no pueden pasar . . . Y mira qué policías éstos. Ni para un remedio." The "gran corrillo, que a cada momento engrosaba más," remains. Fortunata, however, is otherwise perturbed: "se quitó del balcón porque le faltaba ánimo para presenciar tal espectáculo" (III, v, 3; 164).

[86] Caudet notes that the *cab* is the two-wheel vehicle known as a "cabriolet" or "cabriolé" (2: 345, note 49).

[87] The salesman demonstrates how hard the pencil-points are by punching them against wood. The conjunction of a phallic shape with "madera" would be inescapably sexual in a pertinent context. To Freud, the word "'wood' seems, from its linguistic connections, to stand, in general, for female 'material'" (*The Interpretation* 5: 355).

[88] Galdós uses another industrial invention as a metaphor to de-abstract: Lupe "limpiando súbitamente su espíritu de toda idea de independencia, como se limpia de sombras un farol cuando aparece dentro de él la llama del gas" (II, ii, 6; 504-05).

[89] Freud is interested in the somatic causes of dreams, and so he cites evidence of bladder pressure and hence the urinary stimulus in dreams. But here he relies on Otto Rank's belief that a sexual stimulus can "find satisfaction regressively in the infantile form of urethral erotism." He cites Rank on such equivalencies as "Water = urine = semen = amniotic fluid [...] to get wet = enuresis = copulation = pregnancy [...] rain = micturate = symbol of fertility" (*The Interpretation* 5: 403, note 1).

[90] A significant difference between López-Baralt's source and Freud's complete writings is evident: "It would, incidentally, be a mistake to expect that if we had a still profounder knowledge of dream symbolism (of the 'language of dreams') we could do without asking the dreamer for his associations to the dream and go back entirely to the technique of dream interpretation of antiquity. Quite apart from

individual symbols and oscillations in the use of universal ones, one can never tell whether any particular element in the content of a dream is to be interpreted symbolically or in its proper sense, and one can be certain that the *whole* content of a dream is not to be interpreted symbolically" (*On Dreams* 110). Freud affirms (emphasis added) that "there are *some* symbols which bear a single meaning *almost* universally: thus the Emperor and Empress (or the King and Queen) stand for the parents, rooms represent women and the entrances and exits represent female body openings. The *majority* of dream symbols serve to represent persons, parts of the body and activities invested with erotic interest; in particular, the genitals are represented by a number of often very surprising symbols, and the greatest variety of objects are employed to denote them symbolically. Sharp weapons, long and stiff objects, such as tree trunks and sticks, stand for the male genital; while cupboards, boxes, carriages or ovens may represent the uterus" (*On Dreams* 108-09). The equivalance of King and Queen with parents becomes (emphasis added) "*as a rule*"; "all elongated objects [...] *may* stand for the male organ"; "rooms are *usually* women." Freud concludes this section of Chapter 6 with the text that follows this note, above.

[91] López-Baralt argues that "Galdós insiste una y otra vez en estos símbolos de penetración para expresar el carácter erótico de la relación entre Fortunata y Juan," citing an earlier impression of his voice that "fue como si me entraran una aguja muy fina y muy fría" (III, vii, 3; 249). The banal fact is that similar images involving voice and glance appear in the novel. Fortunata reacts sharply to Mauricia's adulterous encouragements: "Al oírlas, un relámpago glacial le corría por todo el espinazo" (II, vi, 6; 632). When Feijoo momentarily repents of his indoctrination of Fortunata, "De improviso sintió como una vibración intensísima en su interior, y un relámpago a manera de lanceta fugaz atravesóle de parte a parte. Creyó que una desconocida lengua le gritaba" (III, iv, 10; 145). Finally, Fortunata's stare is so fixed that it is "como una espada, tan bien hundida que no la podía desclavar" (III, iv, 9; 141).

[92] Freud applies this principle specifically to the mnemonic images in question: "the intensities attaching to ideas can be completely transferred by the dream-work from one idea to another. [...]. [A]ll the logical relations belonging to the dream-thoughts disappear during the dream-activity or can only find expression with difficulty" (*The Interpretation* 5: 543). That is, the intensity of the elements of a dream are determined not only by wish-fulfilment but by condensation.

[93] "Incidentally, reversal, or turning a thing into its opposite, is one of the means of representation most favoured by the dream-work and one which is capable of employment in the most diverse directions. [...] [R]eversal is of quite special use as a help to the censorship, for it produces a mass of distortion in the material which is to be represented, and this has a positively paralysing effect, to begin with, on any attempt at understanding the dream. For that reason, if a dream obstinately declines to reveal its meaning, it is always worth while to see the effect of reversing some particular elements in its manifest content, after which the whole situation often becomes immediately clear" (*The Interpretation* 4: 327). Freud returns to the concept of reversal many times in his treatise.

[94] Resentment is Guillermina's reproach to Fortunata after the latter's confrontation with Jacinta: "si ya no hay nada absolutamente entre usted y el marido de mi amiga, si todo pasó, ¿por qué guardamos ese rencor a una persona que no nos hace ningún daño? [...] Es que usted, como si lo viera, conserva resentimientos y quizás pretensiones que son un gran pecado; es que usted no está curada de su enfermedad del ánimo; es que usted, si no tiene ahora trato con aquel sujeto, se halla dispuesta a volverlo a tener. Las cosas claritas" (III, vi, 10; 230).

[95] Mauricia dies on the feast day of San Isidro, clearly early in the week, because Guillermina arranges to meet Fortunata on Friday and tells her blacksmith that she expects to pick up some joining plates ("gatillos") on Thursday.

[96] See Kris 39. The classic examples of psychoanalysing an author through his work are Jones and Sharpe.

[97] There is no basis to doubt the truth of Fortunata's "volviendo a exaltarse y a tomar la expresión del anarquista que arroja la bomba explosiva para hacer saltar a los poderes de la tierra" (III, vii, 3; 250). Can there be *galdosistas* who believe that the author approved of this tactic? Preceding this mood is a moment

when "ya no estaba exaltada, sino en un grado de humildad lastimosa, y su tono era el de los penitentes muy afligidos" (III, vii, 3; 250) Here, the adjectives are judgementally neutral. But still earlier in the sequence, there appears another judgemental "exaltación insana" (III, vii, 2; 248). Then there is the narrator's antithetical pair of comparisons: "con la inspiración de un apóstol y la audacia criminal de un anarquista" (III, vii, 2; 247). Perhaps Galdós approved of apostolic inspiration, but criminal audacity?

WORKS CONSULTED

Aliverti, O. E. *"Fortunata y Jacinta": historia o novela.* Neuquen: Universidad Nacional de Comahue, 1979.

Arencibia, Yolanda y María del Prado Escobar. *Fortunata y Jacinta: claves de lectura.* La Laguna, Tenerife: Universidad Internacional de La Laguna, 1989.

Bécquer, Gustavo Adolfo. "Teatro Real." *Escenas de Madrid. Obras completas.* Madrid: Aguilar, 1954.

Blanco Aguinaga, Carlos. "Entrar por el aro: restauración del 'orden' y educación de Fortunata." *La historia y el texto literario. Tres novelas de Galdós.* Madrid: Nuestra Cultura, 1978. 49-94.

———. "'Having No Option.': The Restoration of Order and the Education of Fortunata." *Conflicting Realities.* Ed. Peter B. Goldman .13-38.

———. "On 'The Birth of Fortunata'." *Anales Galdosianos* 3 (1968): 13-24.

———. "On the Historical Determination of Galdós's Fiction." *Galdós.* Ed. Jo Labanyi. London: Longman, 1993. 199-217.

Bly, Peter A. "Fortunata y la Cava de San Miguel, Nº 11." Ed. Germán Gullón. *Fortunata y Jacinta.* 94-113.

———. *Galdós's Novel of the Historical Imagination: A Study of the Contemporary Novels.* Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1983.

———, ed. *Galdós y la historia.* Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1988.

———. "Ripples on the Pond: Interdependent Approaches to the Galdós Chapter." *Conflicting Realities.* Ed. Peter B. Goldman. 73-94.

———. *Vision and the Visual Arts in Galdós: A Study of the Novels and Newspaper Articles.* Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1986.

Brenner, Charles. *An Elementary Textbook of Psychoanalysis.* Revised and expanded edition. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1974.

Casalduero, Joaquín. *Vida y obra de Galdós (1843-1920).* Madrid: Gredos, 1961.

Caudet, Francisco. "Introducción." Benito Pérez Galdós. *Fortunata y Jacinta.* Madrid: Cátedra, 1983. 11-91.

———. "*Fortunata y Jacinta*: el 'naturalismo espiritual'." *Textos y contextos de Galdós.* Eds. John W. Kronik and Harriet Turner. 91-104.

Chamberlin, Vernon. "A Further Consideration of Carnal Appetites in *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Anales Galdosianos* 20:2 (1985): 51-59.

———. "Eroticizing Isidora's Traffic Jam in Fortunata's Dream (III, 7, 4)." *Rumbos* 13/14 (1995): 75-86.

———. *Galdós and Beethoven: "Fortunata y Jacinta." A Symphonic Novel.* London: Tamesis, 1977.

———. "Poor Maxi's Windmill: Aquatic Symbolism in '*Fortunata y Jacinta*'." *Hispanic Review* 50 (1982): 427-37.

Charnon-Deutsch, Lou. *Gender and Representation: Women in Spanish Realist Fiction.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1990.

Cirlot, J. E. *A Dictionary of Symbols.* 2nd ed. New York: Philosophical Library, 1971.

Condé, Lisa P. *Stages in the Development of a Feminist Consciousness in Pérez Galdós.* Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

Correa, Gustavo. "La presencia del bien y del mal en *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *El simbolismo*

religioso en las novelas de Pérez Galdós. Madrid: Gredos, 1962. 96-117.

———. *Realidad, ficción y símbolo en las novelas de Pérez Galdós.* Madrid: Gredos, 1977.

Dendle, Brian. *Galdós: The Mature Thought.* Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1980.

Elizalde, Ignacio. *Pérez Galdós y su novelística.* Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 1981.

Engler, Kay. "Notes on the Narrative Structure of *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Symposium* 24 (1970): 111-27.

Eoff, Sherman H. *The Novels of Pérez Galdós: The Concept of Life as Dynamic Process.* Saint Louis: Washington University, 1954.

———. "The Treatment of Individual Personality in *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Hispanic Review* 17 (1949): 269-89.

Estébanez Calderón, Demetrio. "Naturaleza y sociedad: claves para una interpretación de *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Textos y contextos de Galdós.* Eds. John W. Kronik and Harriet S. Turner. 81-90.

Freud, Sigmund. *Dora: An Analysis of a Case of Hysteria.* Ed. Philip Rieff. New York: Collier Books, 1963.

———. *On Dreams.* New York: Norton, 1952.

———. *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud.* Tr. and ed. A. A. Brill. New York: The Modern Library, 1938.

———. *The Complete Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis.* Tr. and ed. James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1966.

———. *The Interpretation of Dreams (1900-1901). The Standard Edition.* Eds. James Strachey and Anna Freud. Vols. 4, 5.

———. "The Sexual Aberrations." *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex. The Basic Writings.* 553-79.

———. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud.* Eds. James Strachey and Anna Freud. London: The Hogarth Press, 1953.

———. "The Transformation of Puberty." *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex. The Basic Writings.* 604-29.

Fuentes, Víctor. "La dimensión mítico-simbólica de Fortunata." *Anales Galdosianos* 22 (1987): 47-52.

Gillespie, Gerald. "Dreams and Galdós." *Anales Galdosianos* 1 (1966): 107-15.

Gilman, Stephen. "Feminine and Masculine Consciousness in *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Anales Galdosianos* 17 (1982): 63-70.

———. *Galdós and the Art of the European Novel: 1867-1887.* Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1981.

———. "The Birth of Fortunata." *Anales Galdosianos* 1 (1966): 71-83.

———. "The Consciousness of Fortunata." *Anales Galdosianos* 5 (1970): 55-66.

———. "The Spoken Word and *Fortunata y Jacinta* (1961)." *Galdós.* Ed. Jo Labanyi. London: Longman, 1993. 57-76.

Gold, Hazel. *The Reframing of Realism: Galdós and the Discourses of the Nineteenth-Century Spanish Novel.* Durham, North Carolina: Duke Univ. Press, 1993.

———. "Therapeutic Figures: The Body and Its Metaphors in *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *A Sesquicentennial Tribute.* Ed. Linda M. Willem. 72-87.

Goldman, Peter B. "'Cada peldaño tenía su historia': conciencia histórica y conciencia social en *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Galdós y la historia.* Ed. Peter A. Bly. 145-65.

———, ed. *Conflicting Realities: Four Readings of a Chapter by Pérez Galdós ("Fortunata y Jacinta", Part III, Chapter IV).* London: Tamesis, 1984.

———. "El trabajo digestivo del espíritu: sobre la estructura de *Fortunata y Jacinta* y la función de Segismundo Ballester." *Fortunata y Jacinta.* Ed. Germán Gullón. 299-310.

———. "Feijoo and the Failed Revolution: A Dialectical Inquiry into *Fortunata y Jacinta* and the Poetics of Ambiguity." *Conflicting Realities.* Ed. Peter B. Goldman. 95-145.

———. "O máquina buena o mujer mala: visión determinista y conciencia temporal en *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 21 (1987): 67-91.

Gullón, Germán, ed. *Fortunata y Jacinta.* Madrid: Taurus, 1986.

Gullón, Ricardo. *Galdós, novelista moderno.* Madrid: Taurus, 1987.

Hafter, Monroe. "Ironic Reprise in Galdós' Novels." *PMLA* 86 (1961): 233-39.

Hoddie, James H. "Need, Honor, and Romance

in *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Anales Galdosianos* 20: 2 (1985): 39-50.

Jones, Ernest. *Hamlet and Oedipus.* London: Gollancz, 1949.

Jung, C. J. *Dreams.* Ed. and tr. R.F.C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1974.

King, Sarah E. "Food Imagery in *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Anales Galdosianos* 18 (1983): 79-88.

Kris, Ernest. *Psychoanalytic Explorations in Art.* 1952. New York: Schocken, 1971.

Kronik, John W. "Galdosian Reflections: Feijoo and the Fabrication of Fortunata." *MLN* 97 (1982): 272-310.

———. "Narraciones interiores en *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Homenaje a Juan López-Morillas.* Eds. David A. Kossoff and José Amor y Vázquez. Madrid: Castalia, 1982. 275-91.

——— y Harriet S. Turner, eds. *Textos y contextos de Galdós. Actas del Simposio Centenario de "Fortunata y Jacinta".* Madrid: Castalia, 1994.

Labanyi, Jo. "Introduction." *Galdós.* London: Longman, 1993. 1-20.

———. "The Raw, the Cooked and the Indigestible in *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Romance Studies* 13 (1988): 55-66.

Lewis, T. E. "*Fortunata y Jacinta*: Galdós and the Production of the Literary Referent." *MLN* 96 (1981): 316-39.

López-Baralt, Mercedes. *La gestación de "Fortunata y Jacinta." Galdós y la novela como re-escritura.* Río Piedras, Puerto Rico: Huracán, 1992.

López-Landy, Ricardo. *El espacio novelesco en la obra de Galdós.* Madrid: Cultura Hispánica, 1979.

Malaret, Nicole. "El bestiario de *Miau.*" *Anales Galdosianos* 23 (1988): 47-55.

Menéndez Onrubia, Carmen. "Historia y familia en *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Textos y contextos de Galdós.* Eds. John W. Kronik and Harriet S. Turner. 105-14.

Molina, Estrella. *Fortunata y Jacinta.* Barcelona: Puntos Clave, 1987.

Montesinos, José F. *Galdós.* Vol. 2. Madrid: Castalia, 1969.

Ortiz Armengol, Pedro. *Apuntes para "Fortunata y Jacinta."* Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1987.

Penuel, Arnold M. "Galdós, Freud, and Humanistic Psychology." *Hispania* 55 (1972): 66-75.

Pérez Galdós, Benito. *Fortunata y Jacinta.* Ed. Francisco Caudet. 2 vols. Madrid: Cátedra, 1983.

———. *Fortunata and Jacinta.* Tr. Lester Clark. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1972.

———. *Fortunata and Jacinta.* Tr. Agnes Gullón. Athens: The Univ. of Georgia Press, 1986.

Pérez Vidal, José. *Galdós, crítico musical.* Madrid-Las Palmas: Patronato de la Casa de Colón, 1956.

Ribbans, Geoffrey. *Conflicts and Conciliations. The Evolution of Galdós's "Fortunata y Jacinta."* West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue Univ. Press, 1997.

———. "Contemporary History in the Structure and Characterization of *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Galdós Studies.* Ed. J. E. Varey. London: Tamesis, 1970. 90-113.

———. "Feijoo: Policeman, Inventor, Egotist, Failure?" *Anales Galdosianos* 22 (1987): 71-89.

———. *Pérez Galdós: Fortunata y Jacinta.* London: Grant & Cutler and Tamesis, 1977.

Rodgers, Eamonn. *From Enlightenment to Realism: The Novels of Galdós 1870-1887.* Dublin, 1987.

Rodríguez-Puértolas, Julio. "*Fortunata y Jacinta*: anatomía de una sociedad burguesa." *Galdós: burguesía y revolución.* Madrid: Turner, 1975. 13-59.

———. "'Quien manda, manda': la ley y el orden en *Fortunata y Jacinta.*" *Textos y contextos de Galdós.* Eds. John W. Kronik and Harriet Turner. 115-25.

Schimmel, R. "Algunos aspectos de la técnica de Galdós en la creación de Fortunata." *Archivum 17* (1957): 77-100.

Schraibman, Joseph. *Dreams in the Novels of Galdós.* New York: Hispanic Institute, 1960.

———. "Los sueños en *Fortunata y Jacinta*'." *Benito Pérez Galdós.* Ed. Douglass M. Rogers. Madrid: Taurus, 1973. 161-68.

Sharpe, Ella. "From *King Lear* to the *Tempest.*" *Collected Papers on Psycho-Analysis.* London:

The Hogarth Press, 1950.

Shoemaker, William H. *The Novelistic Art of Galdós*. 2 vols. Valencia: Albatros/ Hispanófila, 1980.

Sinnigen, John H. "Individual, Class and Society in *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Galdós*. Ed. Jo Labanyi. 116-39.

———. "Sexo y clase social en *Fortunata y Jacinta*: opresión, represión, expresión." *Anales Galdosianos* 22 (1987): 53-70.

Tarrío, Ángel. *Lectura semiológica de "Fortunata y Jacinta."* Las Palmas: Excmo. Cabildo Insular de Gran Canaria, 1982.

Toscano Liria, Teresa. *Retórica e ideología de la Generación de 1868 en la obra de Galdós*. Madrid: Pliegos, 1993.

Tsuchiya, Akiko. *Images of the Sign: Semiotic Consciousness in the Novels of Benito Pérez Galdós*. Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1990.

———. "'Las Micaelas por fuera y por dentro': Discipline and Resistance in *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *A Sesquicentennial Tribute*. Ed. Linda M. Willem. 56-71.

Turner, Harriet. *Benito Pérez Galdós. Fortunata and Jacinta*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992.

Ullman, Joan C., and George H. Allison. "Galdós as Psychiatrist in *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Anales Galdosianos* 9 (1974): 9-36.

Vilarós, Teresa M. *Galdós: invención de la mujer y poética de la sexualidad. Lectura parcial de "Fortunata y Jacinta."* Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno, 1995.

Weber, Robert J., ed. *Galdós Studies II*. London: Tamesis, 1972.

Whiston, James. "Determinism and Freedom in *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 57 (1980): 113-27.

———. "The Maturation of Life: Religion in *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Anales Galdosianos* 14 (1979): 65-81.

Willem, Linda M., ed. *A Sesquicentennial Tribute to Galdós 1843-1993*. Newark, Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta, 1993.

Zahareas, Anthony. "El sentido trágico de *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Fortunata y Jacinta*. Ed. Germán Gullón. 114-29.

RESEÑAS-ARTÍCULOS

CHOICES AND CONSEQUENCES: REFOCUSSING THE DEBATE ON THE MEANING OF *FORTUNATA Y JACINTA*

Peter A. Bly

In a period of four years Geoffrey Ribbans has published two extensive monographs on Galdós, a feat that is all the more noteworthy because of his official retirement from active academic service this year. When most scholars in his situation would have been content to rest on their laurels, Ribbans has continued to write studies that attest to the continuing vitality and relevance of his ideas. The second of these two books, *Conflicts and Conciliations: The Evolution of Galdós's "Fortunata y Jacinta"* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue Univ. Press, 1997), pp. xv & 352, is, like its predecessor, a magnificent study, displaying all the virtues *galdosistas* have come to expect and admire from its author : impeccable scholarship in the sifting and evaluation of textual evidence, a descriptive and discursive style that is absorbing and elegant (apart from the redundant "in my view"), as well as managing to transmit an enormous amount of factual detail together with well-reasoned commentary, emotionally seasoned, on the odd occasion, as when, in discussing Juanito Santa Cruz's view of "pueblo" morality, he exclaims: "about individual moral standards he is a fine one to talk!" (153).

Undoubtedly destined to become the authoritative study on Galdós's masterpiece for years to come, Ribbans's book is quite unlike previous monographs on this novel. First, it has an ampleness of space in which to develop at leisure ideas that was not available, for example, to Harriet Turner. Whilst she tied her study exclusively to the text of *Fortunata y Jacinta*, Ribbans is able to roam wider with references to Galdós's other work, before and after the *"magnum opus,"* but not to the degree Stephen Gilman did in his 1981 book, whose principal aim was to trace the development of Galdós's narrative strategies through the years from the first novel, *La Fontana de Oro*, published in 1870, until their triumphant perfection seventeen years later in *Fortunata y Jacinta*. Ribbans does cover this ground, but in two brief pages (12-14) and with a different purpose: to establish Galdós's constant interest in formal experimentation. However, his monograph does resemble Gilman's in another way: basically, it is a re-writing of previously published articles and (unlike Gilman's) a book (1977), through, in the author's words, "a process of recycling which has left them all but unrecognizable" (x).

Yet there is much new material: the quotations are now taken from Francisco Caudet's standard edition of the novel; the intensive research on the novel during the last twenty years, especially by feminist critics, is duly incorporated, leading to some slight modifications of Ribbans's interpretations of certain episodes and characters. (For the obvious chronolgical reasons, Teresa Vilarós's Lacanian study and Paul Ilie's anti-Freudian monograph in this volume of *Anales Galdosianos* were not available.) As in his 1993 study of history in Galdós's fiction, Ribbans displays a new tendency to buttress textual analysis and documentation with apt references to the work (and terminology) of such literary theorists as Bakhtin, Genette and Iser, amongst others.

The most innovative feature of *Conflicts and Conciliations*, however, is its comprehensive examination of the evolution of the text of *Fortunata y Jacinta* through the five stages of composition: 1) the Alpha version (A), which, although it covers, schematically, the whole range of the novel, has many "cuartillas" missing, with varied treatment of the respective Parts; 2) the Beta manuscript (B), which was used for the galley proof; 3) discarded sheets from earlier versions of the Beta text, labelled C by Ribbans; 4) the galley proof (G); 5) the printed text (P). Other scholars have examined this material in varying degrees before (Caudet, Entenza de Solare, Fernández Sein, Hyman, López-Baralt and Whiston, amongst others), but none as comprehensively as Ribbans does in his new book, whose aim is not to treat all these versions in isolation "but, as part of the process of reaching out toward the coherent definitive text" (ix). Hence the constant desire to indicate the respective variants as he discusses the major elements of the novel. The former, skilfully marshalled and coordinated, are inserted into the main body of the study as well as into more than 450 notes (not all totally justifiable, e.g. note 53 [295], on Galdós's Latin teacher at university) that are to be found in the 67 pages of supplementary material. Simultaneous consultation of the latter requires a constant flicking of pages back and forth that does not make for a fluent read. Nevertheless, the various correlations are fascinating and indispensable to Ribbans's fundamental purpose. Typographical errors are few, although more prevalent towards the end of the study, the most egregious being the spelling of the Aransis family name from *La desheredada* ("Asensis," 34).

One immediate question raised by the content and format of this book is the identity of the target audience, especially in light of the statement made in the Preface that in the English-speaking world "Galdós has yet to make decisive inroads in the nonspecialized literary consciousness" (ix). How far this state of affairs is corrected by a book which does not provide English translations of the quotations and presupposes a very intimate knowledge of *Fortunata y Jacinta* as well as of other Galdós novels, is open to question. Certainly veteran *galdosistas* will be very familiar with the general lines of Ribbans's interpretation of the novel, as well as with the chronological details about the composition of *Fortunata y Jacinta*, the contemporary situation of narrative in Spain and Galdós's personal life and mature production (1-14). Nonetheless, even in such a short Introduction temporarily forgotten or unexpected snippets of information catch the eye: for instance, from an examination of the dating on the various Parts of the manuscripts and Galdós's personal correspondence (especially with Pereda and Alas), as well as of his journalistic articles for *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires at the same time, Ribbans demonstrates that the writing of Part III gave Galdós the most trouble. Equally surprising is the almost total lack of visibility the novel received in the contemporary press. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the prime beneficiaries of this study will be the novice joining the Order of *Galdosistas*, who will have at their disposal an exquisitely delicate instrument with which to diagnose their initial readings of the text.

* * *

The outline of Ribbans's second book on *Fortunata y Jacinta* follows closely that of his first, although the titles of chapters and sub-divisions have been slightly modified, if not always to illuminating effect: for example, Chapter One is now entitled "Structure," but the first half deals not with what one expects to be the structure of the novel, but its various stages of composition. Perhaps a pluralized title would have captured better the author's intention in this chapter. Somewhat similar confusion is created by the title of the final section of Chapter Two ("The Treatment of Time"), for that of Chapter Three, five pages on, is entitled "Time and Space." In fact, that final sub-section of Chapter Two would have been better placed in the Introduction or right at the beginning of Chapter One, for it offers a very lucid and concrete summary of the novel's plot. In its current position, it presents events and characters that already have been discussed in some detail as if they were being presented for the first time, a not infrequent occurrence, although Ribbans generally tries to forecast or cross-reference repetitions.

Chapter One of *Conflicts and Conciliations* lays the foundation for the subsequent chapters when it classifies the characters of the novel into principal, leading and secondary groups: the last has the important function of connecting the other two, with their different social and economic milieux (treated at length in Chapter Three and Chapter Four ["Characters in Family and Society"]). To represent the relationships of the principal and leading characters, Ribbans prefers a wedge-like triad structure to Ricardo Gullón's closed "triángulos cambiantes," sketching out a number of diagrams that he discusses at length in Chapter Five ("The Positivist-Idealist Dichotomy"), Chapter Six ("Frustrations and Accomodations") and Chapter Seven ("Fortunata"). With characteristic perceptiveness, Ribbans notes that, as well as never meeting the other aggrieved spouse in the novel—Jacinta—, Maxi does not figure prominently in these triad structures, because he has a largely independent devolopment of his own.

Chapter 2 ("Representation") presents a discussion of Galdós's narrative technique, with Ribbans using as his point of departure the metafictional discussion on form and content, or story and discourse, between Ponce and Segismundo on their way to Fortunata's burial. Ribbans argues persuasively that, by indicating at the end of the novel these differences of approach to the representation of Fortunata's life, Galdós is inviting the reader to meditate on—to use Wolfgang Iser's term—the "indeterminacy" of the text: a semiotic approach ignoring the context is as inadequate as a socio-historical interpretation that overlooks the structure. In a similar attempt to reconcile conflicting interpretative strategies, Ribbans stresses the need to see both metonymy (long associated with the Realist novel) and metaphor (more associated with modern literature) at work in *Fortunata y Jacinta*. Other implements in Galdós's narrative armoury are then briefly introduced for prolonged examination in subsequent chapters: summary and scene; spoken language, with allusions to Saussure's distinction between "la langue et la parole" and Bakhtin's theory of "heteroglossia"; free indirect style; dreams and the subsconscious; the narrative voice; the reliability of the narrator (aptly and usefully designated throughout the study as Mr. X), and the machinery of time treatment: ellipsis, pause, analepsis, paralipsis, prolepsis and non-closure.

The allusions to variants at other stages in the compositional process take on greater prominence in Chapter Three (perhaps, in other respects, the least revised and, therefore, the most instantly recognizable, of previous publications). Ribbans is adamant in his defence of the

relevance of the incorporation of historical material through its various manifestations: the recall of historical events by such characters as Estupiñá and Isabel Cordero; physical resemblances to historical characters; the intertwining of contemporary political events with the strands of the plot. The use of Madrid and Spanish topogarphy is also charted at length.

If Ribbans appears to be over-indulgent in his analysis of minute historical and sociological details, it is precisely because Galdós, extremely careful with their incorporation in the novel, forces the conscientious reader to respond in kind. This is particularly noticeable in the novelist's use of financial details when presenting the various representatives of the social classes in *Restoration Spain, the subject of Chapter Four. Rejecting Blanco Aguinaga's notion of a class* conflict in Galdós's presentation of Restoration Spain, Ribbans reckons that the novelist was more interested in painting a society "in a state of perpetual fluidity, with a constant jockeying for position among its constituent parts" (123). In a novel principally concerned with two married women, considerable attention is given to the lives of petty bougeois widows. Doña Lupe, for one, has a surprising amount of freedom for independent action, and in Aurora, Galdós may be charting—in social terms, at least—a new direction in job possibilities for single women. As far as the "pueblo" is concerned, they lack the sympathetic spokesman that the bourgeois have in Mr. X or Feijoo. Within this considerable social contextualization, Ribbans is able to sketch some penetrating psychological character studies, substantiating, in a number of instances, the findings of Turner. Of particular note is his assessment of the essential idleness of Juanito and the excitement he derives from illicit conduct, an assessment that is resumed in a memorable phrase: "he [Juanito Santa Cruz] is a Don Juan in miniature" (138).

Ribbans's most complete and successful character study—of Maxi—follows a discussion of the respective merits of the forces of social determinism and idealism at the beginning of Chapter Five. An adroit selection of variants from the A manuscript shows that Maxi did engage in some kind of sexual activity with Fortunata before marriage. By opting for a more ambiguous sexuality in the final P version, Galdós gave more credibility to Maxi's plans for the spiritual redemption of Fortunata. The failure of this attempt and Maxi's growing insanity are traced in the remainder of the chapter as Ribbans proceeds to justify the largely autonomous development of Maxi's story and its forceful presence at the end of the novel as a sign of the great importance Galdós attached to the idealistic impulse that Maxi, more than any other character, represented.

In Chapter Six the structure of Ribbans's book, not entirely satisfactory, perhaps, for some readers, emerges more clearly: picking up the threads of previous observations, he proceeds to analyse the three female figures who have such a decisive influence on Fortunata: Mauricia la Dura, Guillermina and Jacinta. The most impressive case study is that of Mauricia la Dura, who, like Maxi from amongst the principal characters, receives the most independent development of all the leading characters. Ribbans ably applies Bakhtin's theories to Mauricia's behaviour in the famous chapel scene in Las Micaelas when she tries to steal the Host: directing questions to an unidentified interlocutor is an example of "hidden dialogicality", whilst Mr X's condemnation of her at the same time as he reproduces her thoughts and words in free indirect style is an example of "double-voiced discourse." Ribbans is certainly more positive in his view of Mauricia than most critics, with the exception of Braun, whom he cites often, preferring to see beneath her blasphemy, uninhibited sexuality, and rebellious behaviour more spiritualistic,

idealistic urges. At the same time, she is a representative of all poor, downtrodden women as well as an example of the Mad Woman in the Attic syndrome.

Despite his warm embrace of recent feminist approaches to Galdós's fiction, Ribbans does not always accept their conclusions, as, for example, when he disagrees with Catharine Jagoe's view of Guillermina's role as an infraction of the "ángel del hogar" syndrome. For Ribbans "la santa" is indeed an exception to the rules of Restoration society, but she is to be admired, if not imitated. Yet his own previous and subsequent evaluation of her activities would suggest that "admiration" is not quite the right word. Indeed, like Mauricia, Guillermina is a confusing mixture of conformist and revolutionary attitudes that reflect internal impulses within Fortunata herself, as readers of *Fortunata y Jacinta* have long recognized. In all three women these antagonistic forces are symptomatic of a much deeper spiritual urge.

The third and probably most decisive influence on Fortunata is Jacinta, whose function in the Santa Cruz household and later relationship with Moreno-Isla are fundamental determinants in the development of her personality and her influence on Fortunata. Once more Ribbans perceptively points out the flaws in some feminist interpretations of the novel: Jacinta is not the typical "ángel del hogar," precisely because she has no legitimate children or the chance of having any. Ironically, both she and Fortunata long for the ideal of normal peaceful domesticity propagated by the "ángel del hogar" apologists. But in this desire they are thwarted by the patriarchal establishment of the Santa Cruzs and Rubíns, who are not concerned about heirs. The late development of Moreno-Isla's passion for Jacinta in Part IV, as well as providing Fortunata with another reason to be interested in her lover's wife, serves to give Jacinta's story solid support just when Fortunata's is overwhelming the narrative.

It is in Chapter Seven that all the threads of the preceding character and thematic studies are brought together in the detailed examination of Fortunata's development from a rather passive character, reliant on others and possessing a fatalistic view of events, into a liberated woman in charge of her own destiny at the beginning of Part IV. Her meditative stroll down the Calle de Santa Engracia towards the end of Part II is correctly viewed as an important turning-point in this development. Another climactic moment of self-assertion is reached in her two interviews with Guillermina, which Galdós had split off from a single confrontation in a discarded section of the Beta manuscript, labelled C3 by Ribbans.

The Conclusion of *Conflicts and Conciliations* (Chapter Eight) commences with a frustrated attempt to place Galdós in one of the three groups into which 19th-century Realist novelists can be classified, but, not surprisingly, Galdós can not be neatly pigeonholed into any of them, as he shares features with all, to a certain extent. Chance versus fate, the prominence of women, and narrative self-consciousness are the other topics that are all summarized before Ribbans delivers his verdict on the novel's unique presentation of a compassionate, ironic view of life.

* * *

As one of a number of modern students of the novel whose publications are most generously cited, the present writer would appear ungrateful and churlish if he were to label as flaws in Ribbans's thesis the following reservations, which are essentially slight differences of interpretation or emphasis, generated in fruitful, professional dialogue (as so often in the past) by Ribbans's most stimulating research.

In his on-going discussion of fate and chance in *Fortunata y Jacinta*, Ribbans seems to argue that, within the parameters of these two forces, Galdós posits the freedom of the individual to make certain choices of action, prompted by their idealistic urges, or—to continue the culinary metaphor so prominent in the novel—to select options from a menu, however poor and limited. And, of course, these choices have their inevitable consequences, whether logical or illogical, positive or negative. Such an eminently acceptable approach to the novel's basic operational assumptions could be better reflected in a change of title for the study: "Conflicts and Conciliations" (an adaptation itself of a chapter title in the 1977 Critical Guide, "Confrontations and Reconciliations") could be replaced by another pair of c-words: "Choices and Consequences." The choices that Fortunata, the novel's central character, makes are of crucial importance: at the general level, they control the direction of the story; for example, what would have happened if she had decided not to look out of the half-opened door to see who was climbing the staircase at No. 11, Cava de San Miguel, or if she had not transferred her baby to Jacinta before her death? In particular terms, these choices have important consequences for both her and many others. Is she aware of them, does she have to be? Unfortunately, at these two important junctures in her fictional existence, the narrator exercises his own options, by not filling in the full picture for the reader. More precisely, after the initial staircase encounter, we are not directly shown the beginning of the Fortunata and Juanito liaison, although we hear later from both separately its general line of development and immediate consequences. Who seduced whom after that initial meeting? There is every reason to believe that Fortunata is not averse to attracting the attention of men from a higher social order: particular attention is called to Juanito's fascination with her elegant footware, although Ribbans, unlike Goldman, does not enlarge upon this important detail. In an obviously unequal relationship that could never become permanent through marriage, the readers are not accorded the privilege of witnessing directly the exchanges between the two lovers so as to establish their respective responsibility for what ensues: of course, there is responsibility on both sides, but to the same degree? Much less problematic is the division of responsibility in the part of Fortunata's life that constitutes the core of the novel. The readers can judge for themselves who is to blame for what and when. The fickle Juanito toys with Fortunata when his fancy takes him and then abandons her. For her part, Fortunata can not resist his appeal, even though she is now a married woman, and succumbs. Each character is equally responsible for his and her actions, especially Fortunata when she conceives her "pícara idea". Despite its measured incubation, it is, in social terms, an entirely unrealistic plan, and, as Ribbans notes, on her deathbed is compared to alcohol. In fact, this obsession with Juanito had been characterized as a "borrachera" in the dream sequence examined by Ilie in this volume of *Anales Galdosianos* : "A la media hora le entró, como el día anterior, la embriaguez aquella, el desvanecimineto de las ideas, que se emborrachaban con tragos de dolor y se dormían" (III, vii, 4; 255). Coincidentally, in that same dream sequence, her perambulations across Madrid under the sway of "la pícara idea" are clearly presented as a

decision consciously made on her part, but without full cognizance of its reason: "allí duda si tirar hacia Pontejos, a donde la empuja su pícara idea, o correrse hacia la calle de Toledo. Opta por esta última dirección, sin saber por qué" (III, vii, 4; 256). The last sentence sums up perfectly Fortunata's attitude in the formulation and realization of her "pícara idea": she makes a decision on what to do of her own free will, yet the reasons for that choice seem, even for her, clouded in an alcoholic haze, to become denser as the action unfolds.

The readers are certainly front-seat spectators of Fortunata's last moments when she dictates to Estupiñá the letter in which she cedes the recently born infant to Jacinta. So there can be no room for doubt about what Fortunata says and does in her last moments of full consciousness. Or can there? The words she wants Estupiñá to write in the letter are subject to constant rectification and we never know whether Estupiñá has correctly transcribed them or, at best, represented her intentions (Bly). The nearest we come to an understanding of her real reasons for this act of sacrifice (totally impossible in the matter of her bequest of the bonds to Guillermina) is when she decides on the following wording: "Para que [Jacinta] se consuele de los tragos amargos que le hace pasar su marido, ahí le mando al verdadero *Pituso*" (IV, vi, 13; 521). These bland words hardly do justice to the force of conviction in her original "pícara idea," now suddenly transformed into a very different "idea": "Vaya, D. Plácido, prepárese: verá qué golpe... Se me ocurrió una idea, hace poco, cuando estaba sin habla, al punto que me entraba también la idea de mi muerte" (IV, vi, 13; 521). Fortunata's final choice is, therefore, for her, one made with total cognizance of its consequences and of her own responsibility for it. But for the reader, doubt lingers on after the novel's open ending, as it must, given what we are told about the motives, wisdom or indeed efficacy of this final act of autonomous action, especially with regard to its long-term consequences for other people. Ribbans's proposition that Fortunata is an angel in human terms, (if not in those of Christian theology or those of the "ángel del hogar" ideology), with her essential goodness vindicated, has, then, to be assessed in the light of the enigmatic nature of Fortunata's last lucid moments.

Ribbans, however, is determined to reconcile opposing interpretations of this dénouement, maintaining that Fortunata's final settlement establishes a "new balance between realistic and idealistic considerations" (282) for it shows that she is thinking of the interests of her baby, Jacinta's need for a child, the interests of the Santa Cruz dynasty and the maintenance of her new-found dignity. The result is a general infiltration of the "pueblo" into the bourgeosie, with a corresponding reassessment of values, regarding both patriarchal society and the situation of women. Yet Ribbans diminishes the force of his argument by later recognizing that Fortunata's "aburguesamiento," propounded by Blanco-Aguinaga and Goldman, is only "a stage in a process of assimilation—part of the 'dichosa reconciliación de las clases sociales'—which is steady, if limited and partial." If this social assimilation is limited and partial, or snail-like, to cite Ribbans's own favoured metaphor, how beneficial is it, then, in the long run and to whom? To the "pueblo," which is being slowly assimilated, individual by individual? Or to the bourgeoisie itself, revitalized and therefore made more prosperous by dint of the personal sacrifices of such "pueblo" women as Fortunata and Mauricia? If Ribbans does not deny the ending's tragic side nor is prepared to accept the novel as a work of gentle optimism, his view that the forces of altruism, though less powerful, are no less evident does not really amount to very much, since no final equilibrium or balance is achieved. What the novel ends on is a tilt toward the side of

the forces of conservatism in Restoration society, however regrettable and unfair that may seem to the unbiased reader. The idealism of Maxi and the altruism of Feijoo do deserve recognition, but in both cases, they are tragically flawed at important junctures by inevitably self-centred concerns.

In the "ironic view of life, inclining towards a wry, attenuated pessimism which does not eclipse an underlying vitalism" (282) that, for Ribbans, the novel offers the reader, the evaluation of Segismundo Ballester's role in the composition of this "chiaroscuro" picture is crucial. One may be inclined to accept that he is a unique example of completely unconditional love and friendship for Fortunata, but, on the other hand, her decease has conveniently avoided a breakdown of his fragile composure. Ribbans's second role for Segismundo—as a possible husband for Fortunata—is highly questionable, leading to some fanciful speculation about the suitability of such a union. Segismundo does stand as a mirror character to all of his predecessors as Fortunata's champion and defender, but surely the principal reason for Galdós's daring introduction of this new leading character in Part IV is that he needed an efficient, practical helper for Fortunata in the final phase of her odyssey, when her previous protectors had either abandoned her for good (Juanito) or were unable to help her for health reasons (Feijoo and Maxi). The final struggle with opposing forces, both natural and social, would have been unfairly weighted against her from the outset. Moreover, how accurate is it to claim that Segismundo's third and final role is to testify, "as a true and reliable witness who has full knowledge of her life and behavior, of the essential innocence of her character" (264)? Does Segismundo know all about Fortunata and her innermost thoughts, even the full extent of her "pícara idea"? María-Paz Yáñez is nearer the mark when she calls Segismundo a "lector incompleto" of Fortunata's story. Furthermore, Ribbans, although he goes to great lengths to emphasize how Segismundo reluctantly but realistically accepts that the passing of time will eventually obliterate Fortunata from his memory, fails to note the irony of this realization when the story of Fortunata, in far greater detail than even Segismundo could know, has been immortalized in the fiction that Mr X has assembled. This is even a surprising oversight for such a devotee of the arts as Segismundo, especially after his perceptive metafictional discussion with Ponce before Fortunata's funeral. For Ribbans, Segismundo "represents the most balanced outlook in the book. His mixture of unselfishness and pragmatism allows for both idealistic impulses and the practical continuation of life" (283). But what if Fortunata had not died? Would Segismundo have been able to control his natural impulses much longer?

The most serious objection to this view of the novel's balanced message, exemplified by Segismundo, derives from Mr X's final discharge of his narrative duty. Although Ribbans, prompted by Galdós's terse statement that "el estilo es mentira. La verdad mira y calla," (65), shows a proper awareness of the ability of all verbal constructs to confuse and deceive, giving rise to a constant use of irony that is subversive of the directly mimetic process, he lapses into an occasional loss of direction. When he adamantly affirms that Mr X's opinions have to be assessed in the light of his social prejudices and limitations, he is only half-stating the truth. The context of Mr. X's statements may well undermine the substance of his remarks, as, for example, when he pontificates on impulsive behaviour as Fortunata is considering assaulting the Santa Cruz house in Part III. Yet Mr X's "rather convoluted arguments" here (77) are not without some truth and can not be dismissed out of hand. Similarly, Mr X's use of such terms

as "la santa" and "la mona del Cielo" to refer to Guillermina and Jacinta respectively may reflect his class attitudes and reinforce social stereotyping, but he is not the only "dramatis persona" to employ these designations with some frequency, unless we incline to the view that even the choice of words by the fictional characters is a reflection of Mr X's social prejudices.

Yet, the essential narrative mode of the novel is ironic. As Diane Urey reminded us nearly two decades ago, readers have constantly to question the veracity of statements made by the omnipotent, if apparently not omniscient, Galdosian narrator in the light of what already has been read: interpretations have to be checked or rectified. Yet we can never be sure that any reading of the text is correct or complete, since the use of irony injects a shot of ambiguity that pervades the whole text. Hence when Ribbans declares: "I have no doubt that we are meant to view him [Feijoo], in human terms, in an essentially favourable light" (240), perhaps others would demur. Total certainty and definitive conclusions would seem to be precluded at any stage in *Fortunata y Jacinta* because of the use of irony. Mr. X is slotted directly into the fiction he narrates in order to sew the seeds of permanent doubt in the minds of Galdós's readers.

In this context, Mr. X's update at narrative time, i.e. in 1885, on Barbarita and Baldomero II, inserted so early in the novel is very important for what it omits: any reference to the final condition of Jacinta, Juanito or Juan Evaristo. Naturally, any such reference is totally out of the question, because their story has not even started by the time Mr. X gives that example of prolepsis. Nonetheless, because the readers know that Mr. X is familiar with the state of the Santa Cruz family ten years after the events he has narrated, they wonder later how Juan Evaristo has been reared by the Santa Cruz family: has he been socially indoctrinated by his grandparents and parents? Has Jacinta, though motivated by impressive maternal affection, attended to his every whim, as the Pitusín débâcle seems to ominously forecast that she might? Are we to conclude from that single enigmatic prolepsis in Part 1 that patriarchalism, where the worm of corruption resides, is alive and well in the Santa Cruz household, as in the rest of Restoration Spain in the "años bobos," as Galdós later called them, of the eighties? If this is indeed the message to be read into Mr X's bewildering reticence at the end, to whom is the eloquence of Galdós's pro-feminist agenda in the rest of the novel to be directed? To contemporary male readers in the hope that they will change their life-style and attitudes to help the next generation of women—their daughters? That seems a rather far-fetched notion, conceivable but improbable, because Galdós, through Mr. X, has deliberately and discreetly shrouded the path to a total comprehension of his text with a veil of uncertainty and ambiguity, and there is nothing that the reader can do about the matter!

* * *

The essential originality of *Conflicts and Conciliations* lies in its systematic treatment of the various versions of the *Fortunata y Jacinta* text. Ribbans proves beyond all shadow of a doubt that Galdós was most attentive to improving his text at every stage of its production. Galdós's "modus operandi" in *Fortunata y Jacinta* as well as in other novels, as perceptively summarized by Entenza de Solare, seems to have been based on the need to produce in the first

instance the complete body of a text, albeit with some parts more developed than others, which he could keep on revising right up to the page-proof stage. Ribbans correctly concludes that the printed text (P)is undoubtedly superior to any of the intermediate versions, principally because the character of Fortunata is far more developed: if her staircase meeting with Juanito is not evident in A, her melodramatic suicide that terminates the same first version has been vastly modified. However, it is Ribbans's summation about the timing of these textual revisions that will undoubtedly catch the attention of all *galdosistas*, giving them much food for thought: "What is astonishing is the extent to which the novel's successes are the result of last-minute inspiration. Galdós seems to have possessed an intuitive capacity for determining the best solution in the nick of time" (269). A sobering thought, indeed!

Yet, for all the voyeuristic pleasure afforded by this kind of behind-the-scenes documentary in which the lens of Ribbans's paleographic camera leaves few details about the text's gestation unscanned, it is still the final form of that literary offspring, the princeps edition of 1886-87 (P), that must govern the readers' responses. Collating the variants in A, B, C and P does certainly illuminate the steps leading to the final version, but, paradoxically, at the same time it increases the complex and enigmatic texture of the novel. In the private inscription to a copy of his book that Geoffrey Ribbans sent, with typical generosity, to the present writer, he modestly referred to it as "one more exhaustive study of an inexhaustible text." *Galdosistas* will unreservedly apply the second adjective to Ribbans's own study as well, for it is, insooth, an inexhaustible source of nourishing ideas. Comenting on the metafictional discussion between Ponce and Segismundo at the end of *Fortunata y Jacinta*, Ribbans asserts that "only the quality of the finished project is essential. Since food imagery is so prominent, with Galdós we may in truth say: 'the proof of the pudding is in the eating'" (278). This proverbial saying could be applied with equal justification to *Conflicts and Conciliations* for "nous avons très bien mangé chez toi ce soir, Geoffrey!"

Queen's University,
Kingston, Ontario

WORKS CITED

Blanco Aguinaga, Carlos. "Having No Option: The Restoration of Order and the Education of Fortunata." Peter B. Goldman, ed. *Conflicting Realities*. 13-38.

Bly, Peter A. "Give and Take: Ironic Verbal Echoes in the Last Chapter of *Fortunata y Jacinta*". *Crítica Hispánica* 13 (1991): 69-85.

Braun, Lucille V. "The Novelistic Function of Mauricia la Dura in Galdós' *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Symposium* 31 (1977): 277-89.

Caudet, Francisco, ed. Benito Pérez Galdós. *Fortunata y Jacinta*.. 2 vols. Madrid: Cátedra, 1983.

Entenza de Solare, Beatriz. "Manuscritos galdosianos." *Actas del Tercer Congreso Internacional de Estudios Galdosianos*. 2 vols. Las Palmas: Cabildo Insular de Gran Canaria, 1989. 1: 149-61.

Fernández Sein, Ana H. "Razones y sinrazones de un final: apuntes para la geometría de *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *La Torre* 2 (1988): 277-87.

Gilman, Stephen. *Galdós and the Art of the European Novel: 1867-1887*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1981.

Goldman, Peter B. Ed. *Conflicting Realities. Four Readings of a Chapter by Pérez Galdós ("Fortunata y Jacinta," Part III, Chapter IV)*. London: Tamesis, 1984.

———. "Feijoo and the Failed Revolution: A Dialectical Inquiry into *Fortunata y Jacinta* and the Poetics of Ambiguity." *Conflicting Realities*. 95-145.

Hyman, Diane Beth. "The *Fortunata y Jacinta* Manuscript of Benito Pérez Galdós." Diss. Harvard, 1972.

Jagoe, Catherine. "The Subversive Angel in *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Anales Galdosianos* 24 (1989): 79-91.

López-Baralt, Mercedes. "*Fortunata y Jacinta*: de la versión Alpha a la versión Beta del manuscrito galdosiano." *Anales Galdosianos* 22 (1987): 11-24.

Ribbans, Geoffrey. *History and Fiction in Galdós's Narratives*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

———. *Pérez Galdós: Fortunata y Jacinta. Critical Guides to Spanish Texts*, 21. London: Grant and Cutler, Tamesis, 1977. [Spanish translation in Geoffrey Ribbans and J. E. Varey. *Dos novelas de Galdós: Doña Perfecta y Fortunata y Jacinta (Guía de lectura)*. Madrid: Castalia, 1988.

Turner, Harriet S. *Benito Pérez Galdós: Fortunata y Jacinta*. Landmarks of World Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992.

Urey, Diane F. *Galdós and the Irony of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982.

Vilarós, Teresa M. *Galdós: invención de la mujer y poética de la sexualidad: lectura parcial de "Fortunata y Jacinta"*. Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1995.

Whiston, James. "Las pruebas corregidas de *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Actas del Segundo Congreso Internacional de Estudios Galdosianos*. 2 vols. Las Palmas: Cabildo Insular de Gran Canaria, 1978. 2: 258-65.

Yáñez, María-Paz. "Autores y lectores de un texto llamado *Fortunata*." *Actas de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*. 11. Ed. Juan Villegas. 5 vols. Irvine, California: Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas, 1994. 5: 252-63.

OPCIONES Y POSICIONES: A PROPÓSITO DEL REALISMO/NATURALISMO. UN LIBRO DE S. MILLER

Joan Oleza

La reseña del libro de Stephen Miller, *Del realismo/naturalismo al modernismo: Galdós, Zola, Revilla y Clarín (1870-1901)* (Las Palmas: Ediciones del Cabildo Insular de Gran Canaria, 1993), llega con bastante retraso a manos del lector, a pesar de lo diligentemente que me fue encomendada por el director de los *Anales*, así que pido mil excusas por este retraso que no tiene otro responsable que yo mismo, ni otra excusa que la de no dejar pasal el libro sin el comentario crítico que el esfuerzo de su autor se merece.

El libro tiene un inconfundible ademán de insistencia en tratos y temas ya abordados en el anterior del autor, *El mundo de Galdós*, que le precede en diez años, y que han vuelto a ponerse a prueba en el último Congreso Internacional Galdosiano, en el verano de 1997, por medio de la ponencia plenaria que Miller presentó bajo el título, "El fin de siglo y la búsqueda galdosiana de un paradigma vital." Lejos de ser obra de circunstancias pertenece a esa clase de libros que vuelven sobre planteamientos anteriores para afianzarlos y llevarlos un paso más álla, insertándose en un discurso que excede sus límites materiales y que en este caso aspira a explicarse la evolución cabal de una estética, la del realismo/naturalismo, que el autor bautiza como socio-mimética, y cuyo movimiento significativo persigue en la obra de Galdós y de Clarín, pues "a pesar de que se mencione a cuatro autores en el subtítulo [ellos] son el verdadero centro del libro" (19). Si se les incorpora los nombres de Revilla y de Zola es porque la labor crítica de Clarín se entiende mejor en continuidad con la de Revilla (20) y porque "Con Galdós, Zola es lugar de cita ineludible para entender a Clarín y, por consiguiente, su visión de los temas que interesan aquí" (21). En las páginas finales Miller recuerda y remacha esta advertencia: el libro tiene a "Galdós y Clarín como puntos principales de referencia y Manuel de la Revilla y Emilio Zola como complementos especialmente significativos" (205).

* * *

Si el núcleo de intereses del libro queda delimitado con precisión, una estética barajada a cuatro manos a lo largo de treinta años, no sucede lo mismo con el propósito que ha movido la escritura. En la "Introducción" se anuncia—no sin una cierta dosis de enigma—que es posible "que una manera de entender lo que se pretende en el presente libro es concebirlo como un extenso proceso de mediación entre estéticas y vigencias que no se llegaron a comprender." Una meditación que al autor se le antoja necesaria a la vista del repudio que noventayochistas, novecentistas—Ortega, pero también Ramón—y hasta algunos miembros de la generación de 27—Antonio Espina, Rosa Chacel—opusieron a la estética realista-naturalista y, en especial, a

Galdós. Para llevar a cabo esta mediación, Miller se propone "reconstruir en sus propios términos la [...] perspectiva realista/naturalista del fin de siglo, del tiempo en que se hizo vigente el amplio cambio cultural llamado modernismo" (14).

No se acaba de entender cómo puede llevarse a cabo una mediación entre dos estéticas, cuando no se va a estudiar más que una de ellas, y cuando se dejan de lado las abundantes y no siempre reconocidas continuidades entre la una y la otra, como en el caso particular de la influencia de Alas sobre Unamuno o sobre Azorín, o como en el más general del institucionismo, del krausismo, del positivismo sociológico, o—sobre todo—del pensamiento espiritualista europeo del fin de siglo. Pero S. Miller propone—en la práctica—sustituir ese posible estudio comparativo de posiciones por medio de una hipótesis, la de que puede postularse un común período histórico, que a todos abrazaría: "fundamental al presente estudio es una visión del modernismo que comprenda la Generación del 68, el fin de siglo, la Generación del 98 y la de 1914" (16). Es obvio que Miller se acoge a la citadísima definición del modernismo que Federico de Onís hizo en su *Antología de la poesía española e hispanoamericana* (1934) y a la abusiva utilización que algunos críticos han hecho del concepto de "Modernism" (Modernismo= "Modernism") para oponerse a la desfasada visión dualista del fin de siglo español (Modernismo "versus" Noventayocho). Pero si estos críticos (Gullón, Shaw, Cardwell, Butt) tienden con excesiva alegría a meter en un mismo saco—el de una concepción idealista de lo moderno—todo lo ocurrido en el período histórico "modernist" (del fin de siglo a las vanguardias, de Martí y Unamuno a Lorca y Vallejo), obviando la pluralidad de corrientes estéticas, de cánones literarios, las profundas contradicciones internas del pensamiento ético y estético de la modernidad—no se puede confundir a Hegel con Nietzsche: por muy antirrealista que sea el pensamiento de ambos, no entran en el mismo saco—, la perspectiva de Miller ensancha aun más el saco y hace entrar en él a los escritores de la Generación de 1868. Si a este saco ya muy lleno le añadimos que críticos como Cardwell o Shaw no pueden concebir el modernismo al margen de un amplio movimiento de la sensibilidad y de la conciencia modernas que se inicia con el romanticismo, y que otros, como Sebold, retrotraen el romanticismo al mismo siglo XVIII, nos podemos encontrar con que, sumando esfuerzos, hemos metido toda la modernidad (de 1770 a 1936, más o menos) dentro del saco modernista, con grave riesgo de descoserle las costuras. A mi modo de ver, mal puede servir un concepto histórico que comienza por anular lo que es más propio de la historia: sus cambios, sus transformaciones, sus diferencias. Foucault—tan citado por alguno de estos críticos, que no parece entenderlo del todo—, en aquel alegato contra la generalización del discurso histórico que fue *L'Archéologie du savoir*, se propuso formular una "teoría general de la discontinuidad" y declaró el propósito radical "de no descuidar ninguna forma de discontinuidad, de corte, de umbral o de límite." Más de un historiador haría bien en escucharlo.

S. Miller aduce en su apoyo bibliografía de G. Allegra, J. Blasco, R. Gutiérrez Girardot, o J. Macklin, quienes "han escrito en el mismo sentido que Onís" (16). "Evidentemente—comenta—esta visión del concepto favorece la perspectiva que aquí se ensaya." Y para afianzarla mejor, procede a elaborar una fórmula multigeneracional del modernismo, apoyándose en la idea orteguiana de vigencia generacional y en la contabilidad de Julián Marías: de quince en quince años hay que cambiar de generación. El resultado es que el modernismo de S. Miller abarca desde la generación de Valera-Pereda-Alarcón a la de Ortega-Juan Ramón-Pérez de Ayala, pasando por las de Galdós-Revilla, Clarín-Ortega Munilla, y Unamuno-Valle Inclán, de manera

que "los términos realismo/naturalismo, Generación del 68, Generación del 98, modernismo y fin de siglo corresponden a la realidad diversamente vivida y representada por nada menos que cinco generaciones" (17). En esta fórmula la generación de Clarín jugaría el papel de gozne (la tercera de cinco) y Clarín mismo aparecería con un relieve muy especial, el de propiciar posibles mediaciones entre unos y otros. El argumento se cierra con una lamentación: "Este hecho hará necesario especular sobre lo que significó la muerte prematura de Clarín por su posible papel, tristemente no desempeñado, de mantener más abiertas, más vivas las comunicaciones entre las generaciones que coincidieron en vivir las crisis múltiples del fin de siglo" (18).

Acorde con este plantamiento aparecerá una y otra vez, a lo largo del libro, un razonamiento con visos de doctrina: "Se apreciarán diferencias notables entre Galdós y Clarín que, precisamente, pueden derivarse del sistema de vigencias [generacionales] afín a cada uno. Diferencias que hacen que [Clarín] [...] no se conciba nunca como representante máximo de la Generación del 68, y que su nombre no suela aparecer en [...] [las] listas negras" (18). A medida que S. Miller se adentra en el estudio de la relación entre Galdós y Clarín, estas diferencias van concretándose y pueden inventariarse y describirse: se trata de una tendencia de Clarín hacia la marginalidad y el malditismo contrapuesta al popularismo galdosiano (113), de la mayor exigencia estilística y compositiva de Clarín—en la línea de Flaubert—frente al desarreglo galdosiano (151), pero sobre todo, del desinterés clariniano por el pasado histórico como materia novelable, tan opuesto al interés de Galdós, y de sus claras preferencias por una novela psicológica frente a las de Galdós por la sociomimética. "Esta preferencia por lo personal sobre lo social y lo histórico señala claramente las bases de la crisis modernista. Scott, Balzac, Dickens, Tolstoi, Galdós y Zola, todos, centran su obra más característica en lo socio-histórico. Proust, Joyce, Valle-Inclán, Mann, Hemingway, Faulkner, son, en cambio, cultivadores de mundos personales. [...] Clarín es escritor de transición. [...] [A]cepta a nivel teórico la mimética socio-histórica [—Dios nos ampare el oído—] del realismo/naturalismo, seguida por Galdós y Zola, aunque a nivel práctico—el de sus gustos particulares—, no" (107). A nivel práctico, se nos dice, Clarín prefiere *El amigo Manso* a *La desheredada*. "Lo que no puede ver todavía es que su gusto personal señala una nueva estética que va naciendo del gran cambio de supuestos culturales europeos" (107).

La formulación en forma de tesis de este razonamiento no se hará esperar: las divergencias entre Galdós y Clarín, que se incrementan con los años, obedecen a diferencias generacionales y anuncian en Clarín actitudes estéticas que se impondrán con el modernismo, en especial, su preferencia por un "arte más centrado en lo personal" y no por el "arte socio-histórico" (107). Estas divergencias se iniciarían con la reseña por Clarín de *Lo prohibido* y alcanzarían una zona caliente con la lectura recíproca de sus obras maestras: "ni Clarín ni Galdós llegan, al menos en esta época, a comprender bien la obra maestra del otro. [...] [A] partir de *La Regenta* y *Fortunata y Jacinta*, las trayectorias literarias de Galdós y Clarín se separan" (120). S. Miller cree ver *La Regenta*, a través de los ojos de Galdós, como un "desafío" al realismo/naturalismo en nombre de una poética psicologista de la novela, que expresaría su forma especial de reacción a la crisis modernista de fin de siglo. El Clarín posterior, el de "Cambio de luz" y el del prólogo de los *Cuentos morales*, se apartaría todavía más de "la visión realista/naturalista del mundo y de la estética socio-mimética" (169).

El razonamiento que conduce desde la conjugación multigeneracional entre realismo/naturalismo y modernismo, como fases de un mismo proceso histórico modernista, hasta la

exploración de las diferencias entre Galdós y Clarín como consecuencia de sus diferencias generacionales, pasando por la interpretación de la obra de Clarín como factor de mediación entre realistas y modernistas, no puede dejar de resultar polémico.

En primer lugar, porque resultaría de casi imposible consenso, entre la crítica especializada, la asimilación del realismo/naturalismo al modernismo, por laxa que sea la concepción que se tenga de este último. De entre los estudiosos citados por S. Miller en su apoyo ninguno aceptaría tal posibilidad, ni siquiera como suposición. El mismo Rafael Gutiérrez Girardot, tal vez quien más ensancha los límites de su aproximación, al estudiar en el modernismo fenómenos que sobrepasan su cronología, y que se incriben en el proceso mismo de la modernidad, como el antagonismo burgués/artista, la pérdida de función social del arte, la secularización de la cultura, la influencia de la vida urbana, la constitución social de la inteligencia o el significado de la bohemia, se cuida muy mucho de confundir los planteamientos de unos y de otros, por más que extraiga datos de la obra de Galdós o de la de Valera, el menos "socio-mimético" de todos los escritores de la Restauración. Y si, en lugar de acudir a R. Gutiérrez Girardot, acudimos a R. Gullón, R. Cardwell, F. J. Blasco, J. Macklin, G. Allegra, o a cualquier otro de los estudiosos que se han apoyado—más o menos críticamente—en las tesis de Federico de Onís o de Juan Ramón Jiménez para erradicar la visión dualista del fin de siglo español, entonces, encontraremos una posición unánime—por encima de las muchas diferencias y matices que les separan—en apoyo de un modernismo contemplado en toda su amplitud (bien como "Modernism," bien como fase española del simbolismo-decadentismo europeo) y cuyo rasgo más global, más articulador más cohesionador, sería, precisamente, su radical rechazo de la estética realista/naturalista En la bibliografía crítica de los últimos treinta años, cuanto más se extiende el concepto de modernismo, tanto más se intensifica su médula antirrealista. Para no poner sino un par de ejemplos, los extraigo del reciente colectivo, editado por R. Cardwell y B. McGuirk, bajo el título, *¿Qué es el modernismo? Nueva encuesta, nuevas lecturas* (1993), obra muy representativa de las posiciones a que estoy haciendo referencia. Escribe John Butt ("Modernismo y *Modernism,*" 40-41): "Con el paso de los años, el carácter *Modernist* de la literatura española del período 1895-1936 se hace cada vez más perceptible. La literatura castellana de estos años va adquiriendo los perfiles de un solo movimiento literario dotado de una compleja pero inconfundible unidad [que] consiste esencialmente en una reacción en contra del realismo y del mimetismo tan característicos de toda la literatura de lengua castellana no sólo del siglo XIX sino también de la segunda mitad del siglo XVIII." Por su parte, dice F. J. Blasco Pascual ("De 'Oráculos' y de 'Cenicientas': la crítica ante el fin de siglo español," 65): "hay que tener en cuenta que, por debajo de la variada suma de escuelas y de estéticas, existe—y ahí radica precisamente la clave del sincretismo característico del momento—un factor unificador que la crítica—especialmente Ana Balakian—ha identificado como 'decadent spirit'," que F. J. Blasco comienza a caracterizar por sus rechazos: "en cuanto negación de una lengua (la de la retórica restauracionista), de unos valores ideológicos (el racionalismo positivista), morales (el materialismo y utilitarismo burgueses) y estéticos (los presupuestos del realismo), y de unas creencias tradicionales (la religiosidad heredada), la literatura finisecular hace suyo el camino de la *decadencia*."

Pero, si es francamente aventurado encajar el realismo/naturalismo dentro del modernismo, no lo es menos sostener que las hipotéticas divergencias entre Galdós y Clarín se deben a experiencias y vigencias generacionales diversas.

Hasta ahora ha existido un consenso crítico muy extendido sobre la trayectoria paralela de Galdós y Clarín, desde que J. E. Rodó, en *El que vendrá* (1920), señalara que los artículos de Clarín sobre *La desheredada* jugaron ante la opinión española el mismo papel que la novela de Galdós, a la hora de abrirle camino al naturalismo. De hecho, se puede establecer fácilmente una triple correlación en la evolución de ambos. El apoyo de Clarín a las novelas de tesis de Galdós se expresa muy especialmente en la doble reseña de *Gloria* (1877)—en la que el entusiasmo del crítico le lleva a aceptar "la oportunidad" de la "novela tendenciosa o filosófica" que, en principio, parecía poco o nada acorde con su formación idealista[1]—y en "El libre examen y nuestra literatura presente" (1880), célebre artículo en el que Clarín aboga por una literatura vinculada al "pensamiento libre" y por una novela vehículo de las ideas de progreso. El segundo momento corresponde a la adhesión de Clarín al naturalismo, que se manifiesta a partir de la publicación, al año siguiente, de *La desheredada* (1881), y que, por conocido, no demanda mayor comentario. El tercer momento de plena coincidencia en la evolución poética de ambos escritores sobreviene con la publicación de *La incógnita* (1888) y *Realidad* (1889) y se manifiesta en las correspondientes reseñas (1890) de Clarín, que suponen un nuevo giro de ambos, esta vez hacia el espiritualismo, que he estudiado en otro lugar.[2] Estos tres momentos ensamblan una evolución poética e ideológica en paralelo, en la que, por supuesto, pueden encontrarse cuantas diferencias de detalle se esté dispuesto a buscar. Es posible, incluso, interpretar como divergencias determinados silencios del crítico ante la publicación por el novelista de esta o de aquella novela—es sólo una de las interpretaciones posibles—, pero el gesto estético que estos tres momentos trazan, su dirección y su sentido, parecen fuera de duda, puesto que es el sentido evolutivo de toda una época el que afirman, ese sentido evolutivo que conduce del realismo tendencioso de los 70 al naturalismo de los 80 y finalmente al espiritualismo de los 90, tres fases de una misma estética que a S. Miller le gusta llamar "socio-mimética." El Galdós que evoluciona de *Fortunata y Jacinta* (1886-87) a *Realidad* (1889), a *Ángel Guerra* (1890-91), a *Nazarín* (1895), a *Misericordia* (1897) y a *El abuelo* (1897), evoluciona en la misma dirección de conjunto que el Clarín, que, desde *La Regenta* (1884-85), evoluciona hacia *Mezclilla* (1889), *Su único hijo* (1890), *Un discurso* (1891), *Doña Berta* (1892), *Ensayos y Revistas* (1892), *Teresa* (1895), *Cuentos morales* (1896) o los prólogos a *Resurrección* y *Trabajo*, ambos de 1901. Que en esa evolución haya más titubeos o aparentes vueltas atrás en Galdós (muy especialmente en *Miau*, en las tres últimas novelas de la serie de *Torquemada*, o incluso, forzando las cosas, en *Tristana* y en *La loca de la casa*) parece claro, pero también antes de estas fechas escribe Galdós novelas que se pliegan mal a sus distintas fases evolutivas (*Marianela*, respecto a la novela de tesis; *El amigo Manso*, respecto a la naturalista), y tal vez ello tenga que ver más con la abundancia de la obra creativa de Galdós frente a la escasez de la de Clarín, mucho más dedicado al trabajo crítico y, por tanto, menos proclive a oscilaciones de poética, que con una hipotética diferencia generacional.

Para que el consenso crítico en torno a la evolución paralela de ambos autores variase en el sentido que propone S. Miller, sería preciso probar, cuando menos, tres requisitos. Primero, que existen diferencias relevantes entre ambos autores que son de poética y no de opción o gustos estrictamente personales. Segundo, que, más allá de ellos, esas diferencias se extienden a los otros miembros de sus respectivas generaciones. Tercero, que tienen que ver con las distintas experiencias y vigencias generacionales.

En cuanto al primer requisito, en el capítulo IV. 6 de su libro, S. Miller afirma que "a partir de *La Regenta* y *Fortunata y Jacinta*, las trayectorias de Galdós y Clarín se separan" (120), y que esta separación se debe a "cómo están cambiando los supuestos socioliterarios de la novela conforme cede la visión realista/naturalista del mundo frente a la crisis europea del modernismo" (126), y que consiste en que "el principio de la novela de costumbres y el de la novela psicológica son principios diferentes" (129), por lo que Galdós, partidario de una novela de costumbres, no puede ya comprender en toda su dimensión *La Regenta*, novela psicológica, mientras Clarín, que opta decididamente por la novela psicológica, se siente cada vez más insatisfecho con la novela socio-mimética de costumbres. Se trata, efectivamente, de una diferencia relevante y de poética, la que separa la novela psicológica de la novela sociológica, siempre que se entienda por novela psicológica una fórmula novelística diferenciada de la del realismo, una forma como la que pondrán en juego, unos años después, con el título de "roman d'analyse," un grupo de novelistas (Bourget, Margueritte, Rod) que pretenden dar la alternativa al naturalismo, combatiéndolo programáticamente (*Le Disciple* 1889), pero parece muy dudoso que *La Regenta* pueda ser concebida como una novela de este tipo y contrapuesta a *Fortunata y Jacinta* como una novela de tipo predominantemente sociológico. Hacer una lectura de *La Regenta* como la novela del análisis psicológico de Ana Ozores, olvidando cuanto hay de minucioso y extraordinario análisis sociológico de toda una sociedad y una época (en ciertos aspectos, como los de clase, más refinado que el practicado por Galdós antes de *Fortunata* y de la serie de *Torquemada*), encarnadas en la Vetusta de la Restauración, co-protagonista de la novela, parece, cuando menos, desenfocado. Tanto más, cuando a esta primera consideración se añade una segunda, según la cual este análisis no tenía precedentes en el realismo ("La figura de Ana es nueva porque no es común que se conciba de la mujer como ser problemático, ser cuyas acciones vienen dadas como reacción muy personal a una situación vital sin sustancia" [130-31]), que no tiene suficientemente en cuenta los estudios de mujer que el realismo había ofrecido ya a la novela por medio de Stendhal (Matilde de la Mole, Mme De Rênal), de Balzac (Eugénie Grandet), de Flaubert (Mme Bovary), de Tolstoi (Anna Karenina), de Eça de Queiroz (la Luisa de *O primo Basilio*), de Zola (Marthe Rougon, de *La conquête de Plassans*), o del propio Galdós (Isidora Rufete, Rosalía de Bringas), y que hace un flaco favor a *Fortunata y Jacinta*, privando de relevancia su progresiva profundidad psicológica, y no sólo en el caso excepcional de Fortunata. Es como si se pretendiese utilizar una diferencia tan tópica en la crítica literaria francesa, como la que se establece entre la tendencia sociológica de Balzac y la psicológica de Stendhal, para establecer una disyuntiva poética que hiciera de Balzac el prototipo del realismo romántico y de Stendhal el disidente, y para atribuir esta disyuntiva a una causa generacional. Y como si se olvidase que la fórmula de la novela realista del siglo XIX nace de un prodigioso equilibrio—raramente repetido—entre psicología y sociología, entre individuo y sociedad, que unas y otras novelas decantarán hacia un lado u otro sin romperlo, pues su ruptura entrañaba la ruptura del pacto realista.

Por otro lado, el desenfoque es tanto más notorio cuanto se hace desde un análisis que, si enfatiza las diferencias entre dos novelas singulares hasta el extremo de proponerlas como alternativas, lo hace, sin embargo, desde un marco teórico que no establece ningún matiz en la estética del realismo/naturalismo, que resulta en bloque socio-mimética, y que no da importancia alguna a las diferencias (mucho más de bulto) entre el realismo postromántico de Alarcón, el

realismo tendencioso de los setenta, el realismo-idealista de Valera, el costumbrista-regionalista de Pereda, el naturalismo conservador de la Pardo Bazán, el liberal de Galdós, el naturalismo espiritual de los noventa, o el postnaturalismo de un Blasco Ibáñez. Todo es realismo/naturalismo, tanto monta, y todo es socio/mimético, monta tanto. No se entiende cómo diferencias tan singularizadas pueden poner en peligro un marco tan holgado.

En cuanto al segundo requisito, parece bien poco probable que los compañeros de generación que S. Miller propone para Clarín (Menéndez Pelayo, la Pardo Bazán, Picón, Palacio Valdés, Ortega Munilla, Maura) compartan alguna de las supuestas actitudes generacionales de Clarín, como el malditismo,[3] o estén obsesionados, como Flaubert, por la lucha por el estilo (lo están, desde luego, mucho menos que Pereda o Valera), o prefieran la novela psicológica a la de costumbres sociales, y si no practicaron la novela histórica con tanta dedicación como Galdós, habrá que preguntarse si fue por falta de sensibilidad histórica de la generación (Menéndez Pelayo protestaría vivamente contra esta suposición) o por cualquier otra razón menos fácil de esquematizar.

Respecto al tercer requisito, S. Miller no se extiende en ningún momento al análisis histórico (social, político, estético) de los factores que pudieran diferenciar las experiencias de ambas generaciones, por lo que su hipótesis queda en el aire. No hay manera de saber si lo que diferencia a Clarín de Galdós son diferencias generacionales, si no se caracteriza a las respectivas generaciones.

Pero lo más sorprendente es que, a medida que nos adentramos con S. Miller en el estudio de la relación entre Galdós y Clarín, parece como si el autor fuera olvidándose de la tesis que ha venido sosteniendo durante toda la primera mitad de su libro para comprobar la reacción común de ambos escritores ante la crisis, cada vez más palpable, de la norma literaria realista, crisis de la que ambos comienzan a ser conscientes en fecha tan temprana como 1887 (139-41). Así, en el momento en que S. Miller comienza la V parte de su libro, titulada "El pos-realismo/naturalismo en Galdós, Clarín y Zola (1888-1901)," con un capítulo dedicado a constatar "Dos situaciones literarias en crisis," ya anuncia lo que desarrollará páginas después: "Este nuevo dato complica, evidentemente, una interpretación del Clarín de esta época. Sugiere o quizás anticipa, una actitud que se verá presentarse con toda claridad en su crítica galdosiana sólo a partir de 1895: una especie de retirada al pasado realista/naturalista por una parte de Clarín que quiere volver a un pasado en que se sentía más seguro de sus ideas literarias" (140). En el capítulo 8 de esta misma parte V, al estudiar el teatro de Galdós y de Clarín, S. Miller hace a ambos autores un mismo reproche crítico, fundado en su común reincidencia en los temas social-realistas: "estas obras son más sociales que psicológicas [...]. La cuestión obrera, el capitalismo, la mano económicamente muerta de la iglesia son los temas y reciben un tratamiento claramente liberal. Es decir, que Galdós y Clarín coinciden extrañamente en crear la parte más débil de su obra por razones análogas" (182-83). El capítulo 9 se titulará significativamente "Indicios de una vuelta por Galdós y Clarín al realismo/naturalismo," indicios que el autor detecta en obras como la serie de *Torquemada, Nazarín, Misericordia*, que suponen "un renovado énfasis realista/naturalista por Galdós y, de hecho, por todos sus compañeros generacionales" (184), y en la adhesión crítica de Clarín, especialmente al ciclo del avaro: "A mediados de la década de los años noventa, Clarín ve más continuidad que evolución verdadera en esta parte de la obra de su amigo. [...] Y más significativa es la creencia—explícita en Alas, implícita en Galdós—de la continuada, aunque no exclusiva, oportunidad de este tipo de arte" (188). S. Miller pone en conexión el entusiasmo

de Clarín por las novelas de *Torquemada* con "la labor tan ingrata por tantos conceptos de traducir *Travail* de Zola" en sus últimos años de vida y con el prólogo que escribirá para ella: "comprendí—dice S. Miller de sí mismo—que los trabajos relacionados con Zola forman parte de una *devolución* teórica por parte de Alas hacia una estética más cercana a la de *La desheredada* que a la de *El amigo Manso*" (189). Evoca S. Miller la pregunta, llena de melancolía, que Clarín dirige a sus lectores y a sí mismo, mientras medita sobre la obra de Galdós: "¿Quién duda que, pasado algún tiempo, volverá el gusto popular a encontrar interés y atractivo en la pintura viva, *impersonal*, exacta ... del *dato*, sin comentario espiritual, del fenómeno natural y social ordinario, aislado, desligado de toda sistematización ideal, moral o poética o científica?" S. Miller recoge la autocontestación de Clarín: "Dentro de veinte años los mismos escritos y procedimientos de Balzac ofrecerán más *novedad* e interés que las mil retorcidas y alambicadas esencias depuradas que hoy embelesan a muchos" (189). Diagnostica entonces S. Miller: "la estética socio-mimética [...] es un refugio" (190).

Y como este retorno a lo socio-mimético entra en contradicción flagrante con la tesis de un Clarín que actuaría de puente con el modernismo, sostenida hasta esta parte V de su libro (precisamente la que se refiere al "pos-realismo/naturalismo"), S. Miller concluye: "Alas incurre en contradicciones sin posibilidad de resolución. [...] Clarín entra en un mundo de categorías confusas" (192). El resultado no puede ser más paradójico: si hasta ahora ha partido de la tesis de que Clarín era el más moderno y, por supuesto, el más modernista de los dos, por pertenecer a una generación más joven, ahora se ve obligado S. Miller a manifestar que "no debe sorprendernos que la crítica clariniana evidencie un criterio menos seguro que anteriormente. Y menos seguro que el galdosiano. Mientras don Benito se abre a diferentes y nuevas maneras [...] el Leopoldo Alas de esta época da indicios de estar cerrándose a las mismas" (193).

No obstante lo cual, y cuando en el capítulo 11 y último de esta parte V, S. Miller aborda el último momento de la relación entre ambos escritores— el prólogo (póstumo) de Galdós a la segunda edición (en libro) de *La Regenta*, en 1901—es para hacer constar que el escritor canario comprende ahora mejor la novela de lo que la comprendió en 1885, y que la interpreta en clave de lucha social e ideológica, dado que "[E]s una época en que la persona y el arte de Galdós están fuertemente comprometidos con la lucha socio-política" (203).

En resumen: la evolución de ambos escritores no ha conducido en la dirección prevista inicialmente, en la que irían profundizándose las diferencias, a medida que nos acercáramos al fin de siglo, mostrándose Clarín—como perteneciente a una generación más joven—más propicio a la sensibilidad modernista. Ha conducido a todo—o casi todo—lo contrario: siempre según S. Miller, Clarín se reafirma finalmente en la estética socio-mimética como en un refugio, mientras que Galdós—que en el período entre 1889 y 1897 parece reafirmarse también en el realismo/naturalismo—comprende mejor ahora (1901) que entonces (1885) a Clarín, empujado por su compromiso socio-político, aunque, estéticamente, evoluciona de forma más abierta, más experimental y diversificada.[4]

* * *

El libro de S. Miller se inscribe en un contexto específico, el del debate en el seno del galdosismo norteamericano en torno a la concepción y métodos de la crítica literaria, así como en torno al canon que se postula como objeto de estudio. Hasta qué punto el debate se mantiene encendido es algo que se percibe fácilmente en intervenciones de carácter tan conscientemente polémico como la de John W. Kronik, "'¿Qué es un Galdós?' Los estudios galdosianos en la edad posmoderna," leída en sesión plenaria en el V Congreso Internacional Galdosiano,[5] como se percibe en reacciones tan acaloradas como las que dieron origen primero, y resonancia después, al libro de Harold Bloom, *The Western Canon* (1994), hasta qué punto se trata de un debate epistemológico que desborda el campo del galdosismo, y el del hispanismo, para proyectarse en general sobre la teoría, la historia y la crítica literarias.

S. Miller marca desde la primera página de su estudio, en una nota comedida pero suficientemente verbalizada, su divergencia respecto a "los títulos y contenidos de los estudios por Ricardo Gullón (1966) y John W. Kronik (1966)," que, como el de Mario A. Blanc sobre Bécquer, se acercan "a autores del pasado exclusivamente desde la perspectiva 'moderna'" (9, nota 1). S. Miller se plantea, por el contrario, "entender mejor los autores y movimientos tratados desde su propia perspectiva" (9, nota 1). Y si el libro se abre con esta bandera, se cierra volviendo a izarla: "Un intento del presente libro [...] es remitir al lector a la problemática socio-estética que vivieron y así rescatar para el presente ese pasado. A toda costa me parece importante no rehabilitar a Galdós, Clarín y algún otro compañero o compañera de generación para después darles trato de escritores demasiado 'modernos.' En otras palabras, creo que Galdós y Clarín se pueden salvar sin llegar a extirparles de su contexto realista/naturalista. Y lo que es más, opino que se pueden salvar de verdad sólo como realistas/naturalistas que tienen que vivir la crisis modernista" (206). Su apuesta lo es por una aproximación a los textos que trata de rescatarlos en su pasado más que de apropiárselos en nombre de exigencias de presente, se plantea más como "historia de la literatura" que como "crítica literaria" (R. Wellek, *Theory of Literature*), y si es bien cierto que no es posible una historia desprovista de los intereses del historiador, no lo es menos que siempre es posible distinguir una aproximación predominantemente historizadora de otra predominantemente actualizadora. En el delicado equilibrio entre fidelidad y traición a la obra estudiada, en que consiste toda paráfrasis crítica,[6] hay aproximaciones que priman la fidelidad y otras que priman la traición, y las dos pueden ser plenamente legítimas—y plenamente creativas—si saben ser coherentes.

Desde un punto de vista histórico-epistemológico caben pocas dudas. A un lado se sitúan los estudios que en los últimos ochenta años—desde la fundación del *Opoiaz*—han acentuado la naturaleza formal del texto literario, como espectáculo autosuficiente del lenguaje, insistiendo en su condición de ambigüedad y de polivalencia significativas y abriendo espacio a la interpretación—más aun, a la deconstrucción—del crítico, pues, cuanto más cerrado de forma y abierto de significados es el texto, mayor es el margen de maniobra del intérprete, su derecho al protagonismo.[7] En el lado opuesto se sitúan las aproximaciones que ponen de relieve el carácter histórico, el contexto social, político, estético, la relación del texto con su autor y con sus lectores, o con las instituciones del entorno y con la práctica literaria en que se inscribe, las aproximaciones que tienen en cuenta, en suma, las determinaciones del texto, sus anclajes, su dimensión vivida, y que operan con una capacidad de interpretación autorregulada. A un lado,

pues, y en grandes líneas que no matizan excepciones ni salvedades, el formalismo ruso y el New Criticism, la estilística, Jakobson, Barthes, el estructuralismo y el postestructuralismo franceses, la semiología formalista, buena parte del deconstruccionsmo, etc. Al otro, Mukarovski, Bajtín o Loiman, la fenomenología y la estética de la recepción, el marxismo, el feminismo, la semiótica pragmática, Ricoeur, el New Historicism, la historia de las mentalidades, etc. S. Miller toma partido, de principio a final, por una perspectiva historicista y la desarrolla con coherencia y precisión metodológica.

Como, además, una y otra aproximación crítica han generado a lo largo de los últimos doscientos años cánones diferentes, y dado que la crítica formalista-postestructuralista—dominante en la teoría literaria europea durante los años 60 y 70—predicó un canon que excluía en su casi totalidad el realismo-naturalismo (sólo Flaubert se salvaba, y no precisamente como mártir del adulterio, sino del estilo, el primer mártir moderno del estilo), estética acusada de "anti" o de pre-moderna (de R. Barthes a F. Lyotard, e incluso a F. Jameson), no es de extrañar que la posición de S. Miller conlleve la defensa de la posición central de Galdós, Clarín o Zola en el canon literario, ni que trate de rescatarlos, no como han hecho otros estudiosos, salvándolos de su época y de su denostada poética y trayéndolos a la nuestra, modernizándolos, cambiándolos—de forma a veces vergonzante—de canon, convirtiéndolos en decadentistas o simbolistas o modernistas, sino restaurándolos de lleno en su contexto, el de la estética realista/naturalista y el de un período histórico tan definido como el de 1870-1901.

El libro se inicia así con la protesta por la marginación de los escritores del 68 por los del 98, por Ortega, por Ramón, incluso por Torrente Ballester ("los escritores de la Generación de 1868, o viejos o muertos, sufrieron el ser condenados al registro negro," 11), y acaba con una declaración de principios nada ambivalente: "A toda costa me parece importante no rehabilitar a Galdós, Clarín y algún que otro compañero o compañera de generación para después darles trato de escritores demasiado 'modernos.' En otras palabras, creo que Galdós y Clarín se pueden salvar sin llegar a extirparles de su contexto realista/naturalista. Y lo que es más, opino que se pueden salvar de verdad sólo como realistas/naturalistas que tienen que vivir la crisis modernista" (206).

Nada tengo que objetar ni al enfoque[8] ni a la reivindicación canónica de Galdós y de Clarín, en particular, y del realismo/naturalismo, en general, que comparto. El libro de S. Miller viene a añadir una voz más a todo ese "reino de las voces" que, desde la teoría literaria, desde la arquitectura, la pintura, el pensamiento filosófico o el político, la novela o la poesía, han planteado la resolución de la crisis de la modernidad por una vía de reapropiación de la tradición, de crítica del modernismo, de recuperación de la mímesis y de la representación, y de un nuevo entendimiento con la realidad emprendido desde la disolución de los discursos legitimadores, un "reino de las voces" que abarca desde Ricoeur y Habermas hasta Huyssen y White, pasando por Antonio López, Raymond Carver, Antonio Muñoz Molina, Paul Auster, Kenneth Loach, D. Leavitt, o Luís García Montero.

De hecho, el interés mayor del libro de S. Miller—desde mi punto de vista—estriba en su atento—minucioso—seguimiento de la evolución de la poética realista desde una temprana formulación por Galdós, en los artículos de 1870-71 y en las cartas a Mesonero, hasta llegar a la crisis de la misma de finales de los 80 y al examen de las reacciones respectivas de Galdós y Clarín ante la nueva coyuntura modernista, todo ello pasando por la adhesión a esta poética de

los dos más relevantes críticos de actualidad de la época, Manuel de la Revilla y Leopoldo Alas 'Clarín,' y por el consiguiente asentamiento de esta poética, tanto en la crítica literaria como en la práctica novelesca.

Los capítulos I y II, en especial, me parecen aportaciones iluminadoras. En el primero, "Teoría del realismo/naturalismo de Galdós y Zola (1870-1881)," S. Miller escoge una aproximación histórica nada tradicional, que asimila implícitamente las experiencias interpretativas de la estética de la recepción: Galdós es estudiado como lector, se explora "esa labor de recuperación e identificación de una tradición nacional literaria sobre la cual un escritor de su día puede basar su propia obra" (24, nota 2), se examina la formación de una poética realista a través de algunos ensayos muy representativos ("Don Ramón de la Cruz y su época," "Observaciones sobre la novela contemporánea en España," el epistolario cruzado con Mesonero entre el 75 y el 81), así como la selección de un canon nacional y moderno en el que fundamentar su propia creación, un canon conformado por los sainetes de D. Ramón de la Cruz y la prosa costumbrista de Mesonero y Ruiz Aguilera. El gesto de Galdós viene a ser así paralelo—aunque anterior—al de E. Zola en "Les romanciers naturalistes" (1875-80): "Los dos identifican una tradición nacional de fiel recreación de la vida social e histórica, y proponen dicha tradición como base de la novela que tiene que escribirse en el presente. Lo que Balzac, Stendhal y Flaubert representan para Zola, lo constituyen Ramón de la Cruz, Mesonero Romanos y Aguilera para Galdós" (39). S. Miller es consciente de la desigualdad artística de ambas tradiciones y apunta la cuota de formación que Galdós recibe de Balzac, Scott o Dickens, pero prefiere centrarse para su estudio en lo que hay de búsqueda de una tradición narrativa estrictamente nacional. Es una lástima que no haya elaborado S. Miller "la necesidad" galdosiana de esa tradición estrictamente nacional en un período tan "europeo" como el que abarca, lo que, sin duda, le habría precavido contra entusiasmos poco justificados, como el que le hace admirarse de que "Galdós y, después, Clarín, hacen el trabajo de tres generaciones en menos de quince años" (41), esto es, el equivalente del que llevaron a cabo Balzac, Flaubert y Zola, todo junto.

El capítulo II, "Problemas y crítica prácticos de la novela española de 1870 a 1880" tiene la virtud de centrarse en la figura de D. Manuel de la Revilla, sin duda, la de mayor formación intelectual y capacidad de discernimiento crítico de esa época. La obra de Revilla no ha llamado hasta muy recientemente la atención de los estudiosos, y sólo tras la publicación de *Vida, obra y pensamiento de Manuel de la Revilla* (1987), de C. García Barrón, nos ha sido posible disponer de una visión panorámica de la misma. S. Miller acierta al estudiar el seguimiento crítico de Revilla de las sucesivas novelas de Galdós como uno de los factores decisivos en el afianzamiento de lo que él llama—con no muchos prejuicios de oído— "la estética socio-mimética" en España y en la atracción de los lectores hacia la obra de Galdós, y vuelve a acertar al establecer un paralelo, o mejor dicho, una relación de sucesión, entre la crítica de Revilla (desaparecido prematuramente en fecha tan clave como 1881) y la de Clarín. El pormenorizado estudio de las reseñas de Revilla a las novelas de Galdós abunda en observaciones de calado crítico, por parte de S. Miller, como la que se refiere al papel evolutivo, de inflexión, que juega *La familia de León Roch*, respecto a la novela de tesis, al abrirse a una visión más plural y compleja. En general, S. Miller comprueba en la práctica ensayística de Revilla la formación de un modelo de crítica literaria—que heredará Clarín—y, a la vez, la evolución de su poética desde el rechazo del arte docente, expresado en "La tendencia docente en la literatura contemporánea" (1877), hasta su

aceptación en la obra de Galdós, a quien canoniza como el primer novelista español, sobre todo a partir de la adhesión, ya sin reparos, que provocará en el crítico la publicación de *Gloria*, y que culminará en la declaración de principios—su credo y su testamento, a la vez—a favor de un arte realista, progresista y pedagógico, en la reseña de *La familia de León Roch*. Revilla pone aquí la crítica al servicio de "la producción de novelas que realizan plenamente las aspiraciones inherentes en la teoría socio-mimética del realismo/naturalismo" (68).

No es totalmente así. Revilla no llega a aceptar nunca el naturalismo, al que rechaza explícamente en un artículo de 1879, "El naturalismo en el arte," que S. Miller comenta, sin que ello le lleve a cuestionarse la tesis recién citada. Su aceptación del realismo, y del realismo docente, es, pues, una aceptación limitada, que Clarín desbordará en ese mismo año de 1881, con su adhesión al naturalismo en la novela (reseña de *La desheredada*) y en el teatro (*Solos de Clarín*). Una aceptación limitada, dentro de una evolución llena de matices, dudas, autocompensaciones, como he tratado de mostrar en otro trabajo.[9] A S. Miller le hubiera convenido contrastar el pensamiento de Revilla con los debates y las preocupaciones filosóficas de los intelectuales liberales de la época, y más concretamente, consultar los artículos publicados en la década en las revistas del liberalismo, especialmente en la *Revista de España*, la *Revista Europea* y la *Revista Contemporánea*. De especial utilidad son las reseñas de las sesiones del Ateneo, en la *Revista Europea*, en 1875, bajo el título de "Ventajas e inconvenientes del realismo en el arte dramático y con particularidad en el teatro contemporáneo," y en 1876, bajo el encabezamiento "¿Se halla en decadencia el teatro español? Si se halla...," para comprobar cómo Revilla, en sus intervenciones, se muestra claramente partidario de una estética idealista, del arte por el arte, de estirpe hegueliana, por entonces mayoritaria en la intelectualidad liberal española, y muy lejano al realismo a la francesa, al que condena sin paliativos: "el realismo, tal como comúnmente se entiende, y sobre todo el realismo francés, es funesto para el arte," declara en el debate de 1875. La influencia que sobre él ejercen José del Perojo en materia de pensamiento filosófico (Revilla se incorpora a la redacción de la *Revista Contemporánea*, que dirige Perojo, en ese mismo año de 1875) y Galdós, en materia literaria, son los factores que provocan la evolución del crítico, evolución hacia lo que se ha llamado el krausopositivismo español y que fue muy característica de los intelectuales liberales de los 70: supuso a la vez una aceptación limitada del positivismo y una persistente, aunque, atenuada vinculación al krausismo, síntesis, que, en Revilla, es particularmente inestable y que le impedirá asentir al naturalismo. La aceptación del realismo por Revilla se inscribe así en el debate general de toda una época y de todo un grupo social, el de la intelectualidad liberal, el debate entre idealismo (hegueliano o krausista) y realismo (en los años 70), que, al radicalizarse como debate entre idealismo y naturalismo (en los 80), adquiriría connotaciones ideológicas y políticas nuevas.

Los capítulos III, IV y V se centran en la relación entre Galdós y Clarín, con referencias a Zola poco significativas, y en la evolución de la estética "socio-mimética" desde su plenitud hasta su crisis, y tienen un interés más difuso, vivo mientras el autor se ciñe a las observaciones que despiertan en él unos materiales observados muy de cerca, lastrado, sin embargo, por las poco convincentes tesis panorámicas de la unidad multigeneracional del período 1868-1936 y de las diferencias estético-generacionales entre Galdós y Clarín, que ya he discutido. Por lo general, se nota un mayor dominio de la documentación y de la bibliografía concerniente a Galdós que de la que atañe a Clarín, desajuste que es mucho más notable, si se extiende a Zola.

En cuanto a Galdós, la tesis de su triple evolución ("la estética humana," "el simbolismo ideológico," y "el simbolismo de ensueño"), una vez aflorada la crisis de la estética realista, que ha sido reiteradamente expuesta por S. Miller, me parece todavía poco elaborada. Quizá le conviniera plantearse al autor la oportunidad de una expresión como "estética humana," que deja en el lector la impresión de que todas las demás son "inhumanas" y que presenta los graves inconvenientes de no relacionarse con ningún término del debate de la época (el debate filosófico y literario es entonces entre "positivismo," "naturalismo," "idealismo," "espiritualismo," "simbolismo," "decadentismo," y no entre "humano" e "inhumano"), de no dejar ver a través del nombre ninguna característica poética precisa (fuera de la "bondad" moral que se le supone, por "humana"), y de encubrir importantes diferencias de poética (pues, si se descarta su común ideología espiritualista, hay diferencias muy notables de dirección entre *Realidad* y *Misericordia*, muy semejantes a las que existen entre una novela de Bourget y una de Tolsoi, o, si se quiere, entre el "roman d'analyse" y la novela espiritualista rusa). El pensamiento literario contemporáneo, en especial el francés (de Brunetière a Vogüé, pasando por Faguet, Lemaître o Giraud) del que tanto dependía Clarín, creó el término "espiritualismo," que utilizan tanto Galdós como Clarín, y que, por otra parte, domina el debate filosófico y científico de los últimos veinte años del siglo (Ravaisson-Mollien, Renouvier, Boutroux, Guyau, Bergson, Lotze, Spir) y que ha sido reelaborado en los últimos años por la crítica actual (Lissorgues, García Sarriá, García San Miguel, Sobejano, Oleza), por lo que, en principio, parece más adecuado que el de "estética humana." Por último, la falta de elaboración de la relación de esas tres estéticas entre sí (¿cuáles son sus límites, cuáles sus contradicciones, cuál su coherencia de base?, ¿cómo es posible que se compartan simultáneamente tres estéticas diferentes?, y si son sucesivas, ¿cómo y por qué se pasa de la una a la otra?) y con las corrientes ideológicas del momento (¿con qué intereses sociales, con qué otras obras literarias o artísticas se relacionan, qué precedentes y qué consecuentes tiene, pongamos, el "simbolismo ideológico," a qué necesidades ético-políticas responde?), proporcionan a la evolución del Galdós penúltimo un grado de inmotivación y de arbitrariedad, seguramente no buscados por el autor del ensayo.

Desde el punto de vista metodológico, la mayor aportación de una obra como ésta, que aborda un período histórico tan amplio, con una ambición totalizadora, estriba en su capacidad de seguir al paso el devenir poético, ciñéndose, sin concesiones, al ir y venir de las ideas literarias, aisladas de todo contexto artístico, filosófico, social, político o ideológico en general. En estas condiciones, el conocimiento resultante ha de ser, por fuerza, más evolutivo que histórico, o, si se prefiere, la historia resultante es estrictamente literaria, partidaria de la autonomía institucional de la literatura, y poco tiene que ver con esa otra consideración de la historia que la contempla como convergencia y entrecruzamiento de esferas de actividad muy diversas. Es la opción de S. Miller, una opción elegida en libertad y en pleno uso de sus facultades profesionales, y en su abono es preciso decir que ha puesto no poco esfuerzo y sí muchos merecimientos. El efecto de este libro sobre los estudios galdosianos no puede ser sino beneficioso. Y vale.

Universitat de València

NOTAS

[1] Clarín (o mejor dicho, 'Zoilito') había rechazado desde las páginas de *El Solfeo* este tipo de novela en su reseña a *La novela de Luís* (1876) de S. de Villarminio, especímen puro del "arte docente," y ello a pesar de sus afinidades ideológicas con el autor: "*La novela de Luís* empieza por no ser una novela; pero es un libro que puede enseñar mucho al que lea sus páginas" (en J. F. Botrel, ed., *Preludios de Clarín* [1972], 53). Volverá a mostrar reticencias importantes hacia "el utilitarismo en el arte" en su reseña de *La familia de León Roch (Solos de Clarín* [1881]), en la que, sin embargo, lo justifica. Pasados los años, Clarín no sólo volverá a sus recelos frente al "arte docente" sino a una franca desautorización: "Yo creo firmemente que esta fórmula del arte por el arte está en cierto modo anticuada, y que si sirvió perfectamente para combatir la literatura didáctica, y también en parte la tendenciosa, no es útil ante los propósitos de las nuevas generaciones artísticas, que rechazan—es claro—la obra *de tesis*, así como suena" (*Nueva campaña* [1887], 230-31). Ni el mismo Galdós se libraría de esta desautorización, aunque a él se le aplicase de forma amortiguada: "Se puede decir que sus novelas contemporáneas, antes de *La desheredada*, pertenecen fracamente al idealismo *tendencioso*" (crítica de *Realidad*, en *Galdós* [1912], 197).

[2] J. Oleza, ed. L. Alas, Clarín, *Su único hijo* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1990).

[3] Por otra parte, ¿qué es eso del malditismo de Clarín?: ¿cuándo un Clarín de día en día más castelarista asumió la condición de maldito que Verlaine acuñó para actitudes tan hostiles a la sociedad burguesa y tan bohemias como las de Rimbaud y él mismo?; ¿cuándo Clarín se acercó siquiera al autoenclaustramiento lutúrgico del poeta de la rue de Rome?

[4] Debo advertir que me limito a exponer las ideas del autor, pues por mi parte me es difícil—si no imposible—compartir esta idea de la evolución de Clarín. En mi edición de *Su único hijo* ya mostré cómo la evolución de Clarín, lejos de refugiarse en la insistencia en el naturalismo, se dirige hacia una fase muy marcada de realismo espiritualista—como, por otra parte, el Galdós posterior a *Fortunata y Jacinta*—, en conexión con corrientes estéticas y filosóficas europeas que él conoce y comenta, fase de la que serán hitos algunos textos que abarcan la diversificada escritura de Clarín y cuya consulta a fondo se echa en falta en el libro de S. Miller, textos como *Ensayos y revistas* (1892), en el terreno de la crítica literaria, *Un discurso* (1891), en el del pensamiento, el prólogo a *Resurrección* (1901), en el de la estética, o el inacabado—y tan profundamente innovador—relato de *Cuesta abajo* (1890-91).

[5] Publicada en sus *Actas* (Las Palmas: Cabildo Insular de Gran Canaria, 1995), 2: 391-401.

[6] La fidelidad completa a la obra estudiada implica su repetición, y, por tanto, la esterilidad del trabajo crítico, incapaz de otra cosa que no sea la glosa o la descripción. A medida que nos separamos de ella se gana en capacidad de explicación, pero también se pierde en fidelidad. Toda crítica debe moverse, por consiguiente, dentro de los límites de una cierta traición, de una actitud que podríamos caracterizar como infidelidad aceptable.

[7] Una pintura abstracta se presta a un mucho mayor alarde de libertad crítica que la representación pictórica de una escena narrativa, pongamos una Anunciación.

[8] Ya en el que fue mi primer libro, *Sincronía y diacronía. La dialéctica interna del discurso poético* (1976), escrito en 1971, en pleno apogeo del estructuralismo, me planteé la necesidad de superar las dicotomías saussureanas y de abordar la renovación de la crítica desde un análisis formal que fuera a la vez capaz de dar cuenta de la dimensión histórica y social, pragmática en suma, del discurso poético. Ni que decir tiene que no he olvidado aquellos "buenos" propósitos.

[9] "El debate en torno a la fundación del realismo. Galdós y la poética de la novela en los años 70," *Actas del Quinto Congreso Internacional de Estudios Galdosianos* (Las Palmas: Cabildo Insular de Gran Canaria, 1995), 2: 257-77.

RESEÑAS

ENRIQUE MIRALLES. *Galdós, "esmeradamente corregido"*. Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, 1993. 96 pp.

Mercedes López-Baralt

Con *Galdós, "esmeradamente corregido,"* Enrique Millares contribuye a una bibliografía que, partiendo de los trabajos de Weber (*The* Miau *Manuscript of Pérez Galdós: A Critical Study,* 1964), Pattison ("The Manuscript of *Gloria,*" 1969), Rodolfo Cardona ("El manuscrito de *Doña Perfecta*: una descripción preliminar," 1976) y James Whiston ("Las pruebas corregidas de *Fortunata y Jacinta,*" 1980; *The Early Stages of Composition of Galdós*' "Lo prohibido," 1983), recientemente ha dado frutos como los libros de Yolanda Arencibia (*La lengua de Galdós,* 1987) e Isabel Román (*La creatividad en el estilo de Galdós,* 1992), así como las ediciones críticas de *Zumalacárregui* (Arencibia, 1990) y de la novela *Realidad* (Ella Martínez Umpierre, 1997). Al igual que los trabajos narratológicos en torno a la obra galdosiana, el corpus en cuestión supone un esfuerzo crítico encaminado a desmentir las acusaciones de "garbancero" sufridas por Galdós de parte de los generacionistas del 98, en particular Valle-Inclán, al demostrar el cuidado obsesivo que nuestro autor otorga al estilo a través de múltiples revisiones que van de los manuscritos a las galeradas de sus novelas. Sólo que en el libro que nos ocupa Miralles pone en duda la veracidad del subtítulo "Esmeradamente corregida," añadido a la carátula de las novelas y *Episodios nacionales* re-editados por la empresa editorial, "Obras de Pérez Galdós."

Enrique Miralles comienza narrando los avatares editoriales de Galdós, desde su larga sujeción (de 1874 a 1897) al contrato leonino de su primer editor hasta las empresas libertarias de publicación que asumió tras ganar la demanda que le impusiera al Director de La Guirnalda. Como sabemos, don Miguel Honorio de Cámara y Cruz se arrogaba la mitad de la propiedad intelectual de las obras de don Benito. Pero con el laudo del 31 de mayo de 1897, que resuelve el pleito con Cámara y Cruz a favor del novelista canario, éste recupera sus derechos como autor. Dice en sus *Memorias* Galdós que "viéndome dueño de mis obras, resolví establecerme como editor de ellas en el número 132 de la calle de Hortaleza, piso bajo." Su primera aventura editorial— "Obras de Pérez Galdós," cuya administración había dejado en manos de su sobrino, don Hermenegildo Hurtado de Mendoza—es de escasa duración: comienza en 1897 y termina en 1904, cuando don Benito cede la administración de la publicación y re-edición de sus obras a la casa editorial de Hernando, Sres. Perlado, Páez y Cía.

Partiendo de la hipótesis de que la Casa Editorial de Hernando mantendría las versiones de las novelas galdosianas fijadas por la colección "Obras de Pérez Galdós" y aun las de la Guirnalda que no hubiesen sido reimpresas por aquélla, Miralles se da a la tarea de comprobar la veracidad del reclamo publicitario que figura en la portada de la mayoría de los títulos editados por la casa

editorial, "Obras de Pérez Galdós." No aborda la totalidad de cada texto, pues ello sería tarea ingente, que requeriría, necesariamente, de un equipo profesional, sino que realiza el muestreo sobre una extensión textual de una media de 2,000 dígitos, equivalentes a las siete primeras columnas de texto del tomo correspondente en la edición de las *Obras completas* de Aguilar: unas cuatro páginas. Complementa su libro con un apéndice que reúne cuadros cronológicos de las ediciones de las obras estudiadas, cuadros con las obras publicadas por la casa editorial de Galdós y gráficas con las estadísticas de las variantes recogidas en las novelas.

El cotejo de variantes de las obras publicadas por la casa editorial de Pérez Galdós (*Napoleón en Charmartín, Gerona, Torquemada en la hoguera, Trafalgar, El 19 de marzo y el dos de mayo, Juan Martín el Empecinado, El Grande Oriente, Un faccioso más y algunos frailes menos, Doña Perfecta, Marianela, El equipaje del rey José, Memorias de un cortesano de 1815, La segunda casaca, 7 de julio, Los cien mil hijos de San Luis, El terror de 1824, Los apostólicos, Gloria, La corte de Carlos IV, Un voluntario realista, La familia de León Roch, Zaragoza, Cádiz, La batalla de los Arapiles, El doctor Centeno*) lleva a Miralles a varias conclusiones, entre ellas: la cifra media de las correcciones del conjunto del muestreo es de 22.5 variantes por obra (hay que advertir una excepción; que no hay ninguna corrección textual ni anuncio en la portada de *Torquemada en la hoguera*); la naturaleza de las correcciones es bastante uniforme, pudiendo advertirse que las guían dos criterios implícitos: subsanar deficiencias gramaticales y operar con rigor semántico; el balance de las enmiendas resulta positivo, aunque una gran proporción de variantes carece de justificación lingüística o literaria. Este último punto, unido al hecho de que los estudios publicados hasta ahora sobre las revisiones a las que Galdós sometía sus manuscritos y galeradas señalan como consecuencia frecuente de éstas una alteración profunda del estilo y de la caracterización de los personajes, lleva a Miralles a preguntarse sobre la presunta responsabilidad del autor ante las nuevas versiones de sus obras y a proponer que no proceden de la pluma del novelista, sino de algunos de sus colaboradores más cercanos (quizá Gerardo Peñarrubia), que, de seguro, seguiría las recomendaciones de don Benito. De ahí que la indicación de "esmeradamente corregida" parezca obedecer más a un reclamo publicitario que a la realidad textual. Una razón de orden biográfico parece avalar la propuesta de Miralles: durante los años de 1899 y 1900, en los que se concentra la mayor parte de los títulos publicados por su casa editorial, Galdós se hallaba inmerso en la redacción de la tercera serie de los *Episodios nacionales*, por lo que resulta casi imposible pensar que pudo entregarse a la relectura y corrección minuciosa de las obras en cuestión.

La argumentación de Miralles es convincente, y la seriedad de la metodología científica de su estudio no tiene fisuras. Tiene buen cuidado de no hacer aseveraciones tajantes, ofreciendo su propuesta como una hipótesis plausible, pero no como conclusión cerrada. Es por ello que quisiera—como buena galdosista, alumna de aquella asevaración con que don Benito aludía, desde su discurso en la Real Academia Española, a su amigo santanderino: "Pereda no duda, yo sí"—abonar un poco a los resquicios de duda que puedan permanecer en cuanto a la autoría de las correcciones consignadas en este libro. Me refiero a algo que Miralles no ha advertido, y es a la intención coloquial o irónica que guía algunas de estas revisiones. Por ejemplo:

1) *Los cien mil hijos de San Luis*:
Ella asistía a / Asistía la tal;
he vivido muchas veces / he pasado temporaditas;
2) *Los apostólicos*
Es verdad que no / ahora caigo que no;
3) *Gloria*
se estén con esa bendita calma / se les pasee el alma por cuerpo;
ciertas pastas / no sé qué pastas;
4) *La corte de Carlos IV*
mueble / armatoste
5) *Un voluntario realista*
un compuesto de / un guisote de

Revisiones como éstas tienen un claro sabor galdosiano. Sin embargo, por tratarse de pocas, bien podrían deberse a la pluma de un colaborador que quiso asimilarse al estilo de don Benito.

Más allá de las aportaciones que he consignado de esta sólida investigación, *Galdós, "esmeradamente corregido"* tiene el indudable mérito de obligar a los estudiosos de Galdós a replantearse el problema de la fijación de los textos definitivos de sus novelas, ingente labor que apenas ha comenzado. Pues, no todas las variantes incorporadas a las nuevas versiones de un texto galdosiano son, necesariamente, de la pluma del autor. Tenemos, entonces, que agradecer a Enrique Miralles más que las respuestas que su libro ofrece la gran pregunta que su investigación formula.

Universidad de Puerto Rico

LINDA M. WILLEM, ed. *A Sesquicentennial Tribute to Galdós 1843-1993*. Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, 1993. 360 pp.

Mary L. Coffey

Much has been said about the growth of Galdosiana in today's academy. In a recent article on the state of the field, John Kronik refers to the "phalanx of Galdós studies" which have appeared in recent years. This situation is both a boon and a burden for scholars. Staying abreast of the large number of studies is an overwhelming task. Yet the continued development of feminist, psychological, sociological and other approaches, when combined with the more traditional close-reading and historical contextualizations of Galdós's texts, make the work of the student of Galdós ever more intellectually stimulating. Certainly this diversity of critical orientations is due to the very richness of Galdós's work. His *Novelas contemporáneas*, *Episodios nacionales*, "teatro" and "periodismo" prove to be more attractive and to provoke even deeper intellectual responses from successive generations of *galdosistas*.

Linda M. Willem's anthology, *A Sesquicentennial Tribute to Galdós 1843-1993*, is a case in point. The book is, above all, a welcome addition of articles written by important contemporary Galdós scholars. It also highlights the increasing breadth and depth of current Galdós scholarship. This collection of twenty-three articles (sixteen in English, the rest in Spanish) offers analyses of metaphor, of literary self-referentiality, the complicated role of the narrator in Galdosian fiction, the position of Galdós vis-a-vis postmodernism, and many other historical, stylistic and aesthetic issues. Although there is no formal organizational structure, the order of the articles indicates a hierarchy. The book begins with eleven articles devoted to the *Novelas de la primera época* and the *Novelas contemporáneas*. Of these, a small cluster of four focuses on *Fortunata y Jacinta*. *Tristana* also receives treatment in two studies, as befits its continuing popularity. The *Episodios nacionales* are then represented by five contributions, three dealing with the first series, and two that explore thematic and stylistic issues in the fourth and fifth series. The last seven articles in the volume address a wider range of production: Galdós's journalism, his theatre, biography and reception by the critics.

The group of articles dealing with *Fortunata y Jacinta* offers an excellent example of how a Galdós novel can generate different and yet complementary readings. Akiko Tsuchiya, for instance, explores the process of re-education that both Fortunata and Mauricia la Dura undergo in the Micaelas convent as representative of Foucault's theories of power and its operation within social institutions. The struggles relative to domination and resistence, she notes, find themselves inscribed onto the physical bodies of these women. Hazel Gold uses the concept of the body in a very different way in her article, exploring how Galdós employs metaphors of the body as a "narrative shorthand" for representing both an inner spiritual life and a larger social world. Gold argues that this recurring trope emphasizes that all experience of the world is ultimately channelled through the body. Geoffrey Ribbans's contribution addresses the role of the narrator in *Fortunata y Jacinta*, claiming that Galdós's narrative style, as it reformulates itself throughout the story-telling process, is more ironic than unstable. He claims a high degree of mimesis for the narrator's role and points to moments in the text when the narrator's apparent omniscience reveals the author's ironic commentary on the attitudes of Juanito Santa Cruz and his ilk. In the last article of this group, Harriet Turner attempts to formulate an equation for Galdós's particular approach to realism, applying the author's own comments on the necessity to balance "exactitud" and "belleza" in creating fictional worlds. Her proposal, both bold and deceptively simple in its articulation, complements Ribbans's article in its examination of the realism of the text. These articles speak to each other in interesting ways and provide a useful example of how varying critical positions placed in juxtaposition can illuminate an object of study.

The following pair of articles also demonstrates significantly different critical approaches, this time in relation to *Tristana*. Chad Wright delves deeper into the metaphor of the body in his examination of corporal fragmentation in the novel, while Teresa Vilarós proposes that we understand the character of Tristana and her story as a metaphor for the act of writing itself. Both authors argue that *Tristana* is more than a commentary on the problematic social circumstances of women, and when Wright refers to the "amputated" ending of the novel itself, Vilarós's proposal that we explore the relationship between the invention of the text and that of the character becomes even more compelling.

Stephen Miller leads off the articles focusing on the *Episodios nacionales* with an exploration of the origins of Gabriel Araceli, linking him more specifically to the master/servant representations of Iriarte than to traditional Spanish picaresque figures. He then proceeds to compare Araceli with Felipe Centeno as characters with similar backgrounds and significantly different levels of success, claiming that Centeno represents Galdós's growing pessimism about the social opportunities for Spain's lower class. There are two other contributions that address the first series: Diane Urey's thoughtful analysis of the literary collapse of distinctions between history and fiction, reality and illusion in *Bailén* and Pierre Ullman's application of an expanded system of exegesis to analyse the allegorical importance of the rats in *Gerona*. The last two articles that deal with the *Episodios* expand the focus by examining tendencies throughout entire series. Brian Dendle schematizes the various female characters in the fourth series, concluding that, though the female characters display undeniable psychological strength, they do not break free of traditional social roles. Linda Willem, in turn, calls for a re-evaluation of Galdós's later work, claiming that his deliberate inclusion of fantastic elements in the fifth series indicates the development of literary techniques which anticipate postmodernism.

Among the other articles in this volume there are a few which stand out for their overlapping with other pieces in the collection as well as for their independent critical value. For example, Lou Charnon-Deutsch's piece on the Pygmalion effect stands in provocative contrast to Dendle's analysis of the fourth series of *Episodios*. Similarly, Rubén Benítez's examination of Galdosian "cervantismo" provides added insight to many of the preceding articles. Peter Bly's analysis of landscapes and skyscapes in *La familia de León Roch* is an exceptional close-reading, and Germán Gullón's careful analysis of the critical attitudes of Galdós critics (Alas, Menéndez Pelayo and later, Casalduero) leads him to identify specific paradigms through which Galdós's work was understood. His "crítica de la crítica" challenges us to examine our own contemporary approaches in a similar fashion.

Willem has assembled an impressive array of Galdós scholarship in this tribute volume. It is well-produced, attractive and has few typographical errors (with the notable exception of the introduction of Lisa Condé's article on *La loca de la casa*). My one concern about the collection is, not surprisingly, its very breadth. While Willem's approach undoubtedly honours the extensive literary production of the "insigne maestro," the lack of a substantive introduction and more formal organization of the contributions makes this volume less satisfactory as a whole. This is not to imply that only certain aspects of the author's production merit critical focus; indeed, Galdós's theatre, short stories, journalism and his life are all areas of investigation which demand greater attention and better integration into our understanding of his literary and historical importance. Rather, this collection of articles might have made a greater impact if it had been organized around a few guiding principles; a statement on current trends in Galdós scholarship might have gone a long way to fill the void.

That said, Willem's anthology is a notable contribution to Galdós studies, for it brings together the current work of many of the best Galdós scholars of different generations. For that reason alone, it is a valuable tome, destined to encourage both new readers to explore Galdós's fictional worlds and new generations of Galdós scholars to advance their own research into the historical, aesthetic and cultural import of those worlds.

Pomona College

MARÍA ASUNCIÓN BLANCO DE LA LAMA. *Novela e idilio en el personaje femenino de José María de Pereda.* Santander: Concejalía de Cultura del Excmo. Ayuntamiento de Santander y Ediciones de Librería Estudio, 1995. 236 pp.

Lily Litvak

La autora intenta analizar los personajes femeninos de las novelas de Pereda por métodos diferentes a los que ha adoptado la "crítica feminista." Cree que, en general, estos análisis de personajes son unilaterales y parten de presupuestos ideológicos. Así, si el personaje femenino es rebelde y no acepta los condicionamientos sociales, se considera interesante. De allí una tipología femenina de la novela decimonónica que será fundamentada en el criterio feminista. Para el feminismo más beligerante, la diferenciación entre feminidad y virilidad es cultural y metafísica, consideradas las dos como mitos, y se niega la esencialidad de ambas naturalezas. También discute la investigadora la opinión de otros críticos, para quienes el escritor montañés no tenía dotes de psicólogo como Galdós o Clarín, debido a la filiación costumbrista que le incapacitaba para crear individualidades. Según la crítica, los puntos vulnerables de los personajes peredianos radican en la configuración psicológica construida sobre las nociones maniqueas del bien y del mal, y el resultado son arquetipos faltos de verosimilitud.

Blanco de la Lama pretende ofrecer una visión distinta, que parte de la incidencia del personaje femenino en la novela, de cómo va fraguándose esa personalidad en la mente del autor, y en la que la coherencia constante de los actos no debe interpretarse como limitación del personaje, sino como logro del creador. Elabora su tesis a base de las teorías expuestas por Fernando Montesinos en su *Pereda o la novela idilio* (Madrid: Castalia, 1969), y echa mano de una moderna bibliografía. Comenta las posibles comparaciones de personajes femeninos de Galdós, Clarín y Valera con los de Pereda y concluye que las figuras del escritor montañés no son ni pretenden ser complejas psíquicamente: lo que representan es el ideal femenino del escritor.

Analiza la investigadora cómo la ideología del narrador se plasma en la visión que ofrece de las mujeres, visión decimonónica que se vierte en la creación de su personaje, transformándolo en el reflejo de una realidad histórica. La novela perediana se caracteriza por una ideología católica, y sus ideas sobre el arte están de acuerdo con esta visión. La novela perediana está impregnada del "realismo filosófico," por lo que la realidad transcrita no es pura mimesis, sino de lo que se trata es de transcribir la naturaleza de los objetos y no sus formas.

El supuesto ideológico del escritor cántabro sobre la mujer crea una imagen femenina resultante de la triple dimensión ideológica: social, humana y literaria. La imagen resultante está contenida en parámetros ideológicos, por lo que ofrece una visión social opaca de la mujer, opacidad resultante del predominio de la función ideológica y moralista sobre la estética.

La imagen humana del personaje femenino de Pereda se construye también en función de un cierto concepto de "feminidad," diferente en Pereda de otros escritores decimonónicos. La feminidad para esa otra tradición literaria misógina posee atributos de ternura, sensibilidad, delicadeza, que se manifiestan en procesos de introspección y autoanálisiis. Este tipo presenta fuerte dependencia del hombre. La feminidad del personaje perediano posee rasgos opuestos al paradigma anterior. Pero la sensibilidad, delicadeza, y la ternura no son rasgos exclusivos a la

mujer. La feminidad en la narrativa perediana rompe los cánones tradicionales y se fundamenta en la coherencia que se establece entre el mundo interior y exterior de sus personajes. La inteligencia es un elemento importante en esas figuras de mujeres, que, además, se adecuan a un esquema próximo a la virilidad; dureza, frialdad, fortaleza; no se dejan conducir por sentimentalismos, y la razón predomina sobre la pasión.

La tipología perediana se basa en el tópico literario de la oposición campo/ciudad. La mujer urbana se opone a la aldeana, y esta oposición se basa en la descripción de la naturaleza. La mayoría de los personajes femeninos peredianos carecen de la singularidad de otras hermanas suyas en la narrativa decimonónica. Pereda sí construye personajes singulares en Sotileza, Agueda, etcétera, pero esa originalidad radica en la construcción del personaje y en su comportamiento alejado de los tópicos femeninos literarios decimonónicos. Se trata de una figura de mujer normal y corriente, no extraordinaria: viven peripecias poco interesantes, el tipo físico tiene lugar secundario, y está en armonía con el mundo interior del personaje.

El molde ideológico perediano se nutre de tres elementos: el cristianismo, la influencia materna y una doble dimensión geográfica y literaria. Bajo estas perspectivas se obtiene un personaje creado sobre la noción de un ideal. Esta figura deberá poseer las virtudes cristianas: abnegación, fortaleza, discreción, y aun una inteligencia superior a la masculina. La sencillez y naturalidad son otras cualidades inherentes a ellas.

Explica la autora que la novela del siglo XIX rompe con el esquema antagónico que establece héroes y antihéroes. Los personajes ganan en profundidad psicológica al transformarse en personajes redondos, las categorías de héroes y antihéroes pierden el espacio literario anterior. Los personajes son objeto de análisis a través del monólogo interior, por el que el novelista accede al mundo interior que describe muchas veces asepctos negativos de la conciencia humana. Con esto se inicia la degradación del personaje, que culmina en la novela existencial.

Pereda no sigue la doctrina naturalista-positivista que niega la parte espiritual de la persona. Construye sus personajes por series, de tal modo que muchos constituyen parejas definidas por oposición. La estructura de esa serie de personajes peredianos es piramidal, y en la cúspide se halla el ideal. En muchas novelas, los personajes femeninos van perfilando su personalidad por oposición a su antítesis en esa escala ascendente y descendente.

Las mujeres más suaves corresponden al ideal bucólico como Ana o Lituca de *El sabor de la tierruca* y *Peñas arriba*. En estas dos obras no hay antiheroína, pues éstas son dos novelas idílicas, donde se hace una exaltación de la vida del campo. Tanto Lituca como Ana no necesitan antiheroína, porque son personajes idealizados por la visión poética de su creador y se identifican plenamente con la naturaleza. En el caso de la personificación de la mujer cortesana prevalece la ironía, como recurso para la crítica y desmitificación del personaje, pero en el tipo idílico, la poetización llega al extremo. Pereda recrea a estos personajes femeninos con gran nostalgia, son arcádicos, y contribuyen a la creación del ambiente idealizado.

Sin embargo, Sotileza es la más lograda de las heroínas peredianas. En ella se reúnen todos los atributos mencionados: el magnetismo, la superioridad respecto a los demás. Inclusive Sotileza renuncia a su felicidad posible a través del matrimonio, en aras del ideal de la honra.

Según la autora de este estudio, el modelo de mujer idílica es Lituca de *Peñas arriba*, totalmente identificada con la naturaleza, lo cual redunda en perjuicio de su imagen plástica. No le cabe duda a Blanco de la Lama que es el personaje femenino más discreto y descolorido de

toda la galería perediana, pero no por ello tiene menor proyección novelesca, porque su interpretación debe hacerse desde el punto de vista poético y simbólico. Es Lituca el reflejo de la belleza y armonía de la naturaleza.

Concluye la autora que, por lo demás, las mujeres tienen en la novela perediana un papel social distinto al del hombre: mantienen una independencia afectiva del hombre y una superioridad psicológica sobre él. En los diálogos revelan también superioridad intelectual y caracterizaciones psicológicas más ricas. No es el sexo débil, aunque en algunas ocasiones utilice esta frase que desmienten luego sus personajes.

El libro contiene ideas interesantes, pero echamos de menos algunas referencias bibliográficas indispensables, como el magnífico ensayo sobre Pereda de Ramón Buckley, que ya data de una decena de años (*Raíces tradicionales de la novela contemporánea española* [Barcelona: Península 1986]). Hay en esas páginas uno de los mejores análisis de Lituca, justificándola, precisamente, por su naturaleza arcádica y comparándola con la figura de Marcela en el *Quijote*.

University of Texas at Austin

JULIO PEÑATE RIVERO, ed. *Realidad e imaginación en la obra de Pérez Galdós. Rumbos.* Núm. 13/14. Neuchâtel, Suisse: Institut d'Espagnol, Université de Neuchâtel, 1995. 180 pp.

Wifredo de Ràfols

The Spanish Institute of the University of Neuchâtel has been publishing *Rumbos* steadily since 1986, with each volume dedicated usually to a broad topic like autobiography or testimonial literature. Galdosistas should be gratified to learn, therefore, that here *Rumbos* dedicates a double volume exclusively to works by Galdós.

Julio Peñate Rivero's concise introduction is followed by eleven solid essays that are as varied in subject-matter as in critical approach. The essays are organized into groups that address broad issues, the novel, the *Episodios*, drama, and brief narrative. Víctor Fuentes, in "Galdós en la encrucijada noventayochista: De *Misericordia* a *Electra*," situates Galdós, by the light of Bakhtin, Benjamin, Ricoeur, and, especially, Levinas, at the forefront of "regeneracionistas." Fuentes underscores Galdós's preoccupation with the other and the masses as well as with consumerism and marginalized figures in *Misericordia*, then skilfully portrays Galdós as a trailblazer who anticipates such twentieth-century concerns as those expressed in the "Futurist Manifesto." Stephen Miller takes a very different turn in "Galdós en su tiempo y en el nuestro," in which he contrasts Ortega's and Galdós's views of history, correlates various totalizing accounts (particularly those of Germán Gullón) of Galdós's work with specific novels and periods, and stresses—not unpolemically—the importance of reading Galdós as a nineteenth-century writer. In the following essay, Julián Ávila Arellano contraposes Galdós scholars who perceive language as a chain of signifiers with those who cling to the referent as an index of

historical reality, and takes up the cause of the latter by presenting historical evidence that enriches readings of *La Fontana de Oro* and of the first two series of *Episodios nacionales*.

Critical sparring is notably absent from the next group of essays, which opens with Peter A. Bly's "Cómo pintar en la novela la verdad del estío madrileño, según Galdós y Picón." Bly's profound knowledge of *La de Bringas* is immediately manifest as he scrupulously compares Picón's depiction (in *La hijastra del amor*) of Madrid's summer swelter with Galdós's depiction (in *La de Bringas*) of the same phenomenon. Without devaluating the former's descriptive prowess, Bly records the special efficacy of the latter's descriptions by highlighting their inalienable link with the novel's theme and plot as well as with the protagonists' moral and economic motives. Vernon A. Chamberlin then adds to his incisive studies of *Fortunata y Jacinta* by comparing a traffic jam in *La desheredada* with a similar event in one of Fortunata's dreams, while María-Paz Yáñez rounds out this comparativist medley of essays by tracing—with a keen eye—unresolvable ambiguities in *La incógnita* and *Realidad*.

Rodolfo Cardona, in "*La campaña del Maestrazgo*: palimpsesto romántico," puts forward compelling arguments for accepting the parodicity of this *episodio* and maintains that the paratexts of history and romanticism it enacts anticipate postmodern discourse. Commendably, he strives to disentangle modernism and the "vanguardias" from postmodernism before explaining the manner in which the parodicity of *La campaña* is specifically postmodern. Next, Lieve Behiels focuses on narrative portraiture in the fourth series of the *Episodios nacionales* and develops a useful taxonomy of portraits—the most noteworthy of which is the "retrato diferido."

In "El carácter cinematográfico del teatro de Benito Pérez Galdós," Carmen Menéndez Onrubia sketches the cultural milieu of Spanish theatre against which Galdós would react. Estimable for the ample quoted passages it contains, this essay portrays Galdós as a modernist innovator whose words on cinematography Menéndez Onrubia finds prophetic. In "Metadrama, modernismo y noventayochismo en *Bárbara*," Theodore Alan Sackett offers an impressive analysis of the play's themes, plot, and characters, then scrutinizes its metafictive features. Sackett shows that, even in such details as the stage directions, Galdós's tragicomedy is informed by modernist and "noventayochista" concerns. In the closing essay, editor Peñate Rivero turns his attention to the little-studied *Necrología de un prototipo*. He finds that Galdós was already equipped—at this early stage in his writing career (1866)—with the unique social vision and narrative techniques that would nourish later masterpieces. In particular, Peñate Rivero examines instances of irony as well as hints of satire and parody, which reveal a modern authorial consciousness that is steeped in relativism.

Notwithstanding the wide diversity of outlooks that this double volume of *Rumbos* offers, a majority of these essays reflect a desire to show that Galdós was ahead of his time or, at least, that his texts can be read as participating in various twentieth-century intellectual movements. Synchronic historicists who take a dim view of twentieth-century theorizing about nineteenth-century works may find little comfort in the notion that the apparent ease with which Galdós can be read as participating in, for example, postmodernism is merely a function of the durability and universality of his texts. Yet synchronic and diachronic historicisms need not be mutually exclusive—they may coexist, as they do (albeit unintentionally) in this volume. Even as we increase our understanding of Galdós's work in relation to its historical context, his texts are literary objects that, if they are to continue to resonate through time, will be viewed as partici-

pating not only in the twentieth-century intellectual movements in which many of the essays in this valuable collection deem them to participate, but also in many movements to come.

University of Nevada, Reno

ALAN E. SMITH. *Benito Pérez Galdós. Cuentos fantásticos.* Madrid: Cátedra, 1996. 298 pp.

Julio Peñate Rivero

Quizás Galdós sea el primer responsable del escaso impacto de su obra breve entre los lectores de su época y aún entre los de hoy día, no sólo por lo limitado de su producción sino por la modestia con que a veces se refería a ella: "Son divertimientos, juguetes, ensayos de aficionado, y pueden compararse al estado de alegría, el más inocente, por ser el primero, en la gradual escala de la embriaguez," nos diría en su introducción, más exculpatoria que explicativa, a la edición de 1890 de *La sombra, Celín, Tropiquillos, Theros.*

No obstante, el panorama ha cambiado en los últimos años, gracias a diversas antologías que incluyen entre sus páginas algún cuento galdosiano y, sobre todo, con la aparición de varias selecciones de relatos de nuestro autor, como pueden ser la de Germán Gullón (*La conjuración de las palabras*, 1991), la de Oswaldo Izquierdo (*Los cuentos de Galdós*, 1994) y la del propio Alan Smith, que aquí comentamos. Se trata de una selección de doce cuentos hasta ahora nunca reunidos, a pesar de constituir un conjunto dotado de cierta unidad: su pertenencia a la modalidad literaria del relato fantástico. La reunión de estos relatos, para facilitar que estudiosos y lectores los incorporen a la vertiente fantástica de la narrativa galdosiana, justifica plenamente su publicación y es parte del mérito del editor, como lo puede ser también seleccionar unos textos en posible detrimento de otros. Así como no toda la cuentística de Galdós pertenece a la literatura fantástica, acaso tampoco éstos sean los únicos relatos fantásticos de su autor, puesto que tanto el problema del corpus textual de la narrativa breve galdosiana como el de su adecuación a determinadas modalidades literarias sigue estando pendiente de clarificación.

La selección, precedida de un prólogo sobre la trayectoria galdosiana dentro del cuento literario y de una breve bibliografía, recoge los relatos "Una industria que vive de la muerte," "La conjuración de las palabras," "La novela en el tranvía," "La pluma en el viento," "La mula y el buey," "La princesa y el granuja," "Theros," "Tropiquillos," "Celín," "¿Dónde está mi cabeza?," "El pórtico de la gloria" y "Rompecabezas." En cada uno el editor parte de un texto base (el considerado como la última versión corregida por el autor) y aporta las variantes observadas en relación con la primera edición, generalmente aparecida en la prensa, excepto cuando sólo se conoce una primera impresión. Se intenta modernizar la ortografía dejando la puntuación lo más próxima posible a la del autor.

Dado el enorme espacio ocupado por las variantes a pie de página y el escaso atribuido a las notas aclarativas, tal vez hubiera sido deseable invertir los términos o sustituir las primeras por las segundas, puesto que, además de escasas, suelen ser más bien sucintas. El lector, sobre todo el destinatario probable de una edición como ésta, echa de menos información sobre diversos

términos y nombres propios del texto, por ejemplo, a propósito de "berlina" (280), importante para saber si el descabezado protagonista de "¿Dónde está mi cabeza?" puede o no ser visto por los transeúntes. Por otro lado, probablemente no necesita parte de la que se da, como las notas aclaratorias en torno a personajes como Cervantes, Virgilio o Beethoven (228) y, en cambio, sí agradecería algún dato más sobre la obra de Thorlvaldsen, de quien, aparte de unas someras referencias biográficas, sólo se nos dice que era "conocido por sus temas clásicos" (193). Sin embargo, ese lector no percibirá algunos comprensibles despistes o errores en la transcripción del texto como, por ejemplo, el olvido de la palabra "aturdido," en la primera línea del segundo capítulo del antes citado "¿Dónde está mi cabeza?," que sí se encuentra en la primera versión del relato.

Al margen de estas y otras posibles observaciones, la presente publicación guarda todo su interés en la situación actual de los estudios sobre la narrativa breve galdosiana. Conviene recordar que el autor de esta edición tiene en su haber un análisis anterior de dicha narrativa (*Los cuentos inverosímiles de Galdós en el contexto de su obra*, 1992), lo que puede disculpar la relativa brevedad del prólogo del presente libro. Ambos textos resultan necesarios, tanto para acercarse a la cuentística galdosiana, como para conocer el pensamiento de la crítica reciente en torno a la misma.

Université de Neuchâtel-Bern Universität

JESÚS TORRECILLA. *El tiempo y los márgenes. Europa como utopía y como amenaza en la literatura española.* Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina, 1996. 206 pp.

Sadi Lakhdari

El tiempo y los márgenes de Jesús Torrecilla nos ofrece una reflexión centrada sobre el tema de la europeización y del casticismo en varias obras de Larra, Galdós y Unamuno. El autor de este ensayo defiende una tesis interesante: la conciencia de atraso respecto a ciertos países europeos, Francia e Inglaterra sobre todo, es un factor que condiciona de manera duradera la literatura española al nivel estético y conceptual. La conciencia de atraso provocaría en muchos autores españoles una reacción defensiva de repliegue de tipo nacionalista, destinada a evitar una pérdida de identidad. La ansiedad frente a la pérdida de identidad que supondría la adhesión a la europeización de España tiene como consecuencia paradójica la defensa, en gran parte irracional, del casticismo. La armonización entre las dos tendencias (europeísmo y casticismo) resultaría problemática para los autores incapaces de superar las fuertes tensiones interiores, suscitadas por esta contradicción, tanto en el plano afectivo como en el plano intelectual. Larra estimaría la europeización imposible, mientras que Galdós y Unamuno reaccionarían de manera defensiva, acumulando las contradicciones insuperables y creando una "literatura híbrida en la que se superponen e interaccionan las modas europeas y la tradición nacional" (189).

El autor empieza su ensayo con unos preliminares teóricos bastante complejos, en los que equipara la situación española con la de los países colonizados. Muestra también que las

utopías europeas publicadas a partir del fin del siglo XV tienen como correspondencia en España la proyección del topos europeo. La reflexión sobre las utopías, nutrida de numerosas referencias críticas, es en sí interesante, pero no tiene ninguna prolongación en el resto de la obra. El lector se extraña en particular de la total ausencia de referencias a la literatura utópica en el capítulo consagrado a *Ángel Guerra*. Por otra parte, la misma proliferación de referencias, a veces eclécticas, daña la coherencia general del propósito. Del mismo modo, el carácter heterogéneo de los textos estudiados conduce, a veces, a una esquematización, abusiva en el caso de Galdós. Los artículos o ensayos de Larra o Unamuno se prestan más fácilmente al tipo de interpretación escogido por el autor que las novelas de Galdós. En el caso de *Gloria*, novela de tesis bastante clara, se leen con interés las opiniones, a veces originales, del autor, que propone interpretaciones esclarecedoras de la célebre novela, en particular cuando trata de explicar por qué Galdós escogió un héroe judío.

Sin embargo, en el caso de *Ángel Guerra*, novela mucho más compleja, que no expone ninguna tesis evidente, el enfoque escogido por Jesús Torrecilla resulta mucho menos convincente. Su hipótesis no procura una clave explicativa bastante fina para dar cuenta de esta laberíntica obra. La interpretación fracasa porque el autor confunde las opiniones de Galdós con las de sus personajes, como lo evidencian expresiones como "tanto Ángel Guerra como Galdós" (110) o, "el cambio que en él y no sólo en Guerra, se ha experimentado" (131). Ni Leré, ni Ángel Guerra expresan directamente opiniones del autor. El sentido de la novela es global y muy claro cuando uno se obliga a analizar el texto en su conjunto. No se trata de una tesis sino de una novela cuyo sentido se expresa mediante la acción. La muerte de Ángel Guerra no es la prueba del fracaso de Galdós sino de su deseo de mostrar que la posición de su héroe es insostenible en el mundo contemporáneo, que rechaza las utopías. El pueblo siempre tiene la fe; las capas superiores, no. Ni la burguesía embutida en unas prácticas convencionales, ni los "intelectuales" tienen una fe verdadera, y este estado de cosas es irreversible. A pesar de su rechazo del materialismo grosero, la reacción espiritualista de fin de siglo resulta, para Galdós, interesante, simpática, pero totalmente irrealista.

El importante artículo de Vera Colin, citado por Jesús Torrecilla, establece de una manera creo que es definitiva que las opiniones de Leré son un trasunto de las teorías sostenidas por Tolstoi. Galdós no las nacionaliza, como lo afirma Jesús Torrecilla, las refuta en *Ángel Guerra*, mostrando la imposibilidad total de aplicarlas a la vida. El rechazo de la violencia y de la sexualidad, en particular, es totalmente utópico y provoca catástrofes. Sólo seres excepcionales, al límite anormal, como Leré y don Tomé, pueden carecer, aparentemente, del deseo sexual. Jesús Torrecilla no toma en cuenta la demostración de Vera Colin, lo que le conduce a adoptar ideas comunes, pero falsas, sobre la significación de la obra. Este tipo de interpretación resulta insostenible, si se sitúa la obra en su contexto histórico, que es muy preciso, y en el contexto literario de la época, lo que no hace el autor. Califica, sin más, de conservadora la posición de doña Sales, hablando, a su propósito, de la sociedad tradicional española. Pero ¿de qué conservadurismo se trata? Doña Sales pertenece a la burguesía liberal conservadora, encarna "el formalismo madrileño"; su fortuna proviene de la compra de bienes desamortizados, no representa las antiguas capas dirigentes y no defiende una política reaccionaria. Su concepción de la religión y de las influencias extranjeras son mucho más complejas de lo que deja suponer el estudio de Jesús Torrecilla. Éste nos explica, por otra parte, que "los datos son escasísimos en una obra tan extensa pero indicio

suficiente creo, para permitir afirmar que las ideas revolucionarias por las que Guerra lucha se consideran originadas en Europa." La intentona del 19 de septiembre en la que participa Ángel es la Villacampada (la fecha y el nombre de Campón lo prueban). Se trata, para Galdós, de un pronunciamiento típicamente español como lo puede comprobar el lector que se refiera al artículo vehemente de *La Prensa* sobre el mismo acontecimiento histórico. Este ejemplo muestra que Jesús Torrecilla afirma sin pruebas exactamente lo contrario de lo que dice Galdós y que era evidente para los lectores de la época, como lo muestran las críticas de los escritores contemporáneos, por ejemplo, Emilia Pardo Bazán. Sorprende que Jesús Torrecilla afirme que hay que considerar la totalidad de la producción de los autores para precisar sus posiciones, cuando no alude ni siquiera a los artículos de *La Prensa* que dejan entrever los puntos de partida de la inspiración galdosiana. Estudiar "las asociaciones simbólicas del texto" (119), sin tomar en cuenta el contexto histórico, resulta peligroso. El rechazo de la psicología, fundamental en esta obra, es otro presupuesto legítimo, pero muy discutible.

Siendo falsa la interpretación literal del texto, se derrumba el conjunto de la tesis. El supuesto casticismo defensivo de Galdós no existió nunca. No hay que confundir la observación simpática del atraso, que reviste un aspecto pintoresco en el caso de los campesinos o de los arrieros, con una defensa del casticismo. La crítica del vestido moderno uniformizado, por ejemplo, y la admiración por ciertos trajes de la Sagra corresponde a una nostalgia sin grandes consecuencias. Del mismo modo, la admiración por el arte religioso o por la liturgia católica no implica una conversión al catolicismo, por parte del autor.

Creo, al contrario de lo que sostiene Jesús Torrecilla, que *Ángel Guerra* es un buen ejemplo de la profunda inserción de la obra de Galdós en la corriente europea al nivel estético. Don Benito evoluciona en función de las corrientes literarias o de las obras importantes que se publican en Europa; reacciona frente a ellas pero no las imita. Su originalidad, especialmente a nivel estilístico, y la profunda integración de su obra en la historia española contemporánea, desconocida en el extranjero, explica, en parte, su escasa difusión fuera de los países hispanohablantes. La situación de atraso relativo de España en el siglo XIX, frente a lo que Galdós llama la incontestable fuerza de Francia en el dominio literario, es otro factor explicativo que habría que profundizar desde una perspectiva de sociología literaría.

Falta espacio para apuntar otras equivocaciones como, por ejemplo, la que se refiere a la noción de misticismo en *Ángel Guerra*, que no tiene nada que ver con el misticismo del siglo XVI, ya que Galdós es casi incapaz de entender una fe verdadera que no esté basada en la caridad activa en vez de la contemplación.

En resumidas cuentas, el trabajo de Jesús Torrecilla resulta interesante por los problemas que plantea y las interrogantes que suscita. Es mucho más sólido en las secciones que tratan de Larra o de Unamuno que en los capítulos dedicados a Galdós, siendo su método mucho más adecuado al estudio del pensamiento político o filosófico que al de la ficción.

La Sorbonne

MARÍA-PAZ YÁÑEZ. *Siguiendo los hilos: estudio de la configuración discursiva en algunas novelas españolas del* siglo *XIX*. Bern: Peter Lang,1996. 215 pp.

John W. Kronik

Hay títulos de libros que comunican su contenido; hay otros que sirven para seducir al lector. *Siguiendo los hilos* mana de la segunda alternativa. El subtítulo de este libro, más académico que seductor, incluso un poco torpe, no esclarece del todo el caso, pero da a entender que se tratará de una investigación de orientación teórica moderna encauzada hacia la narrativa del siglo pasado. Lo que el título deja en el tintero lo especifica el índice y lo explica la autora en una extensa introducción.

Con rigor y convicción, María-Paz Yáñez expone su proyecto de estudiar determinados esquemas recurrentes en una serie de textos que ha seleccionado no sólo por su importancia sino por su aptitud para ser abordados desde este ángulo. Tras resumir con autoridad los postulados teóricos dedicados a la identificación y definición de componentes repetidos en la obra literaria, y tras enfrentarse con la terminología al uso—motivos, temas, funciones, unidades, isotopías—, se apoya en Greimas y elige, no sin lógica, la "configuración discursiva" para designar las iteraciones que va a desenterrar. En la conclusión de su libro Yáñez reconoce el carácter difuso de su concepción de "figura" y concede la posibilidad de grados de figuración. Es tan abarcadora la categoría—objetos, personajes, espacios, conceptos abstractos—que el lector, confuso en un primer momento, tiene que ir acostumbrándose a inclusiones dispares y tiene que dejar atrás arraigadas posturas lectoriales. No sorprende que, a pesar de su concentración en la segunda mitad del diecinueve, Yáñez se distancie de la asediada denominación de "realismo" al distinguir debidamente entre realidad e ilusión de realidad.

Yáñez divide su empresa en dos partes. La primera, titulada "La configuración en el interior de un texto," consta de cuatro capítulos de extensión igual que versan sobre cuatro novelas bien conocidas de sendos escritores. Opta por una organización conceptual regida por configuraciones espaciales—o que ella, con criterios flexibles, define como espaciales—: 1) los espacios geográficos en *Un viaje de novios* de Pardo Bazán, derivados del motivo del viaje; 2) los espacios geométricos en *La Regenta*, concretamente la línea vertical; 3) la figura del carnaval como arquetipo cultural en *El sombrero de tres picos*; y 4) el relato dentro del relato, que Yáñez tiene por "una constante en casi todas las obras maestras" (19) y que discierne en *La Gaviota*. En el segundo tercio del libro Yáñez dedica tres capítulos a tres momentos de la novelística galdosiana, fijándose en cada caso en un fenómeno concreto aparentemente de poca envergadura, pero de fuertes repercusiones. No le interesa el factor diacrónico sino la actuación plurivalente de las configuraciones, por lo cual rehúye la cronología en ambas secciones de su estudio. Anuncia que entre la primera parte y la segunda hay un cambio de perspectivas desde las operaciones interiores de un texto individual a manifestaciones repetitivas a lo largo de la obra de un autor. Las dos partes suponen dos procedimientos analíticos diferentes, cuyos resultados responden a distintos tipos de exploración textual, limitada la una, más sintética la otra, aunque en honor a la verdad, salvo la concentración en un solo autor en la segunda parte, los métodos analíticos no son disímiles.

En todos los capítulos Yáñez exhibe un impresionante dominio de la bibliografía teórica, y, como ha demostrado con provecho en otras ocasiones, es excepcional entre los hispanistas por su capacidad de incorporar a su trabajo las contribuciones alemanas. Por lo que toca a lo concreto, aunque algún que otro artículo pertinente se le escapa a pesar de su vasta erudición y concienzuda investigación, su fuerte sentido de la responsabilidad la lleva a fundamentarse en los estudios críticos de sus antecesores, tanto españoles como extranjeros, pero siempre los supera dando un nuevo paso muy suyo. Donde sus antecesores repasaban los rasgos de movimientos culturales, ella descubre intertextos activos; mientras ellos se concentraban en la historia, ella pone de relieve la importancia del discurso. Ofrece a cada paso correctivos para interpretaciones anteriores, vislumbrando, por ejemplo, tonalidades irónicas en pasajes que otros han leído al pie de la letra.

Tal originalidad ya salta a la vista en su apreciación de *Un viaje de novios*, en cuya organización geográfica descubre una complejidad ignorada hasta ahora. Los sucesivos escenarios de la acción, según Yáñez, corresponden a un viaje discursivo a través de tres estilos literarios que se integran en una última sección. Vista bajo este prisma, la obra de Pardo Bazán es un metadiálogo entre dos estéticas, la romántica, caducando y transformándose, y la naturalista, en auge, pero reconstituida. Por lo tanto, el viaje del lector por la novela abarca simultáneamente el viaje de los personajes en la novela y el viaje literario que emprende la novela.

Por referirse a un texto tan extensa e intensamente analizado, el capítulo dedicado a *La Regenta* brinda menos sorpresas en su escrutinio de la línea vertical que, desde el principio, rige en la estructuración y en el planteamiento semántico de la novela de Leopoldo Alas. Aun así, atenta siempre a los matices poéticos y a la polisemia de las figuraciones lingüísticas, Yáñez da fe de la distancia que media entre una realidad histórica (la de Oviedo) y la nueva realidad creada (la de Vetusta), cuyas raíces en el mundo externo se modifican al volar por la imaginación artística. La conclusión sobre el esfuerzo que hizo Clarín para conciliar extremos es certera, y Yáñez sitúa este intento suyo, fracasado a nivel anecdótico, en la combinación geométrica de imágenes, en la que reside el acierto artístico de esta novela monumental.

El sombrero de tres picos, a pesar de su brevedad y su carácter popular, da ricos frutos al ser sometido a un estudio críticamente refinado que indaga en el carácter lúdico del relato. Tal aproximación conduce a Yáñez a apreciar el sombrero como objeto de disfraz y a percibir que el arquetipo cultural de lo carnavalesco es fundamental en la estructuración de la historia, aunque el carnaval como tal se concreta sólo en la segunda mitad. La investigación exhaustiva sobre la tradición carnavalesca y la viva capacidad asociativa de Yáñez le sirven al lector para vislumbrar mejor la elaboración formal y semántica de la obra; pero son de más resonancia las últimas páginas de este tercer capítulo, un colofón donde la autora opina que las subcorrientes irónicas, ambiguas y relativizadas del relato alarconiano dan a entender que las cosas no son como parecen. El ejercicio crítico de Yáñez se resuelve en una lectura deconstructiva que demuestra cómo el texto de *El sombrero de tres picos* se subvierte a sí mismo: "el juego consiste en simular una realidad que no existe" (109).

La narrativa de Cecilia Böhl de Faber suele atraer más a los historiadores de la literatura que a los críticos de estirpe posmoderna, de modo que el título del capítulo 4, "El relato autorreferencial. Fernán Caballero: del cuento a la novela," sorprende, a primera vista, porque los estudiosos que ven en su producción una carga tradicional y de peso ideológico no le han

aplicado tal vocabulario. Para conseguir esta transferencia metodológica y para extraer de la obra tonalidades desapercibidas, Yáñez no ha tenido más que aproximarse al texto, al de *La Gaviota* en concreto. Éste le revela sus secretos: su cuidadosa construcción simétrica y enmarcada; su organización a base de espacios geográficos que resultan ser metafóricos; la correspondencia entre estos espacios y escalas sociales y morales; y, a nivel del discurso, unos metacomponentes que desarrollan un planteamiento interior sobre la teoría y práctica de la novela. Bien visto, este capítulo es, más que nada, un estudio—un estudio de impresionante brillantez—sobre las estructuras interiores, metafóricas, que sirven para retratar simbólicamente a la protagonista, Marisalada, y que, a modo de *mise en abîme*, proponen un nuevo modelo para el género novelístico.

Galdós, por ser el verdadero gran renovador del género en España, lógicamente ocupa toda la segunda parte del libro de Yáñez en tres capítulos que llevan títulos poco informativos: "Trayectoria de una metonimia (1878-1887)," "El personaje-anáfora (1898-1900)" y "La conjunción de dos configuraciones (1876-1878)." De hecho, las fechas anexas tienen relativamente poca importancia, aparte de revelar la poca importancia que tiene la cronología. La misteriosa metonimia del primer capítulo se refiere a la velada comunicación erótica a la que recurre Galdós en circunstancias de fuerte represión moral y, consecuentemente, de autocensura. Y el código principal de esta presencia lúbrica que Yáñez ha identificado es "un objeto de uso corriente": el calzado, el modesto zapato que sirve para conservar la modestia de la mujer, pues el calzado es una metonimia del pie durante una época que escondió el cuerpo de la mujer, convirtiendo el pie en una peligrosa zona erógena. El capítulo es, en efecto, la historia de este motivo en una etapa de la producción galdosiana. Yáñez trae a colación ejemplos desde *La familia de León Roch* hasta *Fortunata y Jacinta* y traza la trayectoria de la degeneración moral de Isidora en *La desheredada* a través de su calzado. En lo específico, el zapato es un motivo cargado de múltiples posibilidades de significación, empezando con lo social e involucrando la sexualidad. En términos generales, su utilización por parte de Galdós en un sutil proceso de comunicación con su lector es una prueba más de la riqueza del andamiaje figurativo en sus novelas.

Nadie habría adivinado que con "personaje anáfora" Yáñez se refiere a la inadvertida recurrencia de Saloma, un personaje insignificante en la tercera serie de los *Episodios nacionales*, al menos insignificante antes de caer en manos de la agudísima observadora de detalles textuales que es María-Paz Yáñez. Pero la pobre Saloma está destinada a un papel muy secundario aun en estas páginas, porque este capítulo—el menos coherente y de menos impacto—en verdad se ocupa más del último estertor del romanticismo en una época de desengaño, y en este contexto abarca varios aspectos de los *Episodios* y sus personajes.

¿Qué tiene que ver el motivo de la mina (figura espacial) con la presencia de parejas (figura actorial)? Lo explica Yáñez en su último capítulo, donde reúne cuatro de las novelas de la primera época de Galdós para estudiar en ellas este cruce de configuraciones. Según Yáñez, la familia—o la pareja—es la unidad mínima de una sociedad a la cual Galdós critica, por encontrarse estancada en sus doctrinarias y adulteradas actitudes religiosas. Da resultados esclarecedores la yuxtaposición de *Doña Perfecta*, *Gloria* y *La familia de León Roch* desde esta perspectiva, pues del fracaso de las distintas relaciones de pareja en estas historias emerge el Galdós nada ortodoxo que la crítica moderna ha identificado, el Galdós hostil a la intolerancia

pero impaciente ante la ineficacia de los progresistas. Aunque a algunos lectores les pueda parecer arbitraria la relación, Yáñez asocia hábilmente con estas observaciones la figura de la mina, manteniendo que funciona como espacio metafórico, reflejo de los profundos principios que sólo puede reivindicar un diálogo tolerante. En *Marianela* esta metáfora adquiere su pleno poder poético, gracias a esas profundidades insondables de la imaginación artística, como Yáñez manifiesta elocuentemente. En fin, se trata de una serie de relaciones que al principio del capítulo parecen sorprendentes, si no espurias, pero, "siguiendo los hilos" que Yáñez teje al minar las conexiones recónditas del texto, acaban convenciendo al lector.

Yáñez sigue los hilos de las novelas que estudia, pero los hilos de su propio libro son muchos y dispares. Da la sensación de ser una colección de ensayos (algunos ya publicados); no hace falta leer los capítulos en orden, y no rompe ningún hilo quien omite algún capítulo. La coherencia de su libro reside más bien en la ejemplaridad de su procedimiento: la búsqueda y el encuentro de motivos o unidades mínimas dentro de una serie de textos. "Lo que quiero mostrar precisamente," anuncia al principio, "es cómo todo tipo de elemento recurrente en un texto funge a la vez de engranaje estructural y de soporte de los valores del discurso" (15), y al final ofrece lo que se puede tomar como una defensa contra posibles acusaciones de arbitrariedad o dispersión, al insistir que "cualquier figura del mundo puede crear toda una red de significaciones" (205). Su método supone una lectura cuidadosa del texto acompañada de un conocimiento de sus circunstancias extratextuales. El hilo más fuerte que une los capítulos de este libro, además de su coincidencia en el tiempo, es quizás la insistencia de la autora en la doble constitución del objeto textual como relato de vidas transcurridas en su historia y signo de su propia constitución novelesca. Efectivamente, el título metafórico de su libro se refiere más que nada a su propio método crítico: es un metatítulo. Lo confiesa Yáñez tajantemente en su último párrafo: quiere "llamar la atención sobre la riqueza de posibilidades que ofrece un procedimiento analítico" (208). La lección que desea impartir puede servir a críticos de varia ideología, pero el valor del método reside, no tanto en estas declaraciones de principio, como en la eficacia de su esmerada y provechosa aplicación a los textos que ha estudiado.

Cornell University