Although Galdós does not designate them as such, *El doctor Centeno*, *Tormento* and *La de Bringas* commonly are referred to as a trilogy because of the recurring characters which link the plot of each of these novels to the one preceding it. Throughout this trilogy, a character who originally has a secondary or minor role is suddenly given prominence in a single text, only to recede into the background in the subsequent novels. When we examine the narrative voice techniques used to develop these major recurring characters, we find that the shift in character importance is accompanied by a shift in discoursive presentation as well. While functioning in their original capacity, these characters are portrayed through external views. But during their tenure as protagonists, they receive extensive interior views. Thus, Felipe Centeno, a secondary character with no interiorizations in the *primera época* novel *Marianela*, comes to the forefront in *El doctor Centeno*, where his portrayal is primarily internal. Similarly, Amparo receives a largely external presentation as a minor character in *El doctor Centeno* but is viewed internally in *Tormento*. And finally, Rosalía de Bringas moves from an external to an internal portrayal as she leaves her secondary status in *Tormento* to become the principal character in *La de Bringas*.

As I have shown in my discussion of *La desheredada* and *Fortunata y Jacinta*, an intimacy is established between the reader and those characters who are given prolonged interior treatments. Similarly, a sense of distance is felt by the reader toward characters whose thoughts are rarely or never revealed. Thus, through the skillful interplay of interior and exterior views Galdós is able to ma-
nipulate the reader's emotional response in favor or against each of his various characters. This practice is particularly evident in the case of recurring characters whose discursive portrayal differs from one text to the next. In this chapter I will examine the narrative voice techniques which Galdós uses to depict Felipe, Amparo, and Rosalía as they appear over the course of the trilogy. In so doing, attention also will be paid to the manner in which the discursive portrayal of these three characters compares to the presentation given the other characters with whom they come in contact. Furthermore, I will discuss how narrator reliability affects the reader's reception of the major recurring characters. Finally, I will show how the interaction between the two narrative levels of each text – the story and the discourse – contributes toward the complexity of all three characterizations, and consequently, helps to account for the wide range of critical responses which these sequential protagonists have received over the years.

FELIPE CENTENO

Critical studies concerning El doctor Centeno display a startling lack of agreement, due primarily to the novel's episodic structure and its title character who is often peripheral to the action of the story. Citing the work's loose organization, José Montesinos regards the work as a fusion of two separate novels, the first volume being merely an introduction to the second one which features Alejandro Miquis as its protagonist. Because of his focus on Miquis rather than Centeno, Montesinos places this work into the category of "novelas de la locura crematistica" instead of his "novelas pedagógicas" classification. ¹ But Centeno's central status is defended by scholars who regard this novel as a Bildungsroman which documents Felipe's growth process through his life experience with two masters. ² However, Hazel Gold has suggested that the linear structure of Felipe's personal development is thwarted by the circular

structure also operating in the text. Other critics cite an organizing theme, such as education or traditional values, to compensate for the lack of a clear-cut protagonist. How can we reconcile these divergent critical positions? When we examine the narrative voice in this double volume novel, we find that Galdós varied his distribution of certain devices from one volume to the next. This change in narrative voice technique has an impact on the depiction of both Centeno and Miquis, and consequently affects the reader's perception of each character's importance in the text.

In volume 1 Felipe Centeno's portrayal is primarily internal. That is, the reader frequently has direct access to Centeno's consciousness through direct and free indirect thought. These extensive interiorizations play a large part in quickly establishing a personal relationship between him and the reader. In contrast, Alejandro Miquis's characterization in volume 1 is entirely external, achieved through dialogue and narrative description. Direct representation of Miquis's thoughts and emotions is totally absent. At the close of this volume the narrator states that he will continue to recount the adventures of Centeno and Miquis in the following volume, but that "en vez de un héroe, ya tenemos dos." Significantly, in volume 2 there is a sudden and dramatic shift toward interiorization for Miquis as well as Centeno. Thus, volume 2 features extensive inside views - conveyed through direct and free indirect thought - of both characters.

In the first volume Miquis actively engages in daily activities while Centeno largely observes. Centeno's passive role is offset, however, by the powerful effect of the lengthy interior views which focus reader attention on him. In the second volume the situation is reversed. Because of his illness and financial ruin, Miquis becomes the passive character while Centeno deals with the everyday demands of life. Miquis's prominence in the text, however, is insured by allowing him interior views which were denied him earlier. Since Centeno's interiorization is no longer exclusive, the strength of his
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hold on the reader is somewhat diluted while that of Miquis is substantially augmented.

In short, if we look at the text as a whole composed of two interrelated volumes, we can say that Centeno and Miquis are co-protagonists who complement each other by alternating in emphasis between the story and discourse (the discourse being the means of expression used to transmit the content of the story to the reader) from one volume to the next. In the first volume Miquis controls the story through his numerous plot actions, while the focal point of the discourse is on Centeno’s interior views. In the second volume it is Centeno’s activities which move the story along, while Miquis’s mental musings are highlighted in the discourse. Thus, we can understand the critical contention that the novel does not have a clearly established protagonist. Yet, it is also easy to see how either Miquis or Centeno can be chosen as the main character. Miquis’s initial activity within the plotline lends a high degree of importance to his character, which later acquires additional depth through interior views. Conversely, the intimacy established between the reader and Centeno early in the novel as a result of interiorization is continued into the second half where his actions also become gradually more significant to the plot progression. An examination of narrative voice techniques, then, uncovers some possible reasons behind the differing critical reception of the two major characters of the text. Yet, it gives rise to an even more fundamental question. Why is Centeno depicted internally throughout the entire text while Miquis is granted interior views only in the second half? The following discussion will attempt to answer this question by pointing out the effects which perhaps governed Galdós’s choice of narrative voice techniques to portray these two characters.

Unlike Alejandro Miquis, Felipe Centeno is a recurring character who already had been introduced in a previous novel. Despite the minor role that he plays in Maríanela, his character is well-defined and reasonably developed. In this early work his portrayal is entirely external, through his dialogues with Maríanela and in narrative commentary. His conversations with Maríanela reveal his desire to make something of himself, and the narrator openly praises him for being the only member of his “familia de piedra” to rebel against their dehumanized existence. Nevertheless, Centeno’s higher aspirations are not entirely altruistic. His interest in educating himself is primarily motivated by the financial rewards and prestige
that becoming a doctor would bring him, and it is to that end that he strikes out on his own for Madrid. At the close of Marianela the narrator promises the reader a future book about Centeno’s adventures. El doctor Centeno, of course, is that book. Because of our previous acquaintance with Centeno, his character must display a certain continuity from one novel to the next. Yet, if he is to win our affection, his cocky personality, his greed, and his status-seeking must give way to his better qualities. Thanks to his numerous interiorizations in El doctor Centeno, we learn that these character flaws simply are attributable to his youth and naiveté, and therefore, they diminish as he matures. In contrast, his more positive traits—those we see in his tender moments with Marianela—are shown to be permanent and become more prominent as time goes on. His closeness with Marianela and his genuine concern for her welfare attest to his ability to respond compassionately to others. This potential for human growth finds its fullest expression in his relationship with Alejandro Miquis.

In El doctor Centeno it is important to keep in mind Chatman’s distinction between perspective that resides in the narrator (i.e. the narrative slant) and perspective that belongs to a character (i.e. a narrative filter). Although El doctor Centeno is told by an unnamed third person narrator, it is Felipe Centeno’s perspective as an observer of events which dominates many of the scenes. As Germán Gullón has aptly stated, Felipe “es el prisma humano a través del cual se filtran los hechos que ocurren en la novela.” This role as narrative filter is established in the very first chapter of the novel where the banquet given by don Florencio Morales y Temprado is described from Centeno’s point of view. The narrator clearly announces the perceptual orientation of the scene by stating that Centeno “observaba todo, callado y circunspecto. Nada perdía su activa penetración; a su instintivo examen de las cosas, nada se escapaba” (vol. 1, ch. 1, sec. 3). Thus, the description of the banquet is filtered through Centeno’s point of view. But the boy’s perceptual perspective—what he sees, hears, and smells—is strongly affected by his interest perspective. Because of his overwhelming hunger,
Centeno largely focuses on the food and those eating or serving it. In his joy over receiving such an abundant serving, he regards everyone around him as a representative of all that is good and beautiful. It is left to the reader to make more objective judgments concerning Centeno's dinner companions as the novel progresses.

Centeno functions as the empathetic vehicle for experiencing the events of the text since our knowledge of the novelistic world is largely derived from his impressions of it. Centeno's perspective frequently dominates as the narrator temporarily recedes, only to once again take charge of the narrative and make objective comments or value judgments. Thus, the naive viewpoint of the young boy works in conjunction with the worldly perspective of the narrator to provide the reader with a layered reading experience. Centeno is a boy living in an adult world, and his view of it is conveyed in filtered descriptions. We, along with the narrator, know that Centeno's understanding often is faulty or incomplete due to his youth and inexperience. Thus, we look beyond Centeno's assessments to find the whole picture, and the narrator helps us by providing the necessary clues to fill in the missing gaps. An example is seen in the characterization of Amparo. Centeno's idealistic vision of her conflicts with the narrator's indications of her romantic entanglement with the priest, Pedro Polo. Yet, because the reader sees her largely through the eyes of a highly sympathetic character, her portrayal tends to be positive despite the suggestion of sexual impropriety. Our emotional response to Amparo is influenced by Centeno's view of her, but unlike the boy we are able to temper that opinion with a degree of worldly understanding given us by the narrator. Thus, we reserve our judgment of Amparo until we receive more evidence which, of course, is forthcoming in the next installment of the trilogy. Overall, *El doctor Centeno* combines qualities of the limited perspective of first person narration (conveyed in descriptions filtered through Centeno) with the unlimited perspective of the omniscient third person narrator. In this way we feel the immediacy of Centeno's experience, but Galdós is not hampered by the restrictions of Centeno's solitary perspective. The result is a far richer narrative than would have been possible had it been written in the first person. Despite the picaresque format of the novel, Galdós chose to dis-

---

8 That is, through filtered descriptions the heterodiegetic narrative acquires some of the personalized feel of a homodiegetic narrative.
pense with the protagonist-as-narrator convention associated with that genre, thereby gaining greater flexibility in narrative voice technique.

A variation on the filtered description is found in section 4, chapter 2 of the second volume where Centeno eavesdrops on conversations between Miquis and a woman identified only as “la Tal.” No dialogue is recorded. Instead, the scenes are relayed through Centeno’s mental impressions of the words spoken by the woman. That is, the free indirect speech of “la Tal” is presented from Centeno’s perceptual point of view. In this way we learn the content of the conversations along with some indication of the woman’s manner of speaking. The following is an excerpt from the first of these conversations:

¿Qué lengua hablaban? Ya,... se comía la mitad de las palabras, y las otras las remataba con un dejo... ¡ay! Era andaluza... La Tal charlaba, charlaba en su graciosa lengua andaluza... ¡Tanto tiempo sin verle! No hacía más que pensar en él... ¡pobrecito! Era menester que se pusiera pronto bueno... Ella estaba muy disgustada. ¡Le pasaban unas cosas..., pero unas cosas! No podía vivir. Aún creyó entender Felipe que lloriqueaba algo.

These scenes acquire a secretive feel since they are presented second hand through a hidden observer, and the unknown woman becomes all the more mysterious because we are denied direct contact with her. Indeed, she continues to be a shadowy figure throughout the text since the narrator does not intervene to give us even the most rudimentary information about her, such as her name. Her lack of clarity facilitates the reader’s acceptance of the blurring which will occur later in the novel between “la Tal” and the heroine of Miquis’s play, la Carniola. Indeed, due to these conversations it is Centeno who first suggests to Miquis the similarity between the real woman and her fictional counterpart.

Centeno’s point of view also is conveyed through his thoughts, unequally divided between direct and free indirect passages. Direct thought – displaying Centeno’s idiosyncratic syntax and vocabulary – appears infrequently in the text. More commonly we find passages recording his free indirect thoughts. On the whole these segments reflect some of Centeno’s unpolished verbal style but do not fully imitate his speech. There is a practical reason for this emphasis
on free indirect thought over direct thought. Rather than have the reader struggle to decipher numerous direct representations of Centeno’s idiom, Galdós relies heavily on free indirect thought to capture the general flavor of the boy’s manner of speaking without citing his actual words. Short passages of this type appear in virtually every chapter, however, one lengthy example is worthy of particular note. In volume 1, chapter 2, section 6 a very depressed Centeno is thinking about his failure in Polo’s school. Centeno considers himself to be worthless because he cannot learn anything from Polo or Ido, whom he sees as “dos templos de sabiduría.” He also chastises himself for thinking that instead of using books, he can learn by asking questions about everyday things that interest him. In this free indirect thought passage the double-voicing associated with this device is used to juxtapose Centeno’s limited understanding of the situation against the narrator’s larger appreciation of what is happening in the story. In the process, Polo’s school is ironized because of its failure to respond to the natural curiosity of a student who is highly motivated to learn. Felipe’s desire to learn about natural phenomena (“por qué las cosas, cuando se sueltan al aire, caen al suelo; ... Qué virtud tiene una pajita para dejarse quemar, y por qué no la tiene un clavo; ... por qué el aceite nada por el agua; ... qué es esto de echar agua por los ojos cuando uno llora”) finds no answers in what the narrator calls Polo’s inyectocerebral method of teaching by rote memorization. As José Luis López Muñoz has observed, “Felipe Centeno habría sido el alumno ideal para Jesús Delgado.” Indeed, this former employee of the Dirección de Instrucción Pública was dismissed precisely because he advocated the kind of active, student-centered, hands-on learning Felipe craves. Thus, through Felipe’s naive view of himself as a “bobo,” Galdós is able to comment not only on Polo’s pedagogical techniques in particular, but also on Spain’s educational system in general.

Present tense narration provides an additional method of communicating the events of the text from Centeno’s perspective. Dur-
ing periods of emotional intensity, it occasionally is used to provide a link to Felipe's consciousness. In effect, these are quasi-interior views which combine the properties of both direct and free indirect thought. That is, the present tense format of direct thought is coupled with the third person pronoun reference and untagged status of free indirect thought. Present tense narration has the appearance of a free indirect thought passage, but it features present and future tense verbs rather than the traditional imperfect and conditional tenses. By allowing the present tense to momentarily encroach on the domain of the past tenses and assume the function of telling the story, Galdós is able to give a feeling of intensity and immediacy to the events thus represented. This phenomenon can best be explained through an examination of the different temporal planes operating in the storytelling situation: the story NOW and the discourse NOW. The story NOW refers to the time period in which the characters engage in the events which take place, while the discourse NOW is the time period in which the narrator tells the story to the reader. In El doctor Centeno these time periods are 1863 and 1883, respectively. Since the narrator deals with events which already have occurred, the story NOW of the characters pre-dates the discourse NOW of the narrator and consequently is related in the past tense. But the discourse NOW also exists as a type of perpetual present which is shared with each new reader who enters into the storytelling situation. The introduction of brief passages of present tense narration into a text which is otherwise narrated in the past suddenly reduces the distance between the reader and the fictional world by placing the reader and the characters on the same temporal plane – that of the story NOW. The reader lives the moment along with the characters, and therefore it appears more vivid. This effect accounts for the traditional use of the “historical present” by writers who wish to heighten the impact of dramatic scenes. Segments typically cast in the present tense by Galdós, however, differ from the norm because they involve emotionally intense situations that focus on the subjective reactions of the characters rather than the dramatic quality of the events. Consequently, they feature descriptive passages of events which in themselves are mundane, but which hold some special importance to the characters. 
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such cases, it is the *personal* drama of the events which is conveyed. Galdós uses present tense narration as a vehicle for allowing the reader to experience the events of the story though the emotional filter of its participants. In *El doctor Centeno* that filter is Felipe; in *Tormento* it is Amparo.

The entire first section of *El doctor Centeno* is narrated in the present tense. It opens with the chronicler-narrator's remarks concerning Felipe, during which he formally announces himself as an "historiador" bringing information to his reading public. This introductory portion is told entirely in the voice of the narrator, but approximately midway through section 1 — when the boy lights up the cigar — Felipe's voice begins to seep into the narration. Throughout Felipe's cigar smoking experience and his subsequent fainting spell, the narrator's presence fades as Felipe's strengthens. Information concerning Centeno's external reality is sifted through the boy's consciousness and presented as a response to what he sees. Like free indirect thought, present tense narration can capture the essence of Centeno's verbal style while retaining the voice of the narrator. This combination is particularly effective in its final few paragraphs:

Contempla la mole del Hospital. ¡Vaya que es grandote! La Estación se ve como un gran juguete de trenes de los que hay en los bazares para el uso de los niños ricos. Los polvorosos muelles parece que no tienen término. Las negras máquinas maniobran sin cesar, trayendo y llevando largos rosarios de coches verdes con números dorados. Sale un tren. ¿Adónde irá? Puede que a Rusia o al *mismo* Santander... ¡Qué tíe que ver esto con la estación de Villamojada! Allá va echando demonios por aquella *escañada*... Sin *ponderancia*, esto parece la gloria eterna. ¡Válgame Dios, Madrid! ¡Qué risa!... Al héroe le entra una risa franca y ruidosa, y vuelve a escupir.

¿Pues y la casona grande que está allí arriba, con aquella rueda de *columnas*?... ¡Ah, ya, ya lo sabe! Poquito el ciego se lo ha dicho. Ya se va *destruyendo*. ¡Sabe más cosas!... En aquella casa se ponen los que cuentan las estrellas y *desaminan* el sol para saber esto de los días que corren y si hay truenos y agua por arriba... Paquito le ha dicho también que tienen aquellos señores unas *antiparras* tan grandes como cañones, con las cuales... Otra salivita.

Pero, ¿qué pasa? ¿Los orbes se desquician y ruedan sin concierto? El Hospital empieza a tambalearse, y por fin da gra-
ciosas volteras, poniendo las tejas en el suelo y echando al aire los cimientos descalzos. La Estación y sus máquinas se echan a volar, y el río salpica sus charcos por el cielo. Éste se cae como un telón al que se le rompen las cuerdas, y el Observatorio se le pone por montera a nuestro sabio fumador, que siente malestar indecible, dolor agudísimo en las sienes, náuseas, desvanecimientos, repugnancia... El monstruo, vencedor y no quemado por entero, cae de sus manos; quiere el otro dominarse, lucha con su mal, se levanta, da vueltas, cae atontado, pierde el color, el conocimiento, y rueda al fin, como cuerpo muerto por rápida pendiente como de tres varas, hasta dar en un hoyo.

Silencio, nadie pasa... Transcurren segundos, minutos... (vol. 1, ch. 1, sec. 1)

By using present tense narration to introduce this character, Galdós establishes an immediate bond between the boy and the reader, who co-temporally experiences the lightheadedness of the novice smoker. In addition, the present tense allows us to feel directly the wonderment of this small-town boy as he comes in contact with the big city for the first time.

Present tense narration is similarly used near the end of the novel (vol. 2, ch. 3, sec. 5) during the scene in which Centeno fulfills his ambition to be a doctor in the only way possible to him – by performing an autopsy on a cat. Thanks to his many hours spent secretly perusing Cienfuegos’s anatomy books, Felipe is able to examine the animal with a degree of naive sophistication. Hardly the dunce he had been characterized as being by Polo, Centeno exhibits a self-taught command of rudimentary anatomy. Centeno’s surgical preparations are recounted in the past tense, but the operation itself is told in present tense narration followed by Centeno’s verbalized thoughts. Every step of the procedure is relayed from Centeno’s point of view. Present tense narration permits us to see the scene through Felipe’s eyes, while his direct thoughts and speech allow us to witness Felipe’s ideas as they occur to him. Past tense narration is reestablished only when Centeno’s concentration
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12 In Images of the Sign: Semiotic Consciousness in the Novels of Benito Pérez Galdós (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1990) 41-48, Akiko Tsuchiya has noted that Felipe’s interest in certain subjects over others is a reflection of his search for a natural correspondence between signs and referents. He enjoys anatomy and geography because these are based on motivated signs, but he dislikes the arbitrary signs of grammar and math.
suddenly is broken by the voice of his neighbor calling to him. The use of present tense in this segment not only underscores the importance of the event to Felipe, but it also allows the reader to participate in it vicariously and to feel the curiosity and enthusiasm that still resides in the boy despite all the hardships he has endured during his disillusioning stay at Polo’s school. Galdós’s choice to narrate the surgery in the present tense represents a change from his original plan. In the manuscript of El doctor Centeno he first described the operation with preterite and imperfect verbs, which he subsequently scratched out and replaced with their present tense counterparts. In so doing, Galdós created the effect of having Centeno’s present and the reader’s present come together in a commonly shared experience.13

Present tense narration is also used to convey Alejandro Miquis’s point of view, but only in the second volume when he too is granted interior views. An interesting combination of present tense narration and free indirect thought is seen in chapter 3, section 7 when Miquis’s illness has so unbalanced his mind that he confuses the people in his life with the characters in the play he is writing. In a long free indirect thought passage he sees himself as the Duque, while la Tal is transformed into his heroine la Carniola, and Centeno becomes Quevedo. In his delirious state Miquis imagines his room to be a stage set, with la Tal’s visit signaling her entrance. As Miquis replaces the reality of his life with the fantasy of his play, the past tense verbs temporarily yield to those of the present. At first, the switch seems to represent nothing more than the common practice of using the present tense to summarize the plot of a play. But when the present tense continues into the description of what la Tal and Centeno are doing, it has the disorienting effect of placing the reader in the timelessness of Miquis’s feverish mind where there is no distinction between his play and the world around him. Significantly, the past tense narration resumes as soon as Centeno and la Tal are out of Miquis’s sight. By switching from the past to the present tense in this segment Galdós was stylistically able to fuse Miquis’s perceptual perspective—what he sees in his

13 The original manuscript of El doctor Centeno is located in the Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid), with a photocopy in the Casa-Museo Pérez Galdós (Las Palmas de Gran Canaria). The present tense segment pertaining to the cat surgery is on page 321.
real life — with the conceptual perspective of the fictional world he is creating in his mind. Furthermore, the present tense orientation of his delirium draws the reader into the now of the story to experience first-hand Miquis’s slowly deteriorating grasp on reality.

Indeed, all the later inside views of Miquis — through direct as well as free indirect thoughts — reveal the picture of a man who is gradually falling under the power of a double obsession: his play and its heroine. As Gustavo Correa and Rodolfo Cardona have shown, Galdós uses El grande Osuna to satirize 19th-century Romantic drama, which was rooted in the artificiality of the Calderonian tradition. But Galdós satirizes the concept of the Romantic artist as well. Romanticism saw a connection between disease and art due to the consuming and devouring nature of both. Tuberculosis, in particular, was associated with a heightening of aesthetic appreciation and was seen as inspiring creative genius. The physically incapacitated writer would channel all natural urges into mental activity. Thus, the consumptive Miquis is in the appropriate state of health to compose his play. His money gone and his strength declining, he is the personification of the suffering Romantic writer who, coincidentally, is composing a Romantic drama. Miquis dedicates all of his attention to perfecting El grande Osuna, and as a result, he becomes enamored with the woman who reminds him of its heroine. His sexual feelings for la Tal, unrealizable in his weakened state, take an artistic form instead. In his mind, Miquis substitutes his role as the Romantic artist for that of the Romantic hero, thereby becoming a robust adventurer instead of a diseased writer. Consequently, when la Tal needs rescuing from a jealous brute, Miquis attempts to save her, just as the duke saved la Carniola from Jacques Pierre. Thus, two versions of the same play are in operation for Miquis — one featuring the historical figures, and the other star-


15 See Jeffrey Meyers, Disease and the Novel, 1880-1960 (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1985) 7-8. In addition, Susan Sontag, Illness as Metaphor (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1977) 63, has noted that the “consumption” metaphor for tuberculosis in the nineteenth-century implied the squandering of resources, both corporal and economic. Thus, Galdós was able to use Miquis’s illness not only to satirize Romanticism, but also to criticize Miquis’s unrestrained spending habits and wild living which led to his physical decline.
ring Miquis and la Tal as their heroic counterparts. The first is communicated to the reader through lengthy conversations between Miquis and Centeno which are reminiscent of the accounts made by Don Quijote to Sancho concerning chivalric novels. Some of these speeches are similar to dramatic monologues since only Miquis’s words are recorded. But whereas this official, written play takes shape during these exterior views of Miquis, the other version develops within Miquis’s mind and is revealed to the reader through interior views. This difference in discoursive presentation helps the reader to distinguish between the two versions later in the text when Miquis himself cannot.

Now we can return to our question of why Centeno’s interior views span the entire novel while those of Miquis are contained within the second volume alone. By limiting interiorizations to Centeno in volume 1, Galdós insures the reader’s interest in his character. This is necessary because Centeno serves as the naive counterpoint to the worldly perspective of the narrator, and the combination of both viewpoints constitutes the global vision of the text. Since this function continues throughout the novel, Centeno’s interior views likewise continue from one volume to the next. Miquis’s role in the first volume is to serve as Centeno’s means of entering the social world portrayed in the text. While Miquis interacts with other characters, Centeno silently observes and reflects on what he sees. Centeno’s mental reactions record Miquis’s physical actions.

In the second volume, however, Miquis’s thoughts also come to the fore. This occurs after Miquis is explicitly announced as co-protagonist of the text. Miquis shares the spotlight with Centeno in volume 2 by suddenly intruding on the boy’s monopoly of interior views, thereby slightly diminishing Centeno’s importance while increasing it for himself. As the boy continues his picaresque adventures and becomes adept at handling the demands of daily life, the master is freed to pursue literary fantasies which eventually bring him to the edge of madness. Thus, the second volume combines elements of Lazarillo de Tormes and Don Quijote. Within the picaresque tale Centeno is the major character and Miquis is the secondary one, just as Lazarillo outshines the escudero. But within the Cervantine adaptation the roles are reversed and Miquis’s position is of greater importance than that of Centeno, mirroring the relationship between Don Quijote and Sancho. This added emphasis on Miquis’s character is reflected in his abrupt switch toward interi-
orization, which implicitly signals his new status to the reader. Volume 2 becomes Miquis’s story while, at the same time, it continues to be Centeno’s story. Just as Centeno’s prime importance in volume 1 is established through interior views, Miquis’s additional value in volume 2 is marked by his interiorizations. Both characters are co-protagonists of the entire novel and primary protagonists of their own realms within that novel, and this situation is reflected in the narrative voice techniques used to portray them.

AMPARO

The second novel in the trilogy has as its protagonist a character who hardly appears in El doctor Centeno but has an important behind-the-scenes role in Pedro Polo’s life. As she moves to center stage in Tormento, the reader is obliged to piece together the truth about her past and to complete the very sketchy personality profile begun in the earlier text. It is a critical commonplace to point out that, with the exception of her lost virginity, Amparo has all of the qualities of the ideal romantic heroine found in serialized fiction. Like these heroines Amparo is a beautiful, poor, modest, domestic, hard-working, and obedient young woman whose very name suggests that she will be a supportive life companion. Unfortunately, she also has the typical heroine’s passivity, a trait which may have led to her sexual liaison with Polo and which most certainly contributed toward the complications in her engagement to Agustín. Yet despite her past affair with a priest, scholars generally consider her to be neither immoral nor bad, and several studies discuss how Galdós uses Ido’s folletín to highlight the inadequacies of a value system that would judge her as being so. In particular, Alicia An-

16 Recently Hazel Gold 101-22 has shown how that same type of character is one of the stock elements of the romantic theater as well.

17 Galdós’s parodic use of the conventions associated with serialized fiction has been discussed from a variety of perspectives in a number of studies. For the most thorough treatments see Alicia G. Andreu, Modelos dialógicos en Galdós, Purdue Monographs in Romance Languages 27 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1989) 21-29; Bridget A. Aldaraca, El Ángel del Hogar: Galdós and the Ideology of Domesticity in Spain, North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures 239 (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1991) 139-59; Stephanie Sieburth, Inventing High and Low: Literature, Mass Culture, and Uneven Modernity in Spain (Durham: Duke UP, 1994) 100-36; Anthony Percival, “Melodramatic Metafiction in Torment-
Dreu and Bridget Aldaraca show how Galdós exposes some of the inconsistencies inherent in the bourgeois feminine ideal by using Amparo’s plight to point out the practical difficulties involved in the concept of virtuous poverty which was idealized in serialized literature. Indeed, Amparo is often described as a victim, not only of Polo’s sexual advances but also of a crushing economic situation from which she has few avenues of escape. Yet a strong minority opinion sees Amparo in a less favorable light. To Rodney Rodríguez she is a scheming opportunist who seduced and financially ruined Polo before abandoning him in search of a richer prey. She is also criticized by Eamonn Rodgers, Peter Bly, and Lou Charnon-Deutsch for what they call her cruel and heartless rejection of Polo. Rodríguez and Rodgers particularly stress the selfishness of Amparo’s behavior because they characterize her affair with Polo as being based on honesty, trust, and affection.

Yet what exactly do we know about the past relationship between Polo and Amparo? Galdós is silent on this point. As Diane Urey has ably shown, the reader must use small clues in the text to fill in the missing gaps. It is through this inferential process that the reader is able to ascertain that their relationship was of a sexual nature. But that fact is all we ever know for sure. Although the text requires us to guess that an affair had taken place between these two characters, it does not allow us to know what that affair was.
like. What Wolfgang Iser calls the "areas of indeterminacy" concerning the affair cannot all be resolved because we are not given enough information about the dynamics of their relationship. But our urge to eliminate every single one of these indeterminacies can become so strong that there is a danger of overfilling the gaps. Like Marcelina, we want to know everything, and consequently we may jump to conclusions or provide elaborate details that make the broadly sketched picture of the lovers seem more complete. Geoffrey Ribbons's lengthy defense of Amparo speaks to this issue by showing how the textual evidence cited by Rodríguez does not support his claim that Amparo seduced Polo. Ribbons also answers those who sympathize with Polo over Amparo by demonstrating how that position ignores Polo's betrayal of his triple responsibility to Amparo as an older relative, as a trusted friend of the family, and as a representative of the church. Finally, Ribbons counters the argument that the affair had been a period of mutual happiness for the lovers by using textual evidence to construct an opposing scenario in which Amparo, due to her youth and inexperience, was seduced by Polo and then pressured into resuming the affair after her father's death. 21 This same interpretation of the events is held by José Montesinos, who cites Polo's violence as a justification for such a reading. 22

All of this debate concerning the Polo-Amparo affair merely underscores the fundamental indeterminacy of the text on this matter. The text leads us to the conclusion that Polo and Amparo were sexually involved, but the textual evidence does not indicate which of the parties was the seducer, neither does it let us know what happened during the affair, nor does it give us the reason why the lovers broke up. That is, certain indeterminacies are meant to be clarified, and some are not. 23 We may speculate as to the nature of

22 Montesinos 2: 105.
23 Michael A. Schnepf, "The Manuscript of Galdós's Tormento," Anales Galdosianos 26 (1991): 45-47 points out that the original manuscript of this novel contains a few additional details concerning the affair, all of which cast Amparo in a somewhat less sympathetic light while portraying Polo more sympathetically. However, it is important to remember that these deleted details were part of a larger rewriting of the plotline and do not represent facts that were intended to be reconstructed by the reader. While manuscripts and galleys provide fascinating insights
the affair, but all of our conclusions are ultimately unverifiable. Those readers, such as Rodríguez, who do attempt to resolve everything fall into the trap of overfilling the textual gaps. Furthermore, in their search for textual clues, these readers are so drawn to the story level of the narrative that they may resist the pull of the discourse, and consequently they may also fail to respond to the interiorization devices used to develop Amparo’s character. Indeed, Amparo’s portrayal in this trilogy is constructed though the carefully balanced interplay of her actions (within the story) and her thoughts (conveyed in the discourse). An emphasis on one narrative level over the other upsets that balance and results in a skewed reading of Amparo’s character. To focus on the story is to condemn Amparo for her behavior with Polo and toward Agustín. To focus on the discourse is to empathize with her to such a degree that she is unconditionally forgiven. Only by taking into consideration both the story and the discourse are we able to avoid such black and white interpretations and come to the more subtly shaded readings that the texts afford. A detailed examination of Amparo’s portrayal in both El doctor Centeno and Tormento will demonstrate how discourse and story combine to create a complex characterization for this heroine who, on the surface, seems nothing more than a one-dimensional romantic type.

In El doctor Centeno Amparo’s presence is limited to the first two chapters, during which she appears only three times: at the banquet given by don Florencio Morales y Temprado; at a holiday celebration following one of Polo’s masterful sermons; and at Felipe’s dismissal from the Polo household after the incident with the bull’s head. On the first two occasions Amparo is merely one of the many guests described at these gatherings. Although we are told about her actions and given bits and pieces of her conversations, we do not know her thoughts. It is not until her last appearance in this text (vol. 1, ch. 2, sec. 13) that her mind is momentarily opened to us. After unsuccessfully pleading with Polo to forgive Felipe, she comforts the boy, and thinking to herself “¡Qué mal hacen en no perdonarte!,” she gives him her lottery winnings. Thus, the final impression we have of Amparo is a positive one, based on her act of

into the creative process, textual analysis must be based on the published novel alone. Indeed, Galdós’s rewritten segments suggest a deliberate effort to shift sympathy away from Polo and toward Amparo.
kindness and charity toward a defenseless child, and reinforced by the intimacy of a brief interior view that shows the genuine expression of her “alma abrumada.” Furthermore, this parting scene is described through Felipe’s eyes. From his perceptual perspective he sees Amparo standing in the light of the setting sun, but his interest perspective converts her into “una hermosa y celestial figura... rodeada de rayos de oro, echando de su frente fulgores de estrellas” and speaking “con voz de serafines.” Although Felipe’s point of view is highly subjective, Amparo’s treatment of the boy is fully in keeping with his angelic vision of her. Felipe idolizes Amparo, just as he idolizes Polo. But unlike Amparo, Polo betrays Felipe’s faith and trust. Polo’s condemnation of Felipe is hypocritical. It is based not on any transgression that the boy may have committed against a sacred image, but rather, it is based on Polo’s fear that the boy will reveal the priest’s late-night tryst outside of the pharmacy building. He seizes upon the accusation that Felipe is a liar, and he uses it to publicly discredit the boy. Amparo’s protective and nurturing behavior towards Felipe stands in sharp contrast to Polo’s cruelty and selfishness. No anguished interior views of Polo’s mind are provided to soften our reaction to his actions. Instead, it is Amparo’s kind thoughts that we hear. In this, the last time we see Amparo and Polo together before Tormento, both the events of the story and the interiorization in the discourse jointly work to incline the reader’s sympathies toward Amparo and against Polo. 24 Lest we forget this scene as we follow Felipe in his adventures with Miquis, we are reminded of it in the second volume of El doctor Centeno when Felipe requests money from Polo to care for the ailing Miquis. Polo toys with the boy until he learns of Amparo’s past generosity. Then, in a calculated attempt to surpass her spontaneous gesture, Polo gives Felipe exactly one peseta more than he had received from Amparo. Once again the contrast between Amparo and Polo is underscored by this hollow act of charity. Indeed, Polo’s lack of concern for Felipe’s welfare is evident when he refuses the boy’s next petition for help. Throughout El doctor Centeno Polo’s portrayal is

24 In “Galdós’s El doctor Centeno Manuscript: Pedro Polo and Other Curiositites,” Romance Quarterly 41 (1994): 36-42, Michael A. Schnepf notes that Galdós also channeled the reader’s sympathy away from Polo by deleting certain portions of the original manuscript, thereby making Polo’s characterization more sinister in the published text.
exclusively external. We know what he does and says, but we don't have access to his thoughts. Despite Polo's major role in the novel, he has no sympathetic interior views to help offset his bizarre and sometimes cruel behavior. But Amparo, though a minor character, is allowed to reveal her thoughts to us at a point in the text where her compassion for Felipe matches our own. As Felipe is dismissed from Polo's school, we emotionally stand with Felipe and Amparo rather than with Polo, Marcelina, and Claudia. Since these same lines will be drawn in Tormento, our loyalties toward Amparo in this scene can carry over to that next novel as well. This isolated use of an interior view to portray Amparo sympathetically in El doctor Centeno will be expanded to produce an extended interior treatment of her in Tormento, thereby increasing our intimate contact with Amparo as she assumes a larger role in the narrative.

Douglass Rogers has commented that the discursive presentations of Amparo in Tormento and Isidora in La desheredada are similar because both heroines are given sustained interior views through the use of free indirect style. Indeed, it is true that the minds of these women are presented to us largely through free indirect thought passages. Nevertheless, it also is important to distinguish between the kind of double-voicing present in each case. In so doing we will see that Galdós uses the same discursive device to create different effects in these two novels. Since free indirect style (both speech and thought) combines a character's perspective with the presence of the narrator, it is necessary to determine the narrator's feelings concerning each character in order to appreciate the nature of the double-voicing. As I discussed in my previous chapter, the narrator of La desheredada is highly critical of Isidora's impracticality and elitist attitudes, and therefore whenever Isidora's conceptual perspective is conveyed in free indirect thought, the narrator's implied censure of that perspective also is communicated through the third-person orientation of the passage. Therefore, in La desheredada most of Isidora's free indirect thoughts contain a strong element of irony based on the conflict between the her values and those held by the narrator. In Tormento a conflict of values also is involved, but it exists between the integrity advocated by the

---

narrator on one hand, and the hypocrisy practiced by Spanish society on the other. The entire seventh chapter of the novel contains the narrator's overt criticism of how false appearances and personal connections are valued over honesty and hard work, not only during the time frame of the story in 1867-68, but also extending to the narrator's present some sixteen years later. In this last half of the nineteenth-century when societal norms demand that each individual present an image that is different from his or her true situation, concealment and deception become everyday occurrences, and the ethics of those actions is rarely questioned. But two characters—Agustín and Polo—do subject the values of their society to scrutiny and find them lacking in moral substance. Consequently, the narrator openly sides with Agustín when he rejects "la falsificación de su ser," as well as with Polo when he asserts his authentic self over the "yo falsificado" demanded of him by society. The third member of the novel's love triangle, Amparo, does not actively question the way her society operates, but she does grapple with the ethical dimension involved in its shams. Although she is guilty of engaging in a sexual relationship with a priest—a crime which transgresses both social and religious laws—she is not guilty of what the narrator considers to be the even greater crime of deliberately attempting to deceive Agustín. At issue here are Amparo's intentions, not her actions. All of her free indirect thoughts concerning Agustín show a total absence of guile, and therefore, the double-voiced nature of this device allows the narrator to implicitly approve of Amparo's efforts to think of a way to inform Agustín about her past without either hurting him or losing his love. Unlike Isidora, who is reproached by her narrator, Amparo is supported by hers. Consequently, the ironic element present in Isidora's free indirect thought passages is not included in those of Amparo.

With both heroines, however, Galdós does use free indirect thought to shorten the emotional distance between the reader and these characters. In the case of Isidora that intimacy is tempered by the narrator's irony, but with Amparo there is no such impediment to reader sympathy. On the contrary, many of Amparo's interior views—whether the style is direct, indirect, or free indirect—contain sympathy producing moments of introspection. Carol Hanbery MacKay, in her discussion of nineteenth-century British fiction, borrows the theatrical term "soliloquy" to refer to self-directed thoughts in which a character assesses his or her situation and en-
gages in various forms of self-debate, self-confrontation, and self-appraisal. Typically, the language of these soliloquies is melodramatic, with self-apostrophes, rhetorical questions, and exclamations. 26 Such melodramatic devices are common to Amparo’s thoughts, and their rhetorical excesses help to convey the desperation she feels. Although she mentally goads herself to speak, she is overwhelmed and silenced by her emotions. Through these soliloquies the reader directly experiences Amparo’s fear, guilt, sincere repentance, anguished confusion, and isolation. We share her mental turmoil and feel her vulnerability. The frequency of these soliloquizing interior views increases during moments of personal tension, and they build toward the crisis point when Amparo chooses to take her own life. Overall, these interiorizations are aimed at cultivating a compassionate reaction in the reader toward Amparo’s plight. They show her to be weak-willed but not bad-intentioned.

Amparo’s first lengthy interior view occurs in chapter 12 where free indirect thought records her mental reaction to the money delivered to her by Felipe from Agustín. Based on the boy’s detailed description of the many people and institutions that his master generously supports on an ongoing basis, Amparo first considers Agustín’s monetary gift to be an act of charity. It is only on second thought that she wonders whether or not Agustín’s romantic feelings for her lean toward marriage. Her confusion is understandable because Agustín had not declared himself verbally to her during their conversation at Rosalía’s home, and he also had failed to include a letter of explanation in the envelope he sent her. Refugio’s misinterpretation of the money as coming “de pie de altar” (i.e. from Polo) leads her to charge Amparo with hypocrisy. Since the reader knows the origin of the money, this false accusation serves as a contrasting element which underscores the truthfulness of Amparo’s assertion that “es el dinero más honrado del mundo.” Agustín’s failure to make his usual visit to the Bringas household the next day keeps Amparo in the dark concerning his motives for sending her the money. It is not until two days later that Agustín finally asks Amparo to marry him. Her flustered response to this proposal includes two attempts to warn Agustín away from her. In chapter 20 she tells him “Yo no valgo que usted cree.” When

Agustín ignores this first statement, she cautions him again by saying “Yo no valgo tanto como usted se figura.”

Since these somewhat oblique references to her past prove inadequate, Amparo begins to think of ways to present her situation to Agustín more clearly. Chapter 23 opens with an indirect thought passage in which the narrator tells us that Amparo is upset about her engagement because she feels that she is deceiving Agustín with her silence but knows that she isn’t strong enough to face him with a confession. The narrator goes on to say that Amparo truly does love Agustín and considers to be virtues what society calls his faults. Thus, Amparo’s indirect thoughts confirm what she had told Agustín in chapter 20 concerning her opinion of him. She clearly is not attracted to him merely because of his wealth, and it is this affection that makes the idea of a confession so painful. As her free indirect thoughts turn to direct thoughts, we also see that she feels guilty for accepting Agustín’s money if she can not marry him. After she concludes that Agustín will forgive her if she tells him the truth about her past, the discourse switches back to free indirect thought to record her mental rehearsal of what she will say. This segment is parallel to the direct thought passage in chapter 9 where Agustín similarly rehearses the words he intends to speak to Amparo. In both cases these imaginary conversations while each character is alone are followed by what actually transpires between the couple. These scenes of them together juxtapose what is said against what is thought. But although we see the spoken words of both Amparo and Agustín, we only learn the thoughts of one of them in each of these scenes. In chapter 9 it is Agustín’s mind that we view as he struggles with the forgotten text of his proposal to Amparo, just as at the end of chapter 23 we see Amparo’s thoughts as she laments her inability to voice the confession she had intended to make. After this unsuccessful attempt, Amparo decides to confess to a priest before confessing to Agustín. Although she does accomplish the former, Polo’s letter informing her of his departure allows her to put off doing the latter. Her weak nature is shown in the contrast between her direct thoughts in chapter 24 and those in chapter 25. Before the letter arrives, her thoughts show her steeling herself for a frank talk with Agustín. But after receiving the letter she thinks: “Que se lo he de decir es indudable; pero me parece que ya no corre tanta prisa.” She does not intend to deceive Agustín. She simply wants to delay the painful and unpleasant task she knows she must perform.
With her mind now relieved, in chapter 25 Amparo engages in a long discussion with Agustín about their future domestic life together. Their conversation is not stated in dialogue form, however. Rather, it is conveyed in a single extended free indirect speech passage where the sentences spoken by Agustín alternate with those spoken by Amparo. Although this segment is too long to reproduce here, the central portion represents the spirit of the entire conversation:

A él le gustaba que todo se hiciera con régimen, a la hora; así no habría barullo en la casa. Para eso ella se pintaba sola; todo lo dispondría con la anticipación conveniente para que en el instante preciso no faltase... Y que ya andarían listos los criados, ya, ya!... Ella no les perdonaría ningún descuido... A él le gustaba mucho, para almorzar, los huevos con arroz y frijoles. El frijol de América era muy escaso aquí; pero Cipérrez solía tenerlo... Ella se ejercitaría en la administración, llevando su libro de cuentas, donde apuntara el gasto de la casa. Cuando no se hace así, todo es enredo, y se anda siempre a oscuras... Irían a los teatros cuando hubiera funciones buenas; pero no se abonarían, porque eso de que el teatro fuese una obligación no agradaba ni a uno ni a otro. Tal obligación sólo existía en Madrid, pueblo callejero, vicioso, que tiene la industria de fabricar tiempo. En Londres, en Nueva York, no se ve un alma por las calles a las diez de la noche, como no sea los borrachos y gente perdida. Aquí la noche es día, y todos hacen vida de holgazanes o farsantes. Los abonos a los teatros, como necesidad de las familias, es una inmoralidad, la negación del hogar... Nada, nada; ellos se abonarían a estar en su casita. Otra cosa: a ella no le gustaba dar dineros a las modistas, y aunque tuviera todos los millones de Rothschild, no emplearía en trapos sino una cantidad prudente... Además, sabría arreglarse sus vestidos... Otra cosa: tendrían coche, pues ya estaba encargado a la casa Binder un landó sin lujo para pasear cómodamente, no para hacer la rueda en la Castellana, como tanto bobo. Siempre que salieran en carruaje, convidarían a Rosalía, que se pirraba por zarandearse. Ambos concordaban en el generoso pensamiento de ayudar a la honesta familia de don Francisco, obsequiando sin cesar a marido y mujer, discurrendiendo una manera delicada de socorrer su indigencia sobredorada... Agustín pensaba señalarle un sobresueldo para vestir, calzar, educar a los pequeños y llevarlos a baños. Pero ¿cómo proponérselo? ¡Ah! Amparo se encargaría de comisión tan
In this back and forth exchange of ideas, the reader must use the embedded pseudo-tags (él/ella; Agustín/Amparo) to determine who says what. By actively engaging in this deciphering process, we come to realize how similar Amparo and Agustín are in their tastes. They are of one mind, as the unbroken flow of their conversation in this passage graphically displays. A simple dialogue would not have brought this uniformity of opinion to our attention so forcefully. Thus, Galdós's use of free indirect speech in this scene serves to indicate how well suited Amparo and Agustín are for one another.

Elsewhere in the text Galdós uses another discoursive technique – filtered description – to display the emotional attachment that also binds these two characters. As Amparo and Agustín are each described in the text from the other's point of view, we experience the pleasure felt by someone in love upon seeing the object of his or her affection. In chapter 27 Amparo is surrounded by the many luxuries present in Agustín's sumptuous apartment, yet her attention is focused instead on her fiancé’s weather-beaten face, with its silver-speckled beard and a skin color that Amparo compares to the warm tone of the terra-cotta figures he collects. Likewise, in chapter 20 Agustín examines Amparo's appearance in loving detail as he contrasts her natural beauty with the shabbiness of the clothing she must wear. Neither Amparo nor Agustín speaks much in this novel. Indeed, silence is what Alicia Andreu considers to be the essential characteristic of their verbal communication. 27 But Galdós compensates for the paucity of dialogue between Amparo and Agustín by creatively using discoursive devices such as filtered description and free indirect speech to subtly show that their relationship solidly rests on a base of genuine affection and like temperament.

But Amparo's decision to delay her confession to Agustín has serious repercussions for the future happiness of this couple. In chapter 27, convinced that it is now too late to confess to Agustín, she worries that he will “ver en ella perversion mayor de la que

había” and that he will misinterpret her silence as disloyalty and deceit. Thus, her innocent intentions have now taken on the appearance of guilty motives— a serious situation in nineteenth-century Madrid where appearances carry more weight than the truth. Amparo becomes tormented by the thought that someone else will tell Agustín about her past, and when Polo’s letter arrives promising “todas las babaridades posibles,” her direct thoughts immediately turn to suicide. But she convinces herself that she might be able to persuade Polo to leave her alone by visiting him one last time. In this confrontation between the former lovers, only Amparo’s thoughts are recorded. Polo’s portrayal is entirely external. Through direct, indirect, and free indirect thought we learn of the various strategies Amparo conceives to try to control Polo’s volatile temper and unpredictable behavior. These same interiorizations also show us the emotional pain she feels about having to lie about her feelings for both Agustín and Polo. Significantly, however, Amparo’s thoughts are not shown when she briefly considers Polo’s proposition to stay the night with him in return for his silence. We are only allowed to hear her rejection of this indecent offer. Throughout this scene Polo’s treatment of Amparo is cruel and sadistic, and no interiorizations of Polo are provided to offset our negative reaction toward his physical and psychological bullying. Although he shows compassion in his care of Celedonia, this behavior merely serves as a contrast to further highlight his brutishness toward Amparo.

After this private meeting turns into a public scandal, Amparo resolves to kill herself in her apartment. But Francisco’s unexpected appearance at her door causes her to move the location of her suicide to Agustín’s home. The entire thirty-fourth chapter focuses on Amparo’s few actions and many thoughts as she prepares herself for this final ordeal. While she imagines herself being found dead by Agustín, direct thought is used in the text. But when she actually takes what she believes is the poison, free indirect thought is used. This allows Galdós to convey the scene from Amparo’s point of view while giving it the appearance of a third person account by the narrator. Indeed, Amparo’s suicide attempt is discursively de-

---

28 Indeed, as Diane Urey has noted, Germán Gullón mistakenly attributes to the narrator Amparo’s feelings of death overcoming her. See Urey 63 n16 and Gullón, *El narrador en la novela del siglo XIX* (Madrid: Taurus, 1976) 113.
signed to convince the reader that Amparo really has poisoned herself. First, the narrator describes Amparo’s preparation of the medicine: “La demente vertió el agua que estaba en el vaso, y, echando en él la mitad del contenido del frasco, se lo bebió.” Next, Amparo’s mental reactions appear in free indirect thought: “¡Gusto más raro! ¡Parecía... así como aguardiente! Dentro de cinco minutos estaría en el reino de las sombras eternas, con nueva vida, desligada del grillete de sus penas, con todo el deshonor a la espalda, arrojado en el mundo que abandonaba como se arroja un vestido al entrar en el lecho.” Then suddenly there is a discoursive switch to present tense narration, which is interspersed not only with direct thought, but also with a present tense equivalent to free indirect thought:

Ocurrele pasar a la habitación vecina. En su alcoba. ¡Soberbio, espléndido tálamo! Hay también un sofá cómodo. No bien da cuatro pasos en aquella pieza, advierte en sus entrañas como una pena, como una descomposición general. Cree que se desmaya, que pierde el conocimiento; pero no, no lo pierde. Ha pasado un minuto no más... Pero siente luego un miedo horrible, la defensa de la Naturaleza, el potente instinto de conservación. Para animarse, dice: «Si no tenía más remedio; si no debía vivir.» La flojedad y el desconcierto de su cuerpo crecen tanto, que se desploma en el sofá, boca abajo. Nota opresión grande, ganas de llorar... Con su pañuelo se aprieta la boca y cierra fuertemente los ojos... Se asombra de no sentir agudos dolores ni bascas. ¡Ah!, sí; ya siente como unas cosquillas en el estómago... ¿Padece mucho? Empieza el malestar; pero es un malestar ligeró. ¡Qué veneno tan bueno aquel que mata tranquilamente! De pronto se le nubla la vista. Abre los ojos y lo ve todo negro. Tampoco oye: los pájaros cantan lejos, como si estuvieran en la Puerta del Sol... Y entonces el pánico la acomete tan fuertemente, que se incorpora y dice: «¿Llamaré? ¿Pediré socorro? Es horrible..., ¡moriré así!... ¡Qué pena! ¡Y también pecado!...» Escondiendo el rostro entre las manos, hace firme propósito de no llamar. Pues qué. ¿Es su muerte acaso una comedia? Después se siente desvanecer..., se le van las ideas, se le va el pensamiento, se le va el latir de la sangre, la vida entera, el dolor y el conocimiento, la sensación y el miedo; se desmaya, se duerme, se muere... «¡Virgen del Carmen -piensa con el último pensamiento que se escapa-, acógeme...!»
Once again Galdós has used present tense narration to convey an emotionally charged situation for one of his characters. And once again we find that this technique was added at the galley stage. When we examine the Tormento galleys, we see that Galdós originally continued the past tense orientation of the narration until the very end of this chapter. But in the galleys he replaced all of the past tense verbs in the last paragraph with their present tense equivalents. By so doing Galdós personalized the situation to a greater degree than would have been possible through standard past tense narration because present tense verbs are better able to convey the immediacy of an experience. Thanks to the free indirect thought introduction to this final paragraph, we are already in Amparo's mind. From that position, we now can respond to the present tense verbs in order to place ourselves on Amparo's temporal plane as well. Thus, Amparo's perspective is retained, but in an intensified form. As Amparo gradually loses consciousness, the present tense rendering of the experience puts us directly at the site at the moment it is occurring. Just as with Felipe Centeno's present tense segments, we live through the scene along with the character, thereby minimizing our emotional distance from the event. In this way Galdós's galley changes not only increase our empathy with Amparo, but also increase the impact of the surprise when we find out that the supposedly fatal preparation that Amparo drank was nothing more than a pain-relieving sedative. We have been duped, but not by the narrator. Rather, it is Galdós himself who tricked us by using discoursive devices that oblige us to experience this "death" through Amparo's point of view. Since she believes she is dying, we do too.

Amparo's central position in the novel ends with her suicide scene. Even though she does not die, she fades into the background. The new focus of the story is on Agustín, and the interiorizations in the discourse shift to him as well. Galdós avoids the vagaries of free indirect thought with Agustín in favor of a more clearly defined discoursive device — direct thought — in order to communicate the solitary purposefulness of Agustín's mental processes as he endeavors to work out his problem without the input of others. Through a series of these direct thought passages we see

---

29 This scene is on page 239 of the Tormento galleys, which are stored in caja 19-3 at the Casa-Museo Pérez Galdós in Las Palmas de Gran Canaria.
the mental turmoil that Agustín undergoes as he balances his love for Amparo against the demands of conventional propriety. Agustín mentally engages in a direct confrontation with the elements of Spanish society he had hoped to embrace—familia, Estado, Fe—and concludes that they all exist on the rotten foundation of engaño. Through the arguments he presents to himself, we see him rejecting the artificial social values he adopted during his sojourn in Madrid in order to re-embrace the authentic personal values which he had developed over the course of his life. The lack of societal restraints in the New World had obliged him to form a personal code of honor based on fairness and integrity. By returning to this code, Agustín is able to judge Amparo according to his own yardstick of acceptability. Thus, he mentally vows to forgive her past actions based on her present remorse, and in addition, he declares his intention to do so in open defiance of societal norms: “Bruto, desgraciado salvaje, que no debías haber salido de tus bosques, júrate que si te dice la verdad la perdonarás... Sí que la perdonaré... Me da la gana de perdonarla, señora sociedad... Si es culpable y está arrepentida, la perdonaré, señora sociedad de mil demonios, y me la paso a usted por las narices” (ch. 36). By the end of the novel Agustín does indeed forgive Amparo, and he flaunts that forgiveness in front of everyone. As Agustín and Amparo unapologetically embark on their life together in full view their acquaintances, they blatantly reject what Bakhtin calls the secondhand, externalizing and finalizing definitions of others in order to create their own definition of themselves and their relationship. Indeed, their arrangement does not conform to the typical pattern established between rich older men and poor young girls. Such affairs—like the one between Feijoo and Fortunata—are grudgingly condoned by Madrid society because they are covertly conducted. Agustín and Amparo are not like those secret lovers, but neither are they like the many polygamous couples found in Brownsville. Agustín and Amparo must absent themselves from both Madrid and the New World in order to develop their relationship on its own terms in the neutral territory of France. Though not legally sanctioned, their union is built on a solid foundation of mutual commitment, and furthermore, it is not

---

hidden from the public eye. Rather, it insistently exhibits itself as a legitimate entity which others will simply have to accept, as evidenced in the invitation Agustín and Amparo extend to Rosalía and Francisco to join them in France the next summer. Having defined themselves in opposition to society’s norms, Agustín and Amparo display an honesty in their “illicit” relationship which highlights the hypocrisy of “respectable” society they left behind.

Hypocrisy is also an issue in the development of Polo’s character. Unlike Agustín, Polo engages in covert activities which place him squarely within the mainstream of Madrid’s social hypocrisy. Yet, a similarity between Agustín and Polo has been pointed out by John Sinnigen, who views these men as undergoing a process of growth as they reject the falseness of society in order to reach the personal integrity that resides in them both. 31 Like Agustín, Polo struggles to find his authentic self behind the “yo falsificado” that his profession requires. But in Polo’s case, none of that struggle is experienced by the reader directly. Agustín and Polo are presented quite differently in terms of discoursive technique. Agustín’s portrayal is like that of Amparo; he rarely speaks but his thoughts are often shown to us. Conversely, Polo is highly articulate, but we seldom know what he is thinking. That is, Agustín’s portrayal is largely interior and Polo’s is overwhelmingly exterior. We know him either through what he says and does, or from what others say about him. Polo is given only one extended interior view. It occurs in chapter 17 of Tormento when he is daydreaming about the many alternative routes his life might have taken had he not gone into the priesthood. But even in this most intimate view, we are not granted direct access to his mind. Rather, his fantasies are told to us by the narrator through indirect thought. Thus, we remain one step removed from them, a position that allows us to retain our critical distance. We can understand his frustration at having to live a lie and even applaud his determination to follow his conscience instead of bowing to societal pressures. But our emotions are not so fully engaged that we excuse the violent behavior he later exhibits toward Amparo. When he locks her in his apartment and tries to coerce her into resuming their affair, our loyalties lie with Amparo, just as they did in El doctor Centeno. Yet, Polo’s single interiorization in Tor-

mento does humanize him to a greater degree than in the previous novel, and consequently, we sympathize with him more in this second work than in the first.

The thoughts of all three main characters in Tormento are used to help cultivate a compassionate response in the reader toward them as they each face a difficult situation in the novel. Our greater exposure to the thoughts of Amparo and Agustín produce a stronger emotional bond with them than with Polo. Nevertheless, Pedro Polo's inner pain is revealed to us sufficiently to create a somewhat charitable attitude toward him as well. In contrast, Marcelina Polo is denied sympathetic interiorizations and is made to present herself entirely through spoken words and actions. When in chapter 30 Marcelina refuses to tend to the dying Celedonia by saying "Por mi parte, me gustaría mucho asistir enfermos, resolver llagados y variolosos, limpiar heridos..., pero no tengo estómago. Cuando lo he intentado, me he puesto mala. También se auxilia a los desgraciados rezando por ellos," we see the selfishness of her religiosity. Similarly, six chapters later when she dangles Amparo's incriminating letters in front of Agustín, we see the spite that hides behind her contention that "yo no comprometo la reputación de ninguna persona, buena o mala... Yo no hago mal a nadie, ni a mis mayores enemigos." Totally devoid of the Christian virtues of charity and forgiveness, this "mujer de madera" simply adheres to the outward trappings of Catholicism. Although Amparo can offer aid and comfort to Pedro Polo, his own sister can not. In every word and action Marcelina reveals her counterfeit piety. She embodies the concept of religious hypocrisy in the same way that Rosalía de Bringas personifies social hypocrisy. But, as we shall see, Rosalía's characterization moves beyond simple social satire as she develops over the course of the trilogy.

ROSALÍA DE BRINGAS

Although Rosalía figures prominently in both Tormento and La de Bringas, discussion of her character generally has been limited to her presence in the latter novel with surprisingly little attention being given to her evolution over the course of the two works. In addition, scholars exhibit a lack of uniformity in their opinion of Rosalía. Some critics find her to be an entirely evil character while
others react somewhat sympathetically to her. What accounts for this discrepancy? A possible answer may be found in the different discoursive treatment that Rosalía receives as she moves from one novel to the next. In Tormento her presentation is almost entirely external, which results in an unflattering portrait bordering on caricature. In La de Bringas, however, she is developed primarily through interiorization devices which help to counterbalance the negative aspects of her behavior. Thus, although Rosalía exhibits the same undesirable personality traits as in Tormento and even adds to her repertoire of reprehensible behavior in La de Bringas, the potential for a certain amount of reader sympathy to be generated in her favor is inherent in the discourse of the later novel. Unlike Amparo — whose interiorizations in Tormento merely reinforce the positive impression she had made in El doctor Centeno — Rosalía needs sympathetic interior views to help mitigate her previously negative characterization.

Rosalía is introduced to the reader in Tormento's second chapter. We are told that her “manía nobiliaria” has led her to fabricate the high-sounding name of Rosalía Pipaón de la Barca from very scanty genealogical evidence. Her pronunciation of this affectatious title is usually accompanied by a swelling of her nostrils, a physical trait that typifies her arrogant nature. To reinforce this implicit criticism of her pretentiousness the narrator provides a list of her true lineage which, being composed entirely of minor palace servants, contradicts the aristocratic background she attempts to project. Subsequent references to her dilated nostrils and elaborate name extend the force of the irony throughout the text, thereby allowing the reader to laugh at Rosalía’s ill-founded feelings of social superiority which give rise to her other negative traits. Following this initial implied commentary, the narrator becomes more openly judgmental of Rosalía for her firm conviction of the primacy of social connections over hard work and education — an opinion, we are told, common to Spanish society during the time of the story in 1867 and still prevalent in the narrator's day some sixteen years later. This generalization extends the critical commentary beyond the fictional world of the text into the existing world of Galdós’s Spain, and consequently projects Rosalía's character into the realm of social satire. The parallel between Rosalía's false values and those of her society is also made explicit when the narrator comments on Rosalía's interest in the theater not as a cultural event but rather as
a social situation where she and others like her go to be seen in all their finery “aunque como en el caso suyo estos alardes fueran esforzados disimulos de la vergonzante miseria de nuestras clases burocráticas” (ch. 7). This disparity between actual wealth and the mere appearance of wealth, the narrator notes, has grown even greater in his own time. Once again the narrator has made the comparison between story now (when the events take place) and discourse now (when the events are being recounted) as well as the implicit link between the text and the extra-textual world of the reader. This theater scene also provides an opportunity to ironize Rosalía’s physical appearance. Although she was initially described as “una de esas hermosuras gordas,” now the narrator undercuts the compliment by revealing that this look is achieved by confining her body, “ordinariamente flácido y de formas caídas,” within the restraints of a tight corset in order to fit into the theater gown. In this way, her attractive appearance is shown to be as much an artificially constructed fabrication as her social position. Overall, in his description of Rosalía in the opening chapters of the novel the narrator expresses a combination of implicit and overt censure of her values, which he then generalizes so as to render Rosalía little more than a satirical caricature of a social type.

Having first established Rosalía’s basic character flaws through direct characterization by the narrator, the text next reinforces these traits through ironic portrait. Once again the presentation is external, relying on either narrative summary of her actions or direct speech records of her words to allow Rosalía to inadvertently reveal her own undesirable features. The full impact of this type of characterization is the result of an ongoing accumulation of negative data by the reader over the course of the novel. Early in Tormento Rosalía’s words and actions are used to exemplify those negative values already outlined by the narrator. For example, her...
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sense of priorities, governed by her “manía nobiliaria,” is underscored in her decision to place the queen’s picture rather than that of Christ in the honored center position on the wall. Then dramatic monologue—a traditionally ironic technique—is used effectively to confirm Rosalía’s pretentiousness as she shows Cándida the wonders of her new apartment. Finally, Rosalía’s disdain for those she sees as inferiors is evident in her treatment of Amparo. Indeed, her first words spoken in the text are directed at Amparo and are critical in nature: “Amparo, pero ¿qué haces? Te tengo dicho que no empieces una cosa antes de acabar otra. Más fuerza, hija, más fuerza. Parece que no tienes alma... Vamos, vivo... Yo quisiera que todas tuvieran este genio mío... Pero ¿qué haces, criatura? ¿No tienes ojos?” (ch. 3). After constantly ordering Amparo about like a servant, Rosalía rewards the poor girl with such treats as half-rotten food and discarded scraps of clothing. In various early scenes we see her mistreat, bully, and embarrass Amparo. Rosalía exhibits her feelings of superiority over the girl in each word said to or about her. Thus, by the end of the seventh chapter Rosalía’s character has been clearly defined and conveyed to the reader in a variety of exterior views.

However, the text as a whole occasionally departs from this discoursive pattern to provide fleeting inside views of Rosalía. For example, in two direct thought passages in chapter 6 she laments the fact that Agustín cannot be closely connected to their family through marriage since she herself is already married and her daughter is not yet of age. For Rosalía, Agustín’s desirability as a marriage partner is based completely on his wealth, as evidenced by the terms she uses to refer to him—salvaje, animal, monte de oro—while mentally focusing on his yearly income of 30,000 duros. This pair of direct thought passages, amounting to a total of only 276 words, is Rosalía’s longest interior view in Tormento. Yet through this very concentrated peek into Rosalía’s consciousness, Galdós is able to establish the preoccupation that will dominate Rosalía’s thoughts and actions throughout the remainder of the novel. Rosalía’s idea of Agustín marrying into the Bringas family is echoed in two of her free indirect thought passages—one in the opening paragraph of chapter 10 (“¿Qué padrazo sería si se casara!”) and the other in chapter 22 (“¡Ah! maldito Bringas, ¿por qué no nació Isabel cinco años antes!”)—as well as in her direct thoughts later in
chapter 22 ("Porque a mí, ¿qué me va ni me viene en esto?... Conmigo no se había de casar, porque soy casada; ni con Isabelita tampoco, porque es muy niña"). But by the end of that chapter Rosalía's anger over Agustín's engagement has risen to such a degree that she falsely projects vengeful feelings onto Amparo in a brief free indirect thought passage ("¡La muy picara no habia ido desde el sábado!... Estaba endiosada. Hacer quería ya papeles de humilladora, por venganza de haber sido tantas veces humillada"). Rosalía's final interior view ("Es nuestro - pensaba - , es nuestro"), found in chapter 37, reveals her joyful belief that her plans to sabotage the relationship between Agustín and Amparo had succeeded.

Throughout the forty-one chapter novel of Tormento these few paragraphs constitute Rosalía's entire interiorization. What function do these brief inside views have? We must remember that Booth speaks of the sustained use of sympathetic inside views to engender a compassionate response in the reader. This is clearly not the case here since Rosalía's interior treatment in Tormento is extremely limited and does not depict a sympathy producing mental confusion but rather reveals a clear sighted ambition to exploit Agustín through an advantageous marriage. By dipping into Rosalía's mind on these few occasions, Galdós elicits additional disapproval from the reader who can see the hypocritical thoughts behind Rosalía's honeyed words to Agustín. Thus, these interior views serve to reinforce the ironic portrait of Rosalía being constructed by the reader. In addition, they inform us of the self-interested motive for her scheming actions against Agustín's engagement later in the novel. Overall, Rosalía's unsympathetic interior views work in conjunction with the various exteriorization techniques to create in the reader what Susan Feagin calls the antipathetic response of Schadenfreude: the "enjoyment of a character's pain or misfortune, as well as its opposite, displeasure in response to a character's joy or success." It is this antipathetic response to Rosalía which carries the reader through the remainder of Tormento.

After her strong presence in the first seven chapters Rosalía virtually disappears from the text while the romance between Agustín
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and Amparo unfolds. During these developments Rosalía’s character is limited to brief conversations with Amparo or Agustín in her home before leaving or upon returning. Indeed, it is her absence from both her home and the text that allows the plot progression to take place. Rosalía reemerges as an active character a full fifteen chapters later when she is informed of Agustín and Amparo’s betrothal. While ostensibly treating Amparo as an honored guest, Rosalía secretly begins to amass evidence against the girl’s suitability as a marriage partner in hopes of keeping Agustín a bachelor until her own daughter is old enough to become his bride. Having found the damaging facts she needed, Rosalía devises a plan for exposing Amparo’s former association with Polo without herself appearing to have malicious intentions. This scheme is presented in a segment of the text characterized by a notable contrast in story order versus discourse order. The three days following Amparo’s visit to Polo’s home are first told with regard to Amparo’s actions in chapters 32, 33, and 34 and then they are retold by focusing on Agustín’s actions in chapters 35 and 36. It becomes the responsibility of the reader to construct the plot progression of the story from these separate discursive sections presenting conflicting information. This results in a dramatic irony which reveals Rosalía’s role in the organization and execution of her plan.

These chapters are filled with time references such as chiming clocks, dawn and dusk, and specific hours and days, thereby allowing the reader to ascertain the chronology of events. The story pertaining to Amparo contains the following elements: On Monday Amparo is informed by Rosalía that she is aware of Amparo’s past and that certain letters confirming her guilt are in Marcelina’s possession. Amparo is then left alone while Rosalía has a private meeting with Torres. When she returns, Rosalía tells Amparo to go home and to keep the affair a secret from Agustín. On Tuesday Amparo spends the entire day at home undisturbed by any visitors or messages. During this time she considers suicide and chooses poison as her method. On Wednesday Francisco calls on Amparo to tell her that Agustín had been told everything by Mompous, and that Rosalía denies having had anything to do with the matter. He then urges her to speak with Agustín before he has the opportunity to visit Marcelina. Upon arriving at Agustín’s house and finding him already gone, Amparo attempts suicide. This version of the story is immediately followed by a retelling that features Agustín’s
movements during the same three days. On Monday Agustín goes to Rosalía’s house after Mompos tells him about Amparo’s past affair. Rosalía tells him not to go to Amparo’s home since she would not be there, and that he should instead wait for her at his own apartment since she promised Rosalía that she would visit him soon to explain everything. On Tuesday Rosalía visits Agustín and tells him that she had tried to contact Amparo at her house but the girl was nowhere to be found. Pretending to console him, Rosalía reminds Agustín that Marcelina may be able to clear up any doubts he has concerning Amparo’s past behavior. On Wednesday after his meeting with Marcelina, Agustín returns home to find Amparo unconscious.

The discrepancies in the two versions of the story are readily discernible, particularly in terms of the lies told to Agustín about Amparo’s whereabouts. Crucial to the success of the plan is the necessity of keeping the couple apart long enough for Agustín to examine the letters. The lies Rosalía tells Agustín are designed to prevent just such a meeting from taking place. Rosalía’s controlling hand over the entire operation is evident to the reader, but this is implied in the discourse order rather than openly stated. Indeed, the sole reference to Rosalía’s involvement is an indirect allusion found in the narrator’s preface to the second version of the events, where he states that no one knows exactly how Agustín learned of the matter, but that it is believed that Mompos told him after Torres had brought the story to him “desde la Costanilla,” that is, from the street on which Rosalía lives. Torres’s friend Mompos, we remember, has a daughter of marriageable age, and therefore Rosalía could count on him to use this damning information to break up Amparo’s engagement to Madrid’s most eligible bachelor. It is the textual evidence itself, then, that allows the reader to piece together Rosalía’s important role as choreographer of the entire incident.

Seymour Chatman’s concept of character – as a paradigm of traits which exist on the story level but are communicated through the discourse – finds no better example in Galdós’s early contemporary novels than Rosalía de Bringas. In Tormento various aspects of the discourse reveal the many character flaws that contribute toward our bad impression of her. This is done first through
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the use of a reliable narrator who both satirizes Rosalía as a representative type and ironizes her as an individual character; then through the depiction of Rosalía primarily in external views accompanied by isolated instances of unsympathetic inside views; and finally through the ordering of the story events to expose Rosalía’s deceit through dramatic irony. In order to cap off this negative portrayal, the novel closes with yet another unflattering exterior view of Rosalía. In chapter 38 the highly sympathetic Felipe Centeno complains to Ido about Rosalía’s tendency to appropriate items from Agustín’s apartment for her own use. Not only does this pilfering activity reflect badly on Rosalía in general, but Felipe’s comment may also remind the reader of a similar conversation that passes between Ido and Felipe at the end of El doctor Centeno concerning the boy’s thieving former landlady, who goes so far as to steal the frock coat off Miquis’s dead body. Thus, an implicit parallel is made between Rosalía and the veteran swindler Cirila. Given all of these discursive cues in Tormento, it is no wonder that José F. Montesinos would call Rosalía “una mujer odiosa, la más odiosa que quizás inventara Galdós.” Neither is it surprising that Stephen Gilman would classify her as having the sickest of all the diseased minds found in the Centeno-Tormento-Bringas trilogy.

In contrast, the discourse of La de Bringas employs distinctly different narrative voice features which, perhaps, accounts for the more sympathetic reception of Rosalía’s character by such scholars as Julián Palley, Roberto Sánchez, Maurice Hemingway, Lou Charnon-Deutsch, Stephen Miller, Ricardo Gullón, and Jennifer Lowe, the last two of whom note that reader sympathy stems from our knowledge of Rosalía’s motivations in La de Bringas. How are
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38 Palley says that Rosalía’s characterization falls between satire and pathos, resulting in a mixture of irony and compassion toward her. Sánchez calls her a tragicomic character who is both a martyr and an object of ridicule. Hemingway says that the moral dimension of Rosalía’s character is too ambiguous to be declared either good or bad. Both Charnon-Deutsch and Miller see La de Bringas as a Bildungsroman that chronicles Rosalía’s attempts at self-determination in a male-dominated society. See Julián Palley, “ Aspectos de La de Bringas,” Kentucky Romance Quarterly 16 (1969): 348; Roberto G. Sánchez, “The Function of Dates and Deadlines in Galdós’ La de Bringas,” Hispanic Review 46 (1978): 311; Maurice Hemingway, “Narrative Ambiguity and Situational Ethics in La de Bringas,” Galdós’ House of Fiction, ed. A. H. Clarke and E. J. Rodgers (Llangrannog: Dolphin, 1991) 21-24;
these motivations communicated to the reader? Above all, this is achieved through the use of inside views. Unlike the externally oriented characterization of Rosalía employed in the preceding novel, the discourse of La de Bringas relies heavily on direct and free indirect thought to portray Rosalía. Diane Urey, in her insightful treatment of Rosalía in both works, notes that the most important difference between Rosalía’s presentation in Tormento and in La de Bringas is based on the greater amount of distance created between her and the reader in the first novel than in the second. Indeed, as Rosalía’s mental world is gradually revealed to us, we draw closer to her. Consequently she ceases to be merely a caricature of a type and becomes a fuller character with human desires, fears, and weaknesses. Interior views, because of their empathetic quality, are particularly effective in reducing the vast emotional distance that normally exists between the reader and such an antipathetic character as Rosalía. In La de Bringas Rosalía’s numerous interiorizations document her feelings as she reacts to the external pressures exerted upon her, thereby allowing us to travel with her though the novel and understand the reasons behind her actions. In the process, the reader’s antipathetic response to Rosalía is lessened. Whereas we rejoice in Rosalía’s failure to break up the relationship between Amparo and Agustín in Tormento, we take less pleasure in the misfortunes whichbefall Rosalía in La de Bringas.

Our intimate connection with Rosalía’s consciousness first occurs in the tenth chapter after a brief reintroduction to her character. The occasion is a shopping spree with Milagros during which Rosalía tries on a beautiful but costly shawl, the seductive power of which gives her a physical sensation similar to sexual arousal. Clearly the desire to own the item is strong, and this temptation (coupled with Milagros’s urgings) proves too much for Rosalía’s willpower. In the chapter’s last paragraph Rosalía’s mental debate with her con-
science as to whether or not she should buy the shawl begins the long chain of free indirect thought passages which run through the novel and later join with direct thought passages to display her mind as she grapples with the far-reaching consequences of this purchase.40

These interior views help establish the reader's involvement in Rosalía's predicament as she emotionally interacts in three important relationships: with her husband Francisco, with Manuel Pez, and with Milagros. The mental panic Rosalía suffers when bills come due and the strategies involved in securing the needed money while hiding her clandestine financial dealings from Francisco are all related through her direct and free indirect thoughts.41 More importantly, her feelings of deprivation due to her husband's extreme economical measures are documented by the same discursive means. Francisco, who had been presented as a commendably frugal man in Tormento, now reveals his miserliness in several conversations with his wife, notably in chapters 22 and 26, where he attempts to control every household expenditure no matter how minor. Although he has hoarded a personal fortune, he continually chastises Rosalía for every small indulgence. In all, Francisco's parsimonious behavior now makes him the subject of his own unflattering ironic portrait. While it is true that Rosalía blatantly lies to her husband on various occasions,42 it is also true that Rosalía's wish to be liberated from Francisco's economic extremism is not
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40 For a discussion of how ornamental goods such as this shawl traditionally are associated with the feminine and the marginal but become a central focus of this novel see Luisa Elena Delgado, "'Más estragos que las revoluciones': Detallando lo femenino en La de Bringas," Revista Hispánica Moderna 48.1 (1995): 31-42.

41 Although Catherine Jagoe views Rosalía as one of Galdós's spendthrift anti-heroesines who exemplifies the morally dangerous consumption of luxury goods by the female bourgeoisie, Aldaraca, Miller, and Charnon-Deutsch all stress that the motive behind Rosalía's purchases is less linked to her desire for clothes than to her desire for independence from her husband's tyranny over the family funds. In addition, Aldaraca points out that "Galdós breaks with the literary stereotype [of the consuming woman out of control], because Rosalía is capable, like a man, of regaining her lost self-control" (175). I also would add that when Jagoe uses the narrator's criticism of Rosalía to support her interpretation, she fails to take into consideration that the unreliable status of that narrator calls into question the validity of his opinions. See Jagoe, Ambiguous Angels: Gender in the Novels of Galdós (Berkeley: U of California P, 1994) 91-95.

unreasonable, and neither is her fear of his exaggerated response to her dilemma. It is in this atmosphere that the reader witnesses through interior views Rosalía’s reaction to Francisco’s offer — first given and later withdrawn — to hand over the financial reins of the household to her. Having believed his confidence in her judgment to be genuine, she acts on his offer only to later find herself in the position of needing to replace the money she lent to Milagros during her brief dominion over the family funds. With Milagros unable to repay the loan, Rosalía is forced to resort to progressively more extreme measures to acquire the money, including trading her sexual favors for it.

The shame she feels after the first of these extramarital liaisons is intensified by the knowledge that she has dishonored herself in vain. Her shock and disappointment from Pez’s failure to fulfill his promised role as her benefactor is discursively rendered in the free direct thought passage filling the lengthy opening paragraph of the forty-fourth chapter.40 Indeed, her response is understandable given the attraction she had felt for Pez and the esteem in which she had held him, also communicated to the reader through interior views. Her free direct thoughts early in chapter 17 and her free indirect thoughts which began chapter 29 both showed Rosalía reflecting on Pez’s desirable social position and fashionable appearance. When she compared him to Francisco, Pez was deemed the more suitable marriage partner in Rosalía’s estimation for a woman such as herself. The pride she felt from his advances and her belief in his offers of financial assistance, again captured in inside views, justify her sense of betrayal when his promises are not honored. Vanity repeatedly has been cited as the main flaw which leads to Rosalía’s ruin. Nevertheless, an equally important contributing factor is her gullibility, which allows her to believe the false words and promises of others: Pez’s flattery and his pledge of financial backing; Milagros’s compliments on Rosalía’s fashion sense and her assurances of repaying the borrowed money; and Francisco’s confidence in her judgment and his offer to give her control over the family finances. Rosalía’s reactions to each of these external forces are revealed in inside views, as is her mental confusion resulting

40 This passage is mistakenly identified as indirect in my article, “The Narrative Voice Presentation of Rosalía de Bringas in Two Galdosian Novels,” *Crítica Hispánica* 12 (1990): 83.
from her growing realization that she has been the victim of the vices of others — Pez's lechery, Francisco's avarice, and Milagros's extravagance. Rosalía must now come to terms with the situation by somehow rationalizing her behavior, including her infidelity. She does this by mentally formulating a philosophy wherein necessity justifies behavior. This coping mechanism sustains her through not only her humiliating experience with Refugio, but also through her subsequent entry into the world of elegant prostitution.

In the Rosalía-Refugio confrontation scene Rosalía is repaid in kind for her calculated cruelty toward Amparo in Tormento. However, if her cruelty in the former novel earned her the reader's hatred, the cruelty she now experiences results in some measure of pity, especially since it is received at the hands of a character who has never engaged the reader's affection. The Refugio who sarcastically belittles Rosalía in La de Bringas is the same Refugio who had maliciously berated Amparo in Tormento. The nature of Rosalía's interior view in this scene differs from all others in the text. Free indirect thought — appearing alone or in combination with direct thought — usually dominates her interiorizations. Here, however, free indirect thought is completely absent. Instead, we find an ongoing record of Rosalía's direct thoughts, in which she uncharacteristically addresses someone else instead of herself. This other-directed but internally verbalized monologue constitutes a silent response to her adversary's sarcasm. When juxtaposed against her spoken words, these thoughts show the degree of self-control she must exhibit and the amount of self-pride she must swallow. It also underscores the degree of her self-delusion since in her mental comments Rosalía refuses to acknowledge that she and Refugio are now on the same moral footing and profess essentially the same philosophy of situational ethics. Clinging to her belief in social superiority, she can blindly continue to view Refugio as her inferior in all respects, including the moral. As long as Rosalía retains her social status, she can justify her behavior as necessary — and even ennoble it as the means of sustaining the family after the revolutionary upheaval —
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without considering herself to be reduced to the moral level of the lower classes.

In addition to Rosalía’s discursive portrayal through interiorizations, a separate aspect of narrative voice – that of the narrator’s persona – also contributes toward softening the reader’s opinion of Rosalía in La de Bringas. The narrator of this second novel is decidedly different from the reliable narrator of Tormento. Although the narrator of La de Bringas professes values similar to those of his predecessor, he himself does not uphold those values. Rather, he exhibits the same unprincipled behavior which he condemns in others. The reader’s confidence in his reliability is undermined early in the text when he shows his willingness to exploit his political connections. Through his friend Manuel Pez, who owes him a favor, he enlists Francisco’s aid in settling a legal matter to his advantage, and he later repays Francisco with gifts from his estate. As Peter Bly observes, this “clearly shows that the narrator is a willing participant in the Isabelline system of deals, favours and personal recommendations at the expense of justice and probity . . . ensuring that his subsequent appearances and comments are not accepted totally without hesitation” by the reader. Unlike the undramatized narrator of Tormento, the narrator of La de Bringas assumes an identity and plays a small but important role as he interacts with the other characters at three points in the text. In the opening chapter he engages in the aforementioned act of political favoritism. Midway through the text he appears at one of doña Tula’s afternoon gatherings, thereby reminding the reader of his social ties to the monarchists. Finally, at the close of the novel he reveals that he is the revolutionary junta’s administrator of palace property. The fact that he holds this post shows that he can opportunistically shift his loyalties to fit the political climate. In this capacity he is approached by Rosalía who offers him her sexual favors in return for certain monetary considerations. Having taken advantage of her invitation once, he decides against resuming the financially draining affair. Therefore, the narrator’s unethical behavior at the beginning of the novel is matched by his immoral association at the end. Consequently, his censure of Rosalía’s lifestyle must be judged in light of
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his own actions in the text. The criticism of Rosalía by Tormento's reliable narrator is sincere while that of La de Bringas's unreliable narrator is hypocritical. This difference accounts in part for the reader's stronger adverse reaction to Rosalía in the earlier work. Since we find the narrator of La de Bringas to be untrustworthy, we are less likely to accept his opinions about Rosalía. We must come to our own conclusions about her, and in the process of doing so, we rely on Rosalía's numerous interior views. Due to the private nature of her thoughts, we become drawn into a more personal relationship with Rosalía than we had with her in Tormento.

To intensify the empathetic effect of Rosalía's interior views, Galdós makes her thoughts the only ones we hear throughout virtually all of La de Bringas. There are only two exceptions, and both concern the cenotafio. Chapter 3 opens with a record of Francisco's direct thoughts as he calculates what the materials for the project will cost him. The intensity with which he tallies insignificant sums of money suggests the excessive pettiness in financial matters which he will exhibit later in the novel. A similarly revealing interiorization occurs in chapter 17 where we are made privy to Manuel Pez's direct thoughts as he examines the partially constructed hair picture: "Vaya una mamarrachada... Es como salida de esa cabeza de corcho. Sólo tú, grandísimo tonto, haces tales esperpentos, y sólo a mi mujer le gustan... Sois el uno para el otro." This single interiorization of Manuel Pez highlights his overall hypocrisy because it shows his real thoughts to be in direct conflict with the flattering words he had just showered on Francisco concerning the object: "Es una maravilla... ¡Qué manos! ¡Qué paciencia! Esta obra debiera ir a un Museo." This glimpse into Pez's mind warns the reader that he is a man whose spoken words are not to be trusted. Therefore we see Pez for the phony he is well before Rosalía realizes it. These two brief interior views of Pez and Francisco are the only moments that we enter the mind of any character other than Rosalía. Even during his blindness Francisco is denied any sympathetic interiorizations that might dilute our emotional attachment to Rosalía and cause us to side with Francisco instead of his wife. These isolated interiorizations of Pez and Francisco do not favorably dispose us toward these characters. Rather, they serve as thumbnail sketches to quickly establish the basic flaws that Pez and Francisco will confirm through their words and actions as the novel progresses.
At all other times in La de Bringas it is only Rosalía who receives an interior treatment. This has the effect of increasing our empathetic attachment to Rosalía while maintaining our emotional distance from the other characters. Direct and indirect speech, as well as narrative commentary are used to create the text's numerous external portrayals. But two characters – Pez and Milagros – also are presented through free indirect speech, a discoursive technique which highlights their negative qualities. As was seen in La desheredada and Fortunata y Jacinta, the overall effect of this technique is mimicry, and as such it exaggerates the tone of the original. Therefore, it is an excellent vehicle for recording Milagros's most self-serving moments. For example, since Milagros's frequent requests for monetary assistance from Rosalía generally appear in free indirect speech, the reader can clearly hear the combination of flattery and persistence in Milagros's tone, which is delivered in a manner that feigns a close friendship between the two women. Similarly, Pez talks a great deal in this novel, but the majority of it is conveyed through the exaggerated medium of free indirect speech. Consequently, his martyred tone when complaining about his family life in chapter 13; his empty rhetoric when discussing politics in chapter 27; and his off-handed description of how he uses his connections to defraud the customs office in chapter 36 all are communicated to the reader more forcefully than if his words had been recorded in direct speech. By using free indirect speech with Pez, Galdós also is able to utilize the double-voicing inherent in that technique to show that the narrator's conceptual point of view does not differ at all from the one being expressed. The narrator and Pez are, as Hazel Gold puts it, kindred spirits. The political and moral collusion between these two veteran exploiters of people and governments is discoursively suggested through Pez's free indirect speeches, which carry with them the tacit approval of the narrator. The irony in this double-voicing is not the result of a disparity between the narrator's values and those of Pez, but rather, it arises from the implied author's censure of the hypocritical set of standards which both Pez and the narrator share.

Having examined the discursive techniques used in each of the two novels featuring Rosalía de Bringas, we can now return to our original question as to the differing reactions to her character. Why do some critics refer to Rosalía in entirely negative terms, while others afford her varying degrees of sympathy? A possible answer lies in each individual critic's emphasis on certain textual aspects over others. As we have seen, in Tormento Rosalía's actions and personal faults are conveyed by the narrative voice in such a way as to render her a thoroughly despicable character. That is, both the story and the discourse combine to preclude any feelings of sympathy toward her on the part of the reader. Indeed, no critic has expressed a sympathetic response to the Rosalía de Bringas portrayed in Tormento. It is only within the context of the second novel that certain critics have been more generous in their assessment of Rosalía's character. Despite the fact that Rosalía continues to engage in unethical behavior in La de Bringas, this text displays a radical departure in the discursive technique used to portray Rosalía, thereby allowing the reader a fuller understanding of her character and subsequently building an empathetic response to her plight. In this way the discursive presentation lessens the impact of the story's events. Perhaps it can be said, then, that those critics who consider Rosalía to be a totally evil character are building on her negative portrayal in Tormento by giving prominence to the story level of La de Bringas in which the lying and hypocritical Rosalía now adds adultery to her list of sins. Here the focus is on Rosalía's traits and her actions within the plot. On the other hand, those critics who are less harsh with Rosalía may be responding more readily to the discourse of the second text which uses interior views (showing her mental distress while contending with the various external demands made upon her) to fill out Rosalía's character and to temper the overall effect produced by her behavior.

My own interpretation of Rosalía favors the more sympathetic view of her, not only because such an interpretation takes into consideration both the story level and the discourse level of her portrayal, as I have shown in my analysis above, but also because it recognizes a complexity in Rosalía's character that Galdós uses to convey a more subtle form of social criticism than would have been possible with a totally evil character. Rosalía's transformation from an antipathetic character in Tormento to a somewhat sympathetic one in La de Bringas makes the society around her seem all the
more corrupt and sordid. In *Tormento* Rosalía's deception and hypocrisy merely serves as a foil to Agustín's and Amparo's sincerity and honesty. But in *La de Bringas* Rosalía is surrounded by characters who are even more mendacious than she is. As Feagin has noted, when antipathetic characters such as Rosalía are taken advantage of by others, the natural response in the reader is pleasure because the character is seen as getting what he or she deserves (130-31). But Galdós complicates the matter in Rosalía's case. By generating empathy for Rosalía through interior views, Galdós places the reader with Rosalía as she tries to survive in a world where no one - not even the narrator - can be trusted. This encourages the reader to look beyond Rosalía's personal hypocrisy to see the corruption which permeates society as a whole. The reader's empathetic understanding of the motives for Rosalía's behavior does not translate into an uncritical acceptance of all her actions, however. Among Galdosian scholars even Rosalía's most ardent apologists have difficulty reconciling their admiration for Rosalía's ability to assert her independence in a patriarchal society, with their concern over Rosalía's final embrace of the corrupt practices required of her to succeed in that society. In my view, this tension is a result of the novel's interaction of story and discourse, and it is used as a rhetorical strategy to extend the social criticism of the novel into the real life of the flesh-and-blood reader. That is, the empathetic effect of Rosalía's interior views creates a degree of reader complicity with her manipulation of the sordid world she inhabits, and it is the discomfort which the flesh-and-blood reader feels at that complicity which leads to an examination of his or her own extra-textual behavior and values. Rather than simply being allowed to feel morally superior to Rosalía, the flesh-and-blood reader is discursively placed on Rosalía's level in the novel and is obliged to question whether he or she also exists on that ethical plane in the real world.

* * *

---

47 See, for example, the following statement by Charnon-Deutsch: "This is not to imply that Rosalía is a character of heroic proportions or that she transcends the corrupt, pretentious society that is so prominently ridiculed in *La de Bringas*. Clearly she is portrayed as a woman who has succumbed to the pressures of the age in which she lives. Yet she has learned and gained something from her lessons and has transcended the domestic organization she once despised" (*Gender and Representation* 135).
Felipe, Amparo, and Rosalía are allowed to develop over the course of the Centeno-Tormento-Bringas trilogy into fully realized characters—each with a rich inner consciousness that is exposed to the reader’s view. By shifting away from the initial exterior portrayal of each character, Galdós is able to draw the reader into a close personal relationship with Felipe (despite his youth), with Amparo (despite her sexual involvement with a priest), and with Rosalía (despite her vanity). In addition to granting interiorizations to these characters, Galdós facilitates our emotional connection to them through present tense narration and filtered descriptions for Felipe and Amparo (thereby mediating our experience of the events through their consciousnesses), and through the use of an unreliable narrator whose criticism of Rosalía seems hollow in light of his own indiscretions.

The third-person narratives discussed in this chapter and the previous one display the panoply of narrative devices which typify the discoursive sophistication of Galdós’s segunda manera. Direct, indirect, and free indirect forms of both speech and thought combine to convey the various perspectives of the characters. Through the interplay of interiorization and exteriorization techniques these texts influence how the reader responds affectively to the characters and the attitudes they hold. Varying degrees of narrator reliability add to the complexity of Galdós’s narrative style and further contribute toward the reader’s reception of the characters and the ideological issues raised in the texts.

The next chapter will concentrate on two first-person narratives: El amigo Manso and Lo prohibido. Galdós has less discoursive flexibility in these texts than in the third-person narratives we have considered thus far because he must restrict his interior views to the protagonist-narrators. Nevertheless, I will show how Galdós overcomes the limitations inherent in first-person narration through structural innovations which also are part of his segunda manera approach to writing literature.