

¿CONOCES TÚ EL EQUILIBRIO...?
FASHIONING A KRAUSIST GAVIOTA IN GALDÓS'S
LA DESHEREDADA

JULIA L. FARMER
University of California, Berkeley

Discussion of the intrinsic relationship between discourse and ideology in the novel has long been a critical commonplace. Bakhtin, for example, writes, «The fundamental condition, that which makes a novel a novel, that which is responsible for its stylistic uniqueness, is the *speaking person and his discourse*. [...] The person in a novel may *act* —but such action is always highlighted by ideology, is always harnessed to the character's discourse (even if that discourse is as yet only a potential discourse), is associated with an ideological motif and occupies a definite ideological position» (333). Indeed, a comparative study of two nineteenth-century novels that played crucial roles in the development of realism in Spain —Fernán Caballero's *La gaviota* (1849) and Benito Pérez Galdós's *La desheredada* (1881)— reveals that the representation of voice in each reflects the greatly differing ideologies of the works' respective authors. In his novel, Galdós in fact appears to dialogue directly with the discursive-ideological framework underlying the second part of *La gaviota*, the first Spanish *costumbrista* novel, or novel of manners.

The novel of manners in Spain was an outgrowth of *cuadros de costumbres*, short vignettes popular since at least the 1830s that portrayed local Spanish traditions and cultural practices. As a result of its basis in these vignettes, the plot of a *novela de costumbres* such as Caballero's often serves largely as a framing device

for countless descriptions of Spanish (and particularly, in Caballero's case, Andalusian) cultural traditions. Caballero states in the prologue to *La gaviota* that

Apenas puede aspirar esta obrilla a los honores de la novela. La sencillez de su intriga y la verdad de sus pormenores no han costado grandes esfuerzos a la imaginación. Para escribirla, no ha sido preciso más que recopilar y copiar. Y en verdad, no nos hemos propuesto componer una novela, sino dar una idea exacta, verdadera y genuina de España, y especialmente del estado actual de su sociedad, del modo de opinar de sus habitantes, de su índole, aficiones, y costumbres. Escribimos un ensayo sobre la vida íntima del pueblo español, su lenguaje, creencias, cuentos y tradiciones. La parte que pudiera llamarse novela, sirve de marco a este vasto cuadro, que no hemos hecho más que bosquejar (39).

This desire on the part of Caballero to provide an «exact idea» of Spanish society in a sense foreshadowed the work of realist novelists such as Galdós, who would come to dominate the literary scene later in the century.

Indeed, critics have often viewed Galdós's realist work as an outgrowth of *costumbrismo*. In the introduction to her edition of *La gaviota*, for example, Carmen Bravo-Villasante writes, «Si las novelas de Fernán Caballero son cuadros de costumbres andaluzas, las de Pereda serán de costumbres montañesas, las de Galdós de costumbres madrileñas, hasta llegar a Blasco Ibáñez, de costumbres valencianas» (19). The correlation between Caballero's work and that of Galdós is more nuanced than Bravo-Villasante's statements imply, however. A more careful consideration of Galdós's relationship with the discourse of *costumbrismo* provides a great deal of insight into the ways in which his own experiments with realist literature reflect a political ideology completely at odds with Caballero's.

If *La gaviota*, thanks to its attempt to portray Spanish customs, can be called the forerunner of the Spanish realist novel, Galdós's *La desheredada* is often considered the true starting point for the more modern form of the genre. Although he had begun to employ certain realist techniques in his so-called *novelas de tesis*, such as *Doña Perfecta* (which he considered the first of his *novelas contemporáneas*), it was not until *La desheredada*, the first of what he called his *segunda manera* novels, that the desire to por-

tray reality took true precedence for Galdós. Thus, the importance that both *La gaviota* and *La desheredada* hold for the development of the realist novel in Spain makes them well worth considering together.

Despite the apparent parallels between Caballero's *costumbrismo* and Galdós's realist work, and despite the fact that, as we will see, Galdós was clearly conscious of *costumbrismo* as one of his primary literary predecessors, surprisingly few critics have studied his relationship with the novel of manners in any detail. Mario Santana has published a relatively brief comparative study of Galdós's *Doña Perfecta* and *La gaviota*, and some of what he discusses there could be further enhanced by an examination of *La desheredada*. In particular, while Santana states that Galdós wrote *Doña Perfecta* in part as a way of «secularizing» *costumbrismo*'s version of realism, which he associates largely with the rural setting of the first half of *La gaviota*, the critic fails to take into account sufficiently the more urban setting of the second half of that novel.

Even as early as 1849, critics who discussed *La gaviota* commented on the differences between its urban and rural halves. In one of the most important examples of early commentary on *La gaviota*, for example, Eugenio de Ochoa commented that he much preferred the first part of the novel to the second, because it struck him as more «simpático» (438). Relatively recent scholars have continued to make commentaries in this vein as well. Lawrence Klibbe, for example, notes the differences between the two halves of *La gaviota*, stating, «The second part is less interesting, less sympathetic in approach and characterization, and lacking in the warmth of the *costumbrista* sketches inserted frequently into the first part» (51). Here Klibbe discerns a «realistic turn» in the second, more urban, part of Caballero's novel, where the author distances herself from the idealistic, romantic tone that had predominated in the first half. The criticism of certain aspects of urban society evident in this second part of *La gaviota* is thus a precursor to the attitudes that would typify the later realist novels.

Given the nature of the contrast between the two parts of *La gaviota*, then, one could view Galdós's *Doña Perfecta* as corresponding to the first half of that novel (the arrival of an outsider in a small town that revolves almost exclusively around a decaying church) and *La desheredada* as corresponding to the second

(a young woman goes to the big city to seek her fortune, becomes involved with unsavory men, and ultimately fails in her quest). That is, the plot of *La desheredada* may be read not only as referencing standard idealist novels, or *folletines*, as critics such as Jagoé have claimed, but as making reference to the second half of *La gaviota* as well, thus providing the means for Galdós to continue to dialogue with his *costumbrista* predecessor. It seems, then, that Galdós' development of his own version of more «modern» *costumbrismo* involved at least a two-step process of displacement in line with Bourdieu's theory of the field of cultural production—each step corresponding at least in part with one of the two very distinct halves of *La gaviota*.¹ There is first the more thematic overhauling that Santana sees in *Doña Perfecta*, and a subsequent attempt in *La desheredada* to create a new representation of voice more in line with the author's progressive political and philosophical leanings. It is on this latter step that I will focus here.

In both *La gaviota* and *La desheredada*, the concept of voice (symbolic of the exercise of individual conscience and power) may be seen as linked to the underlying ideologies of the novels' authors. Fernán Caballero was known in large part for her neo-Catholic, extremely conservative leanings, and her attempt to «capture reality» in her novel of manners was anything but a neutral endeavor. Caballero hoped to create a work that would morally edify those who read it, as evidenced by statements she once made in an open letter:

Hay en otros países una clase de literatura amena que se propone por objeto inculcar buenas ideas en la juventud contemporánea; he echado de menos una cosa análoga en nuestro país y he querido, bien que mal, llenar este vacío. Es claro que si sólo hubiese escrito para literatos ilustrados y gentes instruidas, muchas cosas hubiera dejado de decir por sabidas... Mi instintiva y natural tendencia es espiritualizar el sentir que las novelas modernas han materializado tan escandalosamente... He repetido varias veces que no escribo novelas, puesto que la tendencia de mis obritas es combatir lo novelesco, sutil veneno en la buena y llana senda de la vida real.

¹ Bourdieu writes in *The Field of Cultural Production* that «Few works do not bear within them the imprint of the system of positions in relation to which their originality is defined; few works do not contain indications of the manner in which the author conceived the novelty of his undertaking or of what, in his own eyes, distinguished it from his contemporaries and predecessors» (118).

Esto es hacer una innovación, dando un giro nuevo a la apasionada novela, trayéndola a la sencilla senda del deber y de la naturalidad (cited in Montesinos, 35).

Montesinos comments on this passage, «El propósito está claro: novela de costumbres, pero no de malas costumbres; lo novelesco corregido por un criterio moral que enfrena los ensueños, jerarquiza de nuevo los estímulos y da mayor realidad al relato al mismo tiempo que lo norma» (35). Caballero clearly did not view her role in the portrayal of Spanish reality as a passive one. Rather, she saw herself as in a position of authority and, as such, in a position to use her writings to impose her conservative ideology on her readers.

The desire not simply to present reality but to provide a «morally edifying» narrative locates Caballero's work within the genre known as the *roman à thèse*. Susan Suleiman in her *Authoritarian Fictions* has laid out many of the characteristics of this genre, and an examination of Caballero's work with these characteristics in mind reveals the ways in which a novel of manners such as *La gaviota* may be considered just such an «authoritarian fiction.» One of the main characteristics that Suleiman attributes to this genre is redundancy, which in *La gaviota* would appear to fall under at least two main categories (two categories that, as will become clear shortly, are necessarily intertwined). These are redundancy of character and redundancy of discourse.² For Suleiman, the most important type of redundancy found in *romans à thèse* is the presence of an omniscient narrator who provides moralizing commentary on the action in order to reduce any ambiguity inherent in the work. This commentary is often echoed by characters' statements within the narrative as well. Suleiman notes that what most characterizes these multiple commentaries is the «absence of contradiction between them» (185). Such redundancy is evident throughout the second half of *La gaviota*, where, significantly, discourse and power are inextricably intertwined.

At the opening of the second part of Caballero's novel, the reader finds himself transported from Villamar, the village in which the first half of *La gaviota* is set, to the urban area of Seville, where he is confronted by an extremely long *tertulia* scene in which sev-

² Other primary characteristics of *romans à thèse* discussed by Suleiman include structures of apprenticeship and confrontation.

eral members of the conservative aristocracy discuss various cultural and political matters. It is significant that this *tertulia* scene opens the second part of the novel, despite what many view as its irrelevance to the furtherance of the plot. The extended discussions that take place there are representative of Caballero's tendency to favor speakers within her text who mirror her own conservative ideology. The group of nobles consists for the most part of what Suleiman would deem redundant characters, each representing a point of view nearly identical to that espoused by Caballero and her omniscient narrator. Ermanno Caldera describes the family of nobles thus:

Es [...] una familia patriarcal pero aristocrática, aristocratísima, la del conde de Algar, con una suegra marquesa, un tío general, y un parentesco todo de sangre azul. A su lado, otra familia, la que juega el papel más importante en el contexto de la novela, la del duque de Almansa, con su mujer, sus dos hijos, un suegro marqués y una tía que responde al título resonante de marquesa de Gutibamba. En todos estos, y en sus parientes y amigos que los rodean, a varios niveles, con la excepción [...] de la xenófila Eloísa, se refleja y articula el más puro españolismo. Por eso se les atribuye una perfección sobre-humana, siendo todos un dechado de virtud y belleza (38).

This large group of nobles, each with similar traits favored by Caballero, is a clear example of redundancy of character. Although certain differences exist between the individuals, the group's principal characteristics provide Caballero with multiple vehicles for espousing her conservative ideology within the narrative.

Indeed, the conservative tendencies evidenced in Caballero's open letter cited above are reflected in much of the discussion that takes place among the nobles. One of the first points of view espoused by a member of this powerful group, for example, is the desire that the *status quo* remain as such. Early on, the general demonstrates his opposition to change by condemning Marisalada's desire to achieve fame as a singer: «'Mal hecho,' falló en todo resuelto el general [...] 'porque esas gentes [...] vivían contentos y sin ambición, y desde ahora en adelante no podrán decir otro tanto, y, según el título de una comedia española, que es una sentencia, *Ninguno debe dejar lo cierto por lo dudoso*» (177). Not only does the general here clearly oppose progress, he in fact looks

backwards to a *comedia* written by Lope de Vega (a baroque playwright much of whose work was in large part designed to stem the tide of ceaseless changes that were taking place in Spain during his lifetime as well). The general's commentary, moreover, is similar to that made later by the omniscient narrator, who condemns María's aspirations to achieve fame as a singer: «Marisalada pasaba su vida consagrada a perfeccionarse en el arte, que le prometía un porvenir brillante, una carrera de gloria, y una situación que linsojeara su vanidad y satisficiera su afición al lujo» (206). The direct correspondence between authorial viewpoint and character viewpoint is only reinforced by the oft-cited discussion of literature found near the beginning of the second half of *La gaviota*, where the group of aristocrats, upon discussing the various types of literature common in their day, declares the *novela de costumbres* to be the ideal. Rafael comments:

Hay dos géneros que, a mi corto entender, nos convienen: la novela histórica, que dejaremos a los escritores sabios, y la novela de costumbres, que es justamente la que nos peta a las medias cucharas, como nosotros.
[...] Es la novela por excelencia [...], *útil y agradable*. Cada nación debería escribirse las suyas. Escritas con exactitud y con verdadero espíritu de observación, ayudarían mucho para el estudio de la humanidad, de la historia, de la *moral práctica*, para el conocimiento de las localidades y de las épocas. Si yo fuera la reina, mandarí a escribir una novela de costumbres en cada provincia, sin dejar nada por referir y analizar (215, emphasis added).

Because Rafael's comments repeat to a large extent what Caballero has already said in her introduction and in her open letter, they provide additional support for the author's statements there. Caballero has thus created not one but several characters who espouse her ideology and echo the statements made under the guise of her omniscient narrator.

This extreme redundancy of discourse contains a flip side which is evident as well in *La gaviota*: the ample space dedicated to portraying the voices of those characters who mirror Caballero's ideology in the second half of the novel leads to a silencing of the character whose actions the author most clearly condemns—Marisalada herself. The young singer's arrival in Seville coincides with the clear attempt on the part of Caballero to suppress her

character's speaking voice. During María's first encounter with the nobles at their *tertulia*, for example, we witness the following scene:

- ¡Cuánto tenemos que agradeceros vuestra bondad en venir a satisfacer el deseo que teníamos de oíros! —dijo la condesa a María— ¡El duque os ha celebrado tanto! María, *sin responder una palabra*, se dejó conducir por la condesa a un sillón colocado entre el piano y el sofá. [...] Durante todo este tiempo, la buena y amable condesa hacía cuantos esfuerzos le eran posibles para ligar conversación con María; pero *el laconismo de sus respuestas* frustraba sus buenas intenciones.
- ¿Os gusta mucho Sevilla? —le preguntó con amabilidad.
- Bastante —respondió María.
- ¿Y qué os parece la catedral?
- Demasiado grande.
- ¿Y nuestros hermosos paseos?
- Demasiado chicos.
- Entonces, ¿qué es lo que más os ha gustado?
- Los toros.
- Aquí paró la conversación (238, emphasis added).

The only times María's voice is heard to any extent during much of the second half of the novel are during her performances, where the songs she sings are in large part another manifestation of the conservative Caballero's exaltation of Spanish tradition.

Significantly, María is only permitted to exercise her speaking voice in any sort of substantial fashion after Manuel's trip to Madrid and subsequent mistaken report to the citizens of Villamar that the young woman has died. Only upon being relegated to the figurative sphere of the dead does María find her speaking voice returned to her, as we see in her conversations with Pepe Vera and others. María's ability to speak autonomously (or at least as autonomously as any character can be said to speak) and, perhaps in Caballero's mind, «subversively,» apparently carries with it the prerequisite of her figurative death. Caballero thus represents voice, be it that of a narrator or that of a character, in such a fashion that she creates a truly stifling atmosphere in line with the stagnation that intellectuals such as Galdós believed to be inherent in the absolutist regimes that had ruled Spain during his lifetime. Voice is represented in such a way throughout this half of the novel that only the discourse of the conservative power structure may be heard without the interference of filtering literary devices such as María's apparent death.

Upon examining Galdós's relationship with the author of *La gaviota*, then, one must consider his overhauling of the discursive/ideological framework of the second half of Caballero's novel. As a supporter of the Revolution of 1868, Galdós was opposed to many of the conservative ideals espoused by supporters of the monarchy such as Caballero. The revolutionaries, led by General Prim, wished to replace what Eamonn Rodgers deems Isabella II's «quasi-absolutist» regime with a more progressive constitutional monarchy (10). As a follower of Krausist ideology, moreover, Galdós was a firm believer in the importance of intellectual freedom and claimed that the stamping out of societal corruption depended on the conscience of each individual rather than on the oppressive force of authoritarian religious or political leaders.³ Galdós's reworking of the representation of voice *vis-à-vis* Caballero in *La desheredada* is representative of his more progressive and inclusive ideology. What emerges in that novel is the impression of a community of discourse, in which characters, narrator, and reader work closely together in reaching any moral conclusion that may emerge from the work.⁴

In his «Observaciones sobre la novela contemporánea en España» (1870), Galdós proposes that the middle class, known for its «actividad pasmosa» and the «incesante agitación» with which it pursues political and social reform, should become the subject of the new national novel (112). From these statements, there emerges a contrast with what he views as the static nature of more traditional *costumbrista* works:

De estos cuadros de costumbres que apenas tienen acción, siendo únicamente ligeros bosquejos de una figura, nace paulatinamente el cuento, que es aquel mismo cuadro con un poco de movimiento, formando un organismo dramático pequeño, pero completo en su brevedad. Los cuentos breves y compendiosos, frecuentemente cómicos, patéticos alguna

³ For more detailed discussion of Galdós's relationship with Krausism, see chapter 1 of Rodgers.

⁴ My discussion of Galdós's representation of voice in *La desheredada*, especially in terms of «community of discourse», echoes to some extent Linda Willem's chapter on that novel. Willem examines various aspects of narrative voice in *La desheredada*, particularly as compared to Galdós's earlier *novelas de tesis*. My goal here is to elaborate on the possible *ideological* explanations for Galdós's reworking the representation of voice as he does, not so much with respect to his own previous *novelas de tesis*, as with respect to his principal precursor in that genre, *La gaviota*.

vez, representan el primer albor de la gran novela, que se forma de aquéllos, apropiándose de sus elementos y fundiéndolos todos para formar un cuerpo multiforme y vario, pero completo, organizado y uno, como la misma sociedad (113).

The language that Galdós uses to describe motionless *costumbrista* works here is reminiscent of that which he employs elsewhere to describe the conservative regimes favored by Caballero. In an article for the Progressive newspaper *La nación*, for example, he once declared that those associated with Isabella's regime resembled «cadáveres embalsamados» who spoke with «lenguas petrificadas» (cited in Rodgers, 8).

Given these observations, it seems clear that Galdós viewed the static, even oppressive, nature of *costumbrismo* as inherently linked to its conservative ideology. Thus, a comparison of voice in the works of Caballero and Galdós's *segunda manera* novels provides a useful approach for a more complete understanding of Galdós's liberal ideology. As Linda Willem observes in her study, remarkably few critics have looked beyond Galdós's thematic representation of ideology in order to discover the ways in which his *segunda manera* narrative techniques reflect his opposition to the power of the ruling classes and, linked to this, his desire for greater intellectual freedom. Willem, inspired largely by Bakhtin, makes reference in her introduction to the importance of relating literary form to ideology and social context, but she later seems to move away from this approach, at least in her discussion of *La desheredada*, a fact which is somewhat surprising given the fact that that novel marks such an important stylistic transition in Galdós's career. Willem's excellent discussion of the narrative techniques employed in *La desheredada* could thus be enhanced by a discussion of the ways in which Galdós's Krausism and progressive tendencies are implicit in the narratological overhauling evident in his first *segunda manera* novel.

Leopoldo Alas has observed that Galdós in *La desheredada* distances himself from the idea of author and narrator existing in a narratological hierarchy, where the unfolding of events is completely subject to their whim (93). The lack of narratological hierarchies in that novel goes hand in hand with a lack of socio-political hierarchies, as evidenced by one of the most extended passages in *La desheredada* concerning the political upheaval that followed the Revolution of 1868. The passage in question, whose length

forbids me from citing more than a few excerpts, must hold considerable importance for Galdós, as it opens the second half of the novel: «La República, el Cantonalismo, el golpe de Estado del 3 de enero, la Restauración, tantas formas políticas, sucediéndose con rapidez, como las páginas de un manual de historia recorridas por el fastidio, pasaron sin que llegara a nosotros noticia ni referencia alguna de los hijos de Tomás Rufete» (289). And soon thereafter:

Abril.—Desarme de la Milicia por la Milicia. Dos cobardías se encuentran frente a frente, y del choque resulta una página histórica. [...]

Junio.—Reúnense las Cortes Constituyentes. La Guerra toma proporciones alarmantes, y en Navarra se ven y se tocan las desastrosas consecuencias de la desgraciada acción de Eraul. [...] Consternación. Nuevo Gabinete. Asesinato del Coronel Llagostera. La Guerra, la política, ofrecen un espectáculo de confusión lamentable. [...]

Julio.—Alcoy, Sevilla, Montilla. Sangre, fuego, crímenes, desbordamiento general del furor político [...] (293).

The extremely paratactic nature of these descriptions is a reflection of Galdós's awareness of the intrinsic relationship between narratological form and social structure or ideology. The lack of subordinate phrases and other types of linguistic hierarchies, that is, correlates with the political and social turmoil at issue in the passage.

Furthermore, while Caballero began the second part of *La gaviota* with a group of speakers who almost entirely espoused her (and her omniscient narrator's) conservative ideology, Galdós opens *La desheredada* with the speech of a madman. At the very beginning of the work, the reader finds himself confronted with a series of seemingly incoherent, fragmented sentences cited in direct discourse. Only after a paragraph do we learn the identity of the speaker, as the narrator comments,

El que de tal modo hablaba —si merece nombre de lenguaje esta expresión atropellada y difusa, en la cual los retazos de oraciones corresponden al espantoso fraccionamiento de ideas— es uno de esos hombres que han llegado a perder la normalidad de la fisonomía, y con ella, la inscripción aproximada de la edad. ¿Hállase en el punto central de su vida, o en miserable decrepitud? La movilidad de sus facciones y el

llamear de sus ojos, ¿anuncian exaltado ingenio, o desconsoladora imbecilidad? No es fácil decirlo, ni el espectador, oyéndole y viéndole, sabe decidirse entre la compasión y la risa (68).

From the outset of *La desheredada*, then, there is a clear *fraccionamiento* of voice. Gone is the unity of discourse so dominant in *La gaviota*. Moreover, it is significant that the first speaker in the novel is a resident of Leganés, an insane asylum on the outskirts of Madrid. Galdós clearly wishes to admit voices in his work that, by pertaining to «outsiders,» do not necessarily represent the authoritarian discourse privileged in the second half of *La gaviota*. This initial speech is followed immediately by the narrator's commentary cited above, in which the series of questions and statements of uncertainty allows room for the reader to come to his own decision about the character of the man in question. This is the first indication of a Krausist-inspired technique that will be important to Galdós throughout his work: the desire to leave room for the reader to interpret the events of the text on his own.

This is not to say that the narrator plays no role in the text or refrains from expressing his own opinions. Quite the contrary. As becomes apparent throughout the novel, Galdós's narrator is in certain ways similar to Caballero's, in that he does not necessarily approve of his female protagonist's ambitions. But rather than becoming the authoritarian, pedantic figure we saw in *La gaviota*, in *La desheredada* he appears to be much more a co-participant in the community in which textual meaning is to be created. Just as he expresses his opinion on events as they unfold, he simultaneously creates room for the characters to speak and act more autonomously, as well as for the reader to reach his own conclusions about the action presented in the text.

We see this more «liberal» representation of voice quite clearly, for example, in chapter 2 of the second volume of the work. There, the concept of voice illuminates a Krausist-inspired preference for the guidance of individual conscience over conservative, authoritarian declarations à la Caballero. The chapter begins,

Isidorita Rufete, ¿conoces tú el equilibrio de sentimientos, el ritmo suave de un vivir templado, deslizándose entre las realidades comunes de la vida, las ocupaciones y los intereses? ¿Conoces este ritmo, que es como el pulso del hombre sano?

No, tu espíritu está siempre en estado de fiebre. Las exaltaciones fuertes no cesan en ti sino resolviéndose en depresiones terribles, y tu alegría loca no cede sino ahogándose en tristezas amargas. ¿Persistes en creerte de la estirpe de Aransis? [...] Voz de la conciencia de Isidora o interrogatorio indiscreto del autor, lo escrito vale (300-302).

Here Galdós represents an attitude toward Isidora reminiscent in some ways of Caballero's criticism of María's aspirations, while at the same time employing the concept of voice in a fashion much more consistent with his progressive leanings. There is, first of all, an obvious Krausist emphasis here on the importance of moderation and individual conscience. But gone in this passage is the overt condemnation on the part of an all-powerful narrative voice often present in Caballero's work. The series of questions, for example, creates the impression of dialogue (dialogue being representative of the more inclusive social structure to which Galdós and his fellow liberals aspired). Moreover, the overlapping of the «interrogatorio indiscreto del autor» with the «voz de la conciencia de Isidora» conflates the voices of author and character, thus eliminating some of the hierarchy evident in works such as *La gaviota*. Finally, the fact that the voices of character and author here are indistinguishable requires the reader to make his own decision on the matter in question, and, as a result, to include himself in the dialogue taking place as well. Thus, while Galdós may be hoping to imply criticism somewhat similar to Caballero's of his character's aspirations, his manner of reflecting this criticism clearly ties in with his liberal Krausist tendencies.

Likewise, if María's encounter with the nobles in *La gaviota* led to her silencing, as well as to her subordination to the conservative hierarchy, Isidora's meeting with «her» noble carries with it a sort of revolution, or equalizing on both a narratological and ideological level (although this latter is presented rather ironically). Soon after Isidora's dismissal by the aristocrat she believes to be her grandmother, we read the following:

¡Ay Isidora! ¿Qué significó ese susurro de carcajadas que sentiste dentro de ti? [...] ¿Era que empezaba a comprender la posibilidad de consolarse sin renunciar sus ideas? ¡Oh, no! Antes morir que abandonar sus sagrados derechos. '¡Las leyes! —pensó—. ¿Para qué son las leyes?' Esta idea le infundió algún contento. Sí; ella confundiría el necio orgullo de

su abuela; ella subiría por sus propias fuerzas, con la espada de la ley en la mano, a las alturas que le pertenecían. Si su abuela no quería admitirla de grado, ella, ¿qué tal? [. . .], ella echaría a su abuela del trono. Venían días a propósito para esto. ¿No éramos ya todos iguales? El pueblo había recogido la corona arrojada en un rincón del Palacio y se la había puesto sobre sus sienes duras. ¡Bien, bien, bien! (276)

Here, the voices of narrator and character once again merge, not coincidentally during a reference to the revolution occurring in Spain at that time. This extremely complex passage has several functions. Not only is there the reduction of hierarchies at both the narratological and ideological level and the subsequent elimination of the moralizing narrator, but there is also the expectation that the reader will become engaged in the text actively enough to discern the irony in Isidora's words. Unlike María, Isidora often maintains the ability to express herself without obvious filters—but this does not necessarily carry with it her exemption from criticism on the part of the reader, provided that he, like Galdós, understands the importance of actively employing his own judgment.

The *fraccionamiento* of voice introduced from the outset of *La desheredada* is thus designed to create what Barthes would deem a more «writerly» text, in which active participation of the reader is required. Character, narrator, and reader are all permitted to maintain their own voices and opinions in Galdós's text, which represents a clear overhauling of more stifling ideological works such as Caballero's. The redundancy of voice and, linked to this, character, evident throughout the second half of Caballero's «authoritarian» text gives way to a more polyphonic work in line with Galdós's progressive Krausist ideology. In this way, we see clear evidence of the truth of Bakhtin's observation that the «speaking person and his discourse» can never be separated from ideology in the genre of the novel.

WORKS CITED

- Alas, Leopoldo. *Galdós, novelista*. Barcelona: PPU, 1991.
 Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*. Ed. Vadim Liapunov. Tr. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
 Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*. New York: Columbia UP, 1993.

- Caballero, Fernán. *La gaviota*. Ed. Carmen Bravo-Villasante. Madrid: Clásicos Castalia, 1979.
- Caldera, Ermanno. «El costumbrismo ideológico y literario de *La gaviota*.» *Costumbrismo andaluz*. Seville: University of Seville, 1998.
- Galdós, Benito Pérez. *La desheredada*. Ed. Germán Gullón. Madrid: Cátedra, 2000.
- . «Observaciones sobre la novela contemporánea en España.» *Benito Pérez Galdós: Ensayos de crítica literaria*. Barcelona: Península, 1990. 105-120.
- Jago, Catherine. «Disinheriting the Feminine.» *Revista de estudios hispánicos* 27 (1993): 225-247.
- Klibbe, Lawrence H. *Fernán Caballero*. New York: Twayne, 1973.
- Montesinos, José. *Fernán Caballero: Ensayo de justificación*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.
- Ochoa, Eugenio de. «*La gaviota*. Juicio crítico por el señor Don Eugenio de Ochoa.» *Obras de Fernán Caballero*. Ed. José M. Castro Calvo. Vol. 5. Madrid: Atlas, 1961. 433-441.
- Rodgers, Eamonn. *From Enlightenment to Realism. The Novels of Galdós 1870-1887*. Dublin: Jack Hade and Co., 1987.
- Santana, Mario. «The Conflict of Narratives in Pérez Galdós's *Doña Perfecta*.» *MLN* 113.2 (1998): 283-304.
- Suleiman, Susan Rubin. *Authoritarian Fictions: The Ideological Novel as a Literary Genre*. New York: Columbia UP, 1983.
- Willem, Linda M. *Galdós's Segunda Manera: Rhetorical Strategies and Affective Response*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1998.

BLANK PAGE