LA PITUSA Y LA DELFINA: THE ROLE OF EPITHETS IN *FORTUNATA Y JACINTA*

"Don Benito el garbancero," to the chagrin of those who bestowed that name upon the prolific author to censure him for his use of "vulgar" language, created a narrator who charms readers with his familiar, colloquial discourse throughout the four parts of his tale *Fortunata y Jacinta*. This amiable but unreliable narrator,[1] a member of his own novelistic world, and more specifically, of the upper-class bourgeois society of the Santa Cruz family, uses familiar language to highlight his presence as well as to effect shifts in focalization. The careful reader, whom the narrator includes in his circle with him, is led to see the narrator as one more character in the novel; his discourse is filled with the same amicable, colloquial expressions and chattiness that are present in the other characters' language. Understanding the narrator's identification with his environment, as well as the role of his familiar language as his intrusions in the narration diminish, is the key to perceiving the implied author, or ideology, of this work.[2]

---

1. Acording to Wayne Booth, a reliable narrator is one who shares an ideology with the implied author and with the implied reader, and acts accordingly (430). Conversely, the unreliable narrator is one "whose values, on one or more axes, or whose pictures of the facts of the narrative explicitly depart from those of the implied author" (431). One of the problems associated with recognizing unreliable narration, according to Booth, is that the unreliable narrator does not tell us that he is not to be trusted; he acts trustworthy, he himself thinks he is dependable, and since he may not tell outright lies, the reader is lead to believe in his sincerity (317). The narrator of *Fortunata y Jacinta*, although he admits ignorance of minor details, exhibits a kind of self-confidence which blinds us to his faults. We are not warned of his unreliability and we must take great care to notice his self-contradictory statements and his blindness to social and moral concerns. For more about this narrator's unreliability, see Ribbans, "Notes on the Narrator in *Fortunata y Jacinta*."
2. Depending upon whether the reader considers the narrator of *Fortunata y Jacinta* reliable or not, he or she will arrive at conflicting conclusions. Booth warns that a "misreading" of a text can result in "acceptance of intellectual positions that the author intended to satirize" (389), or even condemn. The complexity involved in determining the implied author's viewpoint leads to critical debate as to the nature of an implied author; Booth mentions *Moll Flanders* in this regard: "It would be a clever reader indeed who could be sure just how much of Moll's behavior is consciously judged and repudiated by Defoe" (321). A similar debate is occurring among critics of *Fortunata y Jacinta* who see the novel as a dialectic of nature versus society; there are those who believe that *Fortunata y Jacinta* ends in a tragic defeat of individuality by the forces of society, while others see a triumph of moral conscience over the immorality of society. See, for example, Blanco-Aguinaga, "On 'The Birth of Fortunata'"; Gilman, "The Birth of Fortunata"; Jagoe, "The Subversive Angel in *Fortunata y Jacinta*," and Ribbans, *Pérez Galdós:* Fortunata y Jacinta. The problem is reminiscent of the one Booth describes surrounding *The Turn of the Screw:* "we cannot decide whether the subject is two evil children as seen by a naïve but well-meaning governess or two innocent children as seen by a hysterical, destructive governess" (346). Those who do not take into account the nature of the narrator in *Fortunata y Jacinta* can not discover the real intentions of the story. Scholes and Kellogg note the active role the reader must take in this process (265); Booth reminds us that we should rely on our own superior judgment (over the narrator's) in determining the values of the implied author (240).

One of the most significant forms the narrator's familiarity takes is his use of epithets for characters. James Whiston's study of the galley proofs of *Fortunata y Jacinta* shows that of all the corrections Galdós made, the most frequent involved replacing the names of characters with epithets. He maintains that Galdós was motivated to do this to avoid tiring repetitions of a character's name throughout the novel, and also at times to reflect the point of view of the narrator or character (258, 260). Antonio Sánchez Barbudo notes that the use of epithets lends a subjectivity to descriptions and narration, especially when used ironically (64-65). Kay Engler asserts that not only do they serve to underscore the role or personality of a character; they are used as well to emphasize the narrator's presence, revealing the consciousness which is interpreting the events of the story, along with its opinion or perspective *(The Structure of Realism* 56). For example, epithets can be literary, artistic or historical allusions with an ironic function, according to Engler, such as the narrator's epithets for Estupiñá,"Rossini" and "Polichinela," Quevedo's wife's epithet "Doña Desdémona," and Mauricia's nickname "Napoleón." Thus,"Villamil and his fellow bureaucrat wandering through government offices [are] Dante and Virgil wandering through hell" (56). Geoffrey Ribbans maintains that the epithets in *Fortunata y Jacinta* reflect social attributes, as opposed to moral ones, and constitute an "immediate snap judgment of society, expressed through the narrator, and subject to rectification by the implied reader." He further states that the narrator uses these epithets to effect his own commentary, "reflecting uncritically the moral values of upper-class society" ("Notes on the Narrator in *Fortunata y Jacinta*" 103).

One must keep in mind, however, that epithets do not necessarily imply the judgment of the narrator, but may instead convey the filter[3] of a character who is judging another or who may be judging himself. Mikhail Bakhtin calls epithets the concealed speech of another, even of general opinion (306). They are used to underscore the narrator's or characters' differing points of view, and thus to affect the reader's reaction. In evaluating epithets, then, one must be conscious of the role

---

3. I am employing Seymour Chatman's terms for "focalization" or "point of view." His solution to the confusion of terminology generated by previous studies (See Bal; Cohn, "The Encirclement of Narrative;" Cohn and Genette; Genette; Stanzel; and Uspensky) is to give different names to designate the "point of view" of the character and that of the narrator. He gives us the term "filter," easily recognized as internal to the story-world, for the character's point of view, and "slant," recognized as external, for the narrator's ("Characters and Narrators" 203-04). "Filter" would refer to "the much wider range of mental activity experienced by characters in the story world—perceptions, cognitions, attitudes, emotions, memories, fantasies, and the like" *(Coming to Terms* 143). The character is used as a "'screen,' 'filter,' 'mirror' or 'reflector' of the events, settings, and other characters in a story" ("Characters and Narrators" 196); the narrator is not telling the story "neutrally," but "from" or "through" a character's consciousness (196). Chatman's term "slant" refers to the "narrator's attitudes and other mental nuances appropriate to the report function of discourse" *(Coming to Terms* 143); slant may be expressed implicitly or explicitly. Examples of explicit slant are commentary and judgment, while implicit slant may be presented through the use of epithets, as well as ironic narration.

that heteroglossia, or double-voiced discourse, plays;[4] it is important to precisely distinguish between the narrator's discourse and that of the characters.

The narrator of *Fortunata y Jacinta* is acquainted with his characters' stories and personalities, as well as the nicknames that others call them. José Izquierdo is "Platón," Fortunata is "la *Pitusa,*" Jacinta is "la Delfina," Doña Lupe is "La de los pavos," Juanito is "el Delfín," Mauricia is "la Dura," and, of course, Guillermina is "la santa" or "la rata eclesiástica." The narrator's use of these nicknames shows that he knows the characters well and that he is aware of society's view of them, reflected in the names. But the epithets that are not regular nicknames are of more concern to us here. Such epithets for Maxi as "el redentor," "el improvisado amigo," "el apreciable muchacho," "su amante," "el enamorado," "el joven Rubín," and "el generoso galán" go beyond an expression of society's attitude toward a character and convey someone else's. Fortunata, in the context of her relationship with Juanito, is "la *Pitusa,*" while in the context of her redemption in the convent, she is "la pecadora." Epithets such as these occur abundantly throughout the novel, and reflect the narrator's slant or a character's filter, depending upon the degree of hybridization involved. For example, epithets contained in passages of psycho-narration[5] as well as free indirect discourse, while expressed in the speech of the narrator, generally reflect that character's filter, rather than the narrator's slant. In this

---

4. Heteroglossia, according to Bakhtin, is "another's speech in another's language" (324), refracting the intentions of the narrator. It serves two speakers and two intentions: "the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author" (324). Emil Volek states that in a dialogic form of discourse, there is an orientation towards the other speaker and this can be manifested in the adoption of elements or phrases from that other speaker's language, resulting in "double-voiced words" (61). Bakhtin explains that this kind of "hybrid construction" belongs to one speaker, grammatically and compositionally, although it consists of "two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two 'languages,' two semantic and axiological belief systems;" the heteroglossic word or expression thus "has two contradictory meanings, two accents . . ." (304, 305). He cites several passages from Turgenev, in which the narrator uses expressions or the emotional tone of a character in a public opinion statement. These statements have the appearance of objective narrator's commentary, but they are not; the choice of words is determined by the character's point of view, and thus contain "two accents (the author's . . . transmission, and a mimicking . . . of the character)" (318). Bakhtin asserts that these double-voiced words project points of view; they are "forms for conceptualizing the world in words, specific world views, each characterized by its own objects, meanings and values" (291-92). Boris Uspensky treats epithets under his phraseological plane; he says that they may reflect social level, may indicate relations between the characters, or may reflect the attitude of the speaker towards the character named. Further, changes in the character may be signalled by changes in the names the narrator or characters call him (22). Since each character has a particular way of calling someone, the filter character can be identified by the name used for another character (26). Thus Uspensky's analysis of the epithets used for Napoleon in Tolstoy's *War and Peace* concludes that the changing attitude of Russian society toward Napoleon can be seen through the evolution of the epithets referring to him throughout the novel (27).

5. Psycho-narration is Dorrit Cohn's term for narrator's discourse about a character's consciousness. See her book, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction,* for a full discussion of this technique. Psycho-narration does not simply render the language of thought, but rather presents a character's perceptions and emotions. For the present study, it is important to note that psycho-narration is often heteroglossic, consisting of the narrator's discourse frequently colored by the filter character's discourse. The focalization may be the narrator's slant, but is more frequently a character's filter. Passages of double-voiced psycho-narration often merge into a passage of free indirect discourse.

vein, Engler suggests that the epithet "el iluminado" emphasizes the "'enlightened' Maxi's new-found faith in himself and the strength of his 'reason,' just as the epithet 'el sietemesino' accurately reflects Maxi's own sense of inferiority, even if it has been reinforced by society" *(The Structure of Realism* 73). Engler continues, "When Fortunata is called 'la pecadora' during her stay in the convent of the Micaelas, it is because she has been placed in that role by society; but, nevertheless, because Fortunata has momentarily accepted the role society has given her, the epithet accurately reflects Fortunata's opinion of herself" (73-74). In dealing with epithets, however, it is difficult at times to discern whether they indeed reflect that character's own feelings, or transmit the narrator's perception of the character. Therefore, it is entirely possible that the epithets for Maxi just mentioned reflect the narrator's mocking commentary, while those of Fortunata pronounce his judgment of her; recognizing these as "double-voiced words" reminds us that they contain two voices and convey two meanings, a vivid example of the richness that heteroglossia provides in the novel. Engler's conclusion that "epithets clearly function as clues to the discovery of the point of view manifest at any one point in the novel" (74) is clouded by this ambiguity which hybridization produces.

An examination of the extraordinary number of epithets which appear in Part II, Chapter 2, illustrates the effects achieved through their use. The following table lists the epithets for Maxi found in the narrator's discourse in this chapter, the focalizing character for each designation (whether it is presented through the narrator's slant or through a character's filter, or both), and the page number where it appears.[6] As one can see, many of the epithets are double-voiced, while some reflect purely the narrator's stance, often with ironic intentions.

EPITHETS FOR MAXI, PART II, CHAPTER II:

Epithet	Focalizer	Page
"redentor"	narrator	(I 479)
"su improvisado amigo"	narrator/Fortunata	(I 479)
"el apreciable muchacho"	narrator/Fortunata	(I 479)
"su amante"	narrator/Fortunata	(I 480)
"aquel chico"	narrator/Olmedo	(I 480)
"su protector"	narrator	(I 480)
"el excelente chico"	narrator/Fortunata	(I 480)
"el enamorado"	narrator/Maxi	(I 481, 491, 511)
"del joven Rubín"	narrator	(I 481)
"el generoso galán"	narrator/Maxi	(I 481)

6. References to *Fortunata y Jacinta* are from the second edition by Francisco Caudet, 2 vols. (Madrid: Cátedra, 1985), and are given by volume number and page number.

"el inspirado y entusiasta mancebo"	narrator/Maxi	(I 483)
"el doctor amante"	narrator	(I 484)
"el honradísimo aprendiz de farmacéutico"	narrator/Maxi	(I 484)
"el enfermo"	narrator/Maxi	(I 490)
"Rubinius vulgaris"	narrator/professor/students	(I 493, 514)
"mi hombre"	narrator	(I 494)
"el pobre chico"	narrator/Maxi	(I 494)
"su amigo"	narrator/Fortunata	(I 495)
"el joven"	narrator	(I 496, 498, 502, 507)
"el amante"	narrator/Maxi	(I 496)
"el exaltado mozo"	narrator	(I 496)
"su sobrino"	narrator/Lupe	(I 497 twice; 498 twice; 504, 515, 516, 519)
"al pobre chico"	narrator	(I 498)
"el estudiante"	narrator/Maxi/Papitos	(I 500)
"el señorito"	narrator/Papitos	(I 501 twice; 502; 503 twice)
"el hombre"	narrator/Maxi	(I 503)
"el orador"	narrator	(I 503)
"el sobrino"	narrator/Maxi/Papitos	(I 505)
"el redentor"	narrator/Maxi	(I 506)
"el pobre chico"	narrator/Fortunata	(I 507)
"su amante."	narrator/Maxi	(I 507)
"el pobre muchacho"	narrator	(I 511)
"aquel desgraciado"	narrator/Fortunata	(I 512)
"el muy hipocritón"	Lupe	(I 515)
"el señoritingo"	Lupe	(I 515)
"al chico"	narrator/Lupe	(I 517)
"el estudiante"	narrator/Lupe	(I 517)
"el buen chico"	narrator	(I 517)
"el pobrecillo"	narrator/Lupe	(I 519)
"el delincuente"	Maxi/Lupe	(I 519)

Through the narrator's use of double-voiced epithets, the reader can enter Maxi's consciousness as he vacilates in his own self-concept. The narrator himself transmits a supportive attitude toward Maxi through these denominations, at times poking fun at his desire to reform Fortunata, but generally sympathizing with him. At the same time, the narrator alternately abets doña Lupe in her rage or feels sorry for Maxi along with Lupe, Maxi himself and Fortunata. The most critical of the epithets, "el señoritingo" and "el muy hipocritón," are found in a passage of doña Lupe's free indirect discourse and correspond to her filter, reflecting doña Lupe's

censure of Maxi, not the narrator's. Thus, the narrator has employed a wealth of epithets to influence the reader without explicitly engaging in commentary.

Several scholars have noted that the narrator of *Fortunata y Jacinta* intrudes less as the novel progresses. John W. Kronik asserts that although there is statistically a diminished presence of the narrator in the later part of the novel, "the juggling of narrative levels never disappears" (47). Engler maintains that the "characters gradually usurp the function of the narrator" ("Notes on the Narrative Structure of *Fortunata y Jacinta*" 120), and Hazel Gold points out that the last chapter of the novel is given over to the characters' viewpoints, without narratorial commentary (233).[7] Stephen Gilman suggests that the narrator evolves from a "half-titillated, half-bored chronicler of [Fortunata's] times and personal history" to a less intrusive narrator who thinks Fortunata's consciousness is more important than his own commentary *(Galdós and the Art of the European Novel* 376). Moreover, Gilman's study of the manuscript reveals that Galdós eliminated much of the narrator's original commentary and analysis; Gilman explains that the reader will then have to judge the events directly through the characters' experiences ("Narrative Presentation in *Fortunata y Jacinta*" 296). Galdós himself, in his "Prólogo del autor" of *El abuelo*, talks of why he has written *Realidad* and *El abuelo* in a dialogue format:

> El sistema dialogal, adoptado ya en *Realidad,* nos da la forja expedita y concreta de los caracteres. Estos se hacen, se componen, imitan más fácilmente, digámoslo así, a los seres vivos, cuando manifiestan su contextura moral con su propia palabra y con ella, como en la vida, nos dan el relieve más o menos hondo y firme de sus acciones. La palabra del autor, narrando y describiendo, no tiene, en términos generales, tanta eficacia ni da tan directamente la impresión de la verdad espiritual. . . . Con la virtud misteriosa del diálogo parece que vemos y oímos, sin mediación extraña, el suceso y sus actores, y nos olvidamos más fácilmente del artista oculto que nos ofrece una ingeniosa imitación de la Naturaleza. (11)

Booth would agree with Galdós: a silence of the narrator, he asserts, can bring about suspense as well as more freedom for characters to speak, which will increase our sympathy for them as we experience what they feel. We will identify with the characters, get more involved with them and be less inclined to judge them *(Rhetoric* 273). In spite of these explanations, one may question the motives the narrator in *Fortunata y Jacinta* has for deciding to decrease his voice in favor of the characters' self-presentation. Is there a change in his own personality which would

---

7. Although Gold maintains that the characters in *Fortunata y Jacinta* displace the narrator and become "ancillary (i.e. interior or metadiegetic) narrators" (232), it is important to note that characters who engage in metadiegetic narration are still characters, and their "narratives" consist of their direct discourse, no different than the direct discourse of those characters who do not tell metadiegetic stories. Thus, if one begins to call characters narrators based on their storytelling, it will be necessary to find a way to draw the line between those characters who become narrators and those who simply engage in direct discourse. The present study attempts to show that the "main" narrator has not disappeared, as Engler and Gold believe.

account for his changed style? Ribbans explains his evolution as narrator's "privilege" ("Notes on the Narrator in *Fortunata y Jacinta*" (97), which allows a narrator to enter into characters' consciousnesses. G. Andrade Alfieri and J. J. Alfieri assert that the narrator uses more familiar expressions while introducing new elements in the narration and in descriptions of characters, but that when he finishes the expositive phase, the expressions diminish because when a serious problem affects the lives of his characters, the narrator identifies with them, even suffers with them, and this prevents him from making humorous comments (32). Notwithstanding these observations, there is more to this narrator's transformation.

While the narrator's explicit intrusions diminish in the last part of the novel, he nonetheless continues to impose his influence on the reader; epithets become his principal tool for commentary, as an examination of the last chapter shows. In Sections ix through xiv of that chapter, Fortunata is called "la diabla" eight times; "la joven" eight times; "la madre" or "su madre" four times; "su amiga" three times (referring to Ballester); "la infeliz joven" and "la enferma" twice each; she is named each of the following once: "la prójima," "la de Rubín," "su mujer," "la mujer aquella," "la pecadora," "su sobrina," "la moribunda," and "*La Pitusa.*" In addition, she is called "Fortunata" many times. In this same sample, Maxi is dubbed "Rubín," "Maxi," "Maximiliano," "aquel hombre," and "su marido." Guillermina is called "la santa" eight times; "la fundadora" and "la dama" twice each; and "la casera," "su amiga," and "la maestra" once each. Ballester is labeled "el regente," "el buen farmacéutico," "el farmacéutico," "su amigo," and "Ballester." Lupe is named "la de Jáuregui," "doña Lupe," "*la ministra,*" and "*La de los Pavos.*" Estupiñá is called "el hablador" twice, as well as "el buen viejo," "Rossini," "el administrador," and "el anciano." Fortunata's baby is dubbed "el *Delfinito,*" an implicit commentary on the anticipated upbringing and future awaiting the baby.

Manuel C. Lassaletta makes some insightful comments concerning the use of epithets toward the end of the novel,[8] but he fails to recognize the double-voiced

8. Among Lassaletta's suggestions in *Aportaciones al estudio del lenguaje coloquial galdosiano:* "Galdós" calls Fortunata "la pecadora" many times to suggest to the reader the idea of a woman guided by her erotic instinct, who has not assimilated any of the prejudices of civilized society (50). Fortunata is called "el basilisco" when the narrator is conveying the point of view of doña Lupe or Nicolás, who think of Fortunata as "la hembra de rompe y rasga que se las ha ingeniado para envolver en la red de sus artes al inexperto Maxi" (52). Fortunata is called "la prójima" to imply epithets more clearly derogatory (some examples are found in I 565, 566, 569, 603, II 208, 515) and to present Fortunata as a woman whose passions govern her (51). Lassaletta discusses especially the contrast between what he calls the respectable clergyman and the girl of questionable reputation in the passage where she is referred to as "la samaritana" and "la prójima" (I 569). This is the interview between Nicolás and Fortunata before she enters the convent. However, Lassaletta fails to recognize the irony and mocking attitude the narrator takes toward Nicolás, especially in the opening paragraph on I 564 and in the ending lines of the section. He also does not note the other epithets used in this seven pages of interview: Fortunata is referred to as "la prójima" twice, "la samaritana," "la penitente," "la infeliz," and "la pecadora." Nicolás is called "aquel clérigo, arreglador de conciencias," "el capellán," "el clérigo." The variety of epithets for Fortunata respond to Fortunata's filter throughout the section, a reflection of her desire to become an honorable woman.

nature of many of these epithets. For example, not mentioned by Lassaletta are those epithets critical of Fortunata which come to us through the filter of other characters, such as "la otra": in a passage of Jacinta's psycho-narration and free indirect discourse, we read, "Las facciones del heredero niño no eran las de la otra, eran las suyas" (II 534). Jacinta is the filter character; for her, Fortunata is still "la otra." Nevertheless, keeping in mind the nature of heteroglossia, we must recognize that the narrator still thinks of Fortunata as "la otra" as well, leaving us with an ambiguous perception.

In explaining why doña Casta fires Ballester from his job at the pharmacy, the narrator refers to Fortunata as "la infame;" however, the epithet occurs in a passage of heteroglossic psycho-narration of doña Casta: ". . . porque doña Casta se enteró de sus relaciones (que a ella se le antojaban inmorales) con la infame que tan groseramente había atropellado a Aurora" (II 536; ellipsis added). Recognizing that the entire expression consists of double-voiced words belonging to both the narrator and to doña Casta, we will not mistake it for the narrator's commentary alone. If anything, he is poking fun at society's indignation over Fortunata's attack on Aurora while turning a blind eye to Aurora's immorality and underhandedness. Nevertheless, we cannot be sure to what extent the narrator shares in doña Casta's opinion of Fortunata; this is double-voiced discourse, after all, and the ambiguity is inescapable.

Lassaletta tells us that the narrator's employment of the epithet "la diabla" for Fortunata sheds light on the "lucha pasional que lleva a Fortunata a su muerte" (*Aportaciones* 52), citing the passages where Fortunata offers to love Maxi if he will kill Juanito and Aurora (II 498-99). However, the reader should also note that one of the only ways the narrator gives us a glimpse into his own feelings at this point in the novel is through this use of epithets. He refrains from explicitly telling us his own reactions to Fortunata's delirious attempts to seek revenge, but he is not silent: "—Di si quieres... —repetía la diabla con exaltación delirante—. Déjate de santidades, y reconciliémonos y querámonos" (II 498). The reader notices, moreover, the contrast between the narrator's epithet and Fortunata's choice of words, "santidades." In the following passage, the reader again must attend to the epithet "la diabla" to discern the narrator's slant:

> En el tiempo que estuvo fuera Encarnación, la diabla no hizo más que dar a su hijo muchos besos, diciéndole mil ternezas. [. . .] «Estás tan ricamente... hijo mío. No te querrán tanto como yo, pero sí un poquito menos. [. . .] Me muero; la vida se me corre fuera, como el río que va a la mar. Viva estoy todavía por causa de esta bendita idea que tengo... ¡Ah!, qué idea tan repreciosa... Con ella no necesito Sacramentos; claro, como que me lo han dicho de arriba. Siento yo aquí en mi corazón la voz del ángel que me lo dice. [. . .]» (II 520)

It is clear through Fortunata's direct discourse that she does not think of herself as a "diabla" at this moment, and Guillermina is not present; thus, the epithet reflects the narrator's slant alone. Yet, while the narrator still considers her "la diabla," the

reader is able to perceive the implied author's position; it is apparent through Fortunata's words and actions that the narrator is not necessarily to be taken at his word. A short while later, Guillermina arrives and the narrator calls her repeatedly "la santa," "la fundadora" and "la maestra," while referring to Fortunata as "la enferma," "la infeliz joven," "la diabla," "la moribunda," "la infeliz señora de Rubín," and "La *Pitusa*" (II 525-27). It is during this passage that Guillermina extracts from Fortunata her forgiveness of Juanito, then of Aurora: "Este perdón sí que era de los duros. Callóse la santa observando a la diabla intranquila" (II 526); then she attempts to make her renounce her "idea" that by producing Juanito's child, she is his true wife, but this last is in vain. As Harriet Turner states,"By now epithets like *diabla* and *santa* have become ironic misnomers as Guillermina insists on ritual purification, while Fortunata knows that her shining idea suffices" (91). Most of the epithets in this passage are those of the narrator's slant and do not involve the filter of any character. Although he expresses pity for Fortunata through epithets such as "la infeliz joven," he is clearly convinced that she will not be redeemed. Nevertheless, the reader's attention begins to focus on the incongruity of the so-called "santa" browbeating one who is proving herself to be an "angel."

In this final chapter, the narrator's epithets for Guillermina and Fortunata remind the reader that his steadfast loyalty to the Santa Cruz circle prevents him from grasping the reality of the events as Guillermina's ulterior motives in paying so much attention to Fortunata and her baby are revealed, and while Fortunata plans and carries out her act of selfless generosity which will ultimately redeem her. Further, the reader is shown Guillermina's obsession with the official rites of the church in the face of Fortunata's adherence to her "idea" that giving Jacinta her baby will make her an "angel." Throughout the novel, the narrator has shown great admiration for Guillermina, calling her such names as "aquella sin igual mujer" (I 264) and "la infatigable iniciadora" (I 265). He refers to her often, as do the other characters, as "la fundadora," "la virgen," and, affectionately, "la *rata eclesiástica,*" as well as "la santa." As Turner points out, it does not dawn on the narrator that Guillermina is a fraud who doesn't really like the company of the children she "saves" from poverty; furthermore, she brokers the sale of a baby for a commission, she "acts as a confessor" to Fortunata while Jacinta listens, and engineers the taking of Fortunata's baby from her (91). Turner continues,

> *La santa* dismisses the gift of the child as a *rasgo*—merely an impulsive act—whereas *la diabla* knows her generous gift redeems both herself and her rival. Redemption lies beyond the narrower religious faith of Guillermina, who fails to perceive that *la diabla* is, as she claims, angelic. (91-92)

The narrator, too, fails to see the true meaning of this outcome, along with Guillermina and everyone else in the novel except Ballester and finally Maxi. The astute reader has not missed the point, however, and is able to discern the shortcomings in the narrator's ability to understand the actions he reports.

In composing the novel, Galdós purposely set out to emphasize Juanito's emotional immaturity through the use of the diminutive; Mercedes López-Baralt's study of the "Alpha" and "Beta" versions of the manuscript demonstrates that Juanito appears as Juan throughout most of the earlier rendition (17). In the final version, the narrator's treatment of his companion is consistently benevolent, sometimes ironic, sometimes lightly mocking, but never severely critical, as some scholars suggest. Juanito appears as "el adorado nene" (I 102) through the filter of his parents, as well as "el simpático joven" (I 113), "el niño," "el Delfín," and "el heredero." The few derogatory epithets for Juanito appearing in the narrator's discourse are presented indulgently when they are indicative of the narrator's slant; others appear through filter characters, and at times through Juanito himself as filter. For example, the narrator ironically calls Juanito "el muy farsante" (I 193) when he describes how Juanito put on a big show of thinking over the idea of marrying Jacinta; this epithet of mock disapproval calls the reader's attention to something which the narrator knows we will recognize as trivial when considered with the evidence of far more serious moral flaws in Juanito which escape the narrator's admonitions.

Similarly, the narrator had taken an opportunity earlier to call Juanito "el bárbaro señorito" after Maxi attacked him: "La víctima no daba acuerdo de sí, y aprovechando aquel momento el bárbaro señorito, que vio pasar su coche, lo detuvo, montóse en él de un salto y ¡hala! partieron los caballos a escape" (I 707). However, it is with a measure of irony once again, for the narrator had just described the incident, in which Maxi desperately makes attempts to attack Juanito while Juanito simply pushes him off and finally lifts him into the air and throws him down. We feel sorry for Maxi, but considering his deranged condition, the adjective "bárbaro" could easily be applied to him in this instance, and the narrator uses it in fun, barely disguising his glee at Juanito's swift escape. Furthermore, the narrator delights in describing the subsequent scene, when someone in the crowd gathering around the wounded Maxi dismisses the possibility that his condition could be the result of an altercation over a woman:

> —No, cuestión de faldas, ¿verdad?
> —¡Quita allá! ¿Pero no ves que es marica? (I 708)

Later, Maxi is taken into custody by two officers, who think he is a "pillete" who probably deserved his injuries. The whole event has been presented in such a way that the pity the reader had felt for Maxi becomes ridicule, and in the process, the narrator has managed to check any inclination on the reader's part to condemn Juanito.

Later, when the reader has enough information to want to stop going along with Juanito's transgressions, the narrator admiringly refers to Juanito as a "juggler" as he cites his ease at extricating himself from the predicaments he creates, never censuring him for his treatment of either Fortunata or Jacinta:

> Al llegar aquí Juan se asustó, creyendo que se le había ido un poco la lengua, y cayó en la cuenta de que si Fortunata era como él decía, si no tenía *complexión viciosa,* mayor, mucho mayor era la responsabilidad de él por haberla perdido. Jacinta hubo de pensar esto mismo, y no tardó en manifestárselo. Pero el prestidigitador acudió a defender la suerte con la presteza de su flexible ingenio. (II 63)

The narrator joins Juanito in his satisfaction at being able to get out of a jam. The double-voiced "prestidigitador," reflecting Juanito's own filter as well as the narrator's slant, confirms the narrator's approval of Juanito's activities as he praises him for "la presteza de su flexible ingenio." Similarly, when Juanito had earlier contemplated his promise to confess his erroneous ways to Jacinta, the narrator refers to him as "el pecador," again through Juanito's filter:

> Pero el momento de la confesión se acercaba, y el pecador estaba algo confuso, sin saber cómo iba a salir de ella. Lo que él quería era quedar bien, remontarse hasta su mujer, y superarla si era posible, presentando sus faltas como méritos, y retocando toda la historia de modo que pareciese blanco y hasta noble lo que con los datos sueltos del botón y el cabello era negro y deshonroso. (II 59-60)

The careful reader will not jump to the conclusion that the narrator is finally criticizing Juanito's behavior, since it is evident that Juanito himself is the filter in this passage of double-voiced psycho-narration, thinking of himself as a "pecador" for the moment, although what is most important to him is getting out of his predicament. The reference to the "dark and dishonorable" air surrounding the incriminating evidence Jacinta has found are not judgments on the part of the narrator, but rather reflect Juanito's conception of the situation he will now try to paint white.

Ribbans detects "unequivocal condemnation" of Juanito by the narrator ("Notes on the Narrator in *Fortunata y Jacinta* 97) in Part III of the novel; however, a close examination of the passage he cites demonstrates that the opposite is the case:

> Quien supiera o pudiera apartar el ramaje vistoso de ideas más o menos contrahechas y de palabras relumbrantes, que el señorito de Santa Cruz puso ante los ojos de su mujer en la noche aquella, encontraría la seca desnudez de su pensamiento y de su deseo, los cuales no eran otra cosa que un profundísimo hastío de Fortunata y las ganas de perderla de vista lo más pronto posible. ¿Por qué lo que no se tiene se desea, y lo que se tiene se desprecia? Cuando ella salió del convento con corona de honrada para casarse; cuando llevaba mezcladas en su pecho las azucenas de la purificación religiosa y los azahares de la boda, parecíale al Delfín digna y lucida hazaña arrancarla de aquella vida. Hízolo así con éxito superior a sus esperanzas; pero su conquista le imponía la obligación de sostener indefinidamente a la víctima, y esto, pasado cierto tiempo, se iba haciendo aburrido, soso y caro. Sin variedad era él hombre perdido; lo tenía en su naturaleza y no lo podía remediar. Había de cambiar de forma de Gobierno cada poco tiempo, y cuando estaba en república, le parecía la monarquía tan seductora... Al salir de su casa aquella tarde, iba pensando en esto. Su mujer le estaba gustando más, mucho más que aquella situación revolucionaria que había implantado, pisoteando los derechos de dos matrimonios. (II 75)

This is a passage of Juanito's psycho-narration and free indirect discourse, punctuated by his own and the narrator's double-voiced question; to both of them it is a given, that what one does not have, is desired, while what one has, is scorned. Juanito is in the process of changing his mind once again about which woman he prefers, and the reference to trampling the rights of two married couples is presented through Juanito's free indirect discourse, and thus through his filter. We are witnessing Juanito's own self-recrimination, a safe thing to do because he is congratulating himself for desiring his wife and wanting to end "aquella situación revolucionaria." The narrator, moreover, hints of his approval for Juanito's stance; the double-voiced statement "Había de cambiar de forma de Gobierno cada poco tiempo" insinuates authorization for Juanito's actions. The two epithets for Juanito in this passage, "el señorito de Santa Cruz" and "el Delfín," are equally heteroglossic, reflecting the narrator's as well as Juanito's concept of the privileged son of a well-connected family, and certainly are not critical of Juanito.

The narrator remains sympathetic to Juanito to the end. The last allusions to Juanito refer to him as "el habilidoso caballero," "su marido," "Santa Cruz," "el pobre hombre," and "el Delfín" (II 533), demonstrating the narrator's unfailing identification with Juanito, even in his final downfall. This is not to say that these epithets are devoid of ironic overtones; they are presented through the narrator's slant and partially through the filter of Jacinta, but do not involve Juanito's filter, and we must take care to discern the narrator's intentions. He does not disguise Juanito's failings, but rather expresses pity for him as Juanito realizes the consequences of his actions:

> Cuando se quedaron solos los Delfines, Jacinta se despachó a su gusto con su marido, y tan cargada de razón estaba y tan firme y valerosa, que apenas pudo él contestarle, y sus triquiñuelas fueron armas impotentes y risibles contra la verdad que afluía de los labios de la ofendida consorte. Esta le hacía temblar con sus acertados juicios, y ya no era fácil que el habilidoso caballero triunfara de aquella alma tierna, cuya dialéctica solía debilitarse con la fuerza del cariño. (II 533)

The narrator calls Juanito "el habilidoso caballero," suggesting that his artful ways will no longer serve him, but he has refrained from calling him anything which would truly indicate censure, preferring to chide instead with an ironic epithet. As he continues, the narrator's pity for Juanito is the overriding characteristic of his slant, rather than admonition:

> La situación desairada en que esto le ponía, inflamaba más y más el orgullo de Santa Cruz, y ante el desdén no simulado, sino real y efectivo, que su mujer le mostraba, el pobre hombre padecía horriblemente, porque era para él muy triste, que a la víctima no le doliesen ya los golpes que recibía. No ser nadie en presencia de su mujer, no encontrar allí aquel refugio a que periódicamente estaba acostumbrado, le ponía de malísimo talante. Y era tal su confianza en la seguridad de aquel refugio, que al perderlo, experimentó por vez primera esa sensación

> tristísima de las irreparables pérdidas y del vacío de la vida, sensación que en plena juventud equivale al envejecer, en plena familia equivale al quedarse solo, y marca la hora en que lo mejor de la existencia se corre hacia atrás, quedando a la espalda los horizontes que antes estaban por delante. (II 533)

The narrator's epithets for Juanito in this passage of his psycho-narration ("su marido," "Santa Cruz," and "el pobre hombre") certainly demonstrate sympathy for his companion as Juanito contemplates the emptiness of his life. There is not the slightest hint of reproach in his presentation of Juanito's consciousness, and the reader is left free to condemn or to feel sympathy as he or she chooses. It seems incredible that the narrator should not castigate Juanito; many critics have assumed that he does, because the reader condemns him, as does the implied author. But examinations of the text prove that this narrator, although he pities Juanito, does not criticize him at all. Of course, the reader has by now come to understand that the implied author is not working in concert with the narrator.

At the end of the novel, the narrator lets us know that Fortunata and Jacinta are reconciled, and he confirms this through his use of epithets. In a passage of Jacinta's psycho-narration, the narrator refers to Fortunata as "la mujer sin ventura" and "la muerta" (II 531), double-voiced epithets which convey Jacinta's sympathy for Fortunata; he then refers to both of them as "las dos mujeres," confirming the reconciliation through Jacinta's filter (II 532). Still, although others in the novel become convinced that Fortunata has become an "angel," this is one epithet which the narrator himself never uses for Fortunata, either in his own slant or through any other character's filter, demonstrating that the narrator can not accept the implications of the story he himself has given us.

The narrator had begun the novel wanting his consciousness to be the lens through which we perceive his story-world, but as the novel progresses it becomes increasingly obvious that his ideology does not coincide with that of the implied author, and the narrator himself begins to realize that his own biased viewpoint may not reflect the same values as those which are being presented through his characters and the events affecting them. He slowly decides to let the actions, the words and the consciousnesses of the characters speak for themselves, not necessarily because he begins to adopt those ideas himself, but because he recognizes the futility of trying to comment upon ideas and situations which may be more worthy than his own, and which he can not bring himself to adopt. Furthermore, his opinions and comments may not be believed by a reader whose values may be at odds with a narrator who demonstrates an inability to grasp all that is happening in his story-world. In spite of his evolving awareness of values other than his own, evidenced by his diminishing intrusiveness and greater reliance on epithets to effect his commentary, does the narrator's attitude change? No. Even at the end, when Jacinta thoroughly discards Juanito and any love she still had for him, the narrator cannot bring himself to criticize him, not only because at this point he is not overtly commenting on the characters, but because he really does not feel that Juanito

deserves outright condemnation. We can know this only through his epithets for Juanito in that scene, all of which express sympathy for him.

Bakhtin's declaration, "The speaking person in the novel is always . . . an *ideologue*, and his words are always *ideologemes*" (333), reminds us that language in the novel represents a way of viewing the world. The narrator of *Fortunata y Jacinta* constantly uses familiar language, colloquialisms, sayings, and epithets, addressing the reader as he would any of his other friends in the Santa Cruz crowd; his familiarity helps the reader to classify him in a certain social circle, laden with its particular ideology. Although the narrator begins to comprehend his failure to evaluate the significance of events, evidenced by his progressively less intrusive nature, he nonetheless exerts his voice to the last through the epithets he gives his characters, proving that his values remain at odds with those of the implied author.

The familiar language and colloquialisms used in this novel and in many others by Galdós provoked the criticism and scorn which resulted in his own epithet, "don Benito el garbancero." However, his ability to manipulate a colloquial style for his narrator and thus present him as a bearer of a certain ideology, distinct from that of other characters in the novel and from that of the implied author, has resulted in one of the masterpieces of literature.

Lily Anne Goetz
Universidad Católica de América

WORKS CITED

Andrade Alfieri, G.,and J. J. Alfieri."El lenguaje familiar de Pérez Galdós." *Hispanófila* 22 (1964): 27-73.

Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bal, Mieke. "The Narrating and the Focalizing: A Theory of the Agents in Narrative." *Style* 17 (1983): 234-69.

_____. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Trans. Christine van Boheemen. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Blanco-Aguinaga, Carlos. "On 'The Birth of Fortunata.'" *Anales Galdosianos* 3 (1968): 13-24.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Chatman, Seymour. "Characters and Narrators: Filter, Center, Slant, and Interest-Focus." *Poetics Today* 7:2 (1986): 189-204.

_____. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Cohn, Dorrit. "The Encirclement of Narrative: On Franz Stanzel's *Theorie des Erzählens*." *Poetics Today* 2:2 (1981): 183-191.

_____. *Transparent Minds. Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Cohn, Dorrit, and Gérard Genette. "Nouveaux nouveaux discours du récit." *Poétique* 61 (1985): 101-9.

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

_____. *The Structure of Realism: The Novelas contemporáneas of Benito Pérez Galdós*. Chapel Hill: UNC Printing, 1977.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Foreward Jonathan Culler. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980.

_____. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

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

_____. *Galdós and the Art of the European Novel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.

_____."Narrative Presentation in *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Revista Hispánica Moderna* 34 (1968): 288-301.

Gold, Hazel. "Problems of Closure in *Fortunata y Jacinta:* Of Narrators, Readers and their Just Deserts/Desserts." *Neophilologus* 70 (1986): 228-38.

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

Kronik, John W. "Feijoo and the Fabrication of Fortunata." *Conflicting Realities: Four Readings of a Chapter by Pérez Galdós* (Fortunata y Jacinta, *Part III, Chapter IV)*. Ed. Peter B. Goldman. London: Tamesis, 1985.

Lassaletta, Manuel C. *Aportaciones al estudio del lenguaje coloquial galdosiano*. Madrid: Insula, 1974.

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

Pérez Galdós, Benito. *El abuelo. Prólogo del autor*. Vol. 6 of *Obras completas de Benito Pérez Galdós*. Ed. Federico Carlos Sainz de Robles. 6 vols. Madrid: Aguilar, 1961. 10-11.

_____. *Fortunata y Jacinta. Dos historias de casadas*. Ed. Francisco Caudet. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Madrid: Cátedra, 1985.

Ribbans, Geoffrey. "Notes on the Narrator in *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *A Sesquicentennial Tribute to Galdós 1843-1993*. Ed. Linda M. Willem. Newark, Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta Hispanic Monographs, 1993. 88-104.

_____. *Pérez Galdós:* Fortunata y Jacinta. London: Grant & Cutler, 1977.

Sánchez-Barbudo, Antonio. "Vulgaridad y genio de Galdós." *Archivum* 7 (1957): 48-75.

Scholes, Robert, and Robert Kellogg. *The Nature of Narrative*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Stanzel, Franz K. *A Theory of Narrative*. Trans. Charlotte Goedsche. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Turner, Harriet S. *Benito Pérez Galdós:* Fortunata y Jacinta. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Uspensky, Boris. *A Poetics of Composition: The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form*. Trans. Valentina Zavarin and Susan Wittig. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Volek, Emil. "Colloquial Language in Narrative Structure: Towards a Nomothetic Typology of Styles and of Narrative Discourse." *Dispositio* 5-6 (1980-81): 57-84.

Whiston, James. "Las pruebas corregidas de *Fortunata y Jacinta*." *Actas del Segundo Congreso Internacional de Estudios Galdosianos*. 2 vols. Las Palmas: Ediciones del Excmo. Cabildo Insular de Gran Canaria, 1979. 1: 258-65.