GALDÓS'S

SEGUNDA MANERA

Rhetorical Strategies and Affective Response

BY

LINDA M. WILLEM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

My three-pronged approach to Galdós's *segunda manera* is sum-
marized in the few words that make up the epigram above. [1] The
game-playing relationship which Iser indicates between the author
and the reader implies the use of strategies and a reliance on
agreed-upon rules. These strategies and rules correspond, respec-
tively, to the rhetorical and reader-response aspects of my analysis.
In addition, the image of a playground suggests not only a field to
play *on* but also the presence of apparatus to play *with*. That appa-
ratus is taken into account by the narratological facet of my exam-
ination. Throughout this book, then, I will employ a pluralistic ap-
proach which combines narratology with both rhetorical and reader
response criticism. The narratological terminology will allow me to
identify and analyze the various aspects of Galdós's narrative pre-
sentation, while rhetorical and reader response theories will allow
me to place his new mode of presentation within the context of its
role in the communication between the author and the reader.
Thus, I will focus on narrative technique, but I will emphasize the
affective quality of the text, thereby examining the ways that tech-
nique influences the reading experience.

---

[1] Wolfgang Iser, *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*
(Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989) 250.

The subject of my study is Galdós's *segunda manera*, so called because of the now-famous letter which Galdós wrote to D. Francisco Giner. In it Galdós stated: "Efectivamente, yo he querido en esta obra entrar por nuevo camino o inaugurar mi *segunda* o tercera *manera*, como se dice de los pintores (Galdós's emphasis)." [2] That novel, of course, was *La desheredada*, and with it Galdós truly did mark the beginning of a new phase in his literary production. After his break with "La Guirnalda" editorial house in 1897, Galdós formalized the distinction between his early and later work by separating his novels into three categories – *Episodios Nacionales*, *Novelas de la Primera Época* (*La Fontana de Oro* through *La familia de León Roch*), and *Novelas Españolas Contemporáneas* – thereby distinguishing the novels of this "nuevo camino" from the historical and thesis novels that preceded them.

As can be imagined, Galdós's shift toward a different kind of writing has occasioned a great deal of critical interest. Discussion of what constitutes Galdós's new *manera* in *La desheredada* has largely centered on the issue of Naturalism, and has generated a lively debate concerning the degree to which Galdós follows Zola's theory of the novel. In related discussions, scholars have noted the less overtly political and religious nature of the novels following Galdós's *primera época*. These concerns have served as a backdrop to the multitude of articles and books which examine the themes, characterizations, structures, and politics of the various contemporary novels.

Overall, critical work on Galdós's *segunda manera* has tended to concentrate on the content of his novels, with surprisingly little attention given to the way in which Galdós conveys that content to the reader. While it is true that underlying many of these studies is the tacit assumption that the reader's appreciation of the content is influenced by how the story is told, few critics specifically address the issue of Galdós's narrative technique. Yet when the early contemporary novels are examined in light of the narrative devices they contain, it becomes clear that the change in Galdós's writing is not confined to content alone. Indeed, *La desheredada* marks the beginning of a more sophisticated and varied mode of narrative presentation in Galdós's novels. In this book I will examine that complexity

---

[2] See Manuel Bartolomé Cossío, "In Memorium: Galdós y Giner: Una carta de Galdós," *Boletín de la Institución Libre de Enseñanza* 44 (1920): 62.

and show how Galdós's narrative technique contributes toward the development of the characters and the ideological concerns of the novels in which they are found. That is, rather than simply providing a narratological description of the features which characterize the narrative presentation of Galdós's *segunda manera*, I will use that description as a point of departure to explore how those features function rhetorically within the individual novels. In so doing I will show how the affective response associated with particular narrative devices plays a role in influencing the reader's reception of the characters and the social, political, religious, or ethical attitudes they display. Thus, I will not be limited to the structuralist concerns of "pure" narratology. Rather, my narratological treatment will link Galdós's use of narrative devices to the rhetorical, ideological, and affective aspects of his *segunda manera* novels. "Critical narratology" is the term given to this type of endeavor by Ingeborg Hoesterey because it mingles "impulses from critical theory and narratology proper into a hybrid form of critical discourse."[3] Such discourse has at its base the close reading of texts and the attention to narrative devices which characterizes narratology, but this methodology is placed within a broader theoretical framework that can draw on any of the post-structuralist perspectives. The various dimensions of my own approach will be addressed in this introduction.

NARRATOLOGICAL DIMENSION

In *Story and Discourse* and its sequel *Coming to Terms*, Seymour Chatman draws on a wide variety of Anglo-American, Russian, and French theorists to define the various features of a narrative text.[4] The foundation of his theory rests on the structuralist distinction between the basic components of narrative: the content plane (including the characters, setting, and chain of events) and the expression plane through which the content is transmitted. Chatman refers to these as the "story" and the "discourse," respectively. The

---

[3] Ingeborg Hoesterey, introduction, *Neverending Stories: Toward a Critical Narratology*, eds. Ann Fehn, Ingeborg Hoesterey, and Maria Tatar (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992) 4.

[4] Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978) and *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990).

story concerns the *what* of the narrative while the discourse deals with the *how* (SD 19-26). Based on this duality Chatman is able to clearly define a number of problematic concepts. Of particular importance to my study of Galdós's works is Chatman's distinction between two terms that often are used interchangeably in literary discussions: point of view and narrative voice.[5]

Point of view concerns the concept of perspective, which can have any of three different orientations: perceptual (through one's physical senses); conceptual (through one's attitudes/world view); and interested (through the personal stake one has in the situation) (SD 151-58). Since perspective can pertain either to a character or to the narrator, Chatman designates the agent involved by referring to the "filter" of a character and the "slant" of the narrator (CT 143-44). Certain perspectives reside in the story and others in the discourse. Since characters exist within the realm of the story, their perspectives similarly are part of that domain. The narrator's point of view, however, is more complex. The perspective of the heterodiegetic narrator belongs entirely to the discourse.[6] In contrast, the ho-

---

[5] The problems associated with the concept of "focalization" – both in its original formulation by Genette and in the modifications introduced by Bal – are avoided through Chatman's distinction between narrative voice and point of view, as well as through his classification of point of view according to orientation and agency. William Nelles also has attempted to clarify the issue by modifying Genette's theory yet another time, and most recently, Manfred Jahn has provided the framework for a new "revitalized" theory of focalization by deconstructing Genette's text-centered theory to include a place for the reader in the transaction. Despite all of these refinements, I agree with Chatman that the term "focalization" has become too controversial and it should be replaced by more precise terminology. See Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980) 185-94 and *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988) 72-78; Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, trans. Christine van Boheemen (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1985) 100-18; William Nelles, "Getting Focalization into Focus," *Poetics Today* 11 (1990): 365-82; and Manfred Jahn, "Windows of Focalization: Deconstructing and Reconstructing a Narratological Concept," *Style* 30 (1996): 241-67.

[6] Gérard Genette's definition of narrators is based on two separate types of attributes. One of these attributes pertains to narrative level: the extradiegetic narrator narrates the primary narrative; the intradiegetic narrator narrates a secondary narrative embedded in the first; and the metadiegetic narrator narrates a tertiary narrative embedded in the secondary one. The other attribute pertains to the narrator's relationship to the story: a homodiegetic narrator is a character in the story, while a heterodiegetic narrator is not (when the homodiegetic narrator is the protagonist, he or she may be referred to as autodiegetic). Consequently, any given narrator can be described by two attributes, one identifying the level and the other stating the function. See *Narrative Discourse* 243-48 and *Narrative Discourse Revisited* 84-87.

modiegetic narrator has two perspectives, one as a character within the story, and one as the narrator within the discourse. Thus we can speak of the perceptual, conceptual, or interest filter of the narrator-as-character, but we should speak of his slant when he is functioning in the discourse.[7] Often these perspectives are identical, but they need not be so, as will be seen in my discussion of *El amigo Manso*.

Narrative voice is the means by which the various points of view are conveyed to the reader. As such, it pertains to the realm of the discourse and encompasses all of the narrative devices available to an author. Chatman lists these in the order of ascending degree of narratorhood, from total narrator effacement to the maximum amount of narrator presence (SD 166-253). For my purposes, however, I will divide these devices into two broad categories based on the concept of interior vs. exterior views. Interior views grant the reader access to the mental workings of a character (thoughts, impressions, etc.) while exterior views do not. Exterior views of a character are achieved through:

    1. Narrative statement: commentary, summary, or description by the narrator concerning the characters.

    2. Direct speech: record of the words spoken between the characters (including dialogue and dramatic monologue).

    3. Indirect speech.

    4. Free indirect speech.

Interior views of characters are achieved through:

    1. Direct thought: record of a character's thoughts.

    2. Indirect thought.

    3. Free indirect thought.

Some of these terms may need clarification. Direct speech or thought records can either be *tagged* or *free*. Tagged refers to the use of introductory clauses (such as *he said* or *she thought*) to explicitly note the spoken words or thoughts. These indicators are absent in free (also referred to as untagged) statements. Both forms, however, record the exact words of a character, with or without quotation marks. As such, these records have a first-person refer-

---

[7] This distinction for the homodiegetic narrator is not explicitly stated by Chatman, but is implied in his argument. Since events and settings can be filtered through any of the characters in the story, they also can be filtered through the narrator when he or she is functioning as one of the characters in the story.