The galley stage in the production of Galdós's novels provided the author with an opportunity for final revision before his texts went to press. Despite Berkowitz's claims to the contrary, Galdós did make numerous changes in his works prior to their publication (114-16). Indeed, no page of Fortunata y Jacinta's galleys is left untouched. Yet, surprisingly little critical attention has been afforded this important stage in the production of Galdós's masterpiece. In 1978 James Whiston pioneered the way for further study in this area by publishing a brief article discussing how minor substitutions and additions to the galleys rendered the language of the text more natural or expressive and created a more positive impression of Fortunata's character. Some eight years later Francisco Caudet acknowledged the importance of the galleys by supplementing the text of his 1985 edition of the novel with footnotes, quoting some of the material that was either discarded or changed at the galley stage. More recently, in her 1992 book analyzing the development of Fortunata y Jacinta from the Alpha manuscript through its published version, Mercedes López-Baralt dedicated a chapter to showing how various galley revisions affected the characterization process. Finally, my own 1993 article examined the relationship between Moreno-Isla and Jacinta in light of material that was deleted from the galleys.

Given the length of Fortunata y Jacinta and the volume of deletions, additions, and substitutions contained in its galleys, it is clear that much work is still left to be done on the analysis of Galdós's revisions. For example, one of the most extensively modified scenes in the galleys—Jacinta's initial visit to the “cuarto estado” in Part One, Chapter Nine, Section One—is not mentioned by either Whiston or López-Baralt, and is only partially reproduced by Caudet. Its revisions consist of a series of five deleted passages, ranging from one to four sentences each, which occur at varying intervals. Unfortunately, Caudet footnotes only two of these deletions (1: 319), thereby losing the continuity of the scene as originally written. In this paper I will examine the galley version of this scene in light of all the pre-publication material that was removed, and I will show how the absence of the five passages affects the published version of the novel.

In order to appreciate the impact of the deletions, it is useful to keep in mind the narratological format of this scene. Although it is written in the third-person, it is focalized through a character rather than through the narrator. That is, the entire scene is written so as to reflect Jacinta's sensations as she moves through the bustling market en route to Ido del Sagrario's house, and the descriptions are subjectively tinged by her feelings and attitudes toward what she experiences. In Seymour Chatman's terminology, Jacinta is the "filter" through which the events of the scene are described (Coming to Terms 143-44). These "filtered descriptions" present Jacinta's impressions of the reality around her. They do not convey Jacinta's thoughts, as would an interior monologue or a free indirect style passage, but they do capture her point of view. As
Chatman has observed, point of view is subject to three types of engagement: perceptual (through the character’s physical senses); conceptual (through the character’s attitudes, feelings, and worldview); and interested (through the personal stake the character has in the situation) (Story and Discourse 151-58). All three forms come into play in both the galley and published versions of this scene, but the proportions differ in each version as a result of the textual deletions.

The orientation of the scene from Jacinta’s viewpoint is explicitly announced by the narrator prior to the description of the marketplace: “Recibía tan sólo la imagen borrosa de los objetos diversos que iban pasando, y lo digo así, porque era como si ella estuviese parada y la pintoresca vía se corriese delante de ella como un telón.” She perceives her surroundings as a jumbled mixture of sights and sounds where details rather than whole objects dominate. Since she is only aware of bits and pieces of the activity around her, the pace seems frantic, the figures appear to be grotesquely distorted, and the colours are intensely vivid. This walk along the Calle de Toledo is her first exposure to the poverty in which the “cuarto estado” lives. Galdós’s use of such a politically-charged term in the chapter title explicitly signals the class distinction that exists between Jacinta and the denizens of the Cava Baja.

For Jacinta, raised in a protected, middle-class environment, the slums are another world which disorients her and fills her with apprehension. Unlike Guillermina, whose charitable activities frequently bring her into contact with the least fortunate members of society, Jacinta is completely unaccustomed to lower-class life. Consequently, she registers what she sees and hears in negative terms. That is, the impressions which she receives from her physical senses (her perceptual perspective) are influenced by her middle-class attitudes (her conceptual perspective). Thus, the voices of the women hawking their goods seem so harsh that they hurt her ears, while her eyes are assaulted by the vivid colours of the clothing on display. Seen through Jacinta’s “mareada vista,” each colour projects some undesirable trait, from “el naranjado que chilla como los ejes sin grasa” and “el bermellón nativo, que parece rasguñar los ojos” to “el cobalto, que infunde ideas de envenenamiento” and “ese amarillo tila, que tiene cierto aire de poesía mezclado con la tisis, como en La Traviatta.” As the scene progresses, one colour comes to dominate and everything takes on a blood-red hue, above all, the tavern doors that she sees at every turn. Jacinta suddenly feels herself surrounded by “un pueblo que tiene la religión de la sangre,” and she becomes afraid. That is, her conceptual perspective has caused her to move from simply disliking her surroundings to seeing them as dangerous. Guillermina confirms unwittingly Jacinta’s fears by stating that taverns are the breeding ground for all crime. Immediately after Guillermina’s comment, the published text begins to diverge from the galley.

Thus, in the published text the entire issue of Jacinta’s concern for her personal safety is dropped. Instead, Jacinta’s interest perspective is powerfully engaged, first by the infants with their mothers in the street, and then by the older children playing in the patio. Although she does notice their shabby clothing and lower-class speech, they remain fascinating to her pre-
cisely because they are children. That is, her interest perspective totally overrides her fears and
the sense of danger which her conceptual perspective had generated just moments before.

In the galley version, however, Jacinta’s misgivings about her surroundings do not abate. On the contrary, her distress increases as the scene progresses. Jacinta’s sustained impression of
the Cava Baja as a sinister locale is due entirely to five passages which are present in the galleys
but absent in the final version. In the following transcript from Part One, pages 202-04 of the
galleys, these discarded passages can be viewed within the context of the material that was
retained. All deletions are indicated in bold print. Spelling and punctuation are as they appear
in the galleys:

Las puertas de las tabernas también de color de sangre. Y que no son ni una ni dos, Jacinta se asustaba de
ver tantas, y Guillermina no pudo menos de excluir: “¡Cuánta perdición! Una puerta sí y otra no,
taberna. De aquí salen todos los crímenes... Jacinta miraba hacia la cavidad roja de las tabernas, con
curiosidad y miedo. Creía ver salir por cada una de aquellas puertas un hombre ensangrentado,
bludiendo la navaja de lengua de vaca en la mano, y abriéndose paso con ella entre la multitud.

Cuando se halló cerca del término de su viaje, Jacinta fijaba exclusivamente su atención en todos
los chicos que iba encontrando, ya sueltos de la mano de alguna persona mayor, ó bien en brazos de sus
madres. De unos apartaba pronto la vista por demasiado grandes, de otros por muy pequeños.
Pasmábale la señora de Santa Cruz de que hubiera tantísima madre por aquellos barrios, pues á cada paso
tropezaba con una, con su crió en brazos, muy bien agasajado bajo el ala del mantón. A todos estos
ciudadanos del porvenir, no se les veía Jacinta más que la cabeza por junto al hombro de su madre. Algunos
iban vueltos hacia atrás, mostrando la carita redonda, dentro del círculo del gorro y los ojuelos vivos, y se
reían con los transeúntes. Otros tenían el semblante malhumorado, como personas que se llaman á engaño
en los comienzos de la vida humana. También vió Jacinta no uno, sino dos y hasta tres, camino del
Cementerio. Jacinta les suponía muy tranquilos y de color de cera dentro de aquella caja que llevaba un
tío cualquiera, al hombro, como se lleva una escopeta.

—Aquí es— dijo Guillermina, después de andar un trecho por la calle del Bastero y de doblar
una esquina., No tardaron en encontrarse dentro de un patio cuadrilongo. Jacinta miró para arriba y vio
tres filas de corredores con antepechos de fábrica y pilas amparelas de madera pintada de ocre, mucha ropa
tendida, mucho refajo amarillo, mucha zalea puesta á secar y oyó un zumbido como de enjambre. En el
patio, que era todo de tierra, empedrado sólo á trechos, había chiquillos de diferentes edades. Parecía que
perseguían á Jacinta, pues á donde quiera que enderezaba la vista no veía mas que muchachos. Tres ó
cuatro niñas saneadas y ágiles como cabras, jugaban con mayor inquietud que los varones. Una tenía en
la cabeza toquilla roja con agujeros, ó con orificios, como diría Aparisi; otra, toquilla blanca, y otra estaba
con las greñas al aire. Esta llevaba zapatillas de orillo, y la otra botitas finas de caña blanca, pero ajadas ya
y con el tacón torcido. Los chicos eran diversos tipos. Estaba el que va para la escuela con su cartera de
estudio, y el píllete descalzo que no hace más que vagar todo el santo día. Por el vestido se diferenciaban
poco, y menos aún por el lenguaje, que era duro y dejoso, ese lenguaje en cuyo fondo se advierte la
influencia torera, y cuyas reflexiones4 duras sientan tan mal en bocas infantiles.

—Chicooin... mia éste... Que te rompo la cara..., ¿sabéis...?
—Ves esa farolona?— dijo Guillermina á Jacinta, —es una de las chicas de Ido ... Esa, esa que está dando brincos como un gato montés ... ¡Eh! Chiquilla... No oye... Venid acá.

Todos los chicos, varones y hembras, se pusieron á mirar á las dos señoras, y todos callaron. Al mismo tiempo Jacinta vió que hacia ella marchaba con las alas abiertas un gallo de pelea, la cabeza peluda y roja como un tomate. Parecía un perro guardián que la quería morder. Guillermina le amenazó con el pie, y el gallo en un arranque de despecho, se dió un picotazo á sí mismo, y enseñó á las señoras su rabadilla, también peluda y roja como la cabeza. Los muchachos no se acercaban. Estaban lejos, mirando á las señoras, entre burlones y respetuosos. Las que se acercaban paso á paso eran seis ó ocho palomas pardas y con reflejos verdes. Lindísimas, gordas, venían muy confiadas meneando el cuerpo como las chulas, picoteando en el suelo lo que encontraban. Eran tan mansas, que llegaron sin asustarse hasta muy cerca de las señoras ...

Thus, in the galley version Guíllermina’s statement linking alcohol to criminal behaviour serves as the catalyst for Jacinta’s imagination, prompting her to envision blood-soaked killers bringing the violence of the taverns out into the very street where she and Guillermina are walking. Jacinta’s fears are momentarily forgotten, however, when she notices that the streets are filled with women and young children rather than dangerous men. As in the published version, Jacinta’s interest perspective is engaged by the children, but in the galleys that engagement has a specific goal—finding Juanito’s son. Consequently, she quickly turns her attention away from those children who are not of the appropriate age. In the published version, Jacinta’s focus on the children is tied to her obsession with motherhood and her desire to have a child of her own. In the galleys, however, Jacinta does not show lovingly maternal feelings toward the youngsters she encounters. On the contrary, they become agents of torment to her. Although the boys and girls in the patio leave Jacinta alone, she immediately feels hounded by them. Whereas the published text merely shows the children running, jumping, and insulting one another, the galleys emphasize the menacing quality Jacinta feels they project toward her because of their large numbers, unruly behaviour, and crude language. That is, in the galley version, Jacinta’s interest perspective is so overwhelmed by her conceptual perspective that she reacts to the youngsters with alarm. The hostility Jacinta perceives in this unfamiliar neighbourhood culminates in her reaction to the fighting cock that approaches her. Although Guillermina is not at all frightened by the creature, Jacinta sees it as a ferocious animal ready to do her harm. Furthermore, its red colour and aggressive behaviour are reminiscent of that knife-wielding man that Jacinta had conjured up in her imagination just a few minutes earlier. With this segment deleted, Jacinta is confronted with nothing more intimidating than a few tame pigeons.

The major difference between how this scene is presented in the galleys as opposed to the published novel rests on the degree to which Jacinta’s fears at finding herself in an environment so unlike her own are allowed to develop and grow. In the published text these fears are diffused as soon as they arise, but in the galleys they resurface after being only temporarily suspended. Taken together, the galley deletions display Jacinta’s exaggerated emotional response to her lower-class surroundings. The mere presence of taverns causes Jacinta’s imagination to populate the streets with armed and dangerous men, where in reality only women and children are
found. These children, in turn, are perceived as wild and oppressive, even though they are simply playing. Finally, Jacinta’s sense of being an outsider in this environment leads her to view the fighting cock as a guard dog ready to bite her for being where she does not belong. The comic result of her encounter with this animal underscores the extreme position Jacinta takes in response to what merely constitutes the daily life of the “cuarto estado.” Collectively, the galley deletions present a fearful image of the slums which is rooted in the facts, but which is significantly intensified by Jacinta’s middle-class biases. Due to Jacinta’s emotional distortion of the facts, a slightly ironic tone pervades the scene. As a filtered description, this scene captures Jacinta’s point of view. But since it is written in the third person, the presence of the narrator implicitly stands behind the description, asking the reader to compare Jacinta’s strong reaction with what actually exists around her. The removal of the galley passages minimizes this irony and restricts it completely to Jacinta’s experience in the market place, before she comes in contact with the children of the neighbourhood.

Whereas in the galleys Jacinta’s conceptual perspective dominates the scene, in the published novel her interest perspective is dominant. This shift in the orientation influencing Jacinta’s perception of what she hears and sees results in a decidedly different subjective experience in each of the two versions of this scene. This shift also accounts for the two major effects achieved through the galley deletions. First, since Jacinta’s interest perspective is centered on children, its uninterrupted control of this scene in the published text produces a more maternal characterization of Jacinta than in the galleys. Through the deletions, Jacinta’s original disinterest in youngsters not matching Pituso’s description disappears, as does her unease around the patio children at play. The impression left by the remaining text is of Jacinta’s fascination for children in general. Second, since Jacinta’s conceptual perspective—based on middle-class values—is diminished in the published text, the portrayal of the lower class is less naturalistic. In the galleys the reader is presented with Jacinta’s impression of the Cava Baja as a perilous environment filled with danger and alcoholic excess. After the removal of the five passages, what remains in the published text is the picture of a neighbourhood in which there is much squalor, but it is non-threatening. Thus, in making these deletions Galdós continued a practice he had employed earlier in his revision of the La desheredada manuscript. As Michael A. Schnepf has shown, some naturalistic material displaying “the crudity and destructive potency” of slum life was cut from the manuscript before publication (53). In particular, the description of La Sanguijuelera’s neighbourhood was made less harsh through the removal of two passages: one mentioning the violent quarrels which frequently occurred among the inhabitants, and another dealing with Isidora’s reaction to the numerous taverns in the area. This latter passage is reminiscent of the material deleted from the Fortunata y Jacinta galleys. Like Jacinta, Isidora reacts with “la curiosidad y la repugnancia” to the red doors of the taverns she sees all around her, and, also like Jacinta, she begins to envision the intoxicated customers of these establishments (56). By removing the pre-publication references to alcoholic overindulgence in both La desheredada and Fortunata y Jacinta, Galdós downplayed the theme of lower-class drunkenness associated with naturalism in Zola’s novel, L’Assommoir.

Susan Stanford Friedman has suggested that the various versions of a text, when taken together, can be viewed as a palimpsest, and that by comparing each version, it is possible to reconstruct the “story” of the revision process (18). My analysis of this scene is but one illus-
tion of how the galley stage of Galdós's masterpiece can contribute toward the telling of that "story."

Butler University

NOTES

1 See Mieke Bal’s discussion of the important distinction between “the vision through which the elements are presented” and “the identity of the voice that is verbalizing that vision” (100-18).

2 The concept of estates dates back to pre-revolutionary France, where old-régime society was legally divided into three groups: the clergy (first estate), the nobility (second estate), and the combined middle- and lower-classes (third estate). Post-revolutionary political rhetoric elaborated on this three-part division and designated a fourth estate which separated the working class from the bourgeoisie of the third estate. As Caudet notes, the term “cuarto estado” was used by the workers themselves to indicate lower-class solidarity and separateness from the middle class (315, note 225).

3 The *Fortunata y Jacinta* galleys are stored at the Casa-Museo Pérez Galdós. Parts I and II are in “caja” 21, and Parts III and IV are in “caja” 22. I wish to thank Butler University for the travel grants that allowed me to consult these galleys.

4 Page 7, 1.11 of the Beta manuscript reads “inflexiones” rather than “reflexiones” here. Both the original manuscript (Alpha) and the fair copy (Beta) are located in the Houghton Library of Harvard University.

5 Unfortunately, because of missing pages in the Alpha manuscript, only the opening portion of this scene exists in its original version. The entire fragment reads as follows: “Por la mañana, a la calladita, sin decir nada a nadie, Jacinta y doña Guillermina se personaron en la calle de Mitre el Río alta, la primera con su elegante abrigo de terciopelo color de pasa, y la segunda vestida con la humildad de costumbre, la falda de merino negro, un mantón negro también de poco abrigo y un velo, de viso que tiraba a ala de mosca. Desde que entraron por el patio, antes aun, desde que entraron en la calle del Bastero, Jacinta fijaba su atención en todos los chicos que encontraba, ya sueltos, ya de la mano de sus madres, ya en brazos de éstas. De unos apartaba pronto su vista por demasiado grandes, de otros por demasiado pequeños. Muchas mujeres pasaban llevando un crío bien agazapado bajo el ala” (Alpha 332; Hyman 220-21). Despite being incomplete, the Alpha manuscript does provide an important insight into the evolution of this scene. The absence of the Calle de Toledo description prior to Jacinta’s entrance into the patio shows that Galdós’s choice to filter Jacinta’s surroundings through her conceptual point of view was made during the creation of the Beta version, upon which the galleys are based.
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