Handout

Source (Fuente) 3

Database landing page for the journal article:

Small Talk: Towards a Poetics of the Detail in Galdós
Hazel Gold
Revista Hispánica Moderna
Año 47, No. 1 (Jun., 1994), pp. 30-46
Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/30203371
Page Count: 17

Topics: Novels, Narratives, Narrators, Poetics, Literary criticism, Novelists, Allegory, Aesthetics, Poetry, Authors
SMALL TALK: TOWARDS A POETICS OF THE DETAIL IN GALDÓS

While applauding the spontaneity of dialogue, the daring experiments of form, and the breadth of social portraiture that characterize Galdós’s novelistic art, critics have often indicated that many a Galdós novel appears to have been conceived under the sign of excess. Writing on Mi au, for instance, Clarín remarked that Galdós seemed irresistibly drawn to copying virtually everything he observed on the contemporary scene. As a result, the principal shared defect of such works as Fortunata y Jacinta and Mi au is a certain repetitiveness, a “delectation morosa con que el autor se detiene a describir y narrar ciertos objetos y acontecimientos que importan poco y no añaden elemento alguno de belleza, ni siquiera de curiosidad a la obra artística” (Mazella 271). Despite his admiration for the scrutiny Galdós affords Ramón Villaamil’s petty bourgeois world, he feels compelled to point out the novel’s many moments of narrative inertia and superfluous dialogue, its unnecessary amplifications and “pormenores menos significativos.”

Ironically, Alas himself was not exempt from the descriptive zeal – “este prurito de pararse en lo minucioso” – that he attributes to his colleague. Reviewers of La Regenta were quick to note that the portraits of Ana Ozores and Vetusta were exhaustive of their subject matter and exhausting to their readers. For Rafael de Altamirás’s taste, “Hay demasíadas cosas en La Regenta, aunque estén maravillosamente contadas,” while another critic, Natalio Vida, wondered: “¿A qué ese prurito del detalle? A qué tanto personaje con los que sobre para hacer una novela?” (qtd. in Tintoré 226; 155). Frequently identified in pathological terms as a “prurito,” “vicio,” or “manía,” the immoderate use of detail was labelled by such Krausist commentators as Jerónimo Vida as an “achaque de escuela,” an affliction variously attributed to the rise of individualism, the interest in the physiological datum evinced by the naturalist movement, and the beguiling examples provided by Flaubert and Zola. Comparing Clarín’s most famous novel to Cervantes’s, Luis Vidart concurred: “si alguna falta pudiera notarse en la obra del señor Alas, es precisamente esta exageración descriptiva” (qtd. in Tintoré 165; 229).

From frustrated students who complain that Galdós’s long-winded passages of description hinder the progress of the plot and overwhelm them with archaological minutiae of which they have little knowledge or interest, to literary critics who examine the devices and conventions that create the illusion of the text’s identification with the referent, readers of classical realist fiction everywhere stumble upon that pernickety little element: the detail. In his recent biography of Vladimir Nabokov, Brian Boyd recounts that in the literature classes he taught at Cornell University, the Russian-born author often fixed on the most minute of textual particles, as in the following, not atypical exam question on Madame Bovary: “Describe Emma’s eyes, hands, sunshade, hairdo,