THE ADAPTATION OF GALDÓS'S *REALIDAD* FOR THE STAGE
(A Preliminary Manuscript Study)

Lisa P. Condé

> . . . recrearse en las obras ajenas sabiendo cómo se hacen o cómo se intenta su ejecución; es buscar y sorprender las dificultades vencidas, los aciertos fáciles o alcanzados con poderoso esfuerzo; es buscar y satisfacer uno de los pocos placeres que hay en la vida, la admiración . . .
>
> (Pérez Galdós, Prólogo, *La Regenta* 79-80)

"Galdós's plays still await their critic," declared John Varey in 1970 (35). Over the last decade the challenge has been taken up, and there has been a marked resurgence of interest amongst Galdós scholars in the great novelist's turn to the stage in 1892 and in his subsequent somewhat erratic and traumatic career as a dramatist. Three full-length studies of Galdós's theatre (Finkenthal, Menéndez Onrubia) were followed by the publication of the manuscript of *La de San Quintín* (Boo). Increasing interest is further reflected in the greater proportion of papers devoted to the theatre at the last Congreso Internacional de Estudios Galdosianos in Las Palmas and in the number of recent articles and doctoral theses on the subject. Prior to this resurgence, modern critics had paid comparatively little attention to the plays written by Galdós and subsequently staged between 1892 and 1918. Although these plays have been dismissed as so inferior artistically to the novels as to be almost unworthy of attention, the quest for a greater understanding of Galdós's mature thought demands their consideration. Particularly in the case of the writer's drama, such understanding is greatly facilitated by a closer analysis of the creative process through manuscript study.

Matilde Boo's preliminary study of *La de San Quintín* provides the first close look at the manuscript of a play, although Finkenthal comments briefly on some of the copy manuscripts available in the Biblioteca Nacional and stresses the need for further analysis to correct the prevailing "visión inexacta de las intenciones y métodos teatrales de Galdós" (109). Boo details structural changes and refinements that illustrate the care Galdós took over the composition of his drama, despite accusations to the contrary, and she reveals modifications to the presentation of concepts which otherwise "hubieran podido herir la sensibilidad de algunos espectadores" (Anejo 25). Such modifications are even more apparent and pertinent in the adaptation of Galdós's first, most complex, and controversial staged play, *Realidad.* Its mixed reception was due in no small part to confusion, much of which was exacerbated by the need for compromise.

Galdós himself was to lament the superficial nature of the critical reaction to *Realidad:* "Entre las diversas críticas no hubo ninguna que profundizase en el asunto y caracteres del drama juzgado" (*Memorias* 176). A closer look at the creative process involved in the adaptation of *Realidad* for the stage and at the compromises to which the new dramatist was subjected is a step towards the fulfillment of the implied obligation in Galdós's lament.

Galdós between Novel and Play

Realidad finds Galdós poised between the novel and the play as he courageously attempts to present the "reality" of his narrative on the stage. Just as in his "Observaciones sobre la novela contemporánea en España" of 1870 he had called for the reform of the Spanish novel, so in 1885 he declared: "Para que el teatro entre con pie derecho en la escuela de la naturalidad, es preciso que un autor de grandes alientos rompa la marcha y acometa con recursos de primer orden esta gran reforma" (*Nuestro teatro* 141). On both occasions Galdós was to rise to his own challenge, but his "atrevimiento experimental" (Sobejano 41) in the theatre was largely frustrated. From the beginning, the new dramatist encountered problems of form and content in the attempt to realise his aspirations and found himself both encouraged and restrained by his director, Emilio Mario. Mario, while genuinely receptive to the idea of reform, was reluctant to risk loss of income and reputation by being overly radical (see Sánchez 275). Galdós also had to struggle with his public and critics and often expressed his frustration to his leading lady, María Guerrero, as in a letter of July 1895: "En todo el mundo hay progreso y *proceso educativo*. En el arte dramático no, y parece que el público es cada día más tonto y más infantil" (Las Palmas, Caja 2, Carpeta 6, Legajo 2; Menéndez Onrubia, *El dramaturgo* 121). As a result of such external pressures, Galdós was forced to make changes, and much of the progressive ideology encompassed in his first staged play was obscured.

The play *Realidad* appears at the crossroads of Galdós's trajectory as he turns from the frequently ambiguous presentation of the complex social and moral issues in the *Novelas españolas contemporáneas* to the more schematic and symbolic plays and novels that were to follow. Despite the dialogue form of the original version, *Realidad* displays much of the characteristic complexity and ambiguity of the novels of the 1880s. Such complexity was to entail prolixity, both of which were to cause problems and confusion for the audience presented with this work on the stage. As Picón concluded in his review of the play: "*Realidad* hace pensar . . . " (*El Correo* 16.III.1892).

Realidad was the first of six dramas to be adapted by Galdós from their original novel form, four of which were "novelas dialogadas." A play converted from a novel is inevitably to some extent a pruning exercise in itself, yet Galdós's declaration in 1897 that "[e]l Teatro no es más que la condensación y acopladura de todo aquello que en la novela moderna constituye acciones y caracteres . . . " (*Novelas* 3: 801) is clearly an oversimplification. While this statement might partly explain certain technical weaknesses in many of his plays which, consciously or unconsciously, are novelistic in conception, we shall see that the new dramatist exercised great care and thought in the adaptation of *Realidad* to ensure that the play was not merely a shortened version of the novel. At the same time, in preparing his work for the stage, Galdós was unable to ignore the many voices insisting on the synthethic nature of drama.[1]

The Manuscripts

Realidad is a lengthy play, yet one glance at the manuscripts shows that, if Galdós had had his way, it would have been much longer still, as considerable cuts were made at the last minute at Mario's instruction. Evidently, Galdós worked closely with the director, probably both before and during rehearsals, until they arrived at

the final version that was to be performed and published. Emilia Pardo Bazán explains how "activáronse los ensayos de *Realidad* . . . discutióse la famosa cuestión de *la sombra* . . . y empezó para Galdós el purgatorio en que todos los autores dramáticos deben de haber expiado sus culpas, a saber: el del lápiz rojo" ("*Realidad*" 26).

Our intent to trace the artistic development of *Realidad,* drama, and to consider the various changes and compromises that Galdós made in the course of this procedure is reflected in Galdós's own words that introduce this essay.[2] The only study of a *Realidad* manuscript is in Finkenthal's chapter entitled "Los manuscritos" (101-09), where he comments briefly on various manuscripts available in the Biblioteca Nacional, some of which were temporarily on loan from Las Palmas. In the case of *Realidad,* it is not completely clear whether he was working from the original or a photocopy of the earliest loose-leaf manuscript written by Galdós. He states that the manuscript to which he had access began with act I, scene ix, and he acknowledges that "[u]na vez concluido el manuscrito de *Realidad,* drama, se introdujeron nuevos cambios para la versión que se había de representar, como se hace evidente comparándolo con la edición de Aguilar" (105).

In the Casa-Museo in Las Palmas, I was able to consult the comprehensive manuscript originals of *Realidad* (Caja 14, Núm. 1-2), which comprise the following material: the original loose-leaf manuscript written by Galdós, referred to as manuscript A; and three separate *adaptaciones*, portions of each of which are in Galdós's hand and which will be referred to as manuscripts B, C, and D. Manuscript B includes act I up to scene x and is entirely in Galdós's handwriting on the larger sheets used for the second and the final *adaptación*; manuscript C is an amended act I, scene x, in script; and manuscript D is the final, complete, bound *adaptación*, in a script of which part is arguably Galdós's own. This document contains a great number of deletions in blue crayon, presumably the director's.

Manuscript A consists of some 233 pages plus 56 reverse sides (in addition to rewriting on the majority of those remaining) written in pen on loose octavo-size sheets of thick, coarse paper. Galdós's hand is not always easy to decipher, as he himself was aware. (He occasionally slowed down to write a more painstaking and ornate script, and in 1900 he reverted to the use of pencil for greater speed and control.[3])

The first six scenes of act I are missing in the loose-leaf draft, which begins towards the end of scene vii, where Orozco exclaims: "No; dispénseme la diplomacia . . ." (*Cuentos* 123). Scene viii is also missing, but the rest of the manuscript is then complete from scene ix, although the ending of the play is left unresolved, as we shall see. It seems probable that Finkenthal had access to a photocopy of this manuscript, whose missing pages would have been pertinent to his argument concerning the ending of the play.

The remaining pages of act I in manuscript A are extensively rewritten on both sides, with numerous amendments to every line. The same procedure is apparent in manuscript B, where it is interesting to note Galdós's pains at using a more careful script. It is possible that manuscript C, again written more painstakingly and ornately, could also have been penned by Galdós, particularly if one compares this writing with the careful hand he used when corresponding with Lorenza Cobián and later with their daughter María (see appendices 3 and 4 of Condé, *Women in the Theatre*).[4] A study of these manuscripts confirms their developmental sequence, as the later alterations are transferred to the final *adaptación*, manuscript D.

While the possible existence of draft *adaptaciones* like manuscripts B and C for other acts cannot be excluded, a comparison of manuscripts A and D shows that the material in the final *adaptación*, before last-minute superimposed amendments and deletions, agrees with Galdós's original manuscript, A, with the exception of act I. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that this collection of manuscripts is almost entirely complete (with the stated exception of the first six scenes of act I). The final version, manuscript D, *as amended*, is the version published by Aguilar, except for one or two obvious misprints in that edition, later (undocumented) alterations to scenes i, ii, and vii of act IV, and the amendments to the final scene of the play, which are written on a separate sheet.

One can well imagine Galdós cringing at the sight of the director's crayon poised to eradicate so much of his carefully composed dialogue. Pardo Bazán explained the problem well: "Ha de entenderse que las tachaduras y supresiones en una obra dramática, aceptada y reconocida ya por buena y de ley, pueden obedecer a dos causas: extensión, y pudor o delicadeza de epidermis en el público" ("*Realidad*" 27). Manuscript D illustrates clearly the transformation from Galdós's own final version to the one he ultimately agreed (with Mario) to have performed on stage and published. By tracing the evolution of the drama *Realidad* from manuscript A to the final amended manuscript D, with reference to the novel version where appropriate, I hope to consider the effects of external influences and pressures on Galdós's dramatic debut and to shed light on the artistic and ideological development and adjustments that Galdós underwent at this crucial point in his career.

Throughout the following study, those parts of quotations from manuscript D that were ultimately deleted will be italicised.

Presentation

The front cover of the final, bound *adaptación* (manuscript D) reads as follows:

REALIDAD

Drama en Cinco Actos y en Prosa
Arreglo de la novela del mismo título

por
B. Pérez Galdós

Representóse en el TEATRO DE LA COMEDIA la noche del
15 de Marzo de 1892
Madrid
Imprenta de LA GUIRNALDA
1892

On the back cover is written:

Para el Teatro de la Comedia
Sr. Pérez Galdós

The list of *Personajes* that follows reveals that Galdós had originally named Leonor's maid "Celestina," an interesting detail in the light of his praise of *La Celestina* as the "novela hablada" par excellence. Only at the last moment in this final *adaptación* was the maid's name modified to "Lina." Details on a separate page of the *Decoración* include a sketch by Galdós that illustrates his requirements for the stage setting.

The conversion of the *Jornadas* of the novel into *Actos* for the play immediately presented problems of location. The term *Jornada* is generally taken to suggest action which takes place in one day, though often in several different locations. These locations, or settings, were greatly reduced for dramatic presentation, markedly so in act II.

Act I

Act I was the easiest to adapt in terms of location, as the action of the novel's Jornada Primera took place entirely in the home of Augusta and Orozco. Nevertheless, it is evident from manuscript A and further reinforced by manuscripts B and C that Galdós encountered the greatest difficulty in condensing act I for the stage. Firstly, the social panorama in which he so delighted had to be greatly reduced, so that a large number of minor characters are eliminated. As Nicholas Round observes, however, Galdós successfully counteracts any resulting thinness of texture by retaining and developing two pairs of contrasted characters: the pessimist Aguado and the optimist Villalonga, who remain background figures; and Malibrán and Infante, whose roles are developed as mischief maker and *raisonneur*, respectively (34).

More seriously, a compromise had to be found for the depiction of the psychology of Augusta's situation. The confusion and complexity of her thoughts, reflecting the emotional distance she feels from her husband, are more effectively portrayed through the combination, possible in the novel but not on the stage, of soliloquy and *monodiálogo* (see Sobejano, "Forma" 86). On a more practical level, certain details allowing a fuller understanding of the marriage are minimised or omitted in consideration of the public's sense of propriety. The very setting of this final scene of act I, so much reworked by Galdós, of the "Alcoba en casa de Orozco," with its "Dos camas, una a cada lado de la estancia" (*Novelas* 2: 1236), would hardly have been appropriate for a nineteenth-century Spanish stage but would certainly have been telling.

Scene x was the longest and most complex scene in act I, as it had been in the novel, where it was scene viii. Galdós had worked out Augusta's confusion meticulously, not only in the original manuscript but in two further draft *adaptaciones*, only to see it drastically cut at the last moment. As doña Emilia observes, "más de una vez debió maldecir el convencionalismo escénico" ("*Realidad*" 28).

A number of finer points that Galdós had clearly thought through between the novel and the play were lost with these deletions, for while several of the deleted lines are virtual repetitions from the novel and often superfluous, others are new, and some are subtle refinements offering a further dimension to the work. An example of the latter occurs in this final scene of act I. In the novel version of this scene, Augusta's husband tells her: "Desconoces los verdaderos grados del bien. Tu inteligencia es grande, pero no ve la verdad" (*Novelas* 2: 1239). In the original draft of the play and still in the final *adaptación*, before the blue-crayoned deletions, Orozco declares: "*Tu inteligencia es grande, pero la has acostumbrado a no ver más que horizontes limitados. Con-*

viene ver más, más . . ." (D). This developed statement is more subtle and open-ended than the text in the novel and offers deeper insight into the situation. Galdós's use of the phrase "horizontes limitados" with regard to Augusta calls to mind his depiction of female roles in the *Novelas contemporáneas*, where the boredom and consequent irresponsible behaviour of many middle-class women can be seen to stem both from a lack of educational and vocational opportunities and from superficial social and moral values. The phrase also recalls Pardo Bazán's lament of the lost opportunity in *Tristana*, where "Galdós nos dejó entrever un horizonte nuevo y amplio y después corrió la cortina . . ." (*La mujer* 141). Indeed, it is quite possible that doña Emilia's lament encouraged Galdós to open the curtain ever wider, as is borne out by subsequent plays. The phrase he introduces here—"Conviene ver más, más . . ."—is also reminiscent of Tristana's realisation, "Quiero luz, más luz, siempre más luz . . ." (*Novelas* 3: 394), and is again echoed by Pardo Bazán's quotation from Legouvé: "¡Apartemos vanas objeciones inspiradas en leyes de un día: en nombre de la eternidad, debéis a la mujer la luz!" (*La mujer* 94).[5] The desirability of widening women's vision and role in society is promoted throughout Galdós's dramatic work, following his exploration of the problem in the *Novelas contemporáneas*.[6]

In Galdós's final version of act I, scene x, before the last-minute deletions, Orozco demonstrates a deeper and more sympathetic understanding of the fundamental differences existing between himself and his wife:

Orozco *Y existe entre los dos una disparidad lamentable que por hoy no tiene remedio. Tú adoras la sociedad y los placeres bulliciosos. Yo la detesto. Me metería de buen grado en el último rincón del mundo, y viviría solo, mientras que tú . . .*

Augusta *¡Ah! Yo también . . . pero . . .*

Orozco *No, no creas que pienso privarte* [subsequently replaced with *apartarte*] *de la sociedad . . . Yo sacrifico mis gustos a los tuyos. Algo tengo que violentarme para compartir contigo esta insustancial vida; pero no te importe.*

(D)

This section is new; then Galdós finishes Orozco's speech with a clearer, condensed passage from the novel:

Orozco *En el mundo, en plena sociedad activa es donde se debe luchar por el bien. Nada de ascetismo. Los que se van a un páramo tienen menos mérito que los que luchan en medio de este tráfago y del torbellino de maldades que nos envuelve.*

Augusta *Es verdad.*

(D)

The entire dialogue is deleted in the interests of concision, yet these words reveal Galdós's wish to portray his hero in a more human, less inflexible light, at the same time as they underline the fundamental incompatibility between husband and wife, which forms the core of the drama.

Act II

The locations in act II were reduced from the half dozen changing settings of the novel to two: Leonor's house and Augusta and Federico's meeting place. While the relationship between Augusta and her husband is crucial to the proper understanding of *Realidad*, the relations between Augusta and Federico and between Federico and

Leonor, "la Peri," are also highly significant. Act II again bears witness to the difficulty Galdós experienced in condensing their portrayal. Indeed, the original manuscript of the *novel* version of *Realidad* (Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 21785) also reveals extensive rewriting of dialogues between Federico and Leonor, indicating the importance Galdós attached to this relationship from its conception.

Scenes iv and v of act II are cut substantially in the final *adaptación* of the play, yet the essence of the relationship between Federico and Leonor remains. Most of the eliminated parts were from the novel. The following speech from scene iv, where Federico wonders at his feelings in accepting help from Leonor and confides his confusion to her, is an important example:

Federico *Quizás si tus auxilios se hicieran públicos, yo los rechazaría con horror. Pero es el caso que de otras personas, bien seguro estoy de ello, no los recibiría ni aún ocultándolos con el mayor sigilio. Mi orgullo tiene esta debilidad contigo, quizá porque entre tú y yo hay un parentesco espiritual, algo de común, que no es honroso, sin duda, la desgracia. Leonor, el envilecimiento . . . Esto me confunde.*

Leonor *(sin entenderle) No, tonto, es que nos sale de dentro el ser amigos.*

(D)

In this same scene, when Leonor tells Federico, "Pues no teniendo amores contigo, como no los tengo, primero me corto la lengua que decirte una falsedad" (*Cuentos* 132), the Aguilar edition prefaces Federico's response with "Aparte" in brackets, whereas in the final *adaptación* this stage direction related to the second part of his speech, which was subsequently deleted as follows:

Federico Sí, sí, en cuestión de amores, tú [changed to *ella* in the Aguilar edition] ruedas por tu lado, yo por el mío, y venimos a juntarnos en este punto inexplicable de nuestra confianza, que es para mi alma un gran consuelo. *(Aparte) ¿Será verdad lo que digo, o me engaño con palabras artificiosas? ¿Será que me he con-naturalizado con la degradación, como los seres que viven en una sentina, y no pueden respirar si se les saca del aire corrupto? ¡Es triste que haya venido a encontrar mi único afecto reposado en el trato de esta mujer envilecida!*

(D)

This compression explains Round's surprise over Galdós's use of the *aparte* in this scene (41).

Among other parts of act II that were taken from the novel, subsequently modified by Galdós, and then deleted from the final *adaptación* is the following dialogue from scene vii:

Leonor ¡Ah, sí! . . . Yo también quería decirte . . .

Federico *¿Qué? (con ansiedad)*

Leonor *(Con misterio) Me han dicho que ese diplomático tiene cuartos. Se me ha ocurrido que yo podría sacarle diez o doce mil reales para dárselos a ti.*

Federico *¡Qué horror! Cállate por Dios . . .*

Leonor *Melendritos . . . bueno . . . me callo. Yo lo decía por que verás. En las partidas de golfo que echamos algunas noches, Don Cornelio juega tan mal y se distrae tan estúpidamente haciéndome el amor, que no es difícil darle un pego.*

Federico *(Horrorizado) Cállate . . . ¡Qué ignominia! Leonor, me matas, me estás matando.*

Leonor *Bueno, pues lárgate con viento fresco.*

Federico *Lo que yo te decía de Malibrán es que . . .* Sé por Celestina [deleted and replaced with Lina] que anoche habló de mí . . .

(D)

The complexity of moral values is again highlighted here, and Galdós's presentation of the sympathetic prostitute and the values she has acquired is skilful. In the amend-

ed final *adaptación*, the omission of this section, apart from losing the moral/social comment, also leaves Federico appearing somewhat indifferent to whatever Leonor wished to convey to him, and the impact of the action is lessened. However, as those responsible for the staging of *Realidad* were only too aware, the Spanish theatre-going public of the nineteenth century had no stomach for such lengthy expositions.

Scene ix, which focuses on Federico and Augusta, contains the largest number of deletions and reworkings in act II. To that end, Galdós utilised both sides of almost all the sheets in the original manuscript. Much of the romantic element of the relationship between Federico and Augusta (where, again, a study of the manuscript of the novel reveals considerable reworking) is lost in the stage adaptation, and later refinements are deleted at the last moment, as when Augusta prompts her lover: "Sigue . . . ¿Por qué se te traba la lengua? Porque sólo la verdad, *semejante a la grasa que en las máquinas se emplea*, la pone expédita y corriente, y tú me engañas" (D). Another vivid image is deleted from Augusta's next declaration, which Galdós clearly wished to retain from the novel: *"Cuando se ama de veras, gusta mucho absorber toda la vida de la persona amada. Tú no me ofreces más que la flor de la vida, y eso no me satisface. Yo quiero también las hojas, el tronco, las raíces . . ."* (D). This is a long scene, and the director evidently saw the need for careful pruning beyond that already undertaken by Galdós. One particular phrase, however, which the author seemed eager to emphasise, having moved it to the opening of one of Augusta's speeches, also fell victim to the blue crayon: *"Te quiero locamente,* y este amor primero y último hace una revolución en mi naturaleza *y en toda mi alma"* (D). This irrational aspect of the power of passionate love is crucial to *Realidad*, linked as it is with the yearning for "lo prohibido" upon which Galdós had focused in the novel of that name.

Another phrase taken from the middle of a speech in the novel and placed at the beginning in Galdós's final *adaptación*, only to be struck before production, was Augusta's telling statement: *"Es que aspiro a fundir la ilusión con la razón, a hacerte feliz en todos los terrenos . . ."* (D). A section from the novel that Galdós effectively adapted into a rapid and dramatic exchange between the two lovers met the same fate:

Federico *Lo que te decía es que no me hables a mí de favores de ese hombre, porque no puedo admitirlos.*
Augusta *¿Ni míos tampoco?*
Federico *(con resolución) Tampoco.*
Augusta *(con despecho) ¡Orgullo necio!*
Federico *Sea.*
Augusta *¡Moral sin sustancia!*
Federico *Claro.* Desde el momento en que me hablas de generosidades tuyas o de tu marido, la cuestión moral se me impone . . .

(D)

Also omitted is a careful amendment by Galdós to Augusta's subsequent speech, where she attempts to explain to her lover her feelings for her husband:

Augusta Me inspira un cariño acendrado y puro, admiración, veneración, no sé qué . . . *Pero, ¿no hay, no debe haber diferencia entre el amor que debemos a la divinidad, a la perfección moral, y el amor terreno, al que tenemos a nuestro igual, al semejante a nosotros por el pecado y la impureza?* Yo reverencio a Tómas . . . le rezaría . . . pero te amo a ti. *Me casé sin saber lo que es amor, y no lo supe hasta que tú me lo enseñaste.*

(D)

It is clear from Galdós's reworking in the original manuscript that considerable deliberation had gone into the subtle change in presentation from the novel version of

these thoughts on love and that, wishing to emphasise the complexity of these matters, he was beginning to evolve a dramatic technique suited to this end.

Galdós altered the last part of this scene to produce a more effective ending to the act as the lovers part. His final version was left relatively untouched in the *adaptación*, apart from the following speech by Federico: "Huye, apártate de mí, si no quieres que *me vuelva loco, que te trastorne a ti también,* y te lleve a la perdición . . ." (D). Once again the reference to madness is deleted, perhaps regrettably, as the concept is both relevant and dramatic. Subsequently, when Federico insists, "Vuelve, y olvídame," Augusta's retort is also lost: *"(con rabia) ¡Otra vez! Ningún hombre verdaderamente enamorado sugiere a la mujer que ama la idea de volver al deber* . . . (Altanera) Basta. Esto no puede ser . . ." (D).[7] Despite these omissions, the dramatic parting of the two lovers at the end of this act creates added tension and carries far greater impact than the novel version.

Act III

All of the action in act III is confined to the Orozco household, whereas the first three scenes of the Jornada Tercera in the novel were set in Federico's apartment and the rest in various rooms in Augusta and Orozco's home. The adaptation produced further major modifications to this act, which some critics still consider superfluous (e.g., Carney 145).

The lengthy expositions of Clotilde's situation in scene i of the original are deleted in the final manuscript. Nevertheless, Clotilde's role in the drama remains far greater and more complex than in the novel. The writer was currently involved in a love affair with the actress who was to play the part of Clotilde in the stage production of *Realidad*, Concha-Ruth Morell, and this shift may respond to his wish to give greater emphasis to her role. By the same token, Galdós now seems keen to present women's potential role in society in a more positive light, an inclination that develops through his subsequent plays.

Among the details of Clotilde's situation deleted from the manuscript in scene i are those provided in the following dialogue:

Orozco *He oído contar horrores de la anarquía que reina en esa casa. Y ahora se espanta de la insubordinación de Clotildita después que la tiene años y años viviendo en compañía de gentes groseras y vulgares . . . ¡Qué educación y qué ambiente para una joven!*

Villalonga *Cómo que no ha querido nunca presentarla en sociedad, porque la pobre niña, formada en esa vida de encogimiento y abandono, llegó a adquirir, según dicen, una timidez invencible que raya en salvajismo.*

Orozco Pero si mil veces le hemos dicho . . .

Villalonga *Pues la niña, oye lo mejor . . . aunque huraña y sin trato de gentes, no carece de arranques para lo que es de su propio interés. Anoche, o ayer tarde . . . fijamente no sé la hora . . . abandonó la casa de su hermano, llevando su ropita en un lío debajo del brazo.*

Orozco *¿Qué me cuentas?*

(D)

Although longer, this original version, with its stress on such emotive expressions as "horrores," "anarquía," "insubordinación," and "salvajismo," lends dramatic impact to Clotilde's situation, as well as providing important information regarding her background. Yet, one is reminded that this is a subordinate plot not vital to the understanding of the main action and that the need for concision is a major problem for a writer of Galdós's character and purpose.

Emphasis on Clotilde's innocence is omitted from scene ii, when, in answer to Orozco's "¿Amor, Manolo?" (*Cuentos* 139), Infante responds:

Infante *Amor, no . . . pero un apoyo desinteresado, leal, sí tendrá en mí.*
Villalonga *¡Es tan mona!*
Infante *De una inocencia increíble para su edad.*
Orozco *¿Diez y ocho?*
Infante *Veintiuno. Lo dice la cédula . . . que tengo aquí.*
Villalonga *Vamos, Infantillo, desbáncalo, desbanca al hortera . . . veintiún años, buen palmito, inocencia probada, como de quien no ha tenido trato de gentes durante los años en que se forma el carácter . . . Anímate, hijo, y puede que "el cometa", si te salen bien sus negocios, la dote el mejor día.*
Infante ¡Ea! Se acabaron las bromitas . . .

(D)

Scenes iii and iv of act III were subject to minor deletions in the final *adaptación*, and in scene v only one dialogue between Augusta and Malibrán that could be considered of any consequence was suppressed. Following Malibrán's description of Federico, Augusta continues:

Augusta *¿Sí? Pues la definición de Federico Viera me parece acertadísima. Le ha observado V. bien.*
Malibrán *Aún pienso observarle mejor. Corazón fiero, orgullo indomable, ideas anticuadas, consistentes, macizas, que serían muy buenas en una época de acción y de unidad, pero que se vuelven ineficaces y hasta ridículas en una época de inestabilidad, de polémicas y de dudas.*
Augusta *¡Cuando digo que estamos hoy muy sabios!*
Malibrán No lo puedo remediar . . .

(D)

Scene vi was much reworked by Galdós in the original manuscript, and minor deletions were made in the final *adaptación*, including the following as Clotilde speaks of Pepe: "En casa del tío Santana . . . frente a donde yo vivía . . . llevaba solito todo el peso del escritorio . . . Nunca sirvió en el mostrador, que repugna sus hábitos. Pero hoy, está decidido a todo, *hasta a fregar platos y copas en una taberna, hasta a vender en una plazuela pepinos y tomates,* con tal de ganar . . . un céntimo. *Sirve también para cajero, y es honrado como el sol*" (D). In scene vii, Joaquín Viera's philosophising is cut short in the final *adaptación:* "¡Buena conducta! . . . por ella. *¡Ah! los que todo lo tienen porque han recibido de la suerte, de la herencia o de la casualidad los bienes de este mundo, son muy inclinados a juzgar a los demás con una moral severísima, bárbara, cruel, que si prevaleciera, nos llevaría otra vez a la desigualdad social, a la esclavitud, a las castas . . .* No hijo mío . . ." (D). Galdós attached great importance to this speech, which he reworked at length in the manuscript. Although a dishonest and unreliable character makes the statement, its implications should not be dismissed.[8] Nevertheless, while this kind of philosophising may be acceptable in a work to be read, staging produces the dilemma of a need for greater care and concision. The inevitable tension between the enthusiasm of imaginative ideas and the restraint called for by the exigencies of representation is reflected in a letter to Galdós from Emilio Mario on the necessity for cuts in this act: "He leído el acto 3.° de Realidad, es muy hermoso pero creo que puede alijerarse algo la escena de Viera y Orozco . . .; como estamos en el acto 3.° debemos caminar a la acción en cuanto sea posible: En fin estas cosas se ven mejor en los ensayos y pa cortar siempre hay tiempo" (Ortega 357).

Further philosophising is omitted from scene viii in this discussion between Augusta and Orozco:

Orozco No me hace falta consultar a nadie.
Augusta *Pero es cierto que pagas . . .*
Orozco *Sí, y añado que esa obligación pendiente pesa sobre mi conciencia, y no estaré tranquilo hasta que de ella no me descargue.*
Augusta *¡La conciencia! Grandes y bellas cosas ha hecho la humanidad en su nombre. Pero también, también hay que poner tonterías muy gordas en el haber de los espíritus menguados, de esos que adoran la letra de la ley . . . (enojada) Explícate: ¿quieres decir que alivias tu conciencia pagando?*

(D)

The stress on "la conciencia" is another concept from the *Novelas contemporáneas* which Galdós wished to retain but had to sacrifice (see Condé, "Women in the Novels," ch. 5).

A later section of this dialogue, potentially dramatic in its depiction of direct conflict and extensively rewritten by Galdós, is omitted in the final *adaptación*, and the financial details that follow are greatly reduced:

Augusta ¿Has pensado bien?
Orozco *He meditado muy detenidamente la solución de este asunto, y no vacilo, no puedo vacilar . . . (con firmeza) Debe ser así . . . ¡y será!*
Augusta *Contra mi voluntad . . . Ya lo sabes . . . Me opongo . . . Por primera vez surge la discordia entre nosotros. Hazlo si quieres; pero conste, conste que me contrarías, que me disgustas profundamente.*
Orozco *Me parece que no. Hablas así porque no has entendido . . .*
Augusta *(inquieta e impaciente) Pues* explícame por Dios . . .

(D)

Scenes ix and x have been left in the final *adaptación* as Galdós had written them, as has scene xi with the following exception: while Federico and his father are discussing Clotilde, a comment by Viera, reworked by Galdós in the manuscript, is covered over in the final *adaptación* (although still discernible):

Federico Desconoce la vida, y no sabe el daño que causa.
Viera *Conoce la vida mejor que tú, que eres un sonámbulo, un cata-humos, y e pasas la vida mirando a las estrellas viendo la fortuna pasar, rozándote los dedos, a que se te [ocurre] cerrar la mano y atraparla. No sales a mí, como ésta, sales a tu madre.*

(D)

Act IV

Act IV takes place entirely in Federico's apartment and deviates significantly from the novel version. The role of Felipa, Augusta's maid, is eliminated in the final *adaptación*, which simplifies and intensifies the dramatic impact of the act, particularly in the closing scene.

Scene i of act IV was carried over to the final *adaptación* almost intact from Galdós's manuscript but was subsequently subjected to change for which there is no documentary record available. Between the completion of the final *adaptación* and the version presented and later published, the issue of Federico's mother's *devocionario* is introduced. This theatrical device may well have been suggested by Mario in an attempt to deny any possible suggestion of Leonor's superior moral worth to Augusta.

Scene ii suffers a few deletions at this point, as in the following dialogue between Federico and Leonor. Leonor is confiding to Federico her financial problems, exacerbated by her latest lover, Ojirris:

Leonor Debo más que el Gobierno, y ese condenado "Gaditano" va a dar con mis pobres huesos en un hospicio. *Cuentas del sastre, cuentas del café, cuentas de la Taurina, cuentas de la grandísima puerca de su madre. Todo lo tengo que pagar, y ya me voy cansando, como hay Dios.*

Federico *(tirándole suavemente de una oreja) Eso te pasa por no hacer caso de mí. Ya te dije que ese ¿cómo le llamas tú? Ojirris, era una calamidad. Bien te aconsejé . . .*

Leonor *Sí, sí hijo de mi alma. Pero lo del amor ya sabes que es capítulo aparte, y los consejos y la amistad son para otras cosas. Ya sabes que me dio muy fuerte, que me cegué . . . Pero ya me voy enfriando, y conozco que es un reverendísimo peine.* Ahora está conmigo hecho una confitura . . .

(D)

This deleted section is a slightly amended version of part of the dialogue in scene vii of the novel. As on other occasions, Galdós seems to have chosen the most pertinent and dramatic part of the dialogue already written, and while its deletion leads towards the concision so badly needed for the stage, some impact is lost.

This scene, like scene i, is later affected by the introduction of the *devocionario,* which Federico insists Leonor is unworthy to touch: "Esto es sagrado y no puede ir a tus manos" (*Cuentos* 151). In my view, this insertion is totally inconsistent with Galdós's intentions, and there is no mention of such a prayerbook in either his original manuscript or final *adaptación.*

Scene iv in Galdós's manuscript subsequently becomes scene iii and is relatively untouched with the exception of the following deletion, as Federico is disturbed by Orozco's presence:

Orozco Vamos, que he venido a ser tu idea fija . . .

Federico *Eso . . . tú lo has dicho.*

Orozco *Soy la pesadilla, no diré de tu conciencia, sino de tu orgullo, que quiero reducir y someter a la razón.*

(D)

Irony abounds here, of course, in the insistent use of the word *conciencia.* Scene iv also has the following lines deleted from Federico's soliloquy, which again contain some pointed phrases:

Federico No me atrevo a salir. Temo encontrármele en los pasillos . . . , en la escalera . . . , en la calle. *Pero esta tarde (herido por un recuerdo desagradable) Augusta me invita a cenar allá. Pobre mujer, alucinada por el amor* (subsequently replaced by Galdós with *la pasión) me ha lanzado a esta lucha, a este vértigo . . . Y ya no sé si es amor o si es odio lo que me inspira . . . ¡No, yo no voy allá! No quiero verla más, no quiero ver a nadie.*

(D)

Scenes v and vi have been left as in the original manuscript, and an extremely short scene vii, where Federico reads a letter from Augusta asking him not to fail her that night, is cut out. However, Galdós plainly experienced great difficulty in condensing the final scene between Federico and Augusta, the action that covers the first six scenes of the Jornada Quinta. Signs of transfer between generic conventions are apparent, although the final *adaptación* of this scene had to be reduced by almost half to achieve its goals. Galdós had already disposed of the *sombra* from Jornadas Primera and Cuarta of the novel but was reluctant to dispense with some of the dialogue between the two lovers, much of which was transferred from the novel. His own writing reveals that he reworked the ending of this act several times on the final *adaptación* before arriving at the ultimate version in which, as Round observes, the "element of erotic playfulness" (37) is all but lost. Still more regrettable is the loss

sustained in the condensation and (undocumented) rewriting of Galdós's version of scene vii for purposes of staging, for which the insertion of Federico's gift to Augusta, the *devocionario,* is poor recompense.

Federico's offstage suicide at the end of act IV again indicates attention to theatrical exigencies in the transfer from the novel version where the suicide, surrounded by confusion, occurs in the final Jornada. The careful building of tension to a climax, the intensity of which is heightened by the gunshot and Augusta's collapse, is more conducive to an immediate emotional response of shock on the part of the audience and thereby arouses, according to Descartes, the first of the passions: astonishment *(admiratio)*. Galdós had rearranged this tragic scene in his original manuscript of the drama, although the dialogue between the lovers that precedes Federico's suicide was rewritten before the final *adaptación* was published.

Act V

Act V, like act I, takes place entirely in Orozco's house. Speculation over the mystery surrounding Federico's death is shortened in the final *adaptación*, but the essential details remain, slightly changed from the novel version. In scene i Villalonga also speaks of Leonor's immense grief in a passage adapted from *La incógnita*. It is notable that Galdós chose to bring this episode back from his first conception of the relationship between Leonor and Federico; his stress on their friendship indicates his interest in the possibility of such understanding between a man and a woman who are not romantically involved.

The short scene ii of this act undergoes only a minor one-line deletion in the final *adaptación*, but scene iii is almost halved. This section, too, is different from the novel, where Augusta discusses her position with her maid, Felipa. In the play, she confides in Infante, to whom Galdós originally had her exclaim: *"¡Ay, qué bien hice en confiarme a ti! . . . Fue una inspiración del cielo. Aquella noche terrible, cuando medio muerta llegué a casa, después de presenciar . . . no se me ocurrió más solución que llamarte, y decirte . . . (llora)"* (D). They go on to discuss in more detail possible pieces of evidence and the formalities of the ensuing investigations, which, so as not to impede the dramatic action and for the sake of brevity, are dispensed with. Other deletions might be judged more regrettable, as when Augusta says "Mi vida no es vida" (*Cuentos* 161) and continues: *"Me espanta mi propia sombra: ya creo que la inflexión de mis palabras me auna* [?], *ya que me delata mi propio silencio, y no puedo fingir la calma que necesito para parecer menos culpable de lo que soy"* (D). This constant tension between reality and appearance or imagination is emphasised in the following deleted passage, as Augusta agonises over the possible reality of her imagined confession to Orozco. She tells Infante: "No puedo explicártelo" (*Cuentos* 161) and goes on:

Augusta *Imposible que formes idea de lo que me atormenta esta duda . . . Ayúdame a salir de ella. ¿Crees tú posible que yo . . .?*
Infante *¿Yo? Difícilmente podré asimilarme tu estado cerebral, tu excitación nerviosa . . .*
Augusta *Quizá el acto aquel sólo tuvo realidad dentro de mi cerebro.*
Infante *Sí, sí, es lo más probable . . .*
Augusta *Pero también podría ser que . . .*
Infante *Podría ser . . . sí. Hay casos . . .*
Augusta ¿Crees tú en el sonambulismo?

Infante Te diré . . . *yo no he visto ningún caso . . . soy algo escéptico en esas cosas . . . Pero no hay duda que . . . Si en efecto, en un arrebato morboso de la mente, confesaste, eso tienes adelantado, y . . .*
(D)

From the final *adaptación*, it would appear that the director at first wished to delete the whole of this debate, but Galdós managed to save what he felt to be a crucial part in the depiction of Augusta's psyche, as he has rewritten, clearly in his own hand, the first part, which had been deleted after Infante asks her: "¿Estás segura?" (*Cuentos* 161), and she replies: "No, y ése es mi suplicio . . . Lo sospecho. Es como un recuerdo de lo que fue, como un temor de lo que pudo ser. No puedo explicártelo" (*Cuentos* 161). Galdós, always fascinated by the complex Cervantine realm of confused imagination and reality, found himself greatly frustrated by the theatre's exigencies for concision.

Scene iv is the longest in this act and arguably the most crucial one in the whole play. Only a few deletions are made, and it is perhaps reasonable to assume that Galdós was little prepared to compromise with this vital dialogue between Augusta and Orozco. The minor omissions include an aside from Augusta as Orozco remarks:

Orozco Te observo temerosa, y esperaré a que te tranquilices.
Augusta "¡Temerosa yo!" *(aparte) Fingiré un valor que no tengo . . . Hasta para confesar lo necesitaría, pues si me rindo, conviene hacerlo con dignidad.*
(D)

As with his overuse of the outdated soliloquy, Galdós found it difficult to dispense with such asides in his efforts to portray the character's psyche on stage. Another later aside in this scene is finally shortened, as Augusta becomes increasingly convinced that her husband is aware of her guilt:

Augusta (Aparte, sin moverse en el asiento, arropándose) Lo sabe . . . Ese lenguaje claramente lo indica . . . ¡Qué actitud tan extraña! *Esa serenidad sublime* [*sublime* crossed out], *¿qué es? ¿Qué significa? ¿Todo esto será para oírme y perdonarme? Pero ese perdón otorgado por quien no participa de nuestras debilidades, ¿puede satisfacer a un alma dolorida? ¡Oh! no* [*no* crossed out] ¡su santidad me hiela! . . . *¡No confieso!* ¿Y si tras esa mansedumbre, rebulle el próposito de *imponerme un castigo severo? ¿Si en su sistema moral, para mí no bien comprensible, entra también el trámite de* matarme?
(D)

While the reasons for these omissions are apparent, some subtle ties are lost, though the last deleted part of this aside comes directly from the novel and adds little to the drama. Yet another aside is struck from this scene as Orozco prepares for his psychological divorce from Augusta:

Orozco . . . ¡Ah! no tiene alma para nada grande. *Si me confiesa la verdad, la verdad completa, la perdono y procuraré regenerarla.*
Augusta *(aparte) Imposible . . . imposible confesar . . . Pero si ya se lo revelé . . . Si no tengo duda . . . Paréceme que viéndome estoy en el acto inconsciente de anoche; oigo mis propias palabras, me retumban aquí, como si ahora mismo las pronunciara. Todo lo dije claro. Y si lo sabe, ¿a qué me lo pregunta? ¿Es que quiere humillarme?*

The only other line that is deleted in the final *adaptación* from this lengthy scene places further emphasis on Augusta's concerns about her husband's pardon should she confess: "No sé qué siento. El alma se me desgaja. Si fuera posible decir toda la

verdad, toda . . . *si tras esa verdad viniera el perdón* . . ." (D). This omission, together with the one where Augusta fears that Orozco might "imponerme un castigo severo," throws doubt on the statement by Menéndez Onrubia that "Augusta, plenamente embutida en el naturalismo, se niega a confesar su pecado, no por temor al castigo, sino porque no va a ser castigada" (*Introducción* 153).

Galdós pondered and perhaps agonised over the closing scene of the play until the very last moment. Indeed, he did not even attempt to finish it in his original manuscript. Having arrived at the point where Orozco recognises Federico's ghost, "Te conocí . . . Te esperaba . . . ," Galdós begins the following speech by La Sombra: "He venido, porque pensabas en mí más de lo que yo merezco . . . Tu pensamiento ha removido mis pobres huesos, trayéndome a tu casa que profané, a tu presencia que ya no me causa temor" (A). He then concludes the manuscript with the notes: "Imposible escribir definitivamente el resto de la escena, mientras no se sepa en qué forma y por qué procedimientos ha de aparecer la sombra, y qué aspecto quiere presentar ante el público" (A). Apparently, Galdós is still struggling for a more complete "theatre sense" as he searches for a dramatically and ideologically acceptable finale to this thought-provoking work. From a study of the manuscripts available, it is clear that he did not realise this aim until the last moment. Working out the final *adaptación* (manuscript D) from the original draft (manuscript A), Galdós completes the last scene in a manner closer to the novel version, although carefully revised and more sharply presented.[9] In this manuscript both Orozco and La Sombra declare their lack of fear for each other. In the definitive version this statement is confined to Orozco as Federico's ghost does not actually speak, whereby the figure becomes more enigmatic and also more conceivable as a figment of Orozco's imagination, that is, artistically and conceptually more viable and convincing. The moral grandeur of the scene is intensified through this concentrated focus on a solitary man reaching beyond the petty confines of contemporary values to the finer, more absolute qualities of truth and forgiveness. It is clear from the version in manuscript D that Galdós had consistently wished to emphasise such a reading, but the final rendition shows a greater mastery of stage presentation, consistent with the inherent realism of the work. It is also apparent from all versions of this final scene, including the ending of the novel, as Round points out (44), that Federico's appearance was designed to be seen as a subjective phenomenon.

Francisco Navarro y Ledesma had voiced his concern over this problem in a letter to Galdós dated 27 December 1891: "Pero una duda se me ocurre. ¿Va usted a suprimir la sombra de Orozco? No lo veo fácil, si no se ha de mutilar el final hermosísimo del drama . . . . Y si no la suprime usted, ya usted sabe cuán poco amigo es nuestro público de sombras y apariciones, cuando éstas no van acompañadas de los Santos" (Ortega 307). On 22 January 1892, Galdós wrote back: "Creo que en el arreglo conservo los caracteres y la estructura de la novela. La sombra de Orozco la he suprimido; pero no la sombra final" (Menéndez Onrubia, *Introducción* 302). This decision was generally well received, as contemporary criticism attests (see Condé, *Women in the Theatre*, ch. 5).

The version of the play's ending ultimately staged and published was written in Galdós's hand on a separate sheet of the octavo size paper, which he marked "148 bis," "Acto V. Final," inserted in the final *adaptación* (manuscript D) after page 148. This document shows conclusively that Galdós was responsible for the shift of emphasis from the unfinished opening of the final scene in manuscript A. Not having had

access to this last sheet, Finkenthal assumes that Galdós meant to let stand the speech by Federico's ghost, which he had broken off. He therefore challenges the Aguilar edition, where "la línea 'tu presencia no me causa terror', que en el manuscrito MS11 pronuncia el espíritu de Federico, aparece puesta en labios de Orozco" (105). Finkenthal argues the improbability of this rendition on the grounds that terror is an emotion that Orozco would not experience. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable that anyone who believes they are seeing a ghost should be aware that terror is a natural reaction; hence Orozco's statement, "tu presencia no me causa terror," does not appear out of place. Since this final version is clearly written in Galdós's hand, it could not be an error in the Aguilar edition, which faithfully reproduces the passage. This wording is, in my view, far more subtle and satisfactory than either the novel's ending or the text initially prepared for the final *adaptación*, as it retains and enhances the essence of the drama without loss of credibility.

Conclusions

The evolution of *Realidad* shows an increasing dramatic sensitivity on Galdós's part, a personal determination that the depth of his work should not be surrendered to the cause of immediacy. Galdós wanted success on the stage, but he also craved a deeper communication with his public. For some viewers, the dramatic version of *Realidad* was capable of achieving such depth, notwithstanding certain weaknesses. For others, despite the substantial cuts insisted upon by the director, *Realidad* was still too long, too complex, and too radical a work to be fully appreciated.

While many of the cuts imposed were desirable or necessary, in certain cases the reflection of Galdós's evolving ideas is lost, together with subtle shifts of emphasis that lend further dimensions to the work. The final *adaptación* presented by Galdós, prior to deletions, might be considered a worthy "drama de lectura" (*Novelas* 3: 801) in itself. Alternatively, a skilful director might be able to use the documentation available to restore the psychological depths and social connotations lost, through the editing process, in the original production of *Realidad*. A modern director, less inhibited by outdated, irrelevant, and possibly misguided moral standards and theatrical conventions, might use the playwright's original conceptions and the text's latent dimensions to recreate a dynamic and relevant dramatic production.

In any event, a scrutiny of the *Realidad* manuscripts goes some way towards answering Goodale's charge that "[i]n the instances in which Galdós has dramatized a novel for the stage he has done little more than to condense it. The transformation from novel to drama has involved very little rewriting of the dialogue or any tightening of the plot. On the contrary, there has been no fundamental change—no 'dramatization'—only elimination and abbreviation" (153). In point of fact, the extensive rewriting involved in the adaptation of *Realidad* reflects Galdós's intention to "replantear los problemas de nuevo" (Alvar 61). As Round stresses: "the 'arreglo' of the title page is too modest a description of the adjustments which this involved" (34).

An examination of the various documented steps involved in the process of refining *Realidad* for the stage also clarifies some of the apparent confusions in the play's ideology, although it remains an inherently complex and ambiguous work. Issues of individual and social morality that concerned Galdós in his novels are further explored and developed as the writer's own ideology becomes increasingly progressive.

The depiction of modern concepts concerning individual relationships and their social and moral implications was, however, potentially problematic on stage. Galdós, subject to diverse influences and pressures affecting his first staged play, was forced to compromise, and many of his developing ideas were modified.

At the same time, the implied reformism of the *Novelas contemporáneas* becomes increasingly foregrounded and exaggerated as it is made more literal and direct in the transfer between generic conventions and as certain crucial subtleties are lost. This textual evidence of the evolution of the final dramatic version of *Realidad*, revealing Galdós poised between the novel and the play, may provide a key to the fuller understanding of this turning point in his career and to the problems developed in his subsequent dramatic production. While the compromise to which the new dramatist was subjected in the adaptation of his first and most challenging play for the stage may have stemmed the evolution of a truly realist theatre in Spain, *Realidad* marks a milestone in its history and in the writer's trajectory and remains, for many, "la más valiosa de las obras dramáticas de Galdós" (Sobejano 41).

University College of Swansea
Wales

NOTES

[1] Among these was José Yxart, who, expressing his admiration for *Realidad*, also insists that "el teatro es *síntesis*, y no consiente el *análisis*" (310). Nevertheless, while Galdós had to acknowledge and to some extent submit to prevailing attitudes and critical notions, he did not allow these pressures to lead to his renunciation of the need to give "espacio a la verdad" (*Cuentos* 524). Although he was subsequently to simplify the presentation of his ideas on stage, the analytical conception of *Realidad* remains.

[2] See Alvar for a structural comparison of published novel and drama versions of *Realidad* (91-95). The present study goes farther into the intervening process, with particular reference to Galdós's development of ideas, many of which are subsequently deleted, diluted, or amended beyond recognition.

[3] Galdós explained to his friend Tolosa Latour in a letter dated 30 August 1900: "He adoptado el lápiz para escribir, y me va muy bien con este instrumento caligráfico" (quoted by Schmidt 143).

[4] A number of cards and a few short letters are available in the Casa-Museo (Caja 1, Carpeta 2, Legajo 4).

[5] Doña Emilia was a considerable and continuing influence in the creation of Augusta and her situation. Having initially spurred the creation of Augusta through her own infidelity to Galdós, she continued to influence him on ideological and literary levels, reading and discussing proofs and attending many of the play's rehearsals, much to Clarín's disapproval.

[6] Pardo Bazán's frustration at Galdós's ultimate "failure to deliver" in his hasty and, in her view, unsatisfying conclusion of *Tristana* is partially explained through a study of its manuscript. Whilst the novel is extensively reworked up to chapter 26, the second half of the text contains several excerpts from *Realidad* and an increasing number of *garabatos* in the margins, which indicates Galdós's preoccupation with his new dramatic creation and confirms some continuity between the two. Furthermore, notes on the manuscript reinforce Galdós's obvious indecision over the resolution of this novel: "¿Se corta la pierna de don Lope?" then "Se corta la pierna de Tristana" (*Tristana* ms., Casa-Museo, Las Palmas, Caja 19, Núm. 1).

[7] There follows an error in the Aguilar edition (repeated in Escelicer's *Teatro selecto* but correctly transcribed from the manuscript in the La Guirnalda edition). The substitution of "pero" for "poco" in Augusta's comment, "Tu moral de última hora es ridícula, poco delicada, inconveniente [originally 'y hasta grosera']" (D), destroys the sense of Augusta's statement.

[8] The creative use of "unstable" characters to utter ostensibly valid points of view, initiated in *La desheredada* with Miquis and the clerk in Leganés and further illustrated through such characters as Refugio in *La de Bringas*, is a frequent device of Galdós.

[9] See Condé, *Women in the Theatre*, Appendix 10, for a transcript.

WORKS CITED

Alvar, Manuel. "Novela y teatro en Galdós." *Estudios y ensayos de literatura contemporánea*. Madrid: Gredos, 1971. 52-110.

Boo, Matilde L. *El manuscrito de "La de San Quintín" de Benito Pérez Galdós. Anales Galdosianos*. Anejo, 1986.

———. "El manuscrito de *La de San Quintín* (Estudio preliminar)." *Anales Galdosianos* 18 (1983): 125-30.

Carney, Hal. "The Dramatic Technique of Benito Pérez Galdós." Diss. Univ. Of Nebraska, 1956.

Condé, Lisa P. "Women in the Novels of Galdós." M. Phil. diss. Univ. of Sheffield, 1983.

———. *Women in the Theatre of Galdós: From "Realidad" (1892) to "Voluntad" (1895)*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

Finkenthal, Stanley. *El teatro de Galdós*. Madrid: Fundamentos, 1980.

Goodale, Hope K. "Pérez Galdós: Dramatic Critic and Dramatist." Diss. Bryn Mawr College, 1965.

Menéndez Onrubia, Carmen. *El dramaturgo y los actores: Epistolario de Benito Pérez Galdós, María Guerrero y Fernando Díaz de Mendoza*. Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1984.

———. *Introducción al teatro de Benito Pérez Galdós*. Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1983.

Ortega, Soledad. *Cartas a Galdós*. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1964.

Pardo Bazán, Emilia. *La mujer española y otros artículos feministas*. Ed. Leda Schiavo. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1976.

———. "*Realidad*: Un drama de Pérez Galdós." *Nuevo Teatro Crítico* 2.16 (1892): 19-69.

Pérez Galdós, Benito. *Memorias*. Vol. 10 of *Obras inéditas*. Ed. Alberto Ghiraldo. Madrid: Renacimiento, 1930.

———. *Nuestro teatro*. Vol. 5 of *Obras inéditas*. Madrid: Renacimiento, 1923.

———. *Obras completas. Cuentos, teatro y censo*. Ed. Federico C. Sainz de Robles. Madrid: Aguilar, 1973.

———. *Obras completas. Novelas*. 3 vols. Madrid: Aguilar, 1973.

———. Prólogo. *La Regenta*. By Leopoldo Alas. Madrid: Tipografía de Ricardo Fe, 1901.

———. *Teatro selecto*. Ed. Rodolfo Cardona and Gonzalo Sobejano. Madrid: Escelicer, 1973.

Picón, Jacinto Octavio. "Estreno de *Realidad*." *El Correo* 16 Mar. 1892.

Round, Nicholas G. "Galdós' *Realidad*: Novel into Drama." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 20 (1984): 30-48.

Sánchez, Roberto G. "Emilio Mario, Galdós y la reforma escénica del XIX." *Hispanic Review* 52 (1984): 263-79.

Schmidt, Ruth. *Cartas entre dos amigos del teatro: Manuel Tolosa Latour y Benito Pérez Galdós*. Las Palmas: Ediciones del Excmo. Cabildo Insular de Gran Canaria, 1969.

Sobejano, Gonzalo. "Efectos de *Realidad*." *Estudios Escénicos* 18 (1974): 41-61.

———. "Forma literaria y sensibilidad social en *La incógnita* y *Realidad* de Galdós." *Revista Hispanica Moderna* 30 (1964): 89-107.

Varey, J. E. "Galdós in the Light of Recent Criticism." *Galdós Studies*. Ed. J. E. Varey. London: Tamesis, 1970. 1-35.

Yxart, José. *El arte escénico en España*. Vol. 1. Barcelona: La Vanguardia, 1894.