

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Spanish Language and Literature

Modern Languages and Literatures, Department of

1982

Ambivalence and Ambiguity in La Familia de Pascual Duarte

Leon Livingstone

Emeritus, State University of New York, Buffalo

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/modlangspanish>



Part of the [Modern Languages Commons](#)

Livingstone, Leon, "Ambivalence and Ambiguity in La Familia de Pascual Duarte" (1982). *Spanish Language and Literature*. 61.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/modlangspanish/61>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Modern Languages and Literatures, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Spanish Language and Literature by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

AMBIVALENCE AND AMBIGUITY IN *LA FAMILIA DE PASCUAL DUARTE*

LEON LIVINGSTONE

Emeritus, State University of New York, Buffalo

When *La familia de Pascual Duarte* irrupted onto the Spanish literary scene in 1942 it created a furore whose effects have still not subsided. Most particularly is this reflected in the stream of critical surmise that continues to surround the work. The bafflement of interpreters, the «frustrating conjecture»¹ to which they are impelled, centers around the evaluation of the protagonist as good or bad, hero or coward, victim or criminal, and also «difficulties» which «concern certain unexplained mysteries in the narrative.»² Among the latter can be noted the seemingly arbitrary killing by Pascual of his dog Chispa, the absence of the protagonist on lengthy travels during which his wife is left exposed to the advances of his rival; the disparity between the modest background of the narrator and the stylistic elegance of his confession; the dedication of the latter to a murder victim of Pascual's whose death is unexplained in the text; and, indeed, the very violence of the character himself. «En realidad,» says Paul Ilie, «buscamos en vano un indicio de motivación psicológica para la subsiguiente violencia de Pascual. No la hay: sólo sabemos que es literalmente poseído por turbulentos cambios orgánicos e impelido a matar.»³

Faced with the enigma of Pascual's conduct, critical interpretation has tended to a unilateral choice between alternatives. Thus, he is seen as an example of the primitive man whose response to circumstances is «automática e irresponsable» (Ilie); as the elemental judge incapable of understanding that good and bad are not absolute and opposite values;⁴ as a practitioner of the Spanish attitude of *la real gana*, of doing what one damn well pleases,⁵ and so on. The critic who seems to have come closest to grips

with the significance of the novel is R. C. Spires in his evaluation of its «systematic doubt⁶», its «contrived ambiguity,⁷» and the basic ambivalence of a work whose tone «fluctuates» between irony and sincerity.⁸ But then this critic modifies his perspicacious conclusions by limiting the ambivalence of the novel to the temporal.⁹ A reading of the text from the criterion of ambivalence, however, would seem clearly to demand an interpretation that does not limit this aspect to the technicality of the disparity between the present contrition of a prisoner awaiting execution and the past brutality of the perpetrator of horrific crimes,¹⁰ but extends it to an overall duality, eventually subsumed into a total ambiguity in which irony and sincerity do not simply fluctuate but are inextricably bound together, an ambiguity which is that of existence itself and of art.

The unilateral resolution of the central question of Pascual Duarte as victim or wilful criminal is typified by the provocative analysis of Mary Ann Beck. In an intriguing article this critic suggests that there is an «ironic discrepancy between the words and the acts of Pascual Duarte;»¹¹ that is to say that he is an example of what Wayne C. Booth calls the «unreliable narrator.» In this view, Pascual, perfectly aware of his duplicity and cowardice, his written confession a camouflage for the bitter truth, deliberately attempts to mislead the reader in order to create a more favorable picture of himself as an innocent victim of circumstances. But the truth is quite other, argues Professor Beck. «To take the law into one's own hands...constitutes an act of volition and for that, inevitably, one must choose. And if there is choice, one is not a victim.»¹² Professor Beck reinforces her interpretation of the spuriousness of Pascual's victimization by reporting a comment of Cela to the effect that an averagely normal man is always responsible for his acts.¹³ But in his acts Pascual Duarte is anything but «medianamente normal.» As Cela wrote in retrospective consideration of his creation «it is not easy to apply the norm to the abnormal.»¹⁴ Similarly, D. W. McPheeters arrives at the conclusion that while «Pascual is not a psychopathic killer» his protestations of innocence can be taken as «rather broad irony.»¹⁵ This is another case of a substantial interpretation of the character as a guileful, deceptively (if not self-deceptively) cunning criminal, and a reduction of the novel to the level of melodrama.

Pascual Duarte is both normal and abnormal, an essentially well-meaning man driven to violence by what Ilie classifies as an «inseguridad básica» (p. 52) that reaches the level of the

pathological.

The pattern of Pascual's behavior adheres closely to that of the pathologically insecure individual described by R. D. Laing as suffering from «existential» or «ontological» insecurity, «a schizoid state that can be understood as an attempt to preserve a being that is precariously structured.» Particularly pertinent is Laingian analysis as an explanation of Pascual's overreacting to the look of his dog Chispa, the victim of his blind rage («La perrilla se sentaba enfrente de mí, sobre sus dos patas de atrás y me miraba...la perra volvió a echarse frente a mí y volvió a mirarme; ahora me doy cuenta de que tenía la mirada de los confesores, escrutadora y fría»¹⁶ and, indeed, to the look of all his victims («el día llegará y en el día no podremos aguantar su mirada, esa mirada que en nosotros se clavará aún sin creerlo» (p. 117). Says Laing: «to the schizoid individual every pair of eyes is a Medusa's head which he feels has the power actually to kill or deaden something precariously vital in him.»¹⁷

Where Pascual's conduct most strikingly conforms to the Laingian interpretation is, as the title of the novel indicates, as an example of the influence of his own family. Pascual's irrational behavior is the result of fearful feelings of inadequacy exacerbated into festering growth by the lack of human warmth and affection on the part of his own immediate kin, his need of compassion and understanding frustrated in abortive attempts on his own part (to his little brother, his children, his sister) or denied him by his unnatural mother. The absence, above all, of maternal instincts on the mother's part, especially when she fails to cry on the death of his brother Mario («secas debiera tener las entrañas una mujer con corazón tan duro») converts him stage by stage into her hated enemy, «en un enemigo rabioso, que no hay peor odio que el de la misma sangre». Says Dr. Laing: «a necessary component in the development of self is the experience of oneself as a person under the loving eye of the mother...It may be that a failure of responsiveness on the mother's part to one or other aspect of the infant's being will have important consequences» (p. 116).

It is his lack of self-assurance, his fearful feelings of inferiority towards others, that drives Pascual to submit to the masculine code of conduct that prevails in his particular milieu, a concept of *machismo* that makes him, contrary to his own better impulses, cease kissing the cleric's ring (an act not worthy of a man, says his wife), that forces him to struggle against the temptation to burst in-

to tears when under stress or to be apologetic when he does so, that leads him to commit murder when he is taunted about his lack of manhood. It even characterizes his conquest of his wife Lola in what amounts to a virtual rape («una lucha feroz», he calls it. «¿Es esto lo que quieres?», he asks her after their first, violent sexual encounter. And she replies with gusto «¡Sí!» [p. 68].)

But if Pascual's conduct is dictated by the mores of his milieu, he submits to brute force also because he lacks the resoluteness to follow his own natural impulses to tenderness, to the actual avoidance of violence (he has, for example, to be goaded beyond endurance by El Estirao before resorting to action). Yet despite his violence, his brutality, his cowardice, Pascual Duarte demonstrates a certain nobility of character as he struggles against his fate. He is both victim and hero.

How the apparently contradictory combination of wilfulness and victimization operates in the tragic hero has been subtly analyzed by Ortega y Gasset, for whom «Es esencial al héroe querer su trágico destino.»¹⁸ The heroism of the tragic character, argues Ortega, does not stem from the fact that he is an unwilling victim of a hostile fate but that he goes voluntarily and even resolutely to meet the destiny he knows awaits him. He is the target of fate but acquires heroic stature by making his destiny coincide with his will.

The applicability of this concept to the behavior of the unheroic hero who is Pascual Duarte could not be more appropriately confirmed than in his own chilling account of the murder of his mother, a striking confirmation of the ambivalence of the tragic hero which cannot be lamely reduced to a case of temporality, to the alternation between past violence and present calm, repentant recollection. In fact, rather than simple recollection it is an intricate entanglement of recall and anticipation, of resistance and determination. First comes the blood-curdling rehearsal of the crime, the premeditation, a remarkably self-fulfilling prophecy in which Pascual both courts and struggles against his fate, proclaiming the responsibility of the criminal and yet his powerlessness to resist a destiny which will inexorably impose on him the very same pattern in the drama of death he foresees:

Se mata sin pensar, bien probado lo tengo; a veces, sin querer. Se odia, se odia intensamente, ferozmente, y se abre la navaja, y con ella bien abierta se llega, descalzo, hasta la cama donde duerme el enemigo. Es de

noche, pero por la ventana entra el claror de la luna; se ve bien. Sobre la cama está echado el muerto, el que va a ser el muerto...

Pero no se puede matar así; es de asesinos. Y uno piensa volver sobre sus pasos, desandar lo ya andado. No, no es posible. Todo está muy pensado; es un instante, un corto instante y después...

Pero tampoco es posible volverse atrás. (p. 117)

And then this inextricable mixture of fatality and wilfulness brings about the actual slaying:

Era algo fatal que había de venir y que venía, que yo había de causar y que no podía evitar aunque quisiera, porque me parecía imposible cambiar de opinión, volverme atrás, evitar lo que ahora daría una mano porque no hubiera ocurrido, pero que entonces gozaba en provocar con el mismo cálculo y la misma meditación por lo menos con los que un labrador emplearía para pensar en sus trigales. (p. 178).

It is by no means incidental in this fine balancing of individual responsibility and the force of destiny that the actual assassination, which he nevertheless admits to «*provoking*,» should hinge on the fatality of circumstances, when the murderer is on the very point of abandoning his proposed crime: «Di la vuelta para marchar. El suelo crujía. Mi madre se revolvió en la cama.—¿Quién anda ahí? Entonces sí que ya no había solución» (p. 175).

It is in the light of this inseparability of will and fate that the seeming strangeness of the conduct of Pascual Duarte assumes its own logic as the abortive attempts of a man to avoid his fate but whose weakness of character invites the very tragedy he seeks to flee, who stumbles into disasters that in a sense he subconsciously pursues. Thus it is that Pascual's unnecessary absences on lengthy travels—absences, as Juan Luis Alborg justly claims,¹⁹ that make virtually inevitable the unfaithfulness of the wife he has left behind and the subsequent slaying of his rival—can be seen as desperate attempts to avoid confrontation and violence but attempts that actually prompt the feared dénouements. Another instance of contraproductive behavior by a self-willed victim of fate, another virtual invitation to disaster, is Pascual's negligence in permitting the

pregnant Lola to ride a spirited mare, who then pays the ultimate bloody penalty for her ensuing miscarriage.

If the ambivalence of the unheroic hero is the key to the duplicity of the character, it also goes a considerable way towards explaining the apparent discrepancy between the humble background of the character and the subtlety of his language, the yawning gap between his cultural deprivation and a style that combines philosophic irony with a poetic elegance, a language ill-befitting one who left school at twelve years of age, as Ilie and others have pointed out. Even making allowance for the fact that Pascual formulates his opinions and gives vent to his feeling in terms of comparison that would come naturally to a rustic, the articulate quality of his expression, at times even its intricate delicacy, seem out of keeping with the characterization of Duarte as an incoherent man constantly so baffled by words, so cowed by the articulateness of others, that he feels impelled to resort to violence as an alternative to speech. His genuine awe of words is revealed on repeated occasions. On his honeymoon, for example, he is left in open-mouthed astonishment at the stream of insults (uttered «a tal velocidad y empleando unas palabras tan rebuscadas que yo me quedé a menos de la mitad de lo que dijeron») spewed out in a street fight in which the opposing parties incredibly «no hicieron siquiera ademán de llegar a las manos» (p. 136); and, on another occasion in which he does attempt to defend himself verbally, he comes off so badly («a mí me ganaba por la palabra») that he swears he will never again make the same error, classifying it as «la única pelea que perdí por no irme a mi terreno» (p. 52). Again, when he returns from prison only to have his joy at being free crushed by the curt indifference of the station master, it is to his eternal enemy, words, that he ascribes this new humiliation: «Iba triste, muy triste; toda mi alegría la matara el señor Gregorio con sus tristes palabras» (p. 155)

There is, however, an explanation for the rough but tender eloquence of Pascual Duarte's confession which is completely in keeping with the character's second nature, that of the sensitive sentimentalist, and with his situation. «You can count on a murderer for a fancy prose style,» said another condemned killer, Humbert Humbert, in Nabokov's *Lolita*. The opportunity to compose the story of one's life in the calm and security of a death-cell lends itself to the temptation, as this other murderer suggests, to weave an elaborate word-picture around the ugly facts of existence. And in

no case could this be more enticing an attraction than to one (albeit no intellectual, like Nabokov's character) intimidated by words...in the mouth of others. For there is all the difference in the world between being a victim of language and its undisputed master, safe in seclusion from any possible rebuttal or humiliating riposte. This authorial freedom from verbal reprisal, this liberation from the fear of others, provides the *orally* inarticulate Pascual with his verbal revenge, a recourse to the power of words that is also his opportunity for self-rehabilitation, as he reveals to the world—and to himself—another dimension of his personality, that of a reflective, essentially decent, man.

The ambivalence towards language of Pascual is also that of the author. For Pascual, the composer of his own confessions, the author within the novel, duplicates the dilemma of the writer of novels who must reconcile truth (the illusion of truth) with fictional pretense, sincerity with the artfulness of style, a problem which will beset many a twentieth century novelist.

The double portrayal of the good but evil Pascual, the heroic coward or cowardly hero, the sentimental brute, is shown to be not just a delusion in the mind of the character himself, for it is confirmed in the divergent interpretations of two outside witnesses to his hanging: the prison chaplain and a corporal of the Guardia Civil. One rings the praises of the «aplomo y serenidad,» the «edificante humildad,» with which the condemned man goes to his end, an end, he says, unfortunately marred by his last moments, and the other disdainfully gives an unedifying version of the coward who faints at the sight of the gallows and dies «de la manera más ruin y baja que un hombre puede terminar, demostrando a todos su miedo a la muerte.» Two accounts which the author pertinently labels «Una. Y la otra,» their ambiguity further compounded by the element of enigma contributed in the transcriber's lament at «la falta absoluta de datos de los últimos años de Pascual Duarte.»

The conflicting visions of the nature of Pascual Duarte²⁰ are the product of two different ways of appraising human character, both firmly anchored in Spanish tradition: one which demands that an individual be judged by his conduct—the Cervantine «cada uno es hijo de sus obras» brought up-to-date—and one which gives more weight to the inner man, to the potentialities of character, whether they have been realized or not—the Unamunian principle that one should be judged «por el que hayamos querido ser, no por

el que hayamos sido,» for the one that one wishes to be or would have liked to be is the real person.²¹

To the question, therefore, of whether Pascual Duarte is good or bad, hero or coward, victim of fate or the hewer of his own destiny, the novel's ambivalence replies not with an either-or criterion but with an assertion of both-and. Pascual is both a lamb (a «Pascal» lamb) and a hyena, as he is variously categorized in the postscripts, he is both lying to himself and to the reader and yet baring his soul, he is both better than his victims, as Marañón suggests,²² and worse, basically normal yet with psychopathic tendencies. It is not a case of alternatives but of Pascual's «dos caras», as Zamora Vicente says.²³

However, if both points of view are valid they are so only when taken together. The application of one criterion to the exclusion of the other makes for falsification. To judge a man only by his acts, failing to take into account his inner aspirations, or, conversely, ignoring his conduct to identify him entirely with his impulses, especially when these are aborted, is not to do justice to the truth. But what is the truth? To apply both criteria, even jointly, does not mean that one can arrive at a mathematically precise identification. For Cela, no less than for Unamuno, who rejected the «inagotable ingenio combinatorio» he assigned to one of his own unhappy characters in favor of an «impetu confusionista e indefinicionista»²⁴, human reality escapes comfortable definitions. And so Cela refrains from passing judgment, declining to coordinate the disparate perspectives of his creation. The contrary versions of Pascual Duarte are left unresolved, and intentionally so. That is ambiguity, an ambiguity which assumes the force of an esthetic principle, as the evaluation of the character, the resolution of the enigma of the novel, is left to the reader. It is a creative approach, for ambiguity lends to the analytic, calculating aspect of ambivalence a human quality, that of the elusive contradictoriness of the living organism, and transforms what could have the appearance of documentation into literature, raising the work to the level of art.

The double view of Pascual explains both his condemnation by society and the self-defense offered by the character himself. His claim to innocence at the very outset of his confession, his insistence that «Yo, señor, no soy malo, aunque no me faltarian motivos para serlo» (a disculpation which is not without literary precedent in the Spanish novel²⁵) is not mere hypocrisy but the cry

of anguish of one who has struggled long but ineffectually against his own baser impulses. On the other hand, judged by his acts Pascual undeniably appears evil, a social scourge whose conduct is a model not to imitate but to flee from, as the note of the transcriber has it. And this moral lesson is not to be dismissed as simply a sop to censorship, as has been suggested. As a negative model of conduct Pascual Duarte shows what happens to man when his civilizing restraints are removed. That the inspiration for this lesson was still fresh in the minds of both author and public in the recent experience of the Spanish Civil War, a conflict whose ferocious violence is a matter of record, is a natural inference, particularly in view of the date of publication of the novel so soon after the war's conclusion. That would seem to be confirmed also by the author in a later novel, *San Camilo 1936* (1969), Cela's fictional self-revelation on his name day viewed retrospectively on the eve of the Spanish holocaust. There, in terms highly reminiscent of those applied to the protagonist of *La familia de Pascual Duarte* by the priest as «un manso cordero, acorralado y asustado por la vida,» he writes that «un animal acorralado se ciega y no distingue la verdad de la mentira, la verdad es el lujo de los fuertes y el hombre es un animal débil y acorralado.»²⁶

The historical application of *La familia de Pascual Duarte* is, however, oblique, by implication or inference, not direct but in the form of a parable. To seek, therefore, to attach to the killing of Don Jesús González de la Riva, Conde de Torremejía, the key to the novel and an essentially explicit reference to the Civil War, a reading which leads Gonzalo Sobejano to interpret the «familia» of the title as «la familia social, la sociedad española»,²⁷ is to overlook entirely the novel's ambivalence and ultimate and intentional ambiguity.

Another critic, also attributing to the killing of don Jesús a central significance in the narrative, argues that it is this act alone which transforms the beleaguered Pascual from victim into tragic hero. For, says Juan María Marín Martínez,²⁸ in slaying don Jesús, one of the privileged of society, representative of those on whom fortune has smiled, Pascual destroys that fate which would separate men inexorably into those who walk «el camino de las flores» and others «el camino de los cardos.» By thus thwarting the designs of fate, which had destined men like don Jesús for a happy end, Pascual has been able to «afirmar su libérrima grandeza humana,»²⁹ argues Marín, and hence to become an authentic tragic

hero. Once again, this is a unilateral interpretation of the character and his actions that ignores the complexity of his existence, of all existence. For if by interfering with the preordained fate of another Pascual undermines the force of destiny, it is equally true that by this same act he subjects himself to the very fate that had been reserved for him. For it is for the killing of don Jesús, and not for his other crimes, that he is finally condemned and ignominiously comes to his end. Once more a case of ambivalence: Pascual is both hero *and* victim, a heroic victim, a victimized hero. And also a case of ambiguity.

The speculation over the mystery surrounding the death of don Jesús and of the meaning of the dedication of the document to one «quien al irlo a rematar el autor de este escrito, le llamó Pascualillo y sonreía» is therefore ultimately beside the point. For if the dedication is mystifying it is intentionally so, a symbolic token of the fundamental ambiguity of the novel. And this is not the only occasion on which this same author has recourse to what Marín calls a type of «obra abierta, incompleta».³⁰ The open-ended form, a device calculated to deny the work the appearance of a neatly-contrived narration which ties up all the loose ends and satisfies the curiosity of the reader, is employed by Cela also in *La colmena* (1951), in which the ambiguity of the enigmatic, unexplained ending serves effectively as a counterfoil to the quasi-documentary nature of the picture of life in post-Civil War Spain that the novel offers.³¹

The difference between ambivalence and ambiguity and their relationship in Cela's esthetics is effectively demonstrated in the question of the style of Pascual Duarte's confessions. The dual attitude towards language of the character, his fear of words and yet his enthusiastic recourse to them, does not, of course, ultimately account for the mastery of expression that Pascual demonstrates. Duality is finally «resolved» in duplicity, as ambivalence leads to ambiguity. This is accomplished once more by the purposely unresolved double interpretation offered, with the effrontery of simple continuity, in the introductory note of the transcriber. Writes the latter: «Quiero dejar bien patente desde el primer momento que en la obra que hoy presento al curioso lector no me pertenece sino la transcripción; no he corregido ni añadido ni una tilde, porque he querido respetar el relato hasta en su estilo» (pp. 17-18). But then he goes on to add: «He preferido, en aglunos pasajes demasiado crudos de la obra, usar de la tijera y cortar por lo

sano; el procedimiento priva, evidentemente, al lector de conocer algunos pequeños detalles—que nada pierde con ignorar—; pero presenta, en cambio, la ventaja de evitar el que recaiga la vista en intimidades incluso repugnantes sobre las que—repito—me pareció más conveniente la poda que el pulido» (p. 18). It is clearly useless to seek to resolve the inherent but intentional contradiction of the document-left-intact-which-has-admittedly-been-tampered-with.

What, then, is the final significance of the ambivalent ambiguity—or ambiguous ambivalence—of *La familia de Pascual Duarte*? It is a striking exemplification of what Roland Barthes calls the «fatal duplicity of the writer, who interrogates under the guise of affirming» (a position to which must correspond the «duplicity of the critic, who answers under the guise of interrogating»³²). The assertion of the critic corresponds to the «allusion» of the work, for literature, maintains this critic, is at one and the same time meaning offered and meaning withheld («sens posé et sens déçu»). The work of art is not a self-contained entity, encasing in itself an unchanging significance, but poses questions that each age will answer in its own way and with its own concepts and language.³³ It is for that reason, in the last analysis, that the writer must abstain from answering his own «indirect interrogation» and that the work must essentially and ultimately appear an enigma. «Ecrire», says Barthes, «c'est ébranler le sens du monde, y disposer une interrogation *indirecte*, a laquelle l'écrivain, par un dernier suspens, s'abstient de répondre.»³⁴

NOTES

1. D. W. McPneeters, *Camilo José Cela* (New York, 1969), p. 38.
2. David W. Foster, *Forms of the Novel in the Work of Camilo José Cela* (Columbia Mo., 1967), p. 28.
3. Paul Ilie, *La novelística de Camilo José Cela* (Madrid, 1971), p. 49.
4. Gregorio Marañón, «Prologo a *La familia de Pascual Duarte*», *Insula* 5 (1946), 1, 3.
5. D. Pérez Minik, *Novelistas españoles de los siglos XIX y XX* (Madrid, 1957),

p. 264.

6. Robert C. Spires, «Systematic Doubt: The Moral Art of *La familia de Pascual Duarte*», *Hispanic Review* 40 (1972), 283-302.

7. *Idem.*, p. 301, n. 14.

8. *Idem.*, *La novela española de posguerra* (Madrid-Kansas, 1978), p. 25: «el tono fluctúa entre lo irónico y lo sincero, y de esta fluctuación tonal surge la dinámica de la novela.»

9. *Idem.*, «ambivalencia temporal», pp. 32, 37, 40.

10. Spire's version of «temporal ambivalence» is anticipated by Paul Ilie's statement that «en general, todos los «estados de ánimo» experimentados por Pascual corresponden a la situación de remembranza durante su período de internamiento» (p. 48).

11. Mary Ann Beck, «Nuevo encuentro con «La familia de Pascual Duarte»,» *Revista Hispánica Moderna*, 30 (1964), 279-98.

12. Even Spires submits to a view of this «contradiction» between the «apparent resignation and repentance» of the narrator and his inability to «resist the temptation to consider himself an innocent victim of fate» («Systematic Doubt...», p. 292).

13. Quoted by Beck from Mariano Gómez Santos, *Diálogos españoles* (Madrid, 1958), p. 36.

14. Camilo José Cela, «Palabras ocasionales», preface to *La familia de Pascual Duarte*, ed. H. L. Boudreau and J. Kronik (New York, 1961), p. ix: «No es fácil aplicar la norma a lo anormal.»

15. McPheeters, p. 38.

16. Camilo Jose Cela, *La familia de Pascual Duarte* (Barcelona: Ediciones Destino, 1963), pp. 32-33. All quotes from the novel are from this edition.

17. R. D. Laing, *The Divided Self. An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness* (Baltimore, 1970), p. 43.

18. José Ortega y Gasset, «La tragedia,» *Meditaciones del Quijote* (1914).

19. J. L. Alborg, *Hora actual de la novela española*, Vol. 1 (Madrid, 1958), p. 86.

20. It would perhaps be too tempting to read into Pascual's surname («Du-arte») a reference to this duality of character.

21. «Prólogo II», *Tres novelas ejemplares y un prólogo*.

22. See n. 4, above.

23. Alonse Zamora Vicente, *Camilo José Cela (Acercamiento a un escritor)* (Madrid, 1962), p. 48; «la ruidosa y primeriza, y la sosegada e íntima.» But then Zamora takes sides by adding «que es la que más nos importa.»

24. The character in question is don Fulgencio Entrambosmares in *Amor y Pedagogía*. See «Prólogo» to *Niebla*.

25. Isidora Rufete in ch. 30 of Galdós's *La desheredada* declares that «Yo no soy mala. Es que las circunstancias me obligan a parecerlo.»

26. Camilo José Cela, *Visperas, festividad y octava de San Camilo del año 1936 en*

Madrid (1969), Pt. 3, ch. 3.

27. Gonzalo Sobejano, *Novela española de nuestro tiempo* (Madrid, 1955), p. 83. Also inclining to this view are J. M. Castellet, «Iniciación a la obra narrativa de Camilo José Cela», *Revista Hispánica Moderna*, 28 (1962), 107-50, and David Feldman, «Camilo José Cela and *La familia de Pascual Duarte*», *Hispania*, 44 (1961), 656-59.

28. Juan María Marín Martínez, «Sentido último de *La familia de Pascual Duarte*», *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, 337-38 (julio-agosto, 1978), 90-98.

29. *Idem.*, p. 90.

30. *Idem.*

31. The novel ends as Martín Marcos pockets the newspaper he has been reading without noticing an item referring to him which has caused considerable alarm to his friends. The item is not explained nor cited.

32. Roland Barthes, «Avant-Propos», *Sur Racine* (Paris, 1960): «il faut qu'a la duplicité fatale de l'écrivain, qui interroge sous couvert d'affirmer, corresponde la duplicité du critique, qui répond sous couvert d'interroger.»

33. An analogous idea has been advanced by Azorín in his «revisión de valores.» In his *Memorias inmemoriales* Azorín writes that «Al leer un autor antiguo dilecto, sin darnos cuenta, transferimos el estado de nuestro espíritu, cuando leemos un moderno, al autor antiguo. Se puede decir, por tanto, que los modernos, poetas o novelistas, hacen revivir a los antiguos.»

34. Barthes, *loc. cit.*