

sis—"is best observed by isolating from the body of Lope's plays one particular kind of play and then examining in more or less chronological order its various manifestations" (p. 159).

One could take serious exception to several of the views expressed in Larson's book; for instance, his disquieting (to my mind) reliance on Américo Castro, his heady if ingenious parallel between narrative romance and the plays of the middle period, his somewhat circumscribed understanding of tragedy, and the significant exceptions to his chronological scheme (e.g., *La victoria de la honra* and *Los comendadores de Córdoba*) that are neatly glossed over, as well as to his sociological approach to both author and audience. But to do so would require an alternative study. I am content for the moment to recommend this volume, with only the caveat that it is from the early period of Professor Larson's scholarly pursuits, which endeavors, one imagines, can be expected to change and grow with time, as did the dramatic craftsmanship of the subject of this monograph.

JAMES A. PARR

*University of Southern California*

*Estructura de la novela. Anatomía de "El Buscón."* By Gonzalo Díaz Migoyo. Madrid: Fundamentos, 1978. 177 pages.

This is a book that is methodologically consistent, true to itself and even elegant at times in its argumentation. Its main lines of inquiry are derived from Aristotle and such modern non-contextualists as Booth, Culler, Kristeva, and Todorov. It is not flamboyant, but reasonable and sober. There is an enthusiastic afterword by Juan Goytisolo. Díaz Migoyo attempts an "anatomy" of the *Buscón*, conceived as a series of exploratory incisions to lay bare the internal organization and functioning of the narrative structure.

Chapter i insists on the logic of the plot as a structure of cause and effect. Díaz Migoyo divides Pablos' life into three principal periods and demonstrates this relationship throughout them. The traditional thesis that the *Buscón* is a random collection of *agudezas* is no longer tenable. I missed reference to A. A. Parker, S. Eoff, P. N. Dunn, and C. B. Morris, all of whom could at least qualify as precursors of Díaz Migoyo's thought. The cardinal point, which will inform both Pablos' life and Díaz Migoyo's interpretation of it, is the constant presence in Pablos of an exacerbated sense of shame and corresponding need to attempt to pass for someone he is not, to *aparentar honra*. This is what organizes his life and determines the choices he makes. These choices result in his eventual failure.

Chapters ii and iii attempt to separate Pablos narrator from Quevedo author. Díaz Migoyo establishes a hierarchy of *emisores* and *receptores*. He insists on the levels of mediation between Quevedo and ourselves and attempts by this means to separate the narrative goals and style of Pablos from the intention of Quevedo. Certain of Pablos' attitudes—the exaggerated respect for the nobility, for example—which occur also in the historical Quevedo, are seen as aspects of Pablos' overwhelming need, even at the moment of narration, to *aparentar honra*. Similarly, Pablos' prose style, the dazzling verbal pyrotechnics so reminiscent of Quevedo himself, is in fact an aspect of Pablos' own personality and part of his rhetorical strategy. For Díaz Migoyo, Pablos narrator is the real protagonist of the *Buscón*, and Pablos is “tan pícaro ahora como antes.” Pablos actor spends his life trying to *negar la sangre* and climb the social ladder by pretending to be someone he is not. His principal weapon is verbal duplicity. Pablos narrator spends his narration trying to convince Vmd. that he no longer suffers from the feelings of shame and inferiority that motivated his career as actor, by gleefully calling attention to his former shortcomings. Again, his principal weapon is verbal duplicity.

Chapter iv is devoted to various varieties of verisimilitude, and represents the most original segment of Díaz Migoyo's analysis. He begins with Kristeva and Culler to the effect that verisimilitude means the referability of a text to something already known. The text is always predicated on some pre-text, in conjunction with which it acquires validity and meaning. Díaz Migoyo then goes back to Aristotle and observes that a man (Quevedo) imitates the actions of another man (Pablos), who in turn imitates his own actions as actor. This implies two distinct verisimilitudes, which must be studied separately. Pablos' verisimilitude relates to his own experience, to a context of general social probability. Quevedo's verisimilitude relates to this and to pre-existing literary genres, notably the picaresque narrative and the three-act *comedia*, as well. But Pablos situates his verisimilitude in a cultural (verbal-amusing) context and not the natural (existential-unpleasant) one of his experience *qua* experience. Pablos subordinates natural pre-text to cultural (verbal *agudeza*) pre-text. Quevedo subordinates both to literary pre-text. As Díaz Migoyo has observed in Chapter i, Quevedo is like a dramatic *autor* who puts on stage a troupe of actors who imitate (re-create), in the best Aristotelian sense, “men in action.” Moving to the picaresque genre proper, Díaz Migoyo affirms that the great originality of the *Buscón* resides in the fact of Quevedo's having rejected the previous possibilities for degree of ethical difference between narrator and protagonist—the “absolute differentiation” of *Guzmán de Alfarache* and the “ambiguity and undefinable relation between Lázaro's picaresque past and his present narrative conduct”—and having eliminated any difference whatsoever. The others are “*relatos de pícaros*”; the *Buscón* is a “*relato*

*pícaro*,” with respect to Pablos’ attitude toward Vmd., as Díaz Migoyo establishes it in Chapters ii and iii.

Now, Claudio Guillén has demonstrated that Lázaro narrator is not himself an ironist, but the object of the author’s irony. This suggests that for Lázaro, the terms “cumbre de toda buena fortuna” and “material success purchased at the price of moral degradation” may not be contradictory at all, whereupon the ethical separation of narrator from protagonist disappears. As for *Guzmán*, the most current criticism maintains that, for whatever reasons, the ethical stance of Guzmán narrator is identical to that of Guzmán pícaro. The originality Díaz Migoyo’s thesis calls to mind is not a matter of real differences in ethical posture, but the deliberateness with which the appearance of such a difference is created. In *Lazarillo* and *Guzmán* it would seem that the final, real identification of narrator with protagonist is unwitting, while as Díaz Migoyo demonstrates, Pablos is supremely conscious of only pretending to have changed.

In his conclusions Díaz Migoyo unfortunately abandons Booth’s useful category of implied author, apparently confusing the idea of Quevedo we form on the basis of our reading of his text with the real Quevedo who actually wrote it. This allows him to explain how Pablos can destroy himself—a conscious strategy of misdirection he had already explained—but leaves open the question of how Pablos and Quevedo can sound and act so much alike. Insistence on the implied author would have resolved this dilemma, allowing Díaz Migoyo’s thesis to harmonize with Maurice Molho’s most recent meditations, and allowing the text to stand as the *imitatio* of a fictional representation of Quevedo tacitly condemning Pablos’ picaresque career as actor and his picaresque narration of the same.

CARROLL B. JOHNSON

*University of California, Los Angeles*

*Nicolás Fernández de Moratín*. By David Thatcher Gies. Boston: Twayne, 1979. 184 pages.

For many a Spanish writer the Twayne series has provided the only book available in English. For some, the series has given us the only book in any language devoted exclusively to a single writer. Such is the case of David Gies’s study of Nicolás Fernández de Moratín whose merits as a writer were long unexplored by critics.

Mesonero Romanos said of Don Nicolás that his best “work” was his son Leandro (*Manual . . . de Madrid*, 3rd ed. [Madrid, 1844], p. 63). Gies disarms this attempt—similar to others on the part of the Roman-