

ineludible si pretendemos entender mejor la *Execración contra los judíos*, la utilización del material histórico y literario en la obra de Quevedo o la reutilización que hace un autor famoso por ser "literatura" (por citar el manido adagio borgiano).

Julio Vélez-Sainz

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Roses, Joaquín. *Góngora: Soledades habitadas*. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, 2007. PB. 384pp. ISBN: 978-84-9747-195-4.

Joaquín Roses's recent book, *Góngora: Soledades habitadas*, is a collection of previously published essays, now reprinted in slightly revised version with updated bibliography. Those who have been following Roses' scholarship will welcome the opportunity to have ready access to the *corpus* of Roses' studies on Góngora, which continue the author's focus on aspects of the *Soledades*, the polemic over Gongorism and the trajectory of Góngora's work. This volume, handsomely bound in paperback by the Thema series of the Universidad de Málaga, is traditional, philological criticism with a transatlantic twist, written in a colorful but exacting style which reminds readers that all of us who study Góngora begin with the model of Dámaso Alonso, who combined erudition with poetic imagination and the gifts of a good teacher.

The initial sections of the book, dedicated to the *Soledades* and the controversy they occasioned, include essays published in *homenaje* collections organized to mark Robert Jammes' retirement as well as lesser known material. Roses honors the legacy of Jammes' work in his elegant close readings of passages of the poem and in his painstaking efforts to establish the chronology and integrity of Gongorine texts as well as the documents of the polemic surrounding them. In this sense Roses develops the scholarly concerns he demonstrated from the beginning in his first book, *Una poética de la oscuridad: la recepción crítica de las Soledades en el siglo XVII* (Tamesis 1994).

The essays on the *Soledades* proper highlight significant aspects of Góngora's poetic technique as well as features of structure, imagery, and sources. The first two essays study the four elements and temporal descriptions (*cronografía* or *descriptio temporis*) in the work without engaging directly the most recent critical debate over the supposedly allegorical format Góngora was said to have planned for the poem. John Beverley's scholarship should have been thoughtfully addressed, especially on this point, particularly given Beverley's extensive and

early treatment of the issue of temporal structure. The third essay on dramatic elements in the *Soledades* posits the interesting theory that Góngora's *Comedia venatoria* was not unfinished actually, but rather was completed within the *Soledades*, with the *peregrino* and other disguised courtiers functioning as character types similar to those of the *comedia*, as Jammes has suggested. Here Roses' thesis nicely supports José María Micó's studies of Góngora's early work as raw material for the "forge" of the *Soledades*, but skirts the broader question of generic fragmentation—the emptying out of a sense of generic function—raised by Andrée Collard and Beverley.

Roses also draws attention to elements of eclogue in the *Soledades*, continuing the important and original work of Aurora Egido. In a subsequent essay Roses provides a fine close reading of the *peregrino's* soliloquy of II, 112-89, locating its sources in Renaissance eclogue and specifically piscatory eclogue, Petrarchan amorous plaint, and funeral motifs of baroque poetry. This piece is complemented by an essay on the image of the Americas in Góngora's writing, which includes a close reading of the "Égloga piscatoria en la muerte del Duque de Medina Sidonia," and which offers additional insight on the "Discurso contra las navegaciones."

The last essay in the section on the *Soledades* examines variants within the framework of a newer concept of "genetic" textual study, whose goal is not to establish which version of a text its author intended, but rather to study the genesis of a text as a series of versions which give insight into the writing process itself as a creative act. Roses concludes with a stylistic analysis of the types of corrections Góngora made since the primitive version, offering some striking observations on the role of rhyme scheme which develop (implicitly) Beverley's work on rhyme as an organizing system within the apparent formal disorder of the *silva*.

Roses' essays on the polemic over Gongorism include an examination of Francisco Fernández de Córdoba, Abad de Rute's contributions on the question of the genre of the *Soledades*. In this discussion Roses reveals that he postponed his previously announced plans to re-edit Fernández de Córdoba's *Examen del Antídoto*, still only available through the appendix included in Miguel Artigas' biography of Góngora from the 1920s. One hopes that Roses will be able to attend to this project soon. Roses follows with an essay on the notion of *ingenio* and inspiration at the time of Góngora, refining his analysis of the Platonic theory of poetic furor in relation to the *Soledades*. He examines treatises of Renaissance poetics and draws attention to newer Spanish scholarship on this topic (which augments Weinberg's classic study) by Antonio García Berrio and María Isabel López Martínez as well as

more recent bibliography on the work of Juan Huarte de San Juan. All of this will be quite useful to scholars who work in the field of early modern literary theory.

In this context Roses includes his own edition of a previously unknown treatise on poetic inspiration contained in Francisco Martínez de Portichuelo's *Apología en favor de don Luis de Góngora*. This document is key to the debate between Navarrete and Portichuelo over meanings of "dictar" and "inspirar" in the first four verses of the *Soledades*, a debate which Roses locates within the evolution of a poetics which privileges *ingenio* over tradition and *poesis* over mimesis. Here, Roses offers important new evidence which reinforces the arguments of Andrée Collard on the nature of Góngora's innovation.

The final section of Roses' work is devoted to the Latin American trajectory of Góngora's poetry, a concern suggested in the book's very title, which is a play on the name of Lezama Lima's essay on Cernuda. Roses studies colonial Gongorism in Sor Juana's use of the four elements in her "Loa (I) a los años del rey Carlos II," comparing her primarily with Calderón but also offering extensive bibliography on her relationship to Góngora. He follows with discussion of the avant-garde revival of Góngora, beginning with a brief essay on Rubén Darío, in which he cites the parallels between the modernist project of rejuvenation of poetic language and that of Góngora. An essay on Borges is more extensive, and is perhaps most useful as a window into the transatlantic revival of Góngora at the time of the tercentenary of his death. Roses contextualizes Borges' appreciation of Góngora, frequently expressed as a classicist rejection, within his literary circle and within a paradoxical meditation on the problem of the reception of a Baroque author's work by modern readers (the source, I would suspect, for Borges' story of another sort of Symbolist revival, "Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote"). Interspersed between the essays on Darío and Borges is a solid close reading of Luis Cernuda's poem, "Góngora," which identifies echoes of Góngora's poetry and letters as well as the incorporation of Góngora's metrical experiments in alternation with free verse.

Roses' book is monumental in scope, not only for the depth of his own research, but for his extensive citation of previous scholarship. Roses includes lengthy footnotes, citing exhaustive critical histories of many points, often citing as well a parallel *lapsus* in his contemporaries, both European and American. It would seem that some scholars fail to document sources through ignorance of essential bibliography; perhaps one solution would be to develop better coordination between library databases and more equitable access to materials, both within Spain, within Europe, and internationally. Yet the issue of citation also

involves different disciplinary protocols; on the whole, U.S. journals will not permit extensive footnotes as we no longer observe the philological imperative to document entire critical histories and instead usually cite only the immediate sources for material referenced. Roses' complaint certainly signals some subjectivism as well; scholars should cite honestly, regardless of ideological difference or any perceived disciplinary conflict between critics who use philological approaches and those who use more contemporary theory as a guide.

There can be no doubt that Roses has accomplished much in his history as a scholar of Góngora, and *Góngora: Soledades habitadas* admirably documents that achievement. Roses has also contributed as an editor of the *Góngora Hoy* series and as director of the Colección de Estudios Gongorinos, published by the Diputación de Córdoba, a major source of important new work on the poet.

Roses stands in a unique position as a potential bridge builder between the various national academies. It is an exciting time for Góngora scholarship and a time for the best in international cooperation.

Crystal Chemris
University of Iowa

Tubau, Xavier. *Una polémica literaria: Lope de Vega y Diego de Colmenares*. Madrid / Frankfurt: Iberoamericana / Vervuert, 2007. 256 pp. HB. ISBN 978-84-8489-081-2.

Los textos sobre la poética de Lope son numerosos. Parece discutible, sin embargo, que el Fénix estuviese de veras interesado en la poética como disciplina. Sus pronunciamientos delatan flagrantes contradicciones y en absoluto constituyen doctrina (en el sentido de pensamiento coherente, organizado); se obtiene la impresión de que la poética, en Lope, se reduce a «un conjunto de lugares susceptibles de ser citados o parafraseados según las necesidades del contexto» (11). Conste que no se pretende insistir, con lo dicho, sobre el tópico del Lope adicto a las enciclopedias y carente de profundidad y rigor intelectuales; subproducto del aprendizaje universitario de la Retórica, el acopio de lugares comunes, a veces contradictorios, en favor (o en contra) de tales o cuales puntos de vista forma parte de las prácticas habituales de los escritores castellanos del Siglo de Oro. Es imposible, empero, hacer abstracción del hecho de que la mayor parte de los escritos alusivos a cuestiones de la poética de Lope «se escribieron como respuesta a censuras recibidas o como anticipo de las que se figuraba que recibiría» (20).

Entre 1621 y 1624, Lope y el oscuro erudito segoviano Diego de Colmenares intercambiaron sendos pares de escritos a propósito de la «nueva poesía» que don Luis de Góngora y sus secuaces propugnaban. La primera de las cartas de Diego de Colmenares lleva fecha de 13 de noviembre de 1621; la segunda, de 23 de abril de 1624. Se trata de respuestas inmediatas a dos textos de Lope de Vega, a saber: su «Discurso de la nueva poesía», compuesto en el segundo semestre de 1617 e impreso en 1621; y su contestación a la primera de las cartas de Colmenares, compuesta en 1621 ó 1622 e impresa en 1624. Los textos del Fénix, incluso en *La Filomena* (1621) y en *La Circe* (1624), gozaron, por supuesto, de mayor difusión que los de Colmenares; ello, además del hecho de que Lope no identifique a su interlocutor con nombres y apellidos, ha contribuido a la disolución del contexto genuino de sus afirmaciones. Con el propósito de restituir los textos en cuestión a su prístino escenario histórico, Xavier Tubau edita, en las últimas páginas de su ensayo (161ss.), las respectivas intervenciones de Lope de Vega y Diego de Colmenares a partir de cierto impreso, sin lugar ni fecha de edición, en que aparecen convenientemente reunidas.

El capítulo que Tubau dedica a desentrañar el origen del misterioso impreso («Un impreso en busca de imprenta», 63-71) es, sencillamente, apasionante. C. Colin Smith sostuvo, en el año 1955, que el libro había sido impreso en la oficina de la viuda de Alonso Martín. Difícil de creer: las críticas de Colmenares contra el Fénix no podrían haber visto la luz «en la misma imprenta donde se editaban y habían editado buena parte de las obras de Lope», dado que, en tal caso, «la viuda de Alonso Martín, Francisca de Medina, estaría comprometiendo su vínculo con el más importante de los escritores contemporáneos» (64). El examen de las letras capitales del impreso y su comparación con las utilizadas en otros volúmenes contemporáneos conducen a Xavier Tubau hasta el verdadero factor del opúsculo: Diego Flamenco. Le delatan el fugaz establecimiento de su negocio en Segovia (1628-1629) y, sobre todo, el uso reiterado de una deteriorada «L» capital. El responsable de la impresión, que constaría a lo sumo de «una decena o quincena de ejemplares» (70), fue, según sospecharon C. Colin Smith y algunos estudiosos posteriores, el propio Colmenares.

Tubau no se contenta con editar y discutir los cuatro textos de la polémica; espiga, de paso, posibles ecos de la confrontación en las obras de uno y otro contendiente. Se encuentran alusiones más o menos cristalinas a las críticas de Diego Colmenares en un buen puñado de textos datables en el lapso 1623-1637, desde los paratextos de la *Parte XIII* de Lope hasta la segunda edición, adicionada, de la *Historia de la insigne ciudad de Segovia* de Colmenares. La conexión de algunos otros de los textos que discute Xavier Tubau con el intercambio de pareceres