

2013

"Por un clavo se pierde un reino": Alfonso Reyes, the Generation of 1927, and the Imperial Appropriation of Góngora

Aurora Hermida-Ruiz

University of Richmond, ahermida@richmond.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/lalis-faculty-publications>

 Part of the [Latin American Literature Commons](#), and the [Spanish Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hermida-Ruiz, Aurora. "'Por Un Clavo Se Pierde Un Reino': Alfonso Reyes, the Generation of 1927, and the Imperial Appropriation of Góngora." *Calíope* 18, no. 2 (2013): 161-93.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Latin American, Latino and Iberian Studies at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Latin American, Latino and Iberian Studies Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

“POR UN CLAVO SE PIERDE UN REINO”: ALFONSO REYES, THE GENERATION OF 1927, AND THE IMPERIAL APPROPRIATION OF GÓNGORA

Aurora Hermida-Ruiz
University of Richmond

Ruben Darío era mi sol, era el sol de Nicaragua y de muchos muchachos y países más. Y aquel sol fue de aurora para los españoles, y esa aurora venía, nadie lo duda, fuera por donde fuera, de la América de nuestra lengua.

Juan Ramón Jiménez, “El modernismo poético en España y en Hispanoamérica” (168).

¡Diez años de intensa actividad en Madrid! ¡Y qué Madrid el de aquel entonces, qué Atenas a los pies de la sierra carpetovetónica! Alfonso Reyes, *Historia documental de mis libros* (177).

In the year 1900, Raymond Foulché-Delbosc discovered in the National Library in Madrid the Chacón manuscript, a compilation of Luis de Góngora’s poetry that contained nothing less than “la obra de Góngora en su forma definitiva,” as the French hispanist understood it then, and as it has been regarded ever since (1: xii). Two decades later, in 1921, the first modern edition of Góngora’s poetry, *Obras poéticas de d. Luis de Góngora*, edited in Paris by Raymond Foulché-Delbosc, was published in New York by the Hispanic Society of America.¹ Concluding the introductory remarks to this watershed edition of Góngora, Foulché-Delbosc tells us:

Copié el manuscrito Chacón el año de 1900. Al publicarlo tantos años después, la suerte me deparó la amistad de don Alfonso Reyes—a quien considero como el primer gongorista de las nuevas generaciones— el cual no solamente me ha ayudado en una última revisión del manuscrito, sino que ha compartido conmigo la minuciosísima tarea de la corrección de pruebas. A él debo asimismo más de una valiosa sugestión relativa a la inteligencia de ciertas poesías. Me complazco en darle público testimonio de mi agradecimiento. (1: xvi)

To be sure, Foulché's edition of Góngora's poetry was a major international event for twentieth century *gongorismo*, and, in that sense, a professional accomplishment of which Alfonso Reyes felt particularly proud and honored throughout his life. As Reyes himself put it in 1923: "debe considerarse un progreso definitivo en los estudios gongorinos" ("Mi edición del *Polifemo*" 156); or again, in 1926: "[es] la única edición que posee verdadera autoridad crítica" ("Reseña de estudios gongorinos" 110).² The experience of working with the Chacón manuscript in Madrid while Foulché stayed in Paris left Reyes with vivid memories and amusing anecdotes to embellish this story of international collaboration and accomplishment. It was a story that Reyes liked to tell often, describing himself on every occasion as the "humilde albañil" under the "architect" Foulché; a metaphor that aptly conveyed his respect and admiration for the "wise" Foulché, the physical demands of philological labor, and his view of Hispanism as a multilayered effort.³

The story, nonetheless, was first told by the eminent Foulché-Delbosc, who spoke in Spanish and within the field of Hispanism when he asserted in 1921 the primacy of Alfonso Reyes and the generational renewal of *gongorismo*. And considering that the statement came along with the newly edited Chacón manuscript, the latest *sine qua non* of philological *gongorismo*, it should be more than obvious that Reyes's work and stature was an inescapable fact to the members of the soon to be called Generation of 1927, an affiliation of self-baptized and self-promoting "nietos de Góngora" of immense consequence not only for the modern appreciation of Góngora and *gongorismo*, but for Spanish literary historiography as a whole.⁴ Indeed, one can hardly overstate their dual and celebrated identity as poets and philologists. At the time, that was clearly the case: at least until the famous commemoration of Góngora's centennial in 1927, Reyes's commanding place in *gongorismo* was as unavoidable in Spain as it was undisputed. Even in 1926, Miguel Artigas, recent winner of the Spanish Royal Academy prize for his work on Góngora, gives Reyes the title of "secretario perpetuo del club Góngora" ("Review" 343).⁵ Jorge Guillén confesses in December of 1926 to feel ashamed and intimidated "nada menos que ante el primer gongorista de nuestro tiempo" (Maurer 105),⁶ and Dámaso Alonso, acclaimed by the group as "nuestro capitán" (Diego, "Traslación de Góngora" 116), starts his 1927 review of Reyes's recent

work as *gongorista* by referring to him as “el primero que se ha acercado a Góngora con ciencia y ecuánime comprensión” (“Dos trabajos gongorinos de Alfonso Reyes” 718), and concludes by recalling *verbatim* the exact title given by Foulché-Delbosc: “primer gongorista de las nuevas generaciones” (724). This and similar epithets circulated widely in the Spanish cultural scene of the 1920’s, especially in Madrid, Reyes’s own city of residence during a particularly intense and prolific decade as *primer gongorista* (1914–1924), and the site where the strategic plans to commemorate Góngora’s anniversary would famously be drawn up in the Spring of 1926 during one of the informal café gatherings so typical of the cultural life of the city:

Mes de abril de 1926. Una improvisada y amistosa tertulia pone sobre la mesa de un café el tema del Centenario de Góngora. Hay que hacer algo. Y tenemos que hacerlo nosotros. (Gerardo Diego, “Crónica del Centenario” n. pag.)⁷

And yet, the very exclusive club that the Generation of 1927 became—the famous “Sociedad Limitada” (Lara Garrido, “Adiós al Góngora del 27” 322)—never recognized Reyes as one of its full members, let alone as its leader. In fact, when the issue of Reyes’s membership in Góngora’s club was approached, it was argued over and nearly disqualified for reasons that had nothing to do with Reyes’s views on Góngora or any anticipated conflict of interpretation. In the original list of possible contributors to Góngora’s commemoration, Gerardo Diego included Alfonso Reyes against the advice of Dámaso Alonso who, considering the inclusion of the Mexican highly inconvenient and ultimately self-defeating, emphatically stated: “*Creo que se debe prescindir de él desde luego*” (Morelli 45; Alonso’s emphasis).⁸ As Diego explained in his “Crónica del centenario de Góngora,” “se convino en limitarse a artistas españoles y –espiritualmente– jóvenes” (n. pag.). In a letter addressed to Reyes, Diego further explains the “magnífico plan... aclamado por todo el grupo,” and the exceptional character surrounding the final gesture of inclusion:

El centenario *nuestro* tiene el carácter de ser un homenaje de artistas jóvenes (la generación de 1920 ó “de los señoritos” ¡no fuera malo!) españoles. De los cuadernos de Góngora se encargan, de cinco de

ellos, Salinas, Guillén, Dámaso, Cossío y Artigas. Falta 1 que debe ser Vd. Con Artigas y usted se hacen dos excepciones [:] a lo de artistas con el erudito y a lo de españoles –aunque tan “honoris causa”– con el mexicano. Pero ambas, tan honrosas y útiles para nosotros, las ha acordado la asamblea por unanimidad. (Morelli 119; my emphasis)⁹

If the original caveat of Reyes's inclusion may seem ultimately resolved, the aside pairing him with Miguel Artigas and the subsequent *distributio laboris* leaves no doubt, in my opinion, as to their new form of marginality: neither Reyes nor Artigas would be assigned to work on any of the major poems ultimately responsible for Góngora's reputation. Alonso took possession of the *Soledades*, while Guillén and Salinas chose, respectively, the *Octavas* (*Panegírico* and *Polifemo*) and the *Sonnets*, which, in the end, neither of them produced.¹⁰ Given very little choice by Gerardo Diego “entre las *Letrillas* o *Canciones-Décimas-Varia*,” Reyes, in turn, accepted a commitment to produce a new edition of Góngora's *Letrillas*, which he also left unfulfilled. As it happened, Artigas did just the same with his own share of secondary poems, which he half-jokingly renamed *Canciones, Décimas y desperdicios* (Morelli 178).¹¹ As is well known, Diego's *Antología Poética en honor de Góngora desde Lope de Vega a Rubén Darío* was the only homage, out of the six originally planned, to appear in 1927. Out of the six new editions of Góngora's poetry, only two materialized in the end: *Soledades de Góngora* by Dámaso Alonso, and *Romances de Góngora* by José María de Cossío (Soria Olmedo, “Presentación,” 17). After all the fanfare, this output was so meager that Diego himself made light of it in his “Crónica”: “Los 4 tomos restantes de poesías de Góngora estarán impresos –dado el escrúpulo y el pudor de Guillén y Salinas, de Reyes y Artigas– para el IV Centenario de don Luis, en el año 2027” (n. pag.).

As far as we can tell, Reyes did not show much enthusiasm for working on the *Letrillas*, which he turned in “con cuentagotas,” as Diego put it to Guillén (Morelli 32), missing several deadlines, and ultimately, without producing even the brief prologue Diego was willing to accept from any of the procrastinators by September of 1927:

¿Y las *Letrillas*? He recibido en sucesivos envíos hasta *Oh qué vimo, Mangalena* (1619). Es urgente que me mande Vd. el resto y el prólogo

que puede ser todo lo breve –o lo largo– que Vd. quiera. Ya había visto el de Cossío que no puede ser más discreto. (Morelli 139)¹²

Instead, what Reyes worked on and did in fact publish just in time for the 1927 celebration was *Cuestiones gongorinas*, acclaimed by Azorín as the “vademécum de todo gongorista”:¹³ a collection, published in Madrid by Espasa Calpe, of all the articles on Góngora written during his years living in the city. Reyes, in other words, had enough material on the poet to fill an entire book well before the members of the Generation could produce a single edition. This was clearly a fully independent act of commemoration, strategically located, as it were, inside Spain but outside “nuestro Góngora” or “nuestro centenario.”¹⁴ Regarding the question of *gongorismo*, *Cuestiones gongorinas* resolves the issue of expertise and inclusion for Reyes as much as for Miguel Artigas:

Hace tiempo que pensaba reunir estos trabajos y el próximo aniversario de Góngora (muerto el 23 de mayo de 1627) me anima al fin a realizar el proyecto Sé que las apreciaciones literarias que hay en este volumen van como ahogadas por el fárrago erudito; pero no he querido hacer un libro ameno (tiempo habrá para todo), sino un libro documental Todos estos trabajos son anteriores a la obra fundamental de Miguel Artigas, *Don Luis de Góngora y Argote, biografía y estudio crítico*, que ha venido a refundir cuanto se había escrito sobre la materia, añadiendo copiosos descubrimientos eruditos. (11)

The timing of *Cuestiones gongorinas*—as well as its proud display of academic rigor and Spanish pedigree—has yet to be addressed as Reyes’s reaction to the Generation of 1927’s misgivings. A major part of the problem is that the impulse to distance or subordinate Reyes has been reproduced even among the most knowledgeable critics. An expert on Reyes like Robert Conn, for example, anachronistically places his *gongorismo* in the 1920’s as resulting from his embrace of Dámaso Alonso’s not yet formulated school of stylistics (29).¹⁵ And Soria Olmedo, to give another telling example, makes the mistake of situating in Paris the work on Góngora that Reyes wrote and published in Madrid:

En paralelo avanzaba la erudición y el gusto de Alfonso Reyes, el diplomático y poeta mejicano, que antes de trasladarse a Madrid escribió en París, entre 1915 y 1925, una serie de ensayos luego reunidos en *Cuestiones gongorinas* de 1927. (“Góngora 1627-1927” 35-36)¹⁶

If we consider that Reyes, unlike Artigas, shared with most members of the “Góngora F. C. (Góngora Football Club)” their most relevant identity trait of being poet-professors, the debate over Reyes’s membership in the club appears to be rather contradictory.¹⁷ How could Alfonso Reyes be excluded from the *sancta sanctorum* of *gongorismo*? Why was *gongorismo* turned into such a Spanish national affair by the Generation of 1927? And why has Góngora’s celebration in 1927 turned out to be, more than a *non-sequitur* for Alfonso Reyes, the occasion of the Mexican writer’s near disappearance from our view of *gongorismo* in contemporary Spain?

The displacement of Alfonso Reyes to the periphery of “nuestro centenario” highlights some of the major questions concerning the Generation of 1927 and its impact on the modern appreciation of Góngora and the definition of *gongorismo*. Considering that Rubén Darío was widely perceived to be the origin of the modern cult of Góngora in Spanish, the stature of Alfonso Reyes as “primer gongorista de las nuevas generaciones” meant a new form of primacy that clearly pointed to the dominance of Latin America in the narrative of contemporary poetics. Thanks to Foulché, who had carefully made his own discovery of the Chacón manuscript coincide with the inaugural year of 1900, Reyes was widely heralded as leader of a new wave, the avant-garde of *gongorismo*, just as Rubén Darío before him was seen as leader of its first wave. As Miguel Artigas tells us: “En Rubén y por Rubén comenzó la adoración de los poetas modernos españoles por el viejo y denigrado Góngora” (*Góngora y el gongorismo* 6-7).¹⁸ I would like, then, to explore the anxiety that the Latin American origin of *gongorismo* caused in Spain in both its poetic and philological dimensions. I consider it key for understanding the highly opportunistic, theatrical and ephemeral battle for Góngora orchestrated in 1927 by the so-called Generation. Moreover, it provides a different angle from which to approach the ongoing polemics about its arbitrary membership, its contrived identity, or the most uncomfortable issues concerning the depth, originality and commitment of its *gongorismo*.¹⁹ I want

to show that the attempt to turn Góngora’s commemoration into “nuestro centenario” was a reactionary intervention in literary history born of sheer nationalist pride, which achieved, on the one hand, the normalization of Góngora as a viable icon of Spanish national identity and, on the other, the appropriation of Modernism within the native legacy of *gongorismo*. To do this, we need to go back to the beginning.

Reyes and Góngora before 1927. Mexico-Paris (1910-13)

Escaping from the revolutionary turmoil of his native Mexico, Alfonso Reyes arrived in Paris in 1913 and immediately approached Raymond Foulché-Delbosc. Their relationship was so absorbing for Reyes that his friend Pedro Henríquez Ureña had to frequently scold him for forgetting that he was, after all, in twentieth century Paris, the very heart of European modernity, and not in the dusty Spanish library of Foulché-Delbosc.²⁰ But meeting and working with Foulché was no accident of history and exile; on the contrary, it was a result of Reyes’s already proven devotion to classical Hispanic literature. It was also the beginning of a dream that could only be realized, perhaps, in his condition of expatriate: the dream of dedicating *trabajos y días* only to literature. This in fact happened very soon thereafter in 1914, when his diplomatic post in Paris vanished at the beginning of the Great War and Reyes, still unwilling to return to Mexico, decided to leave for Madrid. Nor was Reyes’s commitment to Góngora the result of a first-hand fascination with Europe, Foulché-Delbosc, or the Chacón manuscript. Included in his “Correspondencia entre Raymond Foulché-Delbosc y Alfonso Reyes” is a postcard dated October 12, 1911, in which the French hispanist acknowledges receipt of *Cuestiones estéticas*, an eclectic collection of essays on the aesthetic transcendence of the classical, humanist tradition. Among them is the article “Sobre la estética de Góngora,” Reyes’s first venture into Hispanism and, undoubtedly, a major impetus for their mutual admiration and future collaboration.²¹ By 1913, just before their first meeting in Paris, Foulché could address Reyes as a fellow *gongorista* and a read and admired author: “... et j’aurais plaisir à vous remercier de vive voix et à vous féliciter d’être l’auteur des *Cuestiones estéticas* que j’ai lue naguère avec le plu vif intérêt” (46).²²

Cuestiones estéticas is Alfonso Reyes’s first published book, and

according to the friendly prologue by Francisco García Calderón, his first attempt as “paladín del ‘arielismo’ en América,” which he defines as “el ideal español, la armonía griega, el legado latino, en un país amenazado por turbias plutocracias” (12). “Sobre la estética de Góngora” was originally a paper delivered at the center of Mexican *arielismo*, the *Ateneo de la Juventud de México*, in January of 1910, a momentous year in Mexican history, marking both the centenary of Mexican independence from Spain and the beginning of the Revolution. Under the circumstances, Reyes’s aesthetic interest in Góngora needs to be read in the context of “a stage of feverish nationalist affirmation that tended toward the telluric and autochthonous cultural roots” (Oviedo 383). Góngora, a major representative of the Spanish colonial past, had been a hot topic of identity politics since independence for conservative and liberal thinkers alike, having been particularly desecrated by the latter as the *ür*-representative of Spanish colonial decrepitude.²³ With a century-long tradition of post-colonial thought, Góngora’s iconic value was a Mexican staple, and one not necessarily devoid of a positive reading, as was the case in Spain. By 1910, thanks to the French Symbolists and to Rubén Darío in particular, Góngora had also become a direct link to European modernity: an icon that Reyes would use for all its worth in opposition to the current vogue of folkloric Mexicanism.

“Sobre la estética de Góngora” starts by questioning the long established critical tradition of explaining Góngora in negative terms, and sets out to do exactly the opposite: “reivindicar el mérito positivo de tantos incomparables versos que debemos al cordobés” (61). Reyes’s prose is rich in images and deserves ample quotation:

... el verdadero deber crítico exige ya urgentes rectificaciones. Pues todo aquel hacinamiento de errores que la rutina ha amontonado sobre Góngora parece quiste incrustado en un organismo vivo; parece un islote que se cristalizase en el mismo corazón del mar y se mantuviera contra la fluidez de las olas por no sé cual milagro de resistencia. (61)

To vindicate Góngora, Reyes starts by using the unlikely authority of Menéndez Pelayo, “príncipe de la crítica española” (63)—not for his proverbial intolerance of Góngora (which Reyes does not even

mention), but for his dismissal of any social, historical or religious criteria to explain the aesthetic phenomenon. The immediate result of this move is the rejection of both *culteranismo* and *conceptismo* as symptoms of an artistic decadence exclusive to Spain: “porque la historia nos enseña—concludes Menéndez Pelayo in the quote chosen by Reyes—que semejantes vicios artísticos no fueron peculiares de España, sino que un poco antes o un poco después, y en algunas partes al mismo tiempo, hicieron pródiga ostentación de sus venenosas flores en todas las literaturas de Europa” (65). Having established these pan-European origins, Reyes proceeds to trace the positive and defining qualities of Góngora’s lyricism in all kinds of verses, from the most simple or popular to the most representative of his *culteranismo*:

... en estos primeros versos ya luce lo único que había de ser su cualidad perdurable —la elegancia, la pureza artística, el anhelo de aristocrática perfección, que hacen de cada uno de sus versos, aislados, maravillas de belleza en tantas ocasiones, y de donde había de surgir para los poetas españoles todo deseo de perfección aristocrática y todo odio a los lugares comunes... (70-1).

Reyes lines up verses from different *romances* and *letrillas* and insists: “De muy atrás se venían ya revelando las cualidades definitivas de Góngora” (75). Timidly but surely, Reyes was confronting the chronological division of Góngora’s poetry years before the Chacón manuscript could be used as the ultimate evidence to discredit it. Instead of the “two Góngoras” established by tradition and recently exhumed by the French Symbolists in their cult of “le plus grand poète maudit des lettres espagnoles” (Dehennin 3), Reyes claimed a single, evolving Góngora deeply rooted in the aristocratic tradition of the lyric, and therefore, deeply rooting Hispanic culture within it.²⁴ For Reyes, in other words, Góngora was a solid classic more than a modern misfit and, metonymically speaking, the same had to be said about contemporary *gongorismo*, and about Latin American culture in general. In this sense, Reyes reasserts the positive and defining legacy of Góngora and *gongorismo* in Latin America—the relevance of its colonial past to its modernist present—while pushing away at the same time that “mental Gallicism” which Juan Valera lamented in Rubén Darío and served no other purpose, in Reyes’s mind, than to alienate Latin America from

any form of tradition and continuity with Spain.²⁵ On this point, Reyes is more clear than ever in a personal letter written in 1932 to Héctor Pérez Martínez, who had made a similar allegation in *El Nacional* to reproach Reyes's interest in Góngora as the same old French snobbery or "evidente falta de vinculación de México" (Enríquez Perea 152):

¡Por los dioses! Góngora jamás ha influido en la literatura francesa Góngora sólo fue practicado en Francia por los filólogos y eruditos de historia literaria Pero nunca Góngora ha llegado a nadie a través de las letras francesas En fin: todo esto se lo cuento para conversar con usted sobre asuntos que son de mi afición. Pero no diga que Góngora ha sido influencia francesa en México. Quien sabe si lo contrario sea más verdadero. ¿Sabía usted que yo he sido el albañil de la magna edición de Foulché-Delbosc, y que ésta no hubiera llegado jamás a publicarse si no llego yo a estar en Europa y obligar al sabio editor? (Enríquez Perea 68-70)

Spain (1914-1924)

Tomás Navarro Tomás, Reyes's friend and colleague at the *Centro de Estudios Históricos*, had these years in mind when he summoned the memory of the late Reyes in two simple epithets: "el comentador de Góngora y admirador de Mallarmé" (335).²⁶ Perhaps the best way to capture the transcendence of Reyes's gongorism in Madrid is with the revealing testimony of José Bergamín—one of the participants in the famous commemoration of Góngora in Seville—who recalls Reyes's house in Madrid as the very site where Góngora's "sacred name" first stirred his generation:

Así recuerdo aquel rincón de su casa en la calle Serrano en Madrid, donde se iniciaba la revista *Índice* (con Enrique Díez Canedo y Juan Ramón Jiménez) Allí sonó y resonó para mí, con su apocalíptico destello luminoso y sombrío a la vez, el relampagueante nombre sagrado de Góngora, que acogerían como una bandera o banderola, provocativa y llameante, nuestros juveniles afanes literarios. (Valender 30)²⁷

In many ways, the fortunes of the journal *Índice* paralleled those of the editing of the Chacón manuscript, with the imposing name of Juan

Ramón Jiménez replacing that of Raymond Foulché-Delbosc in the insidious effacement of Reyes. Founded in 1921, *Índice* actually began as a successful joint venture, even if Reyes’s presence has practically vanished from most expert accounts, which regularly refer to it as “la revista de Juan Ramón” (Soria Olmedo, “Góngora 1627-1927,” 35).²⁸ In fact, *Índice* was more plural and inclusive than we have been led to believe, and this was made unequivocally clear from its opening number:

Its editors are writers and artists of the most distinct tendencies. Spaniards and Spanish Americans, united only by the common interest of the exaltation of the spirit and by pleasure in beautiful things. (Aponte 130)²⁹

Leaving aside this proclamation of transatlantic unity and plurality for the moment, we should point out that *Índice*’s role in the development of the Generation has been considered nothing less than crucial. Thus, just as the commemoration of Góngora in 1927 is said to have given the Generation its identity card, *Índice* is commonly imagined as its birthplace.³⁰ Indeed, José Bergamín points directly to “la significativa revista *Índice*” to locate the historical appearance of his group of writers (9). As Aponte notes, Federico García Lorca and Jorge Guillén “really began their literary careers in *Índice*” (130). Inasmuch as Juan Ramon Jiménez is deemed a major influence in the development of the group—as its first leading model (Díez de Revenga, *Los poetas del 27* 13), or as a “padre espiritual de todos ellos” (Rogelio Reyes 171)—, so then should Reyes be considered the origin, at the very least, of any interest they would develop in Góngora as a forerunner of avant-garde poetics. Juan Ramón himself made this clear: “Todos los jóvenes me deben algo, pero no ciertamente el gongorismo. ¿De dónde viene concretamente todo esto? Alfonso Reyes aquí, Cassou, Valéry Larbaud allá, [eran] los impulsores” (“¿Gongorismo?,” 129).

With all these pieces in place, *Índice* certainly offers ample evidence of Reyes’s gongorism and its ascendance within the Generation. First of all, it was *Índice* that pioneered, among other things, the inclusion of Golden Age poetry, a practice “que fue seguida puntualmente por todas las publicaciones periódicas relacionables con la generación del 27” (Díez de Revenga, *Los poetas del 27* 15), namely, *Litoral*, *Verso y*

Prosa, and *Carmen*.³¹ Secondly, it was in *Índice*'s first "suplemento humorístico," *La rosa de papel*, where Reyes and Enrique Díez Canedo published in 1921 their most polemic and seminal "burla literaria:" an apocryphal epistolary exchange between Góngora and el Greco. Introduced by Reyes and Díez Canedo as a mock divination of Cubist and Impressionist aesthetics, this piece is particularly noteworthy because it was—much to the authors' amusement—denounced as fraudulent by the critic Julio Cejador y Frauca, who took it seriously.³²

Índice and its iconoclastic "burlas literarias" "enlivened the cultural life of Madrid" while stimulating debate on the relevance of the canon and the modernity of the Baroque (Aponte 132). It also set an example very closely followed by Gerardo Diego, who gave a similar dual identity to his own poetic magazines: the serious *Carmen* and the irreverent and mischievous *Lola*, its "amiga y suplemento," in whose first two numbers appeared the satiric "Crónica del Centenario." As is well known, Reyes and Díez Canedo were fully responsible for these "burlas literarias;" but not so Juan Ramón Jiménez, who was not exactly known for his light sense of humor or his harmless wit. Their tone of mischief and laughter as much as their success in the ensuing embarrassment of Cejador y Frauca should stand as a source of inspiration for the bizarre program of festivities celebrated on the night of Góngora's anniversary (May 23rd). In fact, the main events of the night were conceived less to honor the poet than to taunt the academic establishment, with Cejador y Frauca figuring prominently.³³

Still, the embarrassment caused by the apocryphal exchange between Góngora and el Greco may run deeper as an inspiration for the campaign for Góngora in 1927. According to Reyes and Díez Canedo, the motivation for the fake epistolary was the avid interest in novelty, not of their Spanish readers, but of "Ozenfast, director de 'L'Esprit Nouveau', a moción del poeta chileno Vicente Huidobro" (258). Unfortunately, this possible source of embarrassment has all but disappeared from most accounts, as tends to happen to the agency and wit of Alfonso Reyes:

... la apertura de la España finisecular "a los vientos europeos" trae consigo el renovado interés por el Greco y por Góngora. Si ya en 1894 Santiago Rusiñol pasea en procesión un Greco por las calles de Sitges..., en 1921 ambos quedarán asociados como "precursores del

cubismo” en las páginas de *Índice*, la revista de Juan Ramón. (Soria Olmedo, “Presentación” 15)³⁴

Reyes’s effective sense of humor is just one aspect of his influence as *Índice*’s gongorista. In 1923, Reyes published a beautiful new edition of Góngora’s *Fábula de Polifemo y Galatea* in the elegant *Biblioteca de Índice*, which he had inaugurated in 1921 with his *Visión de Anáhuac*. This in turn inspired the most serious and professional project of the 1927 celebration: the plan to propagate Góngora’s poetry in the six new editions that were to appear in *Revista de Occidente*.³⁵ The stated goal of Reyes’s *Polifemo* was to make Góngora’s poetry accesible to the lay public by producing a text fully but invisibly grounded in Foulché-Delbosc’s edition and, more generally, in his “autoridad de un gongorista, como crítico de la literatura y de los textos de Góngora” (“Mi edición del *Polifemo*,” 156).³⁶ As Diego would later put it: “...no se evita recurrir a la ed. F[oulché]. D[elbosc].... La edición crítica con todo el aparato de variantes, notas, índices, etc. quédese para quien deba” (Morelli 53).³⁷

Now that Jorge Guillén’s doctoral dissertation of 1925, *Notas para una edición comentada de Góngora*, has finally been exhumed, we are in a position to know that Guillén relied explicitly on Reyes’s edition of the *Polifemo* (Guillén 23), while appropriating one of Reyes’s main ideas without attribution: namely, the call to give more consideration to Góngora’s contemporary commentators—like Pellicer or Salcedo Coronel—than to the calligraphist of the Chacón manuscript (Reyes, “Mi edición del *Polifemo*” 156; Guillén 21).³⁸ This could perhaps explain not only Guillén’s unwillingness to publish the dissertation, but also his refusal to share it with Reyes, who had repeatedly requested of Guillén the favor of consulting a copy: “... mi pobre tesis gongorina es tan precaria, tan floja y flaca, tan provisional, tan avergonzante, que no se atreve a presentarse nada menos que ante el primer gongorista de nuestro tiempo” (Maurer 105).³⁹ Interestingly, when Reyes reprinted “Necesidad de volver a los comentaristas” (1920) in *Cuestiones gongorinas*, he added this footnote: “En vano he procurado del poeta Jorge Guillén que de a la estampa un estudio semejante que —sé yo— tiene acabado de hace algún tiempo” (151).

The originality of Guillén’s dissertation, as much as its mysterious disappearance, is a topic that merits a study of its own.⁴⁰ For now, I would simply argue that Guillén’s “Notas” do little more than exhume

for an academic tribunal what Reyes had chosen to keep unseen by the general public. With that, Guillén qualified for an opening at the University of Murcia, gaining both the academic authority that was to be so defining of his poetic generation, as well as the attention and respect of Reyes himself, who already admired him as a poet and repeatedly tried to approach him as a fellow *gongorista* and a fellow editor of the *Polifemo*.⁴¹ For all this, it is uncanny to remember Reyes's assessment of *Índice* in his letter in homage to Juan Ramón Jiménez: "In the year 1921, Juan Ramón and I founded together the magazine *Índice*, the first literary home of some young men, now teachers" (Aponte 151).⁴²

Spain 1927

Considering the trauma of 1898, the perception of decadence, and the widespread calls for reconstruction and regeneration, the appeal of Reyes' approach to Góngora in Spain represents the possibility to retroactively extract the idea of decadence, decline or isolation from the legacy of the Spanish Empire. Since the eighteenth century, Góngora had been considered the exact opposite of the equilibrium and beauty of the Renaissance. He was rather the very symbol of Spanish imperial decadence, the very expression of Spain's difference and abnormality. Menéndez Pelayo highlighted these aspects in his unforgiving assessment of Góngora; and they are the same ones that the French Symbolists exploited in their admiration of the strange and decadent writer. They ultimately also explain why most members of the Generation of 1898 shied away or recanted from an open admiration of the poet in their agonistic quest for less afflicted or deprived "señas de identidad." If by an extreme metonymic selection, Góngora was capable of representing the ailments of the Spanish Empire, or, more recently, the decadence of the entire Western civilization, who better than Góngora to exorcize such demons? Reading Góngora, all of Góngora, inside the aristocratic tradition of the Renaissance amounted to undertaking such exorcisms.

To this end, one can hardly overemphasize that the main lines of Reyes's interpretation of Góngora are basically what most experts of the Generation consider to be, in the words of Rogelio Reyes, "la tesis oficial de los del 27 sobre la existencia de un sólo Góngora y su oposición rotunda a esa dicotomía artificial de 'el Góngora bueno y el malo, el

claro y el obscuro, el ángel de la luz y el ángel de las tinieblas” (174).⁴³ Indeed, if we compare Alfonso Reyes’s earliest essay on Góngora, “Sobre la estética de Góngora” of 1910, and Dámaso Alonso’s first monumental work as *gongorista*, *La lengua poética de Góngora* of 1927, the number of similarities are as numerous as they are relevant: both refute the established notion that the popular vein of Góngora’s poetry—the Góngora *castizo*—is less unnatural than his *culteranista* poems and, therefore, more legitimate; both claim Góngora’s lyric poetry in its totality as the “exhibit A” of European high culture, and both claim it as a tradition perfectly coherent with their present.

La lengua poética de Góngora, awarded no less than the “Premio Nacional de Literatura” in 1927, begins by confronting the critical tradition in a way that, perhaps less poetically, immediately recalls “Sobre la estética de Góngora:”

Espero... probar la falsedad de la separación tradicional en el arte de Góngora y cómo en el poeta de las obras más “claras” está en potencia el autor de las *Soledades* y el *Polifemo* Al ir estudiando por separado cada una de las principales notas distintivas de la poesía gongorina, irá resaltando esta verdad, y nosotros procuraremos ponerla de manifiesto una vez y otra vez... porque cuando un mito literario se ha fosilizado tanto como el presente, todo esfuerzo para destruirlo resulta pequeño. (20)⁴⁴

Like Reyes, Alonso insists on the need to see Góngora’s work in its entirety as a positive and not a negative value—“No es defecto, es un valor positivo de la poesía de Góngora” (127)—, and tries to discredit the old division by showing first the unnatural quality of the so-called “first epoque” (25-48). Unlike Reyes, Alonso has the evidence of the Chacón manuscript to assert the lack of any chronological basis for the division. Unlike Reyes as well, Alonso has a strong personal tendency to be categorical, ironic, and confrontational (29; 33; 48; 146). The conclusion to the study is a case in point:

Nada más normal... que el desarrollo de la lírica de Góngora. Nada más normal que su producción a la zaga del Renacimiento. La misma ley que explica todo su estilo (intensificación y acumulación de elementos propios anteriores) explica también sus relaciones con la lírica renacentista, y así, por lo que respecta al léxico y al uso

sintáctico, podemos ya anunciar... que *el gongorismo es la síntesis y la condensación intensificada de la lírica del Renacimiento*, es decir, *la síntesis española de la tradición poética grecolatina*. (235; Alonso's emphasis)

In other words, "Góngora es profundamente fiel a la tradición del Renacimiento; no es, en este sentido, un innovador" (237). The classical ascendancy and normality of Góngora is a point Alonso repeated often in most of his works from 1927. In his review of Reyes' *Cuestiones gongorinas*, for example, Alonso states: "Góngora, revolucionario, como todo creador de una nueva forma artística, es, por otra parte, el más conservador de nuestros poetas Es decir, todo lo contrario de lo que se pensaba (sin motivo) hacia 1900" ("Dos trabajos gongorinos de Alfonso Reyes" 717). In "Escila y Caribdis de la literatura española" we have the same idea in a slightly different phrasing: "Unamos ahora la figura de Góngora a toda la línea de la poesía lírica del Siglo de Oro... y veremos que tenemos un magnífico desarrollo lírico que ocupa todo el siglo XVI y XVII" (248). Contrasting Góngora to Mallarmé, Alonso states: "Góngora es una última evolución de lo clásico; Mallarmé de lo romántico" ("Góngora y la literatura contemporánea" 741). Even in 1928, when Alonso famously recanted in name of the entire group—"Góngora no es nuestro poeta, ni menos *el poeta*" ("Alusión y elusión," 338; Alonso's emphasis), he insisted: "...dentro de la literatura grecolatinizante, nuestra admiración por el autor de las *Soledades* no tiene límites, ni él, en lo técnico, rival" (337). Other members of the Generation repeated the lesson as well, such as Lorca, who in a softer tone stated: "Góngora tuvo una gran cultura clásica y esto le dio fe en sí mismo" (234).⁴⁵

"Por un clavo se pierde un reino" is the way Alonso put it in one of the pieces from 1927, "Escila y Caribdis de la literatura española" (249), referring precisely to the real and multiple consequences that were to come from wielding Góngora's aristocratic and ultraconservative Greco-Latin legacy as a weapon against Spanish difference, Spanish belatedness, Spanish lack, or Spanish folkloric exoticism and local color:⁴⁶

España, dentro del cuadro europeo, es una nación excepcional. Los extranjeros siempre, pero en especial desde que el romanticismo puso de moda lo exótico y lo colorista, han buscado el pintoresquismo

español. Y lo pintoresco español no se encontraba (a primera vista) en géneros como la lírica del Siglo de Oro, la cual, por ser de tradición grecolatina produjo obras de tono y tema en general semejantes a las de otras naciones de Europa, especialmente de Italia De esta conjunción se han extendido por el mundo ideas absolutamente erróneas, como la de la insignificancia de la lírica española La crítica española parece no haberse dado cuenta de que en contra de esta limitación de los valores hispánicos ella debía haber exaltado lo universal y selecto de la literatura de España. Porque el extranjero que se entusiasma con el popularismo español va a buscar lo barbaramente primitivo, reduciendo nuestra literatura a poco más que un arte de indios o de negros. (246)

“Escila y Caribdis de la literatura española” is the talk Alonso gave in Seville, when the famous photograph of the Generation was taken. Interestingly enough, it is a talk whose content is rarely remembered along with the photo or any of the many other brilliant mementos of Góngora’s tricentennial.⁴⁷ As we can see, Alonso claims the Europeanism of Góngora not only as the rightful legacy of Spain, but as a higher, more select dignity from which to achieve the cleaning and whitening of Spain’s cultural identity. Góngora, in other words, belongs to Spain, Spain belongs in Europe, and the ripple effect cannot but be felt on the other side of the Atlantic. Implicitly, Alonso proposes a vindication of Spain’s Imperial power; sometimes, explicitly too:

Hay un imperio español A ese imperio español debe corresponder un idioma, un idioma poético, noble, solemne, pomposo, puro Y todo el esfuerzo de Góngora será la creación de una lengua poética española imperial y universal” (*La lengua poética de Góngora* 123)

Certainly, if the appreciation of Góngora as a European classic gave the Generation of 1927 the superiority of an imperial aristocratic lineage to display in international circles, the same dynamic was directly applied, as it had to be, to the assessment of Rubén Darío’s impact on the present. “Por un clavo se pierde un reino” indeed. Becoming “nietos de Góngora” or direct inheritors of his European legacy meant, among other things, no longer being “hijos de Darío.” This is a major intervention in literary history, and its main design was, once again,

advanced by Dámaso Alonso in 1927 in his “Góngora y la literatura contemporánea:”

Rubén Darío aprendió en los simbolistas la admiración por Góngora y a través de Rubén se difunde por los medios literarios españoles más despiertos del principio de este siglo. Admiración profundamente *snob*, injustificada. Sí, desde luego. Pero la moderna generación literaria, los nuevos que en 1927 celebran el homenaje a Góngora, que son los primeros que... tienen motivos serios, externos, e internos, para poder interpretar y admirar al autor del *Polifemo*, no pueden prescindir de reconocer esta prehistoria del entusiasmo gongorino de nuestros días. (733)

Alonso portrays Darío's gongorismo as a passing fad or a pose mimicking the French poets who did not speak or understand Spanish—all the more unforgivable for a native speaker. For Alonso, the paternity of Darío's *gongorismo* is a myth that only needs a bit of critical dissection to disappear into thin air:

Porque ¿qué fue el gongorismo de Rubén Darío? Los mitos literarios se forman ante nuestros ojos: tal creo yo que ocurre con éste. Constantemente cuando se habla del poeta de Nicaragua, se cita como precursor a Góngora. ¿Hasta qué punto influyó en Darío? Hay algo en la obra de Rubén que pruebe una lectura detenida, un conocimiento de la técnica gongorina, una admiración profunda del poeta de la *Marcha Triunfal* por el de las *Soledades*? (744)

Of course, after a painstaking search for Góngora's influence in Darío's poetry, he answers “no” to all these questions: Rubén “no revela un gran conocimiento” (748), “la poesía de éste no se parece en nada a la de Góngora” (749), and, Alonso concludes, “su gongorismo no existe” (750). As Alberti would put it: “El Góngora nuestro, el que habíamos hecho revivir, convivir con nosotros en todo instante, era muy distinto a las generaciones anteriores, incluso a la de Rubén Darío, pues aunque ésta también tenía el suyo, era un Góngora bastante superficial, oído casi a la ligera” (“Don Luis de Góngora o el primor de lo barroco” 130).

Only a few steps need to be taken from here to Pedro Salinas' famous article of 1934, “El problema del modernismo en España, o un conflicto entre dos espíritus;” an article of extreme nationalistic views

which soon became historiographical dogma in Spain.⁴⁸ As Salinas clearly proves in the conclusion to this study, the denaturalization of Modernism was the logical result of the normalization of Góngora; the best antidote against Rubén Darío’s conquest:

Se dio por supuesto que el modernismo era la expresión cabal de lo que la nueva generación quería en la literatura, y se dijo que América había conquistado España Y nuestra poesía española tomó otro rumbo. Aunque esto se salga de mi tema, si se me preguntara cuál es ese camino divergente del modernismo, yo contestaría que no es otro que el de la gran tradición poética viva, no académica, española, la de Garcilaso y Góngora, San Juan de la Cruz y Bécquer Porque no hay duda de que los tres poetas mayores de la España reciente, Jorge Guillén, Federico García Lorca y Alberti, aunque sean beneficiarios de la herencia modernista, en distinto grado, atienden desde su poesía muchísimo más al son del Romancero, a la música refinada de los Cancioneros o de Góngora, a las pastorales platónicas o místicas de Garcilaso o San Juan de la Cruz, que a las cantarinas seducciones de aquellas sirenas parisienses con quienes Rubén Darío bebía champaña... (24-25)

There was no one more opposed to this view than Juan Ramón Jiménez, who defended the pivotal role of Rubén Darío to the end, and suspected (correctly) that the Generation of 1927’s campaign for Góngora was not just historiographically wrong, but secretly deceitful:

No podemos aceptar que [la poesía española contemporánea empieza] en Góngora o San Juan de la Cruz o Garcilaso o los Cancioneros o el Romancero, como algunos pretenden para complicar el asunto o por secreta conveniencia, por la sencilla razón de que no son contemporáneos nuestros efectivos. (“Crisis del espíritu,” 212)

How ironic that it was Alfonso Reyes who made Góngora and *gongorismo* fashionable and its normalization possible in the Spain of the 1920’s. Apparently, Reyes’s prodigious erudition also made it an affront to national honor: if Góngora was no longer an extravagant poet or a recent import from France thanks to Reyes, he still was, precisely thanks to Reyes and more than ever before, a product of Latin America.

To be sure, claims for rehabilitation and protests of historical

injustice are by now a commonplace in Reyes criticism, and ironically recall his own fight and his own reasoning regarding the centrality of Góngora as a Latin American author and part of a Latin American tradition.⁴⁹ In “A vuelta de correo,” his open letter to Héctor Pérez Martínez, Reyes defended the authenticity of his *gongorismo* with the logic of a very simple syllogism: he was all the more Mexican precisely because of his work and devotion to Góngora; and Góngora was all the more Mexican because Reyes, a Mexican, and many Mexicans before him, were or chose to be *gongoristas*: “... a Góngora –cuyas relaciones con la tradición americana están, por otra parte, ya establecidas– lo hemos convertido hasta cierto punto en *cosa nuestra*, desde que algo contribuimos, con varios años de trabajo, a la reivindicación de su poesía” (Enríquez Perea 152; my emphasis).⁵⁰ If continuity with Spain and the classical tradition was key to Reyes’s understanding of Latin American culture, it was only the will to study it, teach it, and cultivate it that in his view would prove, first and foremost, the humanist imperative of Mexicans and Spaniards alike to observe the Delphic oracle (“Pasado Inmediato” 311), and subsequently, the maturity and parity of true post-colonial independence.⁵¹ Fully aware of the nationalist sentiments and resentments his work sparked on both sides of the Atlantic, Reyes never claimed Góngora’s legacy as the given right of any Mexican, but as the logical result of his own inclination, his own work, and his own achievements and merits, very prominent among them that of “albañil” of Foulché’s edition in Madrid.

Should we continue, then, to judge Góngora’s “centenario de fuego,” the foundational event of the Generation of 1927, as a success, for a rationale that was so short-lived, for a series of goals it never met, and for a perspective that was by no means original? Why not judge the event for what actual successes it had? The strategic importance of the revival of Góngora needs to be analyzed according to its impact regarding the legacy of Empire and its loss in 1898, the notion of Spanish decadence, and the vision of Spanish modernity and *gongorismo* as recent imports from Latin America. With this in mind, the celebration of Góngora’s centenary was indeed a consequential success in contemporary literary historiography for two important reasons. First, because it offered a positive light from which to vindicate Spain’s *Siglo de Oro* as a single, integrative whole encompassing two long centuries of Spanish imperial history; a major feat, perhaps, but

also an extremely selective and reductive approach from which Spanish literary history has yet to recover. And second, because it restored to the present the literary legacy of the Spanish Empire, extolled in Dámaso Alonso's perception of a second Golden Age: “Podemos estar contentos: hemos tenido la suerte de vivir en un período áureo de la literatura de España” (Alonso, “Una generación poética” 676).

NOTES

¹ Foulché had formed a life friendship with its founder, Archer M. Huntington, whose generosity gave him the leisure, among other endeavors, to continue editing the *Revue Hispanique*, the journal Foulché-Delbosc founded in 1894 and which the Hispanic Society had published since 1905. Foulché was on the advisory board of the Hispanic Society along with two other Europeans: Fitzmaurice Kelly and Menéndez Pelayo. For an account of his relationship with Huntington, see Krappe.

² Both these studies were collected in his 1927 *Cuestiones gongorinas*.

³ “Me relacioné con Raymond Foulché-Delbosc, el sabio director de la *Revue Hispanique*, a mi llegada a París, 1913, y comencé a darle algunas colaboraciones Años después, cuando yo ya me encontraba en Madrid, tuve la suerte de ayudarlo, en calidad de humilde albañil –pues él, desde Francia, era el arquitecto–, para la edición monumental de las obras de Góngora, fundada en el manuscrito Chacón, que el poeta dejó preparado a su muerte. Góngora nunca llegó a publicar en vida una colección de sus poemas. Añadimos todas las cartas del poeta que hasta entonces se conocían, y creo que hemos dejado una edición ‘básica’” (Preface to his “Correspondencia entre Raymond Foulché-Delbosc y Alfonso Reyes” 43-4). The most flavorful anecdotes of this story can be found in “El reverso de un libro”: “Yo frecuentaba sobre todo la sala de manuscritos. Para calentarme las manos entre una y otra copia, y más cuando confrontaba con los tres gruesos y espléndidos volúmenes del manuscrito Chacón las pruebas de la edición gongorina que, desde París, dirigía Raymond Foulché Delbosc y de que yo era el albañil, descubrí unos aparatitos japoneses que... ardían a fuego lento y sin humo. Aun así, la tarea manual era dura, pues aquellos volúmenes de vitela soberbiamente empastados se cerraban solos como un estuche de resorte. Había que dejar la mano izquierda puesta sobre el libro abierto, como en un juramento zurdo, mientras la derecha se las arreglaba como podía para escribir y sujetar a un tiempo el papel. No bastaban las dos manos y más de una vez tuve que pedir los auxilios de mi esposa” (96-7). See also Reyes's letter of 1932 to Héctor Pérez Martínez that appears later in this paper.

⁴ “Nietos de Góngora” comes from Gerardo Diego's famous “Epístola a Alberti,” which appeared in *Verso y Prosa* in February of 1927. It is one of the key texts selected by Gabrielle Morelli in *Gerardo Diego y el III centenario de Góngora*, from

which I quote (193).

⁵ Artigas, director of the Menéndez Pelayo library and editor of its *Boletín*, was awarded the prize in 1925 for *Luis de Góngora y Argote: Bibliografía y estudio crítico*. In 1927 he would also win the *Premio nacional de literatura* for *Semblanza de Góngora*, a prize he shared with Dámaso Alonso for his *La lengua poética de Góngora*.

⁶ This appears in a personal letter to Reyes to which I will come back later. Christopher Maurer has collected the full epistolary between Reyes and Guillén in his article.

⁷ Gerardo Diego's "Crónica" was published in the first two installments of *Lola*.

⁸ From a personal letter to Gerardo Diego of July 2, 1926.

⁹ The letter is dated August 28, 1926. The names Diego lists for Reyes as part of the approving committee are: "poetas Salinas, Guillén, Lorca, Dámaso Alonso, Alberti... prosistas F[ernánd]ez Almagro, Marichalar, Bergamín, Cossío (José María) etc." (Morelli 119). The approved plan, as Diego also explains to Reyes in this letter, was to publish in *Revista de Occidente* twelve "cuadernos" divided in two series of six: one dedicated to Góngora's poetry—referred to here—, and another to homages by *gongoristas* old and new.

¹⁰ Noticing hesitancy in Diego's invitation, Reyes, writing from Paris, demands clarity: "Dígame qué debo hacer. PRONTO Y CLARO" (Morelli 121; Reyes's emphasis). The answer from Diego leaves little room for choice: "Querido Alfonso Reyes: estoy muy contento con su participación en nuestro centenario Acabo de hablar con Artigas. Vamos a dejar los *Sonetos* a Salinas, que ya debe haber empezado con ellos y las *Octavas (Panegírico, Polifemo, etc.)* a Guillén. Las *Soledades* con traducción moderna a Dámaso Alonso y los *Romances* a Cossío. Puede Vd. ahora elegir entre las *Letrillas* o *Canciones-Décimas-Varia* A Artigas le es indiferente hacer uno u otro, de modo que elija Vd". (Morelli 122). The first to push for a choice seems to have been Alonso, who wrote Diego in the same letter of July, 2 1926 quoted above: "Yo, por mi parte estoy dispuesto a hacer *lo que Vd. quiera*. Pero debo advertirle que el Góngora que conozco bien es el de las *Soledades* y el *Polifemo*. Conozco mal, en cambio, *letrillas*, *romances*, etc. En fin yo preferiría hacer una de las dos *Soledades* (o las dos) con o sin traducción. Le digo esto porque creo que debemos confesarle a Vd. nuestras preferencias" (Morelli 46).

¹¹ Artigas names it thus in a familiar letter to José María de Cossío, also included in Morelli's selection of relevant correspondence.

¹² Contradicting testimonies have turned Reyes's *Letrillas* into something of a mystery. In a letter from February 1928 to Antonio Marichalar, Diego states: "Alfonso Reyes me anunciaba en noviembre último el envío de su tomo que hasta la fecha —fines de febrero— no ha llegado a mis manos (Morelli 99). In June of 1928, Reyes sends Diego the remaining poems, still without the prologue (Morelli 143). Many years after the fact, Diego tells us he had the complete original: "No salieron, en efecto, más que tres tomos. Pero yo poseo los originales de los *Sonetos*, por Salinas, y de las *Letrillas*, por Reyes, ambos suficientemente

merecedores del visto bueno, aunque sus autores no se lo otorgaran. Después, a mi requerimiento, fueron tan generosos como para enviarme el original” (*Carmen* 25); “... y si Reyes y Salinas no entregaron sus respectivos textos de Letrillas y Sonetos no fue por otra causa sino falta de tiempo y exceso de escrúpulos. Yo conservo atesoradamente los originales que solicité de ambos” (“Traslación de Góngora” 116).

¹³ Azorín’s verdict appears on the back cover of volume 7 of Reyes’ *Obras Completas*, in which *Cuestiones gongorinas* is included.

¹⁴ *Cuestiones gongorinas* reunites a series of articles on Góngora and *gongorismo* written in Madrid from 1915 to 1923. Nearly all of them were originally published in *Revista de Filología Española* and *Revue Hispanique*, except for an article each in *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* and *Hispania*.

¹⁵ Even when Reyes’s precedence is not only acknowledged but fully emphasized, his link with the Generation of 27’s campaign for Góngora is interpreted as a form of identity and continuity, not as a reaction or a source of tension. Gutiérrez Girardot stands as the critic who most emphatically affirms the unequivocal impact of Reyes on the Generation of 1927, but his interest in Reyes’s agency and originality regarding the interpretation of Góngora in Spain never goes as far as unearthing any frictions or hidden motives on the part of the Generation (90; 103). Thus from the most attentive Latin American perspective, they are taken to represent aspects of a singular, if not identical, avant-garde *gongorismo* or Transatlantic Neobaroque (Parkinson Zamora 141; Gonzalez Echevarría, 114; 195). For González Echevarría, continuity is key, even in the title of his study: *Celestina’s Brood: Continuities of the Baroque in Spanish and Latin American Literature*. See Mejías López on the erasure of precedence in favor of pan-Hispanic simultaneity as a recurrent feature in contemporary critical discourse (115-6).

¹⁶ In a slightly different wording, the same mistake also appears in his “Presentación” to *¡Viva don Luis!* (15).

¹⁷ Gutiérrez Girardot considers Reyes to be the model regarding the characteristic most often associated with the group: “la de ser poetas profesores” (100). The label “Góngora F.C.” reveals a more nationalistic perspective and is used by Gerardo Diego in his “Crónica” (n. pag.). I believe the first to liken the group to an “equipo de futbolistas” was Jorge Guillén in a letter to his wife, Germaine Cahen, written on the train during the famous journey to Seville (Reyes 183).

¹⁸ In the work that earned Artigas the first prize of the Spanish Academy in 1925, he is just as unequivocal: “Conocida es la enorme influencia que Rubén Darío ejerció en los poetas españoles de últimos del siglo XIX y de principios del XX, y es indudable que a él se debe en gran parte el entusiasmo, no siempre consciente ni fundado en la lectura, que entre estos poetas se ha despertado por Góngora y tal, que en un plebiscito ganaría, por gran mayoría de adeptos, el primer lugar entre los poetas clásicos castellanos preferidos” (253).

¹⁹ Lara Garrido is one of the most vocal critics of the Generation of 1927 in regards to their actual knowledge of Góngora’s poetry or the hidden motives

behind the celebration of Góngora's centennial in 1927. He has insisted that "la actualización forzada por esta especie de filología poética tenía su contrapunto en acusadas limitaciones de intelección. Las fallas de un ejercicio amateur y sin norte metodológico... lastró indefectiblemente el resolutivo alegato que daba carta de naturaleza en 1927 a la 'tradición gongórica'" ("La estela de la revolución gongorina" 123). Lara Garrido has advanced the issue of marketing and self-promotion as the main "maneuver" guiding the Generation of 1927's vindication of Góngora ("Adiós al Góngora del 27" 321-2; 332). In a particularly contentious defense of Góngora as a gigantic figure in the Spanish poetic canon, Lara Garrido sees the celebration as "una operación de asalto y carnaval" (321), by virtue of which the poets of 1927—dwarfed by comparison—were able to jump without merit or justice on the shoulders of the giant (332). Lara Garrido's attempt to rescue Góngora's poetry from the lasting effects of 1927 often lacks, in my opinion, critical distance and balance, but I understand his frustration regarding the fossilized authority of the Generation as much as the scarcity of revisionist efforts.

²⁰ "Hallas amarga mi carta sobre tu preocupación por cosas mexicanas y no por las de París, y para probar lo contrario me hablas de libros y de Foulché. Pero ¿de París? No me dices una sola cosa de la ciudad. ¿No ves nada europeo en ella, es decir, nada que no sea español ni americano?" (*Correspondencia* 403). As Conn explains, Alfonso Reyes made clear in his own letters "that he did not feel the French spirit was compatible with his own" (28).

²¹ The postcard reads: "Je vous remercie, cher Monsieur, de l'aimable envoi de votre volume *Cuestiones estéticas* que je vais lire cette semaine" (46).

²² From a letter dated October 11, 1913.

²³ See González Stephan for a detailed account of the main lines followed by conservative and liberal historiography on the meanings of Europe (hispanophobia, gallophilia, and its opposites) in the processes of Latin American nation building. As she explains, conservatives tended toward the wholesale defense of Hispanic values and a positive evaluation of the *Siglo de Oro* (250), while liberals rejected identification with the colonial past and singled out *gongorism* as synonymous with colonialism: "*gongorismo* era prácticamente sinónimo de *colonialismo*" (270; her emphasis)

²⁴ See Conn, 88-92.

²⁵ Most critics agree that "Reyes appropriates a literary figure who has been a model for both the *modernistas* and, more generally, all those who beginning with Sor Juana have contributed to the *gongorista* tradition in Latin America" (Conn, 92). On the critical tradition on Darío's "mental gallicism" started by Valera, see Max Henríquez Ureña (93-4), and Mejías López (87-8).

²⁶ See Alvar and Aponte for a broad account of Reyes's activities in Madrid. See also Robb for Reyes's work at the Centro de Estudios Históricos, and a transcription of his epistolary exchanges with Navarro Tomás. I'd like to recall Reyes's testimony in the epigraph to this article, sentiment he echoes in 1939: "Diez años, diez fecundos

años de España, años de provechosa lucha, la mitad en plena vida periodística y literaria, y la otra mitad de nuevo en nuestro servicio exterior, me permitieron conocer aquel mundo por los dos extremos y el medio, y compenetrarme para siempre con la gente que preparaba el porvenir de aquel pueblo con cuyo dolor han latido las más altas esperanzas del mundo” (135). Reyes’ best account of his life and work in Madrid can be found in “El reverso de un libro.”

²⁷ Bergamín’s words are from 1956. The number of *Boletín de la Fundación García Lorca* in which Valender’s study appears presents the written correspondence between Reyes and different members of the Generation (García Lorca, Altolaguirre, Guillén y Salinas, as well as Juan Guerrero Ruiz and Juan Montero). It remains one of the few examples of any critical interest among experts of the Generation of 1927 on the relationship between Reyes and the group of poets. See also Morelli (29-32).

²⁸ As Juan Ramón himself recognized: “En *Índice* me ayudaron mucho Alfonso Reyes, Enrique Díez-Canedo y José Bergamín” (“El modernismo poético en España y en Hispanoamérica” 175). The exclusivity of Juan Ramón’s agency in *Índice* is usually implied by the mention of his name alone. Díez de Revenga, to give another example, refers to it as “la revista que alentó Juan Ramón Jiménez” (*La revista “Verso y Prosa”* 5). For the relationship between Juan Ramón and Reyes, see Aponte (129-134).

²⁹ I quote from Aponte’s own translation of this “manifiesto.”

³⁰ As Díaz de Revenga forcefully put it, Góngora “dio a la famosa generación poética el número de documento nacional de identidad, 1927” (93). In Gabrielle Morelli’s words: “La celebración del III centenario de Góngora (1927)... terminó por marcar concretamente la identidad de la llamada Generación del 27” (9).

³¹ These, together with *Índice*, were the ones selected by Gerardo Diego in the prologue of his famous antología of 1932 (*Poesía española contemporánea* 576).

³² Cejador denounced it as a “superchería” (“Burlas literarias” 257), and asked for his protest to appear in *Índice*, which the authors, tongue in cheek, allowed: “afirmamos con toda solemnidad que la carta del señor Cejador es auténtica” (259). Reyes and Díez Canedo started these highly learned literary jests in 1919 in the weekly *Madrid* and continued the practice in *Índice* in 1921. Cejador y Frauca was also the butt of the joke in the first one they wrote: “Desgracia española de Dante” (251-3).

³³ In one of the events programmed for the occasion, the famous *Auto de Fe*, “el número esencial de la conmemoración y desagravio gongorino” (Diego, “Crónica” n. pag.), works of Menéndez Pelayo, Cejador y Frauca, Hurtado y Palencia, Cotarelo, and Fitzmaurice-Kelly, among others, were condemned and burned. Incidentally, only Cejador y Frauca was honored with the burning of two titles: *Historia de la Literatura* y *La verdadera poesía javiera*. Before them, three figures representing academic erudition were also “festively” burned: “el erudito topo, el académico marmota y el académico crustáceo.” For a detailed account of these events, including the “juegos de agua,” the “wetting” of the *Real Academia*

Española walls, see Diego's "Crónica de los sucesos," a section of his "Crónica del Centenario." Perhaps the most heavy-handed case against the academic establishment is Alonso's "Góngora y Ascálaro," which originally appeared in June 1927 in *La Gaceta literaria* and was later anthologized in his *Obras Completas*.

³⁴ Giving no credit to Reyes and Díez Canedo, the epistolary between Góngora and el Greco is, nonetheless, included in Soria Olmedo and Valverde's anthology under the rubric "Antecedents" (78-80).

³⁵ Elsa Dehennin, who also starts by giving most of the credit to Juan Ramón Jiménez, "qui fit paraître le livre dans l'attrayante collection de *Índice*," ends up remarking on the exemplarity of Reyes's *Polifemo* for the Generation of 1927: "... grâce surtout à la qualité d'un texte correct, mais dépourvu de notes et commentaires, qui prend toujours, d'après l'éditeur, le parti de la poésie. Sans doute trouve-t-on là la raison pour laquelle cette édition, qui fut très vite épuisée, a servi de modèle aux philologues de 1927, qui, eux, ont donné, par leurs publications si diverses, un sens à l'anniversaire de Gongora en un rayonnement durable" (18).

³⁶ The task was to give Góngora a life beyond his commentators and critics: "Reciente la publicación de las *Obras de Góngora* por Raymond Foulché-Delbosc en la Bibliotheca Hispánica, y habiendo yo colaborado en algunas materialidades de esta edición,... la que ahora publico del *Polifemo*... sólo debe considerarse como un intento de dar, al público literario general, una edición bella, cuidadosa y accesible del poeta cordobés" (ibid., 156).

³⁷ Or in this early letter from Alonso to Diego of August 26, 1926: "Criterio para las ediciones sólo la obra lírica. Orden cronológico aproximado siguiendo a Foulché. Pero sólo las fechas al pie, cuando sean seguras. Versión básica la de Foulché (ms. Chacón)" (Morelli 49).

³⁸ Reyes defended the idea at length in "Necesidad de volver a los comentaristas," published in 1920 in *Revue Hispanique* and later included in *Cuestiones gongorinas*.

³⁹ In this letter of December 17, 1926, Guillén continues to refuse to give Reyes his dissertation with much self-deprecation: "No tiene interés. De verás. Es un monstruo lírico-crítico, hecho -deshecho- atropelladamente por un motivo legal. No podría usted filtrar nada. Pídame lo que usted quiera, y yo le complaceré siempre. Pero eso No puedo. (Lo peor es que es verdad!): la tesis es mala, aunque usted no me la pidiera)" (105-06).

⁴⁰ The first such study is J. M. Micó's prologue to the edition of Guillén's dissertation. Micó acknowledges (while downplaying) the case of Guillén's embarrassment—"a pesar de ciertas servidumbres que sin duda le incomodaron..." ("El Góngora de Jorge Guillén" 9)—remarking instead on Guillén's talents, insight and originality: "la tesis de Jorge Guillén destaca, más que por la sintonía con lo reciente, por el anuncio [...] de lo que se avecinaba" (10). Considering that Micó was introducing a long awaited discovery, his positive assessment is not surprising. Perhaps more surprising is that Micó reproduced the same opinions almost verbatim years later in "En la raíz del lenguaje poético" (193-96). In Elsa Dehennin's study, Reyes is not even mentioned, in part because Dehennin intends

to read Guillén's dissertation “en el marco de la poesía pura”(33), and in part because Dehennin is herself convinced that Góngora's celebrity in the 1920's is the late result of “una tan azarosa como oportuna confluencia franco-española” (38).⁴¹ The epistolary exchange between Guillén and Reyes starts in 1923 and mostly deals with mutual admiring requests to send a contribution to *Índice* or some other literary review. In 1926, the main topic becomes Guillén's dissertation. After Guillén's final refusal to show Reyes a copy of it (December 17, 1926), there are no more letters between the two for almost two decades. All the letters exchanged with this purpose can be found in Maurer (103-06). Reyes recounts his early and deep admiration for Guillén's poetry in *Historia documental de mis libros*: “Otro joven principiante, entre los gratos recuerdos de entonces, Jorge Guillén. Lo adiviné poeta desde los primeros instantes y le dije: “No se seque en la filología, *Tu Marcellus eris*” (218).

⁴² It is Aponte's translation. The original “Carta de Alfonso Reyes” was published in *La Torre* in 1957.

⁴³ Gutiérrez Girardot rightly points to Reyes's earliest work on Góngora as “el eje poetológico del grupo del 27, esto es, la culminación del barroco concebido como expresión del supremo ideal de la belleza desrealizadora y la culminación del simbolismo francés concebido como intento de llegar a través de la belleza a la explicación del mundo” (“Alfonso Reyes y la España del 27” 89). For Gutiérrez Girardot, Reyes “illuminated Góngora” for the poets of 1927, using an image that most critics would have immediately assigned to Alonso's discourse: “lo iluminó para que los poetas españoles posmodernistas lo convirtieran en su signo” (*Última Tule* xii).

⁴⁴ Although the original version of this study is from 1927, Alonso did not publish it until 1935.

⁴⁵ I quote from the earlier version of Lorca's conference “La imagen poética de don Luis de Góngora,” as edited by Arturo del Hoyo. The quote does not appear in García Posada's edition, which is based on a later version. Lorca delivered the conference in Granada (1926), Madrid (1927), and Havana (1930), and published it in 1932. Although the piece sufficiently shows his timely engagement in the redemption of Góngora, Lorca was not one of the poet-scholars and should be considered an exception in the group. “La imagen poética de Góngora” is also an exception in Lorca's production, and Lorca starts it by modestly acknowledging that he does not have the authority of an academic. Indeed the piece is full of “errores eruditos,” as Dámaso Alonso did not fail to point out (García Posada 11).

⁴⁶ The English version of the old proverb is “For want of a nail the kingdom was lost.” The proverb, normally applied in a negative situation, expresses regret in hindsight about the huge consequences caused by a small mistake. In Alonso's use, the proverb is positively applied in anticipation of the chain of benefits that may come from a small but purposeful action.

⁴⁷ See its absence in Soria Olmedo's anthology, for example. The original title of the talk was “Altitud poética de la literatura española.” With the title “Escila

y Caribdis de la literatura española,” it was first published in 1933 and given particular relevance once again in 1955 as the opening prologue to *Estudios y ensayos gongorinos*.

⁴⁸ Mejías López identifies the figure of Darío and the arrival of Modernism in Spain as the foundational “inverted conquest,” and analyzes the reactions of Spanish intellectuals as the first attempts to undermine, dismiss or fully “erase Spanish American transforming presence in Spain and the Spanish literary field” (117). As he puts it, “*modernismo* produced an unprecedented transformation in the cultural field of the nation that not long before had been Spanish America’s imperial metropolitan center, helping prompt a profound national crisis in Spain, a period of national self-reflection. This relocation of authority across the Atlantic has haunted Spain ever since” (113). My own reading of the generation of 1927’s *gongorismo* as a reaction to Darío and Reyes can be seen as another chapter in the history of erasure of the “inverted conquest” described by Mejías López, another instance of the same “imperial denial” of influence (117). I thank Crystal Chemris for referring me to the work of Mejías López.

⁴⁹ See, particularly, the collection *Alfonso Reyes y los estudios latinoamericanos*, edited by Adela Pineda Franco and Ignacio Sánchez Prado. It ends with a “Postcritum” by Roberto Fernández Retamar in which the critic, a strong advocate of Reyes’s centrality in Latin America, states: “Es tiempo sobrado para abandonar la superficialidad de ciertos juicios y que se le reconozca al maestro mexicano el lugar que le corresponde como figura de primer orden en nuestra cultura” (348). According to Fernández Retamar, Reyes and Borges are “los mayores hombres de letras en la Hispanoamérica actual” (347). In his own contribution to the collection, Sebastian Faber relates changes in Reyes’s historical fortune with the change of paradigm produced by transatlantic studies (19). This seems to be the case in the reassessment of Reyes’s *gongorismo*. Adela Pineda Franco and Ignacio M. Sánchez have said: “Al recuperar a Góngora y, en sus *Capítulos de literatura española*, a los coetáneos del poeta español ubicados a ambos lados del Atlántico, Reyes rompió las jerarquías que entre el Siglo de Oro y el barroco americano establecían las historias literarias. Con ello, retomó la problemática relación España-Hispanoamérica y cuestionó las visiones decimonónicas que tendían a hacer énfasis en la calidad imperial de este referente, o las perspectivas modernistas que asociaban el legado castizo con el rezago cultural de América Latina” (7).

⁵⁰ The letter is very insistent on this point. To wit: “La literatura mexicana es la suma de las obras de los literatos mexicanos” (167); “Porque tampoco hay que figurarse que sólo es mexicano lo folclórico, lo costumbrista o lo pintoresco” (169); “Lo que yo hago pertenece a mi tierra en el mismo grado en que yo le pertenezco” (170); “la única virtud que aquí defiende... es la de ser mexicano” (178).

⁵¹ Referring to Mexican education under the *Porfiriato*, Reyes says: “Y como también se ignoraba a España olímpicamente —otro aspecto de nuestra reacción consistió en rectificar este punto— resulta que, alejados de lo que más se nos parecía, privados de todo elemento lógico de comparación, carecíamos de instrumentos

para investigarnos a nosotros mismos” (“Pasado inmediato” 31). As he saw it, the case of Spain was, if anything, worse than that of Mexico. While living in Madrid, Reyes became particularly aware of the general ignorance and indifference in Spain towards Latin American events and affairs, and felt stronger than ever “la necesidad –para mí imperiosa– de asear las reflexiones de los hispanoamericanos sobre España y de los españoles respecto a Latinoamérica” (*Historia documental de mis libros* 311). A series of essays written while in Spain in the first half of the 1920’s are of particular importance in this regard. See, for example, “España y América,” and “La ventana abierta hacia América.”

WORKS CITED

- Alberti, Rafael. “Don Luis de Góngora o el primor de lo barroco.” 1987. Soria Olmedo and Valverde. 122-30.
- Alonso, Dámaso. “Alusión y elusión en la poesía de Góngora.” *Estudios y ensayos gongorinos* 1928. 318-38.
- . “Dos trabajos gongorinos de Alfonso Reyes (Las *Cuestiones gongorinas* y la edición del *Polifemo*).” *Estudios y ensayos gongorinos*, 1927. 716-24.
- . “Escila y Caribdis de la literatura española.” *Estudios y ensayos gongorinos*, 1927. 243-58.
- . *Estudios y ensayos gongorinos. Góngora y el gongorismo*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Gredos, 1978. 241-782.
- . “Góngora y Ascálafo.” 1927. *Góngora y el Gongorismo*. Vol. 2. Madrid: Gredos, 1982. 283-88.
- . “Góngora y la literatura contemporánea.” 1932. *Estudios y ensayos gongorinos*. 725-70.
- . *La lengua poética de Góngora*. 1935. *Estudios y ensayos gongorinos* 9-240.
- . “Una generación poética (1920-1936).” 1948. *Estudios y ensayos sobre literatura, tercera parte: ensayos sobre literatura comparada*. Madrid: Gredos, 1975. 653-76.
- Aponte, Barbara B. *Alfonso Reyes and Spain: His dialogue with Unamuno, Valle-Inclán, Ortega y Gasset, Jiménez, and Gómez de la Serna*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1972.
- Artigas y Ferrando, Miguel. *Don Luis de Góngora y Argote: Biografía y estudio crítico*. Madrid: Tipografía de la Revista de Archivos, 1925.
- . *Góngora y el gongorismo*. Córdoba: Tipografía Artística, 1928.

- . Review of *Cuestiones gongorinas* and “Necesidad de volver a los comentaristas,” by Alfonso Reyes. *Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo* (1926): 343-44.
- Alvar, Manuel. “Alfonso Reyes y España.” *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 40.2 (1992): 959-87.
- Bergamín, José. “Literatura y brújula.” *Prólogos epilogales*. Ed. Nigel Dennis. Valencia: Pre-textos, 1985. 9-12.
- Conn, Robert T. “Reconstruyendo la cultura desde España: la Revolución Mexicana y la Generación del 98.” Pineda Franco and Sánchez Prado. 105-30.
- Dehennin, Elsa. “Góngora y Guillén a la luz de *Notas para una edición comentada de Góngora (1925)*.” *Góngora Hoy IV-V*. Ed. Joaquín Roses Lozano. Córdoba: Diputación de Córdoba, 2004. 13-44.
- . *Résurgence de Góngora et la génération poétique de 1927*. Paris: Didier, 1962.
- Diego, Gerardo. “Crónica del centenario de Góngora (1627-1927).” 1927. *Carmen, Revista chica de poesía española: Y Lola, amiga y suplemento de Carmen*. Madrid: Turner, 1977. n. pag.
- . *Poesía española contemporánea (1901-1932)*. 1932. Madrid: Taurus, 1968.
- . “Traslación de Góngora.” 1977. *La estela de Góngora*. Ed. Gerardo Diego and Julio Neira. Santander: Servicio de Publicaciones, Universidad de Cantabria, 2003. 114-17.
- Díez de Revenga, Francisco Javier. *La revista “Verso y Prosa”: Murcia 1927-8*. Murcia: Sucesores de Nogues, 1971.
- . *Los poetas del 27, clásicos y modernos*. Murcia: Tres Fronteras, 2009.
- Enríquez Perea, Alberto, comp. *A vuelta de correo: Correspondencia Héctor Pérez Martínez/Alfonso Reyes (1932-1947)*. México: Colegio de México, 2006.
- Faber, Sebastiaan. “Don Alfonso o la fuerza del sino: Reyes, la cultura latinoamericana y la defensa de la tradición.” Pineda Franco and Ignacio Sánchez Prado. 15-49.
- Fernández Retamar, Roberto. “Postcriptum: Sobre la importancia de Alfonso Reyes para Nuestra América.” Pineda Franco and Sánchez Prado. 347-55.
- Foulché-Delbosc, Raymond, ed. *Obras poéticas de d. Luis de Góngora*. 2 vols. NY: Hispanic Society of America, 1921.

- García Lorca, Federico. “La imagen poética de don Luis de Góngora.” 1926. *Obras Completas*. Ed. Arturo del Hoyo. Vol. 3. Madrid: Aguilar, 1986. 223-47.
- García Posada, Miguel. Prólogo. *Obras Completas*. By Federico García Lorca. Vol. 3. Madrid: Galaxia Gutenberg, 1996. 9-27.
- González Echevarría, Roberto. *Celestina's Brood: Continuities of the Baroque in Spanish and Latin American Literatures*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993.
- González Stephan, Beatriz. *Fundaciones: Canon, historia y cultura nacional. La historiografía literaria del liberalismo hispanoamericano del siglo XIX*. Iberoamericana: Vervuert, 2002.
- Guillén, Jorge. *Notas para una edición comentada de Góngora*. Ed. Antonio Piedra and Juan Bravo. Prologue by José María Micó. Valladolid: Fundación Jorge Guillén, 2002.
- Gutiérrez Girardot, Rafael. “Alfonso Reyes y la España del 27.” Pineda Franco and Sánchez Prado 89-104.
- . Introduction. *Última Tule y otros ensayos*. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1991.
- Henríquez Ureña, Max. *Breve historia del modernismo*. 1954. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1962.
- Jiménez, Juan Ramón. “Crisis del espíritu en la poesía española contemporánea (1899-1936).” 1940. *Prosas críticas*. 211-32.
- . “¿Gongorismo? (hacia 1930).” 1930. *Prosas críticas*. 129-30.
- . “El modernismo poético en España y en Hispanoamérica.” 1946. *Prosas críticas*. 160-78.
- . *Prosas críticas*. Ed. Pilar Gómez Bedate. Madrid: Taurus, 1981.
- Krappe, Alexander Haggerty. *Raymond Foulché-Delbosc*. NY: Hispanic Society of América, 1930.
- Lara Garrido, José. “Adiós al Góngora del 27.” *La hidra barroca: varia lección de Góngora*. Ed. Rafael Bonilla Cerezo and Giuseppe Mazzocchi. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía, Consejería de Cultura, 2008. 321-32.
- . “La estela de la revolución gongorina: Relieves para una cartografía incompleta del gongorismo.” Martín de Vayas. 121-68.
- Maurer, Christopher. “Alfonso Reyes y Jorge Guillén: ‘Normalidad como energía.’” *Boletín de la Fundación García Lorca* 7.13-14 (1993): 91-114.

- Mejías López, Alejandro. *The Inverted Conquest: The Myth of Modernity and the Transatlantic Onset of Modernism*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 2009.
- Micó, José María. "El Góngora de Jorge Guillén." Prólogo. *Notas para una edición comentada de Góngora*. By Jorge Guillén. 7-13.
- . "En la raíz del lenguaje poético." Soria Olmedo and Martín de Vayas. 189-96.
- Morelli, Gabrielle, ed. *Gerardo Diego y el III centenario de Góngora (correspondencia inédita)*. Valencia: Pre-Textos, 2001.
- Navarro Tomás, Tomás. "Prosa y verso de Alfonso Reyes." *Los poetas en sus versos*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1973. 237-345.
- Oviedo, José Miguel. "The Modern Essay in Spanish America." *The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*. Ed. González Echevarría, Roberto, and Enrique Pupo-Walker. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 365-424.
- Parkinson Zamora, Lois. "New World Baroque, Neobaroque, Brut Barroco: Latin American Postcolonialisms." *PMLA* 124.1 (2009): 127-42.
- Pineda Franco, Adela and Ignacio Sánchez Prado, eds. *Alfonso Reyes y los estudios latinoamericanos*. Pittsburgh: IILI, 2004.
- Reyes, Alfonso. "Contribuciones a la bibliografía de Góngora." 1916-17. *Cuestiones gongorinas*. 59-83.
- . "Correspondencia Raymond Foulché-Delbosc y Alfonso Reyes. I (1911-1914)." *Abside: Revista de cultura Mexicana* 19.1 (1955): 43-57.
- . *Cuestiones gongorinas*. 1927. *Cuestiones gongorinas; Tres alcances a Góngora; Varia; Entre libros; Páginas adicionales*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1958. 10-167.
- . *Cuestiones estéticas*. 1911. *Cuestiones estéticas; Capítulos de literatura mexicana; Varia*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1955. 10-168.
- . "El reverso de un libro." 1939. *Pasado inmediato y otros ensayos*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1941. 93-138. Print.
- . "España y América." 1920. *Páginas adicionales: Simpatías y diferencias; Los dos caminos; Reloj de sol; Páginas adicionales*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1956. 566-71.
- . *Historia documental de mis libros*. 1955. *Memorias: Oración Del 9 de febrero; Memoria a La facultad; Tres cartas y dos sonetos; Berkeleyana;*

- Cuando creí morir; Historia documental de mis libros; Parentalia; Albores; Páginas adicionales.* México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1990. 149-356.
- . “La ventana abierta hacia América.” 1921. *Páginas adicionales: Simpatías y diferencias; Los dos caminos; Reloj de sol; Páginas adicionales.* México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1956. 572-73.
- . “Mi edición del *Polifemo*.” *Cuestiones gongorinas* 155-58.
- . “Necesidad de volver a los comentaristas.” 1920. *Cuestiones gongorinas* 146-51.
- . “Pasado inmediato.” 1939. *Pasado inmediato y otros ensayos.* México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1941. 3-64.
- . “Reseña de estudios gongorinos (1913-1918) con un apéndice de 1926.” *Cuestiones gongorinas.* 84-111.
- . “Sobre la estética de Góngora.” *Cuestiones estéticas.* 61-85.
- Reyes, Alfonso, and Enrique Díez-Canedo. *Burlas literarias, 1919-1921. Ficciones.* México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1989. 249-70.
- Reyes, Alfonso, Henríquez Ureña, Pedro, and José Luis Martínez. *Correspondencia.* México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1986.
- Reyes, Rogelio. “Un buen azar que resultó destino: el homenaje a Góngora en el Ateneo de Sevilla.” Soria Olmedo and Martín de Vayas. 71-187.
- Robb, James W. “Alfonso Reyes, Tomás Navarro Tomás y el Centro de Estudios Históricos.” *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 37.2 (1989): 603-20.
- Salinas, Pedro. “El problema del modernismo en España, o un conflicto entre dos espíritus.” 1938. *Literatura española: Siglo XX.* Madrid: Alianza, 1970. 13-25.
- Soria Olmedo, Andrés. “Góngora 1627-1927.” Soria Olmedo and Martín de Vayas. 13-62.
- . Presentación: Soria Olmedo and Valverde. 13-28.
- Soria Olmedo, Andrés, and Alfredo Valverde, eds. *¡Viva don Luis!: 1927: desde Góngora a Sevilla.* Madrid: Residencia de Estudiantes, 1997.
- Soria Olmedo, Andrés, ed. and José Martín de Vayas, coord. *Una densa polimorfía de belleza: Góngora y el grupo del 27.* Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía-Consejería de Cultura, 2007.
- Valender, James. “La correspondencia entre Alfonso Reyes y Manuel Altolaguirre (1926-1941).” *Boletín de la Fundación García Lorca* 7.13-14 (1993): 29-70.