

whom our effort is addressed.” I cannot understand Graf’s English translation in itself, much less its relation to the Spanish original.

A lot more could be said about this article, but to do so would be an abuse of space. I can only add, in conclusion, that normally I consider publication in *PMLA* to be one of the highest honors to be bestowed on an article written by a member of the MLA. But in this case it is clear that the article had not been adequately reviewed before publication.

Elias L. Rivers

State University of New York, Stony Brook

Reply:

I would like to thank Anne J. Cruz and Elias L. Rivers for taking the time to read my article on Garcilaso de la Vega and for sharing their extensive knowledge concerning several details that I did not explore to the extent that I should have. A number of their comments are suggestive and helpful, although I am not convinced by all of them.

Cruz is certainly right to indicate that the late date of 1531 for the return of the poet’s brother to Toledo is telling of an ever-present tension between the Hapsburgs and the Spanish nobility. Nevertheless, just how, when, or where Garcilaso’s disillusionment with Charles V “peaked” will only ever be a matter of debate, and my essay devotes a significant number of pages to showing that the potential for such *desengaño* was there all along. I would like to assure Cruz that it was never my intention at any point in my essay to remove the poet from the political complexities of his day. To the contrary, I take as a given that all the categories we are forced to use when mapping the early modern ideological terrain—imperialist, noble, nationalist, republican, and so on—are always already dynamically related to one another and that the boundaries between them are particularly uncertain when we consider in-between cases like Garcilaso. For this reason, I would still argue that the nationalist rebellion against the newly installed Flemish ministers of the Hospital del Nuncio anticipates the republican zeal of the *comunero* rebellion. Cruz’s easy distinction between the insurrection of 1519 and the revolution of 1520–21 strikes me as specious. Nor am I certain just how she arrives at my having erred by “painting a romantic picture” of the poet, since in the very sentence

that she cites as an example of my misrepresentation I associate Garcilaso with “the kind of modern political pragmatism advocated by Machiavelli” (1320).

The remainder of Cruz’s comments are far more insightful. Garcilaso’s love affair with Guiomar Carrillo is precisely in line with my reading of the political significance of his supposedly transcendental sentimentality, and I thank Cruz for bringing Carmen Vaquero Serrano’s book to my attention. In addition, Cruz’s insistence that we pay attention to the implications and effects of the kind of female agencies found in Isabel de Portugal and María Pacheco is duly noted. Such attention, I hope, will go much further than simply uncovering “the female presence so long kept from public view” and yield real insight into the dynamics of gender in early modern events, not least of which should be the production of literature.

Rivers’s comments are also informative, although they evince a spirit emblematic of the traditionalism that still rages in early modern Hispanism. I must confess to having always been puzzled when listening to mid-career Hispanists speak of a crisis or lament the orthodoxy in early modern peninsular studies. I have always believed that medieval and golden age Hispanism’s impressive legacy of philological and historical work would eventually allow those few interdisciplinary approaches responsible enough to take it into account to begin to cultivate interesting ways of scrutinizing a field that has no justifiable reason to be as boring as it has become. But I think I am beginning to understand the frustration involved here. I indeed deserve to be upbraided for what Rivers calls my “most glaring error,” in the omission of a more extended commentary on Garcilaso’s use of the Greek accusative, by which an adjective (normally one associated with a body part) is transferred into an epithet for a person. But evidently Rivers would have us believe that the origin of such a technique in Latin poets like Horace and Vergil precludes us ipso facto from interpreting its meaning even in the radically peculiar context of a poetic suicide. I am dismayed, though hardly surprised, to find that a professional critic of Rivers’s caliber envisions the early modern poets as effecting little beyond a stumbling mimicry of their classical forebears. The fact that such a technique was quite startling even to a Latin ear (hence its association with a “Greekish” style) would mean nothing to

Rivers; nor would he ever pause to consider the anti-epic impulse being underscored by Garcilaso's explicitly self-reflexive use of a technique whose most famous instance is Vergil's reference to Dido's naked knees; nor would he find it interesting that the other instance of this technique in Garcilaso's poetry is in his ode in the manner of Horace, surely Rome's greatest satirist. To respond to the other objections that Rivers makes—dismissing the possibility of a pun on the name of Joan Boscà, refusing to reflect on my translation's negotiation of grammatical form

by way of thematic anxiety, chastising me for not using iambic pentameter—would be futile before someone for whom *ingenium* is anathema. While I appreciate Rivers's encyclopedic value (he is acutely aware, for example, of that which “for centuries [. . .] has gone unnoted”), we cannot rely on him alone in our efforts to unravel the sophisticated ways by which early modern poets patterned meaning.

E. C. Graf
Smith College