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variadas fuentes, historia la visión peyorativa que predominaba en Europa sobre América y sus habitantes. Continuando la trayectoria de sus pesquisas sobre el cronista peruano Guamán Poma de Ayala, Rolena Adorno rescata ahora del olvido al historiador texcocano Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl. Al hacerlo, sigue a Michel de Certeau para poner de relieve las estrategias textuales desplegadas por ese sujeto colonial que se esfuerza por entender la nueva realidad, y a la vez subrayar el valor de la cultura autóctona. El trabajo de Beatriz Pastor incide sobre el tema cuando explica los factores que contribuyen a autorizar ciertas voces y a silenciar otras en el arduo proceso de conquista y colonización. Con espíritu revisionista, los estudios de Rabasa, Gómez-Moriana y Jara ofrecen apreciaciones de escritores más conocidos. La polivalencia y el alcance de la obra lascasiana se hace evidente en el cuestionador ensayo de José Rabasa sobre la Apologética historia sumaria, mientras que René Jara señala el aporte de Mier a tan importante consideración como el desarrollo de la conciencia criolla. En este sentido vale notar el manejo del erudito mexicano de postulados empleados también en el Virreinato del Perú para cuestionar el dominio europeo en esa zona antártica; uno de ellos resalta la presunta predicación del Evangelio en América antes de la llegada de los españoles.

En suma, 1492–1992: Re/Discovering Colonial Writing ofrece un conjunto disímil de ensayos que si bien por la variedad de temas y autores tratados no constituye un libro coherente e integrado, sí muestra la riqueza de la literatura colonial y señala caminos para futuras indagaciones. Es de esperarse que los próximos volúmenes hispanoamericanos de esta joven serie delimiten con más precisión su campo de estudio y objetivos para así lograr un examen que nos aproxime a la ansiada y necesaria reconfiguración de la literatura hispánica.
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One must wonder whether it is irony or nostalgia at work: as many of the last departments of Romance languages are dismantled and specialization in a single national literature is ever more deeply entrenched as the sign of professional competence, we are treated to reissuings and reappraisals of the work of several scholars who stood for quite opposite professional and intellectual values. Some of the major examples among
these: in 1982 Geoffrey Green published a book-length study of Auerbach and Spitzer, *Literary Criticism and the Structures of History*; two years later *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature*, Auerbach's collection of essays, was reissued, with a foreword by Paolo Valesio; now this volume of Spitzer's essays—fifteen selected from a vast corpus and six of them which have never appeared in English before. As the title of the collection makes explicit, the intention was to provide an adequate representation of Spitzer's work and to that end the editors have selected essays that respect none of the now-conventional scholarly divisions of labor: Góngora's *Soledades*, Dante, *La Vie de Marianne*, even "American Advertising Explained as Popular Art." The whole lot is framed by two critical meditations on theory: the famous "Linguistics and Literary History" from 1948, at the head, and at the end, from 1960, months before his death, a talk given in Italy entitled "Development of a Method" which, as the editors point out, "reads in every way as his intellectual last will and testament."

Freccero's charmingly anecdotal and personal Foreword recreates the professional and intellectual universe that once harbored not only Spitzer but at least several generations of scholars, most of them far less well known, as eclectic as Spitzer. (Another charming and quite complementary evocation of "the old Hopkins" has also just appeared in *Dante Studies* 104 [1986], dedicated to Charles Singleton; Singleton, of a younger generation, had to face, towards the end of his career, the advancements of departmental specialization and even subdivision—developments for which he had as little understanding or taste as one can imagine a Spitzer or an Auerbach might have had.) One of the effects such a volume might have on an audience of younger scholars, bred in an altogether different period, might well be to wonder at the configurations and implications of a discipline within which one can write with authority on Lope and, no less, Paul Claudel. It is certainly in part true that the vast range of Spitzer's authority and competence had to do most simply with his being Leo Spitzer (and likewise, if we glance at Auerbach's corpus we must be struck by the range, from Dante to Baudelaire). But, as Freccero's Foreword makes clear (and, once again, see the essay by Mackey in *Dante Studies* or the book by Green or the 1980 essay on Auerbach by Lowry Nelson, Jr. in *The Yale Review*) while these scholars may have been exceptionally gifted the intellectual structures that bred them and within which they taught and published made the *Fleurs du Mal* and *Fuenteovejuna* part of the same canon, the same reading list.

Although it is not made explicit, it seems unmistakable that the volume is intended precisely for a younger generation quite far removed from such a concept of Romania or literary studies—and with one exception the editorial procedures are exceptionally helpful. Each essay is preceded by a substantial introduction which gives not only the necessary bibliographical history of the piece in question but which also places the essay
in the broader intellectual contexts of Spitzer's full intellectual biography and of theoretical as well as text-specific arguments, past and present. Not only is everything translated into English (including quotations from primary texts, a practice, the editors note, of which Spitzer would undoubtedly have disapproved) but niceties such as the first names of scholars now little or not known are provided when they are more casually alluded to by Spitzer. And the extended footnotes which Spitzer used for long digressions, in an editorial and typographical innovation, are placed within the text but marked and set off in a smaller typeface, allowing the reader to deal with them as part of the main text (which in great measure they often are) or skip them altogether; most purely bibliographical citations are then relegated to the end (one laments it is to the end of the volume rather than the end of each essay) making the whole far more readable and at the same time conserving much of the digressive nature of Spitzer's style. The single major disappointment is that there is no separate, comprehensive bibliography of Spitzer's work; granted this would have been a major task but, on the other hand, it would have been of enormous interest and help to many scholars and would have provided a very concrete context for the fifteen pieces here, selected from hundreds. But large and expensive volumes of what some might think are old and dusty essays by scholars the profession has passed by are surely not being printed as mere exercises in memory. One might wonder, in fact, at some significant details of the publication of these volumes: Scenes from the Drama of European Literature, for example, is volume nine of a series published by the University of Minnesota Press—the previous eight volumes devoted to Todorov, Jauss, Propp, de Man, and Bakhtin, scholars who, among other things, share with Auerbach and Spitzer the disdain for conventional disciplinary divisions and the presumed boundaries of national literatures. And, as the scrupulously generalizing editorial practices of this volume make clear—and as the strategic framing of the theoretical pieces, as well as Freccero's Foreword accentuate—the theoretical dimensions of Spitzer's work (or Auerbach's or Singleton's, for that matter) are not only of continuing interest but they play a significant and conceivably still unfinished role in the intellectual history of literary studies. While certain aspects of Spitzer's textual ideology are probably irremediably outdated, others—some stated and others implicit in methods and choices of texts—can still participate in the continuing intellectual struggles over the nature of both literary texts and literary studies. The editors of this volume are to be thanked for their efforts which have given us not only a detailed and fascinating reminder of how things were, but, certainly no less, an only slightly eccentric model for how at least some things might continue to be.
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