the entire period. It also calls for an evaluation of how Spain's difference from the rest of Europe can be enclosed in a broader context. Whereas Greer delineates the evolution of the term *Golden Age* and explains how canonical writers came to occupy their places in the history of literature, Weber focuses on the implications of the term *early modern* in connection to other factors. Weber writes that *early modern* "favors other precipitating factors for demarcating a new age: political (the consolidation of monarchical power), social (urbanization and demographic growth), and technological (the introduction of the printing press)" (227). Indeed, the denomination *early modern* is an attempt to depict Spanish texts from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as closer to a contemporary audience, part of a nonending process more like José Antonio Maravall's *fieri*, unfinished and always developing, than his *factum*, closed and complete. Moreover, the term allows for a proliferation of studies in dialogue with other literatures through convergent theories and methodologies.

The inclusion of the three literary manifestos by the sixteenteenth-century Spanish poets Juan Boscán and Garcilaso de la Vega, which follow Greer's and Weber's articles in the same issue, is an assertive editorial decision (233–42). Boscán's and Garcilaso's declarations illustrate how artists' desire for novelty and fear of the criticism their inventions would attract produced an anxiety that cannot be apprehended by the canonical term *Golden Age*. These "little-known documents" draw a picture of how early modern writers approached translation and adaptation. In fact, the absorption of foreign sounds into the vernacular language, the incorporation of new ideas and values into Castilian culture, and the establishment of a dialogue with a European audience prove that Spain was experiencing a dynamic and complex modernization.

My objection to these articles is their omission of noncanonical authors. This exclusion perpetuates the practice that the field tries to overcome, keeping up the pressure on graduate students to write about renowned authors in order to find a niche in the demanding job market. It is justified, however, by the marginal place early modern Spanish literature occupies in Spanish studies. To engage a contemporary audience, then, it makes more sense to mention Cervantes than Francisco López de Úbeda or Francisco Tárraga.

Although the assertion that early modern Spain has been marginalized in literary studies has become a commonplace—one that cannot be explained only by our view of Spain but that also reflects the consolidation of theoretical approaches and the predilection for Latin American and Latino studies in the last decades—it is nonetheless true that early modern Spanish literary studies have experienced a degree of marginalization. For instance, the MLA's series Approaches to Teaching World Literature contains only four texts about early modern Spain and two about colonial Latin America. While these texts include extraordinary volumes on teaching topics such as the Spanish comedia and the picaresque tradition, there are half as many volumes dedicated to this field as to early modern English literature. Although I am not going to contrast the quantity or quality of texts produced by different nations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Europe, it would be naive to think that England's literary production at that time surpassed the impressive and prolific literature of Spain.

I want to congratulate the contributors for such an enlightening group of essays and translations, and I hope that this initiative provokes a series of articles about early modern Spain in a forthcoming issue of *PMLA*.

Melissa Figueroa
Cornell University

Reply:

As the authors of "Thine and Mine: The Spanish 'Golden Age' and Early Modern Studies" and "*Golden Age* or *Early Modern*: What's in a Name?," we appreciate Melissa Figueroa's thoughtful response to and good summary of

https://doi.org/10.1632/S0030812900168415 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the points we attempted to make. We were invited to write our articles for the Theories and Methodologies section to address the question of how debates about the Spanish Golden Age challenge the configurations of early modern studies (and vice versa), as well as the question of how this "age of gold" travels across countries and continents. Doing so in under 3,500 words and attempting to engage with the broad readership of *PMLA* were not conducive to highlighting noncanonical authors, as Figueroa recognizes. That is a challenge for us to address collectively in the field of early modern Spanish studies. Part of that challenge, of course, is the extent of literary production in Spain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, an outpouring too vast, rich, and diverse for any one critic's lifework, much less these brief articles, to fully encompass. Although we did not have space in our articles to discuss noncanonical authors, we recognize the importance of expanding the canon, and we celebrate the recent publication of many editions and studies of little-known dramatists, poets, and religious writers. It could be argued that Hispanists have been in the vanguard of the recovery of early modern women's writing.

Decreasing the relative marginalization of Spanish studies in the early modern field—or ensuring that attention is paid to the Spanish Golden Age in Renaissance studies, if one prefers those terms—is necessarily a bidirectional effort. *PMLA*'s publication of our articles is but one indication of a gradually increasing interest in Spain on the part of other European cultural scholars over recent years. To encourage the continued growth of this interest and engage effectively with other traditions, we should produce more translations of Spanish texts—works by noncanonical authors as well as the less read works of canonical authors—to make them accessible to general readers and useful in comparative courses. (Unfortunately, the academic tenure and promotion policies in the United States do not encourage this effort, so translations, like good scholarly editions, are done more for the love of the art than for career advancement.) At the same time, we need to become familiar enough with other traditions and their critical and theoretical debates to engage with those debates in the articles and books we write or encourage our students to write.

Margaret R. Greer
Duke University

Alison Weber
University of Virginia

Reply:

We would like to thank Melissa Figueroa for her thoughtful response to our Little-Known Documents entry "Three Literary Manifestos of Early Modern Spain." She perceptively points out that the poetic manifestos we translated reveal the anxieties of a newly formed *mentalité* that corresponds to the historiographical designation *early modern*. Yet because the conventional term *Golden Age* is intended to describe not the social conditions of early modern Spain but the aesthetic qualities of its literary production over two centuries, it seems to us still taxonomically useful in that it asserts the literature's classical European roots while proclaiming its distinction. The literature's worth is all the more significant given its authors' diverse social, religious, and cultural origins and, no less, the many obstacles that most authors encountered when attempting to write. If, as Saint Teresa rightly bemoaned, those were exceedingly rough times, they also left us a legacy we cannot afford to devalue. In our own *tiempos recios*, Figueroa's regard for the field is heartening.

Anne J. Cruz
University of Miami

Elias L. Rivers
Stony Brook University
State University of New York

Talking about Lebanon and Gaza

To the Editor:

In replying to Basem L. Ra'ad's recent Forum letter on the exclusion of Lebanon and

https://doi.org/10.1632/S0030812900168415 Published online by Cambridge University Press