A COMPARATIVE HISTORY OF LITERATURES
IN THE IBERIAN PENINSULA
VOLUME I

A COMPARATIVE HISTORY OF LITERATURES IN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES
SPONSORED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMPARATIVE LITERATURE ASSOCIATION

HISTOIRE COMPARÉE DES LITTÉRATURES DE LANGUES EUROPÉENNES
SOUS LES AUSPICES DE L'ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL DE LITTÉRATURE COMPARÉE

Volume XXIV
A Comparative History of Literatures in the Iberian Peninsula. Volume I
Edited by Fernando Cabo Aseguinolaza, Anxo Abuín Gonzalez and César Domínguez

A COMPARATIVE HISTORY OF LITERATURES IN THE IBERIAN PENINSULA

VOLUME I

Edited by

FERNANDO CABO ASEGUINOLAZA
ANXO ABUÍN GONZALEZ
CÉSAR DOMÍNGUEZ
Universidad de Santiago de Compostela

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences — Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A comparative history of literatures in the Iberian Peninsula / edited by Fernando Cabo Aseguinolaza, Anxo Abuín Gonzalez and César Domínguez.
v. cm. -- (Comparative history of literatures in European languages ; v. 24)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Contents: Discourses on Iberian literary history -- The Iberian Peninsula as a literary space -- The multilingual literary space of the Iberian Peninsula -- Dimensions of orality -- Temporal frames and literary (inter-)systems.
1. Iberian Peninsula--Literatures--History and criticism. I. Cabo Aseguinolaza, Fernando. II. Abuín Gonzalez, Anxo. III. Domínguez, César.
PN849.I24C66 2010

860.09--dc22 2009051900
ISBN 978 90 272 3457 5 (HB ; alk. paper)
ISBN 978 90 272 8839 4 (EB) CIP

John Benjamins Publishing Co. • P.O.Box 36224 • 1020 ME Amsterdam • The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America • P.O.Box 27519 • Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 • USA

Table of contents

Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages

In 1967 the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA) launched this series of volumes on the "Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages" (CHLEL), under supervision of an international coordinating committee of sixteen scholars. Its purpose is to publish comparative historical studies, each directed by an international team of editors. As its title indicates, the charge of this committee concerns literatures in European languages, including the diffusion of literary movements in those languages through regions outside Europe — for example, in colonial and post-colonial literatures. The CHLEL coordinating committee serves as a review board that aims to foster the coherence as well as the innovativeness of each of the volumes produced. As in the ICLA, the primary working languages of the series have been English and French, although one volume on the Enlightenment appeared in German. After seven volumes were published with Akadémiai Kiadó in Budapest, John Benjamins Publishing Company has continued publication of the series.

This ongoing project started from two premises laid out by Henry H. H. Remak in his preface to the early volumes. First of all, traditional literary histories confined to specific nations, peoples, or languages, should be complemented by comparative history that studies literary phenomena from a broadly international point of view. Literary movements present a process of international give and take, while also expressing the specificities of local cultural entities. The work of CHLEL is therefore multilinguistic and intercultural. Second, since it is almost impossible for individual scholars to write such comprehensive histories, the editorial committee calls on structured teams drawing collaborators from different nations, to address transnational and interdisciplinary topics. Some projects have required several volumes, in order to provide as wide an overview as feasible of interrelated currents.

The initial long-term undertaking of this comparative literary history was to examine periods or movements that display related stylistic experiences and engage in lively intercultural exchange and transformations of forms and ideas. As comparatists, literary historians observe phenomena such as genres, themes, styles, narrative structures and reception that flow across national boundaries. Aiming not only at truly comparative analyses but also at innovation in their historical methodology, project directors have sought to move beyond the focus of traditional histories on canonical authors or dominant genres. In part through reception study, they have interrogated stock conceptualizations of periods by recognizing time lags in movements, shifts in sensibility, or the variegated rise of nationalistic programs. Attention has been given to "minor" literatures and marginalized phenomena that take on greater resonance when examined across cultures, such as folklore or the intersections between colonial literatures and indigenous cultures in non-European countries. Even with forty to one hundred collaborators working on a project, the goal has never been complete coverage. Instead, it has been to offer syntheses built on exemplary analyses, and to explore sites of exchange and dialogue. Examples of our sub-series devoted to periods are two volumes on twentieth-century avant-gardes, two volumes on Modernism, five volumes on Romanticism, two volumes on the Enlightenment, and four volumes devoted to the Renaissance.

Starting in 1986, the second structural orientation of the series has been to explore the significance of regional determinants, leading to subseries on Africa, the Caribbean, East Central Europe, Iberia, and Scandinavia, each in several volumes. The multiplicity of languages in these regions, which may reflect competing imperialisms, colonizations or diasporic movements of peoples, offers opportunities to study the flowering of diglossia and the significance of transnational literatures such as Latin, Arabic, or Hebrew. Editors of regional studies have used fresh metaphoric models to conceptualize geo-temporal dimensions, to devise pluralistic methods, and to renovate our delimitation of the object of study. They have sought to unsettle hierarchies of value anchored in socio-political biases, in order trace correspondences, censorships, creolizations, and intercultural conflicts.

Each volume takes into account changing scholarly conceptions of the literary and of the methods of history. Current projects therefore also focus on the problematic concepts in our toolkit. With the coordinating committee's help, each CHLEL project designs the methodology pertinent to its subject. Their comparative approaches have highlighted formal as well as thematic analogies and contrasts, historical contexts as well as cross-disciplinary links, and diachronic as well as synchronic connections. Their research methods have drawn on the entire range in practice today, adapting trends such as New Criticism, structuralism, hermeneutics, deconstruction, reception theory, New Historicism, gender studies, post-colonial theories, interart studies, and studies of orality. Further information about this series can be found at our internet sites:

http://www.ua.ac.be/main.aspx?c=.CHLEL
http://icla.byu.edu/www/association/publications.html
http://www.benjamins.com/cgi-bin/t_seriesview.cgi?series=CHLEL

Margaret R. Higonnet
University of Connecticut

Introduction

In June of 2004 the Coordinating Committee for a Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages (International Comparative Literature Association) definitively approved the design for a Comparative History of the Literatures in the Iberian Peninsula, the first volume of which now comes to light. This proposal, first put forward through the efforts of Darío Villanueva, was later backed by the concession, and development, of various research projects led by Fernando Cabo Aseguinolaza at the Area of Literary Theory and Comparative Literature at the University of Santiago de Compostela. We are deeply grateful for the early contributions made by its members.

Since the very outset, the editors clearly understood the necessity of setting in motion a comparative history that would break with the old nineteenth-century historiographic models as much in methodology as in the selection and delimitation of an object of study. Thus, the project was conceived with the collaboration of a wide range of comparatists and literary scholars who were aware of the fundamental principles underlying such an effort. The point of departure was an explicit renunciation of those chronologically organic and narratively omniscient histories which attempt to cover all fields and periods. In the degree in which it was possible, the distinctive sections would have to possess a character particular to Peninsular comparatism. Additionally, the authors of each chapter endeavored to consider the different Peninsular literary traditions when it came time to approach each of the questions to be treated. Ideally, this starting point would produce a novel and attractive approximation, one that paid special attention to the geo-literary dimension of the phenomena making up the object of study. It was of course advisable to shy away from an approach that considered each chapter to be an all-encompassing panorama. The objective was not so much to trace an exhaustive itinerary through the different literatures, from their origins up to the present, but rather to present a particular situation in order to reveal a fundamental factor in the understanding of the Iberian Peninsula as a complex and dynamic framework of interliterary relations. At times, the most operative strategy was to focus on one or more particularly enlightening cases, always procuring that the reader possessed, in two volumes, enough information to navigate comfortably through the network of interconnections which make up a literary history – that of the Iberian Peninsula – which, if not exactly shared, are nonetheless beholden to the convergence/divergence dialectic.

The result is in the reader's hands today. A comprehension of its scope will be more profound if, as it has been said, it is placed within the great historiographical shift towards a spatial or geographic paradigm, which takes shape in a process of regionalization of the object of study – a tendency already present, in a way, in the series of volumes published by the AILC/ICLA. This tendency is evident in the two volumes that Albert Gérard dedicated to sub-Saharan literatures in European languages (1986), in those dedicated to the literatures of the Caribbean area by James Arnold (1997–2001) and above all in the project that Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer (2006–2009), respectively, coordinated on East-Central Europe. Though not pertaining strictly to the publications of the ICLA, the volumes directed by Mario Valdés and Djelal Kadir (2004) must also be cited. It must be mentioned that this shift towards spatialization has

been orientating itself towards peripheral areas with respect to the Eurocentric and canonical nucleus of the most traditional comparatism. This has been accompanied by a postnational impulse linked to questioning the idea of "nation" as an adequate framework for explaining and justifying literature insofar as a cultural phenomenon, needing to distance itself from "monological" concepts of culture, emphasizing those of interference or transmission/convergence. The canonical idea of literature has also been under inquiry, since, practically from its inception, it has almost always tacitly reaffirmed the epistemology of literary historiography. If we approach it from this regional perspective, the boldness of carrying out a *Comparative history of literatures in the Iberian Peninsula* makes even more sense as a vision of the renovating aspirations which seek to grant center stage to the phenomena and questions condemned to obscurity or marginality by nationally-based historiographies. It cannot be overlooked that these historiographies, as it will be seen in the first two sections, therefore become more visible (both in their strength and weakness) and go on to form part of the proposed object of study. Likewise, the eloquent spatial (cartographic) and temporal tensions in the interrelation of the different Peninsular literatures will not be absent, as they necessitate an understanding of comparatism as a critical theory: a vision that sets about establishing its own constitutive elements at the same time, beyond the simple gathering of observations and facts about the literary past in an inter- or supernational framework.

It is fitting to note some other characteristics of this endeavor. It was first necessary to painstakingly review the institutionalization process of literary historiographic discourse within the framework of comparatism. Furthermore, assessing the balance between hetero- and auto-characterization with regards to the literatures in the Iberian area was understood as necessary, and lent itself to an implicit interlacing of perspectives in the selection of a group of collaborators coming from distinctive backgrounds, both intra- and extra-Peninsular. The project seeks to question the foundations of national literatures by consciously challenging them with complex case studies: the literatures connected to nation states (Spanish and Portuguese) are taken as given, but a comparative study has been insisted upon, stressing national literatures without state boundaries, such as regional literatures, as well as what might be called *a-national* literatures, such as those written in Hebrew or Arabic, or those that point towards an extra-Peninsular dimension: Hispano-American or African Lusophone literatures. The reader must permit one final clarification of particular relevance: though conscious of the controversial character of the chosen geographic framework, this project stems from a historical recognition of the Iberian Peninsula as a supranational whole perceived as a *possible community*, not only from its interior but rather from an external and distanced position which defines it in relation to the concepts of *European* or *World Literature*.

As shall be seen, this first volume is divided into five sections of a very diverse nature. These sections produce a decentralized and "multipolar" approximation to the question being elaborated, resulting in the configuration of a literary map with defined contours by the end of the six chapters. Each of the subcoordinators responsible for the different sections took it upon themselves to enter into contact with those he or she considered specialists in each subject and to provide unity and form to the whole. Only the first section does not correspond to these characteristics, as it was undertaken by two of the general editors, Fernando Cabo Aseguinolaza and César Domínguez. The section coordinated by Sharon G. Feldman, "The Iberian Peninsula as

a literary space", explores some fundamental theoretical and comparative aspects for the objectives of this project: from which spatial parameters (Europe, the Mediterranean, the Atlantic…) can we understand the literary reality in the interior of our geopolitical scheme? How can the tension between similarity and difference within the distinctive literary settings be articulated? In what way can concepts such as global, national, regional, and local be understood, and how are these dimensions of the literary to be managed? The answers are complex, as are some of the phenomena studied in this section (concepts such as *insularity* or *extra-Peninsularity*), and place the problem of literary identity at the center of the discussion, while introducing the idea of *literary nation* as the object of a necessary and clarifying problematization.

In the introduction to "Multilingualism and literature in the Iberian Peninsula", Ángel López García focuses on the interlinguistic and intercultural dimension of the Peninsula, which takes shape through successive studies in the analysis of certain examples in which the image of each language in the different Peninsular literatures is perceived, and around others in which bilingual and diglossic situations flower, from the Middle Ages up until our present, with special attention to texts in Arabic, Hebrew, and Basque.

The section dedicated to orality, "Dimensions of orality", coordinated by Paloma Díaz-Mas, closes in on the problematic status of oral literature, considered traditionally as non-canonical or, simply non-literary, and thereby excluded by Peninsular philologists. On the contrary, in her introduction, Díaz-Mas insists on the value of this oral facet for comparatism in general, and the following chapters confirm the borderline character of such phenomena by examining them from a genological and Peninsular viewpoint.

Fernando Gómez Redondo oversees the creation of the section titled "Temporal frames and literary (inter)systems", which is composed of eight chapters dedicated to eight different literary systems as seen from a geo-temporal viewpoint and considered representative of a relative interliterary effervescence, which in each chapter is explained contextually and pragmatically.

The second volume, currently in preparation, will elaborate upon other, complementary, aspects dealing with the images, forms and genres, intermediation, and lastly, the interrelation between popular and mass culture and the literary repertoire. In effect, the first section of this second and final volume will center on the analysis of a series of images and stereotypes associated with the literary culture they have defined and continue to define, as much from the auto- as from hetero-characterization: the different Peninsular literatures in their mutual relations, of course, but also regarding their presence beyond the Peninsular realm. Following it will be a section on genres and literary repertoires, coordinated by María Fernanda Abreu. Twelve chapters are included dealing with twelve literary forms and traditions that have shown themselves to be historically active from a transliterary point of view in the Iberian Peninsula, as well as from outside its limits. Questions dealing with troubadour poetry, pastoral stories, adultery novels, and writings of the "I", to name a few, act in this sense like touchstones to judge the differences and affinities of the distinctive literary repertoires. Thirdly, a section has been reserved for a fully institutional perspective. Under the supervision of María José Vega, it corresponds to what we describe as "forms of mediation". It includes analyses of four fundamental questions: the role of school curriculum, the function and scope of translations, the characteristics and consequences of censorship, and the institutional dimension of different forms of textual compilation and selection – especially the way these have acted as factors in canon

consolidation and in interliterary mediation. Finally, the section coordinated by Anxo Abuín, "Popular culture and literary repertoires", approaches, from an interdisciplinary perspective, the discourse coming out of the most peripheral areas of the Peninsular cultural system, examining film and television, popular music, the comic, or literature of the masses.

Note on Documentation and Translation

We follow *The Chicago Manual of Style* and do not use footnotes, except to provide the original version of the literary quotes that have been included in English translation in the body of the essays. Nevertheless, this general norm has not been applied in the case of Section 4, "Dimensions of orality", due to the fact that the line of argumentation itself and the discussion of the texts dealing with oral tradition and its variants require following the original language. Therefore, only in this section will the footnotes contain translations to English of the literary examples.

The original versions of critical or essayistic citations are not supplied; they appear only in the English translations. However, concepts relevant to the line of argumentation are provided in the original language, followed by the English translation in parenthesis. In later incidences in the same chapter, the concept is expressed in the original language.

The titles of works and journals, as well as other designations (institutional, juridical, etc.) are provided in their original language, followed by an English translation in parenthesis. When a published translation of the work in question exists, this title is used. If this is not possible, then the translation provided by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is used or, as a last resort, we offer our own translation. At times, we prefer clear paraphrasing over an abstruse literality in English. The names of places (towns, cities, public and private organisms) and people (kings, rulers, etc.) have been regulated in accordance with the uses of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to several organizations that have contributed to the elaboration of this volume. In the first place, to the Xunta de Galicia, the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science, and the European Union (with European Funds for Regional Development) for the financial support conceded to the research projects undertaken between 2001 and 2008 which sustained this work. The last of these, still in effect, has as its title "Towards a theory of comparative literary history in the Iberian area" (HUM2007–62467/FILO). We would also like to thank each one of the coordinators of the sections of this volume for the work they have carried out, and especially the members of the Coordinating Committee for a Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages of the International Comparative Literature Association for the constant support provided for this project, and their always careful and valuable intellectual monitoring. The translators and linguistic copy-editors deserve special mention, particularly Cristina Rodríguez, Mark Wiersma, Marla Arbach, Manus O'Duibhir, and Lucinda Wilson.

Section I. Discourses on Iberian literary history

Coordinators: Fernando Cabo Aseguinolaza and César Domínguez

The European horizon of Peninsular literary historiographical discourses

Fernando Cabo Aseguinolaza

National history, foreign literature

There is a significant circumstance that affects the historiography of the two main literary traditions of the Iberian Peninsula when they are considered from a national perspective. This could be referred to as the "family romance" of Iberian literary historiography, which is responsible for causing some confusion as to the origin of these traditions. Quite often, the understanding of this origin has ignored some important aspects in the constituting process of historiographical discourses of Iberian literature. For example, it has been held that the historiography of Spanish literature originated with *Resumen histórico de la literatura española* (Historical review of Spanish literature) by Antonio Gil de Zárate in 1844 (Senabre 1998; Ramos Corrada 2000). In a similar fashion, Francisco Freire de Carvalho (1845), author of *Primeiro ensaio sobre historia literaria de Portugal* (First essay of the literary history of Portugal), and to a larger degree, Teófilo Braga have been credited with initiating literary historiography in Portugal.

There is no doubt as to the importance of Gil de Zárate's *Historical review*, especially given its proximity to the Public Instruction Law of 1845. Two of the principal sponsors of this law were Gil de Zárate himself, who headed the ministerial sub-department responsible for public education, and Pedro Pidal, a minister of the Spanish government, on whom Gil de Zárate depended, and also a major medievalist. Pidal's law – as it came to be known – introduced Spanish literature as a subject in all official curricula throughout the country, which meant the implicit exclusion of literature in languages other than Castilian (Núñez Ruiz 1994). In the same years, Abel-François Villemain, historian of French literature, medievalist, and an outstanding representative of comparative literature, was the minister of Public Education in France. In Portugal, the historiographical standpoint of Teófilo Braga, who would later become President of the Republic of Portugal, was also widely influential. His theories were presented in *Teoría da história da literatura portuguesa* (Theory of the history of Portuguese literature, 1872), which was used in open competitions to become a professor of Portuguese Literature in the Advanced Course in Humanities in Lisbon. Even though they are distant, both these references share the power of their institutional authority as part of a national public program. They are also linked by the prevailing liberalism, endowed with governmental authority and committed to establishing the identities of the new national states, which was highly characteristic of the nineteenth century.

The question is, do these circumstances justify relegating all previous literary historiographies to the level of just mere precedents? There is no doubt that the historiographical discourse

of Portuguese and Spanish literature already had an extensive history, which has often been overlooked. This is due to a value judgment, more or less explicit, that regards works prior to Gil de Zárate and Braga as imperfect or excessively amateur. We could even go so far as to attribute to this perspective the concealed desire to instill an endogenous point of view in each of these literatures, making a national landmark of each historiography. As a result, these literatures would only be as national as the historiographies that study them. As Xosé Luís Méndez Ferrín (2002, 23) said in his acceptance speech to the Real Academia Galega regarding Galician literature: "all *literature* implies a *Literary History*." Under this assumption, all literature that intends to be national must have a national literary history. This is an expression of the belief that there should be a systemic consistency between discourse and meta-discourse in order to assure the national relevance of a given literature. In metaphorical terms, discourse on literature needs to be nationalized as a condition for literature to be conceived as national. On the other hand, based on the above, one can deduce another position which is inseparable from the various historiographical traditions, that which leads to define an institutional and epistemological authoritative focal point, whether an academy, university, or ministry, which can introduce a modal approach into the valuation and authenticity of the literary past as a source of knowledge and education.

Logically, what falls outside of this perspective are the exogenous antecedents of national literary history as well as those paradigms considered failed or imperfect, that is, those models and practices that are not regarded as entirely national. This was the case of the literary histories of the eighteenth century and of the literary histories written by foreign authors and often intended for a foreign public. Nevertheless, the fact of the matter is that in many cases the origin of the national histories of peninsular literatures is foreign, although with time its discourse has become internalized and, paradoxically, more local and irrelevant.

There is, in fact, a notorious resistance to cope with the fact that the first milestones of the historiography of the Peninsular literatures in the nineteenth century were written by foreign authors who had an exogenous point of view and quite often placed Iberian literature within a much broader framework. Two of these landmark histories were Friedrich Bouterwek's *Geschichte der europaische Poesie und Beredsamkeit seit der Ende des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts* (History of European poetry and eloquence from the end of the 13th century), written in twelve volumes published between 1801 and 1819, and Jean-Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi's *De la Littérature du Midi de l'Europe* (Literature of the South of Europe), four volumes, published in 1813. Both of these works touch specifically upon Spanish and Portuguese literature, with some mention of Catalan, and barely deal with Galician and Basque literature.

In the year 1826, Almeida Garrett published a brief outline, *Bosquejo da história da poesia e língua portuguesa* (Outline of the history of Portuguese poetry and language), written as an introduction to the anthology *Parnaso lusitano* (Lusitanian Parnassus). In the very same year, Ferdinand Denis, a Frenchman, published *Résumé de l'Histoire littéraire de Portugal suivi du Résumé de l'Histoire littéraire du Brésil* (Review of the literary history of Portugal followed by the review of the literary history of Brazil). This book was more systematic and extensive than Garrett's, and it introduced Brazilian as a national literature independent of the Portuguese for the first time. Denis served as a cultural mediator eager to introduce new horizons of unknown but interesting literatures to the French and other European readers in accordance with the

logic of the World Republic of Letters described by Pascale Casanova (2005). Even before Denis, the English poet Robert Southey, a key figure in Hispanic and Portuguese studies, had written a brief historical panorama of Portuguese literature in the *Quarterly Review* (1809) to introduce it to the English readers, insisting on the political and commercial opportunities that were becoming available to Great Britain in the Iberian Peninsula.

In other matters, another Frenchman, Francisque Michel, is considered the author of "the first general reflection on Basque literature" (Lasagabaster 2002, 238) with his work *Le Pays basque. Sa population, sa langue, ses moeurs, sa littérature et sa musique* (The Basque Country. Its population, language, customs, literature, and music, 1857), which he wrote while teaching foreign literatures at the University of Bordeaux. As for Catalan literature, just a few years after Magi Pers i Ramona's *Bosquejo de la historia de la lengua y la literatura catalana* (Outline of the history of the Catalan language and literature, 1850), F. R. Cambouliu, again a Frenchman, wrote *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Littérature Catalane* (Essay on the history of Catalan literature, 1858), the first "true history" in this field (Romero Muñoz 1982, 8).

The role of Michel in French dialectology and ethnography during the nineteenth century; the proximity of Cambouliu to the Félibrige movement, so determined to revive Provençal language and literature; the protagonism of Southey in the cultural and political environment of England after the French revolution and in British geopolitical discourse during the Napoleonic wars; and the case of Denis, with his inherent cultural colonialism and the apparent exoticism of his analysis of Brazilian as well as Portuguese literatures (Rouanet 1991, 209 ff.), all constitute elements that cannot be disregarded upon investigating the characteristics of the discourse of the literary historiography of the Iberian Peninsula.

There are other significant factors that are not always given their full value. In 1843, a year before Gil de Zárate's *Historical review*, Friedrich Schlegel's *Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur* (History of ancient and modern literature, 1815) had been translated into Spanish and Adolphe Puibusque's *Histoire comparée des littératures espagnole et française* (Comparative history of Spanish and French literatures) had appeared in France. Well before that date, Schlegel's major work had circulated widely in the Iberian Peninsula in its French translation of 1829 (Palma-Ferreira 1985, 35). This work – perhaps along with *Über dramatische Kunst und Literatur* (Lectures in dramatic art and literature, 1809–11) by his older brother, August W. Schlegel – can be considered the principal authority and inspiration in the validation of Spanish and Portuguese literature as national literatures, in the romantic sense of the word.

One needs to consider, from a comparative perspective, the European context under which the discourse of literary historiography developed since its inception in the eighteenth century. This is the only way to appreciate its true institutional and geo-cultural dimension. It explains the paradox by which the national images, so often enforced by the historiographical discourses of different European literatures, including those of the Iberian Peninsula, are actually the product of a much broader context. Carlos Manuel Ferreira da Cunha wrote that "the national was born out of an international conflict" (C. M. F. da Cunha 2002, 52; Cabo 2004b). He was referring to the thesis developed by Michel Espagne (1993; Espagne and Werner 1994) regarding the influence of the "foreign paradigm," basically German, which helped establish French literature as a national literature throughout the nineteenth century, simultaneously with the formation of foreign literature departments at different French universities starting

in 1830. According to Espagne, the process of the reinvention of French literature as a national literature parted from the prior discovery of the nationalism of foreign literatures, among them the Spanish and the Portuguese (Villemain, Baret, Bougeault, Demogeot). Hippolyte Taine was a crucial figure in this process, as before him, Friedrich Schlegel had been in Germany. In this way, comparatism in the nineteenth century, in particular that of Germany and France, has a profound national dimension that was aimed at securing the recognition of their respective literatures on a European and international level.

The European literary field and national literatures

It is assumed that the European romantic literary field deeply depended on a resentment of French hegemony, particularly during the Napoleonic Wars. We can go even further and talk of a post-imperial dynamics tied to the defeat of Napoleon as well as to the later collapse of the Austro-Hungarian empire and the Iberian empires. It is neither to be disregarded that the emergence of the British empire brought about a transformation in that Europe's attention was now overtly directed overseas, making way for the current ambiguous connection between postcolonialism and nationalism. The most important effect, in any case, was the relationship of the emergence of national literatures with a profound geopolitical recomposition, in which there is an obvious connection, on the one hand, with the constitution of the new nation states, and, on the other, with the development of a doctrinal structure that contributed to the positioning of new literatures in a wider geo-cultural space, that at this point was basically European. Two sets of positions can be seen in this situation, one national, the other international.

The development of literary historiography has been closely tied to the organization and reorganization of the literary field in its European dimension as well as in a strictly Iberian setting. The idea of nation, with regard to both these dimensions, has been crucial from a programmatic point of view. Yet, this development implicates a continuous interlacing of historiographical traditions of diverse scope: some of cosmopolitan pretence; others more strictly European; some national, that at some points may appear regional – possibly an ambiguous and sensitive subject – ; and yet others defined with a supranational character, such as the European *midi* or the Romanic sphere of influence. Even so, the nation has acted as the main basis for historiographical discourses. Its presence depends, however, on the heterogeneity of facets and levels it displays, as well as on the multifarious perspectives and interests being presented. Evidently, the assertion of the nationality of Spanish and Portuguese literatures advanced in Germany with a European outlook which tried to foster the hegemony of German literature is not the same as, for instance, that of Portuguese national literature as far as it is deployed in the context of the specific historical conflicts between Portuguese and Castilian in an Iberian setting. This can also apply to the conflict of the emerging literary nationalities in a Spanish framework, which were originally concealed as regional. This conflictive standpoint is obvious in the modern development of the Catalan, Basque, and Galician literatures and their respective historiographies.

On a national level there are superimposed literary fields always moving in an unstable equilibrium of perceptions and different audiences. Literary histories are an example of this

situation. Roberto Dainotto (2007, 4) – taking up a thesis by Dipesh Chakrabarty – wrote that historical thinking invented Europe as its own main subject. Undoubtedly, one could carry this idea to literary historiography and its relationship with European literature as an object. In truth, the literary historiography of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had as its fundamental basis the idea of Europe. Likewise, national discourses cannot be understood without recourse to a language that has a European or better yet a Eurocentric scope; which, as we have learned, depends greatly on silence and omission, especially in some areas that have an obvious metropolitan dimension, such as the Iberian Peninsula. However, it must be admitted that the idea of Europe emerging from the traditions of literary historiography is far from definite. Although this notion tends to rely on extraordinarily stable axis of reference, it provokes continued dissidence that becomes an effort to reposition each place or identity in the most convenient way for each particular agenda.

Revisio and literary history

Miguel Tamen (1999) referred to the rather inevitably revisionist character of literary history. In effect, literary histories tend to locate their origin in the need to revise preceding history, and focus on the misapprehensions and deficiencies of their antecedents. Nevertheless, as Tamen keenly stated, it is only those supposed errors that legitimize the revision, which ends up incorporating and naturalizing them. In this way a disciplinary language is formed, creating a web of tacit assumptions that gives coherence, leaning on the principle of *revisio perpetua*, to the tradition of literary history. An example within the peninsular field is the apologetic vocation of the larger part of eighteenth-century historiography, determined to rise against the partiality with which Spanish literature and culture had been treated in other European countries by means of the detailed exposition of its heritage. Another case in point is the insistence with which Portuguese historians of the nineteenth century such as Almeida Garrett, Freire de Carbalho, Costa e Silva, or Andrade Ferreira justified their work by claiming to correct the errors and distortions of foreign authors (Bouterwek, Sismondi, Denis). During the first decades of the twentieth century, a similar complaint about the absence of a valid history resonated in the field of Spanish literature, which in many cases was a way of objecting to the dependence upon foreign ideas and demanding a revision of the histories inherited from the nineteenth century (Cabo 2001, 32–34). Likewise, Teófilo Braga continuously redefined the ethnic and geo-cultural support of his vision of the history of Portuguese literature to better adjust its national dimension. In the same manner, this revisionist approach is notorious with those who try to incorporate other literary realities, almost always with a national or proto-national reach, onto the prestigious stage of European literature.

In 1911, José Cervaens y Rodríguez also resorted to this type of revision when he used the epigraph *dead literatures* to describe the Galician, Basque, Catalan, and, curiously, Italian literatures, and to insist on the importance of their contribution to European literature. With reference to Catalan literature, Manuel Milá i Fontanals referred to the process that, in accordance with the development of Romanic studies, resulted in the recognition of "a literary region whose works have been forgotten" (Cambouliu 1910, iii), contributing to the completion

of European literary geography. That same approach to revision that calls for a literary past and strives to assign it a specific position is actually found in Augusto G. Besada or Florencio Vaamonde Lores, the first historians of Galician literature.

The *revisio* becomes one of the trademarks in the discourse of literary historiography. It should be interpreted as the result of a difficult and elusive connection with the past, a connection that carries an argumentative character oriented towards the establishment of identities and positions within a complex geo-cultural framework. This framework includes factors such as the emergence of the modern European national states, the transition from the old regimes to liberal forms of government, the displacement towards the North of geopolitical and cultural hegemony in Europe, the crisis of a specific colonial model, especially of the Peninsular empires, and the post-imperial redefinition of the relation of powers within Europe. Either way, it deals with specific circumstances of supranational character. Different positions could be taken according to different points of view, and they were to be formulated with the help of tools provided by the discourse of literary history.

Geo-literary codes

There is a noteworthy circumstance in this respect. While Iberian literatures were subjected to a geo-cultural typological process from a global European perspective, the same general categories were used internally as a way to attribute identities and reciprocal differences within a specific Iberian context. Orientalism – used so persistently to characterize Iberian culture – radically affected in turn the appreciation of Castilian literature by those who tried to legitimize *ad contrarium* other Peninsular literatures, such as Galician (Manuel Murguía, Vicente Risco), Asturian (Fuertes Acevedo), and Portuguese, through the claim of a differential Celtic substrate and, at times, of a Northern character. Quite significantly, Teófilo Braga's concept of Portuguese literature evolved into a "*transference* of Portuguese literature from a 'Northern' to a 'Southern' point of view, transforming it from its initial Germanic to a Romanic perspective" (C.M.F. Cunha 2002, 337). This was a consequence of the coming to light the great songbooks of Galician-Portuguese medieval poetry beginning in the 1870s, among other factors.

It is a process of symbolic introjection that leads to the replication on an internal level of the traits governing the image of the Other from a European standpoint. Sometimes the resort to a geo-cultural language led, on the contrary, to sustain an Iberian agenda of Peninsular integration on the basis of a common position before Europe, that was often considered as a external reality. This attitude was also prolific, having taken recourse, for instance, to the notion of a common Latin background (J. P. de Oliveira Martins). Be that as it may, the confidence in the unique peculiarity of Iberian literatures, when placed within the context of a universal literary history, has been noted repeatedly by many authors up to the present, for example, Santiago Prampolini (1956, vol. 9) and Raymond Queneau (1958). In addition to this assertion of a global Iberian position on a European or universal literary stage, there was also a distinct determination to use geo-literary codes with European roots to articulate the identitarian connection among different areas of the Iberian Peninsula, as shown for example in the linkage of Galicia with Portugal via their presumed Celtic and Atlantic ties (Manuel Murguía, Vicente Risco) and

the identification of the distinct Catalan linguistic areas by way of their Mediterranean condition (Eugeni d'Ors).

Literary memoir and heritage

According to its basic lines, the historiography of the different Peninsular traditions cannot be considered exceptional or highly idiosyncratic. We should mention in the first place different kinds of literary panoramas, subjected to discursive models alien to those of modern literary historiography, but which may be considered nonetheless as precedents. Many of them partake of a global Peninsular perspective. A good example of this view was *Prohemio e carta* (Proem and letter, c. 1446), addressed by Íñigo López de Mendoza, Marquis of Santillana, to Don Pedro, Constable of Portugal and later Count of Barcelona and suitor to the Kingdom of Aragon. Others were the apologetic panorama of Spanish culture *De asserenda hispanorum eruditione* (Vindication of Spanish erudition, 1553) by Alfonso García Matamoros, the reflections on Castilian poetry of Fernando de Herrera in his *Anotaciones* (Annotations) to the poetry of Garcilaso de la Vega, and *República literaria* (Literary republic) by Diego Saavedra Fajardo, in which works by Ausías March and Camões are also included. An even earlier example is the extraordinary historical survey of Spanish-Hebraic poetry written in the twelveth century by Moses Ibn Ezra, conceived as a demonstration of "the superiority of the Diaspora of al-Andalusia with reference to the creation of poetry, prose, and Hebraic epistles."

A fundamental landmark, noted as a major precedent by the historiographical discourse itself, was found in the pioneer work done by *bibliothecae* and dictionaries, assigned to cataloguing the bibliographic groundwork in each specific cultural area. Nicolás Antonio's *Bibliotheca hispana vetus* (Old Spanish Bibliotheca, 1672) and *Bibliotheca hispana nova* (New Spanish Bibliotheca, 1696) were significant for Spanish literary history. Likewise, the four volumes of *Bibliotheca lusitana* (Lusitanian Bibliotheca, 1741–1759) by Diogo Barbosa de Machado were also important for Portuguese historiography. These were preceded by João Franco Barreto's (1662–1665) work with the same title. There were actually many other catalogues and revisions that resulted in a consistent tradition (Cebrián 1997; F. de Figueiredo 1930, 2, chap. 14; ASJ 1982, 394–5). Tellingly enough, most of these bio-bibliographic catalogues did not rely on linguistic criteria and included works in different languages, clearly expressing the primary need to establish a general repertoire of the literary heritage of the Iberian kingdoms (M. V. Mendes 1999, 69 ff.; Quadrio 2001).

Other works of this kind – *Memorias para ayudar a formar un diccionario crítico de los escritores catalanes* (Annotations to help form a critical dictionary of Catalan authors, 1836) by Félix Torres Amat and *Biblioteca valenciana* (Valencian Bibliotheca) by Justo Pastor Fuster – were important references for future Catalan historians. The last chapter of the aforementioned *Le Pays Basque* (1857) by Francisque Michel provided information regarding all works written in Basque up to first half of the nineteenth century. The primary reference for Galician literature was, in turn, the three volumes of *Diccionario bio-bibliográfico de escritores* (Bio-bibliographic dictionary of authors, 1951–1953) by Antonio Couceiro Freijomil, which was in fact preceded by a tradition of historiographical surveys that had been initiated in the 1880s. This type of index

was also used in other literary domains. Such was the case of *Bibliotheca asturiana* (Asturian Bibliotheca) by Carlos González de Posada (1745–1831), unpublished during his lifetime, and subsequently, *Bosquejo acerca del estado que alcanzó en todas las épocas la literatura en Asturias* (Outline of the status reached by literature over time in Asturias) by Máximo Fuertes Acevedo (1885), which included a bibliography with notes of the area's writers, independent of their language, and appeared as the first step towards a history of Asturian literature (Ramos Corrada 2002, 11–17).

Those are not the only mentionable cases, as shown by *Bibliotheca arabico-hispana Escurialensis* (Arab-Spanish Bibliotheca, 1760–1770) by Miguel Casiri (Michel Gharcieh Al-Ghaziri), a highly influential compendium of Arabic manuscripts preserved in the library of El Escorial Monastery. It was a point of reference for subsequent literary histories and the beginning of Spanish-Arabic studies. The number of dictionaries and bibliothecae is practically inexhaustible, not only by its quantity, but by the diversity of its fields of reference, showing the vast variety of literary spaces that overlap without coinciding.

To these efforts to establish the heritage and expose the literary capital of the Iberian tradition we should add the steady work of erudition dependent on royal institutions such as the Academia Real das Ciências de Lisboa (Royal Academy of Sciences of Lisbon) in Portugal and the Real Academia de la Historia (Royal Academy of History) in Spain. In summary, the dynamics were not different from other ambits in Europe, although the cultural institutions of the Spanish and Portuguese monarchies left a mark on them and submitted to their own agendas the initiative towards the creation of other literary memoirs. Significantly, this was the time in which the term *literature* was being defined as "the knowledge of the collection of works which are considered worthy of being preserved by a nation." (Espagne 1993, 139).

The literature of the eighteenth century was considered a national legacy that needed to be exhibited before Europe. The ideal setting and addressee of many of these endeavors was, in fact, the European literary republic. For instance, in 1745 Father Martín Sarmiento addressed *Memorias para la historia de la poesía española* (Memoir for the history of Spanish poetry) to Cardinal Silvio Valenti Gonzaga, Secretary of State to Pope Benedict XIV, explaining that "much of what is popular in Spain tends to be unknown in other countries" (M. Sarmiento 1775, 2). And the fact is that the esteem of Iberian literatures would evolve from apparent neglect and even contempt to the consideration of interesting manifestations of vigorous literary nationalities. To understand this circumstance we must comprehend the interrelation between the fact that Spanish and Portuguese literatures became an object of study and the process that led the Peninsula to a situation of geopolitical marginalization within Europe. The Mexican intellectual Leopoldo Zea (1957) pointed out that extreme identification with Catholicism and contact with Semitism had alienated the Iberian Peninsula from modern rationalistic discourse, marginalizing it from the West in the same way as Russia. This sort of theses, together with that of the intransitivity and anachronism of Iberian culture, brought about one of the constitutive topics of the modern geo-cultural discourse on the idea of Europe. Angeles Huerta (2004) recently examined some of the discursive keys of this process. Undoubtedly, this idea was persistent and had hegemonic character. Its symbolic charge provided significance to Spanish as well as Portuguese literature in a European context, influenced by the Franco-German struggle to become the core of the new Europe.

Antiaustracismo and Chronopolitics

These are not the only elements to be considered. Taking into account the internal development of the historiographical discourse in the Peninsula. There were specific situations that explain the way in which certain theses about its literature and culture were consolidated. For example, it has been noted that during the eighteenth century there was a fragile development of the 'public sphere,' conditioned by the close alliance of important groups of intellectuals, many of them concerned with literary historiography, and the new Bourbon regime arising after the defeat of Charles of Austria in the War of Succession (1702–1713). Accordingly, these groups had a tendency to define Spanish culture and literature programmatically from a classicist and centralist perspective, perceived as contrary to the state of things during the Austrian monarchy. Even if a number of exceptions could be noted, such as Gregorio Mayans y Siscar, the role played by important cultural institutions such as the Academia del Buen Gusto (Academy of good taste) or the *Diario de los literatos* (Men of letters' journal) along with the protagonism of intellectuals such as Agustín de Montiano y Luyando – first director of the Real Academia de la Historia –, Blas Nasarre – Royal Librarian –, or Luis José Velázquez – author of *Orígenes de la poesía castellana* (The origins of Castilian poetry, 1754) – give credit to the thesis defended by José A. Valero (1999, 198). Valero understands the cultural program of this intellectual elite as "an exercise of historical interpretation, of definition of the present by opposition to an immediate past that had to be overcome."

Recently, other researchers have stressed the profound national and central nature of this cultural agenda (Alvarez Barrientos 2004), thus revealing the ideological framework in which the aesthetic rejection of the seventeenth century was articulated institutionally and canonically. This attitude can be identified with the term *antiaustracismo*. In other words, antiaustracismo may be conceived as the negative appraisal of the Hapsburg period, held to be a time of decadence, as well as the need to overcome it in alliance with the state. In summary, we are facing a basic component of that which José Carlos Mainer (2000, 161) has named *literary regalism*, i.e. the association of literary progress to the progress of the state, held directly responsible for the cultural achievements of the kingdom. Thus, literature was considered as decor and credential of the state on the international stage.

Accordingly, the foundation of the Real Academia Española (Spanish Royal Academy) in 1713 came to be held as a historiographical milestone by important eighteenth-century literary historians such as Luis José Velázquez or the Franciscan Fathers Rafael and Pedro Rodríguez Mohedano (*Historia literaria de España* [Literary history of Spain], 1766–91), who considered this event the turning point in recovering from a period of decay in Spanish poetry and literature. These authors stated in their historiographical projects that the academic institution signaled the beginning of a restoration of the grandeur lost during the period of national decline identified with the final years of the Hapsburg monarchy. Ultimately, Spanish literature was dependent on a broken canon that failed to follow a continuum over time, needing always to recuperate from these interruptions (Mainer 2000, 156 and 159, 176–82).

Similarly, Francisco Freire de Carvalho described in *Primeiro ensaio sobre história literaria de Portugal* (First essay of Portuguese literary history, 1845), clearly dependent still on the historiographical models of the eighteenth century, the decadence of Portuguese literature due to

Spanish "intrusive and tyrannical dominance" and its restoration starting with the foundation of the Academia Real da História Portuguesa (Portuguese Royal Academy of History) in 1720. Thus, the intermission identified with the integration of Portugal in the Spanish-Hapsburg monarchy (1580–1640) became one of the discursive trademarks of Portuguese literary historiography, in spite of some occasional discrepancies (Camilo Castelo-Branco).

Starting with Philip II, the Austrian period was to be considered behind European standards, and consequently, as a period in which the Iberian Peninsula's culture started to be outdated. Clearly, there was a bond between the *antiaustracista* attitude and the interpretation of Iberian culture as an irregular chronological development. This is defined in technical terms as chrono-literary determination, which is a way of explaining the relationship between Iberian literatures and the rest of Europe. The historiography of the nineteenth century implied quite a different aesthetic and ideological context, but *antiaustracismo* as an ideological trademark was retained by many historians of that period like Bouterwek, Sismondi, and Ticknor. As a matter of fact, during this century the thesis of chronological anomaly was strengthened in different ways. The German version of Velázquez's *Orígenes de la poesía castellana*, by the Göttingen Professor Johann Andreas Dieze (1769), was one of the main references for Bouterwek, who was later used as a basic reference by Sismondi (Hart 1952, 80–83; Meregalli 1990, 26). Velázquez was also highly influential in other histories written in the early 1800s by authors such as Malmontet (1810) in France or the liberal Spanish exile A. Anaya (1818) in England. Although divergent in their aesthetic and canonic values, the shared facts and converging logic of these authors led to the development of a Spanish and in general Iberian literature with a well-defined temporal trademark, that of backwardness and belatedness.

Another crucial element in this respect is the concurrence of the formation of the idea of Spanish and Portuguese national literatures with the reduction of modern metropolitan Spain to its Peninsular limits and the marginalization of the Portuguese colonial empire in the colonialist logic of the nineteenth century and the early 1900s. The War of the Spanish Succession ended with the Utrecht treaties (1713) which rearranged and reconfigured the international order of Europe. In this rearrangement Spain lost a large part of its Mediterranean influence. The treaties which put an end to the war led, according to the historian José María Jover (1999, 25), to "the total disarticulation of the Spanish monarchy in Europe." Under British supremacy, geopolitics in Europe was to be remodeled after Utrecht. But the treaties that put an end to the War of Spanish Succession have to be inscribed in a larger sequence of treaties, such as the treaty that ended the Thirty Years War in Westphalia (1648), which exposed the failure by the Spanish to reorganize the continent, and that of the Congress of Vienna (1815), which brought to an end the Napoleonic period and resulted in serious consequences for the Spanish possessions overseas and a growing Germanic influence in Europe. There were other episodes that were crucial for the further development of international relations, for example the Conference of Berlin (1884), which delineated the colonization of Africa, excluding Portugal, the first non-Arab colonist in Africa, and assigning a secondary role to Spain. Without taking for granted a strict parallelism, it has to be asserted that there are close ties between the changing geopolitical situation and the manner in which European literatures were relating to each other during this crucial period that gave rise to Romanticism and the development of the national literary historiographies, as well as literary comparatism.

As for the geopolitical background of these historiographical processes, it is pertinent to consider texts such as *Portugal na balança de Europa* (Portugal in the European balance, 1830), a political reflection in which Almeida Garrett from his exile in London wrote about the precarious position of Portugal on the international stage and recommended its integration with Spain as a lesser evil.

History as apology: Literary nationalism

It is not difficult to discern some of the main reasons behind the apologetic as well as defensive nature of most approaches to Spanish culture, especially those relating to its self-perception, since the last quarter of the eighteenth century. The change in the European geopolitical and geo-cultural equilibrium had a well-known propagandistic dimension. The so-called *black legend* quite appropriately reflects this European geopolitical transformation: it first appeared in Italy in the sixteenth century, continued its development in the Netherlands, and was accepted by the French and English in the eighteenth century. The black legend started as the reactive propaganda of those who viewed themselves as objects of occupation, but evolved into an instrument in the hands of the emerging powers – claiming for themselves the prestige of rationality and modernity – against the declining Iberia. This form of hetero-characterization was very effective from a symbolic point of view and ended up affecting Spain's role in Europe. The famous article 'Espagne' by Masson de Morvilliers in the *Encyclopédie méthodique* (The methodic encyclopedia, 1782) endorsed the thesis of marginality persisting in the topics dealing with decline and decadence of Spain. Among the diverse reactions to this article, the *Oración apologética por la España y su mérito literario* (Apologetic discourse in favor of Spain and its literary merit, 1786) by Juan Pablo Forner, which was sponsored institutionally by the Royal Spanish Academy, is particularly significant. The controversial situation generated by Masson's polemic contribution exposed a "changeable, contrasting, polyphonic perception of the position of the Spanish nation" (Lopez 1999, 403), in which the idea of decadence appeared everywhere.

This mere apologetic attitude gave way in some instances to the first indication of a change in values that lead to the acceptance of the decadence of the time and, simultaneously, to a vindication of the literature of the Golden Age and the wealth of its language; for example, by Antonio de Capmany in his "Preliminary discourse" to the *Teatro histórico-crítico de la elocuencia española* (Critical historical theater of Spanish eloquence, 1786–1794). These views involved a preterist component that searched for the identity of the literature in a time that had already passed and strived to establish a canon according to those assumptions (Etienvre 2001, chap. 9 and 10; Baker 2003). These, along with the emerging interest on medieval literature, are some of the first steps towards the consolidation of the nineteenth-century historiographical conception of literature. In the historiography of the eighteenth century, decadence became the fundamental ideological pattern due to the reorientation of the cultural project as a consequence of the change in dynasty. This reorientation was strongly associated, as it has been mentioned, with a centralized and canonizing perspective of the literary past. Literary productions were viewed as goods – according to the use of this notion by Itamar Even-Zohar (2000, 389) – that

needed to be adduced and vindicated in the face of other European nations, in a horizon of open *intersystemic competition*, to resort again to Even-Zohar's terminology.

Masson de Morvilliers famously asked *Que doit-on á l'Espagne?* (What do we owe to Spain?), a symbolic question about the cultural *goods* of the Spanish nation and the extent of its contribution to the European heritage, which made many Spanish scholars uncomfortable. This question can be understood in terms of cultural capital and the forms of its circulation as well as the quality and quantity of the contributions of a specific group at a moment of a restructured European identity.

The sense of Spain's crisis as a metropolitan entity and European power is clearly defined by its cultural strategy within a context in which "the black legend, image created by foreigners, was at the center of every reflection of Spain during the Enlightenment and acted as a powerful stimulant, justifying all projects and intellectual ventures" (Lopez 1999, 322). In addition, Pierre Chaunu (1964) argued in his classical study on this matter that the singularity of the image of Spain formed and conveyed by the black legend, a heterogeneous ensemble of negative characterizations of the Spanish past, was its ability to affect the Spanish self-proclaimed image of culture and character. However, a distinction must be established between the type of perceptions that still viewed Spain as a threat and the ones, beginning in the eighteenth century, that represented Spain through a progressive process of *exoticism*, emphasizing, especially in France, its picturesque, decorative, ornamental, and legendary character (Pageaux 1996, 55–73). Hetero-characterization predominated over auto-characterization, which is a common trait of every cultural process of marginalization, but with different nuances. It is to be noted, in this respect, that the symbolic minorization, which had reached its peak with the French Illustration, led to a change in values that paradoxically turned out to make Spanish literature, specially through the action of German Romanticism, a crucial element of the alternative conceptualization of the literature and the image of Europe.

The exiled Catalan Jesuit priest Juan Francisco de Masdeu illustrated this case in *Historia crítica de España y de la cultura española* (Critical history of Spain and Spanish culture), originally published in Italy between 1781 and 1787. This work came about as a result of the controversy created by the negative comments regarding Spanish culture made by some Italian intellectuals like Francesco Saverio Quadrio and Girolamo Tiraboschi (Baasner 1995, 137–187). The fact is that Masdeu's work was one of the first general histories of culture, coetaneous with the spread of the term *Kultur* in Germany, which Peter Burke (1997) placed as the origin of the contemporary cultural history.

Masdeu hints at the significance of the chrono-cultural and chrono-literary stereotyping of Spanish culture with his resorting to a language that reminds us of the Aristotelian account of natural slavery. This theory had been used to categorize the New World by authors of the School of Salamanca during the sixteenth century and systematically introduced the chrono-political dialectic to characterize the West. In fact, in his preliminary discourse, Masdeu (1783, 1: 1–2) lamented the proliferation of publications filled with "insults towards Spain" and found in them "the belief by many that the Spanish nation is not only barbaric like the Greek, Roman, and other ancient cultures were but is barbaric by nature, which is not, nor was this true for any other nation." The diminution of Spain to a status of natural barbarism without any real possibility of advancement, denounced by Masdeu, is highly ironic considering that

Spanish intellectuals had resorted insistently to this intellectual tool to build categories for discourse about the New World two and a half centuries before. Although Masdeu's approach might appear strident, the employment of this type of discourse is another example of the radical change in the symbolic judgment of Spain and the Peninsula at this point of the eighteenth century.

In this disputatious context, the Spanish literary repertory functioned as an extrinsic argument and testimony of the prestige of the nation competitively situated in a European framework: "sincerely I believe that if Spain were to write a complete history of its poetry, there would be no other nation in Europe that would be able to publish a better one, whether considering its antiquity, the number and continued series of poets, the influence on other nations' poetry, and finally the sublimity and delicacy of the creativity of Spanish poets" (Masdeu, 1783, 1: 196). The recourse to criteria of antiquity, continuity, capacity to influence, and aesthetic value is apparent, as well as its outright subordination to the objectives of a geo-cultural dispute.

Adrian Marino (1998, 13) placed Masdeu's theory as an example of the eighteenth-century notion of a *literary Europe* and accredited him with being the first to develop it as "a complete set of national literatures." Evidently, the author of *Historia crítica* illustrates the consolidation of a European context of valuation and reference as well as the controversial hierarchical rationale that regulated it. Masdeu referred to "the national genius" of the diverse European nations in the same manner that the Rodríguez Mohedano brothers (1766) talked about "national character." In any case, only in a broad sense is it possible to recognize this as the foundation of national literatures, although a paradigmatic change was imminent in which the chrono-literary foundation was going to be determinant. Masdeu's *genius* was still a typifying feature (Gestalt) – in line with the geographic and climatic determination characteristic of the Illustration – and not an efficient organic cause with a clear historic dialectic dimension as the *national character* would be for Romanticism.

Let us recall that Giovanni Getto (1969, 79 ff.) had already drawn attention to the leading role of the Jesuit priests (F.S. Quadrio, Zaccharia, Tiraboschi) in the definition of a national character in Italian literature, which actually had a parallel with the Spanish Jesuits living in Italy after their expulsion by Charles III. Although Getto pointed out the profound differences with the *national spirit* of the nineteenth century, he found in the eighteenth-century approaches "the necessary germinating moment" of subsequent literary nationalism.

In the eighteenth century a nationalist cultural discourse was established in the Peninsula which had its own peculiarities. It had a programmatic character connected to monarchies such as that of Fernando VI (Luis Jose Velázquez, Father Martín Sarmiento), and Charles III (Fathers Rodríguez Mohedano), and to groups close to key institutions in the Bourbon political culture, like the Royal Academy of History, which was founded in 1735 and remained a fundamental institution during the nineteenth century (Pellistrandi, 2004). The modern discourse of literary history appeared in this context (Alvarez Barrientos, 2004) and was later supported by the publicity of Spanish Jesuits in Italy, most of them Catalan and from the ancient kingdom of Aragon, asserting apologetic strategies in favor of Spanish culture.

The nationalism of the literary historiography of the eighteenth century had two sides bound by some programmatic elements that help to explain it as cultural discourse. On the one side it was a *nationalism of emulation*. This was in response to the "necessities to affirm

its own image set by the national intellectual elites *vis a vis* the literary European republic, in the framework of a classicist and universal notion of culture and within a concept of national heritage by which the glory of the nation was identified with the display of the wellbeing and prosperity of the monarchy" (Valero 2002). Similarly, the *literary regalism*, brought up by José-Carlos Mainer, was linked not only to the geo-cultural dimension of the literary history of the eighteenth century but also to the character of programmatic discourse, reactive to images and stereotypes provided by the dominant cultural centers of the time attempting to discredit the geo-cultural position of the Peninsula.

On the other side, the nationalism of the literary history showed traits of what Valero called *centralist nationalism*. This has to do with the integrator that attempted to support a unitary state through the postulation of a homogeneous cultural model aware of the confluence of different and mixed components. The historiographical discourse was to become one of its main champions. It was not merely coincidental, for example, that when Fathers Rodríguez Mohedano (1766, LXXIII) explained that one of the main purposes of their work was "to place Spanish literature under the same point of view," they added a significant reflection about the literary spatial ambit which included the Peninsula, explicitly excluding Portugal, leaving out the former European dominions, but emphatically incorporating the American territories. In general terms, Spanish literary space coincided with the basic territorial setting of the state at the concrete moment in which this *Literary history of Spain* was planned. The specific conception of Spanish literature depended on a precise ideological and programmatic framework that caused the retrospective building of that concept.

These two sides of the literary nationalism of the eighteenth century were greatly intertwined. To claim a specific European position required the presentation of a combined and homogenous cultural patrimony; and also the opposite, the formation of a unitary discourse about Spanish literature demanded a more or less precise territorial delimitation and an image that defined the position and identity of that literature in the European context. There are two illuminating examples of this polarity.

The language of the nation

The first example points to the role played by languages in establishing an identity for Spanish literature in the historiographical discourse of the eighteenth century. As has usually been stated, the eighteenth-century model was not formed via linguistic identity, but instead included all works within a specific territorial literary framework no matter what language they were written in, in accordance with the extent of the notion of literature of the time. Coming close to wishful thinking, the emphasis on the different languages of the Peninsula in some of these historiographical works has been correlated with "the idea that what defines a nation is the law and not its ethnic features" (Onaindía 2002, 112). However, the book referred to by Onaindía, *Orígenes de la poesía castellana* by Luis José Velázquez (1754), was not so much a proclamation of the Spanish character of Arabic, Basque, Lemousin, Portuguese, and Galician, as a consideration of their influence on Castilian poetry. Poems written in other languages were valued mainly in as much as they were sources of Castilian poetry, and in fact a genetic plot

was devised based on the thesis that Castilian was later than other Peninsular languages and ended up subsuming and incorporating them. There was an evident teleological basis behind this idea. This has been confirmed by Joaquín Alvarez Barrientos (2004, 108) with the following observation: in the literary histories of the eighteenth century, a multi-cultural and multi-linguistic vision of Spanish literature was prevalent but only until the turning point of the reign of the Catholic Monarchs, a development converted into a historical landmark. The significance of this development was comparable to the formation of the Royal Spanish Academy for the recuperation of Spanish literature after the decadence of the Austrian monarchy. This became a point of inflection in which Spanish and Castilian literature were identified in so far as, supposedly, the other Peninsular literary traditions would have already converged into a common national language. In this way a narrative rationalization of Castilian language as the national language was created that with few exceptions was converted into a mark of identity of Spanish literary historiography until the present.

The literary historiography of the eighteenth century somehow substantiated a theory that can be dated to the sixteenth century, when authors like the Jesuit Father Mariana introduced Castilian as the crucible where concurred other Peninsular languages. According to Leonardo Romero Tobar (2006, 43 and 49), this idea was adopted up to the twentieth century by influent historiographers like Ramón Menéndez Pidal and Ángel Valbuena Prat. It was essential in the composition of the historiographical discourse of Spanish literature and was consolidated by historiographers during the 1700s, although existing both prior to and after this period. The argument for the latter preeminence of Castilian in defining the Spanish nation, with the capacity of assimilating and integrating changes, was a concept very similar to the one that served to assure the cosmopolitan superiority of German, French, and English with respect to European and other worldwide literatures at different moments in time.

Geo-literary positions

The second observation pointed to the European horizon of historiographical nationalism of emulation that affected even works that did not openly state this intention. Juan Andrés should be mentioned because of his historiographical work *Dell'origine progressi e stato attuale d'ogni letteratura* (Of the origin, progress, and current state of each literature). Published in Parma between 1782 and 1799, it has been understood in recent times as a distinguished example of the universal history of literature (Mazzeo 1965), as a paradigm of a universal variant of erudite literary history (Sinopoli 1996), and also as a model of comparative literary history (Arato 2000; Pedro Aullón de Haro 2002). Despite the cosmopolitan intention Juan Andrés (1997–2000, 1: 8) clearly emphasized in the introduction, the fact is that the effort to establish a priveleged position for Spanish literature was crucial on the whole and there is reason to believe that it helped condition the proposed global representation of worldwide literature. According to Mazzeo (1965, 125) the divulgement and vindication of Spanish literature was the main stimulus of Andrés's entire literary history. This may be why Andrés has been reproached, from a Peninsular perspective, for the tenuous reference to Portuguese literature and furthermore, for using its erudite works "as a cover for Spanish propaganda" (Palma-Ferreira 1985, 17).

The apologetic direction of eighteenth-century Spanish literary history led to a proto-comparative dimension since it fostered the interest in the reception and influence of Spanish literature and culture in Europe, for example in Lampillas' and Masdeu's work, and also connected Spanish authors with classic authors (Urzainqui 2004, 230–232). Andrés's strategy was less dependent on parallelism and was much more synthetically ambitious. It tried to demonstrate the privileged position of Spanish literature by focusing on its connection to Arab culture and by emphasizing the liminality and transitivity of Spanish culture, which had already been stressed by other eighteenth-century historians such as the Mohedano Fathers and Father Martín Sarmiento. The penetration of Arab culture in the Peninsula was undoubtedly a factor in this process. Juan Andrés was one of the great defenders of a thesis that was to be discarded by the mainstream authors of Peninsular literary history, mainly that Arab culture had a determinative presence in the Peninsula and through it in the whole of Europe (Mazzeo 1965, 155–189).

Once the thesis that Arab literature is the basis of Provençal poetry and aspects such as rhyme is accepted, the conclusion that Andrés advocates is made apparent: "the beginnings of modern literature originated in Spain." Moreover, according to Andrés, the nurturing of literature in the vulgar languages as opposed to Latin was propagated to all of Europe from the Peninsula as a result of the exemplary influence of Arab literature. As this Jesuit wrote: "the fondness for vulgar poetry and the desire to nurture the native language was communicated to France via Spain and onwards to the rest of Europe" (Andrés 1997–2000, 1: 270).

The narrative of the origins of modern European literature was not alien to the emphasis placed by Andrés on Provençal poetry, which he considered prominently Catalan, an opinion also shared by Lampillas and previously Martín Sarmiento (1775, 346). Neither was this narrative dissociated from the proclamation of Petrarch as the first modern European poet, nor the repeated reflection that Spanish and Italian literature had a specific resemblance. From a geo-literary point of view, Spanish literature and poetry, and in general that of the Peninsula, fit in a Southern ambit. Clearly, this concerned a Romanic and meridional conception in which the Arab component was fundamental.

Andrés's theory can be compared fruitfully with the one found in another of the great literary Peninsular histories of this period. This work, *Memorias para la historia de la poesía y poetas españoles* by Martín Sarmiento, was published posthumously in 1775 but had been completed by 1745. It also defended the decisive influence of Arab poetry in the birth of modern European poetry and anticipated the idea of the liminal and transitive character of Peninsular culture (1775, 46–84). However, the geo-literary orientation proposed in this book had very significant peculiarities. For example, although Martín Sarmiento supported the notion of Arab influence in the diffusion of poetry, he also considered that there was a northern origin to rhyme and assumed that it penetrated into Galicia through the Celtics and Suebi (1775, 88–93). This assumption agrees with Martín Sarmiento's repeated vindication of the precedence of Galician poetry among vulgar poetic traditions in the Peninsula as well as in Europe, and its specificity with respect to Portuguese (1775, 197). In this way, Martín Sarmiento showed signs of the re-dimension of the geo-literary situation of the Peninsula, in which the hypotheses of a northern component in the surge of popular poetry and the leading role of Galician poetry in the general development of European poetry began to gain ground.

In Andrés's case, the type of argument he defends is obvious considering that the chapter dedicated to Arabs follows a chapter centered on the Carolingian Renaissance that the author considered a frustrated cultural enterprise. Roberto Dainotto (2006) understands that Andrés's work expressed discontent with respect to the French-centered model of Europe proposed by Montesquieu, whose arguments were based on the break with the classic tradition and the privilege of Charlemagne, and the idea of a Germanic Middle Age as the implicit origin of the idea of Europe. Montesquieu's account was highly chrono-political, as defined by Johannes Fabian, and implied the estrangement of Southern Europe from modernity. Montesquieu transferred to the geography of Europe the alienating dissimilarity between Europe and Asia by considering the South an "inner East," thus indicating its backwardness and marginality with respect to the epistemological, ethical, and political centrality of the "true" Europe. In this context, the thesis that Arab literature and culture were the basic impulse for the creation of modern Europe, springing from the cultural *otherness* of the South and particularly of the Iberian Peninsula, is quite an audacious proposition.

The crisis of a model

In summary, eighteenth-century historiography introduced essential aspects that explained the formation of historiographical discourse concerning the literatures of the Iberian Peninsula. Besides the recollection of data and the establishment of the extent of a determined literary patrimony, the literary historiography of the eighteenth century implied a global characterization of Spanish literature. This was the basis for a process of "invention" with a programmatic design associated to a form of nationalism that developed in two directions that complemented each other: external or emulating and internal or co-optative. In the external kind, geo-cultural tensions and conflicts about the idea of Europe were evident, as well as a geographical collective imagination which profoundly affected the development of literary history, particularly in the Peninsula. In the internal kind, there was a progressive identification between Spanish and Castilian literature, although taking into account as a starting point the linguistic and cultural plurality of the Peninsula. This produced an ambiguous situation for Portuguese literature since Portuguese was considered by many Spanish historians as one of the languages that formed part of the pluralistic substrate of Spanish literature.

However, the eighteenth-century paradigm of literary historiography was soon discarded. The erudite literary history that had its inspiration in the model defended by Francis Bacon in *The Advancement of Learning* (1604) was well received in Southern Europe with the help of Benedictine monks of the Parisian abbacy of Saint Maure, of Franciscans such as Fathers Rodriguez Mohedano, and of Jesuits such as Tiraboschi, Lampillas, Masdeu, and Juan Andrés. José Antonio Valero (1996, 177–78) recognized this model, which was strongly linked to the Church, as "a discipline in which the cultivators of literature were provided with a discursive space suitable to balance the anxiety produced by the modernization of the system of knowledge." No doubt that this "system of knowledge" would very soon replace the kind of alternative encyclopedism meant by the literary historiography of the eighteenth century. There was yet another important consequence of this situation. In spite of the efforts to assign Iberian literature a

central position in the history of European culture, the account of the origins of Peninsular literature bestowed on it a Southern and Eastern character that would foster its marginality in the framework of the new European geo-cultural system, already under way. The kind of literary history that emerged at the beginning of the nineteenth century set out with a very different cultural position, mainly because the notion of literature had been detached from Bacon's model and because the center of influence had been displaced towards the North.

Subjectivity of literature

The chrono-literary dimension mentioned above was connected to a process without which the new notion of literature that emerged and gained acceptance starting at the beginning of the nineteenth century cannot be understood. This process also explains how the marginalization described previously would turn out to be determinant in establishing Spanish and secondarily Portuguese literature as a reference for the idea of European literature linked to the consolidation of literary history as a discipline. This refers to the subjectivity of literature and its connection to a precise, characteristic, and distinctive subject. Literature was no longer a *good* or a *legacy* that needed to be exhibited or vindicated but rather the expression of a particular subject, which was why it acquired a representative and metonymic character, so recognizable in Bouterwek or Sismondi. The concept of literature as a symbolic asset, which did not completely lose its validity, was complemented by the representative principle, which presupposed a relationship with a certain subject and social-historical condition.

Jacques Beyrie (1994, 180) adds an important remark in this sense:

> Literature, customarily conceived as being founded upon subjectivity, either individual or collective, reveals itself to be marked in good measure with the stamp of the Other, especially discernible through intertextuality. Furthermore, this same literature had a tendency to appear in some ways like a consequence or product. In fact, far from being the pure emanation of a prior entity, literature often demonstrates its constituitive and structuring power. For this reason, it tends to become cause, rather than simple effect.

The first indication of a change of course may be noticed in the context of the controversies about the relevance of the cultural and literary heritage of Spain that took place in the 1780s. An example is the previously mentioned article by Masson de Morvilliers and Forner's reply in *Oración apologética*. Several rebuttals were also made outside of Spain, the most notable written by the Italian Carlo Denina. This rebuttal served as the basis for Forner, and was even printed with its Castilian translation alongside Forner's text. Denina, an erudite from Piedmont whose role in the evolution of European comparativism has been pointed up by Baldensperger, Getto, and more recently by Franca Sinopoli (1996), gave a speech in the Academy of Berlin trying to refute Masson de Morvilliers's ideas and reacting to classic aesthetic universalism, so tied to France cultural hegemony. In his 1786 text there was actually a space for geo-political reflection as well, such as in his questioning the motives for the attacks on Spain, since there was nothing to fear from its dilapidated power. This dimension was obvious in passages such as the dedicatory to the Baron von Hertzberg, minister of Frederick II of Prussia, in which Jesús Gutiérrez

(1992, 8) detected an "idealization of Prussian expansionism", which was clearly associated with the recovery of artistic independence:

> I live and write under the protection of the best King the universe has known; a King who ensures the stability of Europe and the freedom of the states that divide it. Doesn't each country, each author, have the same reason to oppose any nation seeking the exclusive right to affect the studies, works, and taste of others? (cfr. J. Gutiérrez 1992, 19)

In reality, these observations fit the evolution of Denina towards a historical-critical concept of literature, more and more aware of the diversity of literary paradigms. This evolution was reflected in successive versions of *Discorso sopra le vicende della letterature* (Discourse on the vicissitudes of literature, 1761) and the treatment given to Spanish literature, even if it doesn't go beyond an enlightened historical-critical assessment. However, it was not only an issue of a distinct artistic sensibility but a matter that entailed a decisive geo-literary dimension, especially in the framework of *literary regalism* characteristic of this time period in European culture. Everything identified with Spanish literature began to attract attention in an international scene where the increasing rivalry between France and Prussia was patent.

It is worthwhile to mention in this regard the important influence of English literary studies and their role in the vindication of Spanish *romances*, conceived by Thomas Percy as primitive expressions of an oriental sensitivity (Wellek 1966, 128–29). In this same vein, and just to mention an outstanding reference, the Romantic poet Robert Southey, who was influenced by Herder's ideas (as was Bouterwek), would also be devoted to Spanish literature, which wouldn't prevent him of being also a conspicuous literary nationalist and disparaging the Neoclassic age "from Dryden to Pope", for instance, in his *Sketch of the progress of English poetry from Chaucer to Cowper* (Bravo 1981, 131 and ff.).

Friedrich Schlegel's *History of ancient and modern literature*

The influence of the chrono-literary interpretation of Iberian literature can be clearly seen in a systematic, doctrinal, and highly influential work, *Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur* (History of ancient and modern literature, 1815), by Friedrich Schlegel. This work was written when anti-Napoleonic sentiment was at its highest and significantly dedicated to Klemens von Metternich, the famous chancellor of Francis I of Austria. In it, Spanish literature occupies an important position, although within a larger teleological scheme which shows the argumentative, and one could even say strategic nature of this position.

In Schlegel's work, what we have called the subjectivization of literature is a theoretic principle which is based on two pillars. The first is identified with national character, though not considered as a product of external factors such as climate or landscape, nor as a means of mere individualization. In the first chapter of Schlegel's work, the notion of *national character* is explained, along with the extent to which a culture can be defined by this principle. One of the factors he emphasizes is the necessity of overcoming the gap between the writers among the courtesan and aristocratic class, and the people. This was because an elitist literature implied cultural alienation, which lessened this literature's national dimension. Another factor is the argument of a connection between literature and social-historical life, without which literature

would be less dynamic and have less of an influence on the nation and the state (Schlegel 1841, 4). In other words, the historical dimension of literature and its capacity of preserving the profoundest memory of a nation were highlighted.

Thus, a true national literature would be that which had a deep popular dimension, was non-elitist, and held a close relationship with the life of the nation. Schlegel's concept was national-popular, radically subjective, and vindicated as an axiological principle in literature "the moral point of view, which commands every thing, from which alone we can discover whether a literature be throughout national, and in harmony with the national weal and the national spirit" (Schlegel 1841, 259). This criterion directly opposed the normative value which would find its support in "any universal theory of art," that is, in the principles of classicism and illustrated aestheticism. For Schlegel, who considered the literature of Spain intimately related to that of Portugal (Schlegel 1841, 257), Spanish literature was the most national of all modern literatures, chiefly because of its collective identification with a defined and characteristic subject (Schlegel 1841, 259–60). Predictably, this idea was to be complacently reiterated by important Spanish historians of literature such as José Amador de los Ríos, Manuel Milá y Fontanals, and Ramón Menéndez Pidal. At the same time, Spanish literature was also characterized by "the maximum charm of romanticism," an idea which Bouterwek and Sismondi had already expressed. At this moment in time Romanticism had a spatial connotation, as it was identified with Romance countries, and a temporal connotation due to its identification with the past.

National character was the first pillar of Schlegel's historiographical doctrine. The second was the geo-cultural dimension of European literature, again important for Bouterwek and Sismondi, which now became a pivotal element of the theories which sustained Schlegel's historiographical philosophy. It is quite clear that as a literary historian, Schlegel worked with cartographic criteria, not literally, but in a virtual and symbolic way. However, it guided many of his judgments on what exactly was characteristic and valuable in the different literatures he studied.

European and extra-European spaces were connected in that the second was the background that explained the cultural identity of the first. Extra-European space, due to its antiquity, was identified with the idea of origin, and by analogy, with that of infancy. Certainly, Schlegel's views are not very far from those of Hegel's philosophy of history. In any case, extensive areas along with their cultures were sentenced to a condition of belatedness. However, these areas were also given considerable importance because of their influence on the modern development of European literatures and because of their geo-cultural clout. In any case, the Eurocentric quality of Schlegel's theories on cultural and literary spaces is evident. After all, his *History* turns out to be a literary history of Europe above all else.

On the other hand, Schlegel deepened the horizontal division of Europe into North and South, following the tradition of several French, English, and Scottish authors from the eighteenth century, among them, notoriously, Mme. de Staël. But the German author added a vertical division that defined a Central European area covering Italy, Germany, France, and England, following a tradition that can be traced also to the previous century. This vertical division left the Iberian Peninsula, as well as Scandinavia and Slavic Europe, in a peripheral position based on religious and historical factors. However, the Crusades and the subsequent contact with the East reinforced the Peninsula's approximation to the central area of European literary geography. Both the Iberian Peninsula and Central Europe had been enriched by an imaginative and

romantic Eastern element, but the Peninsula's history had caused it to maintain its borderland position between North and South and between Europe and the East, as well as distinguishing it for assimilating a great diversity of heterogeneous elements (Domínguez 2006).

Consequently, the Iberian Peninsula, and Spanish literature in particular, faces a unique position due to its national dimension and geo-literary position. The Peninsula obtained preeminence in both aspects, while its peripheral status and singular position were often emphasized. These seem like contradictory traits which both reinforce and deny the process of marginalization that had begun much earlier. In other words, Spanish anomaly and irregularity were the conditions *sine qua non* for the Peninsula to occupy the place it held in Schlegel's historiographical system. This situation was the result of a radical change in the appraisal of the symbolic role assigned to Spain in the realm of European literature. It can only be truly understood by perceiving the agenda that justifies an axiological and teleological historiographical system such as that of *History of ancient and modern history*.

Thus, after emphasizing the national value of Spanish and English literatures, Schlegel added the following paragraph:

> I am far from asserting that this is the only point of view from which literature ought to be surveyed. I shall have occasion in the sequel to show that many literatures derive the greater part of their interest from elements of a very different description. For the rest, I am quite disinclined to sustain the historical-national point of view as the only valid criterion to judge the value of a literature. On the contrary, I will do my best to show in the sequel that it is precisely the inner struggle that makes a great part of French literature and the whole of German literature interesting, as far as it is not a struggle either for mean circumstantial interests or political purposes, but a struggle for renaissance, from which a new epoch of spiritual life must arise that acknowledges divinity, and for a purified science. (Schlegel, 1815, trans. 1983, 743)[1]

What is at stake in Schlegel's *History* is the nature of the decisive axiological criteria. We have already seen the rejection of judgments based on a universal and non-historical theory in favor of a national-historical point of view. Now we can observe that the true honors were bestowed on the capacity of projection into the future of these literatures and their ability to inaugurate a new era. It is also obvious that the struggle for this position is limited to French and German literatures, relegating all others to the past, especially that of Spain. In light of this, it is inevitable to intuit the instrumental significance of the *other* literatures: they are necessary pieces for the construction of a new historical-aesthetic paradigm in which German literature will occupy the most outstanding position, or perhaps the only position possible.

1. "Ich bin übrigens weit entfernt, jenen nationalen Gesichtspunkt für die einzigen zu halten, aus dem der Wert einer Literatur zu beurteilen ist. Vielmehr verde ich mich in der Folge zu zeigen bemühen, wie es gerade der innere Kampf ist, der einem groβen Teil der französischen und der deutschen Literatur ihr hohes Interesse gibt." The translation is mine, since the final remark was introduced by Schlegel in the second edition of *Geschichte* (1822) and it is not included in the American translation.

Göttingen, Coppet…

Both Friedrich and August Schlegel's theories on European literature formed a doctrine that was shared by historiographies throughout Europe, and very particularly in the Iberian Peninsula. This was quite consistent with the importance Spanish literature was given in the context of European literature. Another important factor indeed was this doctrine's capacity to become the dominant ideology of nineteenth-century literary nationalism.

Many of the elements that the younger Schlegel emphasized coincided with those found in early nineteenth-century literary histories of Spanish and Portuguese literature. These works were prior to or contemporary with the writing of *History of ancient and modern literature* and with other texts such as August Schlegel's *Über dramatische Kunst und Litteratur* (Lessons on dramatic art and literature), which was published in three volumes between 1809 and 1811 and became widespread outside Germany in an 1814 French translation. This is the case with the two volumes which Friedrich Bouterwek wrote in 1804 and 1805 as part of his *History of European poetry*. At the turn of the century, Bouterwek had an important position at the University of Göttingen, which was the birthplace of German Hispanism, and where he formed part of a 'think tank' that promoted a Germanic-centered view of Europe in which Iberian culture had an important role. Bouterwek had a close relationship with both the Schlegel brothers (Hart 1952, 40 ff.), and also influenced George Ticknor during his stay at Göttingen. At the same time, in Switzerland, Simonde de Sismondi was very close to Madame de Staël and other members of the Coppet circle, which also included the Schlegel brothers.

Thus, Göttingen and Coppet were important geographical centers for the constitution of Spanish and Portuguese as national literatures at the beginning of the Romantic Age. Of the two, Spanish literature received much more attention, and in fact, under the prism of exoticism, it was considered a model of what a national literature should be. This was especially true in France, where the focus on Spanish literature from a historiographical and comparatist point of view was very intense, and more so after the 1840s. For example, João Palma-Ferreira (1985, 13) wrote that Bouterwek and Sismondi "were the first in Europe who systematically formalized a theory of the characteristics of Portuguese literature," and added that they "implicitly negate the autonomy of Portuguese literature, considering it a marginalia of Spanish literature," thus matching the prevalent images of Spain and Portugal in Europe, and particularly in France (Pageaux 1971; 1984). In this line, Ferdinand Denis criticized in the prologue of his 1826 work on Portuguese literature a lack of other works dedicated to this nation, especially compared to the case of Spanish literature, which he considered "more well-known in France than any other foreign literature" (Denis 1826, VIII). More evidence of this tendency was the 1812 separate translation into French of Bouterwek's volume on Spanish literature, coinciding with the French occupation of the Peninsula.

Portuguese literature was a sort of *terra incognita* for European scholars during this period. The language used by Denis to describe this situation reveals the precarious and peripheral position Portugal was allocated in Europe, as in reality, was the entire Iberian Peninsula. Denis's analogies of coasts, islands, and explorers speak for themselves:

> An author compared Portugal to one of those islands whose coastline though glimpsed by navigators maintained hidden riches. Bouterwek was the first to lead the way, and Sismondi followed his track. However, both historians dedicated to Portugal but a small portion of their estimable works. They deserve the credit awarded to explorers who first sight a new territory, even if only superficially: the literary history of Portugal is still pending. (Denis 1826, ix)

However, this insular analogy was not completely accurate. As we have seen, in this early moment of literary historiography, Peninsular literatures were often considered part of a wider region or territory, which was in keeping with the desire to design a geographical-literary map of Europe with axiological criteria. Thus, for the Schlegel brothers, the Iberian Peninsula formed part of the literature of the "Catholic countries" of Europe. This was a way of emphasizing the Southern quality of Spain and Portugal, following the parameters marked by Madame de Staël in *De la littérature* (On literature, 1800). As a matter of fact, this concept of a literature of Southern Europe including several national literatures was widespread and had enormous influence. Besides Sismondi, several other nineteenth-century scholars, such as Abel-François Villemain (1830), Émile Lefranc (1843), and Eugéne Baret (1857), systematically made use of this characterization. At the root of this trend was the strategy of estranging these literatures, which was one of the reasons why Provençal literature was alienated from French literature by scholars such as Sismondi, who thought that French literature occupied a unique position, not belonging either to the North or the South. Another not very subtle hint of these attitudes was the establishment of Romance studies as something loosely connected to the idea of Romanticism by means of their Southern, medieval, and past qualities, which was especially important to the Schlegel brothers. Furthermore, in the case of the Iberian Peninsula, the geographical-cultural trait of Orientalism was also crucial, implying the Peninsula's uniqueness because of the Arab occupation which began in the eighth century.

Wadda C. Ríos-Font (2005, 136) accused Sismondi of committing an "expropriation of national literature." It is probably more appropriate to point out that the entire nineteenth-century concept of national literature relies on this expropriation. We have seen how it was first applied – from Göttingen, Vienna, Geneva, London, and Paris – to foreign literatures, and only afterwards to domestic literature, first in Germany and then in France, with a clear desire for hegemonic projection in the future. That is why one of the most remarkable features of many these literary histories is their drawing apart of their objects of study, which leads, for instance, to a "Romanesque" tone in the portrayal of Spanish national literature (Ríos-Font 2005), related to the exotic qualities it is attributed. This phenomenon occurs with regard to Spanish and Portuguese literature, and it can be clearly discerned and understood, for obvious reasons, in Denis's work on Brazilian literature. The extremely Eurocentric historic discourse of Friedrich Schlegel, Bouterwek, Sismondi, and Denis not only discovered the *existence* of scarcely-known national literatures; it also conferred to them their *national* quality, though always with the reference points of French and German literature in mind (Rouanet 1991, 183). This implied the design of a coherent geo-literary European map in which issues such as religion, race, forms of government, and the relative position of each nation in relation to the core of the idea of Europe all played a part.

And Boston

Belonging to this line of non-Peninsular historians, the case of George Ticknor and his 1849 work *History of Spanish literature* acquires a special relevance. This three-volume work was much more far-reaching and detailed than other histories of its time. Ticknor, in contrast to other writers like Bouterwek and Sismondi, had first-hand knowledge of Spain, Spanish, and a handful of important Spanish researchers with whom he maintained a close relationship. It is also to be considered that his work was widely disseminated throughout Europe due to its speedy translation into Spanish in 1851 and German in 1852. Ticknor was the first noteworthy representative of the influential branch of North America hispanists, thus broadening the geocultural scope of the making of Iberian historiography. He was influential, for instance, in creating the Department of Modern Languages at Harvard University, where he held the Smith Chair in French and Spanish beginning in 1819 (J.D. Fernández 2005, 49–50; Jaksić 2007).

Ticknor's conception of national literature was clearly influenced by the Göttingen group, where he studied from 1815 to 1817 and met Bouterwek and the Schlegel brothers (Meregalli 1990, 27; Baasner 1995, 318). This can be seen in his appreciation of French literature, which he expounded on in his lectures at Harvard as "a literature of elegant society," in open contrast to the elements he found attractive in Spanish literature (Hart 1952, 64 ff.).

In any case, Ticknor's writings marked a crucial step in the development of the national historiography of Spanish literature. Besides his keen knowledge of Spanish literary tradition, he used some of the basic elements from the preceding European tradition of historians in a powerfully evoking way that fostered the image of their own literature that Spanish historians would come to assume. Among these elements was the belatedness of Spanish culture and the subsequent chrono-political perception of the contemporary situation in Spain, closely connected to a tendency to implement a estranging fictionalization of Spanish nationality. An example can be found in one of his letters:

> There is more national character here, more originality and poetry in the popular manners and feelings, more force without barbarism, and civilization without corruption, than I have found anywhere else. Would you believe it? I speak not at all of the highest class, -what seems mere fiction and romance in other countries is matter of observation here, and, in all that relates to manners, Cervantes and Le Sage are historians… the people still in that kind of poetical existence which we have not only long since lost, but which we have long since ceased to credit on the reports of our ancestors. (*Life, Letters and Journal*; cfr. S. Williams 1968, 2: 5).

Another characterizing trait we can find in Ticknor, and which was also present in Bouterwek, Friedrich Schlegel, and Sismondi, was the belief in the existence of a genuine literature free from foreign influence. It goes without saying that this idea would later become a part of the national institutionalized version of literary history. According to this view, this genuine literature was formed during the struggle against the Moors, and, along with Christianity, it would become one of the founding elements of the notion of a national Spanish literature, even serving in some cases as a basis for differentiating it from Portuguese literature (Southey 1809, 269). This conception of the genuine quality of national Spanish literature was based on the opposition to that other current much more akin to Provençal and afterwards Italian interferences.

For Ticknor, genuine Spanish literature was that which was rooted in the Christian front which battled Islam and had a decidedly Castilian identity (Ticknor 1849, 1: 5–6). His extremely restrictive and identitarian notion of Spanish literature is understandable considering his conservative romantic background, and in spite of some reluctant opinions, it fit neatly into the specific cultural and political circumstances Spain was facing in the mid-nineteenth century.

Nevertheless, Ticknor did not altogether ignore Catalan and Galician literatures. As a matter of fact, he paid considerable attention to Catalan literature, which he pinpointed in the restricted area of northeastern Spain and in a precise time period from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries. It should be added that, for Ticknor, the existence of Catalan literature was connected to the presence in the Peninsula of Provençal literature and language. That is, it had to do with an exogenous element that was foreign to the specific nationality of Spanish literature, and that began when Ramón Berenguer inherited the throne of Provence in 1116 and moved its capital to Catalonia. This explicitly contradicted the thesis held by Martín Sarmiento, Juan Andrés, and Torres Amat that the birthplace of Provençal literature was Catalonia, and not vice versa. Therefore, the explanation for the decline of Catalan literature was that at some point it was kept apart from its European, extra-Peninsular roots. In his own words, "as might be expected, the delicate plant, whose flower was not permitted to expand on its native soil, did not long continue to flourish in that to which it was transplanted" (Ticknor 1849, 1: 322). What resulted was, then, its absorption by the "vigorous spirit" of Castilian literature. In other words, Ticknor constructs a narrative in which Catalan literature's final decline in the fifteenth century was due to the triumph of national literature, under favorable political conditions, over literature that was dependant on foreign influence. Even so, Ticknor did admit that there was a kind of interlude in which literature was actually written in Catalan, "the harsher, but hardier, dialect spoken there by the mass of the people" (Ticknor 1849, 1: 324), and not in Provençal, especially in Valencia.

With respect to Galician literature, Ticknor considered it an ancient literature which was maintained in the Portuguese tradition, and, as in the case of Catalan, that political factors played an important role in its situation. However, Ticknor minimized the importance of medieval Galician literature, a large part of which was still unknown in his time. In accordance with this position, and in spite of the testimony of Santillana, he also rebuked Sarmiento's thesis that Galicia played a leading role in the resurgence of Peninsular poetry, describing Martín Sarmiento as prejudiced due to his Galician background, just as he had ignored Torres Amat's thesis on the origin of Provençal literature because of his "Catalan patriotism."

The conflict between Peninsular literatures during the Middle Ages was reduced to that of a confrontation between a northeastern literature with foreign roots and a northwestern literature which would have originated in the mountains of Asturias and León during the struggle against the Moorish invasion. Galicia, the true Peninsular northwest, was almost invisible for Ticknor, except for two facts. The first is that it was the birthplace of the future Portuguese literature and language. The second, which Ticknor found baffling, was that Alfonso X chose Galician to write one of the main works of medieval Iberian poetry, *Cantigas de Santa María* (Songs of the Virgin Mary), a work in which he found a strong Provençal influence. These two cases of non-Castilian connections alienated Galicia as a peripheral area with little to do with the national principle of Spanish literature, according to the Bostonian scholar.

Ticknor's *History* is a clear example of the Castilian reductionism present in Spanish and even Iberian literary history that resulted in the omission of some basic features of eighteenth-century historiography. Such was the case with the thesis of Peninsular liminality and transitivity, and with the emphasis on the generative momentum of the Galician and Catalan literary traditions, replaced instead with the generally accepted theory of their dead-end condition and demise. In a similar fashion, the Arab presence in the Peninsula was converted into a simple element of opposition which favored the forging of a Castilian spirit. All of these aspects were oriented towards the establishment of a very specific concept of literary nationality in a time when the very notion of Spanish literature was undergoing a process of institutionalization by the liberal Spanish state that was just beginning to arise.

Literary nations

The positioning of the adjective *national* to characterize the noun *literature* is deeply dependent on the development of literary historiography. This idea of nationalism, whether explicitly or not, relies on the concepts of birth and origin, which are also related to land (nation), blood (race), and beliefs (religion). It goes without saying thet this framework is much more restrictive than that which was used by eighteenth-century historians, which is confirmed by istances such as the Arabic theses of Martín Sarmiento or Juan Andrés. Although these Arabic theories never truly disappeared, being conserved even by some canonical historians (Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Álvaro Galmés de Fuentes), they became subordinate to the notion of a genuine national literature and underwent a process of "estrangement." Part of this was due to the fact that language became ever more important as a symbol of identity, with the consequent assumption in Spain of Castilian as the national language. Besides this, there was the appearance of the figure of the 'national historian' who identifies with the object of study because of birth, language, and objectives.

Derrida wrote (1998, 27) that "an identity is never given, received, or attained; only the interminable and indefinitely phantasmatic process of identification endures… in whatever manner one invents the story of a construction of the self, the *autos*, or the *ipse*, it is always imagined that the one who writes should know how to say *I*." The person saying *I* so firmly in this case is the national historian, in the same way that the indefinite process of identification, by its own phantasmatic nature, leads to the permanent *revisio* that Miguel Tamen discussed. Derrida added immediately afterwards (1998, 29) that in order to be able to say *I*, "the *identificatory modality* must already or henceforth be assured: assured of language and in its language. It is believed that the problem of the unity of language must be resolved, and that the One of language in the strict or broad sense be given – a broad sense that will be stretched till it includes all the models and identificatory modalities, all the poles of imaginary projection in social culture." From that monolingual *I* the past is reconstructed, or even invented, as an obsessive and reductive idea of identity, and furthermore, the aim is to contain all the means of access to that "own" past.

Spanish national literary history, with its need for institutionalization, clearly shows this tendency. But what happens when this monolingualism is, to use Derrida's terminology, a

monolingualism of the other, in a symbolic sense? We can define the monolingualism of the other as a monolingualism that is determined from a position alien to the enunciative position that is held to be legitimate as well as the concept of identity that this account formulates. This occurs with many national historians who accepted the theory of a national literature based on geocultural agendas – German, French, American – which went well beyond the strict geocultural limits of the nation. In a different sense, monolingualism of the other can also describe the ideal "monolingualism" of the dominant national history from the point of view of the linguistic and literary traditions which were marginalized. The existence of this monolingualism of the other made it very difficult for a perfect discursive institutionalization to occur, and its weakness and incongruities can be seen in Spanish and Portuguese national historiography. A consequence among others is the permanent friction between the emphasis on literature as an expression of national identity and the systematic process of marginalization that literary comparative historiography has applied to the Iberian Peninsula since this discipline first began.

The institutionalization of Spanish literature

The crucial moment for the establishment of Spanish historiography from an institutional point of view was during the 1840s and 50s, when an interesting series of events occurred. In 1843, Friedrich Schlegel's *Geschichte* was translated into Spanish. A little earlier, in 1841 and 1842, José Lorenzo Figueroa and José Amador de los Ríos had translated and adapted the part on Spain of Sismondi's *Histoire de las literatures du midi* (Romero Tobar 2006, 125–27). In 1844, Gil de Zárate presented his *Resumen histórico*. One year later, in 1845, the education law known as *Plan Pidal* went into effect, introducing the subject "Spanish literature" into secondary education and into the newly founded *Facultad de Filosofía y Letras* (School of Arts and Philosophy), although in a limited and often non-specific way (Baasner 1995, 403–61). At the same time, Pedro José Pidal, the minister responsible for this law and political-literary mentor of Gil de Zárate, had been publishing a series of important works on literary history since the 1830s, which culminated in the early 50s with several texts in which he put forth a closed doctrinal view of Spanish literature. In 1849, José Amador de los Ríos, also related to Pidal, took up the first professorship of Critical History of Spanish Literature at the Central University of Madrid. Also in 1849 Ticknor's classic work was published, immediately drawing the attention of Spanish scholars, and was subsequently translated into Spanish by Pascual Gayangos and Enrique Vedia in 1851. Furthermore, in 1847 the Royal Spanish Academy and the Royal Academy of History were refounded, and other academies were founded to try to adapt them to the liberal state so that they could form an institutional body which "meant the government of Spanish culture by the political and social elite" (Pellistrandi 2004, 117). These academies, especially the Royal Academy of History, played a more prominent role than the unstable universities in the historical revision of Spanish culture, including literature (Cirujano Marín *et al.* 1988).

The beginning of the second stage of the identitarian process of Spanish liberal nationalism, according to the historian Borja de Riquer (2001, 72 ff.), takes place precisely in the year 1843, once the war with the French and Fernando VII's reign, as well as the regency of General Espartero, after Isabella II's coming of age, are left behind. This second stage lasts until 1875, year

of the Bourbon restoration after the failure of the First Republic. According to Borja de Riquer, this stage is characterized by the development of an orthodox point of view of Spanish nationalism with hegemonic pretensions:

> The official discourse of nineteenth-century Spanish nationalism was not based on a strong, attractive, and efficient institutionalizing process capable of producing consensus, but rather Spanish national identity was presented as an established and "ancient" fact, so that a historic point of view predominated, focused on the exaltation of past glories … In this way, the hegemonic strain of Spanish liberal patriotism, made up of moderates and conservatives, finally culminated in a nationalist doctrine that tried to impose its limited vision of the Spanish nation by denying the existence of a variety of identities and cultures, and rejecting decentralized and pluralized projects and demands. (B. de Riquer 2001, 27)

In the field of literary historiography, this process can be understood as an appropriation by a specific political and ideological program of a characterization of Spanish literature which was mainly elaborated from an exogenous – French, German, American – perspective. This process of appropriation can be plainly seen in the sequence of events above, especially in the translations of histories of Spanish literature, which often incorporated a parallel discourse to the original made up of the translator's omissions, additions, and footnotes. In other words, we are confronted with a dialectics between the *representations* of Spain and the Iberian Peninsula in the well-known works of Friedrich Schlegel, Bouterwek, Sismondi, and Ticknor, and the process of *appropriation* carried out with a clearly planned intention by the new liberal Spanish state. In this process, José Amador de los Ríos, a political conservative, played an important role, first as translator of Sismondi and later as the author of the most important work on Spanish literature written by a Spaniard in the nineteenth century.

Pidal, historian and member of the Spanish government

The historical and interpretive writings of Pedro Pidal may be considered an early paradigm of this dialectics between representation and appropriation. In this and other ways, Pidal's writings on literary history are a precedent of *Historia crítica de la literature Española* (Critical History of Spanish Literature, 1861–1863) by José Amador de los Ríos. Coinciding with the first stage of the liberal identitarian process identified by Borja de Riquer, from 1813 to 1843, the first signs of German romantic and pre-romantic influence became apparent, especially in the focus on Baroque theater and the *romancero*. This influence is reflected in the writings of the Hanseatic consul Nicolás Böhl von Faber, Alberto Lista (Juretschke 1951), Agustín Durán, as well as José Gómez de la Cortina and Nicolás Hugalde y Mollinedo, both of whom partially translated Bouterwek's work on Spanish literature in 1829 (Valcárcel Rivera and Navarro Pastor 2002). Pidal, on the other hand, was the main protagonist of the second stage, which was characterized by a profoundly conservative institutionalization promulgated by the movement known as moderate liberalism, or moderatism.

Pidal's theories were not very different from those of his contemporary Ticknor or from those of other foreign authors who were building a nationalist storyline of Spanish literature. However, Pidal was characterized by overlooking the greater European literary framework,

thereby also ignoring the implications of the sort of national literary history that we can symbolically link with Göttingen. Also, Pidal shared some of Ticknor's theses, but in a much more extreme manner. These two aspects show that Pidal made an effort to present a unitary, Castilian version of the literature of the Iberian Peninsula. In other words, Pidal took advantage of certain instruments used by international Spanish literary scholars to institutionalize the image of Spanish literature from a conservative Spanish nationalist viewpoint.

This viewpoint had a Schlegelian foundation, that of literature primarily as the memory of a nation (Pidal 1890, 1: 36 and ff.). Hence, the most highly regarded literature was that which was supposed to be the most related to the nation's memory and, therefore, the most untouched by foreign influences. In other words, popular literature, as far as it was identified with the newsy nature of the *romances* and the figure of the minstrels, popular singers who marked "the divisive line which profoundly separated it from artistic and courtesan literature" (Pidal 1890, 1: 213). The antinomy between popular literature and learned literature was one of the main theses of this school of interpretation of Spanish literature. At the same time, it was also a way of distancing Spanish literature from its European context, a context which was constantly underlying, as historiographically it was the backdrop against which Spanish literature was instituted. Thus, it is by no means surprising that courtly and scholarly poetry, always suspected of having a non-native origin, was considered "better fitted to the thinking patterns of Europe, and to its constant progress and development. It became, therefore, less local, less national than popular literature" (Pidal 1890, 1: 221). Similar statements were made by Teófilo Braga in the field of Portuguese literature and F.R. Cambouliu in that of Catalan literature.

According to Borja de Riquer, "Spanish national identity was presented as an established and 'ancient' fact." We can add that this was a result of a series of resections that removed all illegitimate and improper elements from national identity; so it was at least for literary historiography. The antiquity which national literature was ascribed was quite peculiar. The Middle Ages had been a period of great diversity, and yet Pidal characterized the Peninsular literature of this time as fundamentally Castilian, popular, and Catholic, and so every instance that did not fit this characterization was relegated. As an example, he described Aragonese and Catalan poetry as akin to the Provençal realm and, in accordance with Ticknor, insisted on the strong Lemosin influence found in Alfonso X's Galician poetry. Pidal also minimized the linguistic differences during the Middle Ages, thus emphasizing the nuclear role of Castilian literature in detriment to Portuguese literature, which was described as "a variety, and not a large one at that, of Castilian literature" (1890, 1: 308). In conclusion, Pidal's strategy of nationalization consisted in minimizing anything non-Castilian, either by incorporating it into the Castilian culture or by abruptly labeling it "foreign." In the words of Miguel Ramos Corrada (2000, 41), Pidal "presented the entire Iberian Peninsula as a territory with certain common characteristics *ab initio*, from which any separation could only lead to the collapse of one's own way of being, to the loss of one's own nature, to bewilderment, and to confusion."

The first national historian

The theories of Pedro José Pidal might today seem excessively simplistic, if not mere caricatures. However, it is important to bear in mind that some of his theories, in many cases derived from Schlegel's school of thought, formed a solid part of Spanish historiography and philology at least until the generation of the Seminary of Historic Studies in the first half of the twentieth century. This can be described as a *habitus*, in Bourdieu's sense of the term, a tendency which has conditioned the relationship with the Peninsular literary past from an academic perspective.

One of the first signs of this tendency is *Historia crítica de la literatura española* (1861–1863) by José Amador de los Ríos, which deals strictly with medieval literature. This work can be considered the culminating expression of the second stage described above, particularly its lengthy introduction. This introduction is a brilliant historical panorama of Spanish literary criticism and historiography. Yet, a closer inspection reveals that it establishes a geneology of Spanish historiography, and a historiographical canon, which vindicates some eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers, such as the "purely patriotic" Mohedano brothers, Alberto Lista, Agustín Durán, and Pedro José Pidal, while disparaging many of the eighteenth-century writers, and in particular Martín Sarmiento, who is described as "excessively fond of the land where he was born," in contrast to the more "patriotic" Franciscan brothers of Córdoba. Amador de los Ríos does the same with foreign authors. He regards German authors favorably, especially their defense of Spanish popular literature and theater. However, French authors are censured for their aesthetic exclusivity, although he does admire those French authors from the nineteenth century who "discovered" foreign literature in order to reconvert that of France into a "national literature," such as Louis Viardot, Philarète Chasles, and especially Abel-François Villemain and Adolf Puibusque (Espagne 1993). Pidal was also very harsh with Sismondi and Ticknor. He accused them of straying from the "fundamental principles of our civilization" (Amador de los Ríos 1861–1863, 1, LXXXIX), probably because he considered religious differences as leading to misunderstanding and misrepresentation.

Amador de los Ríos' opinions are an expression of the geopolitical and ideological tension of the time, but also of his self-vindication at being the first national historian of Spanish literature. In several of his comments, registered by Menéndez Pelayo (in Fitzmaurice-Kelly 1901, 14), it becomes clear that the appearance of Ticknor's work moved him to write his *Historia crítica*. Furthermore, it must be remembered that Amador de los Ríos had translated Sismondi while still a young a scholar, including very detailed corrections and notes.

In fact, one of José Amador de los Ríos's most distinctive features is how clearly he expresses his determination to become the first true national historian. To emphasize this, he brought to light the deficiencies of the international attempts to write about Spanish literature and considered them mere initial steps to the theories he himself was outlining:

> Most writers agree, no matter how long their works or the purpose of their writing, that with respect to nationalism, it [Spanish literature] occupies first place of all the literatures that have evolved since the fall of the Roman Empire. However, when this statement is made by a foreign author, no matter how eager he is to find the noble truth, surely he has not been able to penetrate all the mysteries of Spanish culture. It is a reprehensible shame that as yet no Spanish author of this century has considered mapping the history of our literature, so much more

> important for us than any other written by neo-Latin nations. (Amador de los Ríos 1861–1863, 1: II)

Amador de los Rios's logic is clear: first, an emphasis on Spanish literature's privileged position among all other European literatures (although he was in reality only referring to Castilian literature); second, foreign authors' consensus on this aspect; and third, in contrast to the passivity of his compatriots, his own authority to disesteem foreign authors and proclaim himself the first legitimate Spanish historian "in the Castilian language." José María Pozuelo (2002, 344) was quite right to identify in Amador de los Ríos the "constituent optimism that the historical method proposed for itself as opposed to the 'subjectivity' which was anchored in foreign aesthetic models." This was a new surge of the *revisio* movement, which saw literary history as a deliverance from aesthetic dogmatism and as a way of proving the magnificence of Spanish literature. It was also a way for historians to use their nationality in order to assume the exclusive privilege of the correct interpretation and deep understanding of a certain culture.

This development was similar to what was occurring in other historiographical traditions. In the case of Amador de los Ríos it takes on an institutional significance, due to his position of power within the field of education as a member of the Royal Academy of History and the first professor of Critical History of Spanish Literature at the Central University of Madrid. His work, which bears the same title, was funded by Isabella II and also dedicated to her. From this position of authority, Amador de los Ríos propagated the nationalist characterization of Spanish literature that, as we have seen, had earlier origins. For Amador de los Ríos, the profound notion of nationality was misunderstood by foreign historians, to the extent that they failed to apprehend its dependence on the religion and patriotism that were born during the *Reconquista* (Pellistrandi 2004, 217). Curiously, the term he uses most frequently in these contexts is that of "yoke," so that he recurs to it to refer both to the "Islamic yoke" and the "yoke of exotic precepts" (Amador de los Ríos 1861–1865, 1: LXIV), since, for him, all forms of religious or aesthetic (first Italian, then French) influence were equally detrimental to the popular expression of nationality. In contrast to this were the "independence and freedom" of "national literature" (Amador de los Ríos 1861–1863, 1: XXXII). It is quite in keeping then that he considered the Middle Ages to be the height of national literature, compared with the Italian influence of the 1500s. By the same token, the interpretive structure of *Critical History* consists of a series of comparisons between "national" versus "cosmopolitan" and "popular" versus "aristocratic" literature. It is also predictable that, in the wake of August Schlegel, the Count von Schak, and Agustín Durán, Amador de los Ríos highlighted the genre of *romances*, the theater of the Golden Century, and Lope de Vega in particular (Pozuelo 2000a; 2002).

Despite the doctrinal basis of his history, Amador de los Ríos' erudition and his knowledge of medieval literature were unprecedented, just as unprecedented was Ticknor's direct knowledge of the texts he referred to in his 1849 work. In fact, some of the later Spanish medievalists, such as Ramón Menéndez Pidal and his school, were much more reductive in their theories, probably due to the stricter application of late-romantic logic (Gómez Moreno 2004, 164–65; Fox 1997, chap. 6).

The concept of Spanish literature clearly depends on the precise epistemology of the history of literature, and on an ideology and a political project related to the process of cultural

planning. One of the constituents of this process was the identification of Spanish with Castilian literature. The last pages of *Historia crítica* are enlightening to this respect. In them, the *Reconquista* is considered the moment when the "Spanish people in the true sense of the word" was formed, although admitting that post-Augustan Latin had also had a national character, proved by the association of Latin with Catholicism during the conflict with Visigoth Arianism. In these pages, the most influential circumstance was the appearance of "diverse romances" spoken throughout the Peninsula, along with their relationships with Arab and Hebrew. At that point, the text asserts Castilian's central position and the situation of dependence, marginality, and "instrumentality" of any other language when compared with the "genius of Spanish." We find, for example:

> It is not yet the moment to assess the great contradictions and trials to which Providence subjects Spanish genius by giving it those instruments [i.e., the other Peninsular languages] over which Castilian has gained supremacy, as central Spain has naturally taken on its role as the great nationality of the Peninsula. (Amador de los Ríos 1861–1865, 1: XXXII)

The main thesis of this "first historian" of Spanish literature was that of the profound continuity of Castilian with Hispanic-Latin and Hispanic-Goth culture, aimed at proving their hegemony in the Iberian Peninsula from the Middle Ages onward. This rejected the views of earlier historians, who had considered that Spanish literature owed much to the influence of Arab and Provençal (Romero Tobar 2006, 141).

Other histories

This historiographical interpretation of Spanish literature soon faced retorts and clarifications, although often expressed implicitly, that demonstrated the unease with respect to the concept of *Spanish literature* and to the correct model for its historiographical representation. This period witnessed, in fact, the consolidation of literary history as a discipline at a European level, in accordance with the emergence in Spain of differing points of view in relation to the mode of representing Spanish literature. At this time national historiographies of Galician and Catalan literature were formed, and that of Portuguese was definitively consolidated. Other literary histories also appeared, such as that of Asturias, although with less of a desire for nationality, and using less compromising terms, such as *país* (country) (Fuertes Acevedo 1885).

In some cases these departures can be judged as mere corrections of emphasis, although this is also meaningful. Such was the case of Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, considered the main nineteenth-century scholar of Spanish culture. Although he never achieved to write a conventional literary history, he occupied Amador de los Ríos' position as professor of Critical History of Spanish Literature after his death in 1878. The program which Menéndez Pelayo presented to obtain this position at the Central University in Madrid was quite unlike the prevalent view at the moment (González-Millán 2006). Menéndez Pelayo (1941) was opposed to some of the implicit principles of mainstream nationalist literary historiography, and to the literary historiography related with the liberal state, which linked political nationality and literary nationality. Among his ideas were his sound contention about the "Spanish" character of Hispanic

American literature and also about the possibility of there being diverse nations within a single state, "as occurs in the modern empires of Austria and Russia." Applying this principle to the Iberian Peninsula, he found at least three distinct literary nationalities corresponding to the three main Iberian romance languages and was reluctant to use the term "Spanish language" to refer exclusively to that of "Central Spain." Nevertheless, Menéndez Pelayo still referred to all these literatures as sharing a profound common identity and a "mysterious synchronism," thus maintaining them within the framework of "Spanish genius." Although sometimes vacillating, he generally excluded from this concept literatures of Arab or Hebrew background because of their departure from the main Spanish attributes of Latinity and Christianity. Within his program on Spanish literature, these were eventually limited to the section on "Semitic influences."

Menéndez Pelayo went on to reject the identification between language and literature, although with some contradictions, such as the inclusion into Spanish literature of the literatures of the Hispanic American countries. Following to some extent Amador del los Ríos' example, he based this on the belief that the concept of identity is more ancient than that of language. For Menéndez Pelayo, this was almost an epiphenomenon in which cultural Latinity and religious Christianity played an important role. This is why he criticized Ticknor, who began describing the history of Spanish literature with the sudden appearance of the Castilian *Poema de mio Cid* (Poem of my Cid), a facilitative expedient, which Menéndez Pelayo ironically found "much more comfortable and artistic, if the art of history were like a poem or a novel" (Menéndez Pelayo 1941, 11). Menéndez Pelayo's work was not directly opposed to that of his predecessors. His main divergence was not addressed, in fact, to historians such as Pidal, Amador de los Ríos, and even Gil de Zárate, but to the exogenous approach which Menéndez Pelayo coupled with an epistemological principle, the identification of language and literature, and an expositive "romanesque" model.

The difference of Menéndez Pelayo with respect to Pidal and, in a much more nuanced way, Amador de los Ríos was his emphasis on a multilingual Spanish literature, where the concept of a Catholic and Latin "Spanish nation" embraced the whole Iberian Peninsula, including Portugal. This position was affected by the historical moment in which it was formulated and by an integrative and conservative point of view on Hispanic culture. During this time, considered by Borja de Riquer to be the third stage of the liberal identitarian process, the Borbonic Restoration was under way. One of the novelties of this period was the appearance of "regional literatures," in consonance with the Catalan *Renaixença* and the Galician *Rexurdimento*, and of the proliferation of floral games, which were first celebrated in Barcelona in 1859 and then in Galicia and the Basque country. As a matter of fact, Menéndez Pelayo actively participated in the Floral Games of Barcelona in 1888, and even made a speech in Catalan (Peiró 1995, 92–93). In this speech he stressed that he was a follower of Manuel Milá i Fontanals, a participant in the Renaixença cultural movement, and an important figure of Castilian and Catalan literary historiography (Jorba 1989). One of the theses Milá defended was the multilingualism of Spanish literature. He was supported by Menéndez Pelayo and also by Antoni Rubio i Lluch, another of Milá's followers, who was among the first to systematize the history of Catalan literature (Massot i Muntaner 1979; Molas 1986, 281; Romero Tobar 2006, 196–98), thus creating a continuous line up to the present.

However, these theories were not generally accepted at the time. Borja de Riquer (2001, 93) has characterized this third stage that occupied the last quarter of the nineteenth century with the triumph of an official and conservative view of Spanish identity. At the same time, alternative points of view were dismissed, although often they were as conservative, if not more, as the theories which finally dominated Spanish literary historiography, which defined Spanish identity as Christian and Castilian. As a matter of fact, this period also witnessed the development of Catalan literary historiography, because the *Renaixença* also implied the appearance of a specific historiography that shared the ethnic and linguistic national basis of Castilian/Spanish literature, but applied to a Catalan literary nationality.

It has been held that the various Iberian nationalisms should be considered different aspects of a collective process, with an evident chronological coherence and constant interaction among the particular components (B. de Riquer 2001; Martí-López 2005, 156–57). The development of literary historiographies is probably one of the best illustrations of this contention. We have already mentioned the importance of Milá i Fontanals in the early stages of modern Catalan and Spanish literary historiography, and also how the progressive implementation of Spanish literature had relegated the other literatures of the Peninsula to determined, though not equal, positions. One of these positions is that related to their consideration as *marginalia*, which subsumes these literatures within the category of regional literature. As a matter of fact, this idea was partially accepted by the supporters of these literatures and their incipient historiographies. In any case, the emergence of this regional assumption exposes the difficulty to find a univocal understanding of the literature of Spain and the fact that those other literatures (Catalan, Galician, and at first even Asturian) in part derive from the resistance and tension facing the creation of a national Spanish literature parallel to the formation of a liberal state during the same period.

A work that eloquently depicts this situation is *La literatura española en el siglo XIX* (Spanish literature of the nineteenth century) by the Augustan priest Francisco Blanco García (1894). In its third part it focuses on regional and Latin American literatures. These were aspects which could not be ignored, but neither could they be easily assimilated into the concept of *Spanish literature* held by Blanco García. They were apparently *marginalia*, but with the added value of determining the understanding of the whole. Blanco García's attitude towards regional literatures (Catalan, Galician, and Asturian, for he renounced the study of Basque literature because of ignorance of the language) shows an obvious wariness of possible political implications. The paradox is that this suspicious attitude is responsible for a number of important historiographical panoramas which count among the first approaches to theses literatures.

Pers i Ramona et alii

The first history of Catalan literature was *Bosquejo histórico de la lengua y la literatura catalana* by Magí Pers i Ramona, published in Spanish in 1850 and later expanded into a *Historia de la lengua y la literatura catalana* (History of Catalan language and literature, 1857). This first work was concise and clumsy but clearly illustrated some of the basic elements that were reiterated in later works, for example the subordination of literature to language, the awareness of the lack of

adjustment of the political divisions of modern Europe to the geo-political and cultural palimpsest that woud be evinced by minor languages and literatures, and the permanent contraposition between Catalan and Castilian literatures. A few years later, in 1858, F.R. Cambouliu (1910) published in French another history of Catalan literature, which was later translated to Catalan.

It has been commonly assumed that a sort of belatedness can be noticed in relation to the publication of histories of Catalan literature – actually, prior to Amador Rios' and contemporary with Gil de Zárate's and Pidal's – with regard to histories from other European nations (Romero Muñoz 1982, 4; Molas 1986, 257). However, this time lag is not as shocking when compared to other cases like Portuguese, Galician, and Basque. Besides, it has to be observed that Bouterwek, Sismondi, and Ticknor had paid considerable attention to medieval Catalan literature, and that Francesc Jaubert de Passà had already published a brief panoramic vision of Catalan literature as soon as 1824 (Molas 1986, 274). But the fact is that Catalan historiography gained momentum following Pidal's plan and his specific proposal for the definition of Spanish literature, as well as his official endorsement of the academic curriculums to the detriment of non-Castilian literatures. Pers i Ramona's history published in 1850 followed this calendar closely.

Jaubert and Cambouliu were both French writers closely tied to areas historically related to Catalonia. Cambouliu is especially representative of this initial phase that tried to rebuild the ideal of a Southern Romanic literary space, while aware of the decline of its previous power and of its displacement as a consequence of the cultural strategies tied to the modern identity of Europe.

Cambouliu presented a clear argument about the national character of Catalan literature. Catalan national literature, like any other, was understood as an abstraction contingent on a fixed plan of representation and on a epistemology based on identitarian strategies. The process of identification of a proper language and by means of this language became a key point leading to a philological perspective on national literatures and made all the more acute in keeping with its reagent or contrasting character in the comparison with other competing national literatures. As summarized by Gayatri C. Spivak (2003, 27): "In order to assume culture we must assume collectivity. Yet usually we assume collectivity on the basis of culture." If we substitute *culture* for *literature*, what results is a reasonable description of the metalepsis with which a literary nationality is defined: a given collectivity is assumed as national, based on a literary past designed from a linguistic identity or predetermined idiosyncrasy. There is no doubt that Cambouliu's characterization of Catalan literature as well as Pers i Ramona's was a reaction to the collective identity attributed to Catalonia derived from the designs of European, particularly Iberian, literary nationalities, made up by the classic authors of nineteenth-century historiography.

Cambouliu's starting point was his rejection of the vision of Catalan literary history expressed by Bouterwek, Sismondi, and Ticknor, who considered it derivative because of its relationship with Castilian literature. Consequently, the figure of the first historian appeared again, this time as a future historian who was expected to reveal the authentic national identity of literature. Cambouliu wrote in the first pages of his book "Catalan language and literature are still expecting their historian" (Cambouliu 1910, 2). Even if Cambouliu did not introduce himself as this person, he did indeed establish the basis by which the work of the future historian ought to be measured.

Cambouliu founded some basic elements in this respect. First of all, the affirmation of the distinct character of the Catalan nation compared to Castilian through a systematic counter-representation that fostered the acknowledgement of Catalan nationality and national spirit. After this image, Catalan was presented as the third of the three major Peninsular languages following Portuguese and Castilian, yet unfortunately lacking its own historiography. On the other hand, he delimitated the object of this absent historiography by distinguishing between Catalan and Provençal and consequently by discriminating Catalan's tradition from that of the Occitan language. For him, the true milestone of national Catalan literature was King James I and not the Provençal troubadours. Cambouliu insisted on Catalonia as originally forming part of "that grand feudal republic that extends from the Loire to the Ebro and from the Alps to the ocean" (Cambouliu 1910, 15). Nevertheless, he stressed the success of Catalan in consolidating a form of national unity above the ruins of feudalism and the cultural Provençal area thanks to James I, who is made to play a role similar to that of Alfonso X in Castile and Louis IX in France.

The dynamics that shaped Catalonian national literature has, therefore, a European dimension and a basically Peninsular substantiation. It was the triumphant successor of the Provençal cultural period that transformed into the third national literature of the Peninsula with the help of an industrious monarch. In this way, the vision of the three literary nationalities of the Peninsula was endorsed with the exclusion of other possible literatures, as had been sustained previously by Bouterwek and Sismondi and later by Menéndez Pelayo. By the same token, Alfred Morel-Fatio, in *Grundriss der romanischen Philologien* (Gröber 1897), in the section *Die Literaturen der romanischen Völker*, would later dedicate a chapter to Catalan along with Italian, Provençal, Portuguese, and Spanish literatures, while Galician literature was reduced to a medieval episode of Portuguese literature.

However, it was evident that Spanish and Catalan literature were not merely parallel phenomena. The institutional support Spanish literature received because of its pertinence to the state is just one of the reasons for this. Another reason is that from the perspective of European historiography, the two literatures had always been judged very differently. Spanish literature was seen as a paradigm of nationality and as one of the great literatures, that is, a complete literature with an uninterrupted course from its medieval roots to the present. In contrast, Catalan literature had always been studied from the viewpoint of its apparent extinction at the beginning of the Modern Age and considering the strong importance of foreign influences, first from Provençal and afterwards from Italian. This is why the affirmation by national historiography of Catalan literature first had to rebel against the position that it had been given by authors such as Bouterwek, Friedrich Schlegel, Sismondi, and Ticknor. Of necessity, it also had to reject the totalizing reference of Spanish literature within the ambit of the Iberian Peninsula and the Spanish state. This was what Cambouliu intended, in conjunction with the *Renaixença* movement, hence opening the way for the later historiographical tradition up to the present. It can be assumed that Spanish and Catalan literature were not mere national creations competing with each other, since a joint process prevailed which doubted the formation of the historiography of Spanish literature as understood since the first decades of the nineteenth century.

This process can best be found in the literary regionalism of Victor Balaguer, a historian from Barcelona who was also an influential politician and minister of the Spanish government. To a great extent he expressed this idea in important forums like the Royal Academy of History

and the Royal Spanish Academy, to which he was elected as a member in 1875 and 1883 respectively. On both occasion and according to the protocol, Balaguer delivered a solemn speech, devoting the first one to "Catalan literature" and the second to "The significance and importance of regional literatures." Balaguer, who in many senses acted as a mediator between Catalonia and the capital of the state, introduced in these discourses *in partibus infidelium* a persuasive presentation of a series of proposals focused on the cultural and political present as affected by a past shaped in a literary historiographical way. In the second speech he warned, for instance, of the danger of reducing Spanish literature to Castilian since, in his opinion, there were five Spanish literatures identified with different languages and regions: Castilian, Catalan, Basque, Galician, and Asturian. Consequently, he claimed a different perspective to the predominant view in writing about the history of Spanish literature. Furthermore, Balaguer insisted directly on the identifying dimension of this premise, claiming "the emancipation of the mind in literature that is the symptom of nationality" (Balaguer 1883, 9).

In addition, the first of the speeches, pronounced in the Royal Academy of History, constituted an example of the historiographical emergence tied to the literary *Renaixença*. One of the most significant parts of his exposition was the idea shared by other non-Spanish Peninsular historiographical proposals that they were connected to an ancient period, which contradicted the borders of the national articulation of modern Europe. Balaguer attributed to Catalan culture a radically Southern and Mediterranean character, distant not only from the Castilian spirit but from the dominating Northern cultures of Europe. Balaguer's six volumes of *Historia política y literaria de los trovadores* (Political history and literature of the troubadours) (1878–1979) were devoted to this cultural area.

This type of historiographical proposal made use of the space left by the leading discourses regarding the definition of Spanish literature based on the hegemony of the so-called *central Spain,* with an idiosyncratic approach. Balaguer and others found support in Provençal and European literature to tie Catalan to the origins of modern literature. Catalan literature proclaimed itself, alongside Dante and Petrarch's Italy, as the inheritor of the Provençal world, which after the disaster of the anti-Albi crusade gave place to two lines of continuity: one beyond the Alps and the other on the Spanish side of the Pyrenees (Balaguer 1878–1879, 1: 378–80). In this regard, the influence of the Félibrige movement, by means of Cambouliu and Balaguer, on the rise of Catalan literary historiography is noteworthy, since what would appear to be a derivative event – the development of Catalan literature – ended up becoming an autonomous phenomenon and with a far superior reach to that of Provençal literature, that would result a mere regional issue with a limited capacity to question the fullness and self-evidence of French literature. These dissimilar developments provide telling evidence of the distance that separated the respective capacities of self-legitimation of Spanish and French literature in the context of the process of national construction.

The Félibrige movement provided the background for the origin of Catalan national historiography, which immediately established a dialectical relationship with the idea of Spanish literature, as shown by Balaguer's public interventions. The responses of José Amador de los Ríos and Emilio Castelar, in charge of replying to Balaguer's speeches in both Royal Academies, demonstrated once more the concurrence of the roles of the politician and literary historian. Eventually, Spanish traditional historiography would end up discarding the challenge

represented by Catalan literary history towards its own founding ideas. In turn, Catalan literary history was to center itself in the articulation of its identity and autonomy, marginalizing the question of its position in relation to Spanish literature and the Iberian setting. What is more, Catalan's historiographical reason also presented itself as an authoritative reference for other re-emerging literatures. Besides the emulous effect caused by the *Renaixença*, we should recall Balaguer's insistence on the modern influence of the Catalan *jocs florals* in Galicia and the Basque country as the detonator for the reappearance of their respective literatures, as well as on the Provençal character of medieval Galician and Portuguese literature. Present in all this was a sort of patronizing pretense of promoting other Peninsular literatures and consequently the desire for a leading role in the incipient revision of the historiographical conception of Peninsular literatures, previously designed by Spanish moderate liberalism.

Catalan literary historiography followed a process of consolidation based on the basic principles we have mentioned, in strict interrelationship with the changing cultural and political contexts. Some episodes to consider are those constituted by figures like Antoni Rubio i Lluch, fellow pupil of Menéndez Pelayo and first professor of Catalan literature in the *Estudis Universitaris Catalans* (1903), an institution not affiliated with the state university system; the nomination in 1954 of Martín de Riquer as the first professor of Catalan literature in the University of Barcelona; and the increasing demand for manuals and panoramas after the death of Franco. After *Resum de literature catalana* (Summary of Catalan literature) by Lluís Nicolau d'Olwer (1927), some chapters by Jordi Rubiò i Balaguer on Catalan literature were included in *Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas* (General history of Hispanic literatures, Díaz Plaja 1949–1968), which was published after the war. These chapters, like other sections dedicated to non-Castilian Peninsular literatures, focused on medieval times, ignoring any specific reference to the twentieth century. *Història de la literatura catalana* (History of Catalan literature, 1954) by Joan Ruiz i Calonja extended up to the Civil War and followed a tradition that started with Milà i Fontanals and was transmitted from teachers to disciples until the present day. Then, little by little, some histories proliferated that assumed the idea of synthesis, incorporation, and a summary of particular advances in the investigation of an epistemological object that is taken for granted. This is a particular form of literary history, quite different from others, that involved the maximum degree of naturalization of historiographical discourse (Vallverdú 1978). In this form of discourse, *revisio* decreased once a certain degree of saturation was reached.

The main historiographical point of reference continues to be the work directed by Martín de Riquer starting in 1964, which evolved into an eleven-volume history prepared by a group of authors. The introduction holds great significance, as it clearly expressed the desire to legitimize the normality of the literature in question, even at the expense of evident contradictions. Primarily, it is an act of vindication which tried to establish literature written in Catalan as the object of the historiographic effort rather than the general ensemble of written texts in Catalan cut off from any artistic aspiration or texts written by Catalonians in other languages (Latin, Provençal, Castilian, etc.). The philological criteria that made Catalan the literature of not a country but a linguistic community that included the Balearic Islands, Valencia, and Rousillon re-surfaced. As noted by M. de Riquer himself (1964–88, 1:9), one of the biggest problems was that, in spite of the mono-lingual criteria, from a historic perspective, poetry written in Provençal during the Middle Ages was also assumed to be a part of Catalan literature, touching on a

question tackled by Cambouliu that affected the very root of national literature. The exceptions and levels of tolerance frequently turn out to be quite significant.

Suebi and Celts

In the same line, it is also noteworthy that the main nineteenth-century theorist on Galician culture, Manuel Murguía, challenged in *El regionalismo gallego* (Galician regionalism) – an opuscule published in Havana in 1889 – the common assumption that Provençal had a strong influence on ancient Galician poetry, adducing its "Suebi element." Furthermore, and contradicting the polemic anti-regionalist address given by Professor Antonio Sánchez Moguel of the Central University of Madrid upon his entrance in the Royal Academy of History, Murguía took up the Celtic roots of Galicia and its culture, an idea which had already been defended by historians begining in the second quarter of the nineteenth century.

In fact, Murguía carried on with Martín Sarmiento's work in the eighteenth century and his claim for a specific geo-cultural position for Galicia, autonomous from the Castilian-centered predominant historiography of Spanish literature as well as from the Southern and Mediterranean orientation of Catalan cultural discourse. Murguía's position during the nineteenth century was parallel to the one Martín Sarmiento had assumed a century earlier and anticipated the so-called "Atlantism," which was sustained by later intellectuals who also produced noticeable replicas in literary histories. However, while Sarmiento limited himself to toning down the Arab and Hebrew influence and its supposed influence on the origin of Iberian and European poetry as he emphasized the Celtic-Suebi dimension of Galicia, Murguía went on to assert a hierarchical opposition between Aryan and Semitic elements. Murguía's racial approach was in keeping with the paradigm generalized during the nineteenth century, which was very much resorted to by historians of Galician, Portuguese, and later Basque literature as a procedure to enforce their identity claims.

Consequently, in the first history of Galician literature, a youthful and unfinished work written by the future Minister of Finance Augusto González Besada (1887), the Celtic character was the basis for the literary identity of Galicia, simultaneously with the postulation of an autochthonous poetry which preceded a phase of puberty identified with the medieval troubadours. This postulation, shared by the Portuguese historiographical tradition, had, from a geo-literary point of view, the clear function of revising the Romanic and Southern connection derived from the Provençal poetry of the troubadours of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This thesis became canonical thanks to Murguía and Eugenio Carré, who in his book *La literatura gallega en el siglo XIX* (Galician literature in the nineteenth century, 1903) provided a chronological and canonical sketch of literature which is still somewhat in use today. Carré (1903, 15) noted "our poets are more alike to the bards of the North than the ones from the South; due undoubtedly to the ethnicity of our race." Carré, replicating Murguía, validated the existence of a profound and ancient tradition that explained the splendor and characteristics of the troubadours' poetry as well as the so-called *Rexurdimento* (Renaissance) of Galician literature during the nineteenth century. However, this renaissance could only be conceivable in so far as Galician literature – and therefore Galician language – was considered distinct from

Portuguese, as opposed to the thesis quite prevalent among Catalan and Spanish authors (Victor Balaguer or Juan Valera) that recognized Portuguese literature as such, as the third grand Iberian literature together with Catalan and Castilian. In fact, similar claims of Galician specificity were also made by González Besada and Murguía, among others.

In summary, the Northern dimension, the affirmation of a popular antique autochthonous tradition, and the evidence of the Galician origin of Portuguese literature, closely linked to the defense of the linguistic and literary Galician identity, were three basic factors affecting the foundation of the "literary autonomy" of Galicia, as stated by Leandro de Saralegui y Medina (1886, 7), who formed part of the same circle as the previous authors. These factors were the expression of the national macro-text that, according to Xoán González-Millán (1994), identified Galician literature.

The same approach is evident in *Resume da historia da literature galega* (Summary of the history of Galician literature) by Florencio Vaamonde Lores (1898), the first global historic summary written in Galician. However, historiographical views made by authors from outside Galicia, which the local tradition has tended to ignore, did not opt for the Celtic thesis. Blanco García (1894) placed Galician literature as a regional event within the Spanish context. Galician literary history was also included in *Historia de la literatura universal* (History of world literature) by Giacomo Prampolini (1956), in which it was placed amid Iberian literatures. In *Grundriss der romanischen Philologien* (Basics of romance philology, 1897) by Gröber, Carolina Michaelis devoted a part to medieval Galician-Portuguese literature in which the Romanic and Portuguese setting prevailed since no specific attention was given to Galician literature as such, although the Celtic ethnic background of Portugal was mentioned.

Galician historiographical tradition was reassumed at the beginning of the 1950s after the Civil War. In 1951, two histories appeared with some characteristics that illustrated the basic tensions of this historiographical model. Both were published in Castilian given the circumstances of this historic moment. Following González Besada's footsteps, Francisco Fernández del Riego (1951) returned to the Celtic hypothesis in *Historia de la literatura gallega* (History of Galician literature), one of the first publications of the publishing house Galaxia, that was very close to Galician post-war nationalist culture. Going one step ahead, De Riego implicitly assumed that the basic identity of Galician literature was of a linguistic nature. Benito Varela Jácome (1951), on the other hand, wrote a considerably more extensive book which, in accordance with the basic assumptions about a would-be regional literature, included native Galician authors who wrote in Latin, Galician, or Castilian. Hence, he kept himself at a distance from the philological mono-linguistic criteria of literary nationalism (Torres Feijó 2002, 34–35).

Francisco Fernández del Riego's model prevailed but with some adaptations. The presence of Celtic ethnicity, for example, has been identified by current nationalist historiography as a sign of essentialism, characteristic of an incipient literary system or, from a clearly teleological viewpoint, of a literary proto-system that depended on a subsidiary vision (Torres Feijó). It is a fact that more recent literary history has almost unanimously distanced itself from the Celtic thesis. These historians have tended to exchange the old label of *national literature* for the more comforting and shallow *literary system*, although still characterized by a mono-lingual identity (Tarrío 1994; Vilavedra 1999; Gómez y Queixas 2001).

However, the primary reference of Galician historiography continues to be *Historia de la literatura gallega contemporánea* (Contemporary history of Galician literature, 1975) by Ricardo Carballo Calero, partially anticipated in 1963. This book covered the period from the start of the War of Independence (1808) to the Spanish Civil War (1936). It may be considered significant because, like many other literary histories in a similar circumstance, it attempted a global interpretation of a given literature with a high density of value judgments but without renouncing its pretense of research and diffusion, and with a demonstrated capacity to become a reference for everyone entering a literary field, extremely frail at the moment.

It also denoted an awareness of certain relevant circumstances not always present in other histories, not even in some subsequent histories written in a much more settled institutional framework. From a nationalist perspective it was the first history that referred to the ethnic component as secondary, visualizing Galician literature as a contemporary episode under development and not as testimonial or depository of ancient identity. This was not inconsistent with Carballo's particular understanding that the relationship of modern Galician literature and medieval literature was a supervened and mediated experience. There was hardly any continuity that could be reconstructed for a historiographical report, which, to borrow Edward Said's expression, strengthened the secular character of Carballo's approach. Consequently, he emphasized the "Europeanizing" dimension, at times comparative, of influential authors in the process of formation that Carballo tried to represent in his work. It is true that he also showed some less original features, such as the conflictive consideration of the relation with the ouside of the monolingual ambit selected. In this way, the idea of marginality and dependence with respect to other languages and cultural ambits was reinforced, most of the time under the chrono-political label of backwardness. Carballo also used a referent which was deeply interiorized in Galician historiography: the contrasting analogy between the Galician and Catalan literary positions, which would become the model to follow and the referent that could measure the suitability of Galician literary development.

The literature of the Portuguese nation

The situation of the historiography of Portuguese literature is obviously very different from that of Galician and Catalan. Consequently, the interdiscoursive relationship between Portuguese and Spanish literary histories has also its own particularities. Portuguese historiography derived from a specific tradition of *bibliothecae* and catalogues of authors which began in the seventeenth century, along with the eight volumes of *Memórias de literatura* (Memoirs of literature, 1792–1814) sponsored by the Royal Academy of Sciences (F. de Figueiredo 1917). This historiographical tradition was developed in a context of national construction which was independent from that of Spain, although there were many interferences, parallelisms, and interconnections between the two (Pinto and Núñez Seixas 1997). The truth is that, just as occurs in the case of Spanish historiography with the literature of Portugal, within Portuguese historiography the presence of Spanish literature, whether implicit or explicit, has been a determinant factor, and probably to a much higher degree than in the opposite case.

It is important to note that the historiographies of both Spanish and Portuguese literature, as of all Iberian literatures, derived from the general panoramas of Bouterwek, Friedrich Schlegel, and Sismondi, and in the case of Portugal, also from the contributions, very uneven in reach, of Southey and Denis. Afterwards, other relevant authors such as Villemain, Baret, Ferdinand Wolf, and Aubrey Bell further outlined the position of Portugal and Spain in the European geo-literary framework. This circumstance, along with the geo-political situation of the Iberian Peninsula as a whole and of Portugal and Spain in particular during the nineteenth century, helps us to understand that, even more so than in Spain, in Portugal there was a tendency to blame the national deficit of representation on foreign paradigms, and to take the perception of the decadence of Portugal's own literature as a starting point for historiographical representation (Amado 1989). This is just another example of the characteristic dislocation of national historiographical discourse in the Iberian Peninsula, which was always formulated based on a deficiency and the assumption of a counter-discursive position.

Therefore, there are references common to both literatures, although the position assigned to each is far from equal. As a matter of fact, those who lamented the subsidiary treatment of Portuguese literature by European historians and scholars were correct. This explains that *Portuguese literature* by Aubry Bell, first published in 1922, was received as the first complete and detailed guide written in English of the literary history of Portugal (Bell 1971, XII). Nevertheless, the autochthonous Portuguese historiographic tradition was in some aspects more prolific than that of Spain. João Palma-Ferreira (in Braga 1984, 47 ff.), who was familiar with this tradition, distinguished two phases. The first was called "preparation" and was identified with the authors of the 1700s and the *Bosquejo* by Almeida Garrett (1826). The second was the phase of Portuguese literary history proper, and was initiated by Freire de Carvalho, who Palma-Ferreira insists was prior to Denis because Freire de Carvalho wrote in his prologue that he had initiated the writing of *Primeiro ensaio sobre história litteraria de Portugal* (First essay on the literary history of Portugal) in 1814. This defense of Freire de Carvalho as the first literary historian was probably due to Palma-Ferreira's wish to establish an autochthonous tradition before Denis's monograph and even before Garrett's, which would undermine any claim by the Frenchman of having founded the tradition. Apart from this, the truth is that the nineteenth century witnessed a series of important historiographical works by Portuguese authors such as A. Cardoso Borges de Figueiredo (1844), José Maria de Costa e Silva (1850–1855), José Silvestre Ribeiro (1853), José Maria d'Andrade Ferreira (1872). Moreover, within this context there was an intellectual debate on the basis and methodology of Portuguese literary history which was unparalleled in the case of the historiography of Spanish literature.

In the case of Spain, the crucial period for the institutionalization of historiographical discourse was from the 1840s to the 1870s. However, for Portugal, with the exception of the end of the 1820 Liberal Revolution and the figure of Garrett, this period can be identified with the era beginning in 1868 in which an oligarchic liberalism became dominant and eventually led to the emergence of a Republican movement with a large base of followers that culminated in the Republic of 1910 (Pinto and Núñez Seixas 1997, 176–77). During this time, a rich public space was created, and a national identity was constructed with very specific characteristics. This national sentiment was aided by the colonial humiliation and frustration of the British Ultimatum, that destroyed the hopes of unifying the territories of Angola and Mozambique. Within this

environment, Teófilo Braga was an important figure as the protagonist of the consolidation of the discourse on Portuguese national literature from an internal perspective. Just like Amador de los Ríos in Spain, Braga was hailed as the figure of the *first historian*, capable of establishing the principle of nationality as a decisive factor for the understanding of Portuguese literature and of instituting the historic method as a condition for reaching that understanding. For Braga, history was opposed to the rhetorical perspective of his predecessors, which he criticized (M.H. Amado 1989, 202). Once again, this new direction was rooted in the influence of the German historiographical tradition, which was later modified by a strong positivistic tendency.

Although Braga's historical perspective changed considerably over time, it still remained different from the historiographical interpretation of Spanish literature associated to Pidal and Amador de los Ríos. Rather than viewing national literature as the hypostasis of a language and a literature with medieval roots as opposed to others, as occurred in Spain, the essence of Braga's viewpoint was to demonstrate the original identity of Portuguese literature and its implicit difference from foreign literatures such as, specifically, that of Spain. This different attitude was not only due to the proximity of the two nations and to historical events, but also to the fact that the Schlegel brothers' literary map included Spanish literature as a model of originality among Southern literatures, while Portugal had a much more indefinite place. Like many other literary historians of the time, Braga supported his theories with a type of racial semiotics in which first the Mozarabs, with a Germanic element, followed by the Lusitanians and Ligurians, all played important roles. The result was a dialogue between a national and an antinational element (C.M.F. Cunha 2002, 90–100), the latter identified with erudite literature, which was seen as a sterile imitation of foreign literatures (Provençal, Breton, Italian, Spanish…).

These theses, which were presented in *Teoria da história literária portuguesa* (Theory of the history of Portuguese literature, 1872), received public rejoinders from intellectuals such as Oliveira Martins and Antero de Quental. Quental's reply, which was brilliant and knowledgeable, expressed his misgivings about Braga's national-popular and ethnic doctrinism and defended a point of view that was much more open to cultural exchanges in a European context and to the idea of origin as the unique development of foreign elements rather than the representation of primogenial elements. Fundamentally, this was a defense of an appropriate image for the literature of "a nation without an ethnographically designed base, such as Portugal, born of politics, not nature, of institutions, not race" (Quental 1904, 19). Quental also wrote of Friedrich Schlegel's influence on Braga in terms which could be applied to many other Iberian historians: "[Braga] made use of an incomplete theory with a very specific application as if it were a universal principle which could be applied to all literatures, and with it he created a mould which Portuguese literature had to fit into, *coûte que coûte*" (Quental 1904, 15).

This different perspective also implied a difference of geo-literary paradigms, which can be measured by the relative value that was attributed to distinct elements: Germanic (Northern) by Braga, Latin (Southern) by Antero de Quental and Oliveira Martins, and Eastern according to the greater or lesser importance attributed to the Arab cultural influence. It is obvious that this was not merely a matter of defending a literary patrimony; it was in large part an attempt to establish a group identity position within a European framework interpreted as a code of geo-literary positions. In determining this position, the place of Portuguese literature within the framework of the Iberian Peninsula was, of course, crucial.

One of the most striking aspects in this context was the hesitant tone used to affirm this place. Braga, for example, categorically assured that ethnicity was the basis of the identity of Portuguese culture and literature. Moreover, in some of his theories, this basis actually defined areas that traversed the strict limits of Portuguese in the Iberian Peninsula. Thus, when Braga formulated a Ligurian ethnic background for Portugal, he extended its influence to "Portuguese, Galicians, Asturians, and Cantabrians," and also to Extremadura and part of Andalusia. In so doing, Braga was seeking to reinforce the contrast between a Northern element and an element with Southern and Eastern characteristics. According to this contention, Lusitanians maintained the ideal of the Ligurian Northern race, while Iberians were a race "that was a transition between the yellow race and the Arians," whose original characteristics would have been heightened by contact with Arabs and North Africans (Braga 2003 [1909], 70–89). Braga was also responsible for the principle which held that the characteristics of each era depended on their degree of proximity to this traditional element. In other words, external influence was viewed as a disturbance to national identity, and each period was judged according to its stronger or weaker resistance to it.

Thus, it is easy to see an obvious vacillation when establishing the degree of "nationality" of Portuguese literature. According to his own criteria, Braga had to admit that the most visible part of ancient Portuguese literature was the presence of a series of external influences from Provençal, Breton, French, and Spanish origins. Consequently, the genuine and national character of Portuguese literature had to be found in a type of subtext, that of popular literature – thus following the path of Almeida Garrett's contentions –, that for one reason or another played an important role in the identity of all Peninsular literatures. However, as a nationalizing process, this appeal to popular literature lacked conviction. In this way, the true national era of Portugal was relegated to a later time. Instead of considering this era the Middle Ages, it was moved to the phase of *quinientismo* that ended with the death of Camões, also known as the *Época dos descubrimientos* (Age of discoveries).

This delayed epiphany of the Portuguese literary nation holds several timely lessons for the understanding of this nationalizing process. The most obvious one is that, through literature, the maturity of the Portuguese nation was clearly connected to its colonial dimension, by relating it to its geo-cultural position on the edge of the European continent, always distanced from what was considered the true center because of the uncomfortable presence of Spain. It is a fact, in this sense, that a number of different historiographical approximations, with the validation of the notion of *lusofonia* or some other similar concept, seem to be haunted by the motto of the Salazarist New State – "Portugal is not a small country" –, which was created for the First Colonial Portuguese Exhibition (1934) and reveals a distrust of the modern idea of Europe (Pimpão 1947, 1: 9–10). Another important lesson is that this colonialist projection, which was later omitted from most historiographical interpretations, was a decisive turning point for the Iberian geo-literary self-image. Thus, in Braga's interpretation, the discovery of America under the Catholic monarchs, whose reign had been considered by eighteenth-century historians as a milestone of Spanish literary history, was one of the reasons for the process of marginalization of Catalan culture. This is because it implied the transfer of the geo-political and geo-cultural axis to the Atlantic and the hegemony of Castile in detriment to Aragon and its Mediterranean dimension. In this context, it is easy to appreciate the importance for Portugal, and for its

literature, of the discovery of a route to India by Vasco de Gama shortly after the discovery of America, which was the main theme of *Os lusiadas* by Camões.

The role of the 'other' Peninsular literature, Spanish, and the representation of the 'minor' literatures of the Iberian Peninsula are telling characteristics of the historiographical discourse of Portuguese literature. As we have seen, on the part of Spanish historiography there have been many attempts, often sly and timid, to integrate Portuguese literature as a variety of Spanish literature. On the side of Portugal, there has always been a tendency to look in the mirror of those other Spanish literatures, in contraposition to Castilian hegemony, as a way of reaffirming political independence and its consequence in the development of literature. An inevitable reference, precisely because he avoids the strident nationalism of other authors, is Fidelino de Figueiredo, one of the great Portuguese intellectuals of the twentieth century. Following the path of Oliveira Martins and sharing many of the founding criteria of Portuguese historiographical discourse (F. de Figueiredo 1927), he made an effort to evaluate the Peninsular literary community by acknowledging the differences and autonomy of its specific literatures. In this line, he elaborated a contrastive characterization of Portuguese and Spanish literature, which can be interpreted as a simultaneous vindication of the literary personality of Portugal and of its normality and harmony with the dynamics of Peninsular and European literature. As a matter of fact, on this foundation he constructed what is possibly still today the most important exercise of Peninsular comparative literature, his book *Pirene* (1935), which is based on a course he taught at Columbia University (J. C. Martins 2001).

In reality, Spain, and Castile in particular, functioned within Portuguese historiographical discourse as *unheimlich* (uncanny), that which should be hidden but makes itself visible with enduring consequences. This conditioned in large part the geo-literary position of Portugal, the articulation of its historical development in literary periods, and the representation of its European dimension, which is why it was often analyzed from a geo-cultural semiotic perspective. Denis (1826, 2) had already justified the scant knowledge of Portuguese literature in Europe in the following way: "This has to do, obviously, with the geographical location of both countries, and even more with the political relationships between them. The Portuguese, powerful in Asia, were meaningless in Europe, whilst Spain imposed its rule on neighbouring countries." From 1580 to 1640, when the Spanish monarchs from Philip II to Philip IV were also head of the Portuguese monarchy, Spain's influence was overwhelming. In a symbolic coincidence, this period begins with the death of Camões and the end of the *Época dos descubrimientos* (Age of discoveries). This is why the heterodox opinions of Camilo Castelo Branco are so striking when in *Curso de literatura portuguesa* (Course on Portuguese literature, 1876), a continuation of Andrade Ferreira, the Spanish Austrian monarchs relativized to a large extent their responsibility in the supposed decadence of the Portuguese literature of that time, and also in the use of Castilian by many of the main Portuguese writers of the moment (Castelo Branco 1986, 9–21).

Along with the role of Castilian as a reference, Galician also played an important role as a repressed element in the national narration of Portuguese literature. In a way, the negation of Galician worked as a *conditio sine cua non* of national literary identity, just as Portuguese nationality depended on the political segregation from Galicia. In other words, it was presented as the decisive factor for the self-affirmation of Portuguese literature as an independent entity. In this process, Galicia became a kind of negated alter-ego, defined by its frustration, in which

it was very difficult for Portugal to fully recognize its own historic origin (Remédios 1921, 20; F. de Figueiredo 1930, 8–12; 1927, 11–16). In the same way, it has not been easy for Galician historiography to cope with the fact that the medieval lyric tradition had formed part, by means of historical continuity, of Portuguese literature rather than of Galician: it has to do with an enduring and underlying conflict between different national reasons (González-Millán 2006, 416). In Braga's words (2003 [1909], 66): "As for Castilian and Portuguese literature, they advance towards aesthetic perfection, whereas others such as Aragonese, Valencian, and Catalan, which had flourished, are now extinct because the support of nationality was reduced to a regionalism that revolted against political and administrative incorporation, which can be confirmed in the case of Galician." This repeal can inevitably be seen in the usual first chapter of nineteenth-century histories, which was dedicated to the language that justified the identity of the literature in question, since the connection of Portuguese to Galician was almost always obliterated in favor of more questionable hypotheses at that historic moment. To give just one example, Camilo Castelo Branco (1986, 28) committed the anachronism – and blatant incongruty – of presenting the poetry of the Galician medieval school as a case of hispanization of Portuguese literature: "From 1580 onwards we continue to be Spaniards in literature, just as we had been from the Galician school…"

Thus, Portuguese historiography was built on a clear geo-literary foundation. This is one of the most obvious elements of its discourse, and according to different circumstances it was transplanted to the field of ethnic and racial semiotics, to an Atlantic and colonial perspective, and to the comparison with other non-Castilian Peninsular literatures. In this element we can often perceive the complexity of the identitarian articulatin with Spain and also the difficulties of finding a place in Europe. This is why a statement as confident as Fidelino de Figueiredo's (1927, 18) seems so extraordinary, even considering the attribution of a particular "physiognomy": "Portuguese literature is, throughout most of its history, the reflection of general tastes and of the European and Peninsular movements of sensitivity." Perhaps this is because of the implicit violence in the concept of Europe that serves as a reference for this desire for homologation.

This conflict led to a latent insecurity as to the very discourse of the literary nation, as we can see in the writings of Teófilo Braga and Camilo Castelo-Branco. Few have exposed this so clearly and with such a strong comparative viewpoint as António José Saraiva (1946) – along with Óscar Lopes, author of the most widespread contemporary history of Portuguese literature – in his essay "Sociology of Portuguese literature." According to Saraiva's contention, there were two great stages of Portuguese literature which were separated by the boundary of the eighteenth century. The first was absolutely coherent and gave rise to a steady and regular tradition, which ranged from medieval troubadours to the learned poetry of the seventeenth century. This tradition can be explained by its integration in the Peninsular ambit: "until Verney and the Árcades, Portuguese literature is a province of Peninsular literature" (Saraiva 1946, 53). Nevertheless, this so-called Peninsular literature was conceived of as essentially aristocratic and courtesan. Literature of a more popular condition, such as the picaresque novel, would have been left out of this Peninsular communication, which was limited to the culture of the court. According to Saraiva's theory, once these social and geo-political conditions changed, Portuguese literary tradition became fragmented and lost its ancient homogeneity due to the influx of extra-Peninsular influences (French, English, German), and therefore failing to attain

a true national dimension. Evidently, one can disagree with the details or the whole of Saraiva's theory, but there is no doubt that it reflects many implicit recurrent elements of Portuguese historiographical discourse.

Euskal literaturaren historia

The historiography of Basque literature faced a different situation (Lasagabaster 2002). Precedents were set in the nineteenth century, such as Francisque Michel's work. These were followed by brief panoramas, such as Pierre Lafitte's (1941) and Nicolás Ormaetxea's *Orixe* (2002), written in 1927. Nevertheless, there was no true historiographic tradition until the 1960s. This was when two works with the title *Historia de la literatura vasca* (History of Basque literature) were published, the first by Luis Michelena (1960a), who expanded on a chapter of *Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas* (Guillermo Díaz-Plaja 1949–68), and the second by Fray Luis Villasante (1979), written in 1961. Ten years later, Ibon Sarasola wrote *Euskal literaturaren historia* (1971), the first book-length work written in Basque, which was translated to Spanish by Jesús Antonio Cid in 1976 with the title *Historia social de la literatura vasca* (Social history of Basque literature). In recent times we can mention the works by Jon Kortazar (1993), which focuses on the twentieth century, the works by Iñaki Aldekoa (2004), and the work coordinated by Patricio Urquizu (2000). Other recent works are non-specialist panoramas which show the progressive consolidation of an orthodox narrative of Basque literary history (López Gaseni 2002).

Any study of the historiography of Basque literature should start by highlighting its late appearance with respect to that of other literatures of the Iberian Peninsula, although the main histories of Galician literature were also published after the 1950s. All in all, it is evident that this characteristic is a sign of the peculiarity with which Basque literature was regarded from the general ambit of the Peninsula. Because of the linguistic distance of Basque, the scarce number of translations into other Iberian languages, and its specific qualities, Basque literature has rarely been considered in other literary histories. In the cases where it has been mentioned, it is merely to declare, often with an overt disdain, the existence of a corpus which is always surrounded by an air of oddity and uniqueness and which is an exception from more general reflections. One of the reasons for this was the difficulty of positioning Basque literature within a geo-literary European framework, as it is proved by the vacillation in defining the periods of Basque literature; which is quite noteworthy considering that periodology was one of the traditional instruments for the comparative homologation of literatures.

Basque's own historiography has in large part incorporated this feeling of differentiation as well as a clear desire for standardization into its own discourse. A consequence was the implementation of a philological bias in the consideration of literature. In its understanding of literature as an action upon language – promoting either a specific dialectical variant or the standardization of Basque –, the philological perspective understands literature as a documentation of Basque, which had lacked a standardized reference that was acceptable for all Basque speakers. This philological bias is a common trait of less established literatures, and became a recurrent characteristic of Basque literary histories at least until the 1970s. Ibon Sarasola (1976, 31 and 57), for example, introduced his history by warning that the works written in Basque had

almost always been considered "simply as material for linguistic studies," and later emphasized that "until now Basque literature has not been an autonomous field of study" (Lasagabaster 2002, 236).

There is another characteristic which is common in the historiography of peripheral literatures, and in Basque it is particularly palpable. This is the idea of delay with respect to the movements that directed the development of European literature (Kortazar 2004). Sometimes, this delay is represented by historiography as a strict isolation from the general progress of literature. According to the hegemonic interpretation of academic comparative studies, such as that of Ferdinand de Brunetière (1900), the European character of a literature could be measured by its ability to influence and impose its "nationality" beyond its own borders. According to Brunetière, this had occurred in a strict chronological sequence divided into periods in which Italy, Spain, France, England, Germany, and in the late nineteenth century, Norway and Russia, imposed their own peculiarities. Any other literature was marginalized from Europe due to its lack of transcendence and incapacity of overcoming its borders, in what can be understood as an intra-European version of the *isolation* ascribed by other comparative scholars to some of the larger Asian and American cultures. This idea was also applied by Brunetière to some of the "great" literatures, whose works were only relevant from a European point of view according to their "consequences". This assumption led him to neglect authors like Lope and Calderón and to make light of Spanish influence because of its supposed excessive singularity. However, this view had more of an effect on literatures such as Basque and Breton, to name some of Brunetière's own examples.

This context must be considered in order to understand Michelena's metaphorical description (1960a, 7) of his effort "in measuring the proportions of our literature with an international measuring stick, the same used for measuring the literatures of Western nations." It also explains that one of the most remarkable features of recent histories (Kortazar; Aldekoa) is their insistence on trying to insert Basque into an international scheme by means of comparison and contrast with the more canonical references of European literature and the use of a periodological framework that defines a sort of international commonality. This inevitably led to an added awareness of the absence of some of the periods traditionally required for a literature to be considered *complete*, such as "medieval literature," although this was compensated by an important oral literature (which was studied and categorized following the parameters established by Menéndez Pidal for the Spanish *romancero*). One of the paradoxical results of this perspective was that the writer held to be the first author in Basque (at least as far as printing considered), Bernard Detxepare, who had published *Linguae Vasconum Primitiae* in 1545, was commonly presented as an extemporary medieval author.

Basque literature had other outstanding features, such as the change in its geography, with some connections to the history of European colonialism (Michelena 1960a, 85), which moved most of its production South of the international border in the eighteenth century from the North of Bidasoa, where printing first began, Another characteristic is the late secularization of literature, which only became independent from post-Tridentine Catholicism at the end of the nineteenth century, although this process was not complete until the late 1960s. Actually, except for Lafitte, all of the other historians mentioned pertain to the Iberian ambit. Furthermore, we can observe cases such as the prologue to the second edition of Fray Luis Villasante's

History of Basque literature (1979) which is oddly anxious about what had occurred in the political and ideological realm since its original writing in 1961, and the irony and distance of Michelena and Sarasola with respect to the Franciscan historian. These two instances illustrate the surge of a new cultural discourse concerning Basque literature, from which a new literary historiography emerged.

Thus, there are certain characteristics of Basque historiographical discourse that form part of the recurrent dislocation found in Peninsular historic traditions, which can be defined as the assumption that the literature that is its object of study is in an anomalous situation. Of all the histories of Basque literature, the polemic history by Ibon Sarasola, which follows the Bordeaux School in its social orientation, is the one that most tries to search for the causes of this anomaly, namely diglossia, dialectal fragmentation, division among kingdoms and states of the 'cultural nation'. This work also proactively supports procedures which could overcome this anomaly, in particular the adoption of standardized Basque as the language of culture and the acceptance of a radically typographic concept of culture.

Perhaps one of the main ironies of the historiography of Basque literature is that it always contains an implicit comparison with supposedly "normal" literatures, and at the same time it emphasizes and privileges (Michelena, Sarasola…) learned literature, that is, literature written with a clear aesthetic value as opposed to the folkloric view of culture and the predominance of clerical works and essays. Basque historiography adopted a restrictive and orthodox view of literature derived from the dominant historical discourses due to its reservations about its own deficiencies. The following quote from Ibon Sarasola (1976, 39–40), for example, is a late-Romantic lament for the lack of nationalism in Basque literature:

> Detxepare ends a stage of Basque literature. From then on, with few exceptions, we will have to deal with works that the literary histories of other languages would leave aside, that is, with translations and adaptations of foreign works. This situation has not changed until the present century and its consequences have been lamentable. The first is marginalization, that is, the lack of any relationship between literature and life. Basque literature is unfamiliar with European literatures and their movements. At the same time, and for the same reason, in this centuries-long time lapse, Basque literature has not witnessed the events and problems of Basque life, and to a lesser degree has it expressed this life… Basque literature is the literature of the Basque clergy.

Coda

Up to now we have explored some of the key constituents of Peninsular historiographical discourse on literature. It should be completed with a reflection on what has happened subsequently in the history of Spanish and Portuguese literature, which we had left at the end of the nineteenth century. The truth is that neither of these traditions altered the essential aspects with which they had developed during the past century. With the exception of the reaction to the failure of the Restoration and the colonial crisis in 1898 (Cabo 2001), during which there were repeated protests about the lack of a valid history of Spanish literature, both traditions represented a process of naturalization of national ideology. In other words, there was a profound

and intimate acceptance of its foundation that made more explicit arguments, which were present in the 1800s, unnecessary and even uncomfortable. Proof of this is that, on the one hand, the historiographical notion of *Spanish literature* associated itself definitively with the concepts of monolingualism and territoriality of the nation-state, thus excluding Latin American literature and overstating its indifference to other Peninsular literatures, whose historiographies generally acted in accordance with the same logic (Hooper 2006). On the other hand, Portuguese literature seems to have tacitly accepted the pretension of normality that settled after the publication of Fidelino de Figueiredo's work, in contrast to more dramatic positions.

This depiction of Spanish literature is present even in worthwhile histories with innovative intentions such as the one coordinated by Franco Meregalli (1990), which focuses on the notion of *civiltà letteraria* and has a slight comparative orientation. As a matter of fact, the only notable exceptions to this general acceptance were very traditional viewpoints that were based on Menéndez Pelayo and tried to unite Spanish literature, or simply literature in Castilian, with Latin American literature (Cejador 1932; Díez-Echarri and Roca Franquesa 1950). Another exception was the tendency that tried to convert the idea of *hispanidad*, the third phase in the imperial expansion after that of the region, Castile, and of the nation, Spain, into a historiographical object in accordance with a clear ideological viewpoint (Giménez Caballero 1965). From an internal point of view, the only efforts worth mentioning were those that tried to reunite a series of parallel monographs dedicated to Iberian (Prampolini 1956), Hispanic (Díaz-Plaja 1949–68), and Spanish (Díez Borque 1980) literary traditions.

Quite different was the emphasis placed on so-called regional and local literatures, in which the system of *bibliotecae* that began in the eighteenth century was very important, and which was revitalized from the late 1970s within the territorial design set forth by the Spanish Constitution of 1978. This circumstance also had a profound influence on historiography. Contrary to what occurred in France, the existence of other national literatures alongside Spanish profoundly affected the status of those "other" regional literatures. Not in vain, Catalan, Galician, and Basque literature had been represented as regional phenomena during the large part of the nineteenth and early twentieth century (with exceptions such as Menéndez Pelayo), and only afterwards did they consolidate a national statute in what was considered a valuable process of autonomization. As a consequence, in Spain the term regional literature implied an axiological inferiority which was far removed from what regionalism meant for the literary geography of France (Thiesse 1993). In contrast, the situation was quite different in Portugal, a mono-linguistic and mono-cultural nation, at least ideally, which explains why literary regionalism is still a rising phenomenon in this nation.

Perhaps because of these different contexts, regional character tends to be extremely fluid and provisional in direct proportion to the geo-literary ambition of each case. While this regional character may be suitable to characterize a certain ambit from a historiographical point of view as long as one assumes its inscription as a particular element within a larger space, it becomes reproachable in the measure that the geo-literary position of a certain literature seeks to pertain to the literatures of the world without first considering the conceptual intermediation of Spanish literature. There are many historiographical works dedicated to classifying as regional the literature of Navarre, Aragon, Extremadura, and León, and even smaller areas such as cities like Cartagena and Valladolid (Enguita and Mainer 1994). This shows the acceptance of

a subaltern position, but also an implicit vindication of the experience and immediacy of what is near in contrast to the inherent abstraction of national principles. In some cases, we can also see the exhibition of geographic uniqueness, such as insularity or the position as a geo-literary enclave, which illustrates some of the tensions, beyond language, that crossed the consistency of nationalism.

Despite this, there were naturally important differences in the field of Spanish literary historiography throughout the twentieth century. During this period and up to the present, the work of the Hispanists has been noteworthy, from James Fitzmaurice-Kelly (1898) to researchers who head a team of specialists such as Franco Meregalli (Alcina et al 1990), Jean Canavaggio (1994–1995), and David T. Gies (2004). For the most part, these scholars continued the discourse which has already been broadly outlined. This was true even for Gies who, in an elegantly postmodern exercise of *captatio benevolentiae*, discussed the limits and intrinsic paradoxes of the work of the historian. There is much variation in both the tone and ideological background of many of these authors, such as the conservative Catholic Ángel González Palencia (Hurtado y J. de la Serna and González Palencia 1921), the liberal republicans Ángel Valbuena Prat (1937; Pozuelo 2000b) and Ángel del Río (1948), the Falangist who after the Civil War wrote about Spanish literature from 1898 to 1936, Gonzalo Torrente Ballester, and the socialist who wrote in exile, Max Aub (1974). There were also efforts to create a new historiography from a Marxist or feminist point of view. Nevertheless, in its essence, the geo-literary background and nationalism of Spanish literature remained unaltered, although in some cases some specific chapters on non-Castilian literature were introduced (Gies 2004, chaps. 33, 36, 38, and 40).

The situation of Portuguese literary historiography was quite similar. For example, Joaquim Mendes dos Remédios (1921), Dean of the University of Coimbra and Minister of Public Education under Salazar, wrote a history which was very influential in the field of education and which had six editions between 1898 and 1931. This work had a schematic and scholastic design with an aesthetic chronology very similar to Fidelino de Figueiredo's. It tried to present Portuguese literature alongside the great European literatures by means of, among other things, sections in each chapter dedicated to establishing "literary synchronism" with Spanish, French, Italian, English, and German literature, in that order. The figure who most tried to naturalize and normalize the history of Portuguese literature was probably Fidelino de Figueiredo, who distanced himself from identitarian raptures, although he defended this literature's specific character and pertinence to the great European cultural movements. Afterwards, the 20s and 30s gave rise to other historiographical proposals worthy of mention. An example is *História comparativa da literatura portuguesa* (Comparative history of Portuguese literature), by J. Barbosa de Betencourt (n.d.), a manual for middle education which followed the footsteps of Mendes dos Remédios by reinforcing Portugal's place in European literature with a very elementary comparative pedagogy.

Nevertheless, the most widespread and influential manual, from the late 60s, was by António José Saraiva and Óscar Lopes. This work reaffirmed linguistic criteria and social analysis in a reformulation of Saraiva's ancient thesis, which we have already discussed. In more recent times, we must consider two different proposals. On the one hand, we have those that imply the intention of revising and distancing themselves, though often only slightly, from the canonical literary history. Examples of these are the work by Maria Leonor Carvalhão Buescu (1994), a

synthesis which focuses on cultural aspects and connections with the Iberian Peninsula and Europe, and the more ambitious work by Miguel Tamen and Helena Carvalhão Buescu (1999), which was edited in English. On the other hand, we have monumental works in several volumes with a large number of collaborators that, despite their appearance, denote the clear exhaustion of traditional historical discourse. This is the case of the Alfa editorial project (2001), integrated in a series of histories of literatures in Portuguese, and of that headed by Carlos Reis (1993–2005), which explicitly follows the anthological intention of critical discourse that Francisco Rico (1980–2000) applied in the ambit of Spanish literature with great editorial success. These examples are evidence of a complete institutionalization and of an effort to overcome and widen the limits of a stereotyped discourse while accepting its main ideas.

Edward Said (1983, 24) spoke of the "transfer of legitimacy from filiation to affiliation" which characterized the modern literary critic. The dominant discourse of literary history has primarily been a discourse of affiliation, that is, of adhesion or adscription to a certain tale, to a certain ideological concept, to a certain process of institutionalization, and to a certain ideal monolingualism. However, it has also been a discourse that has drawn its strength from a filiate pretense, that of the naturalness attributed to genealogies and identity when associated to language and land. Affiliation has disguised itself as filiation. Historians have profusely put this into practice, such as when they vindicate their own nationality so as to legitimize and give authority to their shaping of the past and contribute to a firmly located discourse dependent on specific circumstances. We must even admit that the model of an Iberian Peninsula with four literatures, which seems to have gained prevalence with the passing of time, is the result of a complex discourse that is full of affiliate excisions and artificial overlaps, and which derives from limited and hierarchical access to the concept of nation.

Within this plurality ruled by the complacent and tranquilizing acceptance of the restrictive principal of literary multi-nationalism, the worst part is not the exclusion and marginalization of anything that does not find its place in one of the Iberian literary nations, such as the Arab and Hebrew literary traditions. Far worse is the imposition by national historiographical discourse of a mediation which is impossible to avoid when interacting with the texts and cultures of the past. This is especially serious in the context of the Peninsula, which has never fully developed a literary criticism free from the heavy mandates of historical discourse. In this realm, historiographical discourse, according to its habitual parameters, is a saturated and intimately conservative mode of discourse, both in its epistemological and ideological premises.

Historiography and the geo-literary imaginary
The Iberian Peninsula: Between *Lebensraum* and *espace vécu*

César Domínguez

> But what a strange lesson in geography I was given! Guillaumet did not teach Spain to me, he made the country my friend. He did not talk about provinces, or peoples, or livestock. Instead of telling me about Guadix, he spoke of three orange-trees on the edge of the town: "Beware of those trees. Better mark them on the map". And those three orange-trees seemed to me thenceforth higher than the Sierra Nevada.
>
> He did not talk about Lorca, but about a humble farm near Lorca, a living farm with its farmer and the farmer's wife. And this tiny, this remote couple, living a thousand miles from where we sat, took on a universal importance . […]
>
> The details that we drew up from oblivion, from their inconceivable remoteness, no geographer had been concerned to explore. Because it washed the banks of great cities, the Ebro River was of interest to mapmakers. But what had they to do with that brook running secretly through the water-weeds to the west of Motril, that brook nourishing a mere score or two of flowers?
>
> "Careful of that brook: it breaks up the whole field. Mark it on your map."
> (Saint-Exupéry 1992, 5–6)

> Because of its massive structure and its varied climate, vegetation and population, the Iberian Peninsula is a continent in miniature. A central plateau dominates the whole structure, forming a geographical nucleus and the historical center of gravity of the Peninsula.
> (Demangeon 1907, 371)

A comparative history of literatures *in* the Iberian Peninsula. The spatial formulation that gives this work its title has an unmistakably systemic appearance, whose exact phraseology would be staunchly defended by, among others, José Lambert: "I should like to suggest that we speak about 'literature *in* France, *in* Germany, *in* Italy,' instead of German, French, Italian literature" (1991, 141). It is surprising how many nuances this simple use of a preposition can create. Next to the adjective of nationality or some other type of spatial allusion (literature *of* France, *of* Germany, *of* Italy), the construction "literatures-in" seems to highlight both the need to question relationships between literature and sociopolitical structures and a search for the heterogeneity that the national paradigm has silenced, obscured, and denied.

But what happens when the spatial referent is not national, but rather, geographical? Note that the title is not – à la Lambert – a comparative history of literatures in Spain and Portugal. We must, then, question ourselves as to the pertinence of a formula such as "in the Iberian Peninsula." My aim here is not to deal with the answer to this question. Obviously, the reader must infer the appropriateness (if any) of the adopted approach, from the whole of the information offered by this *Comparative history of literatures in the Iberian Peninsula*. Some possible answers have already been offered in the preliminary reflections on this project. Fernando Cabo Aseguinolaza, for example, argues that spatial choice means opening various fronts simultaneously, including a distancing as regards the traditional, periodological, historiographical model (thus literary history as *revisio*), and reflection on prototypical historiographical objects to which the geographical approach has been applied:

> In our case […] the spatial setting – the option in favour of localization, a diffuse and contentious localization in fact – implies primarily a sharp distancing from the historiographic perspective that favours periods or movements, tracks that have frequently oriented the march of comparativism. Actually, if we give it a thought, the resort to geography has been generally reserved for literatures, if not emerging, at least somewhat reluctant to the periodological standards of the "great literatures." (2003, 120)

With respect to this last factor, there is nothing more striking than the central position Iberian literatures have enjoyed in the history of international comparatism (we could speak of the myth of the Iberian Peninsula as an emblem of interliterariness) in contrast to the weak position that the discipline has occupied in Spain and Portugal until recent years. It is undeniable that for the few practitioners of comparatism in the Iberian Peninsula, comparison is such only if it occurs between one of the national literatures of the geographical region and a representative of the "central" literatures of the European tradition (German, French, English or Italian, in particular), while the mere possibility of an Iberian intra-comparatism of Castilian/Spanish, Catalan, Galician, Portuguese, and Basque literature (the list is not meant to be exhaustive), whether it opts for a bi- or multi-polar formula, tends to provoke reactions ranging from the friendly condescension reserved for amateurisme, to skepticism, or, at the extreme, vehement rejection for its supposed veiled reactionary centralism/nationalism. In whichever conception of the act of comparison, the epistemological positions are transparent. To illustrate, it is useful to point out that among Spanish comparatists, only Claudio Guillén has drawn attention to the importance of the Spanish domain for the revision of traditional periodological schemes: "The example of Spain is methodologically crucial because in it we see that history is not a series of disparate periods but rather, the coexistence and confrontation of processes and timespans" (1989, 203). However, when just a decade later Andreu van Hooft Comajuncosas (1998) carried out a survey among prominent scholars in Iberian literatures on the subject of the diverse possibilities of their historiographical approach, support for the comparatist option was merely symbolic, if not residual.

My aim is a partial examination of the issue of the appropriateness of spatial delimitation. I call it partial for three reasons. Firstly: because I will focus only on one of the diverse possible analyses, namely, historiographical meta-geography. Secondly: because I cannot develop here in all its complexity the exhaustive analysis that this one line of investigation demands. If studying the geographical imaginary of any one of the Iberian historiographical discourses would in itself be a difficult task, then the attempt to review comparatively the imaginaries of all the historiographical discourses of all literatures that have appeared or that right now exist in the Iberian Peninsula is doubly so. And thirdly: because to my knowledge, it is a field of study that is completely unexplored (both on the Iberian level and in other literary spaces.) Thus, I will offer one possible answer to the thorny issue of geographical pertinence, an answer whose partiality and provisionality may perhaps be offset by its novelty and its ability to shed light on problems that are central to any attempt to write a comparative history of literatures (in the Iberian Peninsula).

Since we find ourselves in the sphere of meta-reflection (the meta-geography of historiographical discourse), perhaps it would not be irrelevant to mention at this time, as a way into literary cartography, another dimension of this meta-discursivity, since, as Mario J. Valdés

has indicated, the specificity of comparative historiography lies in its explicit self-awareness: "a comparative literary history would have to acknowledge the epistemological limitations that its hermeneutic situation creates: each historian will be situated as a real person living in a linguistic and cultural community, and it is from that specific position that he/she can engage what phenomenologists call the horizon of the past" (1992, 4).

The present *Comparative history of literatures in the Iberian Peninsula* has been developed under the auspices of the Coordinating Committee for a Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages of the International Comparative Literature Association. Thus, the spatial delimitation of the project (the Iberian Peninsula) owes much to the hetero-vision alluded to earlier, in which geocultural mythologization (the Iberian Peninsula as paradigmatic space of interliterariness) meets the chrono-politics of exceptionality (Cabo Aseguinolaza 2004a). Of course, the *Comparative history* offered here is a tale that could well corroborate (or question and modify) the basic presuppositions of this mythologization. However, there is a fundamental aspect of this hetero-vision that we must not avoid. To highlight it, we might recall the passage from Conrad's *Heart of darkness* in which Marlow shows his childhood passion for maps: "Now when I was a little chap I had a passion for maps. […] At that time there were many blank spaces on the earth, and when I saw one that looked particularly inviting on a map (but they all look that) I would put my finger on it and say, when I grow up I will go there" (Conrad 2000, 21–22). The aspect to which I am referring is the fact that the territory in question can only be a blank space – a concept that Conrad takes from F. Leopold McClintock's arctic exploration to Sub-Saharan Africa – for the external subject (imperial, in Conrad's tale), but never for the internal subject (the colonized). It is a notable ecology of vision which, in our case, can be put in the context of the previously mentioned comparatist resistance to cartographic representation. Indeed, all maps are a technology of power, a form of critical limitation, since they negate other representations, other perspectives (Gregory 1994, 6).

This (hetero-)vision of the Iberian Peninsula as a blank space susceptible to being mapped introduces a pre-judgment that should not be overlooked. The question must be asked: would comparatists on the international stage greet geographical delimitations such as the Alpine region or Chaco with the same epistemological acceptance as they extend to the Iberian Peninsula? Or even, going back to the same geographical category, would they accept a comparative history of the Italian Peninsula? If the answer is affirmative, the effectiveness of the geographical approach would have to be seriously examined. And if it is negative, we are back where we started, at the question of appropriateness, which is now defined more precisely as the problem as to what makes a geographical area a literary zone.

Some of the authors of the comparative histories overseen by the Coordinating Committee have indicated that the selection of a geographical framework means the beginning of a new phase in the already long history of this project. Thus, for Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer, the first volume of their history of literary cultures of East-Central Europe "inaugurates a new subseries on regional histories within the Comparative History of Literatures in European Language, published by the Coordinating Committee of the International Comparative Literature Association" (2004b, xi). To this new collection will be added, along with the *History of the literary cultures of East-Central Europe*, the present *Comparative history of literatures in the Iberian Peninsula* and the *Comparative histories of Nordic literary cultures*. However, the

selection of a geographical domain as a historiographical object had already been carried out in previous projects of the Coordinating Committee. In 1986, Albert S. Gérard coordinated a history of writing in European languages in Sub-Saharan Africa and between 1994 and 2001, three volumes on the literary history of the Caribbean were published, coordinated by A. James Arnold. To those we can also add, despite the fact that they were not overseen by the Coordinating Committee, the three volumes of *Literary cultures of Latin America: A comparative history*, coordinated by Mario J. Valdés and Djelal Kadir, not only because Valdés was one of the presidents of the aforementioned committee, but also because the *History of the literary cultures of East-Central Europe* itself forms a part of the Literary History Project of the University of Toronto (Cornis-Pope and Neubauer 2004b, xi), directed by Valdés and co-directed by Linda Hutcheon, and of which the *Literary cultures of Latin America* is one of the results. In fact, the selection of a geographical area as historiographical object is highly indebted to various works by Valdés (1996, 1998, 1999a, 1999b, 2002), in which he reflects on the applications of Braudel's methodology to the literary sphere.

It is clear that in the projects overseen by the Coordinating Committee geographical delimitation is not restricted to particular continents. It has been applied to zones in Africa, America and Europe and it is even leading to historiographical studies on a large scale in Asia (see, for example, Koji, Yuan and Yoshihiro 1995). Here two important issues can be considered. First: are continental zones comparable? That is to say, does a *découpage* like Latin America obey similar criteria as Sub-Saharan Africa or the Iberian Peninsula? And second: in the case of Europe, is the principle behind the selection of East-Central Europe, the Iberian Peninsula and the Scandinavian Peninsula as objects of a comparative historiography, not significant?

Regarding the first question, a review of already-published comparative histories shows a notable increase in meta-reflection on the epistemological bases of geographical delimitation. When, in 1986, Gérard found himself of a mind to justify the existence of a comparative history of European-language literatures in Sub-Saharan Africa, the fact that the means of expression of African literatures (European languages) was accepted without great question (obviously, this is a general problem in the Coordinating Committee's historiographical project as a whole) was as suprising as the reasons given for the identification of the geographical group:

> The purpose of the HALEL [History of African Literature in European Languages] project was to deal with creative writing in European Languages produced south of the Sahara. This corpus, however, is typically what mathematicians call a fuzzy set. Although it is geographically well defined, there is neither compelling objective evidence nor unquestioned agreement as to which works and which authors constitute "African literature." (Gérard 1986, 23)

Thus, a geographical category (Sub-Saharan Africa) is offered as sufficient criterion for delimiting a literary corpus, even if the resulting corpus is nothing but a "fuzzy set." But fundamental questions go unanswered, such as which are the bases for the geographical category in question, especially when racial and religious factors play a role in its identification? Africa in this context is converted into the scene of a possible clash of civilizations: "it has not seemed possible at the present stage to integrate Mediterranean Africa in our consideration: for the time being, it seems best to regard it as part of the Muslim world, which is not to overlook the historical fact that Islam has also made and is still making deep inroads into Sub-Saharan Africa" (Gérard

1986, 22). The mere fact that it was not deemed necessary to delve deeper into this geo-categorization (Mediterranean Africa/Sub-Saharan Africa) is highly indicative of the underground workings of meta-geography. In this case these workings lead to a geo-literary equivalence in which the identification of African literature with the creative output of Sub-Saharan Africa is dependent upon the elimination of the geocultural component of the Mediterranean. The concomitance between the continentality of this African literature and that of European literature (with the exclusion of any output beyond the Ural Mountains) as prototypical categories in the history of comparative literature are obvious.

In the case of *A history of literature in the Caribbean*, the justification of the *découpage* remains undefined to a similar degree as in the comparative history of the literature of Sub-Saharan Africa, despite the fact that in this case, a subtitle as explicit as "Charting the Caribbean as a literary region" has been given to the general introduction. Thus, Arnold highlights the novelty of the project, in the sense that he includes the Greater and the Lesser Antilles within continental boundaries (1994, xiii), an inclusion which would allow the claim "to present a contrastive view of how literature emerged as a social institution in the several areas of the Caribbean region" (xiv). However, nothing is said of the criteria which support this geographical choice. For this reason, I intentionally employ the concept of *découpage*, due to its acknowledged weight within the discipline. If the operation in question consists of postulating the existence of a geographical grouping symbolically separated by a name, then we cannot overlook its use in the French tradition (from Lucien Gallois) in the development of a regionalization which pays attention mainly to surface area and, thus, to exploration in linear journeys (D. R. 2003). The basic instrument in this type of regionalization is the geographical map, which, with its flat shape, reinforces that tendency while at the same time satisfying the desire to turn the *unheimlich* into *heimisch* by filling in the blanks.

All those elements are present in the title: charting, Caribbean, literary region. If I am not mistaken, it was the first time that this last concept (literary region) was used in a history overseen by the Coordinating Committee, a term whose epistemological importance must be acknowledged when we recall that, according to Cornis-Pope and Neubauer (2004b, xi), the new orientation adopted by this historiographical project resides precisely in its construction as "regional history." Whether the idea of literary region is used a priori or a posteriori, there is no doubt that it imposes as a territorial imperative the identification of region with a regrouping between states, an issue to which we must give great consideration. But I must now point out that within the framework of literary history in the Caribbean, regionalization takes on a systemic dimension – inherited from the economics of inequality (Werner Sombart) – which means bringing to the field of literature a geometry of distance. The implications of this, however, are not explored in all their complexity, but rather, its operativity seems to answer to its use in identifying spatial units (centers, thresholds) as collective agents, as Julio Rodríguez-Luis highlights in the Afterword to the section titled "Islands and territories": "The primary purpose of the essays on Islands and territories is to study the literary production of those regions that are considered to be marginal in relation to a Caribbean center – be it Hispanic, Dutch, anglophone or francophone – and to define their Caribbeanness" (1994, 96). The ultimate essentialism (Caribbeanness) that guides the *découpage* is no less problematic.

Without a doubt, the comparative histories of literatures in Latin America and East-Central Europe are the ones that have most attempted to justify the geographical approach. Hervé Théry is the author of two works fundamental to the geo-literary line of argumentation and which are contained in *Literary cultures of Latin America*. In the first, Théry explores the consequences of the singularity of Latin America as one continent (the meta-geographical implications of this statement are not discussed) whose name refers to the culture that shaped it, which puts us decidedly within the sphere of cultural geography: "The repercussions of this fact can be traced not only in the region's cultural productions (in the usual sense of the term, and notably in its literatures), but also in its material civilization and geography" (2004a, 3). Thus, we can understand why numerous sections of the work are dedicated to analyzing how Latin America has been imagined in literature (in the wider sense, hence the resort to the phrase "literary culture"), an aim that always seems to be guided by the obsession with contextualizing literary production in its social context (M. Valdés 2004a).

It is perhaps surprising that no reference is made to the fact that Latin America was one of the first designations in the category of world regions. This omission means not dealing with another fundamental issue in the underlying geo-discourse, namely the selection and organization of the (geo-)cultural borders. Both absences result in the implicitly postulated naturalness of the geographical grouping which, in combination with continental borders, give coherence and unity to the historiographical object. But it is important to remember that Latin America is a designation coined by French scholars in the mid-nineteenth century in their desire to include the Spanish-, Portuguese- and French-speaking portions of America (Braudel 1994, 247; Collier, Blakemore and Skidmore 1985, 9) within the framework of Napoleon III's imperial project (a similar enterprise was the creation of the Near and Middle East by the British Empire).

The supposed conceptual cohesion of the delimitation must be questioned, since its final result is the emphasis on religious, linguistic, historic and political affinities through an adjective (Latin) which specifically denies the indigenous and African-American elements (I use the term along the same lines as the cultural studies term Black Atlantic). Not to mention – and in this respect, geographical confrontations are always illuminating – the fact that the supposed geocultural cleanliness of Latin America as constructed by the French imaginary, when taken to its logical conclusion, would oblige us to include Québec, as a French-speaking region of America (M. Lewis and Wigen 1997, 182). This will not be the only occasion where literary and cultural studies accept a priori geographical boundaries originally set out by imperial thinking and military strategy, boundaries by virtue of which we can argue the comparability of spaces. It is interesting to note here that for area studies, whose goal is to trace boundaries based on historical and cultural links and not on geographical formations, Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa, significantly, are clearly recognizable regional categories, as shown by their use in basic geographical education, in the media, and in the practice of *découpage*, now an academic practice (Institutes of Latin American or African Studies).

Théry's second work (2004b) represents a more resolute attempt to develop a literary geography of Latin America, limited to offering a quantitative and cartographic base for the notion of cultural center, through the places of birth and death of its authors. The result is an interesting reformulation of the geographical a priori, since, as a function of that variable, cities such as New York, Madrid and Paris become cultural centers of Latin America on an equal footing

with Buenos Aires, Mexico City and Rio de Janeiro. The nuclear conception of this literary geography – cultural center – is defined in the introduction to Part III of the second volume of the *History* by Eduardo F. Coutinho and Victoria Peralta, for whom "[c]ultural centers are magnetic poles of attraction of a symbolic-cultural order, exercised by a two-way movement – centrifugal and centripetal – in the interior region of a given country's region, but centered around an axis-city" (2004, 310). It is precisely in that third part that the internal spatialization of Latin America is discussed, a spatialization highlighted by the transnational factor, since of the eight regions identified, only one does not go beyond national borders.

In contrast to the visibility theorized by area studies for Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America, it appears obvious that with East-Central Europe we are in a different category of territorial partition. Therefore, it is understandable that the *History of the literary cultures of East-Central Europe* begins with a detailed argument for the justification of its geographical delimitation. Indeed, and I believe that this fact is important, it was the first history overseen by the Coordinating Committee that accepted the challenge of delimiting a *sub*-European space as opposed to the omnipresent continental borders used by histories that followed a periodological formula. Obviously, the greatest difficulties were due to the fact that the literary space selected for the study possessed neither concrete and stable borders, nor a commonly agreed-upon name that would indicate its separation. In that sense, the uniqueness of this project, as compared to the previous ones (Sub-Saharan Africa, the Caribbean, Latin America) and the concurrent or future ones (Iberian Peninsula, Scandinavian Peninsula), is manifest in its ad hoc *découpage*. In contrast to the geo-units of the other histories, which have a recognized and recognizable tradition in one or more disciplines (from physical and political geography to geo-history and geopolitics), for which spatial delimitation is an a priori, subject to various reformulations in its literary dimension, this history of literature in East-Central Europe constructs its own object, creates its *partie du monde* (part of the world) by the very act of denominating (East-Central Europe), regardless of whether the community identity contained within the denomination is consciously felt by the population of the territory in question.

We are certainly not talking about a geographical grouping free of ideology here. In fact, this history invents its space in response to other poetics, like those indicated by *Mitteleuropa, Zentraleuropa*, Eastern Europe and Central Europe, with a name in which the adjective "Central" implies a shifting of the balance toward the West as against the Slavic, pro-Russian, Asian drift of "Eastern." It poses an interesting question with regards to the situation of literatures in France and Germany, when the position of Central Europe is claimed for these others. And I cannot help but introduce a new question here: Would a geographical delimitation such as a comparative history of literatures in the *hautes terres du centre* (central highlands) be as epistemologically acceptable as that of the Iberian Peninsula? In light of the role played by Franco-German literary interrelations in the history of comparative literature, and by Franco-German interspatiality in the career of some important founding fathers (from Louis-Paul Betz and Fernand Baldensperger to Ernst Robert Curtius), the answer is as obvious as the geographical reference is obscure.

The territorial rebalancing revealed by the title is without a doubt a geo-strategic gamble. I have already said that it is not a spatiality free of ideology. In fact, in this Central that modifies Eastern, the dialectic between pan-Slavism and pan-Germanism, between East and West (on

the unsuitability of the Urals as a literary frontier, see Cornis-Pope and Neubauer 2004c, 4), between North and South (a way to refer to the distinction between Eastern and Western Europe during the Enlightenment) are as much in play as the distance between center and periphery (M. Lewis and Wigen 1997, 229n37). Thus, we can understand why this history is so explicit – it is by far the most explicit of all those published with the support of the Coordinating Committee up to now – as regards its extra-academic ends. We are talking about the planning dimension (I use the concept in the sense of the theory of polysystems) of literary history, in which the transnational boundaries of the project are as important as the framework of the nation-state was in traditional history: "The primary inspiration for our project is thus an ethical imperative rather than an epistemological longing. […] A literary history of East-Central Europe will make sense if it furthers, on however small a scale, the communication between the peoples of that region" (Cornis-Pope and Neubauer 2004c, 15–16).

The historical and planning aspects of the justification of East-Central Europe as a historiographical object are discussed in the General introduction of Cornis-Pope and Neubauer (2004c), while the works of Paul Robert Magocsi (2004) and Cornis-Pope (2006a) develop the geographical epistemology that gives meaning to the whole project, and especially to its second volume. In both works, the abandonment of a regionalization of surface area and linearity in favor of a geo-phenomenology highly indebted to the interpretive turn (David Ley) and exhibited here through a literary geography created from its own geographical object can be seen. Of these objects I highlight two (though they are not the only ones that this history offers). First: the border. Its problematization, experience, representation and communication testify to the fact that the border is not a fact, but rather, a construction, as is all of East-Central Europe: "the borders of East-Central Europe have been and still are multi-dimensional. Depending on what characteristic one looks at, the region's borders are simultaneously static, shifting, expanding, contracting, and overlapping" (Magocsi 2004, 19). This is the root of the constructivist approach. We all achieve our spatial experiences through constant construction of the geographical object, not in linearity or sequentiality, but rather, in interspatiality, in the interface. Second: the marginocentric city.

> It is their very marginality, […] as well as their multiethnic composition that has allowed these cities to establish a fertile nexus between Eastern and Western literary traditions. Such "marginocentric" cities encouraged a de/reconstruction of national narratives, a hybridization of styles and genres, and alternative social and ethnic relations. (Cornis-Pope 2006a, 4–5)

Obviously, the identification of marginocentric cities has particular impact within the framework of the final phase of globalization initiated in 1945 – one of the temporal nodes dealt with in the first volume – in that they seem to be objectivizations of the local pole in opposition to the spatial nodes of the global megapolitan archipelago (Olivier Dollfus). This key concept was made explicit when Cornis-Pope placed the agenda of the genre of regional comparative history at an (imagined) equidistant point between the local and the global: "the literatures of East-Central Europe represent an ideal object of study for a regional comparative history, freed from nationalistic agendas but also from a leveling notion of globalism" (2006b, 213).

I believe that we have seen sufficient information to appreciate the merits of the (new) role of geography in (comparative) literary history. Nonetheless, I am not sure that we have

arrived at a satisfactory answer regarding the appropriateness of geographical delimitation. By this, I mean that the answer given by Cornis-Pope only applies within the fuzzy confines of East-Central Europe or other comparable spaces, although it is highly possible that, when all is said and done, comparability is nothing but another variant of that extrapolation – Balkanization – highly disparaged by Maria Todorova (1997): "Our work as literary historians must […] consider the implications of spatial definitions that can become contentious, creating the sort of predicaments we have witnessed more recently in Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia, or the Middle East" (Cornis-Pope 2006a, 1). But the other end of the spectrum is not free from danger either. If we opt for the geographical route with the sole purpose of highlighting the artificiality of previous delimitations taken as natural until now (the nation-state) we may perhaps find that the quest for a literary geography is another chimera, that literature does not have its own space outside of that of words. Between ethics and esthetics there is the constructivist route of the poetics of space, the one I will take here. Space as an artefact, as a phenomenon that literature (and literary history), among other discourses, brings out. It is under this approach that the idea of literary geography highlights another device that is no less important, the now impossible *découpage* between objective (geographical) knowledge and subjective (literary) knowledge.

It is at this moment that the first question mentioned (the comparability of the continental zonal groupings) shows its inextricable link to the second (the criterion for the delimitation of sub-European spaces). As I have already said, a good portion of the general argumentation of the *History of the literary cultures of East-Central Europe* is implied by the introduction of the adjective "Central" to the geographical delimitation. Once again, it is (implicitly) a question of sketching out the meta-geography of the border between Europe and Asia that establishes itself here in the literary sense as static and impassable as the border between east-central Europe and Western Europe is movable, changeable, and open: "in a purely geographical sense Eastern Europe extends to the Ural Mountains. Taking that border seriously, one would have to include Georgian, Armenian and other literatures that had historically relatively little contact with the European literatures west of Russia" (Cornis-Pope and Neubauer 2004c, 4). What is at stake here is nothing less than the affirmation of the Europeanness of the literatures in East-Central Europe (just like the Caribbeanness of the literatures in the Caribbean), an exorcism of their liminality.

The sub-European spaces of the histories of the Coordinating Committee are continental thresholds, the South-Western (the Iberian Peninsula), Northern (the Scandinavian Peninsula) and Eastern (East-Central Europe) periphery of the European *Herzland*, whose literary canonicity has been represented in the secure chronology of periodological succession, from the Renaissance (Klaniczay, Kushner and Stegmann 1988) to Postmodernism (Bertens and Fokkema 1997). Obviously, any of the Coordinating Committee's future projects that opt for a territory within Europe might modify this tendency. But, in any case, the fact that these regional European histories have made topographical contiguity and topological disjunction their main geocultural objective appears neither accidental nor free of consequences. This (1) consciousness of writing from the limits is a meta-geographical mytheme whose combination with other mythemes introduces determining filters for comparative investigation: (2) continentalism, (3) internationality and (4) geo-unity.

By continentalism I allude to the fact that none of the sub-European territories selected is (or is recognized as) transcontinental. The underlying meta-geographical discourse is that transcontinental countries (Turkey, Egypt, Russia, Kazakhstan) are anomalous, and it can be extended to include international territories in the vein of the traditions of area studies.

By internationality I refer to the fact that all the selected sub-European territories encompass more than one nation-state, which is in keeping with the traditional precepts of comparative literature and the opportune transposition to the histories that interest us here of a geo-international rather than a chrono-international perspective: "We have chosen epochs or currents which display a correlation of stylistic expression, where the fruitfulness of the international give and take (as opposed to the idea of national preeminence) can be demonstrated" (Remak 1986, 5). The underlying meta-geographical discourse is that the nation-state (whether the literary history be national or international) is a pertinent unit for study, even when we go beyond its boundaries to recognize that cultural phenomena are rarely contained within political territories.

And by geo-unity I mean the persistence of an active environmental determinism, perceptible in a spatial and cultural congruence both on the continental level (think of the African essence attributed to the literature in Sub-Saharan Africa) and on the level of regional entities. In that respect, it is significant that two of the three sub-European territories are peninsulas, as if physical perceptibility led to literary perceptibility, and therefore, to the spatial identity of the literatures of the territory. When the nation-state proves incapable of establishing the systemic limits of literatures, certain geographical objects prove essential to the logic of separation, classification, and discrimination. Their appropriateness can be accepted or contested as a function of the degree of meta-geographical (un)consciousness of each history, an aspect in which the tendency to identify places as locations of nostalgia, a tendency accentuated by the local/global dialectic to which I alluded earlier, will certainly play an important role.

The four meta-geographical mythemes that I am identifying in the sub-European regional histories (liminality, continentalism, internationality and geo-unity) allow me to introduce one final meta-reflexive comment. As Doreen Massey (1995, 302) has highlighted, criticism of meta-narratives has been a central argument in the postmodern questioning of certain modern forms of theorization. The referent, obviously, is Jean-François Lyotard's *La Condition postmoderne* (The postmodern condition) and its concept of *grand récit* (grand narrative). The trivialization of the adjective *grand* has led to a boom of *petits récits* (little narratives) – even as a new narratological formula for literary history – which has little to do with the incredulity toward the philosophical-political universalization that Lyotard found in Hegelian and Marxist texts, but rather has to do with the emergence of the local, or, in more precise terms, with the confusion of the local and the concrete, which, as Massey affirms (2003, 129), is a confusion between geographical scale and processes of abstraction. The interest in the local has become a new form of empiricism, whose object (concrete) and analysis (description) has been viewed as punishment for the supposed excesses of the opposite pole of the spectrum (general theorization).

Narratologically, the histories of the Coordinating Committee are not unrelated to the encyclopedic model of a sum of *petits récits*, even though there is a curious chiasmatic structure in the dialectic between local and global. As regional histories (with their particular use of the concept of "region") surpassing national boundaries, they appear to demonstrate the idea that

the (greater) size of the historiographical object makes it more suited for theoretical-comparative analysis (Cornis-Pope and Neubauer 2004c, 15 call it "paradigm change"). But their structure as idiosyncratic texts makes the transnational area – where, it is implicity affirmed, interliterary relations are situated – a new form of the local, which narratologically corresponds to micro-analysis: "Volume II […] moves from a focus on the region's macrostructures to a microstructural focus on the literary culture of specific geographical locations" (Cornis-Pope and Neubauer 2006b, x).

It might be useful to reflect on the fact that a city, an intra-national region and a *monde culturel* (cultural world; I use the term in the sense offered in Bonnemaison 2000, 110–11) can also in itself be a suitable object for a comparative history, since both small and large objects are subject to theorization when local processes are examined in a national and international sphere and various levels of change operating in the local area are analyzed. That being said, it is undeniable that the selection of international geographical groupings has been closely linked to another equally interesting chiasm, the displacement of the epic-dramatic historiographical mood from the object to the subject. The emphasis is no longer on the process experienced by the literature, as regards organic-heroic development, but rather, on the overcoming of the dangers and challenges implied by the very process of writing (M. Valdés 2004b, xiii calls it an "extraordinary story") as the product of an international and multidisciplinary collective. It is certainly another variant of the explicit self-consciousness of comparative literary history.

An example of Iberian meta-geography: "The charm of a perpetual enigma"

The figure of English Hispanist Aubrey F. G. Bell (1882–1950) offers an interesting example of how meta-geography saturates the historiographical task and gives meaning to its object, creating and molding it according to an underlying conception of the environment and of those who live in it. In Bell we have not only a historian and literary critic – with monographs on Castilian [Spanish] (Bell 1947) and Portuguese (Bell 1924a and 1971) literature and some digressions dedicated to other Iberian literatures – but an ethnographer, geographer, traveller and excursionist (Bell 1922 and 1924b), all of which add weight to a meta-geographical line of reasoning, and which are accentuated by his external position (that of the foreigner) – even as an English historian vindicating Iberian negligence of its literatures – which offers a fascinating point of view.

In 1946 he published a brief note called "The Spanish mosaic" in the special issue of the *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* called *A record and review of their progress*. In the text, which can be read as a compilation of his ethnocultural impressions about Spain, he combines all the interests I just mentioned. Indeed, Bell had as much luck in the literary history genre as in that of travel writing. Perhaps for that reason, these geo-anthropological notes are not lacking in literary allusions. What is more, I would say that Bell cannot help seeing space and those who inhabit it through literature. Cadalso serves as an authority to ratify the diversity of the provinces (Bell 1946, 24); Palacio Valdés, Pereda and Blasco Ibáñez for the marked individuality of the cities (26); Baroja and Fernán Caballero for the solitary and individualistic character, which has its own literary myths, like El Cid, Santa Teresa and Fray Luis de León (27); Cervantes, Lope, Calderón, Tirso, Unamuno, Valle-Inclán, Benavente or Azorín for the subtlety of thought (28).