

ART OF THE STATE: THE ACADEMIAS LITERARIAS AS SITES OF SYMBOLIC ECONOMIES IN GOLDEN AGE SPAIN

Anne J. Cruz
University of Illinois at Chicago

The analysis of economic exchanges shows that the notion of the *pure symbol*, in the sense of a disaffected substitute that can be perfectly arbitrary, conventional, and unmotivated, emerges of its own accord from *circulation* and thus from the intensification of social exchanges.

Jean-Joseph Goux, *Symbolic Economies*

Estos fueron los versos que se pudieron leer; los demás, por estar carcomida la letra, se entregaron a un académico para que por conjeturas los declarase. Tiénese noticia que lo ha hecho, a costa de muchas vigalias y mucho trabajo...

Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote*

To Cervantes' likely satisfaction, the *academias literarias* that proliferated in early modern Spain, and which he gleefully parodied under the parochial rubric of the "Academia de Argamasilla," have been all but forgotten by modern academics. Aside from the research carried out by Aurora Egido, who has focused mainly on the Aragonese academies, the last major studies, by José Sánchez and Willard F. King, date back more than thirty years. While essential sources of the varieties of literary groups established throughout Spain, these studies in large part neglect the academies' affiliations and associations with the burgeoning centers of power and their competitive positionings during the period. Indeed, while King acknowledges the academies as "a powerful force in the background of the cultural scene," she perceives them as "private" despite their overwhelmingly public function and their patronage by major political figures ("The Academies" 367).

In this essay I address the academies' historical and sociopolitical determinants in order to situate them within a more broadly construed cultural field, whose boundaries separating the public

and private spheres of action were continuously transgressed as much by the significant public roles held by their members as by the political opportunities the reunions afforded them.¹ To apprehend the different aims of poetic production and how it became increasingly controlled in the seventeenth century, the relationship between art and the early modern state—that is, the manner in which the state both regulated and deployed art through the academies—needs to be more fully investigated. This in turn may illuminate more clearly how the academies came to influence and inform actual poetic production, and the degree to which such control in fact delimited its aesthetic qualities as well as its reception.

Like all literary practices, the poetic text not only constructs and is constructed by a linguistic subject, but by what Barry Jordan has called “an ensemble of social determinations that establish the conditions within which reading can take place” (27). Among the issues that most vex critics when studying Renaissance literature as a social force are the author’s target audience and the text’s actual readership. Therefore, the question posed by Elias Rivers in a recent essay, appropriately titled “La poesía culta y los lectores,” remains pertinent: “for whom did Golden Age poets write?” In the case of Garcilaso de la Vega, for example, the answer is that some of his poems were directly addressed to his friends, among them, Juan Boscán, Mario Galeota, and Giulio Cesare Caracciolo. Others were formally dedicated to his patrons: his most mature work, the three eclogues, are all written in honor of the house of Alba.

Rivers remarks that besides this immediate circle of readers, by the time Garcilaso’s poetry was printed with Boscán’s, there was already an audience “out there” eagerly awaiting the new Italianate verses, and it was only a matter of time before his poetry was published separately. Cervantes’ glass licentiate would travel with one of the popular pocket-size “Garcilasos” that, like the “Petrarcas viejos,” were easy to pack on a trip; we might call them, in fact, the Renaissance versions of *libros de bolsillo*. In contrast, the extensively annotated edition by Fernando de Herrera, published but once in 1580, most probably ended up on the coffee tables of wealthy Sevillian *indianos* who wished to display their recently acquired culture.²

Garcilaso’s poetry, then, reached more than one audience: his select readership of friends and patrons, and the broader public, more or less cultured, who either through university classes or

word of mouth had heard and familiarized themselves with his poems. Each audience combined the aesthetic enjoyment of the Toledan's novel lyrics with the full understanding that familiarity with the poems placed one in a privileged social hierarchy: from the noble patrons rendered homage and assured fame by the poem's dedication, to the *letrados* who read Garcilaso as a mark of their erudition, and, finally, to the *indianos* who purchased the expensive Herrera edition flaunting their new wealth.

The use of poetry for purposes other than aesthetic pleasure or moral instruction is, of course, neither new nor unusual at any historical moment, and the political and economic motivations of many medieval texts are by now well known.³ What I am referring to in this essay, however, is a very different phenomenon, although it is evident that poetry in the Golden Age was as likely to be used for these same purposes as in the Middle Ages. Certainly, Garcilaso de la Vega had compelling reasons to dedicate his most accomplished poems to the greater glory of Pedro de Toledo's family, who time and again defended him against Charles and Isabella's imperial ire.⁴ Yet, when we investigate the poems' social value and function, the authors' motivations are ultimately less meaningful than their manner of exchange and the intensification of that exchange within varying social and political spheres.⁵

To this end, Jean-Joseph Goux's recent approach to what he calls "the discourse of political economy," and the parallels that he draws between money and language, are instructive in revisioning the relations between poets and patrons. Garcilaso's association with the house of Alba, in fact, is negotiated through the poetic texts dedicated to the family within the category of use value, since the poet not only benefited from the Alba patronage directly, but his limited poetic production, unpublished in his lifetime, proscribed any excess or superfluity. Citing Marx, Goux describes use value as determined by the "physical properties of the commodity," that is, "by the empirical object, as a prop, with the diverse and accidental qualities inherent in corporality." Exchange value instead "expresses the commodity's substantial, permanent base, its essential universal identity" (19); again, according to Marx, "the surplus or superabundance of products constitutes the proper sphere of exchange" (Goux 27; Marx 209). While Goux, following Marx, speaks primarily of gold as commodity and of the correlative

money form, poetry may also be seen as a commodity of reproduction whose value, depending in part on its aesthetic properties, assumes an ideality that allows for its deferable exchange. As an example, it was not until years after Garcilaso's death that his poems, separated from Boscán's collection and circulating in several annotated editions, moved from direct exchange to an extended form of relative value, as their imitation as species, as indirect exchange, effectively formulated their excess value.⁶

Although the unmediated exchange between poets and their patrons diminished noticeably in the early modern period, there remained vestiges of this feudal relationship through the continued use of lyric poetry as genre of choice among the growing number of *letrados* who relied on their writing skills for their livelihood. Their inflated poetic production, however, created a superfluity that in turn ensured the poems' exchangeability. The multiplying numbers of poets who produced this surplus commodity thus claimed significant agency in the constant shifting of social and economic boundaries caused by Spain's economic and political malaise at the end of the sixteenth century.

In his study of Elizabethan courtesy theory, Frank Whigham shows how poetic tropes served at once to identify the privileged elite and to offer social mobility to ambitious English courtiers. Given the proliferating positions available at court, the cultivation of courtliness paid off in the "lucrative role[s] of intercessor[s], of translator[s], of priest[s]" needed to tend to the secular mysteries of the burgeoning bureaucracy (30). Much of what Whigham writes about England is equally applicable to Spain, since both English and Spanish courtiers took Castiglione's *Cortegiano* as their bible, depending, not solely on a monarch's whim, but on a court hierarchy that operated through a many-layered "matrix of mediation" (12).

In Spain, the court increasingly served as an outlet for the aristocracy whose factions were based on family relations and on an elaborate system of clientage (Elliott, *Imperial Spain*, 259-60). The creation of the Council of State, the posts of the powerful *validos*, and the independent committees of ministers magnified the opportunities for jostling and squabbling for positions. John Elliott points out that "the Spain of Philip III, like the England of James I, saw an inflation of honors...as grandees and lesser aristocrats drifted to

Court, they were followed by thousands who either possessed, or aspired to, a place in their service" (*Imperial Spain* 314-15). He notes the rise in Madrid's population from 4,000 in 1530, to between 70,000 and 100,000 during Philip IV's reign, an increase that placed Madrid on an equal level with Seville (*Imperial Spain* 315).

Many who flocked to court viewed it as a market-place where their artistic talent could be traded for survival. While courtiers, well trained by Castiglione's treatise, successfully converted rhetorical devices into poetry to secure favor, as Daniel Javitch affirms of the Tudor court (108), many employed their slight literary talent in their efforts to promote themselves at court. The profusion of poetasters appears as a literary *topos* in Quevedo's *Buscón* as well as in Lope's *Circe*, where he charges that their abundance is such that "dicen que los pronósticos y almanaques ponen entre garbanzos, lentejas, cebada, trigo y espárragos...tales y tales Poetas" (qtd. in King, *Prosa* 8). Poets who joined literary academies did so not only to seek the company of fellow humanists, but perhaps more often for economic reasons. Writers without any direct access to a noble house or connections at court tired of competing in the artistically limiting *justas* organized mostly for civic or religious purposes such as the canonization of a saint. They sought to legitimize their art and improve their status by joining an *academia literaria* that exempted published authors from the requisite *carta de nobleza* or the nod of a noble for membership (Egido, "Poesía" 130; Jauralde Pou 740 n.35).⁷ Participation ensured rubbing shoulders with the city's power elite, a complex admixture of lesser nobles, aldermen, and other bureaucrats, along with leading poets. Poetry was submitted by members according to specified academy rules on topics advertised in advance. During the reunions, the submissions were discussed, evaluated, and circulated in an atmosphere that fostered competition and called attention to the patrons and the local government officers hosting the academies.

Scholars investigating the origins of the Spanish *academias* usually remark on their imitation of Italian models. It is important to note, however, that these academies had as their main objective the promotion of the national language and literature, goals generally disregarded by their Spanish counterparts until the founding of the *Real Academia Española* in 1713.⁸ This difference may be attributed to Spain's linguistic consolidation in the late fifteenth century,

advanced by Antonio de Nebrija's grammar—the first written for a European vernacular—displacing Italian nationalist concerns. Yet the Italian academies' mission did not safeguard them from coming under attack; King asserts that their role in their own country was much debated (*Prosa* 11). Indeed, from the *Accademia degli Intronati* founded in 1525 in Sienna and lauded in Cervantes' *Persiles* (where, however, it appears misplaced in Milan), to the Florentine *Accademia della Crusca* founded in 1582 and contemporary with the early Spanish meetings, the Italian academies received as much criticism as praise for their part in the production of culture.⁹

In his defense of the Italian gatherings, Eric Cochrane evaluates their contribution to the formation of a common literary culture: "at most, the academies provided a means by which their less productive members could learn about the latest contributions to their common culture and a place in which their more productive members, in accordance with the principles of Renaissance humanism, could test the rhetorical aspects of their individual lucubrations" (25). While some critics emphasize the replacement by these institutions of the universities as "strongholds of humanism," others point to the decadence of the Italian academies' literary standards (Weiss, qtd. in Egido, "De las academias" 85). Still others consider this institutionalization a stranglehold that schematized and inhibited artistic imagination while it enforced dissimulation and sycophancy. The Renaissance poet Torquato Tasso, a stern critic of the academies, concluded caustically that joining them was the surest way of finding a haven and a patron (Woodhouse 175).

There is far less disagreement among scholars of the Spanish *academias*; all hail their literary efforts, nonetheless King and Sánchez at times express doubts as to whether the academies accomplished anything of lasting literary value. Sánchez complains that "son pocas las obras de primera categoría que han sido escritas exclusivamente para ser leídas ante los concurrentes de una academia. ... El intento de las academias literarias no siempre se ha seguido al pie de la letra." What he finds most damaging to the image of these intellectual gatherings, are the "censuras, fiscalías, diferencias, murmuraciones, envidias y mucha habladuría"—serious failings on which he blames the Madrid academies' early demise (20).¹⁰

Although King at first commends the Valencian *Accademia de los Nocturnos* for its good poetry, she then judges it as no better or

worse than the others: "a comienzos del siglo XVII las academias se habían convertido en verdaderas fábricas de producción de versos; quizás dedicasen algún tiempo a debates sobre teoría literaria...pero la poesía, de forma intrincada y contenido algo superficial, era su dedicación principal" (*Prosa* 36). Even Aurora Egido, engaged since her 1976 dissertation in an exhaustive study of numerous *certámenes* and *academias*, and by far the most generous in her judgment of their accomplishments, acknowledges that the Madrid academies "fomentaron la producción literaria, pero también la discusión banal y la burla personal" (Egido, "De las academias" 90). Yet, as their membership drew from eminent political figures and their activities were highly publicized, participation in the academies could result in important political appointments. Bernardo Catalán de Valeriola, the founder of the Valencian *Academia de los Nocturnos*, was named *corregidor* of León by Philip III.¹¹ In contrast, the Madrid academy named *La Peregrina*, whose statutes rivaled the Italian academies in their humanist endeavors, apparently never convened, no doubt due to the conflicting politics of its three proposed patrons.¹²

Taking our cue from Goux, we might ask, then, how these academies functioned as sites of symbolic economies. In what ways were the academies linked to the court structures of power, and what was the effect of this link on the production and consumption of poetry? Although the complex relations between art and the state have yet to be investigated fully, what seems certain is that the institutionalization of poetry came about at a crucial time when poets had ceased to form part of the disintegrating feudal nobility and were no longer subsidized by their own class hierarchy. Their disenfranchisement coincided with an increasing bureaucracy that demanded poetic skills as partial proof of the erudition and courtliness newly expected of political appointments. As Pablo Jauralde Pou explains of the Madrid academies: "Allí se mantenía una ilusión elitista y petulanté por parte de los poetas y un efectivo e implícito control de las actividades artísticas "de altura" por parte de las clases privilegiadas. Se pretendía en las academias la cualificación literaria por un alto grado de tecnificación profesional, esto es, literaria" (740-41). As we have seen, this technical ability, dependent on competition promoted by its commodification, was transformed from individual and immediate use to exchange instituted

by the state (Goux 38). Goux's claims regarding language (129) may thus be similarly applied to poetic production: escaping the order of the signifier, poetry, like language a social process of symbolization, moves from its previous feudal intersubjective relations, to abstract relations between positions.

John Beverley has reminded us that the reception of the kind of poetry called Gongorism, for example, was closely allied to "the relation of a certain way of doing poetry to the dominant ideology and to the society which represented and reproduced itself in and through that ideology" (23). Yet, even before the advent of Góngora's *nueva poesía*, the academies already exercised control over poetic production as an ideological practice. Egido has summarized the obligatory models for poems submitted to the contests organized by the academies: Garcilaso, Boscán, and Figueroa, as well as local writers in the different regions, such as Bartolomé and Lupercio Leonardo Argensola in Aragón. Whenever *canciones* were proposed, the requisite models were Petrarch, Dante, Gino da Pistoia, Boscán, and of course Garcilaso, most likely because the *carteles* announcing the competitions were based on verse manuals that included these poets. The academies required certain meters and themes (or *sujetos*) which included self-referential poetry, as well as ephrastic verses on triumphal arches, paintings, and statues. King finds that the prescribed topics dealt mainly with "love and mythological subjects, almost all of it light, humorous, frivolous, much of it satiric, and a certain small amount of it verging on the obscene" ("The Academies" 371).

The main genres specified were epic, lyric, burlesque, and elegiac, with poems exuding *agudeza* generally predominating on such intransigent themes as "A una dama llamada Cloris a quien por tener los ojos enfermos mandó un médico que le cortasen los cabellos" (Egido, *Fronteras* 115-36).¹³ For Jauralde Pou, the academies' proliferation resulted in "la frívola tecnificación o profesionalización estilística y temática y la pérdida inevitable de algunos de los valores más preciados en los mejores poetas de la época." Nonetheless, he believes that "como contraposición, este ambiente fomentaba la agudeza, chispa e inventiva" (Jauralde Pou 744-45). Whether the artificiality demanded by the academies caused the decline of Spanish poetry in the seventeenth century or, as Robert Jammes has argued, simply made it manifest, there is no doubt that

the poetry's poetic caliber and literary worth depreciated in direct proportion to its increased production.¹⁴

Extending beyond court circles, the academies appealed to professional writers and political figures alike; numerous *academias literarias* were organized throughout the various urban centers in Spain: Toledo, Seville, Granada and in several locations in Aragón. The scholarly reputation of the *Academia de los Anhelantes* of Zaragoza, for example, is intimately linked to the region's impressive intellectual achievements. Founded in the sixteenth century under the auspices of the brothers Argensola, it continued into the mid-seventeenth century with the University of Zaragoza's chancellor and chronicler, Andrés de Úztaaroz, as president.¹⁵ Yet what has been overlooked by previous studies is that the academies in regional areas such as Aragón and Seville responded to different social exigencies from those motivating the Madrid academies. The capital's rapid expansion, together with the growing concentration of power at court, isolated the provinces psychologically as much as it distanced them geographically from the center of power. Aragón in particular felt abandoned by the monarchy; Philip II held only two *cortes* there during his reign, in 1563 and in 1585, a neglect that contributed to the Aragonese revolt of 1591 (Elliott, *Imperial Spain* 255).

The mounting grievances between Castilian rule and Aragonese aristocracy were reflected in the literary production of the academies. In his two famous presidential addresses to the *Academia de los Anhelantes* shortly after the Aragón rebellion, Lupericio Leonardo de Argensola successfully defends the members against the accusations by the Viceroy and the Justicia alike that the academy had circulated poems criticizing the government: "Quisieron saber de mí la verdad...no solamente perdieron esta opinión, pero alabando lo que aquí se hace, creen que la república tiene en vuestras mercedes defensores de virtud y maestros que, con su ejemplo, enseñarán a cada cual a contentarse dentro de sus límites" (qtd. in Sánchez 241). And yet, in the same address, he recommends that the academy members should not merely discuss arms, but actually practice military drills the last Thursday of every month: "Finalmente, me parece que las armas no se traten sólo de palabra, sino que se ejerciten, y que el último jueves de cada mes salgan armados

los caballeros que quisieren al justador, y se encuentren o corran lanzas" (qtd. in Sánchez 243).

The alienation and boredom felt by those living far from court no doubt contributed to the academies' popularity, since the gatherings offered local intellectuals an opportunity to develop and exhibit their literary talents. The desire to emulate the court without, however, falling prey to its vicissitudes is evident in the reasons given by the condesa de Guimerá and her mother, the condesa de Eril, for founding the *Academia de Pítima contra la Ociosidad*, a Zaragoza academy that lasted only three months in 1608:

[P]ues por huir esto [la ociosidad] conociendolo y para no perder tam buena ocasion como la que se tiene de tan honrada compañia me ha parecido juntar a Vms. para dezilles como para remediar el mal que este enemigo comun nos podria hazer...y para esto me parece aproposito que pues entre los que concurrimos aqui ay Variedad de profesiones que para tratar dellas y comunicar (lo que uno save) con el otro escogieremos alguna ora del dia adonde por via de repeticion uno de nosotros por su turno dijere algo dello que a estudiado conque seria pasar por mas gusto la sequedad y pesadumbre del Aldea. (2v)

The regulations drawn up by the founders of this academy demonstrate their efforts to improve upon the Madrid reunions. Under its rules, the academy allowed pseudonyms, since "el intento y instituto de la Junta mas es abilitarse que no engrandecerse con el ruydo y opinion que se podria tomar del fruto" (3v). Topics were to remain serious and of high moral content: "que no se aya de traer satira ni cossa que se allegue a murmuracion porque seria dar en el absurdo de que huymos" (4v). And although King attributes the academy's founding to the Count of Guimerá, it is instructive to note that, perhaps due to aristocratic women's more liberalized roles away from court, its statutes are signed by his wife, another factor differentiating the academy from its court counterparts.¹⁶

The Sevillian academies also functioned differently from those established in Madrid, in great part owing to Seville's hierarchical structures of power. Unlike Aragón, there was little intellectual tradition in Andalusia; indeed, Aurora Egido has suggested that the humanist Juan de Mal Lara's *Escuela de Humanidades y Gramática* may have served in lieu of a university. By the end of the sixteenth

century, the gatherings hosted by Sevillian nobles in their luxurious mansions, which included local literary figures and painters, into miniature replicas of the court. What was missing, however, were the intervening layers of aspiring bureaucrats. The power wielded by the provincial nobles instead permitted a less mediated relationship among patrons and poets than the ones typically established through Madrid academies; Fernando de Herrera's earliest participation in an *academia* hosted by the Count of Gelves in 1565 resulted in his dedicating Petrarchan love poems to Leonor de Milán, the count's wife.

Along with Herrera, Baltasar del Alcázar, Cristóbal Mosquera de Figueroa, Francisco de Medina and Pablo de Céspedes also frequented Francisco Pacheco's *tertulias* and the Duke of Alcalá's palace. The relationships established between poets and patrons in Seville functioned in opposition to the Madrid *academias* in that, similar to Garcilaso's early poems, they represented the use value of the poetic text. As another case in point, Francisco Pacheco and the Duke of Alcalá's father, the Marquis of Tarifa, were directly responsible for the publication of Herrera's poems. The *veinticuatro* Juan de Arguijo, famous for his lavish donations as much as for his own artistic production, held reunions attended by such poets as Rodrigo Caro, Francisco de Rioja, Juan de Jáuregui, and, when in town, Lope de Vega. These gatherings reflected both the patrons' and the poets' needs to create and safeguard social and artistic outlets, distanced as they were from court. Moreover, the political connections initiated at these gatherings eventually bore fruit when the Count-Duke of Olivares, a frequent guest at these reunions, left for Madrid in 1615. Numerous Sevillians owed their positions at court to their friendship with the King's favorite: Francisco de Rioja, who transposed Olivares' love affairs into amatory verse, was named the Count-Duke's private librarian (Elliott, *Conde-duque* 22). The Duke of Alcalá was offered appointments in Barcelona, Naples, and Sicily; Juan de Jáuregui was placed in charge of the Queen's stables; and Francisco Pacheco's son-in-law, the painter Diego de Velázquez, was first brought to court as the King's *ayuda de cámara* (Pérez de Guzmán 86).

The differences between the modes of production of the Andalusian gatherings and those of the Madrid academies encouraged the emergence of *gongorismo* as a radically new poetic form.

Within their own circle, the competition among the Sevillian academies may be measured by the rift between two “outsider” poets often present at their reunions: Cervantes and Lope de Vega. Lope attended Arguijo’s academy, which attracted the most well-known Sevillian poets and painters.¹⁷ The rival members of the *Academia de Ochoa*, organized by Cervantes’ close friend, the theatrical producer Juan de Ochoa, wrote several satirical sonnets against Lope; in an anonymous sonnet attributed to Cervantes, their feelings of inferiority come explicitly to the fore:

Quién es aqueste que, con tardo paso,
el coro de las musas trae inquieto
y a las incultas selvas nuestras llega?
—Si del Tibre deciende, será el Tasso;
Sannazaro, si baja del Sebeto;
y si de Manzanares viene, es Vega. (qtd. in Sánchez 202)

Dependent on his writing for his livelihood, Lope was aware of Arguijo’s influence as a patron. Although he had begun correspondence with his future patron, the Duke of Sessa, Lope acclaimed Arguijo as a “perfecto cortesano” in the *Dragontea*, sent him his *Peregrino en su patria*, and dedicated his *Hermosura de Angélica* and his *Rimas* to him in 1604 when he arrived in Seville.¹⁸ Lope also praised Arguijo in the *Filomena*, and later in the *Laurel de Apolo* (Sánchez 205).

Not to be outdone, Cervantes assigned his patron and friend Ochoa first place on Mercury’s list in his *Viage del Parnaso*, where he lauds Ochoa’s *limpieza de sangre*, compliments his grammar book, and singles out his “unique” poetic talents, the proof of which remains unknown to this day.¹⁹ If, as Adrienne Martín has suggested (147), the buffoonesque *Academia de Argamasilla* in *Don Quixote* Part I records Cervantes’ last laugh at his exclusion from the aristocratic Arguijo academy, it also confirms the hurt and disappointment he must have felt in being rejected by its elitist members.

The main Madrid academies were founded later than those of Seville and Aragón, most probably due to the city’s relative lack of importance until the beginning of the seventeenth century.²⁰ The state bureaucracy, increasingly in need of judiciaries, created unique opportunities for both the high nobility and the *letrados* to

share in its governance; participation in the *academias* exposed the *letrados* to the ruling aristocracy and the city magistrates (Tomás y Valiente 60). The *Academia del conde de Saldaña* was organized during Philip III's reign, after the court returned from Valladolid. Distinguished by its list of nobles and poets, the academy demonstrates the process of "refeudalization" that took place under Philip's ineffectual monarchy, as nobles vied for positions close to the Duke of Lerma, the king's powerful *valido*.²¹

Though not all poets had public offices in mind, they could not help benefiting from their contact with the power elite. Since Saldaña was Lerma's second son, his reunions offered ambitious poets an ideal opportunity to mingle with those in high political offices. Taking advantage of the academy's founding, Lope dedicated his *Jerusalén liberada* to the 24-year-old Count in an excessively servile tone: "La afición que V. Excel. tiene a las letras...el amparo que hace a los que las profesan, siendo su Mecenas y bienhechor, me obliga, y si lo puedo decir, me fuerza, a dirigirle este prólogo de mi Jerusalén, que con fundamento suyo, tiene necesidad de mayor protección" (qtd. in Sánchez 43). Yet Lope decided to abandon the academy in 1612, explaining sardonically to his literary patron, the Duke of Sessa: "Agradóme el dar al diablo la academia, porque no hay más lindos agrios. Ella pasa adelante, y para esta noche hay grandes cosas; y si no cosas, no faltarán grandes, porque Pastrana y Feria serán certísimos" (qtd. in Sánchez 37-38). Two months later, however, he was back, along with Cervantes, with whom he had apparently reconciled after their fight in Seville. Lope again comments to Sessa: "Las academias están furiosas; en la pasada se tiraron los bonetes dos licenciados; yo leí unos versos con antojos de Zerbantes que parecían huevos estrellados mal echos" (qtd. in Sánchez 38).

Lope's dismissive remarks notwithstanding, the roster of nobles attending Saldaña's academy substantiates its importance: Saldaña's nephew the Duke of Cea, the Duke of Pastrana, the Count of Salinas, the Prince of Esquilache, the Marquises of Alcañices, Povar, Peñafiel, Almazán, Velada, and Orani; the Dukes of Híjar and Medinaceli; the Counts of Lemos, Olivares, Villamor, and Rebolledo. Besides Saldaña's page, Antonio Hurtado de Mendoza, the poets who presumably spent most of their time attacking each other at the reunions formed a *who's who* of Golden Age literature:

Lope, Quevedo, Cervantes, Liñán de Riaza, Góngora, Salas Barbadillo, Pantaleón de Ribera, Vélez de Guevara, and Andrés de Claramonte (Sánchez 45). Despite its elite membership, however, the academy closed its doors the same year that Lope ceased attending. In 1611, just one year previously, Cristóbal de Mesa had voiced his disapproval of the academy, reproaching its banality in the following poem to the Duke of Feria:

Ya veis Duque magnánimo de Feria,
que la nueva academia de la corte,
de murmurar a todos da materia,
porque se rigen por incierto norte
sus poetas antiguos y modernos,
sin fruto que al honor de España importe.

Los graves y duros y los tiernos
queriendo en el poético concilio
hacer sus nombres para siempre eternos.
Y aunque a las Musas piden sacro auxilio
y ruegan que del Pindo baje Apolo,
nunca imitan a Homero ni a Virgilio.

Mesa's poem ironically underscores the uncertainty that befell poetic production—the poets led by *incierto norte*—an indecision and distrust symbolically linked to the growing arbitrariness of court power, as hostilities mounted against the corruption of Lerma's isolationist regime.²²

The events of the next six years changed the course of both the Spanish empire and Spanish literature. As Lerma's influence and power waned, his two sons, the Count of Uceda and the Count of Saldaña, abandoned their father and sided with his contender, the Count-Duke of Olivares. It is shortly after the closing of the Saldaña academy that Góngora circulates his *Polifemo* and the first *Soledad* (Rivers 275). Factions are formed immediately: while Cervantes praises the new poetry in his *Viage del Parnaso*, Lope attacks the revolutionary new art form, whose goal, he believes, is to shock the court (Beverley 30; Orozco Díaz 166).²³ Góngora's *nueva poesía* continued to be alternately acclaimed and derided, setting the stage for the escalating battle over *gongorismo* that was to last throughout the seventeenth century. In the social environment of the *academias literarias*, where overproduction devalued all poetry into worthless

tokens, Góngora's controversial new currency was simultaneously valorized and rejected for its "difference."

John Beverley has explained that this difference is at once a differentiation between the poet's conception of his art and how others saw it. Although, after the poet's death, Gongorism is quickly transformed into the "model aesthetic discourse" of the baroque state, Góngora himself perceived his work as a piece of labor (Beverley 32-33). As such, it offers an alternative to the process of abstraction and sublimation that had made academic-poetry increasingly indifferent as a medium of exchange (Goux 50). Beverley quite rightly points out that Góngora's tropes of nature constantly counterpose use value to exchange value (34). He discerns in Góngora's relations with the Duke of Medina-Sidonia, to whom the poet dedicates the *Soledades*, an implicit alliance between the anti-mercantilist aristocracy and the direct producers of agriculture outside the market-place with whom Góngora identifies (34-35).²⁴

Yet Góngora could not—and, indeed, did not—remove himself from this market-place. His desire to participate within the system under the protection of Medina-Sidonia inevitably returns the solitary pilgrim to Court, where he writes the obsequious *Panegírico al duque de Lerma*, through whose favor he receives a royal chaplaincy (Jammes 241). Lerma's fall in 1618 and Philip III's death in 1621 assured Olivares' accession to power as the new King's *privado*. Lerma had astutely arranged his daughter's marriage to Medina-Sidonia, and although Olivares belonged to a branch of the family, he sorely resented his father's not having inherited the duchy. The tensions between Medina-Sidonia and Olivares, plus the fact that Juan de Jáuregui, who led the attack on Góngora's new poetry, was the latter's protégé, all contributed to the poet's marginalization from court, a situation that caused him sustained economic hardship.²⁵

Francisco de Cascales, a member of the *Academia de Medrano*, further criticized Góngora's poetry for not lending itself to the genres required by the academies: "no es buena para poema heroico, ni lírico, ni trágico, ni cómico; luego es inútil" (qtd. in Martínez Arancón 207). The "uselessness" of his poetry inheres in its difficulty, a desirable quality blocking its circulation and accessibility to the "ignorantes," as the poet calls his critics. However, Góngora could not continue to ignore his severe financial difficulties. In a letter to

Cristóbal de Heredia written in November of 1621, Góngora admits that he is soliciting favors from the Count of Monterrey, Olivares' brother-in-law: "El conde de Monterrey sale de aquí pasado mañana; ándolo cortegiando estos días. ...Diré solo que espero en Dios que los pasos que doy en servicio de este Señor que parte han de ser más de provecho que sufre mi dicha, en virtud quizá de Pedro [his profligate nephew] tengo destinada la gracia que me consiguere el Conde" (Millé y Giménez 1003). In 1623, he dispatches a desperate sonnet to Olivares:

En la capilla estoy y condenado
a partir sin remedio de esta vida;
siendo la causa aun mas que la partida,
por hambre expulso como sitiado. (Millé y Giménez 526-27)

That same year, Francisco de Mendoza, the Count of Monterrey's secretary, founded the *Academia de Madrid*, the city's last major academy. Its members included Joseph Pellicer de Tovar, Góngora's indefatigable defender and annotator, and Anastasio Pantaleón de Ribera, who also declared himself a follower of the poet: "Imitador valeroso / del estilo que no entienden / En este siglo los tontos" (King, *Prosa* 58). Góngora was fully aware of the economic potential in the growing public support of his work (Rivers 276). Yet, despite his poverty and his shame over his nephew's debts, and in spite of Olivares' withholding a benefice from the nephew in the hopes of pressuring Góngora to dedicate his poems to him, by his death, he had still not chosen to publish his poetry. Ironically, after Góngora's death, Olivares had the poet's works transcribed on parchment for his library. However inadvertently, such a private method of conservation underscores, even more if possible, their non-circulating and non-productive use-value (Beverley 23).

The Madrid academies that followed Mendoza's in the mid-seventeenth century such as the one-day *Academia del Buen Retiro* were organized for specific occasions, and functioned mainly as hollow literary diversions.²⁶ Their members, along with their poetry, have been justly forgotten for good reason; practically all of the poets whose works are deemed worthy of inclusion in the Golden Age literary canon had died by 1640. The defensive tone of a mem-

ber of the *Academia que se celebró por Carnestolendas* recorded in Madrid, 1675, comes as no surprise: “Mi buena dicha me puso en el numero de los que componen la Academia, pero tuve por mayor el persuadirles me permitiessen sacarla a luz, por los temores q[ue] injustamente ha[n] ocasionado los Maldizientes que juzgan inco[m]patibles estos exercicios con los de cualquiera juizosa Profession, sin distinguir de ocasiones y tie[m]pos.” Instead, poetry as a political force at court was subsumed and supplanted by another state apparatus: the theater. Particularly during the latter half of the seventeenth century, social events were reflected, interpreted, and interrogated through theatrical production.²⁷ As an integral part of the baroque spectacle, the *comedia* responded to the increasing political imperative to create unity, to preserve harmony within the fragmented body politic (Feros 120).

In contrast, the areas marginalized from court—Seville, Aragón, the Vice-Royalties of New Spain and Peru—relied on their *academias* to institutionalize Gongorism as a means of maintaining unity within the empire’s vast territories, since its poetic excess created an idealizing exchange-value. As Beverley puts it, “Gongorism offered a new genre in which ordinary activities of social production and reproduction... could be duly recorded and universalized” (31). Góngora’s transmutable metaphors ideally captured the “natural” luxuriance of the tropics, concealing the production methods exacted by labor—according to Beverley, “a veritable theory of magic accumulation which masks the real ‘primitive accumulation’” (33).

Yet, even as Gongorism flourished, the best Gongorist poets in these regions appropriated and attempted to retain for themselves Góngora’s subversive difference. In Zaragoza, Andrés de Uztarroz, president of the *Academia de Anhelantes*, defends Góngora’s writings, published in that city in 1643 (Egido, “Certamen poético”, vii). In the New World, such poets as Bernardo de Balbuena, Hernando Domínguez Camargo, and sor Juana Inés de la Cruz inscribed a defiant new poetics, its Americanist stance praised by the Neobaroque writer Lezama Lima for expressing “una apetencia de frenesí innovador, de rebelión desafiante, de orgullo desatado, que lo lleva a excesos luciferinos, por lograr dentro del canon gongorino un exceso aún más excesivo que los de don Luis” (qtd. in Sabat de Rivers 84).²⁸ Ultimately, it is in these remote literary territories, at

once colonized and liberated by a poetics marginalized from the Castillian center of power, that the complex dialectics between art and the state continued to be played out.

Notes

¹This essay is respectfully dedicated to Elias L. Rivers, upon his retirement from the academy, with gratitude for his many contributions to Golden Age poetry. *Et in academia ego*.

²The edition sparked a literary debate with the pseudonymous Prete Jacobín that seriously affected Herrera's desire to publish; his authority and erudition as editor, however, were never in question. See Montero.

³Among several examples are Berceo's public relations efforts to increase the convent coffers of San Millán de la Cogolla, Jorge Manrique's chronicles of his father's exploits in the "Coplas a la muerte de su padre" to canonize the family name, and the *romances noticieros'* employment of historical figures as political propaganda (Cruz "The Politics").

⁴For a rereading of Garcilaso's relations with Charles V, Isabela of Portugal, and the Alba family, see Cruz, "Self-Fashioning."

⁵Bringing together the Marxian and Lacanian "objects of drive"—gold, the phallus, the father—Jean-Joseph Goux concludes that their parallel history allows us to speak of a logic of symbolization within all spheres of social organization, enabling us to conceive of the "dialectic of history" (24).

⁶Goux states that "'values' vanish when either direct exchange...or immediate use is practiced, for commodities are universally evaluated only through the detour of *specie*—that is, through signs, masks, representations" (38).

⁷Although the terms are at times used interchangeably, Sánchez explains that literary academies should be distinguished from the more popular *justas* held to celebrate specific religious feasts, and which later turned into *certámenes*, or poetry contests, presided by leading poets (24). The latter two often served political purposes, however; the *certamen poético* held in Toledo to honor Saint Teresa's beatification in 1614 had as its goals to glorify the city of Toledo and to eradicate the saint's dubious lineage. Baltasar Elisio de Medinilla's introduction clearly intends both: "Vos [Toledo] tambien destes principios / a subcesion conociendo / por tener parte en Teresa / le distes a sus abuelos / de buestros linajes nobles / salio el de Cepeda siendo / si principal por la causa / ylustre por el efecto / gracias os deben los hijos / que siempre estais produciendo / pues los poneis en las nubes / tiniendo en ellos asiento / como el hombre es mundo breue / en

vuestras grandeças veo / que si ay Cielos en la Tierra / vos sois un cielo pequeño" (Rodríguez-Moñino 18). Corroborating the contests' often political slant, its judges included representatives of the Toledan nobility and city officials: the *Corregidor* of Toledo, Diego López de Zúñiga; the marqués de Malpica; the conde de Mora; and the Toledan alderman, Luis Antolínez (6).

⁸See Egido, "De las academias a la Academia," 85-94.

⁹As early as the eighteenth century, the historian Girolamo Tiraboschi observed that their enthusiasm in the 1540s for devices and names "made our academies rather ridiculous among northern Europeans; and it must be admitted that such frivolities are unworthy of truly learned men" (qtd. in Cochrane 21). In a 1977 article, Gino Benzoni attacks the Renaissance academicians as "underemployed lawyers, learned pedants, penniless declamators, puffed-up noblemen, and ambitious patrons, all brought together by a common propensity for the most tedious and lead-like obviousness" (qtd. in Cochrane 24).

¹⁰Sánchez cites Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa's complaints that, although some courtiers had serious intentions, they nonetheless fell prey to personal rancor and competitiveness: "juntándose con este intento en algunas casas de señores, mas no consiguieron su fin. Fué la causa, quizá, porque olvidados de lo principal, frecuentaban solamente los versos aplicados a diferentes asuntos. Nacieron de las censuras, fiscalías, y emulaciones, no pocas voces y diferencias, pasando tan adelante las presunciones, arrogancias y arrojamientos, que por instantes no solo ocasionaron menosprecios y demasías, sino también peligrosos enojos y pependencias, siendo causa de que cesasen tales juntas con toda brevedad" (*Plaza universal*, qtd. in Sánchez 22).

¹¹"Deste caballero [Valeriola] tuvo noticia la Real Majestad de Felipe III y después de haberle honrado con un hábito de Santiago, le sacó de Presidente de la Academia para Corregidor de la ciudad y reino de León en la corona de Castilla" (Salvá 6).

¹²Founded by Sebastián Francisco Medrano in 1622, the academy was to meet weekly, with each day dedicated to one of the seven liberal arts. Unlike other academies, the *Peregrina's* statutes were quite strict: all members must be published authors approved by the patrons, and all their subsequent work must be "primero registrada, censurada y corregida" with one copy donated to the academy's library, and another for sale to cover its expenses (54v). The *Peregrina's* proposed patrons were the Count of Oñate, and the Dukes of Híjar and Sástago; the statutes required that one be present at the academy's opening ("La más célebre" 51v-52r). It is most unlikely that they ever agreed to preside jointly over the academy, since Oñate was ambassador to Vienna from 1617 to 1623, where his interventionism in

Bohemia clashed with Lerma's policies; Híjar sided with Lerma, who lost favor after acceding to support the Austrian Habsburgs (Elliott, *Conde-duque* 57-58).

¹³According to Clara Giménez Fernández, attempts to codify academic poetry lead nowhere, as the only theme repeated in the manuscript collections of academic poetry is that of the academy. See her article for an excellent evaluation of manuscripts in the Biblioteca Nacional that contain academic poetry.

¹⁴"El carácter artificial y exclusivamente técnico de los temas propuestos en las justas poéticas ha precipitado, sin duda, la decadencia de la poesía española en el siglo XVII; pero las academias y las justas poéticas no son la causa inicial... sino que son más bien su manifestación y consecuencia, en la medida en que traducen la falta de temas y de inspiración" (Jammes 265 n.18).

¹⁵The University of Zaragoza, modeled on the University of Salamanca, had a long tradition of hosting theatrical presentations, ceremonies, *justas*, and *certámenes*; some of the latter were organized on the death of Philip II, the death of Margaret of Austria, and the beatification of Saint Teresa of Avila (Egido, "Certamen poético" iii).

¹⁶Female participation in *academies* was usually the subject of ridicule in *comedias*; witness Lope's *La dama boba* and *La vengadora de las mujeres*. I have found few women listed as active participants; the most notable exception, María de Zayas y Sotomayor, belonged to the *Academia de Mendoza* in Madrid.

¹⁷See King 27; Sánchez 47 (for *Rimas*). Sánchez cites Rodrigo Caro, who describes Arguijo as "no sólo elegantísimo poeta, sino el Apolo de todos los poetas de España, a los cuales honraba mucho, y jamás censuró a ninguno, antes sí, siendo muy rico de rentas... les favorecía a todos con excesivos dones y donativos" (204). On his death, the poets who attended his gatherings published, in Juan de Jáuregui's *Rimas*, panegyrics "elogiando a Juan de Arguijo por las nubes" (204).

¹⁸Lope's *Rimas*, published under the patronage of Arguijo, begin: "A ¿quién daré mis rimas / y amorosos cuidados, / de aquella luz trasladados, / de aquella esfinge enimas? ... / A vos, Mecenas claro, / dulce, divino Orfeo / clarísimo Museo, / de los ingenios faro; / porque a vos dirigidas, / más que sus versos letras, tendrán vidas" (*Poesía lírica* 55).

¹⁹Miré la lista y vi que era el primero / el licenciado Juan de Ochoa, amigo / por poeta y christiano verdadero; / d'este varón en su alabanza digo / que puede azelerar y dar la muerte / con su claro discurso al enemigo, / y que si no se aparta y se divierte / su ingenio en la gramática española / será de Apolo sin yqual su suerte, / pues de su poesía, al mundo

sola, / puede esperar poner el pie en la cumbre / de la inconstante rueda o varia bola" (*Viage* II:1-17, 73).

According to Sánchez, a poem by Ochoa criticizing the closing of theaters was published by Rodríguez Marín; interestingly, it berates the commercialization of poetry fostered by the Madrid *academias*: "Poetas graduados en sonetos / los que coméis las puntas de los guantes / buscando por la calle consonantes / y a solo el consonante estáis sujetos; / Los que, por parecer hombres discretos / habláis latín delante de ignorantes, / y de un librillo, alivio de viandantes, / hurtáis los dichos y sacáis concetos / Si, como puede, Dios no lo remedia, / presto veremos todos aquel día / en que representéis vuestra tragedia. / Indicios hay bastantes, y, a fe mía, / que, pues ayer quitaron la comedia, / mañana han de quitaros la poesía" (Sánchez 203).

²⁰The two earliest academies, the *Academia imitatoria* dated 1586 and the *Humildes de Villamanta*, 1592, have left little documentation. See King and Sánchez.

²¹While the term "refeudalization" has been used most often by José Antonio Maravall, significant differences obtained between the creation of a new aristocratic elite and the privatization of power, especially through the figure of the *valido*. Elliott notes that the magnates, who had successfully been kept out of power by Charles V and Philip II, were now "pressing for admission" in the councils; Lerma's solution was to personally appoint small committees of ministers (Elliott, *Imperial Spain*, 302-03). See also Tomás y Valiente 63-65.

²²Although two academies were organized after Saldaña's, the first, the *Academia Selvaje*, founded by Francisco de Silva, lasted only from 1612 to 1614; the second, founded by Sebastián de Medrano in 1617, closed after his ordination in 1622. King corrects Sánchez's erroneous contention that Saldaña's academy was still operative when the *Selvaje* academy was founded (King 48 n. 57).

²³See the "carta echadiza" attributed to Lope satirizing the *Soledades*, and Góngora's haughtily indignant reply in Orozco Díaz, 174-83.

²⁴Américo Castro attributes the anti-urban message of the *Soledades* to Góngora's *converso* origins; Orozco Díaz rightly considers the *menosprecio de corte* theme in light of the Córdoba poet's desire for acceptance (190). See also Jammes 491.

²⁵See his complaints to Francisco del Corral and Cristóbal de Heredia (Góngora, "epistolario" 893 ff.)

²⁶The academy's president was Luis Vélez de Guevara, with the Prince of Esquilache one of the judges. Of the sixteen types of poetry solicited, the themes were limited to burlesque: "los sugetos que an de escribir en ella an

de ser todos en burlas decentes sin que por ningun caso se admita picardia ni baxesa" (94r).

²⁷In particular, theater served to simultaneously dignify and instruct the monarch. See Elliott, "Quevedo"; Feros.

²⁸Although space does not allow me to expand on the issue, I believe that *gongorismo* in the New World proffers an antidote to what Roland Greene calls the "Imperialist poetics" of Petrarchism.

Works Cited

- "La mas celebre Academia del Orbe intitulada La Peregrina," in *Poesías Varias*, t. 6, ms. 3889, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid.
- Academia Pítima contra la ociosidad*. Zaragoza, 1608.
- Academia que se celebró en el Buen Retiro*. Madrid, 1637.
- Academia que se celebró por Carnestolendas*. Madrid, 1675.
- Beverly, John. "The Production of Solitude: Góngora and the State." *Ideologies and Literature* 13 (1980): 23-41.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Viage del Parnaso y poesías varias*. Ed. Elias L. Rivers. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1991.
- Cochrane, Eric. "The Renaissance Academies in their Italian and European Setting." *The Fairest Flower*: 21-39.
- Cruz, Anne J. "The Politics of Illicit Love in the 'Pedro el Cruel' Ballad Cycle." *Scandinavian Yearbook of Folklore* (1992): 1-16.
- _____. "Self-Fashioning in Spain: Garcilaso de la Vega." *Romanic Review* 4 (1992): 517-38.
- Egido, Aurora. "Introducción." Juan Francisco Andrés de Uztarroz, *Certamen poético que la Universidad de Zaragoza Consagró al Arzobispo d. Pedro de Apaolaza en 1642*. Zaragoza: Fernando el Católico, 1986.
- _____. "De las academias a la Academia," in *The Fairest Flower*: 85-94.
- _____. *Fronteras de la poesía en el Barroco*. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1990. 115-136.
- _____. *La poesía aragonesa del siglo XVII y el culteranismo*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 1976.
- _____. *'Retratos de los Reyes de Aragón' de Andrés de Uztarroz y otros poemas de academia*. Zaragoza: Fernando el Católico, 1983.
- Elliott, John H. *The Count-Duke of Olivares: The Statesman in an Age of Decline*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1986.
- _____. *Imperial Spain: 1469-1716*. London: Penguin, 1990.
- _____. *Spain and Its World: 1500-1700*. New Haven & London: Yale UP, 1989.
- _____. *The Fairest Flower: The Emergence of Linguistic National Consciousness in Renaissance Europe*. International Conference of the Center for

- Medieval and Renaissance Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, 12-13 December 1983. Firenze, 1985.
- Feros, Antonio. "'Vicedioses, pero humanos': el drama del Rey." *Cuadernos de Historia Moderna* 14 (1993): 103-31.
- Giménez Fernández, Clara. "Poesía de academias (Mss.1-4.000)." *Manuscrt.CAO*. Madrid: Edad de Oro, 1988. 47-55.
- Góngora, Luis de. "Epistolario." *Obras completas*. Eds. Juan and Isabel Millé y Giménez. Madrid: Aguilar, 1972.
- Goux, Jean-Joseph. *Symbolic Economies: After Marx and Freud*. Trans. J. Curtiss Gage. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.
- Greene, Roland. "'This Phrasis is Continuous': Love and Empire in 1590," *Journal of Hispanic Philology* (Diana de Armas Wilson, Guest Editor) 16 (1992): 237-52.
- Guerrero Maylló, Ana. *Familia y vida cotidiana de una élite de poder: Los regidores madrileños en tiempos de Felipe II*. Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno, 1993.
- Jammes, Robert. *La obra poética de Don Luis de Góngora y Argote*. Madrid: Castalia, 1987.
- Jauralde Pou, Pablo. "Alonso de Castillo Solórzano. 'Donaires del Parnaso' y la 'Fábula de Polifemo.'" *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos* 82 (1979): 727-66.
- Javitch, David. *Poetry and Courtliness in Renaissance England*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1978.
- Jordan, Barry. *British Hispanism and the Challenge of Literary Theory*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1990.
- King, Willard F. "The Academies and Seventeenth-Century Spanish Literature." *PMLA* 75 (September 1960): 367-76.
- . *Prosa novelística y academias literarias en el siglo XVII*. XVII. Anejo X. Madrid: Boletín de la Real Academia Española, 1963.
- Martín, Adrienne L. *Cervantes and the Burlesque Sonnet*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.
- Martínez Arancón, Ana. *La batalla en torno a Góngora (Selección de textos)*. Barcelona: A. Bosch, 1978.
- Marx, Karl. *Contribution a la critique de l'économie politique*. Paris: Sociales, 1957.
- Montero, Juan. *La controversia sobre las 'Anotaciones' herrerianas*. Colección Testimonio, 7. Sevilla: Ayuntamiento de Sevilla, 1987.
- Orozco Díaz, Emilio. *Lope y Góngora frente a frente*. Madrid: Gredos, 1973.
- Pérez de Guzmán, Juan. "La labor político-literaria del conde-duque de Olivares." *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos* 11 (1904): 81-111.
- Rivers, Elias L. "La poesía culta y sus lectores." *Edad de Oro* 12 (1993): 267-79.

- Rodríguez-Moñino, Antonio. *Las justas toledanas a Santa Teresa en 1614. Poesías inéditas de Baltasar Elisio de Medinilla*. Madrid, 1964.
- Sabat de Rivers, Georgina. *Estudios de literatura hispanoamericana: Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz y otros poetas barrocos de la colonia*. Barcelona: PPU, 1992.
- Salvá, Pedro. *Cancionero de la Academia de los Nocturnos de Valencia*. Valencia, 1869.
- Sánchez, José. *Academias literarias del Siglo de Oro español*. Madrid: Gredos, 1961.
- Tomás y Valiente, Francisco. *Los validos en la monarquía española del siglo XVII*. Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno, 1990.
- Woodhouse, John. "The Reluctant Academicals: Linguistic Individualism in England after the Crusca." *The Fairest Flower*.