

not simply follow from his aspirations to join the Latinate elite, but rather that it “provided Juan Latino some measure of safety from local tensions” (95), a statement that could be considered somewhat questionable. Wright argues that the Morisco revolt against the Crown (1568–71) threatened Latino’s social status, and I question this for the following reasons: Juan Latino had never been Muslim, he was raised in one of the greatest Christian aristocratic families, very close to the Crown, he was a professor of the University of Granada, and he was married to a white Christian lady; so how could a pro-Muslim revolt make him significantly vulnerable? Furthermore, Wright argues that Juan Latino published the “Song of John of Austria” in order to secure his predominant social position. However, he might have done this just as any other white Spanish writer who wrote poems on Lepanto, and there were quite a few.

Aurelia Martín-Casares, *Universidad de Granada*

*Expostulatio Spongiae: En defensa de Lope de Vega.* Pedro Conde Parrado and Xavier Tubau Moreu, eds. and trans.

Prolope: Anejos de la Biblioteca Lope de Vega. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 2015. 480 pp. N.p.

---

Pedro Conde Parrado and Xavier Tubau Moreu have given us a new volume in the Prolope series, on the *Expostulatio Spongiae*. Described as one of the most cited yet least read works by specialists of Lope de Vega, the *Expostulatio* is an assemblage of varied texts written in Latin in 1618 by a pseudonymous author, Julio Columbario, to rebuke the controversy raised by Pedro de Torres Rámila’s *Spongia* (1617), a now-lost anti-Lopean tirade.

The volume is divided into three sections: an extensive and well-documented introduction, two appendixes, and the text and translation of the *Expostulatio*. The introduction clarifies some of the circumstances that gave birth to the work and reconsiders the importance of Neoaristotelianism to the dispute between the *Spongia* and the *Expostulatio* without discarding its Gongorist element. The study also shows that the author of the *Expostulatio* helps himself to various Latin works of several contemporary foreign authors, including Clarus Bonarscius’s *Amphitheatrum Honoris* (1606), John Barclay’s *Satyricon* (1605), and Claudius Musambertius’s *Commonitoria* (1607). After carefully examining several phraseological coincidences between the texts of the *Expostulatio*, on the one hand, and coeval Latin texts, on the other, the editors identify Juan de Fonseca y Figueroa as the individual behind Julio Columbario.

The second section of the volume is made up of two appendixes. The first contains the *Franciscus Antididascalus* (late 1617) by an anonymous member of the Academia de Madrid. The piece, regarded as the first counterattack against the author of the

*Spongia*, seeks to demonstrate two points: first, that Torres Rámila's Latin is grammatically incorrect; second, that the critic himself is incapable of speaking Latin. The second appendix examines the irregularities of content and the disparities of organization among the seven extant versions of the text, in which the editors propose the copy at the Biblioteca Nacional (BC 3/52677) as the best exemplar to constitute the text of the present edition.

The final section includes an accurate reproduction of the *Expostulatio* in its Latin original, with corrected punctuation and a masterful Spanish translation. Consisting of five varied parts—*Elogia Illustrium Virorum pro Lupo a Vega Carpio*, the *Expostulatio Spongiae*, *Varia Illustrium Virorum Poemata*, the *Oneiropaegnion Sive Locus*, and an *Appendix ad Expostulationem* by Alfonso Sánchez—plus a dedication to Don Luis Fernández de Córdoba and a prologue (*portico*) to the reader, the text of the *Expostulatio* as a whole is a direct response to the vicious accusations of the *Spongia*. In the part labeled the *Expostulatio*, for example, Columbario quotes extensively from Torres Rámila's lost polemic in order to respond directly to the impetuous "sponge" with which the critic sought to obliterate the works of Lope's genius, including the *Arcadia* (1598), *La hermosa de Angélica* (1602), *La Dragontea* (1598), and the *Jerusalén conquistada* (1609). Of particular interest is how Columbario contends that Torres Rámila not only was iniquitous and ignorant as a critic, but also had misinterpreted Aristotle completely when he accused Lope of disregarding Aristotelian notion of unity in Lope's epic.

This new edition, translation, and study of the *Expostulatio* invigorates the pioneering work of Joaquín de Entrambasaguas as well as Julián González-Barrera's recent scholarship on the subject. One wonders, however, whether a closer dialogue with the latter's work would have enriched the volume's otherwise impeccable work. González-Barrera, after all, made the first complete edition and Spanish translation of the work with excellent explanatory endnotes (2011). His scholarly endeavors should be taken as complementary to the present volume. These minor critical suggestions do not diminish my admiration for the high level of this publication. The editors have equipped the Latin text of the *Expostulatio* with judicious and well-informed footnotes, not only to keep the reader abreast of its classical and humanist sources, but also to provide helpful commentaries and interpretations to explicate difficult passages. Likewise, they have ably translated the work into Spanish and provided a useful bibliography. The volume will be essential to those engaged in research on Lope de Vega.

Carmen Hsu, *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*