

Published in *Anales de la Literatura Española Contemporánea*, 8 (1983), 228-30.

Federico García Lorca. *Poeta en Nueva York, Tierra y luna*. Edición crítica de Eutimio Martín. Barcelona: Ariel, 1981. 333 pp.

A critical, "official," edition of Lorca's works has been in the air for many years now. This volume, according to Marie Laffranque's "Presentation," is its first product. The editor is one of the *escogidos* who has been allowed access to a portion of the Lorca archives. What is the result, and what does it tell us about this highly desirable project?

The first thing we can expect from any editor is accuracy. I could not check the poems Martin has edited from the manuscripts, since I only have access to none-too-legible copies of copies of those manuscripts. But I did examine how he has handled texts edited from printed sources. I collated the *Caballo verde para la poesía* text of "Nocturno del hueco," which he follows (p. 256), and found eight unannotated variants of punctuation, eight of accentuation, and one of verse spacing. (Martin routinely annotates punctuation and verse spacing variants.) And to check his "aparato crítico," which claims to give all variant readings (p. 110, but see p. 128), I collated the Norton text of "Fábula y rueda de los tres amigos" with Martin's footnotes, and found twenty-one unannotated variants of punctuation, six of capitalization, ten of verse spacing, and two which may fairly be described as *gordos* (he does not note that the word "abandonados" is found in Norton after verse 13, and that the words "en las maletas nuevas" are missing from line 21).

At that point I stopped collating. I did note, however, while studying the volume further, some other deficiencies. When Martin's base manuscript is confusing, he simply omits the verses in question (p. 123). He does not include the fact that in Séneca the subtitle of "Ciudad sin sueño" is "Nocturno del Brookling Bridge." The dedication of Lorca's book is buried in the introduction (p. 66). The section titles, dedications, and verses of Cernuda and Aleixandre which are found in both Norton and Séneca are reproduced nowhere in Martin's book. Even if he believes that all of these items were the invention of Bergamín and/or Prados, which seems to me most unlikely (see Miguel García-Posada, *Lorca: interpretación de "Poeta en Nueva York"* [Madrid: Akal, 1981], p. 27), the failure to include them in a critical apparatus is unacceptable.

Another thing we may fairly ask of an editor is that he choose his copy-texts with care, and explain his rationale. Martin does tell us that the latest datable text within the author's lifetime is to be

preferred (p. 110); empirically we can see that the editor also chooses the manuscripts from the Lorca family archives over either the Séneca or the Norton text when these latter are the only printed texts he has of a particular poem. He never addresses the crucial issue of why the Norton and Séneca texts differ so dramatically from the manuscripts he edits. The following questions should have been, but are not, answered. Are these changes the work of Lorca? Are these different texts later than the draft manuscripts? If so, then would not Lorca want us to follow them rather than his drafts? (This is García Posada's position, as well as my own, and see Martin, p. 49, n. 17.) If they are not the work of Lorca, then who rewrote Lorca's poetry so extensively, adding and deleting words and lines?

Another legitimate expectation of an editor, especially in the case of a work whose editing is difficult and controversial, is a full discussion of the controversy, and an explanation of the editor's position. We lack this too. Martin does know my book, published by his own publisher ("*Poeta en Nueva York*": *Historia y problemas de un texto de Lorca* [Barcelona: Ariel, 1976]), and he tacitly takes much from it, but he dismisses it in a footnote (p. 24, n. 9), in which only one of the many conclusions in it is attacked. Of the important material published subsequently, he uses only that written in Spanish. He ignores the arguments found in the review article of Nigel Dennis, who called Martin's work "alarming" (*Ottawa Hispánica*, 1 [1979], 47); he shows no knowledge of the review of my book by Derek Harris (see *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 55 [1978], 169–70, and Martin's p. 117), nor of the important article of Andrew Anderson, "Lorca's 'New York Poems': A Contribution to the Debate," *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 17 (1981), 256–70. Although, in contrast with his 1974 dissertation, Martin now believes that Lorca left *something* in Bergamín's office, he makes no attempt to establish what that something was, or to assess its relevance to the editing of *Poeta*. This was, of course, the topic of my book, whose most important conclusion—that the Norton text is the most faithful to the manuscript Lorca had prepared or was preparing in 1936—I have reason to believe even more strongly today.

Since Martin now thinks that there was a manuscript of some sort given to Bergamín, he should explain why he proceeds to edit *Poeta* in the absence of that manuscript and of any confirmation that it does not exist. Neither Martin nor Laffranque explains why the present book is the first, rather than the last, volume of the projected critical edition of Lorca's works.

Discarding the Norton and Séneca texts both for the structure of the book and for the texts of the poems, Martin separates *Poeta en Nueva York* into two books, the one so named and *Tierra y*

luna, the former based on Lorca's public reading, and the second on an early list of titles. In my book I commented on the chronological contradictions of this approach; Anderson has offered new evidence unresponsive of this procedure in "García Lorca en Montevideo: Un testimonio desconocido y más evidencia sobre la evolución de *Poeta en Nueva York*," *Bulletin Hispanique*, 83 (1981); 145–61, and in his *Forum for Modern Language Studies* article previously cited. The public reading of *Poeta*, which Martin uses to establish the canon and structure of the collection, is itself problematical; García Posada (pp. 39–41) interprets it differently from Martin (pp. 102–103), and the "Oda a Walt Whitman" is included by Martin on the basis of an illustration subsequent by several years to the reading. Martin has not, then, even given us a reliable reconstruction of a previous state of *Poeta*, much less a critical edition of the version Lorca was preparing for publication in 1935 and left with Bergamín shortly before his death.

In sum: this edition is inaccurate on every level. It will mislead many, and will lead to lesser, rather than improved, understanding of Lorca's work. A facsimile of the manuscripts, like Nadal's facsimiles of his, would have been much more valuable. Publication of a critical edition of *Poeta* is premature. Regretfully, I must label this edition *apócrifo*.

DANIEL EISENBERG
Florida State University