The Poet and His Readers: The Social and Poetic Matrix of Garcilaso de la Vega

Casey Robert Eriksen
Charlottesville, Virginia

MA, University of Virginia, 2012
BA, The College of New Jersey, 2010

A Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese

University of Virginia
April 2016

Abstract

This dissertation examines the social and literary matrix of Garcilaso's poetry, and, by extension, the forces of canonization that shape and efface poets and poetic works over time. The study explores the circulation and diffusion of Garcilaso's *corpus* in humanist circles. The material manipulation of Garcilaso's poetry has affected reception in significant ways. The presence of numerous editorial hands in the initial compilation and organization of Garcilaso's work speaks to the ways in which scholars received and commented on the poet in subsequent editions. An attention to material circumstances, including manuscript circulation and published editions, likewise provides insight into early literary histories of Garcilaso from a material perspective.

Chapter three formulates an Ovidian analysis of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi," the Second Elegy, and several Sonnets to outline a new reading on Garcilaso's engagement with Latin models and humanistic culture at large. The rediscovery of these influences—particularly in the case of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi"—situates the poet within a broader Renaissance world of Ovidian rewriting. Through the interplay of classical models and *cancionero* tropes, Garcilaso invokes the ambiguous possibilities of euphemism and double-entendre as he draws upon a shared heritage of lexical play and ambiguity. Chapter Four presents a reexamination of Garcilaso's humanist profile as a contemporary Virgil. Garcilaso brings the past into dialogue with the present vis-à-vis mythological subtexts. His poetry conveys an engagement with literary traditions, a study in artful rewriting, and a sense of solidarity that emerges between the poet and his contemporary readers. The transformation of classical and *cancionero* influences occurs through the hand of a talented and well-read poet, yielding a lyrical experiment that represents far

more than the sum of its source motifs and allusions. The interplay of Garcilaso's *cancionero,* Italianate, and Classical sources situates the poet within a transnational context and emphasizes Garcilaso's profile as a Renaissance humanist.

Acknowledgements

The research undertaken in this dissertation would not have been possible had it not been for generous financial support from the Tibor Wlassics Dante Research Fellowship, the Charles Gordon Reid, Jr. Fellowship, the Buckner W. Clay Endowment for the Humanities, and a dissertation year fellowship from the Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese at the University of Virginia. The latter allowed me to spend time consulting sources in Spain, as well as to present my research at conferences in Córdoba, Valencia, and Porto. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the selection committees of these funds that considered this project worthwhile and helped to make it possible.

I wish to express my gratitude to the director of my thesis, E. Michael Gerli, whose intellectual generosity, constant encouragement, and friendship have been a source of inspiration and support over the past six years. It was during early conversations about Ovid and medieval schooling with Michael that I began to understand the literary networks and types of Latin rewriting common to Renaissance material and social culture.

I am grateful for the many readers whose suggestions have done so much to improve this study: to Ricardo Padrón, for his invaluable guidance and expertise on issues of masculine self-fashioning; to Alison P. Weber, for encouraging me to develop my research interests in the many courses I took with her, and for her helpful guidance on new biographical criticism; and to Bonnie Gordon, for serving as an outside reader on this project, and for her suggestion to examine a rhetoric of sensuality in Garcilaso's poetic work. A special thank you goes to Fernando Operé, Joel Rini, and David Gies,

who have encouraged and supported me consistently throughout my time at the University of Virginia.

I feel extremely fortunate for the support of my friends, family, and colleagues over the years. Thank you to Teresa Anta San Pedro, for encouraging me to turn an eye toward issues of textual materiality; to Enrique Peláez Malagón, for his research guidance, expertise, and friendship; to Robert ter Horst, for generously sharing his ideas on the "Ode ad florem Gnidi;" and to Claudia Stevens, for her careful editorial comments, generosity, and support.

This study is dedicated to David, whose love, patience, and encouragement cannot be measured.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii

Acknowledgements iv

Introductory Remarks: Canonization, Literary Histories, and the Spanish Golden Age 1

I Literary Histories, Cultural Capital, and Canonization 5

II The Material Manipulation of the Poet and his Literary Corpus: Garcilaso's Early Reception, Fernando de Herrera, and the *Cancionero* Tradition 23

II.i. The *Anotaciones* and the Rise of the Vernacular 26

II.ii. *Cancionero* Legacies and the Literary Histories of Garcilaso 38

III "Nomen amicitia est, nomen inane fides": Garcilaso's 'Ode ad florem Gnidi,' Ovid, and the Pervasive Presence of the Biographical Reading" 73

III.i. Poetic Rubrications, Paratexts, and the Fallacy of the Romantic Biographical Model 73

III.ii. Ovidian Subtexts and New Possibilities for Interpretation: Voluntary Exile and Legendary Biographies 92

III.iii. Transparent Ambiguities, *Cancionero* Word Games, and the Erotic Register 100

III.iv. The Mythological Literary-Artistic Persona in Renaissance Culture 115

IV The Virgilian Mirror: Garcilaso and the Rediscovery of Virgilian Subtexts 133

IV.i. Virgilian Subtexts in the Vernacular 133

IV.ii. Latin Subtexts in Garcilaso's Odes 146

IV.iii. Etiological Readings, Transvaluation, and Virgilian Mythologies 156

Conclusions: Rediscovering Garcilaso's Profile as a Renaissance Humanist 173

Bibliography 177

"We hear and follow echoes that resound through the centuries, subtly changing as they pass from one author and age to the next— though this is not a linear process, more an overlapping of waves that eventually and often imperceptibly change the nature of the sand shapes on the beach" –Trevor J. Dadson

È sempre suto non altrimenti pericoloso trovare modi ed ordini nuovi che si fosse cercare acque e terre incognite. –Machiavelli

Introductory Remarks: Canonization, Literary Histories, and the Spanish Golden Age:

This investigation, entitled "The Social and Poetic Matrix of Garcilaso de la Vega," discusses the early canonization of the poet to explore broader and more pervasive dialogues surrounding literary histories, cultural capital, and notions of national classics. This work examines the ways in which poetry emerges as an ennobling and enfranchising art closely linked to its social uses at court. While literary histories have perennially cast Garcilaso as the touchstone of Italianate poetic forms in Spanish letters— set in bright relief against older poetic forms in Spain— this broad-based social, cultural, and poetic study of Garcilaso reveals that he was very much a poet steeped in classical Latin poetry and the earlier *cancionero* tradition. I apply theories of canon formation and cultural capital to Garcilaso's poetic commentators to situate his poetic *oeuvre* within the intellectual and political sphere of early modern Spain.

The questions of which authors and books are read, and why, are central to this project. Indeed, prose and poetry reflect values, establish tastes, and codify social norms. This investigation argues that poets such as Garcilaso become canonized in great measure because they are made relevant to the priorities of a specific historical moment. Garcilaso is only one figure for whom such reception applies, and a similar process of canonization holds true for other intellectuals such Juan de Mena and Jorge Manrique.

In this investigation, chapter one outlines the approaches with which canon formation has been historically viewed, as well as broader issues that arise in the writing of literary histories. The chapter brings into dialogue relevant scholarship on Garcilaso (Keniston, Lapesa, Gallego Morell, Rico, Castro, Navarrete, Heiple, Rivers, Arbulú, Hermida Ruiz, Vaquero Serrano, Schmidt, Paul Julian Smith, and others) to show how the early commentaries on Garcilaso have been assimilated and recast through the centuries by generations of scholars. Chapter one also formulates a discussion of canon formation drawn from other disciplines, and applies this to the context of the so-called Spanish Golden Age to show that the canonization of Garcilaso has resulted from the institutional and political priorities of subsequent generations.

Chapter two examines the material manipulation of the poet and his poetic corpus with regard to reception, manuscript circulation, and early published editions of Garcilaso's work. In doing so, the analysis traces the ways in which early critical perspectives emerge from a specific intellectual class and material circumstances. The commentaries of Fernando de Herrera and el Brocense hold particular importance in discussion of the privileging of Garcilaso as the representative Italianate poet in modern literary canons. The discussion of early reception has as much to do with the rise of the vernacular and the debate between ancients and moderns as it does the institutional and intellectual practices of courtly Iberian spheres. Chapter two therefore analyzes the vestiges of *cancionero* poetry in Garcilaso's work to offer an alternative reading to Garcilaso's status as foremost an Italianate poet. This chapter turns attention to a sense of continuity and community among courtly intellectuals to situate Garcilaso's poetry within the frame of its production and circulation. Chapter two addresses prominent

characteristics of the *cancioneros* to underscore an inherent diversity and potential for multiple interpretations. It is known that Garcilaso read Cartagena and other *cancionero* poets; chapter two therefore draws attention to such illusive and problematic signs in Garcilaso's poetry and bolsters a claim that supports Garcilaso's role as a poet firmly grounded in the *cancionero* tradition. Examples from Garcilaso's poetic works reveal the interplay as much in the *cancionero* tradition as in the Italianate and Latinate textual and rhetorical traditions.

The legacies of Hayward Keniston's early biographical readings of the poet continue to guide critical approaches. Chapter three, alternatively, formulates an Ovidian analysis that aims to decenter longstanding biographical and aesthetic readings of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi" to outline a new reading on Garcilaso's engagement with the Latin subtexts. The discussion examines Keniston's reception of Garcilaso and situates the poet within the humanist context of Latin studies and communication that is also linked to the troubadour lyric tradition. This broad-based social, cultural, and poetic study shows that Garcilaso does not write from a biographical perspective, nor does he merely include Ovidian verse equivalences in the "Ode ad florem Gnidi;" rather, the poet recasts an Ovidian love triangle in a tongue-in-cheek manner to produce a completely different reading of the poem. By bringing Latin resonances to the fore, this study illustrates the pervasive presence of literary traditions through the frame of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi."

Chapter four explores Garcilaso's Virgilian subtexts to call attention to the presence of explicit and implicit Latin allusions throughout Garcilaso's poetic corpus. Such a reexamination is relevant to our study of Garcilaso as a foundational poet within

literary canons on the Spanish Golden Age. The study of Garcilaso's Latin subtexts presents a valuable critical model that may be applied to future scholarship on other canonical Renaissance writers.

Through an analysis of reception and literary histories, this study examines an approximation to Garcilaso's poetry that considers not only the sixteenth-century significance of the Latin and *cancionero* subtexts, but also the social and cultural interactions among the poets of Garcilaso's *milieu*. By looking in depth at issues of the material circulation of Garcilaso's corpus, the interplay of *cancionero* and Latin sources, and literary interactions with other poet-courtiers, a more nuanced view of Garcilaso's poetry emerges—situated squarely within the courtly sphere of its production and diffusion. In its exploration of materiality and canon formation, this study moves beyond the lens of Italian imitation and *cancionero* studies alone—to examine broader notions of reception, notions of national classics, and the construction of modern literary histories.

CHAPTER I:

Literary Histories, Cultural Capital, and Canonization

Generations of readers have largely effaced Garcilaso's literary profile and poetic corpus. Selective readings, the fallacy of the biography discourse, and editorial interventions have guided subtle shifts in the reception of the poet, and in turn, have driven the processes of canonization into modern times. Critics have regailed Garcilaso as the foremost representative of Italianate styles in Spain—the melancholy poet-courtier who writes from biographical or sincere perspectives. In the quest for Garcilaso, readers are invited to explore models of canonicity to examine how readers, scholars, and editors have shaped the poet's circulation, reception, and standing in Spanish literary canons.

This chapter will therefore examine approaches to canon formation, ultimately to construct a working model that can be applied to Garcilaso's literary persona and corpus. Literary histories are largely constructions of the nineteenth century, and their conceptualization is frequently based in a response to, or assimilation of, the ideas of past generations of critics. Although canon debates often lead to taxonomic discussion as to which works are to be included or excluded from a specific genre or period, the processes by which canonization occurs have not been sufficiently examined in Iberian contexts. This study seeks to develop a comprehensive analysis of canon formation as a social and intellectual endeavor, and to apply these observations to the early reception and literary histories surrounding Garcilaso de la Vega.

By addressing the material circumstances and intellectual contexts in which perspectives on Garcilaso have evolved, this investigation seeks to articulate the ways in which the practice of commentary helps both to form a dialogue with Garcilaso's poetry

and to consider the broader humanist frame in which commentators shaped the canonization of the poet. In *Commentary and Ideology: Dante in the Renaissance,* Deborah Parker argues that Dante's commentators have utilized Dante "as an authority in ongoing schemes of social legitimation" (ix). She "examines how the civic, institutional, and social commitments of commentators shape their response to the poem" (ix). Above all, Parker's study "seeks to uncover the ways in which these phenomena have informed and conditioned interpretive strategies" (ix). Source texts and commentaries therefore can and should be read hand-in-hand, as each informs an understanding of the other. Similarly, early critical perspectives on Garcilaso's work, I argue, become apparent through an analysis of the commentaries by Fernando de Herrera, el Brocense, and Tamayo y Baus.

Garcilaso rewrites classical texts, transforming them into subtexts in ways that engage the humanist reader's poetic acumen and foster a sense of solidarity among readers and poets. His corpus is directed at a closed milieu of well-read, educated aristocratic humanists. Garcilaso's subsequent canonization is linked to this intellectual class and to its literary engagement with classical and *cancionero* traditions. In his watershed study, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation,* John Guillory argues that literary canons are a reflection of the values and tastes of a specific social class; as products, books codify the social norms and priorities of an elite group. Guillory's model provides a useful framework in which to examine Garcilaso's canonization through the centuries. Guillory holds that scholars should not merely examine which books are included or excluded from the canon: "[E]valuative judgments are the necessary but not sufficient conditions for the process of canon formation, and

that it is only by understanding the social function and institutional protocols of the school that we will understand how works are preserved, reproduced, and disseminated over successive generations" (vii). Guillory thus posits that both traditionalist and relativist approaches to the canon debate are based upon incorrect assumptions. According to Guillory, it is insufficient simply to call attention to those authors excluded from the canon on the basis of categories such as race or gender. Guillory instead reorients the canon debate to consider the production and unequal distribution of books as forms of cultural capital. His work develops and reformulates earlier arguments posited by Pierre Bourdieu:

> The purpose of importing [cultural capital] into the debate about the canon is not to endorse Bourdieu's project in its totality…. I have sought rather to make visible the relative absence of class as a working category of analysis in the canon debate…. The fact that class determines whether and how individuals gain access to the means of literary production, and the system regulating such access is a much more efficient mechanism of social exclusion than acts of judgment. (viii-ix)

Guillory applies this framework to show that it is the unequal production, distribution, and consumption of cultural capital that has shaped traditional literary canons on into current times. More specifically, he shows that canons are, above all, products that reflect the tastes of a specific social context. This is to say that they do not actively seek to exclude works by women writers, minorities, and popular sources—rather, literary canons should retrospectively serve as the barometers that indicate the priorities of a specific historical or political moment. For Guillory, those who would prefer to revise

canons to increase the presence of underrepresented groups are attempting to make specific authors marketable and relevant to the present age. By turning an eye to institutional and university practices, Guillory posits that the decision to promote inclusive, revised canons has been driven in part by a desire to meet current publication demands and to fill undergraduate courses on popular topics in areas of identity, race, and gender studies (55).

Guillory's study reframes the canon debate to include attention to the distribution, access, and circulation of cultural products—both in the initial reception, as well in subsequent centuries of canonized works. In doing so, Guillory rejects aesthetic discourses based upon value judgments. Such discourses of taste, he shows, prioritize works of High Culture and exclude working-class and popular influences. Guillory makes clear that the division between high and low culture is never absolute. Likewise, he argues that since aesthetic criticism subjectively emphasizes form over content, it cannot be used as the basis with which to assess the value or impact of literary works: "To say that the aesthetic disposition determines the relative cultural capital granted to any particular work is to say that the act of judgment is the assignment, or even the *recognition*, of cultural capital…. What appears in the place of aesthetic pleasure of *distinction*, pleasure in the possession of cultural capital" (332-333). Thus, aesthetic judgments are made neither with consideration to content of the works themselves, nor on the basis of enjoyment or pleasure: "It is not necessary to experience aesthetic pleasure at all to enter this game, since judgment itself can be relegated to experts (as it is in the case of the corporate buyers of art), thus dividing the labor of consumption into the certification of cultural capital (by the critics) and its appropriation (by the collectors)"

(334). Literary texts and works of art become expedient commodities in themselves, valued for their utility and sense of prestige by members of a certain social and economic class.

Garcilaso's canonization on into modernity emerges from anachronistic, reductive readings that situate Garcilaso within biographical discourses that serve the respective needs of each generation of readers. In *Is Literary History Possible*, David Perkins proposes a series of considerations that question long-standing assumptions within the discipline that are germane to the study of Garcilaso's canonization. Perkins demonstrates that nineteenth-century ideas concerning literary histories led to reductionist approaches to canon formation. These ideas were often coupled with the rise of national literatures. He writes: "With the unfolding of an idea, principal, suprapersonal entity, or *Geist* as its subject, a literary history became teleological…. Is literature, for the purposes of literary history, only the best writings, or does it also include popular works that are judged qualitatively inferior?" (5). This question is central to the canon debate, but again, it remains problematic; the dominant social class at times appropriates works and styles of popular origin as legitimate forms of cultural capital, often due to the social function or overwhelming popularity of the works. Moreover, Perkins suggests that literary histories are necessary tools written for the use and interpretation by the living; these histories are made relevant to the needs of the present moment, in which emphasis is placed on specific forms of criticism:

> The value of literary histories might be informative, aesthetic, humanistic, or political. In other words, they might present a selection of information about the past, appeal to our sense of form and our imagination, satisfy our hunger for

> wisdom, or fortify our political commitment and our ideologies, but they would not be ideologies…. Historical interpretations and explanations cannot themselves transcend the time and place in which they are produced. (16)

In the case of Garcilaso's manuscripts and early published editions, textual circumstances and editorial interventions have shaped readings of the poet that have distorted longstanding ideas within the field. The desire to impose coherence on Garcilaso's corpus has naturalized the poet's literary persona and work to validate a wide range of critical approaches. These literary histories are doubtless subjective, given that they rise from an implicit rhetorical posture to fulfill specific goals in the present. Perkins aptly recognizes that as critics compose literary histories, they confront a tension between depth, scope, and narration: "Encyclopedic literary history deliberately forfeits coherence, and narrative cannot express its subject with the required complexity…. Even more serious, perhaps, is that the form in which we write cannot greatly differ from the form in which we think" (20). In this way, the critic faces the decision to emphasize on one hand the unity and coherence of an epoch, or on the other, to underscore the diversity and textual heterogeneity of a period or school. Although these two aspects are not by definition incompatible, scores of literary histories have too often emphasized a single narrative vision by excluding those influences and works that fall outside its scope.

Although the encyclopedic form of literary history might overwhelm the reader, it nonetheless embodies what Perkins calls the "multiplicity and heterogeneity of the past (any tract of the past), of the points of view that can be brought to bear, of the hypotheses that can structure the same events" (55). Nevertheless, as Perkins notes, the taxonomies placed on these works are based upon the evaluative judgments of historians and

scholars. Perkins poses a series of rhetorical questions to speculate if literary history can indeed represent the past, to ultimately conclude that, although irrational, literary taxonomies are necessary distinctions made based upon:

- Tradition
- Ideological interests
- The aesthetic requirements of writing a literary history
- The assertions of authors and their contemporaries about their affinities or antipathies
- The similarities that the literary historian observes between authors and/or texts
- And, the needs of professional careers and the politics of power in institutions. (69)

Of these, Perkins underscores the "overwhelming role of tradition" (69) at the moment of classification. This has often been the case in the writing of Spanish literary histories on Garcilaso de la Vega. Garcilaso is celebrated as the chief figure to have embraced and fashioned Italianate styles in High Renaissance Iberia, yet critics have constructed and exploited this posture for extra-literary purposes. This investigation turns attention to the early reception and commentary on Garcilaso's poetry to show that he was equally a poet versed in the other traditions. By approaching literary histories with skepticism, examining the processes of their construction, and applying these to the literary histories on Garcilaso, an alternative discourse emerges. This account is not in itself incompatible with earlier literary histories—conversely, it seeks to draw attention to understudied aspects of Garcilaso's work that inform earlier accounts with a finer lens. To cast Garcilaso solely as an Italianate poet is to fail to recognize the depth and full scope of his

poetic ingenuity and dexterity in the most widely circulated styles of his age. As readers begin to view Garcilaso as a poet who engages and rewrites *cancionero* and classical subtexts, they are invited to consider Garcilaso's corpus within the frame of its material circumstances and diffusion in humanist intellectual circles.

As Perkins shows, literary histories are accommodated to the needs and priorities of a specific moment. Critics in this way seek not merely to describe the past, but to attempt to organize and interpret past works and events at a distance:

> As literary historians they undergo, and make us experience with them, the shock to values, the effort of imagination, the crisis for understanding and sympathy of every profound encounter with the past that seeks to be objective. Though the ideal cannot be achieved, we must pursue it, for without it the otherness of the past would deliquesce in endless subjective and ideological reappropriations.
>
> A function of literary history is, then, to set the literature of the past at a distance, to make its otherness felt…. The cultural diversity of the past can be viewed as a set of options, a reminder of alternatives and possibilities (185)

While it remains impossible to fully reconstruct the past or reception of a work or author, to attempt to do so at a distance is one goal of literary history. By returning to the early commentaries on Garcilaso de la Vega, a richer portrait of his early reception emerges that also informs the writing of subsequent literary histories.

Perkins' discussion of the weight of critical traditions is relevant to the reexamination of longstanding approaches of scholarship on Renaissance humanist poets. Perkins' assertion that authors are made relevant to the needs and priorities of future generations is particularly the case in discussion of Garcilaso's poetic corpus. Literary

histories on Garcilaso all too often mirror the scholarly tendencies toward the discourses of sentimental autobiography and sincerity.

To date, few recent studies have engaged serious approaches to canon formation in the context of the Spanish/Latin American canons. Joan Brown's *Confronting Our Canons: Spanish and Latin American Studies in the 21st Century* examines several assumptions of canon formation, yet in doing so falls back upon the very assumptions that it intends to dismantle. Brown's study perhaps holds applications in the context of the university curriculum, especially regarding reading lists in North American Ph.D. programs. She aims to chart the "multifactorial variables that contribute to canonicity, including crucial cultural forces as well as characteristics that are ascribed to great works of literature" (15), citing numerical statistics to bolster her claims.

Brown's approach falls short, however, in its attempt to revise Spanish and Latin American canons while neglecting the underlying questions on the *reasons for which* specific reading lists have resulted in their respective forms over time. Brown consistently overlooks the fact that canons are both products and indicators of the priorities and literary tastes of specific generations of scholarship. She holds that if only scholars could expose the "canon's missing contents, adducing evidence from the twenty-first century to track the persistence of these gaps" (15), they then would likewise become equipped to advance "specific recommendations to ensure that our literary canons of the future fulfill the functions that we—and our successors—want and need" (15). Brown paints with too broad a brush, relying upon the assumption that she alone might speak as the authority on what scholars can or should mandate for future graduate program reading lists. More serious is her assumption that, by adjusting the proportions

of respective authors and areas of focus, scholars might at once rectify longstanding inequities and vindicate underrepresented texts and groups within reading lists to ultimately "introduce more colors onto the vast Hispanic canvas" (182). This too, while admirable and perhaps valuable for future university programs, fails to evaluate the underlying causes driving canon formation in the first place. Even in her effort to confront the canon, Brown's proposed twenty-first century revision evokes another manifestation (and product) of scholarly choices of inclusion. By pointing out specific missing contents and negotiating proportions of one author or another, Brown holds that this effort might undo centuries of academic bias. Even if one were to adopt Brown's revisionist model, the canon would continue to be a human creation that speaks to the priorities, institutional practices, and cultural tastes of the contemporary moment. Brown's analysis provides a useful window into broader conversations on canon formation, but ultimately falls back upon the very assumptions and value judgments that she purports to dismantle.

Confronting our Canons does however provide a useful discussion of some of the social forces that underpin canonization: "A community defines and in turn is defined by its canon…. Perhaps the most confounding sociocultural characteristic of canons is that they can be an illusion in the sense that Freud considered religion an illusion: a shared belief system unsupported by empirical evidence" (40). In this way, the authority behind literary canons is linked to widespread acceptance and endorsement of the "classics" as real and unchanging. The canon also becomes self-sustaining over generations of scholarship, since it frequently drives pedagogical practices from one generation to the next—as the inclusion of specific works is linked to the rejection of other texts or

authors. Brown aptly notes that the canon's "power is linked to transmission, through control of what is taught…. As Barbara Herrnstein Smith has noted, the same community that safeguards its cultural treasures is also charged with delivering its esteemed collection to 'succeeding generations of subjects'" (41). Reading list and canon selections therefore hold a role in the indoctrination and validation of future scholars, and also shape the professional and educational priorities within a discipline over time.

In discussion of Garcilaso—and the role of the poet within Spanish literary histories—it is useful to call attention to notions of canonical authority and the privileging of enduring critical traditions over generations and centuries. James E. Brenneman's *Canons in Conflict* explores the role of communities and contradictory interpretations that often make canon formation problematic. In discussion of numerous biblical passages, he writes: "contrasting truth claims in the Bible are the same factors that lead to creating canons (references of authority). Such conflicting alternatives, given their scriptural context, invite the question: What is meant by canonical authority?… What institutional purpose was served?" (52). Brenneman shows that canon studies have become commonplace across academic disciplines; he holds that this is linked to an "erosion of consensus" (53) in scholars' acceptance of longstanding views within these respective disciplines. This is to say that epistemological shifts over time (as well as the emergence of more specialized camps of study within a field) have given way to changes in value judgment and postmodern skepticism in the face of long held critical approaches. Some intellectuals might regret this growing sense of skepticism, and yet, as Brenneman remarks, this is how canons have perennially developed throughout the centuries. He summarizes:

> The 'common-sense' consensus among the literati has given way to three decades of seemingly endless challenges to the canons of literature, climaxing in Harold Bloom's reassertion of the Western canon, with its cataloguing of the "books and school of the ages."…. The momentary chaos created by the crisis in literature may appear to be a screaming deathplunge of sorts, and no one would argue that the means to destroy canons is at hand. However, so too is the opportunity to open the old canons to new canonical works or to read old works in new ways. This task, as it has always been, even in the making of the Western canon, is a communal one. (58)

Bloom advances his defense of canonical works on aesthetic grounds, appealing to the notion of consensus among contemporaries that would likewise authorize similar texts. Yet this methodology overlooks the communal debates and quarrels that have once and again shaped curricula, reading lists, and academies divided along distinct schools of thought. As a communal and collaborative product, canons often evolve over time to meet the institutional necessities of those using the works contained within a specific canon. The specific arrangement or content of the canon, then, is also the product of debate and differences of opinion among those with the power to endorse those works that bolster a specific school or thought. Brenneman shows that this likewise drives reading strategies, suggesting that expectations placed on a reader "do not come from a determinate text; rather, [from] the interpretative community whose norms and interpretative strategies create the conditions in which it becomes possible to pick formal patterns out" (47). These patterns of interpretation are often reinforced over extended

periods of time, particularly as successive generations of scholars read and reread canonical texts.

In their volume of essays, Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders underscore the diversity of canon formation in the contexts of Judaic and Christian canons, demonstrating that the inclusion or exclusion of certain books varied across time in response to the need and uses of the communities using the texts. This framework is relevant to the current study on Garcilaso, as it speaks to the idea of a continually changing literary canon open to revision in keeping with the priorities of its users. The scholars point out that in the religious context, “scripture” and “canon” are not interchangeable, as the former refers to the “divine status of a written document,” (11) while the latter refers to the set of texts that define the bounds of a community or discipline. Though some would view the canon as fixed in the religious context, history continually provides evidence otherwise. McDonald and Sanders suggest that Jewish scholars “were able to adapt their authoritative scriptures to new and changing circumstances, and the very adaptability of those scriptures to continue as authoritative texts within the Jewish community…. Canons also change by expansion, though historically also by reduction” (16). For example, when books emphasizing unclean foods became less relevant to the needs of Christian faith communities, complete texts often went unused or were over time removed from Christian canons. As with contemporary canon debates, however, this perspective was not without controversy in the ancient world— among those that viewed the canon as either fluid and open, or conversely fixed and immutable over time. This is particularly true in cases of textual discrepancies, in which the same moment might be narrated from very different

perspectives. One classic example is that of Isaiah 2:4 and Joel 4:10, in which the audience is commanded to beat "swords into plowshares" and "plowshares into swords," respectively.

Sanders in particular explores ways in which canon formation of the Torah was a continuous endeavor, through a case study on the Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls. He remarks that the makeup and contents of the scrolls highlight the diversity (and processes in the evolution) of early Judaic writing:

> The Qumran Scrolls… witnessed to texts underlying the variant readings in the Septuagint. Support for Samaritan readings in the Pentateuch was minimal. But where the Septuagint and the MT have the greatest diversity of readings, as in Samuel and Jeremiah, Qumran fragments of varying sizes indicated that there may have indeed been distinct Hebrew *Vorlagen* lying back to some of the Septuagint…. The Qumran caves, thus seemed to confirm the existence of families of biblical texts deriving from pristine 'originals.' (255).

The Dead Sea Scrolls point toward the presence of several iterations of scriptural accounts rendered again and again from an earlier primer. This is especially true among those scrolls discussing variations of the Greek translations of Jewish scripture, the Septuagint. This observation remains consistent with the idea that the contents of a canon are often adapted, such that a set of texts might continue to hold value within a community. Canons are not unchanging, and this has been the case in the formation of the Judaic canons; outmoded information was removed, and new texts added to meet the institutional and diverse regional circumstances of early Hebrew communities. Sanders remarks that "The concept of canon cannot be limited to a final stage in the formation of

the Bible…. Neither Qumran nor Christian Jews believed 'the canon' was closed, since both added to it, and claimed canonical status for their contributions" (259). In this manner, the transmission of texts over time results in a canon that evolves in keeping with community priorities over time.

Literary histories on Garcilaso likewise have changed over time, given different political circumstances and intellectual tastes. Aurora Hermida Ruiz demonstrates the ways in which twentieth-century commentators have recast Garcilaso's persona and poetry in the wake of the Spanish Civil War. Her dissertation, "Historiografía literaria y nacionalismo español: Garcilaso de la Vega o el linaje del hombre invisible," explores the intersection of Spanish nationalism and the forging of "national literature" by twentieth-century literary historians. Hermida Ruiz shows that "Garcilaso is a cultural icon that needs to be studied together with the history of Spanish nationalism and, in this sense, that his poetry has been especially burdened by the debate, still open and polemic, about the identity and legitimacy of Spain as a nation" (iii). Hermida Ruiz notes that old-style biographical approaches— as well as the discourses of sincerity— are based upon the wrong central questions. Alternatively, she posits:

> Me encontré, para decirlo de una vez, con que la historia de Garcilaso es también la historia de su lectura y, sobre todo, con que ésta es especialmente fascinante para dilucidar las estrechas relaciones que historiografía y nacionalismo guardan entre sí. Aunque considero que Garcilaso de la Vega es, en sus distintas versiones, una construcción crítica, lo que me interesa no es desenmascarar su carácter ficticio o irreal, sino, más bien al contrario, demostrar el carácter "secular," "mundano" o "actual" de las mismas. (2)

The place of Garcilaso's poetry in twentieth-century criticism cannot be divorced from the idealized image of the figure himself. Hermida Ruiz importantly points out that one must recognize Garcilaso's identity as a human man writing within a specific social milieu; successive generations of historians have shaped Garcilaso's legacy. While Hermida Ruiz's study focuses primarily on the twentieth-century, my investigation aims to turn attention to the early reception and commentary surrounding Garcilaso's work. I seek to show that Garcilaso's early reception and canonization were driven by social, political, and extra-literary factors. Generations of critics have drawn upon (or reacted to) previous centuries of literary criticism. For this reason, interpreting Garcilaso's work in the ways in which it was initially read and circulated thus helps to explain the subsequent canonization of the poet. This study underscores the social uses of Garcilaso's work within sixteenth-century Iberian intellectual and social spheres. The commentaries on Garcilaso likewise remain valuable in the present; these need not be relegated to a position of secondary value in Hispanism, as they are in great measure the basis from which Garcilaso's canonization took form. I argue that these commentaries become calcified and are assimilated by generations of literary critics in subsequent centuries.

A brief consideration of canon formation from African American Studies also helps to inform the study at hand. In his watershed study *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism,* Henry Louis Gates discusses the formation of the African American literary canon to "locate and identify how the 'black tradition' had theorized about itself" (ix). Pointedly, Gates argues that the formation of

African American literary canons is linked to the use of the vernacular, as well as to the interactions among black writers:

> A vernacular tradition's relation to a formal literary tradition is that of a parallel discursive universe. By explicating two seemingly distinct bodies of myths, one common to several black traditions and the other an American phenomenon, I have tried to show how the vernacular informs and becomes the foundation for formal black literature….Black writers also read each other, and seem intent on refiguring what we might think of as canonical topoi and tropes received from the black tradition itself….[B]lack writers read, repeated, imitated, and revised each other's texts to a remarkable extent. This web of filiation makes theorizing about black principles of interpretation and revision an obvious project for critics who have undertaken close readings of black canonical texts. (xxii)

In Garcilaso's corpus, the interplay and juxtaposition of *cancionero*, Latin, and Italian syntax, registers, and subtexts are highly evident and invite new dialogues on the writing of literary histories. The vernacular accordingly shapes formal aspects of works from the African American canon studies. Literary interactions among writers affect the early formation and rewritings of Spanish literary canons from over time. In the Iberian context, the influence of the vernacular, as well as the social matrix of literary interactions, are highly evident in the case of the *cancioneros*.

In the context of the Spanish Golden Age, Perkins and Guillory provide particularly apt models from which to reexamine Garcilaso's poetic work. Canonical Spanish authors like Garcilaso often are read through the lenses of biography and sincerity. Hayward Keniston's biographical approach to Garcilaso, like the biographical

reading of the troubadour poets, is a convention that emerges in late nineteenth-century criticism. Such a reading privileges face value, comfortable interpretations over attention to the text and its dialogue with literary traditions and antecedents. In particular, this is a fallacy touched by Romanticism that seeks to link a poet's life with his work. By reexamining the interplay of *cancionero* and Latin registers and subtexts, a more nuanced approach to Garcilaso's poetry emerges that is situated within its intellectual world and social circumstances. Consequently, the study of Garcilaso's work helps foster new perspectives in Spanish literary history and presents a critical model that can perhaps be applied to other foundational Spanish writers in future scholarship.

CHAPTER II:

The Material Manipulation of the Poet and his Literary Corpus: Garcilaso's Early Reception, Fernando de Herrera, and the *Cancionero* Tradition

In the sixteenth century, early commentators of Garcilaso's work shaped the poet's canonization through the production of glosses and annotations to the source verses. Just as earlier scholars had done with Dante's poetry, annotators such as Sánchez de las Brozas and Fernando de Herrera subjected Garcilaso's verses to commentary and interpretation to achieve both literary and extra-literary ends.

Harold Bloom suggests that "[i]f the dead poets… constituted their successors' particular advance in knowledge, that knowledge is still their successors' creation, made by the living for the needs of the living" (19).[1] Garcilaso's work serves as far more than a primer for imitation by later poets; the very practice of commentary shaped broader discourses in the formation and subsequent rewritings of Spanish vernacular canons. Interpreting Herrera's *Anotaciones* (1580) vis-à-vis Garcilaso's poetry provides one framework in which to read the source verses, as well as to examine broader trends in canon formation. The annotations reveal an attention to the social and intellectual interactions between Castilian and Andalusian poets of the courtly milieu. Herrera's glosses of vernacular allusions open a poetic and cultural dialogue and invite further commentary among his contemporaries.[2] By considering Garcilaso's poetry and Herrera's annotations side-by-side, this monograph explores Herrera's literary and political station within the discourses of Garcilaso's canonization.

---

[1] Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: a Theory of Poetry.* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

[2] For a discussion of several principal differences between el Brocense and Herrera, see: Navarrete, Ignacio, "Decentering Garcilaso: Herrera's Attack on the Canon," *PMLA* 106.1 (1991): 21-33.

Criticism on the *Anotaciones* has frequently approached the work as a Neapolitan treatise that adheres to certain standards of style and imitation, including *sprezzatura* and *buen gusto*. These ideas emerge in part from Castiglione's *Il libro del Cortegiano* (1528, *The Book of the Courtier*), in which Count Lodovico da Canossa enumerates the literary and social attributes of the ideal courtier:

> Chi adunque vorrà esser bon discipulo, oltre al far le cose bene, sempre ha da metter ogni diligenzia per assimigliarsi al maestro e, se possibil fosse, transformarsi in lui….[T]rovo una regula universalissima, la qual mi par valer circa questo in tutte le cose umane che si facciano o dicano piú che alcuna altra, e ciò è fuggir quanto piú si po, e come un asperissimo e pericoloso scoglio, la affettazione; e, per dir forse una nova parola, usar in ogni cosa una certa sprezzatura, che nasconda l'arte e dimostri ciò che si fa e dice venir fatto senza fatica e quasi senza pensarvi. Da questo credo io che derivi assai la grazia; perché delle cose rare e ben fatte ognun sa la difficultà, onde in esse la facilità genera grandissima maraviglia. (I.1-27)
>
> Therefore anyone who wants to be a good pupil must not only do things well but must also make a constant effort to imitate and if possible, exactly reproduce his master. I have discovered a universal rule which seems to apply more than any other in all human actions or words: namely, to steer away from affectation at all costs, as if it were a rough and dangerous reef, and (to use perhaps a novel word for it) to practice in all things a certain nonchalance (*sprezzatura*) which conceals all artistry and makes whatever one says or does seem uncontrived and effortless.

> I am sure that grace springs especially from this, since everyone knows how difficult it is to accomplish some unusual feat perfectly, and so facility in such things excites the greatest wonder. (I.1-27)

Castiglione casts these characteristics as humanist standards of good taste in literary and aristocratic circles. He advocates *sprezzatura*, nonchalance, "which conceals all artistry and makes whatever one says or does seem uncontrived and effortless" (I.26). Writers are called to imitate their forebears and to cultivate good form through knowledge of poetry, music, and Latin classics. Garcilaso traveled extensively and lived in Naples from 1532-1536. He would doubtless have been familiar with Neapolitan standards of style and poetic form. Following Castiglione's model, critics have explored Herrera's *Anotaciones* as a formal, systematic discourse on poetic form that is particularly linked to Italianate imitation of Classical sources in the Renaissance. Nevertheless, Herrera frequently calls attention to contemporary Spanish poets throughout his *Anotaciones* in ways not previously present in Castilian vernacular commentaries. Herrera's commentaries are linked to an emerging social and intellectual desire to elevate the Castilian vernacular to a legitimate position alongside Classical and Neapolitan writing. The formation of vernacular canons in romance languages did not involve the mere imitation of Italianate styles, but rather participation in larger Iberian conversations concerning the status of the vernacular. Italian and Latinate references are indeed present, but they are appropriated and refashioned within the Iberian context in new ways. The abundance of Iberian references in Herrera's *Anotaciones* underscores a corrective attempt to clarify Garcilaso's status in the early reception of the poet's work. Herrera not only distinguishes his work from that of El Brocense; he also situates his

commentary within an emerging discourse of Garcilaso scholarship. Herrera's *Anotaciones* become in this way indispensable glosses in a project of vernacular canon formation.

i. The *Anotaciones* and the Rise of the Vernacular:

In the original circulating manuscripts, Herrera's 1580 commentary was accompanied by an introduction by Francisco de Medina that implicitly calls attention to larger questions of canon formation. Medina's introduction is significant in that it draws upon the possibilities and implications of the vernacular in contemporary literary culture. Inoria Pepe and José María Reyes write:

> Con un examen tan lúcido y despiadado, Medina trata en suma, una vez más, de reivindicar las posibilidades de la lengua española para expresarse en los niveles más altos y, contemporáneamente, de manifestar la carencia de una tradición literaria en que hacer hincapié para su desarrollo. El maestro sevillano y Herrera comparten esta posición con otros escritores de su tiempo. (26)

The rise of the vernacular as a worthy form of expression is closely linked to the reappropriation of classical texts and to the processes of *translatio studii* and *imperii.* Ignacio Navarrete points out that during the sixteenth century, although the Spanish Empire was the politically and militarily superior power, there existed a prominent "perception of Italian cultural superiority," manifested primarily in the imitation of Petrarch, whose work served as a "source of poetic renewal, as poets continuously reread, reinterpreted, and reappropriated his work" (*Orphans* 15). Vittore Bocchetta adds to this effect that "la novedad de la técnica del verso, el uso nuevo de la metáfora, la distinta

elaboración de las imágenes… que habían entrado en España por el camino de Italia, no significaron, en nuestra opinión, una imitación poética, sino, más bien, un nuevo y mero <<medio>> poético, una adaptación" (9). The cultural reappropriation of Italian style marks the westward movement of cultural, literary, and artistic capital— *translatio studii*— as a vehicle in the process of *translatio imperii* and the rise of Spanish political, cultural, and economic power throughout Europe and beyond. Garcilaso resituates the idyllic, Arcadian pastoral scene of his Italian predecessors within central Castile along the banks of the Tagus. The Tagus, a river that embraces the imperial city of Toledo, recalls by analogy the Tiber and Rome, the imperial and cultural center of the classical world. The poet not only affirms Spanish cultural legitimacy through the recreation of the pastoral scenes in Castilian verse; he likewise asserts a sense of continuity between antiquity and humanist culture. In his discussion of political and cultural influence, Navarrete explains: "By casting both political and literary history in terms of *translatio*, [writers] seek to predict that literary accomplishments will eventually catch up with military ones. But in the process they reveal a rivalry with Italy for cultural legitimacy, based on feelings of belatedness and displacedness" (18). "Displacedness," therefore, refers to a perception of artistic inferiority that arises as a politically hegemonic culture adapts the styles of another and strives to legitimate its own literary history. One should clarify, however, that Garcilaso does not merely imitate classical subtexts; rather, he transforms source verses for new purposes and ultimately fashions himself as a contemporary Virgil in sixteenth-century humanist circles.

This broader European context, and in particular the state of Castilian vis-à-vis classical works, is central to the rise of the vernacular in Spain. Many scholars wrote of

Iberian figures worthy of imitation— models both ancient and modern. Alfonso de Cartagena, Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, Diego de Burgos, and others invoked the classical contributions of Seneca, Lucan, and Quintilian to bolster their own nationalist claims. A polemic on Spanish "roots" arose partly in response to anti-Spanish sentiment among Italian writers of the age. Sánchez de Arévalo cites legendary origins, recalling that in the Iberian Peninsula "fuerunt reges longe ante primam destructionem Troiae" (146).[3] Hernán Núñez' celebrated glosses to his edition of Juan de Mena's *Laberinto de Fortuna* (1499) are indicative of an intellectual endeavor to elevate the status of the vernacular through poetry. Julian Weiss remarks, "El comentario constituye una novedad en la Castilla de la época, por su extensión, métodos y objetivos. La innovación consiste en aplicar a un poema vernáculo las técnicas filológicas que los humanistas italianos habían elaborado para recuperar los clásicos y depurarlos de los errores de la transmisión manuscrita" (*Glosa* 5). Ambrosio de Morales likewise commented on the need to elevate the status of Castilian for artistic purposes: "Por esto me duelo yo siempre de la mala suerte de nuestra lengua Castellana, que siendo ygual con todas las buenas en abundancia, en propriedad, variedad y lindeza, y haziendo en algo desto a muchas ventaja, por culpa o negligencia de nuestros naturales está tan olvidada y tenida en poco, que ha perdido mucho de su valor" (139). Juan de Valdés' *Diálogo de la lengua* (1535) served in great measure to elevate the prestige of the Spanish vernacular to that of other European languages. For Valdés, there were no inferior or superior languages, as use conferred respect to languages. Valdés utilized the vernacular in a direct style, imitating spoken language; as a pedagogical model, Valdés' work incorporated proverbs (*refranes*)

---

[3] See Gómez Moreno, A. *España y la Italia de los humanistas*. Madrid: Gredos, 1994.

and idiomatic speech patterns into the development of his case for the elevation of the vernacular.

These examples hold important implications for early Spanish literary historiography, marking the Castilian vernacular as a worthy vernacular model for imitation in the sixteenth century. The case for the legitimacy of Castilian writing is likewise apparent in Nebrija's *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, in which Nebrija cites Juan de Mena's verses as examples of grammatical concepts and stylistic models. Dante, Boccaccio, and Petrarch were by this moment regarded as modern classics and models worthy of imitation in the vernacular; Nebrija's *Gramática,* the first of its kind to be published in Spain, invokes Mena and other Iberian authors and serves as a primer for vernacular Castilian writing and grammar. Ruiz Pérez observes:

> El mismo sentimiento de progreso que sustentaba la orgullosa afirmación de Nebrija en el prólogo de su *Gramática* sobre la altura insuperable alcanzada por la lengua castellana se extiende a lo largo del siglo a la poesía como a la prosa, en forma de sentimiento nacional, frente a las obras italianas que inicialmente les sirven de modelo, pero que cada vez sienten como más claramente superadas por las propias creaciones….Entre este conjunto de voces, en esta superposición imitativa y emuladora de textos, la *autoritas* deja de ser un valor innato patrimonio de los *antiqui*, para convertirse en un galardón obtenido por el poeta con ayuda de su saber. (55-56)

In this sense, Latin allusions and references to Italian vernacular writers served not merely as sources of imitation, but as points of departure from which to create one's own Castilian poetry and prose. The resultant poems might even be said to rival their source

models and to take on new value through a unique creative impulse. Such is the Iberian context in which Garcilaso and Herrera lived and composed; Herrera's *Anontaciones* highlight Garcilaso's emulative quality that is particularly evident in Garcilaso's Latin poetry. At the same time, the *Anotaciones* situate Garcilaso as a contemporary classic—a model of imitation in the broader process of an emerging vernacular canon.

Medina's contemporaries, as well as future readers of the introduction, then, are asked to confront or at least recognize this perception of literary inferiority from the onset. Inoria Pepe and José María Reyes write: "[S]e capta que Medina está pensando en un lector culto, preocupado por la suerte de la lengua y la literatura de una España que, a pesar de la potencia militar adquirida en aquel tiempo, no había conseguido aún en el campo de las letras la supremacía de la que gozaba Italia" (25). From the onset, Medina localizes the Spanish vernacular within a tradition of imperial and cultural conquest. He calls to mind the military and linguistic conquests of the Greeks and Romans:

> Siempre fue natural pretensión de las gentes virtuosas procurar estender no menos el uso de sus lenguas que los términos de sus imperios, de donde antiguamente sucedía que cada cual nación tanto más adornava su lenguage cuanto con más valerosos hechos acrecentava la reputación de sus armas…. Crecieron, por cierto, las lenguas griega i latina al abrigo de las vitorias i subieron a la cumbre de su esaltación con la pujança del Imperio. (188-189)

Medina nevertheless draws important distinctions specific to the contemporary Iberian landscape. He suggests that while Classical writers could celebrate military conquests and forge "la inmortalidad de su fama" (188) through use of Greek and Latin, this was not yet so in the case of the Spanish vernacular. Medina recognizes that although many

literary and artistic works were produced, many initially failed to carry the same sense of cultural capital and worth in other European contexts.

Medina addresses the status of the vernacular in a global sense, outlining reasons for which Iberian literary production did not initially match military exploits. He writes: "El ultimo daño que los nuestros recibieron en esta conquista fue aver tan pocos autores los cuales, como caudillos, los guiassen por medio de l'aspereza de aquesta barbaria, i si los avía, faltó quién se los diesse a conocer. I assí, los que de su inclinación se aficionavan a la beldad de nuestra lengua (la cual, bien que desnuda i sin afeite)" (196). Here, Medina speaks to the lack of Iberian forebears to serve as models. Medina is only one intellectual among others to point to the lack of a developed Iberian canon and literary tradition in Spain. Like Juan de Valdés in his *Diálogo de la lengua* and Ambrosio de Morales in his *El discurso de la lengua castellana,* Medina aims to form part of the conversation intended to highlight the value of Castilian writing by turning attention to Castilian authors worthy of imitation and praise. By participating in such a dialogue, Medina both fosters the early canonization of Garcilaso de la Vega and makes Herrara's *Anotaciones* an indispensable component in the early formation of the vernacular canon. Medina remarks that, in spite of the lack of Castilian models, some authors stand out in bright relief:

> [N]o bastaron tantos i tan grandes impedimentos para que algunos de los nuestros no hablassen i escriviessen con admirable eloquencia. Entre los cuales se debe contar primero el ilustre cavallero Garci Lasso de la Vega, príncipe de los poetas castellanos, en quien claro se descubrió cuánto puede la fuerça de un ecelente ingenio de España i que no es impossible a nuestra lengua arribar cerca de la

> cumbre donde ya se vieron la griega i latina si nosotros con impiedad no la desamparássemos….[U]no de los mejores es Garci Lasso, cuya lengua sin duda escogerán las musas todas las vezes que uvieren de hablar castellano. (197)

Medina assigns Garcilaso's poetry a prominent role as a source of future poetic inspiration and imitation in the Castilian canon. As a treatise on broader literary dialogues, Medina's introduction shows that a process of vernacular canonization similar to that of Italian dialects is possible in the Iberian context, and that in Garcilaso (and Herrera), Spain might match the literary histories of other nation-states: "[T]endrá España quien pueda poner en competencia de los más señalados poetas i istoriadores de las otras regiones de Europa" (199). Equally, Medina makes Herrera's commentaries relevant and indispensible to the contemporary moment as the primer by which to understand Garcilaso's work: "En [las *Anotaciones*]… declaró los lugares oscuros que ai en él; descubrió las minas de donde sacó las joyas más preciosas con que enriqueció sus obras; mostró el artificio… i porque podamos imitallo con seguridad, nos advirtió de los descuidos… quedássemos desengaños i mejor instruidos" (200). This passage helps not only to underscore aspects of the original reception of Garcilaso's work (and that of the *Anotaciones);* it serves to emphasize the early stages in the canonization of Garcilaso's poetry as a source of imitation and interpretation in itself. Pepe and María Reyes note: "[L]a postura de Medina ante el texto herreriano es de una clarividencia llamativa, pues viene a sintetizar el proceso filológico o estético de Herrera frente a la obra de Garcilaso: sometida la obra del toledano a una particular aunque seria labor ecdótica… siempre desde la perspectiva de un gran poeta que se enfrenta a otro" (200). Herrera highlights

Garcilaso's debt to his literary forbears, and also shows the ways in which Garcilaso distinguishes his work in new ways.

Herrera's commentary remains unique in its distinction from other commentaries of his age. Sánchez de las Brozas, "El Brocense," published his commentary editions in 1574 and 1577, emphasizing above all the Latinate and Italianate influences in the work. El Brocense adopts an approach of annotating Classical influences that had been widely practiced, focusing attention on classical sources and line comparisons. Herrera embraces a humanist approach, but localizes Garcilaso's poetry within its Iberian intellectual context and submits it to criticism. Although El Brocense's work and Herrera's *Anotaciones* pertain to a similar exegetical tradition, they are distinct in the ends they seek to accomplish. Carmen Codoñer holds that, while Herrera's *Anotaciones* emerge from an established tradition, his work remains unique as it advances commentary as a genre:

> Propio de Herrera… es la atención preferente a las reminiscencias de autores próximos al poeta, en lengua romance…. El comentario de Herrera se mantiene en la línea del comentario filológico, aunque exagerándolo en ciertos aspectos e insertando otros elementos relativamente innovadores que van en el sentido de la transformación…. En efecto, el paso del comentario a la crítica sólo se producirá cuando el núcleo de la atención lo ocupe el nexo entre poema y significación. (34-35)

Herrera makes reference to a wide range of Italianate, Classical, Andalusian, and Castilian writers and situates Garcilaso within the early poetic exchanges of his cultural and political moment. At first glance, annotations from such diverse sources might seem

contradictory. I argue, conversely, that the variety and breadth of literary traditions is indicative of Herrera's larger project. The diverse literary traditions and allusions cited in the *Anotaciones* serve as far more than a paratext for an understanding of Garcilaso's work—they are also a mark of Herrera's own understanding and participation in the discourses of his social milieu.

Herrera was an accomplished poet in his own right, even before the publication of annotations on Garcilaso. Ignacio Navarrete argues that Herrera used his commentaries subversively— as a means to decenter the early vernacular canon that privileged Garcilaso as the touchstone of Italianate styles in Spain. In doing so, Herrera demonstrates his own intellectual stature and forges a position for himself within the canon. In "Decentering Garcilaso: Herrera's Attack on the Canon," Navarrete writes: "Herrera put forth a version of literary history that is a carefully crafted fiction used for polemical purposes. The notes attempt to direct the readers' intertextual location of Garcilaso's poetry, while the profusion of source citations undermines the poet's image as a courtier whose poems were acts of *sprezzatura*" (21). While El Brocense approaches Garcilaso's allusions as if they were effortless acts of poetic virtuosity, Herrera alternatively seeks to link these references to a studied, scholarly approach. Herrera's approach situates Garcilaso as one poet among many in a long tradition of imitation and appropriation. Navarrete notes that this is in keeping with Herrera's goals:

> Herrera appropriates Garcilaso instead as a predecessor of the learned kind of poetry he writes himself. The quotations of sources and analogues allow Herrera to insert himself into the intertext, through his translations of classical poetry, through inclusion of his own poems, and through the sheer quantity of

> annotations, which dwarfs the original texts. Furthermore, the overly erudite citations have a countereffect, as the mass of contradictory information subverts the very notion of authority and thus of canonicity. Such a reading of the *Anotaciones* can be confirmed by the responses of Herrera's contemporary readers. (21)

In the early development of the vernacular canon, this approach contrasted sharply with many of the prevailing opinions surrounding Garcilaso's poetry.

The early reception of Garcilaso (and Herrera) has distinctly shaped subsequent literary histories, particularly on ideas pertaining to imitation and transformation. Though Gonzalo Argote de Molina advocated the use of traditional Spanish forms, he nonetheless highlighted Garcilaso's poetic skill in his *Discurso sobre la poesía castellana* (1575) where he writes: "que en la dulçura y lindeza de conceptos, y en el arte y elegancia no deue nada a Petrarcha" (44). For Argote de Molina, Garcilaso is a worthy and capable poet in his own right, and one of very few Spanish intellectuals to successfully rival Italian styles. Ambrosio de Morales likewise refers to Garcilaso in his "Discurso de la poesía castellana" as a "luz muy esclarecida de nuestra nación, que ya no se contentan sus obras con ganar la victoria y el despojo de la Toscana, sino con lo mejor de lo Latino traen la competencia, y no menos que con lo muy precioso de Virgilio y Horacio se enrriquescen" (187). This privileging of Garcilaso in early literary histories positioned the poet as the only Spanish figure to be used as a model for future imitation of Italian styles. Early commentators set Garcilaso in bright relief to the other figures of his age, yet Herrera also subjected his verses to scrutiny and provided an extensive cataloguing of sources.

Ideas on the nature of imitation, the perception of Garcilaso as a poet-courtier-warrior, and Garcilaso's link to the status of the vernacular are central to the early reception of his work. As the Tuscan dialect gained precedence as the language of literature in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Petrarch was regarded as the chief model for imitation in commentaries. Likewise, in Spain, figures such as Ambrosio de Morales and Gonzalo Argote de Molina recognized Garcilaso as the foremost rival to Petrarch in the Spanish vernacular. G. W. Pigman differentiates among three forms of interaction with the source texts; his approximation provides a useful frame in which to contextualize the reception of Garcilaso's poetry vis-à-vis Petrarch:

> [A]nalogies, images, and metaphors fall into three general classes, which I shall call transformative, dissimulative, and eristic…. The transformative class includes apian, digestive, filial, and simian metaphors…. Dissimulative imagery and explicit advice of dissimulation refer to concealing or disguising the relation between text and model. The doctrines conveyed by these two classes pose serious problems for the interpreter who tries to understand imitations and allusions because they advise the effacement of resemblances between text and model…. Eristic metaphors justify the interpreter's attempt to understand resemblances between texts as allusions, suggest that a text may criticize and correct its model, and reveal a persistent ambivalence in emulation. (3-4)

As an imitator, emulator, and transformer of classical images and styles, Garcilaso's poetry is indicative of eristic *imitatio*—in which the poetic voice rewrites and reframes the allusions of his predecessors. The Renaissance reader, versed in Latin, is invited to view not only the sense of artifice, but moreover, a studied approach present in these

transformations. Pigman also cites Erasmus: “An imitator, however, desires to say not so much the same things as similar ones— in fact sometimes not even similar, but rather equal things. But the emulator strives to speak better, if he can” (25). Here, Erasmus invokes the classical, Ciceronian distinction between imitation (*imitatio*) and emulation (*aemulatio*). Garcilaso does not merely imitate, but also appropriates his Italian, Iberian, and Greco-Roman predecessors to increase Castilian cultural capital. Rachel Schmidt discusses Italian plunder, noting that Herrera “urges his compatriots not only to imitate Roman literary forms, but also the imperial practice of appropriating linguistic spoil, fruits of imperial victory” (17). By appropriating Italian literary and artistic spoils, Garcilaso and his contemporaries sought to validate Castilian cultural history through emulation and transformation of knowledge. Mary E. Barnard provides a useful approximation within which to describe this pattern of emulation in relation to the Orpheus tapestry: “Garcilaso ‘dismembers’ his sources, adapts, and transforms fragments of his antecedents, reconstructs them, and in the process fabricates *his* text” (316). She adds that Garcilaso’s Orpheus “no longer enchants…. Garcilaso deprives him of his lyre; its absence reinforces the notion that Orpheus has lost that special gift to create universal harmony” (321), underscoring a recasting of classical mythology. Garcilaso’s transformative approach, then, links the visual to notions of cultural appropriation: “Garcilaso keeps a delicate balance between *copia* (extension) and *brevitas* (compression) that Erasmus sees as concomitant with ‘true plenitude of language’: the latter occurs not in simple extension, but in inventive richness” (9).

A similar variation in the use of source allusions can be said of Herrera’s commentaries, linked to Herrera’s larger cultural project. In some instances, Herrera

makes only brief mention of a source, while in others, he provides an extended discussion (or omission) of source verses or authors. Bienvenido Morros notes that: "Herrera sabe que el primer paso para poner la lengua castellana en el estado que merece es la traducción o adaptación de… la latina o italiana…pero no siempre se ciñe a la letra de sus modelos, sino que a veces los reelabora con bastante libertad" (59). In fine, criticism on the *Anotaciones* has frequently emphasized Herrera's encyclopedic approach or revisionist perspectives, and has often framed the work as a treatise on poetic form.

ii. *Cancionero* Legacies and the Literary Histories of Garcilaso

Iberian *cancionero* poetry—as a diverse corpus of manuscripts, a series of rhetorical codes, and an ever-expanding subject of exegesis—resists singular interpretations and readings made at face value. In his *Prologus Baenensis* (1444), Juan Alfonso de Baena remarks that: "[E]l arte de la poetría e gaya çiençia es una escriptura e compusiçión muy sotil e bien graçiosa, e es dulçe e muy agradable a todos los oponientes e respondientes d'ella, e componedores e oyentes. La qual çiençia e avisaçión e dotrina que d'ella depende e es avida e reçebida e alcançada por graçia infusa del Señor Dios" (7). As such, poetry emerges as an ennobling and enfranchising art closely linked to courtly culture, as well as to its social uses. *Cancionero* manuscripts, touched as they are by regional histories and cultural, linguistic, and political heterogeneity, have been circulated throughout early modernity and well into the nineteenth century. Despite the continued diffusion of these texts and the familiarity of many early modern poets with the writings of their Iberian forebears, the construction of modern literary canons has greatly underrepresented the influence of the *cancionero* tradition beyond the fifteenth century.

The *cancioneros* have often been viewed as miscellanies, examples of experimental poetry, or old-fashioned writing set in opposition to the prevailing Italianate styles that followed. While Garcilaso has remained the galvanized champion of Neapolitan styles—the only figure to rival Petrarch in Spain— few scholars have recognized Garcilaso's debt to the *cancioneros*. Nevertheless, literary histories often relegate Garcilaso to a singular position as the foremost Italianate poet of Spain. This chapter therefore outlines notable features of *cancionero* poetry more generally, and then applies these ideas to Garcilaso's *oeuvre* to postulate an alternative discourse.

The cancionero tradition. The *cancioneros* are among the most understudied Iberian traditions represented in contemporary literary canons, graduate program reading lists, and recent publications. Though Brian Dutton's monumental 1992 study contributed much to advance bibliographical studies on the *cancioneros*, scholarship continues to view the tradition in limited and simplified terms. E. Michael Gerli writes of *Cancionero* poets:

> When they are read, if they are read at all today, it seems that it is always as a duty. Seen only as the mouthpieces of an effete ruling class given over to the pursuit of abstract, mannered, verse, *cancionero* poets have been labeled little more than textual curiosities or practitioners of a 'primitive' form of poetic discourse against which to measure the lyric flights taken by the revolutionary Boscán or the divine Garcilaso (Lapesa 1985), who boldly accommodated the themes and forms of the Italian Renaissance to Spanish letters. (*Poetry at Court* 171)

Cancionero poetry was one of the most enduring Iberian literary traditions, and works were produced extensively into the seventeenth century and read well through the nineteenth century. Gracián's "Arte de Ingenio" (1642) and "Agudeza y arte de ingenio" (1648) are two examples of noteworthy treatises that circulated in manuscript and also discussed the *cancionero* tradition as poetry worthy of imitation. María Isabel Toro Pascua notes that: "Gracián ha sido considerado el erudito que dignifica la poesía de cancionero al considerarla modelo literario apropiado para la imitación, merced a la introducción de algunos de sus versos como ejemplos retóricos en su "Agudeza y arte de ingenio" (67).

To draw a comparison to a modern example, consideration of the *Cancionero de Miguel de Unamuno* provides a case study in the construction of poetic identities. Josse de Kock comments on the presence of the editorial hand in the compilation of the *Cancionero de Miguel de Unamuno* (1953). De Kock states: "Cuando se estudian los borradores, que subsisten en papeles sueltos, sobres, hojas de guardia y cartas se observan las múltiples y profundas transformaciones a que se somete el primer brote y hasta qué punto puede diferir la versión definitiva de la primera" (14). The *Cancionero de Miguel de Unamuno* serves as a case study in the construction of poetic identities and speaks to the reading pragmatics at work in the *cancionero* tradition. Federico de Onís arranged and edited the *Cancionero de Miguel de Unamuno;* he published the edition seventeen years after the poet's death. By 1953, Unamuno was already recognized as a canonical writer, and de Onís organized the manuscript according to Unamuno's literary profile. Such editorial interventions change the parameters of future interpretations of the poet and his corpus. For many readers, de Onís' editorial interventions (and the 1953

publication) convey the impression that the organization of works was in fact done by Unamuno's design. In reality, de Onís shapes the reader's interaction with the text by imposing a rubric or paratext that reinforces the notion of a neatly constructed poetic persona.

In consideration of these rubrications, one might divide *cancionero* poems into three general and often overlapping categories, which Miguel de Santiago describes as: "1) poesía amorosa; 2) poesía burlesca; 3) poesía doctrinal, ética o didáctico-moral" (219). It is central in all three cases, nevertheless, to draw attention to aspects of wit, pragmatics, and rhetoric common among numerous *cancionero* poets. In his article "Antón de Montoro and the Wages of Eloquence: Poverty, Patronage, and Poetry in 15th-century Castile," Gerli outlines a discussion of pragmatics and an economy of problematic signs at work in the *cancioneros*. Through wit and satire, Antón de Montoro achieved a sense of social enfranchisement by means of poetry; the 'low' register and self-proclaimed poverty in this case did not correspond to a realistic self-portrait of the poet's status, and the illusiveness of language comes to the fore. Gerli shows how the comments of Ciceri and Rodríguez Puértolas present an oversimplified view of Montoro: "[Montoro's last will and testament] suggests, rather, a more subtly complex figure who moved in an environment full of both advantage and abuse—a figure who may, in fact, have shaped a successful literary and commercial career out of complaint and self-fashioned down-troddenness" (269). Montoro in fact constructs poetic persona in his poetry and describes himself as a poor, ironic *converso*; he likewise utilized ingenious word play, often through the use of double and triple puns. Consequently, Montoro is one of many *cancionero* poets that critics have generally read biographically in

subsequent criticism. *Cancionero* verses cannot be read at face-value, and therefore, it is a productive endeavor to view the *cancioneros* through the social dimensions of their composition and circulation.

Modern criticism has frequently dismissed the *cancioneros* as fragmented documents. It is true that the *cancioneros* are diverse texts, used for specific purposes over different historical periods. They are often taken out of context, and much work remains to be done in order to read the *cancioneros* through social circumstances of their production.

This notion of fragmentation, or more pointedly, the notion that the *cancioneros* lack a degree of unity, can be resolved if one considers the intervention of an editorial hand, as well as the conceptual mapping of abstract ideas, at work in the *cancioneros*. The systems of ideas at work in the *cancioneros* often operate on different levels of abstraction, often with a surprising degree of logic and unity across distinct poems and verses. Such is the case of Cartagena's poetry, for example, in which specific images, symbols, colors, and diction are purposely evoked in seemingly unrelated areas of the manuscript for thematic purposes, as well as to highlight the irony of language itself (Gerli "Reading Cartagena:" 178). As modern readers begin to consider the *cancioneros* through the lenses of word play, abstract ideas, and broader political circumstances, a nuanced and diverse account of the social and courtly matrix of *cancionero* poetry emerges. The same can also be argued for Garcilaso's legacy as a *cancionero* poet; as a participant in the discourses and intellectual production of his age, Garcilaso cannot be regarded as merely a talented Italianate poet.

The works of sixteenth-century poets often show evidence of (and often responses to) the literary influences of the composers' social milieu. Ana María Gómez Bravo calls attention to the social networks and materiality of manuscript culture in *Textual Agency: Writing Culture and Social Networks in Fifteenth-Century Spain.* Her analysis is relevant to the discussion of Garcilaso at hand, as similar networks among poets existed in the sixteenth-century; this is particularly the case in Garcilaso's poetic corpus, often via resonances of Cartagena and Juan de Mena. Gómez Bravo writes: "Materialist approaches help bridge the gap between exclusive textuality and that which exists outside language….This interplay grants the text an agency that stems both from human agents and situations, and from the motility of the text as a discrete artifact in a constant process of becoming, making relevant the issue of the textual situation" (5). The motility and movement of the text are germane to subsequent studies on Garcilaso, as readers often shape the evolution of literary histories through their own critical responses. This is particularly true given the distance that often exists between the text itself and the interpretations and paratexts that have been inscribed throughout generations of scholarship on the poet.

The material production and diffusion of the poet's works is consistent with their circulation in manuscripts and early printed editions. The presence of the editorial hand in initial compilation and organization of Garcilaso's corpus informs the ways in which scholars received and commented on the poet in subsequent editions. The rubrications introduced by Ana Girón, printers, and booksellers such as Juan Bages must be questioned as semi-authorial interventions that guide future literary histories and reader reception. Martín de Riquer's excellent study on Boscán brings together primary-source

documents from Boscán's poetry and early publication history; these documents likewise provide insight into the early literary history of Garcilaso from a material perspective. Riquer includes a copy of the book contract between Boscán and the bookseller Juan Bages. Boscán signed the contract on March 23, 1542 and agreed to production of one thousand copies of an edition—a large press run for the date— that included "las obras de Boscán y otras" (230). In the original contract itself, six blank lines follow the word "otras;" Riquer speculates that Boscán no doubt counted Garcilaso's works among the "otras" mentioned in the contract: "[S]e pensaba puntualizar que estas 'otras' eran las de Garcilaso que se imprimieron a continuación de las de [Boscán]" (230). The book contract listed both husband and wife— Boscán and Ana Girón—and stated that they agreed to the following terms: "se comprometen a entregarle el original, a corregir las formas que presentará el impresor y a conseguir el privilegio" (230). Ana Girón thus is mentioned explicitly in the initial contract; this reference takes on new significance in the year that follows. It is a safeguard that, whether intentional or otherwise, protects Girón's status as the eventual compiler and editor of the volume. After the signing of the Boscán-Bages agreement, a printing contract was drawn on March 27, 1542 between the bookseller, Juan Bages, and the printers, Carlos and Juan Amorós.

Following Boscán's unexpected death on September 21, 1542, Ana Girón carried out the organization and editing of Boscán's corpus, which included Garcilaso's poetic work. The publication appeared in 1543 under the title *Las obras de Juan Boscán y algunas de Garcilasso de la Vega repartidas en quatro libros.* Girón's compilation and redaction represents the first editorial intervention in a published edition on the poet. It raises some important questions on rubrications and the later circulation of the works of

both Boscán and Garcilaso. Future readers of Garcilaso owe much to Ana Girón for ensuring that this volume be published. At this historical moment, the Amorós printers were esteemed in literate circles in Barcelona; Clavería Laguarda describes the published volume as "uno de los libros mejor pensados y cuidados del renacimiento español" (x) both for its poetic and historical position in literary histories. In her prologue, Girón explains that Boscán intended to organize Garcilaso's works following the poet's death:

> por q deſpues de la muerte de Garcilaſſo le entregarõ a el ſus obras para que las de xaſſe como deuian de eſtar. Ya que ponia la mano en adereçar todo eſto y querria deſpues de muy bien limado y polido (como el ſin falta lo ſupiera hazer) dar eſte libro ala ſeñora Duqueſa de Soma, y le tenia ya eſcrita la carta que va en el principio del ſegundo libro plugo a dios de lleuarſelo al cielo: y anſi huuo de parar todo cõ tan gran cauſa. Deſpues ha parecido paſſar adelante lo que el dexaua empeçado, digo la impreſſiõ, q en la enmiēda de ſus obras y las de Boſcan no es coſa que nadie la auia de oſar emprender….biē ſe ſabe que tenia intēciõ de mudar muchas coſas: y es de creer q no dexara ninguna o pocas q offēniera alos bueos juyzios. (4)

> because after Garcilaso's death the latter's works had been handed over to him so that he might arrange them properly. Just as he was beginning to get all this in order and planning to dedicate this volume to the Duchess of Soma, after perfecting it, as he knew best how to do, and just as he had finished writing to her the dedicatory letter at the beginning of the second book, it pleased God to take him to Heaven, and hence, for this imperative reason, everything came to a halt.

> Later it was decided to go forward with what he had begun, that is the printing, for the emendation of his works and Garcilaso's was not something that anyone else would dare to undertake….[W]e know very well that he intended to change many things and can trust that he would have left almost nothing to offend good judgment. (4)

This prologue reveals that others in Garcilaso's milieu read his work and sent manuscripts to Boscán for later organization and future circulation—yet the passage also raises the question of by whom works were sent. Taken together, the early compiling by Boscán, the subsequent organization by Girón, and the indication that Garcilaso's corpus was compiled from manuscripts sent to Boscán by others collectively point toward the idiosyncratic nature and possible infidelity of what is preserved and circulated in later editions on the poet.

Most poetry circulated in manuscript form in the sixteenth-century; it was rare for printers to publish a book of poems by specific poets. The title of the volume, "*…y algunas de Garcilasso de la Vega,*" suggests that more works were in circulation. One must infer that any one of the editorial forces at work may have omitted poems from the overall Garcilaso corpus—Garcilaso's friends and family may have rejected specific works, while Boscán, Girón, or Bages may have omitted certain poems from the compilation of the 1543 edition. Though modern scholarship may speak of Garcilaso's corpus as a fixed canon, it is instead pertinent to view Garcilaso's poetry in terms of which works circulated and survived the compilation and publication of early editions.

Following the 1543 edition, an edition was printed in Antwerp in 1544 and sold by the publisher Martin Nucio. Nucio had traveled throughout Spain and was a licensed

publisher of Spanish works in Antwerp. Nucio was a well-known printer of hundreds of Spanish texts, including editions of the *Romancero General*, the writing of Antonio de Guevara, religious and scientific works, various *cancioneros*, and numerous works in Latin and French. The 1544 Antwerp edition is significant because it stands as one example of the influence of printers in the circulation and future literary histories on Boscán and Garcilaso. Nucio's interaction with the earlier 1543 edition, as well as his subsequent version, underscores Nucio's editorial intervention in the future production and diffusion of editions on the poets. In the colophon to the 1544 Antwerp edition, Nucio indicates that he emended and corrected the earlier edition; his comments form a rubrication to subsequent readings of Boscán and Garcilaso and reveal an intervention that affects future readings on both poets. Nucio remarks on the types of changes he introduced in the 1544 edition:

> Estas obras de Iuan Boscán y algunas de Garcilaso de la Vega, además que hay muchas añadidas que hasta agora nunca fueron impressas son también corregidas y emendadas de muchas faltas que por descuydo de los officiales en las impressiones se hallaron, de manera que van agora mejor corregidas, más complidas y en mejor orden que hasta agora han sido impressas. (299v)

This type of deliberation places the editor in a quasi-authorial position, creating the illusion of a holograph; the reader is compelled to note the subjective nature of Nucio's organization, particularly through the qualitative judgements that inform the basis for his redaction. Editorial intervention implies agency and the ability to make crucial changes in the text's reception. Nucio introduced a series of modifications to guide future diffusion and publication of Garcilaso's corpus. In the 1544 Antwerp edition, Nucio

includes works that were previously unprinted, corrects errors found in the previous edition, numbers the pages, and reorganizes the works themselves. Menéndez y Pelayo catalogues some of the specific new material introduced by Nucio, indicating that the printer introduced fourteen new works attributed to Boscán, among them the *Conversión* and *Mar de Amor* (X.137). Readers are invited to consider Nucio's editorial decisions as corrective editorial gestures that add to the rubrications surrounding the poetic corpus of both poets. These interventions are significant, given that they affect later literary histories; such decisions particularly speak to the many hands that have an impact on the production and circulation of poetic works at the material level.

To this effect, Antonio Rodríguez-Moñino examines the idiosyncratic circulation and diffusion of poetic works. Readers often wish to know the circumstances under which texts are composed; when evidence is insufficient or contradictory, scholars often resort to positing selective readings—convenient fictions— to bolster the reassuring explanation at hand. Rodríguez-Moñino draws attention to the muddled circulation of works in *sueltos*, recopied manuscripts, and multiple versions of the same texts. According to Rodríguez-Moñino, scholars must acknowledge these contradictions; doing so does not detract from a work itself, but instead recognizes the multiple perspectives and material evidence that result from the idiosyncratic transmission of recopied manuscripts and published editions. In the case of Góngora's poetry, Rodríguez-Moñino writes: "Hay erróneas interpretaciones, erradas interpolaciones de los comentadores, amén de lamentabilísimas erratas que hacen inextricables determinadas composiciones" (17). Rodríguez-Moñino presents a textual analysis of the *romance* "Servía en Orán al Rey," in which he discusses three widely different versions of the verses. Three glosses

survive for this *romance*, two of which are incomplete and one of which is found interspersed in a manuscript "entre las estrofas de una comedia" (21). In the case of *Las obras de Juan Boscán y algunas de Garcilasso de la Vega repartidas en quatro libros*, in addition to published editions (which varied in specific works and organization), the Boscán and Garcilaso's poetry likewise circulated in *sueltos*, unpublished manuscripts, and recopied manuscripts of early printed editions. The idiosyncratic circulation and diffusion of poetry, coupled with multiple versions and inconsistencies, adds a useful interpretative consideration to both the study of Boscán and Garcilaso. As Rodríguez-Moñino shows, in cases for which literary or historical circumstances are unclear or contradictory, people often prefer *etiological* explanations to account for such idiosyncrasies. Etiological explanations seek to establish underlying causes of origin; when such causes cannot be clearly determined, a supposed cause is often speculated in historical or mythical terms and taken as truth. In the case of literary histories, these approaches promote reassuring readings, though in doing so, they prioritize a reassuring fiction that imposes order to conflicting literary and cultural influences. This is precisely what has in fact occurred in the literary histories on Garcilaso, particularly through the biographical discourse. By returning to issues of manuscript circulation and discrepancies among printed editions, the reader is called to reexamine approaches to Garcilaso with an eye toward material culture and the interactions among poets and commentators.

Another edition of *Las obras de Juan Boscán y algunas de Garcilasso de la Vega repartidas en quatro libros* appeared in Lisbon in 1544 and contributed to the diffusion of Garcilaso's corpus. Elias Rivers notes that from 1543-1557, "seventeen different editions

of the same substantial volume were published throughout a wide geographical area, from Barcelona and Lisbon to Medina del Campo, Estella, Salamanca, León, Venice, Antwerp, and Paris" (1996: 69). The volume and circulation of these editions speaks to the demand for Boscán and Garcilaso's poetic works, and also to the range and diffusion of these works in literary communities throughout Europe. In 1556, Nucio published another edition on the poets, correcting his earlier volume in light of the modifications introduced by others in previous editions. In his 1556 dedication, Nucio comments on the types of changes he made as well as the reputation of the poets and the subsequent reprinting that occurred during the past decade.

Las obras de Juan Boscán y algunas de Garcilasso de la Vega repartidas en quatro libros thus had been reproduced so many times—"tantas vezes auian ſido impreſſas" (299)— that the 1556 edition marks an intervention by which to correct and emend the works. Nucio remarks in his prologue: "Hallar se ha también en esta impressión alguna mudança en la manera de escrivir de lo que hasta agora se ha usado, la qual no he usado sacar a luz hasta que fuesse aprovada de muchos hombres doctos y ábiles en la lengua castellana, cuya aprobación me dio alas para comunicarla" (220). The numerous subsequent editions are indicative of the cultural capital assigned to Boscán and Garcilaso, as well as the philological attention paid to the poets in this cultural and historical moment. Nevertheless, Nucio's edition is also a corrected edition of previously redacted editions—establishing a circular process of editorial intervention and change.

In 1569 and 1570, the first published editions of Garcilaso's poetry by itself were printed in Salamanca and Madrid, respectively. El Brocense's 1574 edition provided the first commentary on the poet, emphasizing Garcilaso's treatment of classical and Italian

models. El Brocense's edition is linked to its social and educational uses, principally in Salamanca. Rivers notes that el Brocense's edition "was intended above all for university students, a fact documented in a letter dated May of 1574. The annotations…appealed to academic readers, familiar with the classics, who enjoyed comparing their favorite Spanish lines with prestigious models" (1996: 69). In these closed scholarly circles, Garcilaso's corpus, read alongside el Brocense's annotations, is situated within a new, academic context.

El Brocense's commentaries constitute another rubrication to Garcilaso's work that promoted, above all, recognition of the classical subtexts at work in Garcilaso's verses. The commentaries likewise eclipse the poems themselves and therefore have to be questioned as editorial interventions in the study of Garcilaso's corpus. University students versed in Latin were led to consider the classical subtext alongside Garcilaso's verses based upon the rubric inscribed in the 1574 edition. Rivers highlights that "both professors and students received, from the annotated editions (1574-1612) of Garcilaso's poetry…lessons in classical imitatio" (1996: 70). El Brocense's edition, as an authorial intervention mediated through commentary, draws attention away from Garcilaso's poetry itself, and guides subsequent interpretations on Garcilaso's poetic corpus. In the closed society of classical scholars, study of the parallels between Garcilaso's corpus and the source texts not only underscores the pleasure and prestige of recognition of source models—it also validates the scholars' status as well-read members of such a literate community.

Garcilaso, Petrarch, and the cancionero tradition. Among those that have discussed Garcilaso's *cancionero* legacies are Rafael Lapesa, Antonio Prieto, Margot

Arce de Vázquez, and Aurora Hermida Ruiz—each with distinct approaches and lenses of interpretation. Prieto suggests that Garcilaso's work conveys a distinct and individualized, though problematic, approach to the *cancionero petrarquista*:

> Garcilaso, que tanto saber humanista recoge desde Petrarca, escribe un cancionero personal, incluso rebelde, que responde a su individual sentir amoroso, oponiéndose así a aquel petrarquismo uniforme, en parte como educación, que Castaldi da Peltre, amigo de Bembo, denunciaba, ya que el amor era un «fuoco interiore» que exigía, en cada individuo que lo sentía, un lenguaje propio. (101)

According to Prieto, Garcilaso's poetry as such draws upon Petrarch, but more pointedly, reveals a unique and personal approach; more than a mere recapitulation of Petrarchan themes and motifs, such a posture remains consistent with a biographical interpretation of Garcilaso. This is problematic for reasons that will be discussed in the pages that follow. Such biographical readings are not uncommon in the literary histories of Garcilaso, from that of Keniston to those written far into the late twentieth century. Following readings on the troubadours and Petrarch, Keniston underscores a tendency to treat Garcilaso's poetry as sentimental autobiography, as was often the case in studies on Petrarch. Lapesa shifted the discussion away from questions of sincerity to questions of aesthetics and style; a 'depoliticized' Garcilaso could likewise be viewed in nationalist terms (even as scholars themselves debated whether or not it is apt to consider the reality of a Spanish Renaissance). More recently, criticism has shifted discussion away from questions of style toward considerations of literary textuality— the material form, circulation, and cultural circumstances of manuscripts—and to questions of social context and rhetoric.

The approaches of Lapesa, Prieto, and Gallego Morell will be discussed in further detail in the pages that follow. I situate my approximation near that of Aurora Hermida Ruiz, through her emphasis of how frames of reception privilege different critical accounts of Garcilaso's poetry and orient the poet and his contemporaries within the social and political spaces of the courts.

As early as in 1961, Margot Arce de Vázquez posited an alternative to limited biographical readings, concurrently rejecting the apparent division between Italianate and *cancionero* styles. Such a sharp divide, she argues, in reality never existed:

> El hecho de que Garcilaso utilizara los métricos italianos y Cristóbal de Castillejo permaneciera fiel a la tradición castellana, no es suficiente, a mi entender, para que se trace una divisoria tan acusada entre ambos….Las diferencias de estilo poético no surgen, ya lo sabemos todos, bruscamente, ni mucho menos como hechos aislados. El desarrollo de un estilo nuevo es un proceso lento, aunque seguro, en el cual las transformaciones van aparaciendo, destacándose poco a poco sobre el fondo del estilo anterior. No negamos, por lo tanto, que Herrera y Góngora hayan mirado a Garcilaso como modelo digno de imitación; pero tampoco atreveríamos a afirmar que entre aquéllos y éste existan diferencias apreciables de estilo. (11-12)

Throughout her monograph, Arce de Vázquez supports the claim that Garcilaso is both the precursor to Góngora, as well as one poet among many who wrote within the *cancionero* social and literary context of the age.

Aurora Hermida Ruiz specifically shows that Garcilaso's Petrarchism has been oversimplified, particularly within twentieth-century criticism; Garcilaso's poetry has

been used to support nationalist readings, especially among twentieth-century scholarship. In her essay "Silent Subtexts and *Cancionero* Codes: On Garcilaso de la Vega's Revolutionary Love," she traces such nationalist approximations in the commentaries of Lapesa, Rico, and Antonio Prieto. On Spanish Petrarchism, Hermida Ruiz suggests that:

> The struggle and distance between Italian and Castilian muses seems to be less radical, however, if we think of Petrarchism from a less idealistic point of view. Leonard Forster recommends that specialists of European Petrarchism should lower their expectations for profundity and originality from a movement that was so highly codified and fashionable…. It seems to me that the notion of radical change and modernity that has traditionally marked the distance between Garcilaso and *cancionero* poets somehow becomes blurred if we explore and connect the idiomatic character of Garcilaso's poetic diction with an equally conventional attitude towards love. This, of course, means sacrificing the romantic, idealized notion of Garcilaso as the first Spanish poet to contemplate the feeling of love in the intimate and solitary realm of his soul. (81-82).

Hermida Ruiz does not seek to diminish the significance of Garcilaso, but rather, to call attention to larger questions of historiography and literary conventions at work in the social, courtly contexts of early modern Spain. This does not entail vindicating *cancionero* poetry as a noble form in itself, Whinnom argued, but rather, to begin to ask a different set of questions specific to the social uses and linguistic features of Garcilaso's *oeuvre*. Such a reading, in conjunction with Guillory's approximation to cultural capital,

is central to larger questions concerning *cancionero* legacies, ancients and moderns, and the status of the vernacular.

Ancients, Moderns, and the Rise of the Vernacular. The literary histories on Garcilaso are linked to dialogues, quarrels, and discourses on ancients and moderns in the Renaissance. Garcilaso's rewriting of Latin subtexts occurs within the cultural and literary frame of the battle between ancients and moderns, a topic of debate that occurs from Antiquity well into the nineteenth century. This was a prominent *topos* in Renaissance writing, especially in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, corresponding with the rise of the academies of Rome, Florence, and Paris. The *querelle des Anciens et des Modernes* specifically emerges as a seventeenth century terminology among humanists including Tommaso Campanella, Charles Perrault, and others. The debate itself had been ongoing for centuries in humanist literary circles. Not paradoxically, Renaissance humanists like Garcilaso often viewed themselves as both ancient and modern simultaneously. For the Renaissance humanist, the ancient informed the modern, and vice versa. Ingrid D. Rowland remarks:

> The fifteenth- and sixteenth-century thinkers who hailed a rebirth of ancient values in their own time did so knowing that their own era was irrevocably distinct from antiquity….The shapers of that modern world also felt the need to have it incorporate the best elements of their forebears' existence. With a rationality born perhaps of commercial training, they probed the past for its systems, what they called "modi e ordini" (ways and orders) or "ragione" (method), hoping to recover the abstract principles that would give their own achievements enduring value. (1)

Humanist circles were closed societies for learned scholars versed in classical sources and Latin studies. Adolescent boys from the aristocratic classes learned Latin particularly through the study of Ovid and Virgil, and in doing so would have been familiar with the source works and verses. Homosocial bonds of solidarity emerged from the humanists' shared knowledge of classical authors, subtexts, and literary models. At the Roman Academy, for example, members edited classical texts, reviewed Roman history, and participated in the intellectual life of its social community. Latin studies united members in scholarship and friendship within a closed society of scholars:

> [Members] signaled their initiation as "brothers" (*fratres*) and "clubmen" (*sodales*) by taking antique names and speaking a Latin they hoped to have stripped of all its medieval words and mannerisms. Their heads wreathed in laurel, they reenacted ancient Roman festivals among the ruins or feasted within catacombs…. [B]rothers of the Roman Academy delivered orations and recited poems. (13)

The ongoing dialogue between ancients and moderns occurs in relief to the landscape of Roman artifacts including the basilicas, baths, and palace ruins of the Roman capital. For the closed, aristocratic community of humanists, classical culture and language served as a form of cultural capital.

The study of classical and contemporary works within a closed society nonetheless holds implications for readership. Contemporary humanists such as Garcilaso were writing works directed at a small but well-read humanist public. Garcilaso aimed to elicit not only knowledge of the source verses from his readers, but also recognition of his poetic virtuosity as a rewriting of the classical model. Consistent

with the discourse of solidarity, this likewise validates the reader's own literary acuity through the pleasure of having recognized and understood the classical reapproapriation at work in Garcilaso's verses.

In Spain, debates among ancients and moderns concerned approaches that privileged Classical imitation, or alternatively, those that emphasized originality, transformation, and the vernacular. The commentaries and annotations of El Brocense and Fernando de Herrera discussed earlier in this monograph respectively represent camps of this debate. The former emphasized the primacy of Classical imitation in Garcilaso's poetry, citing an extended list of Virgilian, Ovidian, and other source allusions. Herrera, by contrast, makes additional references to Castilian and Andalusian source verses and authors. In doing so, he draws attention to Garcilaso's contemporary social milieu and studied approach to poetic production. This is indicative of a broader project of canon formation on the part of Herrera, of which Garcilaso serves not only as a gifted intellectual, but one figure among many that demonstrated a deep, well-read approach to other Castilian poets of the courtly sphere. In "Petrarca-Bembo, Garcilaso-Herrera: el proyecto de un nuevo canon," José María Reyes Cano argues that, just as Bembo elevated the status of the vernacular (toward the formation of a vernacular canon), Herrera likewise shaped the processes of canon formation in Spain through his commentaries on Garcilaso. On Bembo, Reyes Cano remarks that the rise of the vernacular was quite revolutionary:

> Bembo siente cómo, en lengua vulgar, puede elevar a la categoría de clásicos a los grandes autores del Trecento; con la redacción de los *Asolanos* toma conciencia de que puede construir no sólo un *raggionamento,* un diálogo sobre el

> amor, sino también un modelo de comportamiento cortesano, un microcosmos en el que la conversación pueda girar de forma racional y dialéctica, nunca polémica, sobre una serie de temas espirituales— el amor entre ellos y de una manera primordial— que cada día eran más del gusto de un público de corte que exigía, a su vez, una nueva forma de expresión de todo ello. (12)

The vernacular in this way became a mode with which to engage broader spiritual and literary dialogues across European courtly contexts. Petrarch's corpus became a valuable means by which to elevate the status of the vernacular, and Bembo's *Prose della volgar lingua* situated and provided verse commentary on Petrarch as the ideal model of imitation in the vernacular. Bembo sought to bolster the vernacular as a language of art and culture. Petrarch becomes a seminal figure within this new project, and according to Reyes Cano, serves only as a point of departure: "[Bembo] lo considerará un mero punto de partida, de ahí que la obra del aretino, modelo de lengua de arte refinada, exquisita y— sobre todo— diversa del lenguaje cotidiano sirva…de trampolín para la definición y defensa de lo que realmente le interesa: la configuración de esa lengua poético-literaria." (14). The early canon formation surrounding Garcilaso mirrors that of Petrarch, given that Herrera's *Anotaciones* sought to establish the Iberian poet as a contemporary model for imitation. This is particularly relevant in the context of the Spanish Golden Age, as intellectuals sought to elevate the status of Castilian as a language of literature and refined taste in the wake of imperial conquest.

By linking the standardization of language to the literary future of the Tuscan dialect, Bembo situates Petrarch as a primer for imitation. This enterprise allowed Bembo to outline specific parameters on aspects to be imitated—based primarily on the

phonetic features of Italian. Bembo shows that Petrarch is an ideal vernacular model, given the musicality of the *Canzoniere.* Daniel Heiple clarifies that these parameters are not listed as explicit rules on imitation, but rather "as observations on the sound structure of Petrarch's poetry that can serve as guidelines for creating in one's own poetry the same effects of moderation that Petrarch created in his" (78). Many of Bembo's contemporaries no doubt favored Renaissance Latin composition as a literary language, emphasizing the role of Latin metrical structures. Bembo's discussion of the phonetic features of the Tuscan dialect likewise bolstered his case for a vernacular literature of comparable cultural esteem.

As a treatise on poetic form in the vernacular, Bembo's *Prose della volgar lingua* encouraged moderation of style, striking a balance between *gravità* and *piacevolezza*— gravity and pleasantness— though specifically assigning greater precedence to the former. Bembo explains that while gravity conveys a sense of high style and nobility, *piacevolezza* evokes the sonorous, pleasing tones associated with the masses: "sotto la gravità ripongo l'onestà, la dignità, la maestà, magnificenza, la grandezza… sotto la piacevolezza ristringo la grazia, la soavità, la vaghezza, la dolcezza, gli scherzi, i giuochi" (130). Petrarch's balance between gravitas and pleasantness, Bembo argues, serves as an apt model for imitation among other vernacular poets:

> Non dico già tuttavolta che in quelle medesime che io gravi chiamo non vi sia qualche voce ancora piacevole, e in quelle che dico essere piacevoli alcun' altra non se legge scritta gravemente, ma dico per la gran parte…. il Petrarca l'una e l'altra de queste parte empié meravigliosamente, in maniera che scegliere non si può, in quale delle due egli fosse maggior maestro. (131)

Gravity and pleasantness exist in varied proportions, and for Bembo, it is the juxtaposition of these elements that contributes to a successful composition and avoids austere or saccharine extremes.

Bembo's discussion on *gravità* and *piacevolezza* is relevant to the current study on Garcilaso, and more broadly to an understanding of the social nature of the literary context of the Spanish Golden Age. Reyes Cano's argument (that Petrarch is for Bembo a model for vernacular canon formation, as Garcilaso is for Herrera), then, does not fully express the social nature and the extent of literary interactions between poets. The significance of the connections among poets extends far beyond that of mere analogy. Herrera endorsed Bembo's discussion of the acoustic effects of specific consonants and vowels, and likewise applied these theories on sound to his *Anotaciones* on Garcilaso. Daniel Heiple is among the first to note that Herrera's commentaries on Garcilaso "are replete with critical concepts and vocabulary taken from Bembo…. He summarized Garcilaso's poetry as a perfect blending of the sweet and the grave…. As in Bembo, gravity is related to ideas of decorum, social class, and the concept of literary styles" (95). Herrera indeed distinguishes between *gravitas* (or lack thereof) in his annotations, citing specific verses that convey grand or noble qualities. Herrera describes, for example, the effect of "o" and "a" vowels. He comments on the first verse of "Cuando me paro a contemplar mi' stado": "Este verso por las vocales primera y cuarta, que tiene tan repetidas, es muy grave, porque son grandes y llenas y sonoras; y por eso hacen la voz numerosa con gravedad" (H-2). Likewise, Herrera holds that grouping of consonants, as well as repetition of specific consonant sounds, convey dignity and weight. On the verse "gentes, costumbres, lenguas he pasado" of Soneto III, he states:

"El verso, que tiene muchas consonantes, es grave, tardo y lleno como éste" (H-22). These examples show the ways in which a line of continuity in Garcilaso's early reception and interpretation can be traced from Bembo to Herrera and even on to Dámaso Alonso's "Garcilaso y los límites de la estilística" in the twentieth century.

Moreover, Herrera also notes cases in which Garcilaso's verses lack gravity. In discussion of the last verse of Soneto XXIII ("por no hazer mudança en su costumbre"), Herrera remarks: "Este es lánguido y casi muerto verso, y muy plebeyo modo de hablar. Y fue común falta en aquella edad no solo de los nuestros, pero de los toscanos, acabar el soneto no con la fuerza y espíritu de los cuarteles, sino floja y desmayadamente" (H-137). Nevertheless, according to Herrera, verses that lack *gravitas* are not necessarily unsuccessful if they evoke a sense of artifice or sweetness— often to what he sees as Garcilaso's intended effect in the verse at hand. One example of this is evident in Herrera's annotation to Soneto XXVI, in which Herrera notes: "Suaves son todos estos ocho primeros versos, porque la suavidad de la oración es donde no hay muchas consonantes, y se evitan los elementos ásperos" (H-155). In such a case, the smooth, sonorous aspect of the verses is to be confused with vulgar or tasteless style—for Herrera, sweetness and simplicity of expression can often develop Garcilaso's desired tone in a given verse.

These examples collectively underscore a discourse on poetic form in the Spanish vernacular and further nuance the early reception of Garcilaso's corpus, mediated through Herrera's commentaries. A sense of continuity emerges upon reading Herrera's commentaries through the broader frame of Bembo's discourse on vernacular poetic form. During his lifetime, Bembo assumed the mantle of a poetic authority in the

vernacular. Bembo read and praised Garcilaso's Latin works, and situated Petrarch as a contemporary classic for imitation among sixteenth-century poets including Garcilaso. Ettore Bonora remarks that "Al Bembo e ai suoi seguaci il Petrarca prestava una lingua poetica perfetta, nobile e capace, come nessun'altra, di esprimere I grandi temi dell'amore e della morte" (57). Bembo's influence informs a reading of several of Garcilaso's Sonnets and Canciones, particularly through the juxtaposition of grave and stylized diction. Garcilaso's Canción IV presents one example of underlying contrasts: "Canción, si quien te viere se espantare / de la inestabilidad y ligereza / y rebuelta del vago pensamiento / estable, grave y firme es el tormento / le di que es causa cuya Fortaleza / es tal que cualquier parte en que tocare" (161-166). Here, the contrasts of "ligereza-grave" and "rebuelta-firme," among others, evoke ideas similar to those found in Bembo's discourse. Heiple adds that "[t]he short *i* in 'firme' is checked by the double consonant, making it graver than the *i's* in line 162. Line 162 is visually much shorter and can be spoken rapidly, whereas line 164 is longer and reads much slower because of the doubled consonants and short stops" (101). In this way, the length of the verses themselves, as well as the doubling of consonants, accentuates the sense of contrast and gravitas of the verses.

Resisting Binary Approaches. Modern critics have continued the early debates between ancients and moderns in many distinct ways within the discourses of modern literary histories on Garcilaso— sometimes resulting in binary divisions that do not fully capture the breadth and impact of the poet. This is true particularly in cases in which Garcilaso is read primarily as a classical imitator of Latinate and Italianate forms— as the backdrop against which to read subsequent Baroque poetry. These approaches have in

great measure neglected to consider the poetic legacies of the *cancioneros*, as well as Garcilaso's broader social milieu. In many cases, critics have bolstered their arguments with a selection of specific poems, stanzas, and verses used to support exclusively classical, biographical, or aesthetic perspectives on Garcilaso through a single lens.

For example, Herman Iventosch offers an alternative reading to the binaries that often permeated literary histories on Garcilaso. He insightfully shows that Garcilaso's poetic works need not be read as exclusively classical in nature, or otherwise. He demonstrates that Garcilaso's poetry is in fact a composite of styles and influences and draws upon Garcilaso's "Oh dulces prendas" to develop his claim. Iventosh underscores the lasting influence of Cartagena in "Oh dulces prendas," citing line comparisons to those of the *Cancionero general.* Iventosch holds that Garcilaso's work is best described as the collective product of Italianate, Petrarchan, and *cancionero* styles mediated and shaped by a talented poet. He writes:

> [T]he initial "Oh dulces prendas…por mi mal halladas" establishes the basic antithetical motif of the sonnet. The first eight lines thereupon develop directly and clearly the same near-common place, although the insertion of *muerte* at the end of the first quatrain, in a line thought to be inspired by Petrarch and expressive to Lapesa, in all likelihood echoes the celebrated "death in passion" of the troubadours. The final tercets, however, as commonly in the sonnet intensify and involve the motif bearing it to its emphatic conclusion, and here, as mentioned, the sense and structure of the ancestral *cancionero* intrudes. The Renaissance poem is thus complex: those stark 'dulces exuviae' of Dido,

> themselves of course expressive of the "agonies" of "sweet" things lost, are joined to the amorous trivia of the troubadours. (225)

Though Iventosch's article has been relegated to footnotes, ignored, or mentioned in passing, it provides insight into the diverse sources and models that make up Garcilaso's poetic work. Iventosch summarizes that "[t]he alchemy of the poet's art has broken down the elements of the models and brought them into an entirely new solution….The result is the 'composite' we have attempted to describe, a 'background' of a sonnet and an essential stylistic assessment of the work" (227). The transformation of such influences and source verses therefore occurs through the hand of talented and well-read poet, yielding a product that represents far more than the sum of its source motifs and allusions. Through his reading of Garcilaso's "Oh dulces prendas," Iventosch moves beyond traditional binaries that frame Garcilaso as Italianate, Castilian, or otherwise, to instead offer a more realistic (and, to recall Hermida Ruiz's phrasing, "less idealistic" 81) approximation to the "composite" nature of Garcilaso's poetic corpus. Doing so does not diminish Garcilaso's significance, but rather exposes how literary histories on Garcilaso have assigned priority to biographical and Classical perspectives on the Garcilaso corpus. Iventosch's valuable approach can be viewed as one model to guide future study, and recent scholarship has precisely sought to further dismantle artificial binary oppositions within Spanish literary historiography.

One excellent case is that of Isabel Torres' *Love Poetry in the Spanish Golden Age: Eros, Eris, and Empire.* Torres reexamines the literary history of Garcilaso from Keniston and Lapesa to recent decades of scholarship. She points out an important paradox inherent to Garcilaso studies and draws attention to the fact that, while most

modern scholars explicitly reject Keniston's biographical reading and Lapesa's notion of a trajectory, "the vast majority of those readings that accept the self-conscious artistry of Garcilaso's verse also assume a trajectory of stylistic development that depends implicitly on biographical chronology (2)." Torres remarks that even though scholars continually aim to arrange poems chronologically, dispute the dates of specific poems, and reject the role of Isabel Freire as a source of poetic inspiration, "some fundamental principles of [Lapesa's] aesthetic judgment, drawn directly from the flawed trajectory premise, have become subsumed into current thinking and have, therefore, remained largely unchallenged….[C]urrent scholarship denies the biographical basis, but seems irrevocably committed to its…aesthetic principles" (3). Lapesa's *La trayectoria poética de Garcilaso* (1948) has been celebrated, denounced, and discussed heatedly in larger nationalist debates on involving tradition, roots and "Spanishness." There is no doubt an ample basis on which to take issue with Lapesa's claims and overall theses, and these are to be outlined in the pages that follow. Regardless of whether or not scholars agree with Lapesa's approach, however, the 1948 study has become canonical in itself as a point of departure for later scholarship on Garcilaso. The 'trajectory' argument has indeed been discredited (Hermida Ruiz, Creel, Torres), and yet one particular aspect of Lapesa's argument —attention to *cancionero* legacies of Garcilaso— still remains as a valuable and understudied area within Hispanism. Scholars can rightly take issue with Lapesa's analysis and conclusions, but the fact remains that Garcilaso was a poet versed in the literary and courtly world of the *cancioneros*.

One key example to this effect involves resonances of Cartagena in Garcilaso's corpus. Iventosch identifies several verse comparisons between "Oh dulces prendas" and

Cartagena's poetic corpus worth discussion. Iventosch cites a selection of Cartagena's *quintillas* in the tradition of the Latin *Disputatio inter Cor et Oculum:*

> Entre el coraçon y los ojos;
>
> y habla el coraçon.
>
> Enemigos, vos causastes
>
> mi dolor y causa fustes [sic],
>
> porque mirando mirastes
>
> mi gloria y ressucitastes
>
> pena y pensamientos tristes.
>
> ………………………..
>
> Dizen los ojos.
>
> Coraçon, vos nos guiastes
>
> á mirar por do quesistes;
>
> coraçon, vos nos levastes
>
> pues si tormento passastes
>
> doblada pena nos distes (350a-b)

The frame of the dialogue between a personified heart and eyes is a form that evokes familiar *cancionero* images and allegories. Iventosch shows that the above verses are also present in Garcilaso's "Oh dulces prendas."

> porque mirando matastes
>
> mi gloria y ressucitastes
>
> pena y pensamientos tristes.

These verses show a close awareness to (and rewriting of) Cartagena's source verses. It is also interesting to note the similarity of rhyme within the verb forms: "*tristes* is coupled with a verb in *–istes* in both; both are similar with *llevastes* and *levastes;* Garcilaso has *deseastes*, Cartagena *quesistes*. The antithesis of both sound and sense is quite close in Garcilaso's first tercet" (224). Cartagena's *quintillas* not only serve as one source model—importantly, other well-read intellectuals of Garcilaso's milieu would have recognized the source verses within the new context, underscoring an act of poetic dexterity, *agudeza*, and artful composition among poets.

Iventosch moreover shows that through the structure of the sonnet itself, Garcilaso moves toward an antithetical motif that reinforces the connection to the dramatic impact of lost love commonplace to the *cancioneros*:

> Thus obeying, perhaps, as I've said, the sonnet's demand for a tightening structure in the tercets, Garcilaso shifts from the plain exposition of his quatrains to the subtle and antithetical schemes of the *cancioneros*. He does this, moreover, sensewise, by linking what is in essence the "debate" of his quatrains (the reproaches that the poet directs against those "dulces prendas" for bringing him back to misery) to the formal debate of the troubadours. (224)

This is particularly the case given another parallel to the final stanza of Cartagena's debate. Here, the "death in passion" motif commonplace to troubadour lyric is yet another thematic link to Cartagena's verses. Cartagena's debate ends with the verses:

> Yo pago la culpa agena
> sufriendo grandes dolores;
> yo só el catiuo en cadena

en quien se encierra la pena

destos dos competidores

que la muerte me causaron;

lo cual es fuerça sofrir,

pues los ojos que miraron

y el coraçon que engañaron,

quiso tan bien consentir. (351a)

Here, the heart and eyes cause only suffering, as Garcilaso's "dulces prendas" serve likewise to reinforce and to amplify the poetic voice's sense of loss.

"Oh dulces prendas" is only one poem among many in which Garcilaso engages the juxtaposition of register, *cancionero* themes. Our study, however, maintains that it is the interplay of *cancionero*, Latinate, and Italianate subtexts that more fully describes Garcilaso's poetic craft. Such an approach draws upon Iventosch's notion of a 'composite' model of literary antecedents, mediated by the skill of a talented and well-read poet. In addition to the above, Garcilaso recasts Virgilian and Ovidian subtexts that indirectly or explicitly evoke Latin subtexts— through which Garcilaso casts himself as a contemporary classic sixteenth-century Spain.

Nevertheless, Garcilaso's contemporaries did not uniformly praise his poetic works. Literary criticism has situated Cristóbal de Castillejo among strongest anti-Petrarchan detractors of Garcilaso and Boscán. Not surprisingly, the critical models that have positioned Garcilaso as the touchstone of Italianate letters have regarded Castillejo's work as a medieval anachronism. Scholarship has established a binary between Garcilaso and Castillejo that perhaps only holds true in some respects. Rogelio Reyes

Cano writes that it is not sufficient simply to cast Castillejo as the "cara opuesta de la gran revolución garcilasiana" (5). Castillejo advocated what he viewed as Castilian metrical forms and themes, composing much of his work in octosyllabic and dodecasyllabic verses. He wrote against Italianate, Petrarchan styles made popular through the poetic works of Boscán and Garcilaso and participated actively in the Renaissance dialogues of his age. Castillejo's corpus includes amorous poetry, *obras de conversación y pasatiempo*, burlesque texts, and philosophical works. In his well-known poem "Garcilaso y Boscán, siendo llegados / Al lugar donde están los trovadores, " Castillejo renders a scathing critique of Italianate styles though the use of the sonnet and hendecasyllable verse itself. The poet draws attention to the affective qualities of the hendecasyllable and Italianate lexicon:

> Garcilaso y Boscán, siendo llegados
> Al lugar donde están los trovadores
> Que en esta nuestra lengua y sus primores
> Fueron en este siglo señalados,
>
> Los unos a los otros alterados
> Se miran, con mudança de colores,
> Temiéndose que fuesen corredores
> Espías o enemigos desmandados;
>
> Y juzgando primero por el traje,
> Paresciéronles ser, como debía,
> Gentiles españoles caballeros;
>
> Y oyéndoles hablar nuevo lenguaje
> Mezclado de estranjera poesía,
> Con ojos los miraban de estranjeros. (48)

Castillejo accuses Garcilaso and Boscán (and others, including Diego Hurtado de Mendoza) of embracing convoluted language and affected devices that are contrary to his notion of the literary tastes, masculinities, and use of Castilian language appropriate for

"Gentiles españoles caballeros." In the courtly context of the Renaissance, these types of poetic dialogues were common; in another instance, Castillejo invokes Juan de Mena, Jorge Manrique, and Cartagena as models worthy of esteem. While a rhetorical distinction indeed exists between Garcilaso and Castillejo, the framing of this division has often been superficially rendered in reductionist binary terms. The contemporary reader might at first glance seek to classify Castillejo as outmoded or uneducated in his perspectives—casting Garcilaso's poetic virtuosity in bright relief. María del Rosario Martínez Navarro alternatively shows that it is easily possible to bolster a case for Castillejo as a courtly Renaissance humanist in a broader sense:

> [S]e pasó más de media vida en el extranjero, mayoritariamente en la corte vienesa; y teniendo en cuenta esa determinada atmósfera contemporánea, al hablar de su actitud antelas modas de la literatura de su tiempo, no podemos ver sólo en su figura un caso aislado en absoluto en el concepto de antipetrarquismo pues, como fenómeno de tanta resonancia y tan renacentista como el petrarquismo en sí, estaba ya asumido en otros escritores y críticos del XVI, inclusive italianos, con los que entró en contacto tal y como hemos hecho antes alusión y con los que hay que ponerlo en relación al estudiar su obra completa. El denso enclave humanista renacentista europeo del que fue coetáneo y del que recogió sin duda su resonante eco. (39)

John J. Allen reminds his reader that, contrary to what might be claimed in modern considerations on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, anti-Petrarchism was not a reactionary movement. Rather, it is "un fenómeno contemporáneo con éste, y porque entran en sus listas algunos de los mismos poetas más representativos de la

tradición, en cuyas obras se encuentran composiciones petrarquistas y antipetrarquistas a la misma vez" (17). Allen provides examples from the *Romancero general* (1600, 1604, 1605) to reveal a cross-section of anti-Petrarchan transformations. In numerous cases, the intrusion of reality undermines the Petrarchan scene to reveal the ridiculous quality of the artifice:

> Comparaba los cabellos
> aunque mugrientos y sucios,
> a las doradas arenas
> del río Tajo o Danubio
> la frente angosta y pequeña,
> llena e arenas y surcos,
> era hermosa, bien trazada,
> de cristal luciente y puro;
> las cejas, cuya espresura
> cubrieran dos bueyes juntos,
> las llamaba arcos de amor.
> ……………………………………
> los delgados labios feos,
> y de su color difuntos,
> fueron claveles del mes
> en que se ve flor y fruto;
> los dientes que al parecer,
> eran pocos y muy sucios,

> los hizo perlas del mar
>
> que navega para el Cuzco (II.111)

Through this systematic deformation of idealized Petrarchan feminine beauty, the poetic voice recasts golden tresses, porcelain skin, lips of ruby, and teeth of pearl into nothing more than matted, filthy hair, disproportionate features, unappealing lips, and dirty, missing teeth. Later, Cervantes satirizes these Petrarchan metaphors in *La gitanilla.* The hyperbolic enumeration of these features adds a burlesque quality to the scene while shattering readers' expectations in unexpected, novel ways. Even so, works of the same poets do not pertain solely to Petrarchan or anti-Petrarchan categories. Allen suggests that Góngora and Quevedo pertain to both groups, engaging Petrarchan and anti-Petrarchan themes throughout their corpus. Garcilaso's commentators and detractors likewise shape the broader literary histories on the poet. Like those of Garcilaso, their own literary histories cannot be removed from their respective frames of reception, circumstances of material circulation, and engagement with an aristocratic, educated Renaissance public.

CHAPTER III:

"Nomen amicitia est, nomen inane fides": Garcilaso's 'Ode ad florem Gnidi,' Ovid, and the Pervasive Presence of the Biographical Reading

i. Poetic Rubrications, Paratexts, and the Fallacy of the Romantic Biographical Model:

Much has been written on Garcilaso's "Ode ad florem Gnidi," especially with regard to its potential historical and biographical antecedents. The legacies of Hayward Keniston's early biographical readings of the poet continue to affect critical approaches to the poem. This chapter, alternatively, formulates an Ovidian analysis of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi" to outline a new reading on Garcilaso's engagement with the Latin subtexts. The discussion examines Keniston's reception of Garcilaso and situates the poet within the humanist context of Latin studies and communication that is also linked to the troubadour lyric tradition. This broad-based social, cultural, and poetic approach shows that Garcilaso does not write from a biographical perspective, nor does he merely include Ovidian verse equivalences in the "Ode ad florem Gnidi;" rather, the poet recasts an Ovidian love triangle in a tongue-in-cheek manner to produce a completely different reading of the poem. Garcilaso displaces his own Mario through a form of mockery and humor, subtly calling attention to the enduring presence of Classical texts in sixteenth century Spain. By bringing Latin resonances to the fore, the study illustrates the pervasive presence of literary traditions through the frame of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi."

Hayward Keniston's biographical reading on Garcilaso has in some measure been disproven with regard to the notion of sentimental biography. This approach thus examines the Humanistic cultural context of Latinate education and communication to

understand how Keniston's reading had been implicitly internalized within generations of scholarship on Garcilaso. Keniston was trained as a Romanist at Harvard; his thesis, *Garcilaso de la Vega: A Critical Study of his Life and Works,* subsequently published as a book, influenced generations of scholarship on Garcilaso. Keniston's biographical reading of the poet is nevertheless problematic in that it invokes a critical model—that of the biographical reading of the Provençal troubadour poets and Petrarch— and applies this to a biographical interpretation of Garcilaso's life and works. Like his humanist contemporaries, Garcilaso had access to the Provençal texts and is situated within a long poetic tradition linked to the troubadours. Keniston's widely celebrated reading of Garcilaso led generations of scholars time and again to reinforce the biographical reading of Garcilaso. The notion that Garcilaso's work must rightfully correspond to his lived experiences leads to comforting and teleological readings of the poet, yet this posture serves only to reinforce the enduring fallacy of the autobiographical poem. Such an approach undermines the status of poetry as a literary and intellectual endeavor—as an engagement with other literatures, cultural influences, and writers.

Keniston consistently casts Garcilaso within the context of the sentimental autobiography. For example, in discussion of Salicio and Nemoroso, Keniston remarks: "What is it then, that gives the [First Eclogue] its charm? The answer is simple: the poem is beautiful because it is the frank revelation of the poet's own love and grief…. [W]ith the fire of his heart he has fused this time-work form and matter into a gem of perfect beauty….These shepherds are no puppets; their words glow with sincerity" (242). He draws parallels to Garcilaso's lived experiences, travels, lost romances, and family heritage, and more than once deduces anagrams of Garcilaso's name tangentially to

bolster his autobiographical claims. The biographical idiom of Garcilaso, like the biographical reading of the troubadour poets, is an invention of late nineteenth-century criticism that privileges a face value, comfortable interpretation over attention to the text and its dialogue with literary traditions and antecedents. In particular, this is a fallacy touched by Romanticism that seeks to link a poet's life with his work. The erroneous biographical reading of the troubadour poets has been well outlined, and by turning attention to the work as literature, a clearer account of the text emerges, in dialogue with other works, social uses, and literary traditions.

To this effect, Margarita Egan shows that the biographical approaches to the troubadour poets are often fallacious readings that reinforce comforting interpretations in modern scholarship. In *The Vidas of the Troubadours,* she outlines the problematics of the biographical phenomenon through case studies of the *vidas y razos*. She examines the *vidas* as stories that follow a formulaic poetic rubric—a description of the poet and a narrative sequence— that can be traced across many textual examples and poetic contexts: "[N]ot only are the words similar which are used to present the individual character of the poets, but the arrangement of the words is uniform as well…. Sail d'Escola, his vida tells us, was from Bergerac, from a rich town in Périgord, the son of a merchant. He became a jongleur and made good little songs" (xv). A comparative reading of several *vidas* reveals a similar formulaic structure; this in turn raises broader questions as to how and why these patterns emerged within the historical contexts of their circulation. Many *vidas* engage issues relevant to courtly culture, including success or failure in amorous pursuits and continued favor with a noble patron. In her analysis, Egan remarks: "Why do the vidas of more than one hundred troubadours resemble one

another so much? What circumstances led authors composing biographies of so many different poets to follow the same basic thematic and structural framework?" (xix). Egan outlines potential causes for such patterns—each of which resist the notion of an actual biographical *vida*.

First, a reading of the poem itself frequently inspired the writing of the *vida,* as was often the case in the Old Provençal tradition. Details from verses of the poem often corresponded to the content of the *vida*, and as Egan notes, "when particular metaphors or proper names from the poems stirred the biographer's imagination, he did not hesitate to include them in his account of the poet's 'life'" (xxi). In this way, proper names and details of the poetic fragments inspire biographical details fitting to the poet's name. The poet is thus often the construction of the reader. Cercamon's *vida,* for example, reads: "Cercamon was a minstrel from Gascony, and invented poems and pastorals in the old manner. And wandered all over the world wherever he could go" (26). Here, the language of the *vida* corresponds to that of the poetic pseudonym Cercamon (*cercar,* to seek/wander, and *mon*, world). Rather than to construct the *vida* as a lived account of historical circumstances, the biographer ingeniously takes general hints from proper nouns to inscribe the poet's supposed wandering identity.

The *vidas* are paratexts to the poems that follow; as poetic rubrics, the *vidas* lead the reader to draw assumptions on the life of the poet. Given that the *vida* was included as prefatory material, it often held literary and artistic functions: "The vidas sometimes appear in early manuscripts as rubrications. They seem to have been devised as eye-catching prefaces for the poems…. Specifically because of their function as prefaces or introductions, the vidas resemble the Latin *vitae poetae*, part of the *accessus ad auctores,*

introductions to twelfth and thirteenth-century glosses on Greek and Latin writers" (xxv). Like the Latin *vitae,* the *vidas* gathered supposed historical and biographical facts from the literary works themselves; both the Latin *vitae* and Provençal *vidas* drew from a limited range of stylistic features in that they included only details and narration pertinent to the literary and poetic stature of the poet. Biographers often describe the Provençal poets as lovers that compose songs or poems for a maiden, and writers of the Latin *vitae* frequently discuss conversion to Christianity as a prefatory remark to discussions of spiritual themes. In both cases, stylistic characteristics are predictable, serving in great measure as literary (rather than biographical) ornamentation to the material that follows.

Finally, Egan cites signs of oral performance in the *vidas* that resist notions of biographical, lived experiences: "[W]e must assume that reading aloud or recitation of the troubadour verses followed what was an oral account of the troubadour's life. That account may have been composed 'live,' at the time of the performance or written down ahead of time…. In later written versions, the vida texts came to incorporate these spoken elements" (xxvii). The social uses of the text, and issues of oral performance, bolster a convincing case against the notion of the 'truthful' biographical reading. Embellishment and stylistic adaptation in the writing and performance of the *vidas* underscores their status as literary and poetic products in Provençal culture.

It then became a critical commonplace to read the poems autobiographically. This was the prevailing critical model at the time Keniston studied at Harvard and wrote on Garcilaso. Keniston situates Garcilaso within a long tradition tied to the troubadours; the critical tradition that adopts the Kenistonian model has thereby subjected the poet to fallacious biographical readings. Our analysis, however, situates Garcilaso within the

contexts of Latinate educational and intellectual spheres of his early reception. Indeed, in the exclusive, culturally elitist lettered society of Garcilaso's reception, informed readers would have recognized Garcilaso's engagement with Ovidian literary precepts and texts first, rather than seeking a projection of his life. The volta of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi," in which the poem shifts to the first person, evokes a sense of enjambment that produces a moment of recognition—even humorously so—for the informed reader. Garcilaso engages Ovidian allusions and situations that had become almost proverbial among his contemporaries; in doing so, he confronts a long tradition of classical Ovidian texts in a poetic and literary (rather than biographical) manner.

Garcilaso wrote in Latin, though his Latin works are neglected in great measure and are underrepresented in literary histories. Our approach posits that Garcilaso's Ovidian sensibilities are central to understanding the early reception and interpretation of his poetic work. It is pertinent to note that Garcilaso's poetry emerges from a literary and educational milieu in which Ovidian texts were widely used as the primer for the study of Latin grammar. Ralph J. Hexter's 1986 book, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, points to the central role of Ovid within the intellectual, educational, and ecclesiastical systems of the period. Hexter notes that from the twelfth century forward, the study of Ovidian texts increased dramatically: "[I]nterpolations in the text, pseudepigrapha, [and] library catalogues-- indicate that through the tenth and perhaps eleventh centuries, students would have met Ovid considerably less frequently than the major pagan authors.... [D]irect testimonies for the school curriculum suggest a rapid increase in interest in Ovid in the twelfth century" (4). This shift is significant in both pedagogical and hermeneutical terms. Ovidian works became central to the formative study of

grammatica, the first of the seven liberal arts. Hexter argues: "[T]he authors with whom a schoolboy would become familiar and the means by which these authors were presented would have a profound impact on his literary tastes, attitudes, and values for the rest of his life. This is doubly true when the authors were read not only for literary culture but primarily for instruction in grammar" (5). An awareness of Ovid thus extended far beyond the literary and poetic alone, since Ovidian texts became the means by which students learned a scholastic language of the age. Knowledge of Ovidian puns, thematic material, sensibilities, and word play was arguably widespread within the European intellectual communities well into the sixteenth century; the presence of Ovid in the school curriculum of the age, as such, fostered an almost proverbial recognition of the poet within courtly intellectual spheres.

Both Garcilaso and Boscán were educated in Latin at the hand of Pietro Martire d'Anghiera, one of the foremost Latinists of the period. The centrality of Ovid in grammar instruction invited interpretation, commentary, and appropriation of motifs and allusions among contemporary poets and is relevant to the context of the Spanish Golden Age. Hexter explains that the reception and discussion of Ovidian works was particularly unique: "[M]edieval schoolmasters seem to have had no ancient commentaries on Ovid on which to draw. They were forced to make new assemblages" (7). Fewer commentaries of Ovid were produced (or survived) in the centuries between the classical and medieval periods; Ovidian works were particularly open to glossing, commentary, and interpolation. Scholars subsequently produced a prolific corpus of Ovidian commentaries on the themes of ethics, medicine, theology, poetry, and love, among others— commentaries with which Garcilaso and his contemporaries would doubtless

have been familiar. Hexter recognizes the plurality of Ovidian interpretations, to conclude that: "There was not one [Ovid], but several" (11). Each of these— the medical Ovid, the ethical Ovid, and the like— evoked for the contemporary reader different lenses of interpretation and modes of reading the source poetry. In this way, broad and diverse Ovidian sensibilities emerged in intellectual realms, in keeping with the pedagogical modes of grammar instruction and the interpretative practices. Garcilaso and his contemporaries of nearly equal education and study of Latin works would have recognized Ovidian allusions and the distortion of the initial circumstances and scenes. In this elitist and culturally-specific sphere of poet-intellectuals, the pleasure of recognition (of the Ovidian context and of its reappropriation) is central to the early reception of texts like the "Ode ad florem Gnidi."

El Brocense is among the first in Garcilaso's milieu to establish the biographical reading on the poet. He states that the poem is directed at a woman from Naples and that it corresponds to a specific neighborhood in the city. He writes:

> En Nápoles ay un barrio que se dize *il seggio di Gnido,* que es como una parte donde se ayuntan los caualleros. Allí auía muchas damas, entre las quales una llamada Violante Sant Seuerino, hija del duque de Soma, era seruida de un amigo de Garci Lasso, llamado Fabio Galeota….quando dixo *conuertido en Viola,* aludió a Violante; y quando dixo *A la concha de Venus amarrado*, significó a Galeota, como si dixera forçado a la galera de Venus, porque Venus apareció en el mar en una concha (B-43).

Herrera clarifies the biographical references and states: "Mas don Antonio Puertocarrero afirma que no la escrivió su suegro sino por Mario Galeota, el cual piensa que sirvió a

doña Catalina….pensar que fue escrita a doña Violante porque dize *convertido en viola* es conjetura muy flaca i de poco fundamento" (H-246). Importantly, even in these early annotations, Herrera remarks that such correspondences between specific verses and lived reality are at best an unreliable conjecture. Herrera nevertheless falls back upon biographical detail in a subsequent annotation, explaining that "los Sanseverinos son del segio de Nido, y los Galeotas de Capuana" (H-247). Biographical readings on Garcilaso came to represent the prevailing approaches on the poet from the period of his early reception to subsequent generations of scholarship. These biographical approximations worked much like the *vitae,* constructed from information found within the poem.

Peter Dunn's article "Garcilaso's Ode *A la Flor de Gnido:* A Commentary on Some Renaissance Themes and Ideas" is among the first studies to resist such biographical readings. Dunn proposes an alternative model to longstanding assumptions on the poet, particularly in discussion of double meanings and the iconography of Venus. Dunn remarks: "[The poem's] literary origins in Horace and Ovid are not artfully hidden. It has always been known that the poem was an appeal addressed to a lady on behalf of a friend….[O]ne would have thought that this poem would have attracted the cool eye of some critic dedicated to the idea of art as a deliberate, calculated construction" (288). Dunn's thesis is unique; it directs attention away from biographical conjecture toward the poem's engagement of classical sources. Dunn suggests that Latinate comparisons to Horace and Ovid have yet to be emphasized in Garcilaso's work; these patently apparent references, Dunn argues, are "not artfully hidden" (288) and waiting to be discussed by modern scholars versed in Latin.

Such an approach to the poem (as an engagement with literary traditions and texts) has often been unpopular because it obliges the critic to be literate in Latin and also fails to reinforce comforting assumptions (such as Keniston's model lifted from a reading of Provençal troubadour lyric). Dunn comments that it "is not very surprising, perhaps, that critics have not been hasty to touch an object which seemed unlikely to respond in the ways which they demanded" (288). The pages that follow will take up Dunn's invocation and propose a new critical reading of the poem as a literary endeavor that summons and rewrites Latin sources.

Garcilaso recalls Ovidian models to confront a long tradition of classical texts through masterful dark humor. He subtly signals such allusions to his contemporaries; this rereading of Ovid constitutes a unique poetic adaptation of the source images and verses. Like the *vidas y razos* discussed above, the "Ode ad florem Gnidi" challenges its modern reader to resist the tendency toward biographical readings. The *vidas* were rubrics largely lifted from poetic fiction, and by returning to the manuscript itself, a clearer account of the *vidas* as fiction emerges. Herrera's early manuscript commentaries to the Canción V function not unlike a rubric; the glosses eclipse the original text and draw attention toward the commentary itself as a source of scholarly authority. The "Ode ad florem Gnidi" is likewise fictional (as opposed to biographical) in that it enters into dialogue with Ovidian sources. Garcilaso's Ovidian modulations can therefore be framed as a palimpsest of Ovidian allusions and verses. By bringing the Ovidian sources together with the *Canciones*, Garcilaso develops an artful poetic rewriting that becomes apparent upon close comparison of verses.

This particular approximation to Garcilaso is especially valid given the Latinate educational practices of the Renaissance. Latin studies served as more than a mere primer for grammatical competency. Latin mastery represented a rite-of-passage in the educational endeavors of aristocratic writers and poets. Walter Ong discusses this phenomenon in "Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite." He shows that participation in intellectual communities of the age was linked directly to a working knowledge of Latin:

> "The Renaissance educator thought of Latin as bringing students into contact with the ancients, whom Erasmus had declared to be the sources of practically all human knowledge…. [He] was also compelled to teach Latin because the books in use, contemporary as well as ancient, were books written in Latin or translated into Latin" (103-104).

Latin in this way became the literary language of youth. The social and material uses of the texts motivated Latin studies, as intellectuals were compelled to read, write, communicate, and think in the language. While scholars also learned Greek and Hebrew, the widespread presence of Latin eclipsed that of other classical languages. Latin was used as a language of commentary not only in literature, but across a broad range of subjects in the classical sense. Ong cites as examples "philosophy (which meant, besides logic, physics and what we might best style general science, inextricably interwoven with psychology and snatches of metaphysics), books on medicine, law, and theology, not to mention books on military science, botany, alchemy, physiognomy, [and] geography" (104). Latin was the primary means by which scholars would converse and engage in the written discourses, and such circumstances required that scholars become well versed in

the language. Through knowledge of Latin, adolescent boys gained entrance to the literary milieu of Renaissance circles.

Ong's framing of Latin education as a puberty rite is apt in its discussion of Renaissance scholarly communities set apart as specialized "marginal environments" in a linguistic sense: "A sharp distinction was set up in society between those who knew [Latin] and those who did not…. The fact that the marginal environment was primarily a linguistic one only heightened the initiatory aspects of the situation, for the learning of secret meanings and means of communication is a common feature of initiatory rites" (107). Scholars were compelled to master Latin to participate in and contribute to the circulation of ideas in Renaissance learned societies. With the rise of the vernacular, spoken Latin diminished from common usage. Adolescent boys, Ong notes, were often separated from family circles where the vernacular could be used to promote immersion in Latin education: "Closed to girls and to women, the schools, including the universities with their own "schools" (*scholae* or classrooms), were male rendezvous strongly reminiscent of male clubhouses…. This specially closed environment of the universities was maintained by a long apprenticeship or bachelorship" (108-109). In Renaissance Spain, Garcilaso and his audience pertained to such a community of Humanist intellectuals that had been educated in a similar manner. Garcilaso and Boscán were educated in such a context at court; both were educated by Pietro Martire and were part of this intellectual and cultural milieu. Steeped in Latin studies, readers of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi" would have recognized not only its Latin resonances, but also the ingenuity of Garcilaso's artful rendering of Ovidian motifs. To a contemporary reader, a

study of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi" prompts moments of recognition of both Ovidian source verses and Garcilaso's specific modulations.

Love as imprisonment and the fiction of the poet-as-exile. Garcilaso does nothing less than rewrite an Ovidian love triangle in the "Ode ad florem Gnidi." The poem opens with an evocation of Orpheus and discusses the effect of music and poetry: "Si de mi baxa lira / tanto pudiesse el son que en un momento / aplacase la ira / de animoso viento / y la furia del mar y el movimiento / y en ásperas montañas / con el süave canto enterneciesse / las fieras alimañas / los árboles moviesse / y al son confusamente los truxiesse" (1-10). Garcilaso signals immediately to his contemporary readers that he is negotiating Ovidian sources; at the same time, the verses blend Castilian, Italian, and Latinate language and highlight a linguistic interplay of registers that would have been recognizable to Garcilaso's contemporary Humanist readers. The epithet of the "animoso viento" evokes Ovid and corresponds to a verse from the *Amores:* "impulsa est animoso ianua vento" (I.vi.51). Verse twelve confers the poem's title and obliquely evokes the temple of Venus: "no pienses que cantado / sería de mí, hermosa flor de Gñido / el fiero Marte ayrado / a muerte convertido / de polvo y sangre y de sudor teñido" (11-15). In stanzas three and four, the poetic voice rejects military victories and warlike themes to reveal the theme of spurned love in the subsequent strophes.

In these early stanzas, the indications of Ovidian dark humor are already apparent. Not even Orpheus's song can temper the resistance of the *dama.* Stanza four contains the first instances of the "Por tí" anaphora that convey a rhetoric of blame. The accusatory sixth stanza, "y cómo por ti sola / y por tu gran valor y hermosura / convertido en vïola / llora su desventura / el miserable amante en tu figura" (26-30), reveals an impression of

the *belle dame sans merci.* The cruel beauty of the *dama* is commonplace to *cancionero* and troubadour texts, and often provides a frame in which to discuss other literary discourses, often through juxtaposition of styles and themes. The description of the *dama*, as is revealed after the climactic shift to first person, is linked also to Ovidian allusions to Anaxarete and transformation. The emphatic repetition of "por ti" in these stanzas takes on heightened effect through the jarring shift into the first person that follows.

More specifically, this vignette evokes lovesickness, a miserable spiritual condition that recalls the Ovidian *Remedia Amoris* tradition. In the *Remedia Amoris,* Ovid proposes advice to those facing the anguish of lost love. In one instance, Ovid states:

> Ad mea, decepti iuvenes, praecepta venite,
> Quos suus ex omni parte fefellit amor.
> Discite sanari, per quem didicistis amare:
> Una manus vobis vulnus opemque feret.
> Terra salutares herbas, eademque nocentes
> Nutrit, et urticae proxima saepe rosa est;
> Vulnus in Herculeo quae quondam fecerat hoste,
> Vulneris auxilium Pelias hasta tulit. (41-48)

> Come, hearken to my precepts, slighted youths,
> ye whom your own love has utterly betrayed.
> Learn healing from him through whom ye learnt to love:

> one hand alike will wound and succour.
>
> The same earth fosters healing herbs and noxious,
>
> and oft is the nettle nearest to the rose;
>
> the Pelian spear which wounded once
>
> its Herculean foe, bore relief also to the wound. (41-48)

Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* serves as a counterpoint to his *Ars Amatoria,* as he suggests in the passage above. The *Remedia Amoris* outlines cures for lovesickness as a spiritual ailment. The continuity of this tradition is likewise evident in the *cancionero* themes of the sentimental romance, where the allegory of love as imprisonment is accomplished in Garcilaso's Ode via the image of the galley slave. Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de Amor* draws its reader into the psychological theme of love as imprisonment from a long tradition of *cancionero* poetry. The protagonist must surrender his arms—hope, virtue, memory, reason—and is dragged into the Prison of Love by Deseo, a personification of carnal instinct. Letters mediate the Ovidian tale, and in an Ovidian fashion, the treacherous go-between intercepts the female love object. Laureola's symptoms undermine her denials of love; the reader examines her body language and observes contradictory gestures that tend to obscure rather than to reveal truth. In Garcilaso's poem, the poetic voice displays symptoms of lovesickness, including an allegorical imprisonment, misery, and the notion of a living death: "Hablo d'aquel cativo / de quien tener se deve más cuidado / que 'stá muriendo bivo / al remo condenado / en la concha de Venus amarrado" (31-35). Although San Pedro's Tefeo invokes clear Ovidian advice—that women are vile—Leriano disagrees and in fact dies of love. Leriano's self-sacrifice underscores his conflicted subjectivity that sets his love against duties to the state. A

miserable prisoner in the allegorical Prison of Love, Leriano is tortured and, like Christ, is forced to wear a crown of thorns. In a gesture of self-denial, he ingests Laureola's letters; the scene evokes a Senecan suicide or the viaticum, the last sacramental communion. At the same time, Leriano's assimilation of her letters— literal cannibalism— marks his ability to feel and aligns him with the aristocratic class.

The emphasis on inner emotions thwarted by external circumstances and responsibilities sets the personal at odds with the broader power dynamic at court. In this sense, San Pedro mirrors the struggles found in epic poetry and brings antiquity into dialogue with contemporary circumstances. Like San Pedro's readers, Garcilaso's sixteenth-century readership would certainly have recognized the emphasis on the misery of love as imprisonment, overlaid with Ovidian subtexts. The posture of the imprisoned lover, like that of the legendary poet-as-exile, is foremost a literary enterprise that emerges from the poet's rewriting of the Ovidian subtext.

As in *Cárcel de Amor,* Garcilaso's poetic voice is a lovesick prisoner in the Ovidian sense. The poet's transition from stanza six to seven is abrupt; the shift into first person no doubt elicits a reaction aimed at Garcilaso's reader and reveals a sense of mockery. The image of the imprisoned *galeote* condemned to row in the conch of Venus produces a moment of recognition and humor. The humanist reader would note the jarring transition into first person, treatment of the source image (the "conch" of Venus and Garcilaso's innuendo), sonorous effects, and the influence of Italian sound patterns (e.g: "'*stá* muriendo bivo"). Collectively, these features underscore the ingenuity of Garcilaso's poetic rewriting. The reference to "remo condenado" is paramount within the context of Ovidian appropriation, given the erotic sense of the Italian *galeotto* as a go-

between. In popular Italian culture, such a figure arranges seductive encounters, carries messages, and mediates desires in the libidinal market. Moreover, "galeotto" also evokes Canto V of Dante's *Inferno* through the kiss and damnation of Paolo and Francesca da Rimini: "a bocca mi basciò tutto tremante. / Galeotto fu 'l libro e chi lo scrisse: / quel giorno più non vi leggemmo avante" (V.136-138). As the two read from the chivalric romance, it is the book (as go-between) that seals their damnation.

The poem suggests that one must be wary of treacherous go-betweens; poets from Ovid to Juan Ruiz to Garcilaso have demonstrated that go-betweens—particularly friends and relatives— often sabotage the desires of others for personal gain. At the transition from stanza six to seven, it becomes evident that a primary theme is not to emphasize the *belle dame sans merci,* but rather to call attention to cases of treachery among friends. Keniston and Rivers have dismissed such an approximation to the poem; Rivers writes for example, that, concerning the conch of Venus in this Ode, erotic readings "tienen poco que ver con el texto de Garcilaso" (209). The verses discussed above allude to Ovid's discussion of the unreliable go-between in the *Ars amatoria*. Garcilaso renders the scene with subtle humor and wit; at a later instance, however, the Ovidian subtext becomes even more apparent.

The eleventh stanza alludes directly to Ovid and reveals the treachery of a friend. The *Ars amatoria* and its many maxims would have been recognizable and almost proverbial to the Renaissance scholar. Garcilaso's contemporaries, immersed in Latin studies, were compelled to note both the original source and the veiled mockery in Garcilaso's artful appropriation of the source reference. The Ovidian verses read:

Nomen amicitia est, nomen inane fides.

Ei mihi! non tutum est, quod ames, laudare sodali!

Cum tibi laudanti credidit, ipse subit. (I.740-42)

Friendship and loyalty empty words.

Ah me, it's not safe to praise your love to a friend:

if he believes your praise, he'll steal her himself. (I.740-42)

These verses correspond in sense and form to Garcilaso's iteration: "por ti el mayor amigo / l'es importuno, grave y enojoso / yo puedo ser testigo / que hay del peligroso / naufragio fuy su puerto y su reposo" (51-55). Thus, for Ovid and Garcilaso, the potential for danger in love rests not with a lascivious woman (or pimp) but rather among close friends or relatives:

Cognatum fratremque cave carumque sodalem:

Praebebit veros haec tibi turba metus. (I.753-4)

Beware of brothers, relatives, and dear friends:

that crowd offers you true cause for fear. (I.753-4)

Other signs point toward a similar engagement of Ovidian sources (as opposed to biographical detail). The poetic voice employs a *cancionero* register that characterizes the illicit intentions of the go-between: "y agora en tal manera / vence el dolor a la razón perdida / ponçoñosa fiera / nunca fue aborrecida / tanto como yo dél, ni tan temida" (56-60). These signs underscore the poet's dark humor though the allusion to Anaxarete: "Hágate temerosa / el caso de Anaxárete, y covarde / que de ser desdeñosa / se arrepentió muy tarde / y assí su alma con su mármol arde" (66-70). The reference to Ovid's

Metamorphoses points to the danger at hand; "mármol arde" hints at petrification, recalls Pygmalion and Galatea, and underscores the consequences of the interventions of the treacherous go-between as a threat. The poetic voice extends the motif of transformation, culminating in the verses "hasta que finalmente / en duro mármol buelta y transformada / hizo de sí la gente / no tan maravillada quanto de aquella ingratitud vengada" (96-100). Garcilaso's rendering of the unique source vignettes is compelling; the poet engages literary models in such a way that contemporaries would likely have described it as an artful, ironic rewriting of Ovid.

The poem is an example of Garcilaso's eristic imitation. According to G.W. Pigman, eristic imitation is that in which a text may "criticize and correct its model, and reveal a persistent ambivalence in emulation" (4). Here, the poetic voice recasts classical sources in a unique form; the Renaissance reader, versed in Latin, is invited to examine the linguistic shifts present in these poetic appropriations. Peter Dunn discusses the nature of imitation and rewriting at work in the poem and summarizes: "[Garcilaso's sources] show transparently through his poem, but are given a new colour" (307). The interplay of Italianate language and shifts in register also modulate the effect of the original allusions. In a similar way, Thomas M. Greene comments on the unique appropriation of classical texts in the Renaissance. Greene's study is particularly valuable in that it can be applied to Garcilaso's engagement of Ovidian sources: "Renaissance civilization throughout western Europe increasingly defined itself in terms of its filtered assimilation of antiquity….[T]he paradox of rupture and continuity was itself constantly altering the relation of its antithesis" (171). Garcilaso's poem is consistent with such a perspective of "filtered assimilation" of source material. On

creative production, Greene adds that "[t]he imitator simultaneously and paradoxically becomes his model and makes the model part of himself by innutrition….[W]hen the imitator succeeds, then his isolation is truly breached; a civilization flowers through willed acculturation; from the corruption of one society, a new one is generated" (192). This relationship between source text and poetic creation remains in a state of balance and vacillation—to cite Joachim du Bellay—as a dialogue between "the poet of the future and the reader of the past" (286). These ideas on imitation and poetic composition remain relevant in the study of Garcilaso's work. Close textual comparison of Garcilaso's poem reveals a literary rather than biographical engagement with Ovidian models. In its return to the text itself (allusions, verses, modulations of tone) this approach provides a model that advocates reading Garcilaso through the lens of the foundational context of Latin studies. By bringing the Latin forward and alongside the vernacular, a critical framework such as this can be fruitfully applied to scholarship in other areas of Garcilaso's work and to other poets of the Spanish Golden Age.

ii. Ovidian Subtexts and New Possibilities for Interpretation: Voluntary Exile and Legendary Biographies:

The rediscovery of Garcilaso's Ovidian subtexts is so valuable because in addition to challenging longstanding paradigms on Garcilaso's poetic corpus, the approach itself can be applied to other fundamental writers of the Spanish Golden Age. Carroll B. Johnson elegantly summarizes the fallacy of the biographical reading and the role of readers in the writing of literary histories over time:

> Spanish literary history is full of beautiful stories. These stories determine how we read a great many texts, what those texts are about and what they mean….

> Garcilaso is the first Spanish poet to be elevated to the rank of classic, treated and edited and read and studied as a classic, in his own century….Garcilaso is a poet of love, his theme is love, and his poetry moves us because we sense in it the tragic experience with Isabel Freire….Now in 1978 Frank Goodwyn began to tell us a new Garcilaso story in the pages of the *Hispanic Review*. According to this story Garcilaso couldn't have met Isabel Freire in 1526 because he was in Toledo attending to his duties as municipal councilman, engaged in the prosaic activity of awarding contracts for various timbering operations" (288-289).

Johnson discusses how historical evidence has revealed the Isabel Friere link for what it in fact is: a reassuring fiction. Johnson draws to a powerful conclusion, struck by the realization that "we critics arrange the data (text and context, as necessary) in such a way as to make it yield the story we want to hear….Giving up on Isabel deprives us of more than one kind of illusion, but it also frees us to read Garcilaso as a strikingly modern poet whose obsessive theme is poetry itself and his relation to other poets" (304). By drawing upon Johnson's watershed study, our study forges new ground in this area and fosters an approach to challenge the poet's status as a sincere poet writing from a biographical place.

Garcilaso inscribes himself within the fiction of the poet as exile. The Ovidian influences at work are not mere instances of imitation, but rather ingenious rewritings of Ovidian models that align Garcilaso with Ovid in ways that previous scholarship has not fully recognized, especially with regard to the Canción V. The patent Ovidian subtext becomes clear through examination of the odes. Mary Barnard comments on the literary

and material cultural influences that stand in relief to the composition of the odes and add to the legendary fiction of the exilic poet:

> If Rome and the other cities he visited, like Bologna, Mantua, and Ferrara, exposed Garcilaso to storehouses of antiquities and contemporary works of art, it was Naples, above all, that nourished his intellectual life and provided him with a wealth of imagined objects from the textual sources that he and his scholar friends read and discussed. He had arrived in Italy as an exile, fresh from an island in the Danube, where he had been sent by the emperor for having served as official witness to his nephew's marriage to Isabel de la Cueva, heiress to the Duchy of Albuquerque, against the wishes of some members of her family. Thanks to the intercession of Pedro de Toledo and his nephew, third duke of Alba, Garcilaso was allowed to spend his exile in Naples in service to the new viceroy. We hear the nostalgic voice of exile in the poet's first Latin ode, written in Naples and dedicated to his Neapolitan friend Antonio Tilesio. (*Material Culture* 7)

Upon examination of the First Ode, the humanist reader immediately recalls Ovid's exile to the Black Sea at Tomis. The reader also summons Fray Antonio de Guevara's *El Villano del Danubio* in his widely circulated *Relox de príncipes* (1529). Leo Spitzer is among the first scholars to reexamine this work as a literary enterprise that implicitly invokes the analogy between ancients and contemporaries for literary purposes: "Deja bien establecida la línea Cicerón-Guevara…. Todo el episodio del *Villano* ¿no es, por los demás, una dualidad verdad-mentira, un espejo colocado delante de la Roma fastuosa y triunfante y en el cual los que se creen conquistadores felices pueden contemplar su civilización carcomida por los vicios?" (6-7). The construction of a literary persona is

rendered through the discourse of the *villano* Mileno on the banks of the Danube, directed at the senators of Rome:

> ¡O!, Padres Conscriptos, ¡o!, pueblo venturoso; yo, el rústico Mileno, vezino que soy de las riparias ciudades del Danubio, saludo a vosotros, los senadores romanos, que en este Senado estáys juntos, y ruego a los immortales dioses que rijan oy mi lengua para que diga lo que conviene a mi patria y a vosotros ayuden a governar bien la república; porque sin voluntad y parecer de los dioses ni podemos emprender lo bueno ni aun apartarnos de lo malo. (634-635)

As a mouthpiece for commentary, Mileno draws several distinctions between himself and the senators. Antonio de Guevara's narrative develops the posture of an imperial subject that marks an engagement of Cicero's classical works. Garcilaso's rewriting of the Ovidian text doubtless evokes the poetic posturing of the *villano* found in Guevara's text. Like that of Mileno, Garcilaso's poetic voice writes from an exilic place on the Danube—isolated from the centers of culture, and relegated to the same geographical locale.

As he does in the epistles and eclogues, Garcilaso again aligns himself with Ovid as an exile. The skeptical reader is called to resist biographical readings, however, since Ovid was not permitted to return to Rome. In an Ovidian manner, Garcilaso's exile to the Danube resulted from having served as a witness, in his case to the contested marriage; according to Maltby, the objection was raised that the groom was both a commoner and the "son of a *comunero*" (26). One nevertheless must explore the notion of the exiled poet as a literary posture, which from Ovid, to Boethius, to Dante, to Petrarch, to Juan Ruiz, had become a commonplace trope of poetic identities. Our study holds that scholars are compelled to explore the possibility of exile as a deliberate poetic and

intellectual act. Perhaps the two approaches to exile—the biographical, and the literary—are not entirely antithetical. The reader is invited to view the ways in which Latin classics mediated experiences for Renaissance humanists. The case for Garcilaso's rhetorical exile is strong, nevertheless, in that such a posture places the poet in the company of other exiled writers immortalized not only as poets, but also in the legendary sense. Perhaps more legendary biography than fact, his evocation of the Ovidian subtext tinges our perception of Garcilaso and hints to a poetic engagement with classical texts.

In Ovid's *Tristia*, the poet writes from exile in Tomis along the coast of the Black Sea (modern-day Constanța, Romania). The exilic condition, and more specifically, the notion of writing from the outside, becomes a defining stylistic feature. Personified books served as go-betweens— negotiating the traffic of information and ideas across culture, space, and communities of scholars. Ovid charges his book to journey cautiously in his stead, to serve as an advocate for clemency and reevaluation of the exile:

> tu tamen i pro me, tu, cui licet, aspice Romam;
> di facerent, possem nunc meus esse liber!
> ….
> Icarus, aequoreis nomina fecit aquis.
> difficile est tamen hinc remis utaris an aura,
> dicere; consilium resque locusque dabunt.
> si poteris uacuo tradi, si cuncta uidebis
> mitia, si uires fregerit ira suas
>
> (Tr. I.1.57-59, I.1.87-92)

> So go in my stead, you have license,
> be my eyes in Rome (dear God, how I wish I could be
> my book!)
> ....
> So be watchful, unassuming:
> seek no readers beyond the common sort.
> Look at Icarus: flew too high with that rickety plumage,
> gave his name to the Icarian Sea.
> Should you row, or hoist sail to the breeze? It's hard, at this distance
> to decide: you must improvise as occasion dictates.

(Tr. I.1.57-59, I.1.87-92)

Through this rhetorical posture, Ovid implicitly recognizes the potential of the written word to mediate ideas across geographical and intellectual spaces. In his case, he specifically aims to implore Augustus to reduce his exile sentence (or to seek a more hospitable location). Ovid longingly wishes that he might travel to Rome (as does the book), and recognizing this impossibility, he takes solace in the potential of the book to mediate his ideas to others. In his description, he no doubt personifies the book, offering it practical insights for a successful journey: "You may lack a title: no matter, your style will still betray you; dissimulate all you like, it's clear you're mine. Slip in unnoticed..." (Tr. I.1.60-63). At the same time, such a remark can also be viewed as a gap or boast; implicitly, Ovid hopes that his book, written from the far ends of the Empire, will be discussed and read in the cultural center. By invoking Ovidian scenes in the dedication of his First Ode, Garcilaso positions himself in a similar exilic posture to that of Ovid. Readers must therefore explore the possibility that Garcilaso purposefully situates his work with the *Tristia* to signal that his poetry merits comparable literary prestige and cultural caché.

Biographical readings on poets are by no means uncommon in Spanish Golden Age literary histories. Garcilaso is only one poet among many that has been read biographically. Although Ovid's physical exile to Tomis has been generally accepted, Ovid scholars such as J.J. Hartmann and O. Janssen have made the claim that Ovid's exile was a rhetorical posture in itself. The posture of the exiled poet is worth further exploration in the Spanish context, as exile (or imprisonment in the case of the *Libro de Buen Amor*) need not be read literally. In the *Libro*, for example, the reader is warned to

resist literal interpretations in cuaderna sixteen: "Non tengades que es libro neçio de devaneo, / nin creades que es chufa algo que en él leo, / ca, segund buen dinero yaze en vil correo, / ansí en feo libro está saber non feo" (16). The subtext is clearly Ovidian and contributes to the fiction of the poet as exile. G.B. Gybbon-Monypenny situates such a reference within the context of allegorical medieval reading practices as opposed to a factual representation of lived circumstances.[4] Garcilaso recalls Ovid's exile from the onset in his First Ode in the dedication to Antonio Tilesio:

I. AD THYLESIUM

Uxore, natis, fratribus, et solo
exul relictis, frigida per loca
mussarum alumnus, barbarorum
ferre superbiam et insolentes
mores coactus, iam didici, invia
per saxa, voces ingeminantia
fletusque, sub rauco querelas
murmure Danubii levare. (1-8)

Wife, children, brothers, and homeland
abandoned, through cold regions,
student of the Muses, I learned
to bear the pride and fierce costumes
of the barbarians, through impassable rocks

---

[4] See pp.112-113 regarding *cuadernas* 16-18.

that multiply the voices and groans,

to throw my complaints

under the hoarse whisper of the Danube. (1-8)

Like Ovid, Garcilaso is compelled into exile to bear the material difficulties, tribulations, and intellectual isolation from the cultural center. Ovid claims that he almost forgot Latin while living among the barbarians at Tomis; Garcilaso is likewise forced to live among barbarians, far from the literate and intellectual circles of his contemporaries. Garcilaso's rendering of the Ovidian subtext is especially evident in verses 2-6: "through cold regions, student of the Muses, I learned to bear the pride and fierce costumes of the barbarians" (2-6). Garcilaso dons the Ovidian mantle through his emphasis on the harsh conditions and literary exile, placing himself squarely within the Ovidian posture of the exiled poet.

This association holds implications that move beyond the ode itself to inform debates on poetic fiction and legendary biography more broadly. To this end, Jo-Marie Claassen's *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius* formulates a excellent discussion concerning the exilic condition in the writing of legendary poetic histories:

> A desire to evoke sympathy 'there at Rome, where time passes normally,' tempered by humour, colours [Ovid's] portrayal of the-exile-as-lonely-hero and his battle to survive the epic onslaughts of malevolent forces. We may conclude that the poet's portrayal of what the exile sees and experiences, is literary….The first book of the *Tristia* is an "elegiac epic" in miniature, complete with flashbacks, and narration of a heartrending parting, another 'fall of Troy.' The

> exile is an epic hero, a combined Odysseus-Aeneas hounded by the supreme god Augustus-Jupiter. (191)

Through his anguished desire to return, Garcilaso similarly presents himself in legendary terms as the exile. He has fallen from favor and is forced to brave the miseries of nature, distance, and the ignorance of the barbarians. By directly calling attention to the Danube in verse 8, Garcilaso draws a geographical parallel to Ovid's exile in the East at Tomis, far from the centers of cultural, aristocratic, and political influence. Garcilaso postures himself within a tradition of exiled poets and crafts his own legendary poetic biography. The literary persona of Garcilaso—aligned with that of the tradition of the exiled poets—invites a reexamination of the notion of poetic biography as a literary endeavor.

iii. Transparent Ambiguities, *Cancionero* Word Games, and the Erotic Register:

The transparent ambiguities of the verses of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi" negotiate a fine line between overt eroticism and equivocation. An erotic reading of the poem is indicative of the types of puns that Garcilaso's humanist contemporaries would have regarded as acts of poetic skill. These ingenious word games are to be read two or more ways simultaneously for humorous and serious literary purposes within aristocratic Renaissance circles.

Scholarship on the "Ode ad florem Gnidi" has neglected to examine the poem's register within the intellectual context of sixteenth-century history of erotica. Menéndez y Pelayo characterizes the Ode as a mere "precioso juguete," describing it as little more than a dull, abstract poem written to pass the time in Naples: "En buen hora se le ocurrió a Garcilaso dejar las estancias largas y el monótono silogizar de los petrarquistas, para

dirigir a doña Violante Sanseverino, en nombre de Fabio Galeote, aquel precioso juguete" (294). Lapesa endorses Menéndez y Pelayo's phrasing and emphasizes Garcilaso's extensive reliance on Horatian texts. Lapesa situates the Odes as especially balanced and classical compositions within the overall arc of his "trayectoria" project (101). A close reading of the poem nevertheless reveals that risqué ambiguities permeate the verses; language itself serves as a treacherous go-between, transacting meaning via euphemism and double-entendre.

Renaissance humanist readers were keenly aware of aspects of word play and *double-entente*, for these were features were prized as a marks of linguistic acumen. The presence of erotic language becomes especially clear given the Italian context, in which risqué poetry took a particularly direct (even pornographic) form in Renaissance culture. Garcilaso's Galeoto refers to Mario and summons the Dantean "Galeotto"—the book as go-between—that mediates Paolo and Francesca's unfortunate embrace. For contemporary readers, even seemingly innocent words were known to carry sexualized double meanings in the context of *cancionero* poetics. In the "Ode ad florem Gnidi," the poetic voice becomes a lovesick prisoner, a galley slave that seeks to row in "remar en la concha de Venus": "Hablo d'aquel cativo / de quien tener se deve más cuidado / que 'stá muriendo bivo / al remo condenado / en la concha de Venus amarrado" (31-35)." "Amarrado" is very suggestive, connoting someone who is sexually obsessed with another person; it was used not unlike modern uses of "encoñado." Erotic innuendo was a commonplace trope in Renaissance Italian writing[5]—especially among those drawing from Ovidian texts. David O. Frantz explores a "material dealing with earthly delights of

---

[5] Antonio Vignali's *La Cazzaria, The Book of the Prick* (1527), is a notable example, in which an ongoing mock-dialogue among allegorical genitals ensues.

a sexual nature" (1) in his masterful study, *Festum Voluptatis: A Study of Renaissance Erotica.* Frantz shows how veiled language—apples, figs, keys, locks, and the like—summon sexualized double-meanings for the Renaissance. Modern scholars might dismiss erotic poetry as merely obscene or humorous, yet Frantz reminds his reader that sexualized double-readings reveal a high level of poetic acumen and cultural caché in Renaissance literate communities:

> That a commentator uses allegory to find a bawdy meaning is in fact a wonderfully ironic reversal of the Renaissance tendency to use allegory in order to find "serious" meanings in works that were bawdy, or erotic, or even obscene. Such is the commentary of a scholar who would convince us that he deals with "legitimate" fruit while the pedants prefer apples and peaches….[This is] the ultimate in learned erotica, for it takes one step beyond a comic sexual poem that itself displays and mocks learned traditions. (38)

Some passages, however, are far more explicit than those dealing with fruit and common household objects. Pietro Aretino and his follows constitute a school of erotica writers that circulated (and were later translated and published in compiled volumes) in Vienna, London, and Lisbon. In Aretino's *Dubbi amorosi,* the poet describes consummated love through explicit imagery of physical pleasure. To cite one well-known example:

> Dammi la lingua, appunta i piedi al muro;
>
> stringi le cosce, e tiemmi stretto, stretto;
>
> lascia che vada a traversar il letto
>
> che d'altro che di fotter non mi curo.
>
> …

Io vi ringrazio cara Lorenzina,

mi sforzerò servirvi; ma spingete,

spingete come fa la Ciabattina. (56)

Give me your tongue, point your feet to the wall,

squeeze your thighs and hold me as tight as you can;

Let it go across the bed,

for I don't care about anything but fucking.

…

I want to thank you my dear Lorenzina;

I exert myself to serve you, now, push away

just as Ciabattina does. (57)[6]

Here, both parties take part in a dialogue during the sexual encounter. The language is overt, devoid of the unconsummated yearning that is frequently evident the Petrarchan tradition. This direct, pornographic style of erotic literature was common to Renaissance writers such as Aretino, Niccolo Franco, and Lodovico Dolce that circulated in humanist literary spheres and was not unknown by humanists and poets like Garcilaso. Frantz posits a likely Ovidian model for the *conia* motif popularized in Aretino's poetry. He notes that the classical influences in Aretino's dialogues pertain to the *Ars amatoria*, where Aretino's protagonist Pippa is initiated into the world of prostitution in the second part of his *Dialogo.* Through his euphemism of rowing in the "concha de Venus," Garcilaso renders a scene in which sexuality is only thinly veiled. In modern usage,

---

[6] See Frantz, pp 56-57.

"concha" is still a referent for the female *pudendum* in Latin America. The double reading speaks to the amphibology trope that was a common stylistic resource of *cancionero registers*. Here, a phrase is grammatically ambiguous in such a way that causes readers to pause momentarily to observe the euphemism at hand.

Modern readers are called to remain open to the possibility of graphic, risqué uses of language in *cancionero* works. Keith Whinnom shows that a transparent ambiguity existed in *cancionero* registers; like the go-between, language holds the potential to transit between innocent and implicit readings. Whinnom suggests a sense of open-mindedness and caution when discussing *cancionero* codes in modern critical approaches: "La superficial sencillez de muchos versos cancioneriles oculta sutilezas…. Estamos entre Escila y Caribdis. Por una parte, es sumamente peligroso tratar de ingenua a la poesía cancioneril y, por otra, corremos el riesgo de exponernos al ridículo al insistir en ver escabrosidades en versos totalmente inocentes" (59). For the modern reader, studies on the erotic registers in Garcilaso hold the potential to open new dialogues not only on the role of Ovidian texts, but also on the role of *cancionero* rhetoric and tropes of double meanings as a stylistic and thematic resource. Louise O. Vasvari formulates an analysis of ingenious word games in the *Libro de Buen Amor* to show that the work is replete with "comical transpositions of both sacred and secular texts…not meant for all members of the audience, but only for the more sophisticated" (196). Vasvari's study draws upon approaches to medieval parody outlined by Bakhtin in his study on Rabelais; she demonstrates that the equivocal *quoniam*—and other words beginning with an initial /k/— were euphanisms for *cunnus*, "the standard word for 'female sex organ'" (197).

Even earlier in literary criticism, Leo Spitzer cited the association between *la conia, quiniam*, and female sex organs:

> Was aber ist *conia*? ... Eine sexuelle Bedeutung für *conia* wie bei *quoniam* möchte man ja annehmen. (248-249)
>
> But what is *conia*? … One would like to take a sexual meaning for *conia* such as *quoniam*. (248-249)

The pun was a commonplace trope in the period; seemingly innocuous Latin words with similar sound patterns took on new meaning within literary, aristocratic, and ecclesiastical circles. Spitzer bolsters his claim through a series of examples from medieval French, each of which refer to the erotic use of the word. According to Vasvari, such phrases and their Latin variants engaged an intellectual public, prompted delight and recognition, and marked a sense of poetic skill: "From all we know of audiences of the period, it seems that they took pleasure in the re-hearing of the familiar and that part of their enjoyment was in the anticipation of certain stories, set phrases, jokes, and obscene allusions" (200).

Garcilaso's reference to the "concha" conveys a reference to female anatomy that even today carries the same meaning in many regions of Latin America. Latin American vulgar speech has a particular quality of preserving older forms of use, both in the sense and semantics of the word. Though such a meaning diminished from use in Spain, "concha," or "conchita," preserve the original meaning in the Latin American context, especially in Argentina, Chile, Puerto Rico, Nicaragua, and several other countries. "Concha" signifies "vagina," but it also carries a derogatory sense and is used also as an

insult or slur. Through such a reading, Garcilaso's Ode takes on new suggestive meanings through the erotic lens of euphemism and word play. The poetic voice desires to row in the "conch" of Venus; the humanist's keen awareness to the bawdy double-meaning enriches the reader's interaction with the Ode through the pleasure of recognition of two concurrent uses, at once erotic and literary, ambiguous and equivocal. Attention to the risqué linguistic puns as much informs a reading of Garcilaso's registers as it belies his engagement with obscene Ovidian texts.

It is not surprising that Menéndez y Pelayo neglects to discuss the types of *cancionero* word games in Garcilaso's poetry. Menéndez y Pelayo described *cancionero* styles in pejorative terms, particularly as "coplas fútiles, coplas de *cancionero*, versos sin ningún género de pasión, devaneos insulsos que parecen imaginarios. conceptos sutiles y alambicados, agudezas de sarao palaciego tan pronto dichas como olvidadas" (209). *Cancionero* registers have been understudied and poorly understood; verses represent more than mere poetic experimentation and are not devoid of content. In his discussion of language of the widely celebrated *Cancionero general* (Valencia, 1511), Whinnom explains that *cancionero* language itself evokes a sense of transparent linguistic ambiguity. This occurs in part because *cancioneros* vocabularies rely on a relatively small range of words to achieve abstract and allegorical meaning:

> The vocabulary is numerically small, and a count of the nouns in the section devoted to *canciones* reveals that out of a total of 297 different nouns, twenty-five account for over one half of the total number of occurrences of nouns….This poetry is limited conceptually to abstractions, and there are singularly few concrete terms….The same abstract vocabulary recurs (dolor, muerte, esperança,

coraçón, alma, temor), and the conclusion is expressed in conceptual abstractions. (117-118)

Through such abstractions, words come to hold several connotations simultaneously. Readers and listeners would have doubtless recognized the types of word play at hand as ingenious poetic gestures. In the *cancionero* tradition, *muerte* and *morir* are associated with unrequited love, but also evoke the act of making love in the Italian madrigal,[7] as well as the *pequeña muerte,* a euphemism for bliss and climax discussed by Georges Bataille and Roland Barthes. *Gloria*, likewise, was recognized widely as a euphemism for consummated love or climax. There is ample evidence in the *Cancionero general* to support ambiguous, erotic readings in clear sexual terms. Whinnom writes that "if one is alive to the possible sexual connotations and implications of *esperança, remedio, galardón, desseo, voluntad, gloria, servicio, morir*, etc., one can hardly fail to receive the impression that the *canciones* of the *Canc. gen.* are, like the poetry of the troubadours, impregnated with sensuality" (126). Modern readers are called to remain open to these linguistic ambiguities; the rediscovery of the risqué possibilities of language reveals the types of erotic readings that have been elided in the writing of literary histories on Garcilaso.

Jorge Manrique's "Justa fue mi perdición" presents an interesting example of how literary histories have failed to value the erotic aspects of *cancioneril* word play. The poet's *Coplas a la muerte de su padre* have eclipsed his amorous and burlesque works in literary histories. Jesús Manuel Alda-Tesán characterizes Manrique's burlesque works as little more than "un montón de versos desvaídos que figuran como un peso muerto en la

[7] Einstein, Alfred. *The Italian Madrigal.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949, pp. 541.

obra de Manrique" (13). Manrique's satirical and burlesque sonnets are often neglected because they do not fit neatly within canonical readings of the poet as a moralist writer. Read through the lens of *cancionero* double meanings, "Justa fue mi perdición" sustains at least three ingenious readings simultaneously:

> Justa fue mi perdición;
> de mis males soy contento,
> no se espera galardón,
> pues vuestro merecimiento
> satisfizo mi pasión.
>
> II
> Es victoria conocida
> quien de vos queda vencido,
> que en perder por vos la vida
> es ganado lo perdido.
> Pues lo consiente Razón,
> consiento mi perdimiento
> [sin esperar galardón],
> pues vuestro merecimiento
> satisfizo mi pasión. (125)

This poem circulated extensively in the fifteenth century and was even set to music during the reign of Fernando and Isabel. What is perhaps most significant is the ambiguity introduced by the triple meaning of "Justa." The word can function as an adjective ("just" or "fair"), as the name of a lady ("Justa" was my ruin), or as the noun form of "Justar" (Thrusting was my ruin). As the name of a *dama*, "Justa" satirically conveys a sense or scandal that ultimately harms the poetic voice. In the case of "Justar," the word serves as a blatant sexual reference that would have been recognizable and humorous to the contemporary reader or listener. The verse sustains all three meanings at the same time; the pleasure of reading the poem rests in the ingenuity of the multiple meanings that emerge from the opening verse. The poem is laden with erotic ambiguities

through the risqué phrases “no se espera galardón,” “satisfizo mi pasión, “victoria,” and “lo consiente Razón.” The poetic voice only thinly veils references to consummated love. The poem demonstrates a series of commonplace *cancionero* contrasts though the verses “quien de vos queda vencido, / que en perder por vos la vida,” an erotic evocation of *morir* as climax. By remaining open to the possibility of such an erotic reading, modern readers can benefit from the rediscovery of the ingenious, ambiguous readings that have been lost by critical judgment or otherwise in the writing of literary histories on poets such as Jorge Manrique and Garcilaso.

Cancionero codes permeated the courtly spheres of fifteenth and sixteenth century Renaissance culture. Royston O. Jones explores the boundaries between history, *cancionero* language, and fiction in Alvarez Gato’s poetry. He shows that the poems said to refer to Juana of Portugal (wife of Enrique IV) demonstrate a *cancionero* literary engagement foremost, rather than lived biography in itself. On literary criticism surrounding these poems, Jones comments that: “basándose en unas suposiciones erróneas, forzosamente ha sacado conclusiones falsas…. Sin embargo, hay algo más que decir sobre esto; y como me parece que fue bastante desgracia el haber sido mujer del triste Enrique IV, siendo posible librar a doña Juana de estas imputaciones nuevas, sería poco caballeresco no hacerlo” (55). Jones highlights that despite Juana’s terrible reputation at court, it is possible to approach the poems as literary gestures with which *cancionero* poets intended to improve or damage Juana’s reputation. The poems need not be read biographically; instead, they reveal more about the social and literary circumstances of their composition, as well as homosocial *cancionero* codes at court. Otis H. Green reminds his reader that use of humorous and erotic codes not only

promoted serious instruction; such writing also marked acts of poetic virtuosity and generated complicit laughter in the recognition of multiple levels of meaning. On this dynamic, Green remarks that "more often than not, the reader will find himself making complex associational bridges, involving meanings far removed from that of the words left unsaid" (54). Modern criticism has a tendency to dehumanize authors like Jorge Manrique and Garcilaso through the privileging of moralist, formal, and chaste readings of the works themselves; these readings often serve as evidence of biographical readings that efface the types of ambiguous word play found in the poetry itself.

The influence of *cancionero* language was so ubiquitous in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that evidence of *cancionero* codes also exists in the legal discourses that circulated during Garcilaso's lifetime. In "Courtly Love and Lust in Loja," Angus Mackay suggests that the relationship between history, fiction, and literary convention is often problematic: "Even if it is accepted that some, but not all, *cancionero* poems are replete with obscene double meanings, how can we be certain that they are not themselves simply part of a literary convention that has little to do with reality?"(83). Mackay draws attention to a 1509 *información* or *pesquisa,* a legal document that relates the supposed sexual scandals in the town of Loja; the discourse problematizes the distinction between history and courtly love conventions:

> The información, indeed, makes for stranger reading than fiction: people here fall ill with love, the use of religious language and imagery is grotesque, wife-swapping and homosexuality are supposedly widespread, access to the houses of the sexual protagonists apparently presents little problem, the Devil is invoked to

> explain people's behavior, and yet another item of 'lost literature', written in blood, surfaces to be recorded. (83)

In this legal document, Pedro de Morales, a *licenciado*, uses a *cancionero* register to describe the evidence at hand through a vocabulary of courtly love. Ironically, all evidence points back to the *licenciado* directly or indirectly: "In fact no one denied that it was the *licenciado* himself who had had a liaison with Constanza de Briones, and he may well have been indulging in his favorite trick of covering up his own activities by spreading slanders about others." (92). The discourse conveys a slapstick, humorous account of bed switching, sexual propositions, and erotic fantasies that ultimately lead to violence at the highest levels of provincial aristocracy. The authenticity of evidence depended greatly on the literary ingenuity of the *licenciado,* who renders the case through the register of *cancionero* language. Legal *pesquisas* such as this circulated throughout Renaissance aristocratic circles and coincide with Garcilaso's formative years at court. Mackay shows that the idealized courtly rhetoric is a veneer for more risqué messages that would have clearly been understood by a contemporary audience. The fact that the *cancionero* register is found in a legal document is significant, as this is where modern readers might least suspect it at first glance. Garcilaso's contemporary readers were familiar with this ambiguous use of language as a gesture of poetic wit and virtuosity.

Like Jorge Manrique's burlesque poems, several of Garcilaso's works were adapted and set to music in the sixteenth-century, particularly as madrigals. Ambiguous *cancionero* registers are evident in these compositions, and would have doubtless been understood by the listener at court. Alonso de Mudarra set Garcilaso's Sonnet VI, "Por ásperos caminos," included in his *Tres libros de música en cifras para vihuela* (Seville,

1546). Mudarra was a vihuelist and composer who enjoyed the patronage of the powerful Mendoza family. Mudarra is the first composer known to have published a musical composition of Garcilaso's verses. As Stevenson observes, the composer sought to produce a madrigal setting of Spanish verses of Jorge Manrique, Juan del Encina, Boscán, and Garcilaso (173). Sonnet VI reads:

> Por ásperos caminos é llegado
> a parte que de miedo no me muevo;
> y si a mudarme a dar un passo pruevo,
> y allí por los cabellos soy tornado.
>
> Mas tal estoy, que con la muerte al lado
> busco de mi bivir consejo nuevo;
> y conozco el mejor y el peor apruevo,
> o por costumbre mala o por mi hado.
>
> Por otra parte, el breve tiempo mío,
> y el errado processo de mis años,
> en su primer principio y en su medio,
>
> mi inclinación, con quien ya no porfío,
> la cierta muerte, fin de tantos daños,
> me hazen descuydar de mi remedio. (80-81)

In the poem, Garcilaso develops the *cancionero* trope of the wayfarer on the road of love. The path is rugged, and the poetic voice hesitates in fear. These motifs were common to the poetry of the epoch and evoke close resonances of Ausìas March: "Quant he pensat d'Amor del tot estorçre, / contra mi vaig camí que no puch torçre, / portant-me'n part, la qual si be contemple, / no puch dar pas plaent a mon coratge" (CXVI.46-49). Garcilaso's verses, like those of March, convey a sense of fear through hesitation to remain in place. Garcilaso also recalls Petrarch's *Canzone* CCLXIV, yet as Heiple observes, the poem diverges from the model through its linguistic ambiguity and outcomes (166). The verse "el errado processo de mis años" suggests the influence of carnal desire to which the

poetic voice repeatedly is inclined to submit ("me hazen descuydar de mi remedio"). The poem invokes an ambiguous, erotic *cancionero* vocabulary that characterizes the poetic voice as a victim of his "costumbre mala," "hado," or "inclinación"—forces that supposedly are beyond his own control. These are also *cancionero* tropes that are censured in such works as Martínez de Toledo's *Corbacho* (1438), in which the text presents and rebuts notions of star-crossed lovers, predestination, and the effects of "hados," "fortuna," "signos," and "planetas" in matters of love:

> Que si el bueno fue bueno, y su constelación, su planeta, signo, hado cuando naciose lo dio, que bien había de acabar, ya ni grado ni gracias, que según esto santo nació y bienaventurado murió. Eso mismo del malo: si el malo nació en mal signo, y fue así que hubo de proseguir su maldad viviendo, y murió malo, ¿qué justicia sería esta, haber dañación, pues él no procuró de nacer en aquel mal signo, planeta o hado? Y sería venir a la fuerte materia de los precitos y predestinados, diciendo que los unos de necesario han de ser salvos, los otros dañados…. No te excuses pues, con hado, planeta, ni suerte, ni ventura, ni diciendo que le plogo a Dios; sino di que te plogo a ti, y pudieras salvarte, y fue en tu querer y mano, y por poca delectación mundana. (IV.i)

These *cancionero* tropes were common to writing of the period, and Garcilaso subtly engages them in ways that would have been recognizable to readers. The posture of Garcilaso's poetic voice is reflective, looking from a crossroads to the past and future along the journey. The poet nevertheless includes the reference to "cierta muerte," a transparently ambiguous term for sexual consummation. Garcilaso signals to the reader

that the poem can sustain both the reflective and libidinal readings of the poem simultaneously.

The latter reading sustains a more ample interpretation of the poem, and is consistent with the ways in which Garcilaso's contemporaries would have understood his work. The first person narration of the poem contributes to the ambiguity of the verses, situating the reader outside the poetic frame as a complicit observer. In discussion of the poetic voice, Anthony J. Cascardi notes: "The focus in Garcilaso's verse is not the objectivity of the object as potential vehicle for satisfaction of desire (or conversely the suffering and pain that stems from absence of the beloved object) but the ability to create himself out of a series of speech-acts whose ultimate challenge is to establish their own efficacy" (260). It is the reader or listener that must negotiate the double meanings that ground the psychological and erotic possibilities of the poem.

Mudarra's 1546 musical composition of Garcilaso's Sonnet VI speaks to the circulation and diffusion of the poet's work in more than one artistic medium. Maria Oss-Cech Chiacchia provides a valuable musical analysis of Mudarra's "Por ásperos caminos" to reveal the ways in which the composer drew from the poem itself to render the madrigal in keeping with cues from the verses themselves:

> [T]he rhythm of the melody mirrors the text closely by accentuating the prosodic accents of the hendecasyllabic line. Mudarra's attention to text-music relationship is immediately displayed with a melisma[8] that colours and emblematically prolongs the term *llevado* (transported), ending with a Phrygian cadence, that is to say ending on the raised fifth chord A…. In the next phrase, the

[8] Melisma refers to the singing of a single syllable of text while shifting between several different notes in succession.

> melody moves stepwise to remain static on the same pitch, with slightest movement in virtually declamatory style, this to underscore the moment of fear and immobility communicated by the words: "therein petrified with fear I dare not move / and if I attempt to take a step…. Subsequently, a quicker rhythmic figure drives the cadence with a melisma in the melody on the word *tornado* (overturned), thus depicting images of a poet whose attempted move is suddenly arrested by the dragging of the hair. (185-186).

To the listener, Mudarra's attention to the modulations of the poem—to its vocabulary, cadence, and ambiguities—constitutes an almost contemporary reading of the poem that reinforces the double register. The music heightens the suspense of the verses and modulates the poetic voice's ambiguous perspective. The composer thus becomes a reader of Garcilaso's verses, interpreting the sounds of verses and contributing to the diffusion of Garcilaso's work throughout aristocratic Renaissance circles.

iv. The Mythological Literary-Artistic Persona in Renaissance Culture:

Mythological texts have been repurposed in diverse ways over time to draw parallels between humanists and their contemporary cultural contexts. Scholars and artists have recast mythological themes in Western writing and art from antiquity through the Renaissance. The notion of a Renaissance rediscovery of the classics coincided with greater engagement of classical texts in humanist poetry and in the plastic arts. It is important to note that mythologies are above all fictions that are made relevant to the priorities of a specific literary or cultural moment. They acquire new significance through the manipulation of subsequent generations of writers. Perkins asserts that

scholars inscribe meaning to texts and traditions, acclimating works to the uses of the contemporary moment, which is true of the adaptation of mythological themes.

The intersection of history, myth, and fiction informs the intellectual uses of mythology in literary culture throughout historical periods and literary genres. Ernst Robert Curtius writes that "[h]istory relates real events; fable tells of things which never happened and never could happen because they are contrary to nature" (452). For example, Medieval readers did not view fables and myths as representations of lived realities, but rather as legendary fictions that serve literary and didactic ends. *Calila e Dimna* presents *exempla* narrated by animals to promote didactic lessons. Such mythologies served as exemplary or cautionary tales that provided practical advice or moral lessons. Similar use of fables as *exempla* are found in Don Juan Manuel's *Conde Lucanor*, in which the Count and Partronio, his servent, engage in a dialogue. The Count seeks counsel, and Patronio responds with a story that mirrors the issue at hand. Patronio explains the relevance of his *exemplum* to the question presented by the Count; the Count views Patronio's advice as valuable and decides to follow it. The intervention of the Count at the end of each *cuento* (and Patronio's *refrán*) serves as that of a 'super-narrator' that summarizes and reiterates the value of the advice presented. Don Juan Manuel seeks to protect aristocratic privileges against attempts to limit the powers and rights of the nobility; the literary *exempla* he includes instruct the aristocratic, lay reader how to make pragmatic choices in changing times.

In the Renaissance, humanist readers were likewise invited to suspend disbelief, to delight in the recognition of mythical texts, and to view myths as legendary fictions. Mythical scenes are useful to writers and artists because they hold the potential to

negotiate literary and artistic commentaries in allegorical, symbolic, and ekphrastic ways. Renaissance writers and artists appropriated and transformed classical sources because the underlying mythological texts were well-suited as visual and imaginative vehicles for intellectual expression in humanist circles. The public that read and viewed these literary and artistic compositions was well-read, aristocratic, and educated in Latin. Ovidian and Virgilian allusions and verses had become so well-known in these closed, aristocratic circles that scholars were keenly aware of explicit, implicit mythological references, often made indirectly and by oblique suggestion to a classical model. For example, knowledge of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Ovidian vignettes was linked to the educational and social practices of the age; humanist writers and artists consequently were able to not only appropriate an Ovidian text, but also to rewrite such a source in ways that would have been recognizable to humanist scholars. Within the visual arts, such a case is represented by Titian's paintings and is evocative of the types of reappropriations at work in humanist intellectual circles. The painter renders his *Diana and Actaeon* in such a way that conveys psychological depth, movement, and an attention to the respective reactions of the Ovidian protagonists.

Actaeon stumbles onto the spring in which Diana, goddess of the hunt, is bathing with her retinue of nymphs. Embarrassed and enraged, Diana shields herself and turns Actaeon into a stag. This scene from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* had become a commonplace in Renaissance culture. Titian's painting renders the moment of surprise in a novel and unique way, emphasizing the immediate reactions of the protagonists. Actaeon raises his arm to shield his face, while Diana turns her head in anger and embarrassment. The nymphs likewise attempt to cover themselves. For the Renaissance

viewer, Titian's rendering of the source motif takes on new meaning through the unique attention to the characters' individualized reactions. Navarrete reminds scholars that for the Renaissance humanist—and in popular culture more generally—that the river nymphs introduce a sense of erotic ambiguity to Renaissance works. Nymphs were synonymous with prostitutes, rendered in literary and artistic terms as figures that "pursue aristocratic pastimes" (*Orphans* 100). Titian also adds depth and verisimilitude to the painting by including Diana's small dog, a recognized symbol of fidelity and protection, yapping at the intruder. In his recasting of the Ovidian source motif, Titian signals to his contemporary, Latin-educated public that he renders the source scene to mark the surprise of the initial encounter through a sense of psychological immediacy and depth. Imagery and myth often served as the means by which to convey an emotion or shared point of reference in the European Renaissance mind. De Armas writes that mythologies were used "oftentimes to draw a comparison to a [familiar] psychological state" (130). Consequently, the reader is also, as an informed observer, made privy to multiple levels of poetic meaning through the intersection of myth, emotive response, and cultural signifiers.

Like Titian, Garcilaso rewrites classical texts in a way that engages his humanist contemporaries' knowledge and conveys a sense of solidarity between readers and writers. The ways in which Garcilaso presents mythological themes vary widely, from explicit classical references, to oblique echoes of source verses, to rewriting of mythical content at a thematic level. As Joan Cammarata notes, because Garcilaso's humanist readership was educated, mythology provided a useful vehicle for literary creation and commentary:

> The richness and established significance of mythology allow for an economical method of narration and a means of expression. Garcilaso is able to focus his attention on the external elements of his literary creation because the educated reader is able to extrapolate from even the briefest mythological references to a universal canon of ideas, emotions, human characteristics, and conflicts. (30)

The humanist reader's familiarity with classical mythologies affords Garcilaso the chance to follow, reinterpret, or diverge from the original models in ways that would have been recognizable to the contemporary humanist. A central consideration is not the classical reference in itself, but rather, the recasting of the source vignette in a way that is unique and significant to an educated, aristocratic public. The poet sometimes closely mirrors the source model; in other instances, the source allusion provides a point of departure in which to refashion classical motifs for new literary and cultural ends. Knowledge of a classical mythology affords Garcilaso's readers a point of reference with which to engage a similar classical theme in relation to the contemporary work. Garcilaso's mythological subtexts are at the same time a display of knowledge and a gesture of solidarity toward humanist readers.

Such a mythological frame of reference validates the comprehension of its learned audience and offers them the pleasure of recognition with which to identify as members of the aristocratic-literary class. Mythological allusions permit allegorical interpretations and allow Renaissance readers to interpret contemporary literary works vis-à-vis their classical sources. It is important to note that although Garcilaso appropriates Virgil and Ovid, he does not do so indiscriminately. As Cammarata explains: "Garcilaso is independent in his use of mythology, that is, he does not relate the myth for its own sake

nor lets the myth guide his heart and mind. Garcilaso does not accept the myth as true or false, but as a structure of prototypical events or characters which evoke an empathetic experience" (159). Cammarata's claim should not be misunderstood as an endorsement of the discourse of sincerity; rather, this argument speaks to the literary basis of Garcilaso's poetic models and processes of appropriation. By drawing a parallel to classical mythology, Garcilaso introduces a sense of perspective and continuity between past and present. Contemporary rewritings in this way can project a sense of kinship between classical material and Garcilaso's legendary poetic persona. Mythological texts provide a symbolic language with which to represent abstract ideas in imaginative ways.

The visual aspect of these allusions does not suggest mere ornamentation or decoration. Garcilaso's subtexts forge parallels between classical and Renaissance cultural circles, offer clarification and thematic commentary, and serve as narrative elements in the progression of individual poems. The poet problematizes the established meanings of classical allusions in new ways through poetic rewriting; in doing so, verses rhetorically transport readers to a legendary and imaginative space. Garcilaso engages mythologies as both rhetorical and memory devices and writes for a learned audience that is invited to delight in the recognition of these models. As an intellectual enterprise, mythical appropriation recasts allusions for new literary and thematic purposes.

Garcilaso's poetry offers the possibility to explore the erotic, *ekphrastic* potential of poetry in Renaissance culture. The link between written and visual cultures has long been recognized, particularly with regard to notions of perspective. On Renaissance writing, de Armas notes:

> [Writing] had a strong visual component. Poets and writers appealed to this sense in particular since it was thought that visualization was a key to memory…. Although the very notion of writing for the eyes was not new to the Spanish Golden Age, its ubiquitous presence during this period calls for a rethinking of the traditional separation between the visual and the verbal in studies of Iberian culture…. Renaissance poetics crafted a number of bridges between the painter and the poet. (7)

Painting and poetry were viewed as sister arts; particularly in the Renaissance, both summon similar visual codes to create meaning based on the primacy of sight. John Berger discusses this phenomenon in *Ways of Seeing*, to show that all interpretations are in effect "man-made" (9). Images are often separated from the context of their original production, circulation, and social uses; it is therefore the observer that reacts and creates meaning. Berger suggests that observers interpret objects (and form underlying meanings) in relation to themselves through constantly shifting lenses. He emphasizes the importance of the phallic gaze and the centrality of women as an outside viewer or *voyeur*. The erotic presence of Renaissance iconography (mythological or otherwise) has often been elided in the writing of contemporary cultural and art histories, in part due to the lack of knowledge of mythological subtexts themselves. Berger writes that "mythological paintings strike us today as the most vacuous of all. They are like tired tableaux in wax that won't melt….Before these canvases the spectator-owner hoped to see the classic face of his own passion or grief or generosity. The idealized appearances were an aid, a support, to his own view of himself" (100). In the aristocratic Renaissance context, the meanings ascribed to paintings were the constructions of their viewers.

Berger aptly notes that these offered examples of "how the heightened moments of life—to be found in heroic action, the dignified exercise of power, passion, courageous death, the noble pursuit of pleasure—should be lived, or, at least, should be seen to be lived" (101). In poetry as in painting, an attention to reader-viewer response holds the potential to develop productive readings on aspects of perspective and linguistic-iconographic ambiguity.

Erwin Panofsky confirms the central role of viewer response in the construction of meaning, affirming that mythological scenes in Renaissance paintings were capable of producing carnal excitement in observers, as well as ethical contemplation. As Panofsky writes, many of Titian's paintings "deal with a novel subject calculated to stimulate the carnal passions (by juxtaposition of a nude woman with a fully dressed gentleman) as well as to intrigue the mind" (121). Many of these particular paintings feature a naked Venus (with or without Cupid present) and a musician playing an organ or lute.

Titian renders the reclining Venus in full-frontal view, draping her in only a translucent sash of fabric. The musician looks on longingly as he plays his lute. Venus holds a wooden recorder in her left hand, and gazes off to the right as she is crowned by Cupid. Here, the main subject of the painting is indeed the lute player; viewers note the sense of desire with which the lute player observes Venus. In another painting, Titian depicts the reaction of the musician in even more explicit terms.

Cupid is absent in this painting, and the sheer drapery no longer covers Venus; she is full-figured and pets her small dog in repose. The organist is completely turned away from his keyboard. His gaze gestures toward Venus' *os pudendum*, and his body cranes back toward the goddess. In contrast to other iterations of Venus and the

musicians, this male subject (more adult than boyish) gazes particularly intently at his patron. Panofsky further suggests that, regarding this erotic composition and its uses, Titian's rendering of Venus likely corresponds to the image of the patron's mistress (122). Other iconographic features, including the positioning of the organist's sword, seem to corroborate this possibility. Venus reclines upon a lavish blanket, and it appears that the organist also sits on the end of the bed cushions. In discussion of the instrument itself (organ verses lute), Panofsky remarks that in *Venus and the Lute Player* "a musician interrupted in the act of making music by the sight of visual beauty embodied in Venus has been transformed into a musician doing homage to the visual beauty embodied in Venus by the very act of making music. It is difficult to play the organ and to admire a beautiful woman at the same time; but it is easy to serenade" (125).

Titian's paintings, like Garcilaso's poems and pictorial images common to Renaissance art, sought to provoke desire in the viewer. On nudity in art, John Berger explains: "Nakedness has a positive visual value in its own right: we want to *see* the other naked…. This reality, by promising the familiar, proverbial mechanism of sex, offers, at the same time, the possibility of the shared subjectivity of sex" (59). In Renaissance art, female nudity raises several considerations related to the social uses of the paintings themselves: "The contradiction can't be stated simply. On the one hand, the individualism of the artist, the thinker, the patron, the owner: on the other hand, the person that is the object of their activities—the woman—treated as a thing or an abstraction" (62). The voyeuristic nature of Renaissance painting draws viewers into the paintings as complicit observers. It is not surprising that nude paintings were commonly found in bedrooms, on ceilings of libraries, and in the royal El Pardo hunting lodge. The

fact that such paintings were hung in what were viewed as masculine spaces (many of which were restricted to women) speaks not only social uses of the paintings—it also reveals the extent to which interpretations of these paintings have been effaced in generations of criticism. Scholars have often elided the erotic ambiguities of original Renaissance artistic and literary work. In both poetry and painting, modern critics have a tendency to dehumanize figures such as Titian and Garcilaso in the construction of literary canons and notions of national classics. It is worth remembering that these gifted artists and writers were in fact human beings capable of appreciating both high and low registers— classical texts, bawdy humor, risqué vignettes— as expressions of artistic wit and virtuosity. As shown in *Festum Voluptatis,* eroticism was a clear and present component in both sister arts.

Garcilaso's Sonnet XII provides an interesting case study in the relationship between mythologies, the rendering of classical allusions, and the poet's readership:

> Si para refrenar este deseo
> loco, imposible, vano, temeroso,
> y guarecer de un mal tan peligroso,
> que es darme a entender yo lo que no creo.
>
> No me aprovecha verme cual me veo,
> o muy aventurado o muy medroso,
> en tanta confusión que nunca oso
> fiar el mal de mí que lo poseo,
>
> ¿qué me ha de aprovechar ver la pintura
> de aquél que con las alas derretidas
> cayendo, fama y nombre al mar ha dado,
>
> y la del que su fuego y su locura
> llora entre aquellas plantas conocidas
> apenas en el agua resfríado?

Garcilaso rewrites the mythological scene of Icarus and Phaethon and develops the

interplay of classical themes and *cancionero* diction ("deseo," "aventurado," "fuego," "locura"). The poetic voice uses enjambment throughout the poem; the octet establishes the protasis of the conditional sentence, and the sestet provides the conclusion in the form of a question. In the first tercet, the poetic voice emphasizes the visual aspect of Renaissance culture and invokes a painting of the Icarus myth. Icarus, son of the exile Daedalus, affixes wings made of wax and feathers to himself and attempts to fly away in his escape from Crete. Daedalus warns Icarus not to fly too high or low, but the latter does not heed Daedalus' warning. The sun melts the wax, Icarus' wings disintegrate, and he falls toward the sea to his death. Here, Garcilaso reappropriates the Daedalus-Icarus episode discussed in book VIII of the *Metamorphoses:*

> cum puer audaci coepit gaudere volatu
> deseruitque ducem caelique cupidine tractus
> altius egit iter. rapidi vicinia solis
> mollit odoratas, pennarum vincula, ceras;
> tabuerant cerae: nudos quatit ille lacertos,
> remigioque carens non ullas percipit auras,
> oraque caerulea patrium clamantia nomen
> excipiuntur aqua, quae nomen traxit ab illo. (VIII.223-230)
>
> When the boy began to delight in his daring flight,
> and abandoning his guide, drawn by desire for the heavens,
> he soared higher. His nearness to the devouring sun
> softened the fragrant wax that held the wings:

and the wax melted: he flailed with bare arms,

but losing his oar-like wings, could not ride the air.

Even as his mouth was crying his father's name,

it vanished into the dark blue sea, the Icarian Sea, called after him. (VIII.223-230)

The original Ovidian scene, which details Daedalus' construction of the wings and Icarus' flight, spans over fifty verses. Garcilaso's condenses this reference to a tercet. The Ovidian Icarus-Daedalus vignette had become a Renaissance commonplace; such cultural familiarity with the source allusion allows Garcilaso to render the climactic moment of the scene through brief suggestion alone. The poet does not explicitly name Icarus; the evocation of "aquél que con las alas derretidas cayendo, fama y nombre al mar ha dado" (10-11) grounds the mythological frame and allows readers to consider the use of the reference within the context of Garcilaso's rewriting. Bruegel's *Landscape with the Fall of Icarus* provides a useful pictorial analogy, as Icarus' death is rendered in a way that is present, yet hardly noticeable.

According to Audrey T. Rodgers, "The irony of the death of Icarus, who has always been an emblem for the poet's upward flight that ends in tragedy, is that his death goes unnoticed in the spring--a mere splash in the sea. The fear of all poets--that their passing will go 'quite unnoticed'--is an old and pervasive theme" (54). Garcilaso's brief suggestion of the Icarus scene draws upon readers' knowledge of the Renaissance commonplace through brief evocation alone. In both cases, Icarus is not foregrounded; this rendering speaks to the ways in which the mythological text is conceived, manifesting mythological figures as individual lives in a subtle fashion.

In the classical text, Icarus symbolizes reckless conduct, hubris, and subsequent

punishment. The poetic voice suggests that, like Icarus, he will fail despite his ambition and heroism. Garcilaso draws upon a *cancionero* register in the octave, particularly through the phrases "refrenar este deseo / loco, imposible, vano, temeroso" and "No me aprovecha verme cual me veo." Sonnets such as this have been used selectively to bolster biographical readings on Garcilaso, given the tendency for readers to suggest that the poem documents Garcilaso's lived amorous experiences. Nevertheless, *cancionero* diction was familiar within the intellectual milieu of aristocratic circles. The interplay of *cancionero* themes and classical mythologies speaks to a broader engagement with literary models foremost and would have been recognizable as such to Garcilaso's contemporary reader.

The second tercet adds to this sense juxtaposition. Here, Garcilaso renders another classical scene in visual terms. The poetic voice refers to a painting that depicts the death of Phaethon through the verses: "la del que su fuego y su locura / llora entre aquellas plantas conocidas / apenas en el agua resfríado" (12-14). The vignette recalls Book II of the *Metamorphoses* and serves as a visual representation of ambition and misplaced desire. In the classical text, Phaethon drives Apollo's chariot of the sun in an attempt to prove that the latter is his father. Phaethon cannot control the reins and burns the earth. This angers Jupiter, god of the sky and thunder, who casts a thunderbolt as punishment, setting Phaethon ablaze and causing him to tumble to his death in the river below. Phaethon's punishment is seen as fitting, as his hubris leads to his downfall. As in the Icarus painting rendered in the first tercet, Garcilaso condenses the myth and does not reference Phaethon by name. In only three verses, the poet signals to his contemporary readers that he will engage and rewrite the classical source for new poetic

purposes. Both visuals evoke commonplace tropes for desire, hubris, and heroic failure; the poetic voice employs the *cancionero* diction “locura” and “agua” respectively to pair desire with disaster. In his study on the Phaethon myth, Gallego Morell comments that “Faetón era quien mejor simboliza ese deseo loco, imposible, vano, temeroso… Faetón como metáfora de todo amor imposible” (37). Gallego Morell uses this metaphor to reinforce a biographical reading of Garcilaso as a lovesick poet. Nevertheless, the reference to Phaethon remains valid in literary and classical terms, mediating the poetic voice’s association of Phaethon with the danger and futility of amorous pursuits. Through the redoubling of the Icarus-Phaethon scenes, the poetic voice casts the burning, destructive potential of desire (a common *cancionero* topos) in mythological and legendary terms. In this rewriting, the poetic voice uses these classical motifs to new ends.

Garcilaso’s Sonnet XIII likewise condenses classical models through the enumeration and juxtaposition of Ovidian texts. The poem refashions Ovidian transformations and Latin syntax for contemporary poetic purposes:

> A Dafne ya los brazos le crecían,
> y en luengos ramos vueltos se mostraba;
> en verdes hojas vi que se tornaban
> los cabellos que el oro escurecían.
>
> De áspera corteza se cubrían
> los tiernos miembros, que aún bullendo estaban:
> los blancos pies en tierra se hincaban,
> y en torcidas raíces se volvían.
>
> Aquel que fue la causa de tal daño,
> a fuerza de llorar, crecer hacía
> este árbol que con lágrimas regaba.
>
> ¡Oh miserable estado! ¡oh mal tamaño!
> ¡Que con llorarla crezca cada día

la causa y la razón porque lloraba!

In this poem, Daphne is rendered as the dehumanized object of Apollo's love, and Garcilaso problematizes and renders the Ovidian model in new ways. The octet draws heavily upon the iconography of the *Metamorphoses* and identifies with Renaissance humanists' familiarity with classical and vernacular sources. The poem is significant in consideration of how it both utilizes and diverges from readers' expectations on Ovid and Petrarch. Petrarch's *Canzone* XXIII provides one model, which Garcilaso problematizes and transforms:

Ché sentendo il crudel di ch'io ragiono

infin allor percossa di suo strale

non essermi passato oltra la gonna,

prese in sua scorta una possente donna,

ver' cui poco già mai mi valse o vale

ingegno, o forza, o dimandar perdono;

e i duo mi trasformaro in quel ch'i' sono,

facendomi d'uom vivo un lauro verde,

che per fredda stagion foglia non perde.

Qual mi fec'io quando primier m'accorsi

de la trasfigurata mia persona,

e i capei vidi far di quella fronde

di che sperato avea già lor corona,

e i piedi in ch'io mi stetti, et mossi, et corsi,

com'ogni membro a l'anima risponde (XXIII.32-46)

> That savage adversary of whom I speak,
> seeing at last that not a single shot
> of his had even pierced my clothes,
> brought a powerful lady to help him,
> against whom intellect, or force,
> or asking mercy never were or are of value:
> and the two transformed me to what I am,
> making green laurel from a living man,
> that loses no leaves in the coldest season.
> What a state I was in when I first realized
> the transfiguration of my person,
> and saw my hair formed of those leaves
> that I had hoped might yet crown me,
> and my feet with which I stand, move, run,
> since each member accords with the spirit (XXIII.32-46)

The transformations of Petrarch's poetic voice belie a tension between the desire for Laura and the quest for the laurel as a poetic endeavor. Cascardi notes that in the post-Petrarchan world of imitation and recreation, the desire to rival Petrarch's *canzoniere* "presents a multilayered display of poetic self-consciousness…mimesis of desire is rivaled by the imitation (*imitatio*) of the model of a desire founded on lack" (251). Through his rewriting of Ovidian and Petrarchan models, Garcilaso engages a poetic voice that seeks to mediate the reader response to these cultural and literary sources in a

novel way. On Petrarch, Isabel Torres remarks that "[j]ust as Laura is everywhere and nowhere in the *Rime sparse,* dismembered in the breeze (*l'aura*), transformed as the laurel (*lauro*), the poet/lover is equally unstable, sustained by the hope that love will cure the separated self and, like Apollo, seeking wholeness in the reconciliation of art and desire" (11). Garcilaso's recasting of the Daphne-Apollo scene takes on new meaning in the sextet through Apollo's eroticized grief. Mary Barnard argues that Garcilaso's rewriting of the source motif is linked to a grotesque deformation of the classical scene within the courtly, aristocratic world: "Garcilaso subverts and distorts the myth by placing it in his highly artificial, dolorous world of courtly love. In his retelling, Apollo is not a comic, self-deluding deity in newly consecrated laurel leaves; Daphne is not a modest virgin…but a courtly lady destroyed by the bay" (*Myth* 111). This is particularly evident in Garcilaso's rendering of verb tenses.

In line 3, "en verdes hojas vi que se tornaban," the poetic voice observes Daphne's transformation through a preterite verb "vi." The stages of the transformation are rendered in the imperfect tense, suggesting a studied observation in the process of deformation itself. In the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid describes the scene in the historical present; Garcilaso instead frames the perspective of the poetic voice with that of a witness through the use of the preterite tense. Garcilaso evokes *cancionero* and Petrarchan vernacular themes and registers through the distortion of Daphne's golden locks and soft skin, features that pertain to the idealized topos of feminine beauty. Apollo's tears likewise cause the tree to grow, only to augment his own sense of grief and loss: "Aquel que fue la causa de tal daño, / a fuerza de llorar, crecer hacía / este árbol que con lágrimas regaba" (9-11). The transformation offers no redemption, and Daphne

serves as a mere object Apollo's unfulfilled desire. The exclamations recall Petrarchan subjectivities, yet diverge from Ovidian and Petrarchan motifs through the poet's recasting of sources models. As part of a broader humanist project, the erotic desire of unattainable love is brought into dialogue and problematized within the lens of eristic *aemulatio,* an attempt to rival and rewrite classical and vernacular antecedents in a way that contemporary humanist readers would doubtless recognize. These considerations open useful conversations on Spanish literary histories, particularly in discussion of canonical authors such as Garcilaso. A more complete view of Garcilaso's poetic corpus thus emerges through the study of Ovidian, *cancionero,* and Petrarchan subtexts, disrupting the notion of Garcilaso's poetic persona as an established category. Such an approach turns attention to literary sources, offers new perspectives on the poet, and provides a critical approach that can be transferred in productive ways to future scholarship on other fundamental Renaissance authors and texts.

CHAPTER IV:

The Virgilian Mirror: Garcilaso and the Rediscovery of Virgilian Subtexts

i. Virgilian Subtexts in the Vernacular:

Garcilaso's engagement of Latin texts—and Garcilaso's status as a classic— is present throughout the corpus of his poetic work. There is particular evidence of a Virgilian subtext in Garcilaso's Latin poetry, as well as implicit (though not hidden) evidence of Virgil even in Garcilaso's vernacular works. Garcilaso dedicates the First Eclogue to Pedro Álvarez de Toledo, Viceroy of Naples; in doing so, he immediately invokes a Classical paradigm and aligns himself with Virgil; Garcilaso is to the Viceroy as Virgil is to his patron Augustus. The dedication opens with the Latin vocative and reads:

Tú, que ganaste obrando
un nombre en todo el mundo
y un grado sin segundo
agora estés atento solo y dado
al ínclito govierno del estado
albano; agora buelto a la otra parte,
resplandeciente, armado,
representado en tierra el fiero Marte:
agora, de cuidados enojosos
y de negocios libre, por ventura
andes a caça, el monte fatigando

en ardiente ginette que apresura

el curso tras los ciervos temerosos,

que en vano su morir van dilatando:

espera, que en tornando

a ser restitüido

al ocio ya perdido,

luego verás exercitar mi pluma

por la infinita, innumerable suma

de tus virtudes y famosas obras,

antes que me consuma,

faltando a tí, que a todo el mundo sobras. (7-28)

Garcilaso syntactically imitates the Latin vocative and recasts the classical paradigm of the man of arms and letters. Garcilaso recalls Virgil's dedication to his Eighth Eclogue in which Virgil complements Augustus:

Tu mihi, seu magni superas iam saxa Timavui

sive oram Illyrici legis aequoris, en erit umquam

ille dies, mihi cum liceat tua dicere facta?

En erit, ut liceat totum mihi ferre per orbem

Sola Sophocleo tua carmina digna cothurno?

A te principium, tibi desinam! (VIII.6-11)

But you who now sail past the rocks of great Timavus

or coast the Illyrian sea—say, will there ever come

the day when I may be allowed to tell your deeds?

May be allowed to cite your songs throughout the world

As rivaling alone the Sophoclean cothurnus?

You were the starting point, for you I'll end. (VIII.6-11)

Garcilaso's use of the Latin vocative and dedicatory rubric establish a parallel relationship between poet and patron. From the onset, this situates Garcilaso as a contemporary Virgil through the reduplication and rewriting of the Virgilian subtext. Pedro Álvarez de Toledo was the Viceroy of Naples; in relation to the Ode, he occupies a political and social position and rank similar to that of Augustus. Garcilaso casts the Viceroy as the ideal Renaissance leader—the man of arms, letters, and leisure: "resplandeciente, armado / representado en tierra el fiero Marte: / agora, de cuidados enojosos / y de negocios libre, por ventura / andes a caça, el monte fatigando" (13-17).

Garcilaso then invokes Latin subtexts in the description of the Viceroy's pursuit of "los ciervos temerosos." He recalls the myth of Diana and Actaeon through the reference to deer hunting, again situating his own dedication alongside Latin models. In his vernacular works, this marks further evidence of Latin presence through an allusion that would have been commonplace and easily recognized by Garcilaso's contemporaries versed in Latin.

Garcilaso continues that, although the Viceroy deserves to be lauded with an epic, for the moment he must be content with sylvan songs:

En tanto que este tiempo que adivino

viene a sacarme de la deuda un día,

que se debe a tu fama y a tu gloria

(que es deuda general, no sólo mía,
mas de cualquier ingenio peregrino
que celebra lo digno de memoria),
el árbol de victoria,
que ciñe estrechamente
tu gloriosa frente,
dé lugar a la hiedra que se planta
debajo de tu sombra, y se levanta
poco a poco, arrimada a tus loores;
y en cuanto esto se canta,
escucha tú el cantar de mis pastores. (29-42)

Garcilaso displaces the laurel, the "árbol de victoria," with the ivy, the symbol of the forest and of sylvan poetry. He promises to compose the Viceroy's well-deserved epic in the future: "luego verás exercitar mi pluma / por la infinita, innumerable suma / de tus virtudes y famosas obras, / antes que me consuma, / faltando a tí, que a todo el mundo sobras") (24-28). For now, nevertheless, the Viceroy must remain content with the pastoral *silva* and the ivy crown.

It is not surprising, therefore, that our approach draws textual evidence from Garcilaso's poetry itself to reinforce the claim that Virgilian subtexts permeate Garcilaso's poetic corpus. These Latin resonances are central to our understanding of Garcilaso as a contemporary classical writer in his time, and to the rhetorical strategies he used to construct his poetic persona. Through the displacement of the laurel, Garcilaso identifies with Virgil and engages the Latin text of the Virgilian eclogues. He remarks

that the ivy will take root and grow upward; such an allusion to the growing ivy underpins the connection to Virgilian eclogues and casts an analogy to his own composition of an eclogue in the Virgilian style. In short, this reexamination of Latin subtexts invites a rediscovery of the ways in which we study and read Garcilaso—not through the lenses of autobiography or sincerity—but rather through close textual study of Latin allusions and the poetry itself. The reader is therefore led to consider the implications toward the poet's own self-image. Garcilaso fashions himself as a contemporary Virgil; the poet mediates his own self-fashioning in legendary terms and situates himself alongside Virgil through the appropriation of classical scenes. The poet consequently gestures toward his reader, allowing the humanist to delight in the recognition of Garcilaso's poetic rewriting.

Latin subtexts can be found throughout Garcilaso's poetic corpus. In his Third Eclogue, for example, Garcilaso evokes Virgilian and Ovidian commonplace vignettes in description of the water nymphs and woven tapestries. Allusions to the *Georgics, Eclogues*, *Metamorphoses, Ars amatoria,* and *Amores* are evident throughout. The references to nymphs point back to earlier descriptions in the works of Virgil in verses: "De quatro nymphas que del Tajo amado / salieron juntas, a cantar me ofrezco / Phillódoce, Dinámene, y Climene / Nise, que en hermosura par no tiene" (v. 53-56). Elias Rivers aptly cites parallels to "las *Geórgicas* (IV.336-345) de Virgilio: *Phyllodoce* ("quién goge hojas"), *Clymene* ("riego") y *Nesae* ("nadar, isla")…" (24). In the verses describing the first water nymph, the poetic voice states: "Peynando sus cabellos d'oro fino / una nympha del agua do Morava / la cabeça sacó, y el prado ameno / vido de flores y de sombras lleno" (v. 69-72). Here, Garcilaso alludes to the Virgilian verses:

> vitreisque sedilibus omnes obstipuere
>
> sed ante alias Arethusa soreres prospiciens
>
> summa flavum caput extulit unda (350-352).
>
> Then on their glassy seats all were transfixed
>
> till Arethusa first of all the sisters raised her
>
> golden head to peer above the water (350-352)

Garcilaso not only appropriates the above allusion, but also recasts its original context in different ways. In the original reference from Book IV, Aristaeus, son of the nymph Cyrene and Apollo, seeks a remedy for the death of his honey bees. He laments his loss, and here, the nymph Arethusa, sister of Cyrene, emerges and alerts Cyrene to Aristaeus' wail. In the dramatic moment that follows, Arethusa parts the waves and permits Aristaeus' entrance to his mother's home: "She bade the rivers part to admit the passage of the youth. The waves like curving precipices reared all round him, gathered him into the vastness" (359-362).[9] In the Third Eclogue, Garcilaso implicitly invokes Virgil in a way that would be recognizable to his contemporary reader, emphasizing the beauty and peace of the scene in the manner consistent with Neapolitan precepts: "Movióla el sitio umbroso, el manso viento / el suave olor d'aquel florido suelo; / Las aves en el fresco apartamiento / vio descansar del trabajoso buelo" (73-76). Another allusion to Book IV of the *Georgics* is evident in the verses: "secava entonces el terreno aliento / el sol, subido en la mitad del cielo" (77-78). Here, Garcilaso alludes to the following verses from Book IV:

[9] "simil alta iubet discedere late flumina, qua iuvenis gressus inferret; at illum curvata in montis faciem circumstetit unda, accepitque sino vasto, misitque sub amnem" (359-362).

Ipsa ego te, medios cum sol accenderit aestus

cum sitiunt herbae,

et pecori iam gratior umbra est,

in secreta senis ducam. (401-404)

And I myself, when the noonday sun has kindled his hottest fire,

when grasses wilt

and shade is welcome to the herds,

will be your guide to the ancient's hiding-place. (401-404)

Herrera noted the parallel, adding that: "Los rayos del sol más derechos y levantados son más ardientes: y los humildes y inclinados, más tibios" (569). Once again, Garcilaso signals to his reader that he is rewriting Virgil in the present through thinly-veiled, familiar references to the source verses.

A noteworthy allusion is evident in the description of the Orpheus-Eurydice tapestry. In the Virgilian context, the death of Eurydice angers the nymphs, who in turn seek to kill Aristaeus' bees; Virgil then discusses Orpheus' journey to the underworld. Proteus narrates the Orpheus-Eurydice story within the original frame of Aristaeus' tale:

Restitit. Eurydicenque suam

iam luce sub ipsa inmemor heu.

victusque amini respexit. Ibi omnis effusus labor,

atque inmitis rupta tyranni feodera. (490-493)

Forgetful, yielding in his will,

[he] looked back at his own Eurydice.

At that same instant all his endeavor foundered,

void the pact made with the ruthless tyrant. (490-493)

Garcilaso evokes the Virgilian subtext in the Third Eclogue: "después desto, él, impaciente / por mirarla de nuevo, la tornava / a perder otra vez, y del tyrano / se quexa al monte solitario en vano" (141-144). Garcilaso's contemporary reader is invited to remember and visualize the widely-known Orpheus-Eurydice scene. Given that the Virgilian subtext is evident throughout Garcilaso's poetic work, one is compelled to resist the discourses of autobiography and sincerity, and instead to reexamine Garcilaso's work more as an intellectual enterprise throughout Garcilaso's corpus.[10]

In the final verses of Garcilaso's Third Eclogue, the poet once again alludes to Virgil's *Georgics* in the verses: "…siendo a las nymphas ya el rumor vezino / juntas s'arrojan por el agua a nado / de la blanca espuma que movieron / las cristalinas ondas se cubrieron" (373-376). Here, Garcilaso references the following scene, a classic Renaissance commonplace:

Ah miseram Eurydicen ! anima fugiente vocabat

Eurydicen toto referebant flumine ripae.

Haec Proteus, et se iactu dedit aequor in altum,

quaque dedit, spumantem undam sub vertice torsit. (526-529)

Ah, poor Eurydice! As life was ebbing away,

and the river banks echoed across the flood, 'Eurydice!'

So saying Proteus plunged into the depths,

[10] This has been examined to some extent in the case of the Third Eclogue. See Mary Barnard's *The Myth of Apollo and Daphne from Ovid to Quevedo*.

churning a seething whirlpool where he plunged. (526-529)

The fact that Garcilaso closes his Third Eclogue with an echo of the Virgilian text is significant; his contemporary reader, equally proficient in Latin, would doubtless note the Virgilian allusion and Garcilaso's reappropriation of the source motif, calling attention to the pathos of the Eclogue and myth itself.

Likewise, Ovidian motifs and scenes are evident throughout the Third Eclogue in scenes that had become commonplace to Renaissance artistic and scholarly circles. Garcilaso again draws from Ovid as a source of thematic appropriation. In the strophes describing the woven tapestry of Apollo, Daphne, and Cupid, the reader finds:

[P]intando a Apollo en el robusto officio
de la silvestre caça embevecido.
Mudar presto le haze el exercicio
la vengativa mano de Cupido
que hizo a Apollo consumirse en lloro
después que le enclavó con punto d'oro. (147-152)

The verses evoke the myth of Daphne and Apollo, which as Rivers notes, corresponds to the three stages of the Ovidian subtext: "en la tela de Dinámene se representan precisamente los tres momentos de la fábula de Dafne tal como se narra en Ovidio (*Metam.* 452-567): la venganza de Cupido, la huida de Dafne, y su transformación en laurel" (434). Cupid strikes Apollo with an arrow with a golden tip to incite love, and incites flight in Daphne with an arrow tipped with lead ("odioso plomo" v. 160). The vignette corresponds to the Latin verses:

prompsit duo tela pharetra diversorum operum:

fugat hoc, facit illud amorem;

quod facit, auratum est et cuspide fulget acuta, quod fugat,

obtusum est et habet sub harundine plumbum (I.468-471)

Cupid drew two shafts of opposite effect:

the first rejects, the second kindles love.

This last is golden….

the first is blunt, its tip leaden" (I.468-471).

Apollo's desires, as well as the flight of Daphne, were well-known Renaissance scenes in the plastic arts and literature; the vignette also was used heavily in *cancionero* verse. Garcilaso renders the Ovidian subtext not only through correspondences to the Ovidian model, but by conveying a sense of psychological depth and of the suspense of the pursuit that had become a commonplace in the *cancionero* tradition: "por áspero camino tan sin tiento / que Apollo en la pintura parecía / que, porque'lla templasse el movimiento / con menos ligereza la seguía" (155-158). What is new in this instance is that Garcilaso inflects the Apollo-Daphne myth through the lens of *cancionero* language. Apollo pursues less swiftly than possible, hoping in vain that Daphne will voluntarily reconsider her decision to flee. Furthermore, Garcilaso's rendering of the Apollo-Daphne myth holds larger literary implications on fame and poetic composition. In the strophe that follows, Daphne is transformed into a laurel as she is in the Ovidian text: "Mas a la fin los braços le crecían / y en sendos ramos bueltos se mostravan; / y los cabellos, que vencer solían al oro fino… llora el amante y busca el ser primero / besando y abraçando" (vv. 161-168). The consequences of the laurel transformation are several. The laurel is

evocative of the Roman wreaths worn by famed poets and victors, of Petrarch's Laura, and of Garcilaso's attention to the material and artistic production of his intellectual surroundings. Garcilaso's rendering of the Ovidian scene yields laurels, perhaps evoking a meta-poetic association of laurels, fame, and the desire for a legacy forged through literary and artistic merit.

In the Venus-Adonis tapestry that follows, Garcilaso echoes the *Ars amatoria* in the final verses: "boca con boca coge la postrera / parte del ayre que solia dar vida / al cuerpo por quien ella en este suelo / aborrecido tuvo al alto cielo" (189-192). Here, the poet recalls a vignette from Ovid's Book III of the *Ars amatoria*, which discusses pragmatic and prudent advice—tinged with satire—to guide amorous quests. In this instance, Procris, trying to attack Cephalus, accidentally and fatally wounds his lover Aura. The Ovidian poetic voice warns that one would do well to avoid acting in haste, using the story as an example of prudent conduct:

Ille sinu dominae morientia corpora maesto
Sustinet, et lacrimis vulnera saeva lavat:
Exit, et incauto paulatim pectore
lapsus excipitur miseri spiritus ore viri. (743-746)

He clasped her dying body to his,
rained tears on the cruel wound,
and as the last breath ebbed from her (poor rash lady)
the lips of her sad lover gathered in it. (743-746).

In the Ovidian model, Procris embraces his dying lover as she releases her last breath. In Garcilaso's representation, Venus, disturbed and in a state of intense anguish, draws in Adonis' last breath. The poetic voice conveys an overwhelmingly visual scene reminiscent of that of the Ovidian context. Garcilaso's contemporary readers, like earlier medieval readers, would doubtless have been familiar with the Ovidian source as well as Garcilaso's rendering of the scene in a unique form.

References to Ovid's *Amores* likewise can be found in the verses describing a pastoral singing match: "¿Vees el furor del animoso viento / embravecido en la fragosa syerra / que los antiguos robles ciento a ciento / y los pinos altíssimos atierra… al espantoso mar mueve la guerra? / Pequeña es esta furia comparada / a la de Phyllis con Alzino ayrada" (329-336). The vignette summons the "animoso viento" found in the *Amores,* Book I, chapter vi:

> allimur—inpulsa est animoso ianua vento.
> ei mihi, quam longe spem tulit aura meam!
> si satis es raptae, Borea, memor Orithyiae,
> huc ades et surdas flamine tunde foris! (51-54)

> Just a casual gust, rattling the woodwork,
> blowing my hopes sky-high.
> Boreas, flame of a north wind, remember your air-carried bride,
> come thunder these deaf posts down for me! (vv. 51-54).

In the Ovidian text, the poetic voice addresses a porter, begging entry to a house to pursue amorous escapades—and here realizes that what he thought was a creak of a door

was but a mere gust of wind. The voice, consequently, appeals to the north wind, Boreas, pleading that he might permit entry. To the passive reader, these verses might be thought to convey the apparent emotion—even the notion of sincerity—at the pain of lost love.

Overlaid with *cancionero* resonances, when read in conjunction with the Ovidian text, however, the reader notes the rather thinly veiled erotic codes, particularly through the reference to the "animoso viento." Garcilaso's contemporary reader is doubtless privy to Ovid's erotic satire and is consequently prompted to examine the verses in dialogue with those of the Ovidian predecessor. In the closed intellectual community of Garcilaso's readers, Latin references such as these prompt a moment of recognition that holds extraliterary implications. In effect, Garcilaso is offering his readers the pleasure of validating their own knowledge as well-read humanist scholars, and of identifying with him as he does with them. The text creates a cultural bond of intellectual solidarity between humanist readers and writers. This point is fundamental to the writing of literary histories on Garcilaso—histories that have long neglected to examine the humanist literary networks, diffusion of early manuscripts, and the idiosyncratic circulation of poetry on the Spanish Golden Age.

Rediscovering the Virgilian and Ovidian subtexts in Garcilaso's poetry offers the potential to reexamine the entirety of the Garcilaso corpus through textual evidence itself. In doing so, it deconstructs notions of sincerity that have long guided scholarship on Garcilaso. Daniel Heiple comments on the problem of the rhetoric of sincerity:

> Sincerity as a literary criteria creates an unsolvable problem. The authenticity of the author's feeling can be neither affirmed nor denied from the existing evidence of the poetic production. Those who believe in sincerity as a literary criteria

> maintain that successful poetry results from an intensity of feeling that is sincerely expressed, while lesser poetry falls short precisely because the poet's feeling was deficient.... (11)

Like the biographical reading, the discourse of sincerity is the product of readers' assumptions and value judgments that favor comforting, reassuring readings on the poet. Apparent feeling or sincerity cannot objectively serve as a basis for critical analysis. Heiple adds: "One reason that the criterion of sincerity has been applied to Garcilaso lies in the novelty of the Italianate style whose more sensual imagery and rhetorical posture of sincere, passionate suffering have been mistaken for authenticity of feeling, and whose first-person narrative voice has been confused with the poet's own personality" (17). An examination of Garcilaso's Latin subtexts alternatively situates Garcilaso within the literary milieu and educational circumstances of his age. Such a reexamination is significant to our approaches to Garcilaso as a foundational writer within literary canons on the Spanish Golden Age. The discourses of sincerity and sentimental biography have been recast time and again in literary histories. Our study of Garcilaso's Latin subtexts presents an alternative critical model that may be applied to future scholarship on other canonical Spanish writers.

ii. Latin Subtexts in Garcilaso's Odes:

Garcilaso's Latin poetry comprises one of the most neglected and understudied areas of his poetic corpus. Garcilaso's odes are commonly published in sequence; when the Odes are mentioned in scholarship, the critic often does so in passing or merely reproduces the text without including significant supplemental commentary. Prominent

examples of the latter case include Rivers' annotated edition on Garcilaso and Helgerson's *A Sonnet from Carthage*. The odes draw heavily on Virgilian and Ovidian allusions and texts, both implicit and explicit. Given the extent to which scholarship on the sonnets and eclogues eclipses that of the odes, the reader is compelled to question the causes for this void in studies on the odes, as well as to examine broader consequences for literary histories on Garcilaso. Bringing Garcilaso's Latin works to the fore places several demands upon the modern reader, including a reading knowledge of Latin grammar and familiarity with Virgilian and Ovidian motifs. Likewise, such an endeavor challenges the contemporary reader to resist the tendency toward reassuring biographical readings and to examine literary subtexts foremost.

As previously discussed, Garcilaso aligns himself with Virgil in the dedication of the First Eclogue, suggesting that his patron be content with the pastoral ivy in place of the epic laurel for the present time. It is significant that Garcilaso composed the odes through contact with Naples. Neapolitan styles are characterized by an engagement with Latinate texts and iconic vignettes, often rendered through artful, eristic forms of appropriation that challenge the model itself. Naples provided Garcilaso with access to a creative intellectual space in which to interact with Italian aristocrats and intellectuals, among them Tasso, Tansillo, Capese, and Epicuro. Garcilaso took part in the cultural and poetic dialogues of the age, had access to the renowned Accademia Pontaniana, and sent several well-received Latin works to Bembo. This creative, closed environment was a milieu in which participants were well-studied, versed in Latin, and attune to the notion of the Renaissance rewriting of classical sources. Mary Barnard comments on factors pertinent to the humanist engagement with classical texts: "Reworked from the ancients

and Italian humanists, and placed in material settings, myths were convenient vehicles for exploring social and rhetorical issues, the relation between the body and the psyche, and psychic states evinced by melancholia" (*Material Culture* 9). Members of Garcilaso's literary and artistic circles would doubtless have been aware of Latin subtexts in much of contemporary writing, as well as in acts of poetic rewriting of the source model.

The act of recognition of a works' engagement of other literary subtexts and traditions therefore is not only pleasurable—it also reaffirms reader's well-read status as a member of the intellectual, aristocratic, and scholarly circles at court. As a contemporary Virgil, Garcilaso immortalizes his patron, validates the knowledge of those reading circulated manuscripts and *sueltos,* and confirms his own status as a gifted, eloquent poet. Gérard Genette examines these and other themes pertinent to literary communities in *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Genette outlines a theory of *transtextuality* that can be productively applied to discussions of Garcilaso's Latin works. Transtextuality includes "all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts" (1). For Genette, "[t]ranstextuality then goes beyond, and at the same time subsumes, architecturally, along with some other types of transtextual relationships" (1). Discussing the communicative universe of texts in continual dialogue, Genette comments on the thresholds of interpretation at the levels of paratext, abstraction, parody, appropriation, and transposition. Humanist authors engaged in these literary practices, particularly through the gloss (annexation of a text through commentary), paratexts, and evidence of reappropriation of classical sources. Garcilaso's commentators would have encountered source verses and themes through their own

intellectual formation in Latin, and consequently would have had an understanding of the Latin subtexts found in Garcilaso's poetic corpus.

Garcilaso fashions himself to be a contemporary classical writer and in great measure serves as the vehicle for his own immortality and fame in a Virgilian sense. Garcilaso's odes reveal evidence of a masterful command of Latin texts; his Third Ode conveys a mastery of Latin grammar and an artful appropriation of Virgilian and Ovidian verses and themes. The Third Ode addresses Ginés de Sepúlveda (humanist, theologian, philosopher) and is one of Garcilaso's latest Neapolitan works, composed between autumn 1535-spring 1536. This ode draws extensively upon phrasing from Virgil's *Aeneid* and Horace's Ode III. Scholars from Gallego Morell, to Rivers, to Helgerson have explicitly described Garcilaso's Third Ode as the quintessential representation of a well-crafted Latin ode. Rivers summarizes that because of the extensive "ecos verbales virgilianos" found in the ode, "[e]l resultado es que, de sus tres odas latinas, sea ésta la más clásica" (479). Rivers does not provide any other specific textual justification to bolster this aesthetic judgment. Our study intends to outline the case and evidence for extensive Virgilian subtexts in this particular ode.

Before doing so, however, it is worth mention that Rivers' commentary nevertheless contains a degree of truth; Rivers posits a useful observation on the classical subtext of this ode, yet does so in an attempt to answer a different set of questions. First, it is possible to reframe the debate on other terms that allow for a studied approach that is supported by linguistic and thematic evidence drawn from the Third Ode itself. Second, doing so allows the reader to move beyond comparisons of mere line references and textual support to explore an underlying argument concerning the nature of literary

histories on Garcilaso. Readers versed in Latin are consequently invited to embrace a stance of biographical skepticism; in doing so, it is possible to challenge the notion of any fixed poetic persona attributed to Garcilaso that has been recast time and again in Garcilaso scholarship. This is evident in the Ovidian subtexts explained earlier, and the argument remains valid for the odes. By returning to the Third Ode itself, several observations and critical trends emerge that have also shown to hold true for the vernacular works. In the Latin works, Garcilaso yet again identifies with Virgilian texts and explores the role of the poet in the construction and preservation of one's legacy after death. He shows through his odes that it is possible to immortalize military and scholastic achievement in a form that transcends time. The poet is thus able to vouchsafe the legacies of patrons and friends (as well as his own legacy) through the act of writing. The Third Ode commemorates humanist achievement through the union of arms and letters. Arms and letters are viewed as complementary and necessary forms of service in sixteenth-century literary and aristocratic circles, though this union is grounded squarely upon Virgilian and Horacian antecedents. Military service and scholarship serve as two sides of the same coin in the life of the idealized Renaissance humanist and are inscribed in the opening verses of the Third Ode:

AD GENESIUM SEPULVEDAM

Arcum quando adeo relligionis et

saevae militiae ducere longius,

ut curvata coire

inter se capita haud negent,

uni musa tibi, docte Sepulveda,

concessit: pariter dicere et Africam

incumbit pavitantem

sub rege intrepido et pio, (1-8)

Since the power to draw the bow of religion and

of fierce war back farther

to such degree that its curved ends

meet without resistance

the muse has granted to you alone,

learned Sepúlveda, in a similar way

it falls to you also to tell of fearful Africa

under an intrepid and pious king (1-8)

Garcilaso inscribes the union of arms of and letters in the opening image; moreover, he draws from Book XII of the *Aeneid* and casts the reader into the world of Aeneas, Turnus, Jupitor and Juno in the height of epic battle. Specific verse correspondences—including Virgilian references to the iconography of war scenes—can be found in subsequent verses:

qui insigni maculis vectus equo citos

pravertit rapidus densa per agmina

ventos, fervidus hastam

laetalem quatiens manu;

dat cui non aliter turba locum leves

quam flammis stipulae per nemus aridum

aut coelum per apertum

ventis dant nebulae vagis. (9-16)

who mounted on his famed pied stallion,

moves rapidly through the tight ranks,

outpacing the swift wind,

fervently he wields the lethal lance in his hand;

to whom the masses yield as the low grasses

give way to flames in a dry grove

or clouds to shifting winds

in the open sky. (9-16)

The heroic Virgilian subtext is evident here in the battle vignettes, especially in the phrases:

- “insigni maculis” (9)
    - *Corresponding Virgilian Source*: *Georgics* III.56: “maculis insignis”
- “vectus equo citos pravertit rapidus densa per agminaventos” (9-11)
    - *Corresponding Virgilian Source*: *Aeneid* II.345: “equo praevertere ventos”
- “laetalem quatiens manu” (12)

    - *Corresponding Virgilian Source*: *Aeneid* XII.442: "telum immane manu quatiens"

- "quam flammis stipulae per nemus aridum aut coelum per apertum ventis dant nebulae vagis" (14-16)
    - *Corresponding Virgilian Source*: *Aeneid* XII.367: "qua venti incubuere, fugam dant nubila caelo"

What is most notable is not necessarily Garcilaso's attention to the evocation of Virgilian subtexts in these and other verses, but rather, the fact that Garcilaso's humanist reader, educated in Latin and steeped in Virgil, would have had access to the Virgilian allusions and doubtless would have recognized Garcilaso's recreation of the iconography of the *Aeneid.* The reader is led to admire Garcilaso's appropriation of the text, and at the same time, to associate him with Virgil. Garcilaso subtly signals to the closed community of Latin readers throughout the Empire that he is negotiating and recasting Virgilian legendary history in contemporary times. The phrase "pariter dicere et Africam incumbit pavitantem sub rege intrepido et pio" (6-8) situates Sepúlveda within a modern legendary history, for as Rivers notes, Sepúlveda was to write a historical account of the Tunis campaign: "Sepúlveda había de escribir, para su libro *De rebus gestis Caroli quinti,* la sección *De bello africo a Caesare gesto (hoc est, de tunetana expedition commentarium)*" (480). Once again, Garcilaso establishes a set of parallels between past-present, Caesar-Charles V, and ancients-moderns; it is the humanist reader, however, that must draw the connection and delight in its discovery and understanding. As is the case with the Eclogues discussed in Chapter 3, the Latin works likewise suggest codes for

reading Garcilaso as a poet who engages with questions of fame, legacy, and the role of the poet in the writing of the legendary biographies of poets and patrons alike.

The implied poetic continuity that emerges from the recasting of Virgilian texts progresses to the dramatic rhetorical climax; the poetic voice makes reference to Caesar's sacrificed mother, etymological history ("a caeso matris utero"), and possible legendary consequences of such a comparison:

> mater caesa dedit, dum puerum student
> languentem eruere e visceribus, genus
> hinc est caesarum, hinc est
> gaudens caede nova. Putas
>
> saevum funere limine qui pedem
> ad vitam imposuit, non ferat indidem
> ingeneretque furorem
> et caedis calidae sitim? (28-36)
>
> His sacrificed mother gave his name,
> as they struggled to pull the weak child from her womb,
> from this proceeds the Caesarian race,
> from this delight in new slaughter. Do you think
>
> that he who from a funeral threshold
> thrust his savage foot into life

would not mark this and engender in others

a native fury and a thirst for hot blood? (110)

Garcilaso inscribes a sense of continuity from ancient to modern contexts, allowing readers to draw perhaps ambivalent conclusions from the same ode. In one sense, Caesar (and his Imperial descendants) come to embody successful military leaders; on another level, the ambiguity of the final verses introduces ominous implications for the present. Contemporary humanist readers are also led to know that, as legendary descendants of Caesar and of a legendary history tinged by matricide—how could they be anything but brutal? The doubling of Caesar and Charles V—ancients and moderns—thus extends into the current times, perhaps revealing ambiguous and unsettling possibilities regarding the nature of emperors and empire. In fine, the Virgilian references in the Latin works serve thematic and structural ends in Garcilaso's articulation of the legendary biography, as well as a sense of poetic continuity in the humanist literary world of the Renaissance.

Time and again, Garcilaso's Virgilian and Ovidian subtexts problematize the apparent biographical paradigms that are inherent to generations of scholarship on the poet. Garcilaso's poetic corpus requires the contemporary humanist reader to draw upon his own knowledge and studies of Latin allusions and material culture, as well as to recognize that the connections between works, genre, and register are often indirect, idiosyncratic, and linked to the educational and material circumstances of early modern humanist culture. Garcilaso's readership has shaped him into Spain's foremost poet-lover-courtier, and in doing so, readers have (consciously or otherwise) molded the poet to fit within the bounds of established categories and tastes. By returning to the corpus itself, and by revisiting neglected Latin works, a more nuanced account of Garcilaso

emerges. Though biographical skepticism forces readers to reevaluate comfortable readings, the freedom to speculate otherwise opens new areas in scholarship on Garcilaso that also can be applied in similar ways to other canonical figures of the sixteenth-century.

iii. Etiological Readings, Transvaluation, and Virgilian Mythologies:

Garcilaso's identification with Virgil occurs extensively throughout his poetic corpus. The poet fashions himself as a contemporary Virgil in a legendary sense, yet critics time and again frame this literary posture as evidence of Garcilaso's lived circumstances. To this effect, John Marino notes that scholars often seek to answer an erroneous set of questions when considering the significance of classical references, myths, and legendary tales. His analysis is relevant to our study on Garcilaso, specifically to the ways in which the poet recasts classical texts in the construction of his own legendary biography.

> Arguing over the literal truth or falsehood of legends and myths, important as it may be to discern the facts of a particular case to clear up conflicting testimony or to differentiate fact from fiction, misses the purpose of such stories—namely, why tradition was invented, and why myth-history was propagated. Myths abound out of a rationale more complex than "the desire to have honor, ancient roots, and noble blood," ascribed by Alberti[11]…. [H]e himself recognizes the important additional etiological purpose of myth as storytelling to explain continuing practices. (34)

---

[11] See Alberti, Leandro. *Descrittione di tutta italia*. Bologna: Anselmo Giaccarelli, 1550, fol. 365r.

In this sense myths hold etiological functions that seek to explain the origins of historical-literary phenomena or their pretense in the present. When clear causes are lacking or in contradiction with one another, people at times will resort to etiological explanations that reinforce a comforting understanding of the topic at hand. Garcilaso aligns himself with Virgil through his rewriting of Virgilian subtexts. Mythical content in this case asserts a degree of continuity between ancients and moderns through the recasting of classical models. Garcilaso's rendering of Virgilian and Ovidian classical texts develops Garcilaso's own legendary biography for literary purposes. Garcilaso's descriptions advance his literary persona, yet need not be read as indications of lived experiences in themselves.

Etiological approaches foster reassuring readings because they allow readers the chance to embrace neatly formed, teleological arguments. This phenomenon is especially relevant when studying an author's use of classical source material. Thomas Greene aptly describes the ways in which some critics selectively and anachronistically read works without regard to their original contexts:

> Our easy contemporary way of acculturating the remote, appropriating the shards of all eras, costs us that shock of confrontation which might assist us to situate ourselves more knowingly in time, might help us to uncover the vulnerabilities of our own specific historicity…The light in Troy is no longer ravenous, dying, desperately paideic; it is steady, comfortable, artificial. Perhaps it could become an urgent heuristic force once again only if we stopped appropriating, allowed our fragments to withdraw into their proper strangeness. (293)

The "shock of confrontation" Greene describes is often lost on modern readers; Garcilaso's readers must mediate not only the distance between themselves and the sixteenth-century text, but also the distance to the classical subtext itself. Rosemond Tuve drew attention to this fact as early as 1947 and suggested that readers cultivate a "working contemporaneity" (32) with Renaissance writers. As Green suggests, Garcilaso's contemporary readers therefore scrutinize their own interpretive strategies to "uncover the vulnerabilities" (293) of their own critical lenses.

Such an attention to reading practices and literary context is particularly germane to the study of Garcilaso's rewriting of Virgil in his Second Elegy. Garcilaso addresses Boscán and identifies with Virgil as he does in the Eclogues and Odes, employing a similar method of doubling that conveys a sense of continuity between ancient and contemporary circumstances. Garcilaso composed the Second Elegy August-October 1535 and opens the poem within the context of the victorious Imperial campaign in North Africa:

> Aquí, Boscán, donde del buen troyano
> Anchises con eterno nombre y vida
> conserva la ceniza el Mantüano,
> debajo de la seña esclarecida
> de Caesar affricano nos hallamos
> la vencedora gente recogida:
> diversos en estudio, que unos vamos
> muriendo por coger de la fatiga
> el fruto que con el sudor sembramos;

otros (que hazen la virtud amiga
y premio de sus obras y assí quieren
que la gente lo piense y que lo diga)
destotros en lo público difieren,
y en lo secreto sabe Dios en quánto
se contradizen en lo que profieren. (1-15)

Garcilaso situates himself—and his humanist reader— within the legendary frame of Virgil's *Aeneid* from the onset. The strong invocation "Aquí, Boscán," coupled with the enumeration of Virgilian references that follows, signals Garcilaso's contemporary rewriting of Virgilian subtexts. The first three verses localize the Elegy in Sicily, specifically, to where Virgil ("el Mantüano") decided to preserve the ashes and eternal fame of Anchises ("el buen troyano," father of Aeneas). The verses correspond to and recast the following Virgilian model:

hic pelagi tot tempestatibus actus
heu, genitorem, omnis curae casusque levamen,
amitto Anchisen. hic me, pater optime, fessum
deseris, heu, tantis nequiquam erepte periclis! (III.707-710)

Here, alas, I lost my father, Anchises,
my comfort in every trouble and misfortune, I, who'd
been driven by so many ocean storms: here you left me,
weary, best of fathers, saved from so many dangers in vain! (III.707-710)

Garcilaso's contemporary reader would doubtless recognize the Virgilian context as that of Aeneas' first-person anguish upon the death of his father. His rewriting of the original model is significant for several reasons. In Garcilaso's Elegy, the poet adopts the mouthpiece of Aeneas and invokes the classical Virgilian frame in contemporary times. In doing so, the poet identifies with his reader as they do with him. Garcilaso not only validates his reader's knowledge of classical Latin; he likewise fosters a cultural bond of solidarity between humanist readers and writers in the intellectual circles of the Renaissance. The address to Boscán conveys continuity between ancients and moderns. Though Garcilaso writes in a contemporary *milieu* in the Spanish vernacular, his engagement and rewriting of Virgil underscores the Renaissance endeavor to fashion oneself as both ancient and modern. The poet alludes to the present vis-à-vis classical models, and in doing so, he rewrites these models in ways that would have been evident among contemporary readers. The poetic voice is both a participant in the contemporary drama and a witness to its legendary antecedents. Verses 4-6, for example, suggest the doubling of Charles V and Caeser—once again rendering current circumstances through the lens of classical subtexts. Following the victory in North Africa at Tunis, Garcilaso identifies himself among the victors ("nos hallamos la vencedora gente recogida") gathered below the standard of Caesar Africanus (Charles V). To this point, Herrera remarks that the title refers to the Emperor, "como el que davan los romanos a sus Cipiones i cónsules i Césares de las provincias vencidas" (H-359). Tunis, geographically close to ancient Carthage, is to Charles V as Carthage is to Scipio Africanus. The laudatory agnomen is thus applied to the new emperor, given the proximity and the

parallels in Imperial victories. References such as these exemplify the ways in which Garcilaso crafts his own legendary biography and poetic voice in Virgilian terms.

Following this military allusion, the poetic voice shifts abruptly to a discourse on forms of virtue, service, and classical literary precepts. In the verses "unos vamos / muriendo por coger de la fatiga / el fruto que con el sudor sembramos; / otros (que hazen la virtud amiga / y premio de sus obras y assí quieren / que la gente lo piense y que lo diga) …" (8-13), the poet suggests that, now that military conflict has ended, it is time for those gathered to devote themselves to humble, virtuous, and less glorious purposes. Some will tend to the harvest while others will embrace virtue itself, the friend and reward of virtue's works. The verse "que la gente piense y que lo diga" suggests that others will dedicate themselves to commentary on what has happened; like Virgil, others will ensure its fame. The verses "hazen la virtud amiga / y premio de sus obras y assí quieren " obliquely allude to the Renaissance commonplace "virtuti sua praemia; through his verses, Garcilaso signals to his reader that he is negotiating broader intellectual themes pertinent to the contemporary Renaissance context. The poetic voice claims to pursue a middle path: "nunca tanto / quise obligarme a procurar hazienda, / que un poco más que aquéllos me levanto. / Ni voy tampoco por la estrecha senda / de los que cierto sé que a la otra vía / buelven, de noche al caminar, la rienda" (47). In the first person, the poetic voice describes itself as being of fairly modest means, and not of the tendency to act in disingenuous or hypocritical ways. Garcilaso refers to the act of writing and invokes classical precepts on the composition of an elegy: "Mas ¿dónde me llevó la pluma mía?, / que a sátira me voy mi passo a passo, / y aquesta que os escrivo es elegía" (22-24). Through this seemingly offhand remark, the poetic voice subtly comments that

he need not digress into satire, as that would hardly be fitting for an elegy, a composition that is generally of a laudatory, amorous, or funerary nature. Ignacio Navarrete comments that Garcilaso's self-fashioning is linked to what he describes as an equilibrium between arms and letters: "Garcilaso thus succeeds in fashioning his image in literary history: he will forever be known as the courtier poet who healed the theoretical split between arms and letters and made the pursuit of the latter a legitimate aristocratic activity" (*Orphans* 117). Though Garcilaso alludes to the discourses on arms and letters, it is problematic to imply that he sought to reconcile the balance between arms and letters in his poetry. Our study holds that, when present, the poet's allusions to arms and letters often serve other ends.

References to military combat and Empire (such as the parallels between Caesar-Charles V, for example) remain open to interpretation in the Second Elegy as they do in the Third Ode. Isabel Torres reminds her readers that it is important to emphasize the open-endedness of any potential political critique, as well as to resist the tendency to impose modern discourses onto the poet's corpus through a selective reading of a selection of poems. Torres writes: "The textual evidence available to us urges greater caution, conveying an ambivalence that is self-consciously constructed through a reformulation of lyric and epic literary models" (36). Through close textual study of Virgilian subtexts in Garcilaso's corpus, it becomes increasingly clear that potential political readings are often more speculative than definitive. What is evident, however, is the fact that Garcilaso fashions himself as a contemporary Virgil in his poetry. The poet engages a broader process of self-fashioning in legendary terms and gestures toward his humanist reader through reappropriation and rewriting of classical subtexts. Garcilaso

invokes a broader discourse between the past and present that transcends specific biographical and Imperial circumstances to examine instead interactions among Renaissance readers and writers that pertain to a similar scholarly and aristocratic social circles.

The poetic voice shifts from first to third person in verses 25-27: "Yo endereço, señor, en fin mi passo / por donde vos sabéys que su proceso / siempre á llevado y lleva Garcilasso" (25-27). Here, Garcilaso employs a rhetorical strategy found in the *Aeneid* that would have been evident to humanist scholars:

> quam semel informem vasto vidisse sub antro
> Scyllam et caeruleis canibus resonantia saxa.
> praeterea, si qua est Heleno prudentia vati,
> si qua fides, animum si veris implet Apollo. (III.431-434)
>
> I'll explain a few things of many, in my words to you,
> so you may travel foreign seas more safely, and can find
> rest in a promised haven: for the Fates forbid Helenus
> to know further, and Saturnian Juno denies him speech. (III.431-434)

Here, Helenus, son of Priam, refers to himself in the third person ("si qua est Heleno prudentia vati"). In another example from the *Georgics*, Virgil refers to himself in a similar manner:

> illo Virgilium me tempore dulcis alebat Parthenope… (IV.563)
> Then was I, Virgil, nursed by sweet Parthenope… (IV.563)

Garcilaso's use of such an *enallage*—a figure of speech that deliberately modifies the tense or person to include a grammatically uncommon or incorrect element for literary effect—is consistent with that of Virgil in both of these examples. Garcilaso not only rewrites Virgilian allusions; the poet likewise appropriates Virgilian rhetorical forms that doubtless would have been recognizable to his readers. Within sixteenth-century humanist communities, Garcilaso takes on the Virgilian mantle and inscribes himself within the Virgilian legendary fiction as a contemporary classic.

Virgilian allusions can be traced throughout the Second Elegy. In some instances, Garcilaso combines Virgilian subtexts with ones commonly found in the Ovidian and *cancionero* traditions. For example, Garcilaso refers to the "Serena," a commonplace image in humanist circles:

> Assí se van las oras engañando;
> así del duro afán y grave pena
> estamos algún ora descansando.
> D'aquí iremos a ver de la Serena
> la patria, que bien muestra aver ya sido
> de ocio y d'amor antiguamente llena. (34-39)

The poetic voice calls the reader to take respite and to go with him to Naples, land of the Sirens: "estamos algún ora descansando. / D'aquí iremos a ver de la Serena" (36-37). One Virgilian model can be traced to Book V of the *Aeneid*:

> currit iter tutum non setius aequore classis
> promissisque patris Neptuni interrita fertur.
> iamque adeo scopulos Sirenum advecta subibat,

difficilis quondam multorumque ossibus albos

(tum rauca adsiduo longe sale saxa sonabant),

cum pater amisso fluitantem errare magistro sensit (V.862-867)

The fleet sailed on its way over the sea, as safely as before,

gliding on, unaware, as father Neptune had promised.

And now drawn onwards it was close to the Sirens's rocky cliffs,

and white with the bones of many men, (now the rocks,

far off, boomed loud with the unending breakers) when the leader

realized his ship was wallowing adrift, her helmsman lost (V.862-867)

Garcilaso's engagement of Virgil invokes the land of the Sirens and emphasizes a dialogue between ancient and modern circumstances. The sirens were a commonplace cultural reference in the *cancionero* tradition, especially in the poetry of Tapia, the Marqués de Santillana, Jorge Manrique, and Juan Ruíz; sirens were also found in the bestiaries. *Cancionero* poets rendered diverse representations of the sirens, ranging from those of Arcadian maidens, to distant lovers, to parodic, dangerous pursuers of men. Educated contemporary readers would doubtless have had knowledge of these vernacular representations, and to Virgil's classical subtext. In Garcilaso's rewriting, the poet emphasizes the place of the Sirens itself: "la patria, que bien muestra aver ya sido / de ocio y d'amor antiguamente llena" (38-39). La "Serena patria" evokes classical Naples, as el Brocense explains: "Llama la patria de la Serena a Nápoles porque antes se llamó Parthénope, por una de las tres serenas, que ansí se llamaua, cuyo cuerpo allí se halló"

(B-66). The bucolic scene is one of leisure and love. The phrase “antiguamente llena” asserts a degree of continuity between past and present circumstances.

In the same vignette, Garcilaso obliquely alludes to Ovid. Recognition of a brief but important allusion provides a model with which to read the poem. Journeying from Sicily to Naples, the poetic voice mirrors the legendary sea travels of the god of medicine, Aesculapius (son of Coronis and Apollo), who saves Rome from a plague in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses,* Book XV:

> inde legit Capreas promunturiumque Minervae
> et Surrentino generosos palmite colles
> Herculeamque urbem Stabiasque et in otia natam
> Parthenopen et ab hac Cumaeae templa Sibyllae. (XV.709-712)

> From there he skirted Capri, and Minerva’s promontory,
> and Surrentum’s hills well-stocked with vines,
> Herculaneum, Stabiae, and Parthenope,
> born for leisure, and headed for the temple of the Cumean Sibyl. (XV.709-712)

In this rewriting, Garcilaso subtly alludes to Ovid’s “Parthenope, / born for leisure;” he recasts Ovid in modern times and retains the parallel between “Serena la patria” (Parthenope-Naples) and “ocio.” The journey of the poetic voice from Sicily to Naples mirrors that of Aesculapius, forging a sense of continuity between past and present that would certainly have been recognizable to the Renaissance reader. By situating himself within Ovidian and Virgilian mythologies, Garcilaso seeks to immortalize his own legacy as a contemporary classic. The legendary travels of Aesculapius and Aeneas identify the

poet with Ovid and Virgil. The humanist reader is invited to note the larger mythologies at work in Garcilaso's corpus as components of a larger cultural paradigm that unites humanist readers and poets in the Renaissance.

Garcilaso likewise develops the interplay of *cancionero* and Latin sources in this elegy, at times through the juxtaposition of form and theme. In verses 49-57, the poet describes the "fragua d'amor" a *topos* common to the *cancionero* tradition and also to its classical, mythological subtext. Specifically, the poetic voice describes the effect that brief absence has on the flames of love. The passage outlines a comparison to metalworking in the forge:

> la breve ausencia hace el mismo juego
> en la fragua d'amor que en fragua ardiente
> el agua moderada haze al fuego,
> la qual verás que no tan solamente
> no le suele matar, mas le refuerça
> con ardor más intenso y eminente,
> porque un contrario, con la poca fuerça
> de su contrario, por vencer la lucha
> su braço abiva y su valor esfuerça. (49-57)

At the forge, the addition of a small amount of water to a fire, the poetic voice argues, is counterproductive because the fire consequently burns more forcefully ("con ardor más intenso y eminente"); absence in love only increases desire. This passage is especially significant in our analysis of Garcilaso's corpus, given the manner in which the poet negotiates and rewrites *cancionero* and classical traditions simultaneously. In the

cancionero tradition, the analogy is linked rhetorically to the process of "tempering" or "quenching" iron during the forging process; this is to say that a blacksmith places the hot iron into water to fortify the metal from within the blade. Herrera describes the process in his commentary: "el herrero, que estando encendidos i abrasados los carbones en la hornaza, los rocía con alguna agua, con que el fuego se aprieta y fortifica más en sí" (H-370).

In the *cancionero* context, the allegorical framing of the "fragua d'amor" holds patent erotic connotations of lovesickness and carnal desire. Garcilaso evokes *cancionero* motifs from the sentimental romance, such as the allegorical 'wild man' and lovesick prisoner of Amor in Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de Amor*; similar motifs of madness and lovesickness are present in Juan de Flores' *Grimalte y Gradissa* and *Grisel y Mirabella*. Such allegories are found throughout the *cancionero* tradition. The *Cancionero de Herberay des Essarts*, for example, presents a series of these vignettes and Dantean allegories. The manuscript was compiled circa 1462 and contains works by numerous Iberian poets. In one allegory, a poem composed by Diego de Sevilla reads "Por una selva d'amores terribles vozes oy…" (v92., r93), which fuses recurring images from Dante's allegorical landscape with topoi of lovesickness and madness found elsewhere in the sentimental romance.

The allegory of the "fragua d'amor" is a common Renaissance *topos*—a reference to the Ovidian forge of Vulcan found in the *Metamorphoses:*

> primus adulterium Veneris cum Marte putatur
>
> hic vidisse deus; videt hic deus omnia primus.
>
> indoluit facto Iunonigenaeque marito

furta tori furtique locum monstravit, at illi
et mens et quod opus fabrilis dextra tenebat
excidit: extemplo graciles ex aere catenas
retiaque et laqueos, quae lumina fallere possent,
elimat. non illud opus tenuissima vincant
stamina, non summo quae pendet aranea tigno. (IV.171-179)

[Apollo] was the first god they say to see
the adultery of Venus and Mars: he sees all things first.
He was sorry to witness the act, and he told her husband Vulcan, son of Juno,
of this bedroom intrigue, and where the intrigue took place.
Vulcan's heart dropped, and he dropped
in turn the craftsman's work he held in his hand. Immediately he began
to file thin links of bronze, for a net,
a snare that would deceive the eye; the finest spun threads,
those the spider spins from the rafters, would not improve his work. (IV.171-179)

The adultery of Venus and Mars had become a literary and artistic commonplace in sixteenth-century humanist circles. Apollo informs Vulcan of the affair, who thereupon drops his work at the forge. Vulcan then constructs a bronze net with which to capture the lovers. The reference to the classical source is not in itself significant; rather, the unique interplay of Ovidian, Virgilian, and *cancionero* subtexts is central to Garcilaso's rewriting of previous literary models.

In his description of the "fragua d'amor," the poet overlays his verses with Virgilian rhetorical features. This occurs notably through *enallage*, the use as noted of an incorrect tense or form for rhetorical effect. This interchange occurs in the forge motif in in the shift from third to second person: "la breve ausencia hace el mismo juego / en la fragua d'amor que en fragua ardiente / el agua moderada haze al fuego, / *la qual verás* que no tan solamente / no le suele matar, mas le refuerça /con ardor" (49-54, emphasis mine). Examples of *enallage* are common in classical writing and are especially present in Virgil's poetry. An example from the *Aeneid* reads:

> nec litora longe
>
> fida reor fraterna Erycis portusque Sicanos,
>
> si modo rite memor servata remetior astra. (V.23-25)
>
> I think your brother Eryx's
>
> friendly shores are not far off, and the harbors of Sicily,
>
> if only I remember the stars I rightly observed. (V.23-25)

Here, *fratera* modifies *litora* grammatically, yet modifies *Erycis* in sense and meaning. In this and in many other instances, *enallage* (like an enjambment) forces the reader to pause momentarily to understand the syntactic and lexical relationships at work in the verses. In his edition of the *Aeneid,* Randall Ganiban remarks that *enallage* occurs much more frequently in the *Aeneid* than in other works and can thus be construed as an element of stylistic elevation" (474). Garcilaso's use of *enallage* in the "fragua d'amor" in this way appears as a gesture that situates the poet alongside Virgil in contemporary times. Garcilaso once again signals to his reader that he is appropriating and recasting a

Virgilian rhetorical technique to achieve a similar rhetorical effect in the Castilian vernacular.

Reexamining Garcilaso's Second Elegy in light of the interplay of Virgilian, Ovidian, and *cancionero* subtexts advances a productive reading on the poet. Such an approximation yields several conclusions that have not been explored sufficiently in extant scholarship on Garcilaso. By turning attention to the literary basis of the verses, modern readers are led to challenge longstanding critical interpretations of Garcilaso (sentimental biography, aesthetics, sincerity) and his poetic corpus. An examination of the rewriting of classical and *cancionero* source motifs leads scholars to move beyond comfortable, canonical discourses that have long guided criticism on the poet. Such an approach underscores the literary (as opposed to biographical) nature of Garcilaso's work as a textual and poetic endeavor. Such a critical model is consistent with the intellectual and aristocratic environment of Garcilaso's humanist Renaissance readership; the rewriting of classical and contemporary texts speaks to the literary milieu of the Renaissance. The sixteenth-century reader is invited to recognize Garcilaso's recasting of earlier models, and as a perceptive reader, to validate and delight in his own literary acumen. A bond of solidarity emerges between the poet and his readers. The poet brings the past into dialogue with the present vis-à-vis mythological subtexts, and in doing so, forges a classical persona as a literary pursuit. Mere enumeration of verse correspondences to Virgil and Ovid therefore cannot constitute an end in itself. Rather, contemporary scholars are called to engage and examine the effects that Garcilaso's rewriting and reappropriation produce for his literary public— both in terms of recognition and a sense of propinquity between the poet and his sixteenth-century

humanist readers. Garcilaso examines the larger mythologies, allusions, and commonplace classical scenes circulating among well-educated, aristocratic readers in Renaissance culture. The poet recasts, appropriates, and reimagines these classical subtexts to develop implicitly or explicitly a literary and cultural paradigm that unites intellectuals in a shared scholarly enterprise and community.

Conclusions: Rediscovering Garcilaso's Profile as a Renaissance Humanist:

This dissertation has examined the social and literary matrix of Garcilaso's poetry, and, by extension, the forces of canonization that shape, guide, and efface poets and poetic work over time. Many pages have been dedicated to the study of Garcilaso's early readers and subsequent critics to show how critical views on the poet have evolved through generations of scholarship. Garcilaso's poetic persona and corpus in great measure are the constructions of his readers. Critics perennially have framed Garcilaso as the quintessential sentimental autobiographer, the Italianate imitator, and Spain's foremost warrior-poet. Nevertheless, few studies have explored the interplay of Garcilaso's *cancionero,* Italianate, and Classical antecedents to draw conclusions from the poems themselves. By looking closely at the components of Garcilaso's corpus, the study situates the poet within a transnational context to highlight Garcilaso's profile as a Renaissance humanist.

In the first part of the thesis, I draw from theories of canon formation—particularly those of John Guillory and Maxwell Perkins—to construct an eclectic model that can better inform readings on Garcilaso's position as a national classic. Chapter One evaluates several models of canonicity to turn attention to the circulation and diffusion of the poet's *corpus* in aristocratic, humanist circles. As Perkins shows, literary histories are made relevant to the needs and priorities of a specific moment; critics in this way seek not merely to describe the past, but to attempt to organize and interpret past works and events at a distance. This is true of literary histories on Garcilaso, as scholars have repurposed Garcilaso's poetry and poetic persona over time. Guillory's approach reframes the canon debate to include attention to the distribution, access, and circulation

of cultural products in the initial reception and in subsequent centuries of canonized works. From such a perspective, this social and literary study returns to the material circulation and editorial interventions that influence Garcilaso's literary history.

Chapter Two discusses the ways in which the material manipulation of the poet and his corpus has affected the reception and subsequent literary histories in significant ways. The presence of numerous editorial hands in initial compilation and organization of Garcilaso's corpus speaks to the ways in which scholars received and commented on the poet in subsequent editions. An attention to the material circumstances, including manuscript circulation and published editions, likewise provides insight into the early literary history of Garcilaso from a material perspective. The early rubrications introduced by editors, compilers, and early readers have had an impact on subsequent reception, commentary, and canonization. These considerations reveal insights into the poet's early readership and circulation in aristocratic, humanist circles.

The biographical idiom that characterizes much of scholarship on Garcilaso has effaced awareness to the poet's engagement with Ovidian texts. Chapter Three therefore formulates an Ovidian rereading that decenters biographical and aesthetic approaches to the "Ode ad florem Gnidi," the Second Elegy, and several Sonnets to outline a new reading on Garcilaso's engagement with the Latin models and humanistic culture at large. Garcilaso cultivates an exilic posture in the Ovidian sense. The rediscovery of these influences—particularly in the case of the "Ode ad florem Gnidi"—situates the poet within a broader Renaissance humanist world of Ovidian rewriting. Through explicit and implicit references to the poet, new readings emerge that carry erotic implications. Through the interplay of classical models and *cancionero* diction and themes, Garcilaso

invokes the ambiguous possibilities of euphemism and double-entendre as he draws upon a shared heritage of lexical play and ambiguity. This in turn aligns the poet alongside Ovid and informs the development of Garcilaso's literary-artistic persona in Renaissance aristocratic circles.

Chapter Four presents a reexamination of Garcilaso's humanist profile as a contemporary Virgil. The poet's rewriting of Latin texts is indicative of the intellectual environment of Garcilaso's humanist readership; the recasting of classical and contemporary texts speaks to the literary milieu of Renaissance culture. The sixteenth-century reader doubtless would have recognized Garcilaso's recasting of earlier models, and as a perceptive reader, would have delighted in such recognition as a gesture of poetic acumen. Garcilaso's engagement and rewriting of Virgil underscores the Renaissance endeavor to fashion oneself as both ancient and modern simultaneously. The poet alludes to the present vis-à-vis classical models, forging a bond of solidarity between the poet and his readers through shared recognition and poetic skill. He brings the past into dialogue with the present vis-à-vis mythological subtexts, and in doing so, forges a classical persona as a literary pursuit.

The distortions to Garcilaso's poetic persona and corpus that have occurred throughout generations of reception reveal the influence of editors, commentators, readers, and scholars. Garcilaso emerges as the product of the prevailing critical models and trends, and yet, by returning to the poetry itself and to the circumstances of its production, new possibilities for interpretation arise. Attention to Garcilaso's poetic corpus, and particularly to its *cancionero,* Italianate, and Classical resonances, presents the potential for productive readings of the poet within the intellectual milieu of the

Renaissance. Garcilaso emerges as a contemporary classic in his own century, yet modern readings obscure the nuances and breadth of the poet's rewriting of Ovidian, Virgilian, and *cancionero models*. To recall Johnson, literary critics time and again read Garcilaso in such a way to "yield the story we want to hear….Giving up on Isabel deprives us of more than one kind of illusion, but it also frees us to read Garcilaso as a strikingly modern poet whose obsessive theme is poetry itself and his relation to other poets" (304). Modern scholars therefore are invited to return to the works themselves, as well as to consider aspects of their material circumstances and reception within scholarly circles of the Renaissance that can reach back as far as the early fifteenth century. Such a critical model can be applied to the study of other canonical writers such as Juan de Mena, Jorge Manrique, Góngora, Pierre de Ronsard, John Donne, and others, especially with regard to the evolution of literary histories over time. As a literary enterprise foremost, Garcilaso's poetry highlights an engagement with literary traditions, a study in artful rewriting, and a sense of solidarity that emerges between the poet and his contemporary readers. The transformation of classical and *cancionero* influences and source verses therefore occurs through the hand of a talented and well-read poet, yielding a lyrical experiment that represents far more than the sum of its source motifs and allusions. In this sense, this approach moves beyond traditional binaries to offer an alternative reading that allows Garcilaso's poetry to be read and valued as a literary endeavor foremost.

Bibliography:

Alberti, Leandro. *Descrittione di tutta italia*. Bologna: Anselmo Giaccarelli, 1550.

Alda Tesán, Jesús Manuel. *Poesía de Jorge Manrique.* Salamanca: Editorial Anaya, 1965.

Allen, John J. "Antipetrarquismo en el *Romancero general.*" *Hispano-Italic Studies* 2 (1979): 17-22.

Alonso, Dámaso. "Garcilaso y los límites de la estilística." *Poesía Española*. Madrid: Gredos, 1966. 4-108.

Alvar, Carlos, José-Carlos Mainer, and Rosa Navarro. *Breve historia de la literatura española.* Madrid: Alianza, 2014.

Alzieu, Pierre, Robert Jammes, and Yvan Lissorgues, eds. *Floresta de poesías eróticas del Siglo de Oro.* Toulouse: Université de Toulouse, 1975.

Arbulú, Ivy Sara. "Confieren los poetas : Garcilaso y la tradición poética española en las *Anotaciones* de Fernando de Herrera." Diss, University of Virginia, 1999.

Arce de Vázquez, Margot. *Contribución al estudio de la lírica española del siglo XVI.* Second Edition. Palencia: Ediciones de le Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1961.

Argote de Molina, Gonzalo. "Discurso sobre la poesía castellana." *Biblioteca Española de Divulgación Científica*, vol 6. Eleutorio Felipe Tiscornia, ed. Madrid: V. Suárez, 1926. 32-63.

Armas, Frederick A. de, ed. *Writing for the Eyes in the Spanish Golden Age*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2004.

Barnard, Mary E. "Correcting the Classics: Absence and Presence in Garcilaso's Third Eclogue." *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 26.1 (1992): 3-20.

---. “Garcilaso’s Poetics of Subversion and the Orpheus Tapestry.” *PMLA* 102.3 (1987): 316-325.

---. *Garcilaso de la Vega and the Material Culture of Renaissance Europe*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

---. *The Myth of Apollo and Daphne from Ovid to Quevedo*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1987.

Berger, John. *Ways of Seeing*. New York: Viking, 1973.

Bloch, R. Howard, and Stephen Nichols. *Medievalism and the Modernist Temper*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Boase, Roger. *The Troubadour Revival: a Study of Social Change and Traditionalism in Late Medieval Spain.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Bocchetta, Vittore. *Sannazaro en Garcilaso*. Madrid: Gredos, 1976.

Boscán, Juan. *Obras completas de Juan Boscán y Garcilaso de la Vega*. Edition and prologue by Carlos Clavería Laguarda. Madrid: Turner,1995.

Bourdieu, Pierre. “The Forms of Capital.” *Handbook for Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* J. G. Richardson, ed. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986. 241-258.

Bouza, Fernando. *Communication, Knowledge, and Memory in Early Modern Spain*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

---. *Corre manuscrito: una historia cultural del Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, Ediciones de la Historia, 2001.

Brown, Joan. *Confronting our Canons: Spanish and Latin American Studies in the 21st Century.* Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2010.

Bruegel the Elder, Pieter. *Landscape with the Fall of Icarus.* Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium, Brussels.

Bumke, Joachim. *Courtly Culture: Literature and Society in the High Middle Ages*. New York: Overlook, 2000.

Cammarata, Joan. *Mythological Themes in the Works of Garcilaso de la Vega*. Madrid: Porrúa, 1983.

Cascardi. Anthony J. *Ideologies of History in the Spanish Golden Age.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997.

Castiglione, Baldesar. *The Book of the Courtier*. George Bull, trans. New York: Penguin, 1976.

---. *Il Cortegiano.* Charleston: BiblioLife, 2008.

Castillejo, Cristóbal de. *Antología poética*. Rogelio Reyes Cano, ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 2004.

Conde Solares, Carlos. *El Cancionero de Herberay y la corte literaria del Reino de Navarra.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Arts & Social Sciences Academic Press, 2009.

Cruz, Anne J. "Arms vs. Letters: The Poetics of War and the Career of the Poet in Early Modern Spain." *European Literary Careers: The Author from Antiquity to the Renaissance.* Patrick Gerard Cheney and Frederick A. de Armas, eds. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002. 186-205.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Willard R. Trask, trans. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Dante. *Inferno*. Allen Mandelbaum, ed. and trans. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

Deyermond, Alan D. "La difusión y recepción del *Libro de buen amor* desde Juan Ruiz hasta Tomás Antonio Sánchez: cronología provisional." *Congreso Internacional del Centro para la Edición de los Clásicos Españoles. Alcalá la Real*, 9-11 May 2001. Alcalá la Real: Ayuntamiento de Alcalá la Real y Centro para la Edición de los Clásicos Españoles, 2004. <<http://cvc.cervantes.es/literatura/arcipreste_hita/01/default.htm>>.

DiFranco, Ralph. *A Review of Concepts and Methodologies in Scholarship on Juan de Mena.* Ann Arbor: UMI, 1981.

Dunn, Peter. "Garcilaso's Ode *A la Flor de Gnido.* A Commentary on Some Renaissance Themes and Ideas." *La poesía de Garcilaso: ensayos críticos.* Elias L. Rivers, ed. Barcelona: Ariel, 1974. 127-162.

Dutton, Brian, Stephen Fleming, and Jineen Krogstad, et. al. *Catálogo-índice de la poesía cancioneril del siglo XV*. Madison: HSMS, 1992.

Egan, Margarita, trans. *The Vidas of the Troubadours*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1984.

Fernández-Morera, Darío. *The Lyre and the Oaten Flute: Garcilaso and the Pastoral*. London: Tamesis, 1982.

Ferry, David. *The Georgics of Virgil*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

Frantz, David O. *Festum Voluptatis: A Study of Renaissance Erotica.* Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1989.

Gallego Morell, Antonio. *Garcilaso de la Vega y sus comentaristas*. Madrid: Gredos, 1972.

---. *El mito de Faetón en la literatura española.* Madrid: CSIC, 1961.

Garcilaso de la Vega. *Garcilaso de la Vega: Obras completas con comentario: edición crítica.* Elias Rivers, ed. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1974.

Gates, Henry Louis. *The Signifying Monkey*. Oxford University Press, 1988.

Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky, trans. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Gerli, E. Michael. "Antón de Montoro and the Wages of Eloquence: Poverty, Patronage, and Poetry in 15th-century Castile." *Romance Philology* 48.3 (1995): 265-277.

--- and Julian Weiss, eds. *Poetry at Court in Trastámaran Spain: From the* Cancionero de Baena *to the* Cancionero General. Tempe: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1998.

Ghertman, Sharon. *Petrarch and Garcilaso: A Linguistic Approach to Style.* London: Tamesis, 1975.

Gimeno Casalduero, Joaquín ."Fuentes y significado del *Dezir al nacimiento de Juan II* de Francisco Imperial." *La creación literaria de la Edad Media y del Renacimiento.* Madrid: Porrúa-Turanzas, 1977. 35-43.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Greene, Thomas M. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.

Guevara, Antonio de. *Relox de Príncipes.* Emilio Blanco, ed. Madrid: Biblioteca Castro, 1994.

Guillory, John. *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*. Chicago:

University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Hartnett, Daniel. "The Political and Social Uses of Dante in Fifteenth-Century Iberian Court Culture." Dissertation, University of Virginia. Ann Arbor: ProQuest/UMI, 2009.

Heiple, Daniel L. *Garcilaso de la Vega and the Italian Renaissance.* University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.

Helgerson, Richard. *A Sonnet from Carthage: Garcilaso de la Vega and the New Poetry of Sixteenth-Century Europe.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Hermida-Ruiz, Aurora. "Historiografía literaria y nacionalismo espanõl: Garcilaso de la Vega o el linaje del hombre invisible." Diss, University of Virginia, 1999.

---. "Rafael Lapesa y la 'raiz hispánica' de Garcilaso de la Vega cincuenta años después." *Caliope: Journal of the Society for Renaissance and Baroque Hispanic Poetry* 5.2 (1999): 5-26.

Herrera, Fernando de. *Anotaciones a la poesía de Garcilaso*. Inoria Pepe and José María Reyes, eds. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2001.

Holly, Michael A. *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Iventosch, Herman. "Garcilaso's Sonnet 'Oh Dulces Prendas'." *Instituto Orientale* 7.2 (1965): 203-227.

Johnson, Carroll B. "Personal Involvement and Poetic Tradition in the Spanish Renaissance: Some Thoughts on Reading Garcilaso." *Romanic Review* 80.2 (1989): 288-304.

Jones, Royston O. “Isabel la Católica y el amor cortés.” *Revista de Literatura* 21 (1962): 55-64.

Keniston, Hayward. *Garcilaso de la Vega*. New York: Hispanic Notes and Monographs, 1922.

Kock, Josse de. *Cancionero de Miguel de Unamuno.* Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2006.

Lapesa, Rafael. “Notas sobre Francisco Imperial.” *De la Edad Media a nuestros días*. Madrid: Gredos, 1967. 76-94.

---. *La trayectoria poética de Garcilaso*. Madrid: Alianza, 1985.

Lee, Guy. *The Eclogues of Virgil*. London: Penguin, 1984.

Levinson, Jerrold, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Aesthetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Libro de Buen Amor. G. B. Gybbon-Monypenny, ed. Madrid: Castalia, 1988.

Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. “Doña Angelina de Grecia.” *Estudios sobre la literatura española del siglo XV*. Madrid: Porrúa-Turanzas, 1977. 339-353.

Mackay, Angus. “Courtly Love and Lust in Loja.” *The Age of the Catholic Monarchs, 1474-1516: Literary Studies in Memory of Keith Whinnom.* Alan Deyermond and Ian Macpherson, eds. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989. 83-94.

Maltby, William S. *A Biography of Fernando Alvarez de Toledo, Third Duke of Alba 1507-1582.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

March, Ausìas. *Verse Translations of Thirty Poems*. Robert Arched, ed. Barcelona: Editorial Barcino, 2006.

Marino, John A. *Becoming Neapolitan: Citizen Culture in Baroque Naples.* Baltimore:

Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

Martínez Góngora, Mar. "Relaciones homosociales, discurso antibelicista y ansiedades masculinas en la obra de Garcilaso de la Vega." *Calíope* 10.1 (2004): 123-140.

Martínez Navarro, María del Rosario. "Cristóbal de Castillejo: Recepción y percepción de un poeta cosmopolita renacentista." In *Del verbo al espejo: Reflejos y miradas de la literatura hispánica.* Pilar Caballero-Alías, Félix Ernesto Chávez, and Blanca Ripoll Sintes, eds. Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, 2011.

Martínez de Toledo, Alfonso. *Arcipreste de Talavera o Corbacho*. E. Michael Gerli, ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 1984.

Marqués de Santillana. *Obras Completas*. Manuel Durán, ed. Madrid: Castalia, 1980, vol. II.

McDonald, Lee Martin, and James A. Sanders., eds. *The Canon Debate.* Boston: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002.

Mena, Juan de. *Laberinto de Fortuna.* Maximiliaan Kerkhof, ed. Madrid: Castalia, 1997.

Menéndez y Pelayo, M. *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos*. X vols. Madrid: CSIC, 1945.

---. *Obras completas de Menéndez Pelayo*. Manuel Sañudo Revuelta, ed. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1991.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. *Poesía juglaresca y juglares*. Madrid: Colección Austral, 1962.

Morales, Ambrosio de. *Opúsculos castellanos.* Madrid: Benito Cano, 1793.

Morros Mestre, Bienvenido. *Las polémicas literarias en la España del Siglo XVI: a*

propósito de Fernando de Herrera y Garcilaso de la Vega. Barcelona: Quaderns Crema, 1998.

Navarrete, Ignacio. "Decentering Garcilaso: Herrera's Attack on the Canon." *PMLA* 106.1 (1991): 21–33.

---. "La poesía erótica y la imaginación visual." *Venus venerada: tradiciones eróticas de la literatura española.* José Ignacio Díez, and Adrienne L. Martín, eds. Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 2006. 73-87.

---. *Orphans of Petrarch: Poetry and Theory in the Spanish Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

---. "The Problem of the Soneto in the Spanish Renaissance Vihuela Books." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 23.4 (1992): 769–789.

Nucio, Martin. *Las obras de Ivan Boscan y algunas de Garcilasso de la Vega.* Antwerp: Martin Nucio, 1544.

Núñez de Toledo, Hernán. *Glosa sobre las "Trezientas" del famoso poeta Juan de Mena*. Julian Weiss and Antonio Cortijo Ocaña, eds. Madrid: Ediciones Polifemo, 2015.

Orobitg, Christine. *Garcilaso et la mélancolie*. Mirail: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 1997.

Oss-Cech Chiacchia, Maria Carolina. "The Music in Garcilaso de la Vega's Poetry and his Poetry in Music: A Musico-Poetic Interchange Between Sixteenth-Century Spain and Italy." Dissertation. Alberta: University of Calgary, 2014.

Ovid. *The Erotic Poems*. Peter Green, trans. London: Penguin, 1982.

---. *Metamorphoseon*. Antonio Tempesta, ed. New York : Garland, 1976.

---. *The Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Allen Mandelbaum, trans. San Diego: Harvest,

1993.

---. *Ovid's Erotic Poems: Amores and Ars Amatoria*. Len Krisak, ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

---. *Remedia Amoris*. A.A.R. Henderson, ed. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1979.

Panofsky, Erwin. *Problems in Titian: Mostly Iconographic*. New York: New York University Press, 1969.

Parker, Deborah. *Commentary and Ideology: Dante in the Renaissance.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

Parker, Geoffrey. *Empire, War and Faith in Early Modern Europe.* London: Penguin, 2002.

Perkins, Maxwell. *Is Literary History Possible?* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Petrarca, Francesco. *Canzoniere*. Giancarlo Contini, ed. Torino: Einaudi, 1964.

---. *The Complete Canzoniere*. A. S. Kline, trans. Scotts Valley, CA: Poetry in Translation, 2015.

Pigman, G. W. "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance." *Renaissance Quarterly* 33.1 (1980): 1-32.

Poesía cancioneril castellana, E. Michael Gerli, ed. Madrid: Akal, 1994.

Putnam, Michael C. J., trans. *Jacopo Sannazaro: Latin Poetry*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Riquer, Martín de. *Juan Boscán y su cancionero barcelonés.* Barcelona: Casa del Arcediano, 1945.

---, and Isabel de Riquer. *La poesía de los trovadores.* Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 2002.

Rivers, Elias L. *Garcilaso de la Vega: Poems, a Critical Guide*. London: Grant & Cutler, 1980.

---. "Garcilaso de la Vega and the Italian Renaissance: Texts and Contexts." *Calíope* 2.1 (1996): 100-108.

---. "Garcilaso, Góngora, and Their Readers." *EMF* 2 (1996): 67-78.

---. "Garcilaso's Poetry: Between Love Affairs and Annotations." *MLN* 115 (2000): 355-366.

Robbins, Jeremy. *The Challenges of Uncertainty*. London: Duckworth, 1998.

Rodgers, Audrey T. *From Virgin and Whore*: *The Image of Women in the Poetry of William Carlos Williams*. New York: McFarland & Company, 1982.

Rodríguez-Moñino, Antonio. *La transmisión de la poesía española en los Siglos de Oro*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, 1976.

Rodríguez-Puértolas, Julio. *Cancionero de Jorge Manrique*. Madrid: Akal, 1997.

---. *Literatura, historia, alienación*. Barcelona: Labor, 1976.

Rowland, Ingrid D. *The Culture of the High Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Ruiz Pérez, Pedro. "Sobre el debate de la lengua vulgar en el Renacimiento." *Criticón* 38 (1987): 15-44.

San Pedro, Diego de. *Cárcel de Amor*. Keith Whinnom, ed. Madrid: Clásicos Castalia, 1971.

Schmidt, Rachel. "Herrera's Concept of Imitation as the Taking of Italian Spoils." *Calíope* 1.1 (1995): 12-26.

Smith, Paul Julian. “The Rhetoric of Presence in Poets and Critics of Golden Age Lyric.” *MLN* 100.2 (1985): 223-246.

Spitzer, Leo. “Lucca: *sconiato*-florent, *conia*.” *Archivum Romanicum* 11 (1927): 248-50.

---. “Sobre las ideas de Américo Castro a propósito de *El Villano del Danubio* de Antonio de Guevara.” *Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo* 6.1 (1950): 3-15.

Stevenson, Robert. *Spanish Cathedral Music in the Golden Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.

ter Horst, Robert. “Ovid in Garcilaso's Ode ad florem Gnidi.” The Biennial Conference of the Society for Renaissance & Baroque Hispanic Poetry. University of Virginia, Charlottesville. 12 Oct. 2013.

Titian. *Diana and Actaeon*. National Gallery, London.

---. *Venus and the Lute Player*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

---. *Venus with the Organ Player.* Museo del Prado, Madrid.

Toro Pascua, María Isabel. “Gracián y los poetas de Cancionero: *Del Arte de Ingenio* (1642) a la *Agudeza y arte de ingenio* (1648).” *Conceptos: Revista de Investigación Graciana* 6 (2009): 67-85.

Torres, Isabel. *Love Poetry in the Spanish Golden Age: Eros, Eris, and Empire.* Woodbridge, U.K.: Tamesis, 2013.

Tuve, Rosemond. *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery: Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth-Century Critics.* Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1947.

Vaquero Serrano, María del Carmen. *Garcilaso: Poeta del amor, caballero de la guerra*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 2002.

---. *Garcilaso, príncipe de poetas: una biografía*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2014.

Vasvari, Louise O. "An Example of 'Parodia Sacra' in the *Libro de Buen Amor:* 'Quoniam' 'Pudenda'." *La Corónica* 12.2 (1984): 195-203.

Vergil. *Aeneid*. Randall Ganiban, ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2013.

---. *The Aeneid of Virgil: a Verse Translation.* Rolfe Humphries, trans. London: Longman Press, 1987.

---. *Eclogues.* Robert Coleman, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

---. *Georgicon.* Ian Wedde, ed. Wellington, N.Z.: Victoria University Press, 1984.

Weiss, Julian. *The Poet's Art: Literary Theory in Castile c. 1400-60.* Oxford: The Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature, 1990.

---. "Renaissance Poetry." *The Cambridge History of Spanish Literature.* David T. Gies, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 159-177.

Whinnom, Keith. *La poesía amatoria de la época de los Reyes Católicos*. Durham: Durham Modern Language Series, 1981.

Wyrick, Jed. *The Ascension of Authorship: Attribution and Canon Formation in Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian Traditions*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 2004.