

HERRERA'S CONCEPT OF IMITATION AS THE TAKING OF ITALIAN SPOILS

Rachel Schmidt
University of Calgary

Since the publication of Garcilaso de la Vega's work in 1543, the critical debate has centered around the question of the poet's debt to his Italian models, seen either as an appropriation of foreign models necessary to enrich the Castilian language and poetry, or as a betrayal of native Castilian traditions to foreign interests. Like so many debates in sixteenth-century Spain, this one polarizes over the issue of cultural expansion or isolationism, as this relatively, newly-united country struggles with its international role as a major imperial power and self-appointed military arm of Roman Catholicism.¹ Cristobal de Castillejo, one of Garcilaso's most vocal sixteenth-century detractors, repeatedly accuses the poet and his friend Boscán of ridiculing and abandoning native Castilian poetry in their imitation of Italian models.² In a poem of 1591, Hernando de Acuña implies that Garcilaso's imitation of foreign models is not only a "burla" of his native literature, but also an act of theft.³ An anonymous wag, writing "Contra las anotaciones del maestro Sanchez," explicitly labels theft Garcilaso's imitation of Florentine models pointed out by El Brocense.

Descubierto se ha un hurto de gran fama
del ladrón Garcilaso que han cogido
con tres doseles de la Reina Dido,
y con cuatro almohadas de su cama. (Gallego Morell 95)

In his 1580 commentaries on Garcilaso's poetry, Fernando de Herrera defended the theft by valorizing the appropriation of foreign literary forms through the use of the metaphor of the taking of military spoils, a variation on the trope of literary theft, as a metaphor for imitation. Thus, the imitation of the Italians does not betray Castilian poetry, but brandishes the Spanish poet's triumph

over these foreign writers through his use of their models. The competitive tone in Herrera's voice, as he writes these commentaries with an eye to defending his own poetic stature against that of his predecessors, has been previously noted. As Ignacio Navarrete has asserted, Herrera's commentaries represent an attempt by the poet to overcome his predecessor Garcilaso and to establish space for himself upon the literary field by substituting "a remote, less threatening, and Italian poetic father [Petrarch] for a proximate, intimidating, and Castilian one [Garcilaso]" (29).

In this article I will discuss Herrera's own appropriation of Italian literary theory in his development of the metaphor of literary imitation as a form of battle with its resulting spoils. Yet the possible substitution of a Castilian father for an Italian one introduces new tensions, for the poet expresses through his conception of gendered languages a curiously ambivalent attitude, in which Italy is seen both as a rightfully dominated territory of the Hapsburg empire and the Spanish literary tradition, and as a superior culture, which has colonized Iberia in the past and still threatens Spain culturally. In this manner the historical and political relationship between Spain and Italy, one fraught with ancient and modern rivalries and conquests, molds and colors Herrera's poetic enterprise, the defense of the imitation of classical and Petrarchan models by Spanish poets such as himself and the establishment of a national literature worthy of the new empire.

The most important literary form taken directly from Italy is the sonnet, of which both Herrera and Garcilaso were masters. Despite the accusations of their detractors, however, Garcilaso and Boscán did not introduce the form to Spain, as it was already known in late medieval Iberian poetry. In his discussion of the sonnet, Herrera attributes its introduction to the Marqués de Santillana, the prototypical poet-soldier of the fifteenth century, and in so doing provides us with the first glimpse of the commentator's position toward the imitation of Italian models. As he writes,

Pero no conocemos la deuda de habella recibido a la edad de Boscán, como piensan algunos, que más antigua es en nuestra lengua, porque el Marqués de Santillana, gran capitán español y fortísimo caballero, tentó primero con singular osadía, y se arrojó venturosamente en aquel mar no conocido, y volvió a su nación con los despojos de las

riquezas peregrinas; testimonio de esto son algunos Sonetos suyos dignos de veneración por la grandeza del que los hizo, y por la luz que tuvieron en la sombra y confusión de aquel tiempo. (312-313)

Perhaps most striking to modern ears is the military language used to describe Santillana's imitation of the sonnet, as the daring warrior raids foreign shores to bring back literary spoils to enrich the cultural coffers of his country in a time of "sombra y confusión." In Herrera's conflation of the arms and letters debate, letters do not merely adorn the soldier, but provide yet another challenge to prove his personal valor. The early modern poet seems to welcome, if not relish, this competition between himself and other poets whom he imitates, thus applying the concept of the battlefield as the proving ground of personal virtue to the field of literary endeavors. Indeed, as Rodríguez-Salgado has observed, even the young monarch must prove his valor in direct competition with the more established rulers, in this case on the military battlefield (25). The pursuit of poetry is itself a contest between valorous warriors, which the younger poet welcomes.⁴

The use of military metaphors to describe literary imitation is not extremely common in the sixteenth century, but neither is it unique to Herrera's poetics. Castiglione links arms to letters by claiming that glory, "the true provocation" of war, is preserved by letters: "But hee that favoureth not the sweetnes of letters, can not know how much is the greatnesse of glory, which is a long while preserved by them, and onely measureth it with the age of one or two men, for futher hee beareth not in minde" (70). The reader of the glorious deeds of war is then moved to imitate them, not unlike Don Quijote. Castelvetro indicates the metaphoric roots of literary imitation in arms by pointing out that imitation may not necessarily be flattery, but theft. The imitator, in order to justify his use of another's work, must somehow surpass the imitated model, thus initiating a contest between the originating poet and his imitator (42). Luis Vives writes in 1530 that "[l]o que al principio es imitación, debe ir adelantando, hasta llegar a ser certamen, en que se trate, no ya de igualar, sino de vencer al modelo" (Almeida 82). Among other theorists, this contest of language draws upon the ideal of the poet-soldier expressed in the classical topos of *sapientia et fortitudo*. Celio Calcagnini and Johannes Sturm defend imitation

of classical models as a necessarily aggressive move to restore Roman models usurped by the barbarian invaders (Greene 179, 187). Referring to the enrichment of the vernacular language with Roman models, Joachim du Bellay ends his work, *The Defence and Illustration of the French Language*, with a battle cry, "There then, Frenchmen, march courageously upon that pious Roman city, and with the servile booty thereof (as you have done more than once) deck your temples and altars" (107).⁵ Nor are the armies of Francis I the only ones, military or literary, to march upon Rome in search of spoils. Ambrosio de Morales characterizes Garcilaso de la Vega as both a literary victor over the Italians and a competitor with the Romans, who enriches his own nation's language with the spoils of his triumph. "Y no fuera mucha gloria la de nuestra lengua y su poesía en limitar[sic] el verso Italiano, si no mejorara tanto en este género Garcilasso de la Vega, 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 enriquecen" (187).⁶

Marco Girolamo Vida in his *De arte poetica* of 1517 enunciates most clearly the implications of imitation as conquest. Taking the bull by the horns, he exhorts his followers, "Therefore, my pupils, let each of you follow my example; commit your thefts fearlessly and draw your booty from every quarter" (102). This taking of spoils is not a mark of arrogance but rather the poet's recognition that he needs to follow the model of the ancients. Those whose language suffers a lack of literary riches need even more the gold of the ancients, and, indeed, find in the ancients the model for the taking of literary booty. Appropriating the history of Latin to that of Italian, he writes:

If the poverty of your native language is a sufficiently serious hindrance, it is quite legitimate for you to import a formless mass [of linguistic ore] from the prosperous lands the Greeks dwell, and by shaping it on the Latin anvil, compel it to renounce the characteristics of its forebears. It was thus that anciently the riches of the Ausonian tongue grew. Thus, too, Latium flourished, whither contact transferred an overwhelming variety of usages from Argos, as the Italians took up their inheritance from prostrate Athens. Note how many Greek expressions there are which

have been lifted from their Mycenaen milieu and now shine brightly, mingled with our own, with no apparent distinction made between the two sorts of vocabulary; both citizen and foreigner pass everywhere through Latian lands with like marks of honor. (p. 103, vv. 276-287)

In his assertion of Rome's literary debt to the Greeks, Vida imitates Horace who stated that "Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis/intulit agresti Latio" (Greece, the captive, made her savage victor captive, and brought the arts into rustic Latium, "Epistle to Augustus" 408-09). Vida even extends the model of Roman citizenship to the inclusion of foreign words in the language. Citizenship is not a question of origin, but of usage and appropriation. The good poet will make these words even more his own through the infusion of his meaning into their forms.

Often I enjoy playing with phrases from the ancients and, while using precisely the same words, expressing another meaning. Nor shall anyone (however wise) prove my self-betrayed thefts guilty ones, for soon my borrowings will be obvious to all, and our sons' sons and their descendants will approve them. Heaven forbid that I should wish to conceal my thefts or hide my spoils because I feared the punishment of disrepute! (103)

Indeed, Vida boasts that his thefts will be the basis for his fame, and thus he will enter into the chain of literary conflict and victory, fixing for posterity his own reputation and glory.

Herrera himself, when describing imitation as a process, emphasizes the poet's imaginative freedom to embellish, manipulate, and surpass the model. If the poet cannot hope to achieve the clarity, magnificence and grace of the original, Herrera counsels that "el que imita nos proponga tanto decir lo que los otros dijeron, como lo que no dijeron" (511). But the great poet, like the great soldier, competes daringly with the Italians and the Romans, and uses with license elements of the imitated model for the enrichment of his native language.

Osó G[arcilaso] entremeter en la lengua y plática española muchas voces latinas, italianas y nuevas, y sucedióle bien esta osadía; y temeremos nosotros traer al uso y ministerio de ella

otras voces extrañas y nuevas, siendo limpias, propias, significantes, convenientes, magníficas, numerosas y de buen sonido y que sin ellas no se declara el pensamiento con una sola palabra? (523)

The poet improves and enriches his native vocabulary with the best words of the foreign language, paraded before the reader to awe him with the poet's literary prowess, much like the spoils of an imperial military triumphal procession. Herrera appeals to Aristotle's description of poets as "tiranos de las dicciones" (527), free from the constraints of normal language, "sin sujeción alguna," and endowed with "gran potestad y fuerza en las palabras, para demostrar las cosas que son, sin que haya alguna que les deje de reconocer esta sujeción" to common language. Thus, Herrera cedes to poets power, glory, and impunity, attributes of the victorious warrior. The Spanish poet, be he Garcilaso or Santillana, should dare to bear linguistic treasures home, just as the Greeks and Romans did before him: "sigamos el ejemplo de aquellos antiguos varones que enriquecieron el sermón romano con las voces griegas y peregrinas y con las bárbaras mismas; no seamos inicuos jueces contra nosotros, padeciendo pobreza de la habla" (523). Wealth belongs to the victors; thus the Spaniard urges his compatriot poets not only to imitate Roman literary forms, but also the imperial practice of appropriating linguistic spoil, fruits of imperial victory. The poet can "vestir" and "aderezar" his country, increasing her beauty with the most esteemed "despojos de Italia y Grecia, y de los otros reinos peregrinos..." (526). Echoing Cicero, who wrote that the writers should "vestire atque ornare oratione," and Ambrosio de Morales, who wrote that "la imitación con los buenos dechados alcanza mucho" (185), Herrera calls for Spanish poets to dress their own language with elements of *elocutio* taken as spoils from the Romans themselves.⁷

The relationship between Spain and Italy most often alluded to by Herrera parallels that of ancient Rome and Greece. As Terence Cave points out, the example of the Roman imitation of the Greeks is "well-established," although an author such as Du Bellay uses the metaphor of digestion rather than military conquest to describe this appropriation of Greek literature (64). At times Herrera draws a parallel between the nations, as when he describes the uses of for-

eign words to adorn a sentence, "que es cuando uno greciza en latín o italianiza en español y al contrario" (339). Nonetheless, he more often merely alludes to the parallel by the position in which he places Spain in relation to Italy, as a rather barbarous warrior nation, originally unconcerned with learning and literature, now colonizing an ancient, learned civilization. As he writes of his own nation,

Pero los españoles, ocupados en las armas con perpetua solicitud hasta acabar de restituir su reino a la religión cristiana, no pudiendo entre aquel tumulto y rigor de hierro acudir a la quietud y sosiego de estos estudios, quedaron por la mayor parte ajenos de su noticia; y a pena pueden dificilmente ilustrar las tinieblas de la oscuridad, en que se hallaron por tan largo espacio de años. Mas ya que han entrado en España las buenas letras con el imperio, y han sacudido los nuestros el yugo de la ignorancia, aunque la poesía no es tan generalmente honrada y favorecida como en Italia, algunos la siguen con tanta destreza y felicidad, que pueden poner justamente envidia y temor a los mismos autores de ella. (312)

This extensive quote reveals the sense of indebtedness to Italy and the resentment of the same which pervades Herrera's thought. Learning and literature have come to Spain as imperial spoils, and are rightfully hers (or perhaps more appropriately his) through might. Herrera's appeal to the link between the transferral of imperial power and *translatio studii* is almost a topos at this point, and serves as one of the factors promoting the humanists' interest in vernacular languages and literatures. As Nebrija wrote in his Spanish grammar of 1499, "que siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio; y de tal manera lo siguió, que juntamente començaron, crecieron y florecieron, y despues junta fue la caída de entrambos" (5). Ambrosio de Morales claims that Latin gained its authority through the orders given in Latin throughout the empire (180). Nevertheless, as far as Herrera is concerned, the need to imitate Italian models taken as imperial spoils, which he consistently insists is necessary for the enlightenment of Spain, reflects a cultural "belatedness" in his native land, to borrow Curtius' term (541-43).⁸ Given their involvement in the Reconquista in the Middle Ages, the Spaniards, here defined as the Christians, were unable to cultivate

the pen rather than the sword, and can enjoy the fruits of the pen only now that their own country has been united by the sword. Spain finds herself to be the barbarian conqueror of Italy's civilization, a generalization which Herrera implies in his characterization of the Spanish Middle Ages as a dark age.

Yet Herrera also defends his nation's warrior values, which have finally captured and imported learning to Spain. The heroic daring and arrogance of the soldier is emulated by the Spanish poet as he challenges and overtakes his counterparts.

Y como el lenguaje común pida más ornamento y compostura y no se contente con la sutilidad y pureza y elegancia sola de los latinos, forzosamente el poeta español ha de alzar mayor vuelo, y hermohear sus escritos variamente con flores y figuras. Y no sólo mostrar en ellos carne y sangre, pero niervos, para que se juzgue la fuerza con el color que tiene, y no satisfacerse diciendo comúnmente conceptos comunes para agradar a la rudeza de la multitud. (418)

As Almeida notes, that which "recrea o da nuevo espíritu a las cosas comunes es la elocucion[sic]" (98). *Elocutio*, the embodiment of the ideas of *inventio* in language, is here expressed by Herrera with references to the body which reveal his interest in language as a virile instrument of power. His insistence upon the "niervos" of language brings to mind both the image of Durandarte's powerful hand in the Cave of Montesinos episode of the *Quijote*, which Don Quijote interprets as a sign of the knight's physical strength, and the image of Michelangelo's *David*, in which the sculptor achieves a taut balance of reposed beauty and restrained energy. Thus, Herrera responds to Garcilaso's detractors with an affirmation that adorning the language can be done in a virile manner.

Nor was Herrera the only sixteenth-century writer to espouse the necessity to adorn the vernacular while maintaining a masculine "cleanliness" and dignity. As Morales wrote several decades earlier, "Yo no digo que afeytes nuestra lengua Castellana, sino que le laves la cara. No le pintes en el rostro, mas quitale la suziedad. No la vistas de bordados ni recamos, mas no le mengües un buen atavío de vestido, que adereçe con gravedad" (182). Through the balance of beautiful, flowery language, demanded by the Spanish public, and restrained, taut classical language, the Spanish poet will

take triumphant flight, and avoid the pitfall of “effeminate” style. Another of Herrera’s theoretical sources, Julius Caesar Scaliger, locates this balance in *efficacia*, “the power of the oration to represent the object in an excellent way” (Smith 225-26). As Paul J. Smith notes, Scaliger believes that efficacy can be well achieved in accounts of war, and is associated with two vices, “the excess called affectation, and the deficiency known as languor” (226). Even the examples of *efficacia* used by Scaliger and Herrera reveal the deep cultural connection between this rhetorical concept and gender, for “men are essentially (and not accidentally) strong, loyal and just, and the poet’s verbal elaborations cannot affect this fundamental truth” (236). Thus, the concepts of *elocutio* and *efficacia* represent culturally-perceived attributes of masculinity such as strength, clarity, and vigor.

According to Herrera, Spanish, as the language of a warrior nation cultivated by the imitation of classical and Italian sources won as imperial spoils, could attain such a tension of virility and beauty and escape the pitfalls of affectation and languor. In contrast, the poet describes Italian in clearly effeminate terms, as a language too easily softened by elision and apostrophe and too easily penetrated by foreign words.

Porque la toscana es muy florida, abundosa, blanda, y compuesta; pero libre, lasciva, desmayada, y demasiadamente enternecida y muelle y llena de afectación, admite todos los vocablos, carece de consonantes en la terminación, lo cual, aunque entre ellos se tenga por singular virtud y suavidad, es conocida falta de espíritu y fuerza; tiene infinitos apóstrofes y concisiones, muda y corta y acrecienta los vocablos. (313)

Herrera’s gendered description of Italian as an excessively “affected” and yet too yieldingly “languid” language befits his view of Italian culture as weakened by its own beauty and cultivation, a courtesan open to foreign invasion. Nor is his vision of Italy particularly unique, for Herrero García has observed that seventeenth-century Spaniards stereotyped Italians as refined, effeminate, and disposed toward homosexuality (329, 349-52). Yet the poet Herrera owes to Roman culture his very categories of thought, for the appropriation and contamination of an established, but conquered

culture by a less civilized but more militant one serves as the contextual foundation for many classical writings used as the basis for Renaissance understandings of rhetoric. Indeed, in classical rhetoric the adoption of foreign words and vulgar forms such as syncope and apocope are considered acts of *barbarismus* (Lausberg II, 26-32), presumably because they allow the national language to be entered. The subsequent "feminization" of the invaded culture also finds precedence in Roman writings. The Horatian description of Greece "from the day she dropped her wars" as a capricious young girl playing at her nurse's feet and throwing off her toys with impatience and cupidity ("Epistle to Augustus" 404-05) now seems to be applied to Rome.

Spanish stands in contrast as strong, grave, and unyielding, the protector of *latinitas* and the embodiment of masculine virtues.

Pero la nuestra es grave, religiosa, honesta, alta, magnífica, suave, tierna, afectuosísima y llena de sentimientos; y tan copiosa y abundante, que ninguna otra puede gloriarse de esta riqueza y fertilidad más justamente: no sufre, ni permite vocablos extraños y bajos, ni regalos lascivos, es más recatada y observante, que ninguno tiene autoridad para osar innovar alguna cosa con libertad; porque ni corta, ni añade sílabas a las dicciones, ni trueca, ni altera forma, antes toda entera y perpetua muestra su castidad y cultura y admirable grandeza y espíritu, con que excede sin proporción a todas las vulgares, y en la facilidad y dulzura de su pronunciación. Finalmente la española se debe tratar con más honra y reverencia, y la toscana con más regalo y llaneza. (313)

The hierarchical relationship of the languages as presented by Herrera in this passage is clear. Indeed, it once again echoes Horace's "Epistle to Augustus," in which Rome is described as a culture which "was up at dawn with open doors" (405) and warned young men to curb indulgence when it conquered decadent Greece. Spanish enjoys the honor and authority of an imperial language, unduly challenged in its virile integrity. Italian wants and lacks the vigor and solemnity of the former as its own effeminate form is left open to change and invasion. Many critics have recently turned their attention to the colonizing view of the Americas as a virgin land, awaiting European exploration, exposition, and development.⁹ Yet Italy is not seen by Herrera as a virgin land, but as a courtesan,

"desmayada" and "lasciva," who wants not praise nor civilization, but suffers precisely from the excess of the same. This use of the gendered metaphors of rigor and softness, strength and openness therefore operates as a justification for Spanish appropriation of Italian culture. She lies beckoning, while he should claim her graces to enrich his own language and even step in to master and discipline her.

Herrera, however, cannot sustain such an overtly gendered and paternalistic description of Spain's sixteenth-century relationship to Italy, largely because Spain's own past overshadows such a transparent claim to imperial superiority. As Thomas Greene has noted of Renaissance literature in general, "what is unmistakable everywhere is an awareness of discontinuity coupled with the threat of inferiority" (32). William Atkinson and Oreste Macrí recognize Herrera's attempt to present Garcilaso de la Vega as the "persona-símbolo" of the triumph of the Spanish nation, although they claim that, unlike Valdés, the later critic no longer felt his culture to be inferior with respect to Italian culture (208-10; 96-97). Nonetheless, toward the end of his commentaries on Garcilaso, Herrera enters into a tirade against the Italian custom of denouncing Spain, inherited according to him from the Romans. Iberia's colonized past haunts Spain's current colonization of Italy. Classical and Italian literature, the models for the tautly virile language of the Spanish empire envisioned by Herrera, deny the presence of valor in Spain. "Y parece por sus historias que nunca engendró España hombres valerosos para merecer la inmortalidad de la gloria por la nobleza de sus hazañas" (552). Du Bellay, when faced with the same dishonorable past relationship of Gaul to Rome, resorts to accusing the Romans of stealing glory and history from his forebears, a move which, according to Ferguson, forces him to abandon the image of literary appropriation since it has so greatly wronged his own people (31).

Herrera, on the other hand, appeals to the heroic resistance of the Iberians against Rome to defend Spain's nobility. "¿Pudiera Roma domar las rebeldes cervices de aquellos antiguos españoles, hórridos y feroces en la guerra, si quisieran conservar su libertad juntamente?" (553) Finally, he draws upon the legend of Numancia, the town that perished in siege rather than yield to Roman domination, as evidence of Spanish valor. Herrera's conflation of Iberia in

Roman times with Hapsburg Spain is an expression of the Spanish national identity as an *universitas*, a community united through time, and finds parallels in the work of many of his contemporaries, including Morales and Cervantes. Thus, Herrera's vision of the relationship of Spain and Italy is once again complicated and reversed, for the invasion and occupation of Iberia by Rome is still perceived as an affront. Spain was and culturally still is in the sixteenth century a colony of Rome, a barbarian nation civilized by Italy's greater culture.¹⁰ Yet now the conquered find themselves the rulers of Rome, possessors of its great cultural spoils through their greater military power. *Translatio studii* does accompany *translatio imperii*, and the lettered class of Spain, as seen by Herrera, must take on the poetic mantle of empire as evidenced by classical and Italian literature. A gendered concept of language, in which the imperial relationship between victor and vanquished is metaphorically based upon the patriarchal relationship between male and female, comes with the transfer of empire and reinforces the military virtues which establish and protect it. Part of this cultural "baggage," expressed as contempt for the vanquished, colors Herrera's view of Italian culture as effeminate. Spain must accept only those spoils which will preserve its glory and virility, leaving it unchallenged by the ghost of foreign occupation. Yet the ghost of Rome enters into Iberia anew, accompanying the literary spoils of war. Herrera's struggle to define Spain's relationship to Europe and to its own imperial status by challenging that ghost represents yet another attempt to define Spain's national identity, an attempt in which politics and poetics are inextricably meshed, since the model poet he presents is necessarily a hero victorious in arms and letters.

Notes

¹Anne Cruz notes that the acceptance of new and foreign literary forms was made possible in Spain only with the decision of Carlos V to turn away from the nationalism of the Spanish grandees toward Europe, "y su coronación en Italia le otorga además un legado cultural que enriquece el acervo castellano y se intercambia con él" (36). Nonetheless, as Herrera himself states, the sonnet form was already introduced into Spain by the Marqués de Santillana, among others, in the 15th century.

²As an example see, "se miran desmudadas las colores / o espías o enemigos desmandados; / y juzgados primero por el traje, / parecieron-les ser, como debía, / Agentiles españoles caballeros; / y oyéndoles hablar nuevo lenguaje / mezclado de extranjera poesía, / con ojos los miraban de extranjeros" (Gallego Morell 40).

³See his poem entitled "A un buen caballero y mal poeta: la lira de Garcilaso contrahecha:" "Por ley es condenado / cualquier que ocupa posesión ajena, / y es muy averiguado / que con trabajo y pena / el oro no se sàca do no hay vena" (Gallego Morell 48).

⁴For an analysis of the modern poet's conflict with his predecessors, see Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence*. As Bloom notes, quoting Oscar Wilde, influence involves the taking away of something from the poetic father, and thus creates anxiety (6). The early modern poet still has available to him the ideal of victory in battle and the subsequent taking of spoils as a proving ground for personal valor, and therefore can more explicitly acknowledge the conflict between himself and earlier poets, although anxiety still arises concerning the value of one's vernacular language and national literary tradition, as we shall see in Herrera's defense of Castilian before Tuscan.

⁵Nonetheless, in the course of the work, Du Bellay forces himself to legitimize this appropriation through the use of organic metaphors for imitation and the concept of *translatio studium* (Ferguson 32-38). According to Margaret Ferguson, this hesitance to embrace the imperialistic metaphor of imitation as the taking of spoils may be due to his defensiveness before Gaul's own colonized past (35).

⁶In his *Discurso sobre la lengua castellana*, published first in 1546 as a prologue to the *Diálogo de la dignidad del hombre* by F. Pérez de Oliva, Ambrosio de Morales defends the imitation of Italian models from those Castilians who considered concepts such as eloquence alien to and debilitating for their language. Many of Herrera's ideas concerning eloquence and imitation echo many of Morales' arguments, and thus provide a contest for the literary debate within which the later poet was struggling for the canonization of Garcilaso and the justification of his own stylistics. I am grateful to Ignacio Navarrete for referring me to this work.

⁷As Lausberg writes, "La elocutio suministra 'el ropaje lingüístico (Cic. de. or. I, 31, 142 vestire atque ornare oratione" (II, 9).

⁸Earlier Spanish writers account for this "belatedness" in other ways. Antonio de Nebrija, in his introduction to his *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, writes that Spanish is now reaching its "cumbre" as Spain gains imperial power (7). Juan de Valdés, in his *Diálogo de la lengua*, states that Castilian is more "vulgar" than Tuscan, "porque veo que la toscana stá ilustrada y enriquecida por un Bocacio y un Petrarca, ...y como sabéis, la lengua

castellana nunca ha tenido quien escriba en ella con tanto cuidado y miramiento" (44). Valdés does, however, praise his contemporary Garcilaso, remarking in the same dialogue to Marcio that "huélgome que os satisfaga, pero más quisiera satisfacer a Garcilasso de la Vega" (94).

⁹As Patricia Parker writes, "The verbal display of a woman, opened up to view by her possessor; the narrative inventory of a feminized America, as in Alsop, 'opened in view'; the Baconian description of the parts of nature 'laid widely open and revealed'; and the expansive display of an English owner's property 'laid open to View,' but jealously guarded from intrusion—all participate in an image of opening and controlling something gendered as female before spectators and possessors gendered as male, in a process in which ostentatious display, copia, or 'increase' is constrained within an economy of mastery and ownership" (154).

¹⁰For a discussion of the development of the concepts of *universitas* and *patria*, and their role in the emerging nationalisms of the Early Modern age, see Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (232 ff.). The identification of sixteenth-century Spain with pre-Christian Iberia is clearly seen in the elaborations of the Numancia episode of the era. Cervantes states the case for a historical continuum of the people most clearly when the Duero personified in his Numancia justifies the sack of Rome by Carlos V as an example of the rectification of Spain's wronged state by the changes of Fortune, and the expansion of the Hapsburg empire as divinely ordained.

Works Cited

- Almeida, José. *La crítica literaria de Fernando de Herrera*. Madrid: Gredos, 1976.
- Atkinson, William. "On Aristotle and the Concept of Lyric Poetry in Early Spanish Criticism." *Estudios dedicados a Menéndez Pidal*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Superiores, 1956. 189-213.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. London: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Castelvetro, Lodovico. *Castelvetro on the Art of Poetry*. Trans. Andrew Bongiorno. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1984.
- Castiglione, Baldassare. *The Book of the Courtier*. Trans. Thomas Hoby. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1974.
- Cave, Terence. *The Cornucopian Text. Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

- Cruz, Anne J. *Imitación y transformación. El petrarquismo en la poesía de Boscán y Garcilaso de la Vega*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1988.
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1973.
- Du Bellay, Joachim. *The Defense and Illustration of the French Language*. Trans. Gladys M. Turquet. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1939.
- Ferguson, Margaret W. *Trials of Desire. Renaissance Defenses of Poetry*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.
- Gallego Morell, Antonio. *Fama póstuma de Garcilaso de la Vega*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1978.
- Greene, Thomas M. *The Light in Troy. Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1982.
- Herrera, Fernando de. "Comentarios de Fernando de Herrera." *Garcilaso y sus comentaristas*. Ed. Antonio Gallego Morell. Madrid: Gredos, 1972. 307-594.
- Herrero García, Miguel. *Ideas de los españoles del siglo XVII*. Madrid: Gredos, 1966.
- Horace. "Epistle to Augustus." *Satires, Epistles and Ars poetica*. Trans. H. Rushton Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1966.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Manual de retórica literaria: fundamentos de una ciencia de la literatura*. Trans. José Pérez Riesco. Madrid: Gredos, 1967.
- Macrí, Oreste. *Fernando de Herrera*. Madrid: Gredos, 1972.
- Morales, Ambrosio de. "Discurso sobre la lengua castellana." Ed. Valeria Scorpione. *Studi ispanici* 3 (1977): 179-194.
- Navarrete, Ignacio. "Decentering Garcilaso: Herrera's Attack on the Canon." *PMLA* 106 (1991): 21-33.
- Nebrija, Antonio de. *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Ed. I. González-Llubera. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1926.
- Parker, Patricia. *Literary Fat Ladies. Rhetoric, Gender, Property*. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Rodríguez-Salgado, M.J. *The Changing Face of Empire: Charles V, Philip II and Habsburg Authority, 1551-1559*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- Smith, Paul Julian. "The Rhetoric of Presence in Poets and Critics of Golden Age Lyric: Garcilaso, Herrera, Góngora." *MLN* 100: 2 (March, 1985): 223-246.
- Valdés, Juan de. *Diálogo de la lengua*. Ed. Juan M. Lope Blanch. Madrid: Castalia, 1985.
- Vida, Marco Girolamo. *The De arte poetica of Marco Girolamo Vida*. Trans. Ralph G. Williams. New York: Columbia UP, 1976.