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The Latin poetry of Garcilaso de la Vega was praised effusively by his contemporaries. However, until now, only three of his Latin lyric odes have been extant, and these are often disparaged by modern critics. In this study, I present, together with translation and commentary, the text of two newly discovered poems by Garcilaso: the ode addressed to Bembo which the latter refers to in his correspondence; and an ode addressed to the poet laureate Johann Alexander Brassicanus. I also present new critical editions of the three extant poems (‘Ad Antonium Thylesium’, ‘Ad Genesium Sepulvedam’ and ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’) in the light of new witnesses from the same source. I argue that the poems constitute sophisticated meditations on the purpose of encomiastic literature and the nature of lyric poetry. In this way I aim to provide a better understanding of Garcilaso’s Latin odes and restore his reputation as a consummate Latin poet.

Garcilaso’s contemporaries held his Latin poetry in high regard. Boscán praises the poet for his ‘verso latino y castellano’.¹ According to Paolo Giovio, he was ‘horatiana suavitate odas scribere solitus’ (‘accustomed to writing odes
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¹ Fernando de Herrera, Obras de Garcilasso de la Vega con anotaciones de Fernando de Herrera (Sevilla: Alonso de Barrera, 1580), 21.
with Horatian sweetness). Perhaps the most famous example of contemporary praise of Garcilaso’s Latin odes can be found in a letter written by Pietro Bembo to Honorato Fascitelli in August 1535 where, commenting on some of Garcilaso’s Latin odes sent to him by Girolamo Seripando, Bembo writes that the Spaniard is ‘un bello et gentil poeta; et queste cose sue tuttie mi sonno sommamente piaciute: et meritano singolare commendatione et laude’ (‘a fine and gentle poet and that all his pieces have given me unbounded pleasure and deserve unusual praise and commendation’). He is particularly pleased with an ode Garcilaso dedicated to him: ‘Ma io sopra tutto ho con lui questo vantaggio: che a me pare, che l’Oda, che egli a me scrive, sia etiandio piu vaga e piu elegante et monda et sonora et dolce, che le altre tutte non sono, che in que’fogli sono’ (‘But above all I hold in esteem the ode which he addresses to me; it appears to me lighter and more elegant, purer in style, sweeter and more harmonious than all the others that are in these folios’).

Bembo repeats his praise in a letter directly to Garcilaso written later that same month:

[...] illud perfecesti, ut non solum Hispanos tuos omneis qui se Apollini Musisque dediderunt, longe numeris superes et praecurras tuis, sed Italis etiam hominibus stimulus addas, quo magis magisque se excitent, si modo volent in hoc abs te certamine atque his in studiis ipsi quoque non praeteriri

([...] you have accomplished this, that not only do you far surpass and outdo in your verses all your Spaniards who have given themselves over to Apollo and the Muses, but you even spur on Italians, so that they may be incited more and more, if they do not want to be outdone by you in this competition and these studies)

However, until now, only three of Garcilaso’s Latin poems have been extant: ‘Ad Antonium Thylesium’, ‘Ad Genesium Sepulvedam’ and ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’ (also known as Ode I, Ode II and Ode III respectively). They are
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2 Paolo Giovio, Pauli Iovii Elogia virorum literis illustrium (Basel, 1575), 146; quoted in Eugenio Mele, ‘Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega y su permanencia en Italia’, Bulletin Hispanique, 25:2 (1923), 108–48 (p. 118; my translation).

3 Audrey Lumsden, ‘Garcilaso de la Vega As a Latin Poet’, Modern Language Review, 42:3 (1947), 337–41 (p. 337; translation by Lumsden).

4 Il primo volume delle lettere di M. Pietro Bembo (Venice: Girolamo Scotto, 1562), 207v; cited by Lumsden, ‘Garcilaso de la Vega As a Latin Poet’, 337; translation by Lumsden.

5 Cartas, documentos y escrituras de Garcilaso de la Vega y de sus familiares, ed. Krzysztof Sliwa (Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2006), 132; my translation. For more on this letter, see Eugenia Fosalba, Pulchra Parthenope: hacia la faceta napolitana de la poesía de Garcilaso, e-book (Madrid: Iberoamerica/Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 2020), 211–23; and María Luisa López Griguera, ‘Notas sobre las amistades italianas de Garcilaso: un nuevo manuscrito de Pietro Bembo’, in Homenaje a Eugenio Asensio, ed. Luisa López Grigera & Augustin Redondo (Madrid: Gredos, 1988), 219–310.
also plagued with textual problems (for example, line 53 is missing in the text of ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’ as we have known it until now). What is more, modern critics are scathing in their assessments of the literary qualities of these odes. For example, Audrey Lumsden writes of the ode ‘Ad Antonium Thylesium’: ‘it is difficult to find any technical felicity in these rough-hewn verses. [...] The construction is incoherent and the stanzas lack that powerful unity so typical of Horace’. She concludes of all three then-extant odes: ‘The three Latin poems here discussed obviously do not provide a sufficient basis for a discussion of Garcilaso’s merit as a Latin poet. [...] They reveal him as a rather inadequate imitator of Horace’.6

In recent years, attempts have been made to defend Garcilaso’s literary skill in his Latin poems. This has involved in particular a recognition of Garcilaso’s eclectic style of imitation from various poets and to various ends. For instance, Andrew F. Gray argues that, in Garcilaso’s ode ‘Ad Genesium Sepulvedam’, the poet undercuts the ostensible praise of glory in war through his use of allusions to Horace and Virgil.7 He concludes that ‘Garcilaso’s poetics in the odes is so eclectic and transformative that uncertainties surround most attempts at identifying sources, and in several cases source materials are adopted only to produce ironic, even puzzling, reversals of their meanings in the source texts’.8 In my own earlier study, I presented the main source for Garcilaso’s ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’: Erasmus’ translation of one of Lucian’s Dialogues of the Gods. However, I argued that allusions to various other authors such as Catullus, Lucretius and Horace served to increase the comic effect of the poem.9 This pattern can also be seen in the new poems; while both contain substantial allusions to Horace, they also draw on a number of other Classical authors. Indeed, as we shall see, the first problematizes the difficulty of being a Horatian poet, while the second also uses allusion and a Horatian poetic voice to reject the praise of war.

A New Manuscript

I now hope to advance the study of Garcilaso’s Latin poetry further by presenting two new poems by Garcilaso, as well as a new witness for all three poems known previously. The poems appear handwritten in the back

6 Lumsden, ‘Garcilaso de la Vega As a Latin poet’, 339 & 341.
7 Andrew F. Gray, ‘Garcilaso at Home in Naples: On the Neo-Latin Muse of the Príncipe de los poetas castellanos’, Calíope. Journal for the Society for Renaissance and Baroque Hispanic Poetry, 21:1 (2016), 5–33 (pp. 18–23).
8 Gray, ‘Garcilaso at Home in Naples’, 24.
9 Maria Czepiel, ‘Garcilaso’s “Sedes ad Cyprias”: A New Source and a Re-appraisal’, BSS, XCVI:5 (2019), 737–54. For more on Garcilaso’s imitation of Catullus in his Latin odes, see Rosa Helena Chinchilla, ‘Garcilaso de la Vega, Catullus, and the Academy in Naples’, Calíope. Journal for the Society for Renaissance and Baroque Hispanic Poetry, 16:2 (2010), 65–81 (pp. 69–70).
of a printed book, a copy of Doctissimorum nostra aetate Italorum epigrammata (Paris: Nicolas le Riche, 1547). This book, edited by Jean de Gagny, is a verse anthology of Italian poets born in the late fifteenth century including Flaminio, Molsa, Navagero, Cotta, Lampridius and Sadoleto. The copy in question was part of the library of the counts Kinsky (the so-called Kinskyana), and is now in the National Library of the Czech Republic (shelf mark: E IX 000001).10

In the final leaves of the book, a hand which is likely a sixteenth-century Spanish one has written out a further selection of poems by Sadoleto, Garcilaso, André de Resende, Jaime Juan Falcó, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, Pietro Gravina, Juan Ramírez, Honorato Juan and Johannes Secundus.11 The manuscript certainly bears further study. For example, it confirms the authorship of Resende’s poem ‘Rursum tumultu Gallia turbido’, until now known from only one other witness.12 I include an index of titles and first lines of the transcribed poems (Appendix I) for the use of other scholars.

Of the manuscript poems, only two are by Italian poets of the same generation as those in the printed book: Sadoleto (whose work also appears in the printed text) and Pietro Gravina. The last poem copied is by Johannes Secundus, often called Hagiensis (‘from the Hague’), although the copyist has rendered this as ‘Hegius’, and used the poet’s father’s name (Nicolaus). The others are all Iberian poets, which suggests that the hand is Spanish. Furthermore, the Spaniards whose work is copied tend to be later than the poets printed in the anthology; note for example the dates of Honorato Juan (1507–1566) and Jaime Juan Falcó (1522–1594). There is also evidence to suggest the copyist or at least his source came from the university circles of Alcalá. For example, the handwritten note at the back of the book, apparently in the same hand as the poetic anthology it follows, gives an account of how Andreas Navagero stayed in Alcalá de Henares with Doctor Ramírez (that is, Juan Ramírez, professor of rhetoric at the university). While there, Navagero recited a few lines of a poem which he had begun when leaving Naples but had been unable to finish off:13

10 See Doctissimorum nostra aetate Italorum epigrammata (Paris: Nicolas le Riche, 1547), National Library of the Czech Republic, E IX 000001; available at <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=gwXg9zb3vwcC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false> (accessed 12 January 2022).

11 The date ‘1573’ and the initials ‘RL’ (or LR) are found before the title page, but this appears to be in a different hand to the poems copied out in the final leaves.

12 See Virgínia Soares Pereira & Arlindo Correia, ‘Um poema inédito atribuído a André de Resende’, Ágora. Estudos Clássicos em Debate, 15 (2013), 331–42.

13 ‘Andreas Navagero cuius in hoc libello extant carmina elegantissima missus olim legatus a sena[tu] Veneto ad Carolum Imp. cum Matr[j]tum pete[n]s ubi tum Caesar agebat Compluto iter faceret, ibique diem apud Doctorem Ramirium commoratus hospitioque exceptus fuisse, suaveisque quos composuerat versus retulisse gravissime quaerebat, quod nobilissimum epigramma quod venetiis discedens inchoaverat, digne absolvere nequi[s]|set, recitavitque hos versus’ (‘Andreas Navagero, whose most elegant poems are found in this
Aurae quae suavibus percurritis aethera pennis
Et strepitus blando per nemora alta sono
Rusticus Euptolemus paleas dum iactat inanes
Ventilat et medio grandia farra die.

(You breezes which hasten through the aether on soft wings
And you murmurings through the high groves with charming noise,
While rustic Euptolemus makes the empty chaff fly
And tosses the large grains at midday.)

The hand then notes that Navagero subsequently changed and finished the
epigram, and tells the reader that it can be found on fol. 40:

Aurae quae levibus percurritis aera pennis
Et strepitus blando per nemora alta sono.
Serta dat haec vobis, vobis haec rusticus Idmon
Spargit odorato plena canistra croco.
Vos lenite aestum, et paleas seiungite inanes:
Dum medio fruges ventilat ille die.

(You breezes which hasten through the aether on light wings
And you murmurings through the high groves with charming noise,
Rustic Idmon gives you these wreaths, and scatters
Baskets full of fragrant saffron.
Meanwhile you assuage the heat, and separate out the empty chaff;
While he tosses the grain at midday.)

We know Navagero arrived at Alcalá on 6 June 1524, and we even have his
description of the city. The writer’s familiarity with his visit and reference
to an oral recitation suggests that the account is second- or even first-hand
(not impossible given the *terminus post quem* of 1547, the date the book was
printed). The account also confirms that the writer or his source was familiar
with a European circle of intellectuals through which poems by Garcilaso
could have circulated (keeping in mind that Garcilaso’s Latin poetry was
written after his exile from Spain in 1532). One other piece of evidence which suggests a link to Alcalá is the inclusion of a manuscript poem by the aforementioned Juan Ramírez, ‘De morte Socratis’. The fact that, unusually, the hand has not specified his first name in the attribution suggests familiarity.

There are five poems which are listed as being by Garcilaso (the first is attributed to ‘Garsilassì’, and the following poems marked ‘Eiusdem’). The new poems are undoubtedly by Garcilaso. Firstly, they are bookended by the previously known odes: Ode II is copied first (here entitled ‘Garsilassì ode Ad Genesium Sepulvedam Doctorem theologum et regium Historiographum’), followed by the two new poems, and then by Ode I (‘Ejusdem ad Tylesium’) and finally Ode III (‘Venus ad cupidinem’). The first new poem (which I propose to refer to as Ode IV) is addressed to Pietro Bembo, meaning for the first time we can read the ode which Bembo praised so highly. The second new poem (henceforth Ode V) is addressed to Johann Alexander Brassicanus (‘Brasicanum Germanum’), and Garcilaso includes his own name in the body of the poem. Below I offer the texts of the two poems, together with my translation and some comments.

The copies of the poems already known to us are also useful. Thus far, manuscript copies of the three odes have been known in four sources: Mx (Odes I and III), V (Odes I and III); Mt (Ode III) and Mo (Ode II). The texts of Odes I and III all seem to derive from Mx, which is therefore the only one I cite in the *apparatus criticus* for these odes. However, as I shall argue in my comments, some more reliable readings in the newly discovered witnesses in my source (which I call D) show that they are not derived from Mx like the existing copies of ‘Ad Antonium Thylesium’ and ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’. In particular, the new witness allows us to recover line 53 of ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’, missing until now (unfortunately disproving my own earlier conjecture of what the line could have contained). Nevertheless, the inclusion of readings which need emendation and are common to Mx suggests that both have a common source. I will therefore also present new critical texts of the three poems in light of these new readings, with particular notes on some extra lines to be found in ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’.

16 Mx: Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emmanuele III, XIII A. A. 63, 62v–63 (Ode I), 58v–60v (Ode III); V: Cod. Vaticanano latino 2836, 260v–261v (Ode I), 259v–260v (Ode III); Mt: Biblioteca Nazionale V. E. 53, Clarissimorum Aevi Caroli Caesaris V poetarum carmina, ex schedis Seripandi Card. in Bibliotheca S. J. ad Carbonariam quae nunc in Regiam Bibliothecam deductae sunt (Ode III); Mo: Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 5785, 272v (Ode II). I use Luque Moreno’s abbreviations (Jesús Luque Moreno, ‘Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega: notas sobre métrica y crítica textual’, in *Estudios sobre la literatura y arte: dedicados al profesor Emilio Orozco Díaz*, ed. Nicolás Marín et al. [Granada: Secretario de Publicaciones de la Univ. de Granada, 1979], 297–310). I have been able to consult all sources except Mt.

17 See Eugenio Mele, ‘Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega y su permanencia en Italia’, *Bulletin Hispanique*, 26:1 (1924), 35–51 (pp. 43 & 46).
By the same author to Pietro Bembo

Bembo, if perchance the sound of the humble lyre
Diverts your straining senses to your displeasure
From your lofty studies, forgive me gladly,
I pray.
I am not like the man
Who had the power at times to move hearts with his sweet-sounding modes,
And at other times, changing, with a rapid river of words
Tell of the deeds of heroes on his lyre;
Nor like that lyricist who first showed
The metres of Greece to Latium
Not without distinction, in which, refusing to speak of lofty matters,
He rose above himself in flight unawares,
Grander than usual, and then placing a limit
To his wings, took himself with good omen to the banks of the Aufeus
Soothing the flowery ground With varied sound.
The god, I say, who has the cithara close to his heart, to whom poems give pleasure,
Did not insert me in the group of the famous bards,
Nor did he allow me To rend the furthest air with my wings
Oh if only it were permitted, then I should not hesitate
To lift myself nimbly with your winged praises
From the bottom and touch The high stars with my illustrious head;
Not so that I may add riches to your rich pile, since I am poor,
Nomen te celebrans, quem resonat biceps
Collis assiduo sono

But so that I may make a name for myself
by celebrating you,
Whom the two-headed hill re-echoes
With continuous sound,

And for whose head Melpomene with her
virginal hand
Is accustomed to weave an ornament with
leaves,

Whether you sing of Lalage in poetry
Or whether free from the foot

You celebrate the holy city which casts its
wet foundations
In the wandering sea, in a continuous
record of history,
Wherefore envious Iberia
Wets her cheek with tears,

For if your varied reed-pen had adorned
Her illustrious deeds with new colours
She would go safely by her own light
Shining through the dark journey of time.

Thus the great Macedonian wept
Standing at the tomb of Achilles, not
lesser in merit,

Nor lacking virtue, but keen to be read
about
Continually by his future grandsons.

Who when he saw the Thessalian leader
Go through the Stygian waves supported
on the Maeonian shoulder,

Bitterly torn apart by the teeth of Envy,
They say he said tearfully:

‘Oh young man, on whom the goddess
Who rides on wheels that have the power to
change all things to her liking
Has smiled with placid and friendly face,
And favouring your life and ashes,

Happy since you were given by lot
The trumpet which fills all corners of the
earth with its sound,
And scatters the mists of the inert shades
Dissipating forgetfulness with its blast.’

19 i.e., in prose.
20 cuit post corr. D.
It has been noted that the three odes known until now are varied in metre, although all of them are written in Horatian metres: ‘Ad Antonium Thylesium’ is written in Alcaics, ‘Ad Genesium Sepulvedam’ in the Third Asclepiad, and ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’ in the Fourth Asclepiad. This ode exhibits a new metre again, the Second Asclepiad (also an Horatian metre). It is addressed to Pietro Bembo, the Italian humanist, poet and future cardinal famous for his exposition of the theory of Neoplatonic love in Gli asolani (1497–1504), and for arguing that Tuscan should be the literary language of Italy in his Prose della volgar lingua (1525). In this poem, Garcilaso displays a great appreciation for the work of the older Italian, although we know from a letter from Bembo to Garcilaso that they had not met.

The poem begins with a captatio benevolentiae, wherein Garcilaso begs forgiveness for taking Bembo’s attention away from his studies (ll. 1–3), and then asserts that he is not among the famous lyric bards (ll. 4–20). The first of the poets he refers to is Pindar, since the reference to the changes of subject matter and tone, as well as the comparison to a river (‘flumine’ [l. 6]), is reminiscent of Horace’s description of the Greek poet. In Horace, Carmina, IV. 2, Horace refers to the various themes to be found in Pindar’s poetry: ‘seu deos regesque canit [...] sive [...] pugilemve equomve / dicit [...] flebili sponsae iuvenemve raptum / plorat’ (‘or as he sings of gods or kings [...] or as he tells of boxer or charioteer [...] or as he tells of a young man torn / from his weeping bride’ [IV. 2. 13–22]). He also compares Pindar to ‘a rain-fed river running down / from the mountains and bursting its banks’ (‘monte decurrens velut amnis, imbres / quem super noteas aluere ripas’ [IV. 2. 5–6]).

In the third and fourth stanzas, Garcilaso goes on to compare himself unfavourably to Horace; this is signalled firstly by the reference to being ‘Nor like that lyricist who first showed the metres of Greece to Latium’ (‘Nec qualis Latio qui numeros prior / Ostendit fidecen’ [ll. 9–10]), which recalls Horace’s own assertion in Carmina, III. 30 that he was ‘the first to bring Aeolian song to Italian measures’ (‘princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos’ [III. 30. 13–14]). In his poem, Horace makes reference to his origins by the Aufidus (III. 30. 10), as does Garcilaso (l. 14). Garcilaso’s reference to the poet being winged (‘volucer’ [l. 12]; ‘pennis’ [l. 14]) also recalls Horace’s image of himself turning into a bird to express his poetic

21 Lumsden classifies the metre of ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’ as the Third Asclepiadean (‘Garcilaso de la Vega As a Latin Poet’, 340.) I follow the classification of Robin Nisbet and Margaret Hubbard, in A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I, ed. Robin G. M. Nisbet & Margaret Hubbard (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1970), xxxviii–xxxix.
22 Fosalba, Pulchra Parthenope, 214.
23 The translation I am using is taken from Horace: The Complete Odes and Epodes, trans., with an intro. & notes, by David West (New York/Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2008). The text I am using is from Q. Horati Flacci: Opera, ed. H. W. Garrod (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1901).
fame and immortality (II. 20). Finally, Garcilaso states that he has not been inserted into the number of poets by Apollo, god of the lyre (ll. 17–20).

In the following stanzas, Garcilaso asserts that if he could write lyric poetry, he would write in praise of Bembo (ll. 21–24), not because the latter needs Garcilaso’s meagre skills, but because in that way Garcilaso could be associated with him as his panegyrist (ll. 25–28). Garcilaso then seamlessly does exactly what he professes not to be able to do, that is, praise his addressee: Bembo is acclaimed on Parnassus (‘biceps / Collis’, ‘the two-peaked hill’ [ll. 27–28]); compare ‘Parnasosque biceps’ (Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, II.221).²⁴ and by the muse Melpomene (ll. 29–31), both for his poetry (l. 31) and for his prose history of Venice (ll. 32–35). Indeed, Iberia is jealous that Venice has someone like him to immortalize it (ll. 35–40); thus Alexander the Great wept at the tomb of Achilles, and called the young man lucky to have had Homer to immortalize him (ll. 41–56).

The poem is a sophisticated meditation on the ability of poetry and panegyric to immortalize its object. This appears on several levels: Garcilaso will celebrate Bembo, but Bembo in turn celebrates Venice. Furthermore, by celebrating Bembo, Garcilaso will secure fame for himself; significantly, although he professes not to be like the winged and immortal Horace, he states that if he had the skill to praise Bembo, then he would be lifted up on winged praises (‘laudibus / Pennatis’ [ll. 21–22]). We have already seen how Garcilaso draws on Horace’s claims of poetic immortality in II.20; likewise, the references to Horace’s *Carmina*, III. 30 are also significant, since in this poem Horace famously asserts that thanks to his poetry he will not fully die (‘non omnis moriar’ [III. 30. 6]). The anecdote about Alexander the Great is attested in Cicero’s *Pro Archia*, a speech in defence of the poet Archias (see below), but also an apology for the utility of poetry to the Roman imperial project thanks to its ability to immortalize the great deeds of the Romans.

Another major theme of the poem is the anxiety of imitation. Most notably, in his assertion not to be able to compete with the Classical lyricists, Garcilaso alludes to poems where Horace himself wrestles with his relationship to his predecessors. For example, Ode IV. 2, from which Garcilaso borrows his description of Pindar, opens with a warning about competing with Pindar, comparing it to Icarus’ ill-fated flight: ‘Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari, / Iulle, certatis ope Daedalea / nititur’ (‘All those, Iullus, who aim to rival Pindar, / are struggling on feathers waxed by the art / of Daedalus’ [IV. 2. 1–3]). A few lines later, Garcilaso also alludes to Horace’s first ode (I. 1). In this programmatic poem, Horace asserts by way of a priamel that though there are many vocations, his is that of lyric poet. He concludes by addressing his patron Maecenas, the poem’s interlocutor, with a statement of his desire to be counted among the famous lyric poets: ‘quod si me lyricis vatibus inseres, / sublimi feriam sidera vertice’ (‘But

---

²⁴ The edition I am using is *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*, ed. R. J. Tarrant (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2004). Further references are to this edition.
if you enrol me among the lyric bards, my soaring head will touch the stars’ ([l. 1. 35–36]). Garcilaso uses similar phrasing when he claims that Apollo did not insert him in the number of bards (‘Non [...] numero nobilium [...] Vatum me inseruit’ [l. 17–19]). He also refers to these lines when he writes that, if he were able to praise Bembo, he would ‘touch / The high stars with my illustrious head’ (‘tangere et ardua / Claro vertice sydera’ [ll. 23–24]). As well as expressing his inability to compete with his ancient lyric predecessors, Garcilaso suggests an anxiety about competing with contemporary ones. The reference to Bembo singing of Lalage ([l. 31], an object of amorous attention in Horace’s poetry ([Carmina], I. 22, II. 5. 16), suggests that he is also a lyric poet with whom Garcilaso cannot compete. This reference may have been used loosely in reference to Bembo’s love lyrics, since there are no extant poems where he writes of a ‘Lalage’.

However, Garcilaso’s poetic skill is ostentatiously on display at the end of the poem. Garcilaso is likely to have known of the story about Alexander from Cicero’s account:

Quam multos scriptores rerum suarum magnus ille Alexander secum habuisse dicitur! Atque is tamen, cum in Sigeo ad Achillis tumulum astitisset: ‘o fortunate,’ inquit, ‘adulescens, qui tuae virtutis Homerum praecenem inveneris!’ et vere. Nam, nisi Ilias illa extitisset, idem tumulus qui corpus eius contexerat nomen etiam obruisset.

(How many writers Alexander the Great is said to have kept with him to record his deeds! And yet, when standing before the tomb of Achilles at Sigeum, he said: ‘Lucky young man, to have had Homer to proclaim your valour!’ And rightly—because, had it not been for the Iliad, the tomb which covered Achilles’ body would also have buried his memory.)

(Pro Archia, 24)25

However, the source account is a prose speech, and Garcilaso adapts it for a new poetic context. For example, his ‘iuvenis’ ([l. 49]) is more poetic than Cicero’s ‘adulescens’. Like Cicero, Garcilaso writes that Alexander visited Achilles’s tomb ([ll. 41–42]) and that he was keen for his exploits to be recorded in writing ([ll. 42–44]). He later goes on to relate Alexander’s speech ([ll. 49–56]). However, before this, he adds that Alexander saw Homer (metaphorically) carrying Achilles through the Underworld on his shoulders ([ll. 45–47]). This is expressed in a poetic lexicon, such as the phrase ‘Stygias [...] undas’ (found, for example, in Ovid, Metamorphoses, 2. 101, 3. 272; Tristia, 1. 65; Epistulae ex Ponto., 2. 43; Virgil, Aeneid, 7. 773; Propertius, 3. 18. 9). Garcilaso’s description of how Homer’s tuba

25 Latin text: Oxford Classical Texts: M. Tulli Ciceronis: Orationes. Vol. 6: Pro Tullo; Pro Fonteio; Pro Sulla; Pro Archia; Pro Plancio; Pro Scauro, ed. Albert Curtis Clark (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 1911), 97; English translation: Cicero, Defence Speeches, trans., with an intro. & notes, by D. H. Berry (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2017), 118.
scatters the mists of oblivion is also poetic: compare ‘Quae umbrarum nebulae spargit inertium’ (55) to ‘Styx nebulae exhalat iners, umbraeque recentes’ (Ovid, Metamorphoses, 4. 434). Garcilaso seems to be demonstrating the fact that, by praising Bembo, he has indeed been given poetic wings.

Let us turn now to consider the second new poem, Ode V.

[V] Ejusdem ad Brasicanum Germanum

Brasicane meis iure sodalibus
In primis habite[,] indissociabilis
Lasso lege revincte
Vitae tempora ad ultimam[,] 4

Plectro bella canas tu licet aureo
Heroumque genus, fontem et originem
Traddas posteritati
Claro carmine nobilem 8

Demissae tenuem fronte sonum lyrae
Et Lassi numeros accipe candida
Quando ferre recusant
Pondus nostri humeri grave 12

Ad ripas fluvii castra binominis
Tam late posita ut prospicientibus
Tot tentoria, visi
Sint montes nive candidi[.] 16

Cantabis numero Maeonio et pede
Istri dum nitidam canto ego Doridem
Remis sollicitantem
Adverso vada vortice

Vel cum se rapidis obsequio viri
Piscatoris aquis credit, ut adiuvet
Munus candidore
Sublucens tunica nive

Udam27 quae tenuis non aliter tegit
Quam celare rosas vas vitreum solet
Pura aut unda lapillos
Splendentis nitido solo[.] 28

---

26 et dissociabilis D.
27 Udam, D.
This poem is written in the Third Asclepiadean metre (the same as the ode ‘Ad Genesium Sepulvedam’). The poem is addressed to ‘Brasicanus Germanus’; although there were two Brassicanus brothers, the mention of poetry (‘carmine’ [l. 8]; ‘Maeonio [...] pede’ [l. 17]) suggests that the addressee is Johann Alexander Brassicanus, whom Maximilian I crowned poet laureate in 1518.²⁸

The content of this poem suggests that Garcilaso and Brassicanus met during Garcilaso’s time in Germany in 1532. In February of that year, the Spanish poet accompanied Fernando de Toledo, Duke of Alba, on his way to defend Vienna against the Ottoman army.²⁹ The references in the poem to camps (‘castra’ [l. 13]) and tents (‘tentoria’ [l. 15]) are likely to refer to this expedition. The mention (l. 13) of the ‘two-named river’ must refer to the Danube, called both the Danuvius and the Hister or Ister in Latin. The reference to oars (‘remis’ [l. 19]) is also telling. In his second eclogue, Garcilaso recalls how Fernando travelled down the Danube to meet Charles V at Regensburg: ‘En fin al gran Danubio s’encomienda; [...] El remo que deciende en fuerza suma / mueve la blanca espuma como argento’ (Obra poética, 1494–99). Later, the Danube helps Charles V and Fernando row down to Vienna:

El río, sin tardanza, parecía
que’l agua disponía al gran viaje;
allanaba el pasaje y la corriente
para que fácilmente aquella armada,
[...]
en el remar liviano y dulce viese
cuánto el Danubio fuese favorable. (Obra poética, 1602–08)

Whether the latter account was first-hand is the subject of debate. Garcilaso had been condemned to exile for his involvement the previous year in the wedding of his nephew, which had not been sanctioned by the king. On arriving at Regensburg, the punishment was imposed, and he began his exile on a nearby island on the Danube.³⁰ He was then permitted to continue his exile in Naples in the service of Pedro de Toledo. However, Herrera asserts that Garcilaso was present in the emperor’s expedition against the Turks in Vienna, perhaps based on the account in the second eclogue; this would suggest that he was allowed to take part in the campaign before leaving for Naples.³¹ On the other hand, Navarrete states

²⁸ On Johann Alexander Brassicanus, see John Flood, Poets Laureate in the Holy Roman Empire: A Bio-Bibliographical Handbook, eBook (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2011), 230–31.
²⁹ See Garcilaso de la Vega, Obra poética y textos en prosa, ed., notas & estudio de Bienvenido Morros (Barcelona: Crítica, 2007), 288. Subsequent references are to this edition.
³⁰ Hayward Keniston, Garcilaso de la Vega: A Critical Study of His Life and Works (New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1922), 111–12.
³¹ Fernando de Herrera, Obras de Garcilasso de la Vega, 15.
that Garcilaso accompanied Pedro de Toledo when the latter was in Rome in August and then entered Naples on 4 September.\textsuperscript{32} Hayward Keniston complicates the picture by suggesting that a certain ‘Don Gratia di Vega’, who is in the company of the Duke of Alba in October of that year, is Garcilaso.\textsuperscript{33} In any case, Garcilaso’s time in exile on the Danube began in March and ended around the middle of the year, suggesting a window of a few months when he could have met Brassicanus.\textsuperscript{34}

Garcilaso seems to have started writing his Neo-Latin poetry in Naples.\textsuperscript{35} However, the reference to his time in Germany in this poem suggests that the poem was written not long after his arrival in Naples, which would date it to 1532–1533. This is not surprising; Eugenia Fosalba notes that the ‘Ode ad Antonium Thylesium’ was also written surprisingly soon after Garcilaso’s arrival.\textsuperscript{36} In that poem, Garcilaso also refers to his exile in terms that imply it was very recent.\textsuperscript{37}

The descriptions of Garcilaso’s exile in Germany which have been known to us until now have been mostly negative. In the ‘Ode ad Antonium Thylesium’, he writes that he has been forced to abandon his wife, children, brothers and land, to experience cold places and the arrogant customs of barbarians, and alleviate his woes on the banks of the Danube (\textit{Obra poética}, 1–8). Likewise, in Canción III he laments that he is ‘preso y forzado y solo en tierra ajena’ (\textit{Obra poética}, 16). However, ‘Ad Brassicanum germanum’ gives us a more positive view of the exile by focusing on the friendship that he gained there; Brassicanus is ‘Among the first of my companions, bonded / To Lassus by undissolvable law / To the end of my life’ (‘sodalibus / In primis habite, indissociabili / Lasso lege revincte / Vitae tempora ad ultima’ [ll. 1–4]).\textsuperscript{38} Indeed, a similar idea is found in the ‘Ode ad Antonium Thylesium’, where the poet goes on to say that the difficulties of exile have been alleviated by the friendships he has cultivated in Naples with Antonio Telesio, Mario Galeota, and Placido di Sangro, and he concludes that he would not exchange them for the Tagus after all (\textit{Obra poética}, 69–72).

Once again, one of the concerns of the poems is poetry itself. Garcilaso contrasts his vocation of lyric poet to that of Brassicanus, who will write in

\textsuperscript{32} Eustaquio Fernández de Navarrete, \textit{Vida del célebre Garcilaso de la Vega} (Madrid: Imprenta de la Viuda de Calero, 1850), 235.
\textsuperscript{33} Keniston, \textit{Garcilaso de la Vega}, 115–16.
\textsuperscript{34} Garcilaso de la Vega, \textit{Obra poética y textos en prosa}, ed. Morros, 146.
\textsuperscript{35} Lumsden, ‘Garcilaso de la Vega As a Latin Poet’, 339; Eugenia Fosalba, ‘Sobre la relación de Garcilaso con Antonio Tilesio y el círculo de los hermanos Seripando’, \textit{Cuadernos de Filología Italiana}, 19 (2012), 131–44 (p. 139).
\textsuperscript{36} Fosalba, ‘Sobre la relación de Garcilaso con Antonio Tilesio’, 133.
\textsuperscript{37} Fosalba, ‘Sobre la relación de Garcilaso con Antonio Tilesio’, 134.
\textsuperscript{38} The MS reads ‘et dissociabili’, which would in fact mean the opposite (‘dissolvable’). I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer of the \textit{Bulletin of Spanish Studies} for pointing this out. I have therefore amended to ‘indissociabili’.
‘Maeonio [...] pede’ (l. 17), that is, Homeric epic metre. Strictly, this refers to poems in dactylic hexameter such as Brassicanus’ ‘In divum Carolum Rhomanorum Regem Invictissimum Idillium’, but it may also refer more loosely to many of his poems in praise of the Holy Roman Emperor and various public figures written in other metres. Garcilaso asserts that his shoulders cannot bear the burden of singing of the military camps (ll. 11–13). Instead, he will sing of the nymph of the river Danube (‘Istri [...] Doridem’ [l. 18]). This is in keeping with Horace’s recusationes, where the poet claims he will not write epic poetry. For example, in Carmina, I. 6, he proposes Varius as a better candidate to write of Agrippa’s military exploits, claiming to be too slight for those great topics (‘tenues grandia’); rather, he will sing of banquets and lovers’ quarrels (I. 6. 17–19). This move also occurs in Carmina, IV. 2 where, as we have seen, Horace discusses the danger of attempting to imitate Pindar. He goes on to compare his small poetic activity to a bee sipping on thyme (IV. 2. 27–32); by contrast, his addressee Antonius will sing with a ‘greater plectrum’ (‘maiore [...] plectro’ [IV. 2. 33]). Garcilaso perhaps has this in mind when he refers to Brassicanus’ ‘Plectro’ (l. 5). Garcilaso’s use of the future tense verb ‘you will sing’ (‘Cantabis’ [l. 17]) also recalls this poem (compare Horace’s ‘concines’ [Carmina, IV. 2. 33]). The adoption of a poetic persona which claims not to sing of such elevated themes is consistent with Gray’s argument that Garcilaso’s allusions in his Latin poetry suggest discomfort with the glorification of war and imperialism, something which Isabel Torres argues can also be seen in his Second Eclogue.

Garcilaso’s imitation of Horace’s lyric persona appears throughout the poem. His assertion of friendship is very Horatian; it is reminiscent, for example, of Horace’s Carmina, II. 7, where Horace calls Pompey ‘meorum prime sodalium’ (‘first of my companions’ [II. 7. 5]). Garcilaso’s reference to Brassicanus being his friend to the end of his life may also recall Horace’s assertion that he and Maecenas are so close that they will die on the same day (II. 17. 1–9). In the fourth stanza, Garcilaso seems to perform his Horatian aversion to writing about military themes; he compares the tents of the camp to ‘mountains white with snow’ (‘montes nive candidi’ [l. 16]), slipping into the opening of Horace’s famous description of mount Soracte: ‘Vides ut alta stet nive candidum / Soracte’ (I. 9. 1–2).

In the last few lines, the River Danube, which has so far been the locus of military exploits, is now described in the terms of a beautiful nymph: Doris (‘Doridem’ [l. 18]) was a sea-nymph who appears in the ancient poets

39 For a list of works, see Flood, Poets Laureate in the Holy Roman Empire, 231–33.
40 The phrase ‘Plectro [...] aureo’ (l. 5) also has a more specific Horatian reminiscence at Carmina, II. 13. 26–27, ‘aureo [...] plectro’.
41 See Gray, ‘Garcilaso at Home in Naples’, 5–33; and Isabel Torres, Love Poetry in the Spanish Golden Age: Eros, Eris and Empire (Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2013), 45.
She is shining (‘nitidam’ [l. 18]; ‘Sublucens’ [l. 24]). The image of snow comes back (‘candidiore [...] nive’ [ll. 23–24]), but this time, it is describing the nymph’s garment (‘tunica’ [l. 24]). The translucent robe covers her like a glass vessel covers roses, or water covers pebbles (ll. 25–28). The final lines are somewhat reminiscent of Propertius’ examples of the superiority of unadorned beauty: after listing the natural colours of the earth, the wild ivy and wild strawberry tree, he writes:

Et sciat indocilis currere lympha vias.
Litora nativis praelucent picta lapillis,
Et volucres nulla dulcius arte canunt.

(And the stream, untaught, knows how to run its course.
The shore shines, painted with its own pebbles,
And birds sing more sweetly without any art.)

(I. 2. 12–14; my translation)43

I include the final line quoted above as it may have been the inspiration for Garcilaso’s description of the birds in Égloga II (‘aves sin dueño, / con canto no aprendido’ [Obra poética, 68–69]), and therefore seems to be a passage the poet had in mind when depicting scenes of natural beauty. Significantly, Propertius’ images are also inspired by seeing his girlfriend dressed in a delicate dress (‘Coa veste’ [I. 2. 2]), although he contrasts the two. The idyllic setting is also suggested by the connection of this description of the nymph with those to be found in Garcilaso’s vernacular poetry. For example, in lines 21–22, the nymph ‘entrusts herself to the rapid waters’ (‘se rapidis [...] aquis credit’), just like the nymphs in Égloga III who disappear into the river: ‘juntas s’arrojan por el agua a nado’ (Obra poética, 374).

More importantly, the use of an erotic image or vignette to end a poem is an Horatian technique. For instance, Carmina, I. 9 ends by describing a nighttime rendezvous between two unnamed lovers (I. 9. 19–24), and Horace ends several of his odes by lingering on the beauty of a young boy.44 The terms Garcilaso uses are also reminiscent of those in Horace’s erotic descriptions: for example, ‘shining’ (‘nitidam’ [l. 18]) is used of Telephus in Carmina, III. 19. 25, and the comparison of the nymph’s body to roses (‘rosas’ [l. 26]) recalls Horace’s

42 While the use of the proper name may seem bold, it is more likely than understanding ‘Doridem’ to mean ‘the Dorian woman’, which would be inappropriate for the geographical context of the banks of the Danube, and which is more commonly expressed by the adjectives ‘Doria’ or ‘Dorica’.

43 The edition I am using is Sexti Properti Elegos, ed. S. J. Heyworth (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2007). Further references are to this edition.

44 See Stephen Harrison, ‘Hidden Voices: Homoerotic Colour in Horace’s Odes’, in Complex Inferiorities: The Poetics of the Weaker Voice in Latin Literature, ed. Sebastian Matzner & S. J. Harrison (Oxford: Oxford U. P., 2018), 169–83.
images of young boys as rosy or redder than roses (Carmina, I. 13. 2; IV. 10. 4). Thus, by using one of Horace’s closural techniques, Garcilaso cements his programmatic assertion of being a lyric poet.

In short, in both poems, Garcilaso uses an address to his friends as an occasion to explore the role of literature and the nature of his own lyric poetry. In his ode to Bembo, he asserts poetry’s ability to immortalize, and explores his anxious relationship to his poetic predecessors. However, in his ode to Brassicanus, his lyric voice rejects the glorification of war in panegyric, and converts the locus of military encounter into the image of a beautiful nymph. Both poems also give us crucial insights into Garcilaso’s relationships with other humanists: we can finally appraise his ode to Bembo, and his ode to Brassicanus shows us a more positive side of his exile in Germany. These poems will, I think, go some way to restoring Garcilaso’s contemporary reputation as a skilled and sensitive Latin poet.

Finally, I shall now offer new editions of the three extant Latin odes.

II

New Texts of the Old Poems

[I] Ad Thylesium

Uxor, natis, fratribus, et solo
exul relictis, frigida per loca
Musarum alumnus barbarorum
ferre superbiam et insolentes

mores coactus, iam didici invia
per saxa, voces ingeminantia
fletusque, sub rauco querelas
murmure Danubii levare.

O nate tristem sollicitudine
lenire mentem et rebus atrociter
 urgentibus fulcire amici
pectora docte manu, Thylesi!

iam iam sonantem Delius admovet
dexter tacentem barbiton antea;
cantare Sebethi süadent
ad vaga flumina cursitantes

Nymphae; iam amatis moenibus inclytae
non urbis, amnis qu'am Tagus aureo
nodare nux gestit, ultra
me lacerat modum amor furentem.

45 I have modernized punctuation and capitalization in the three previously known odes. The text I use is Morros’, except for the new lines of Ode III and other exceptions noted in footnotes. See Garcilaso de la Vega, Obra poética y textos en prosa, ed. Morros, 245–51 (Ode I), 252–55 (Ode II) & 256–62 (Ode III). See Appendix II for my translations into English of Odes I to III.
Sirenum amoena iam patria iuvat
cultoque pulchra Parthenope solo,
iiuxtaque manes considere
vel potius cineres Maronis.

Aegro deorum quis tulerit, rogas,
herbis repostis auxilium potens,
mentisque consternationem
cantibus et fidibus levarit?

Idem sonanti cui vaga flumina
sistunt, silentes margine vortices
ventosque narratur frementes
per nemora ardua conquiesse,

hic nam revinxit me tibi vinculo
gratis Camoenae quod mihi nexibus
texere, praelargus quid ultra
me miserum potuit iuvare?

Imbrem beatis nubibus aureum
binaque talum compede candidum
nexam puellam coniugemque
languidulis oculis querentem

carmen canentis sic animum rapit
mentemque, ut omnes subiaceant graves
curae et labores, evolemque
aliger his super elevatus.

Te, mi Thylesi, te comite obtulit
sese parentis quem veneror loco,
cui dulce pignus nostri amoris
non animum pigeat patere;

arcana divum dum reserat, novus
huic pectus alte sollicitat furor
curare seu mortalium res
caelicolas grave sive monstrat

natos parentum crimina ob impia
vexari, ut auras carpere dum licet,
nec luxui ipsi indulgeant, nec
poena parentibus ulla desit.

Haec aure cuncti praecipue imbibunt
alte silentes, et Marius meus,
rerumque multarum refertus
atque memor Placitus bonarum.

Honesta cunctos hinc domus accipit
liberque sermo nascitur, haud tamen
impune, nam si tortuosis
nexibus implicitum quid audes

suadere, sperans ingeniosius
quam verius nos pertrahere ad tuum
sensum statim aggressa est cohors te,
ut Ciconum irruit in canentem.
The new witness includes readings which need emendation and are common to $Mx$, namely, ‘et invia’ (l. 5), ‘iam prima iuvat’ (l. 21), ‘animus’ (l. 41), and ‘avidas rosidis’ (l. 70). However, there is also evidence to show it does not derive from $Mx$, and that both derive from a common source. Most importantly, it has a better reading at line 37, where it has the reading ‘bina [...] compede’ (‘double fetters’). In this stanza, Garcilaso is referring to Thylesius’ tragedy *Imber aureus*, which tells the story of Danäe, a princess whose father King Acrisius locked her in a tower after being informed by an oracle that Danäe’s son would kill him. However, Jupiter came to her in the form of a golden shower, and she later gave birth to Perseus. The king found out and cast Danäe and her son into the sea in a wooden chest, but they survived thanks to the gods’ intervention. Perseus famously grew up to slay the Gorgon Medusa. On his return, he also rescued the princess Andromeda, who had been chained to a rock to be sacrificed to a sea monster after her mother claimed to be more beautiful than the Nereids. This is clearly the episode Garcilaso is alluding to in lines 38–40: ‘binaque talum compede candidum / nexam puellam coniugemque / languidulis oculis querentem’ (‘and the girl with her white ankles bound by double fetters, complaining of her bridegroom with weary eyes’).

Curiously, this episode is not related in Thylesius’ *Imber aureus*, which ends with Danäe and her son being cast into the sea; Garcilaso may be simply retelling the rest of the myth, or referring to a lost work by Thylesius on this theme.\(^{47}\) In any case, $D$’s reading ‘bina’ (‘twin’ i.e., one for each foot) fetters is preferable to the strange reading of ‘viva’ (‘living’) fetters, transmitted in $Mx$; it is unclear what this would refer to, and as far as I know commentators have offered no explanation. However, $D$ is then followed by the erroneous reading ‘Tialum’, which seems to be interpreted

---

\(^{46}\) Please see Appendix III for a list of abbreviations used here and in relation to Odes II and III. [Title] Ode tricolos tetrastrophos / Ad Thylesium $Mx$; Ejusdem ad Tylesium $D$. [l. 5] invia *Sauj-Mele*; et invia $Mx$ & $D$; invia et *Mele*-2. [l. 9] sollicitudinem $Mx$; sollicitudinem $D$. [l. 12] pectora $Mx$; pectore $D$; Thylesi $Mx$; Tylesi $D$. [l. 17] inclytæ $D$; inclyte $Mx$. [l. 19] gestit $D$, $Mx$ & *Sauj-Mele*; gestat $Mx$ ante corr. [l. 21] iam patria iuvat *Mele*-2; iam prima iuvat $Mx$. [l. 23] considere $Mx$ & $D$; consedere Keniston & $D$. [l. 35] praelargus $D$; praelargus $Mx$. [l. 36] iuvare? $Mx$; iuvare $D$. [l. 41] animum *Sauj-Mele*; animus $Mx$ & $D$. [l. 38] bina $D$; viva $Mx$; talum $Mx$; Tialum $D$. [l. 45] Thylesi $Mx$; Tylesi $D$. [l. 57] praecipue $Mx$; precipue $D$. [l. 58] Marius $Mx$ & $D$; marius $D$ ante corr. [l. 60] Placitus $Mx$ & $D$; placitus $D$. ante corr. [l. 61] Honesta $D$ & $Mx$; Honesta $D$ ante corr.; accepit $Mx$; recipit $D$. [l. 63] tortuosis $D$ & $Mx$; tortuosos $D$ ante corr. [l. 66] pertrahere $Mx$; protrahere $D$. [l. 69] Tagum $Mx$ & $D$; tagum $D$ ante corr. [l. 70] uvida rosidis *Sauj-Mele*; avida roсидis $Mx$ & $D$. [l. 72] amicis? $Mx$; amicis $D$.

\(^{47}\) The edition I am using is Antonius Thylesius, *Antonii Thylesii Cosentini Imber aureus tragoedia* (Venice: Bernardino Vitali, 1529).
as a proper name, instead of ‘talum’ (‘ankle’). This may suggest that there is corruption in this line in the common source.

Interestingly, Ovid refers to Andromeda being tied to the rock by her arms, not her feet (‘ad duras religatam brachia cautes’ [Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 4. 672]). Garcilaso’s variation may simply be an innovation; alternatively, it could have been an imperfect recollection of Ovid’s description just a few lines earlier of Perseus binding both his feet with wings (‘Pennis ligat ille resumptis / parte ab utraque pedes’ [Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 4. 665–66]).

Critics have been perplexed by ‘considere’ (‘settle’) in line 23; the context shows that this word must be infinitive (‘now it pleases me to settle in the agreeable land of the Sirens [...] and near the spirit, or rather ashes, of Maro [Virgil]’ [ll. 21–24]). However, the metre requires Garcilaso’s usage to have a short i and long first e, whereas the Classical prosody has a long i and short first e. Keniston amends the word to ‘consedere’, a form which would scan metrically but which he acknowledges is not found in Classical Latin.48 He may be right that we are dealing with a late Latin form, but since both *D* and *Mx* have the reading ‘considere’ it seems prudent to keep it as transmitted.

There are one or two errors made by the copyist, including ‘sollicitudinem’ for ‘sollicitudine’ (l. 9) and ‘pectore’ for ‘pectora’ (l. 12). The mistakes may be due to the fact that the erroneous endings occur in the preceding or following words (‘tristem’ [l. 9]; ‘docte’ [l. 12]).

---

[II] *Ad Genesium Sepulvedam*

Arcum quando adeo religionis et saevae militiae ducere longius, ut curvata coire inter se capita haued negent,

uni musa tibi, docte Sepulveda, concessit: pariter dicere et Africam incumbit pavitantem sub rege intrepid et pio,

qui insigni maculis vectus equo citos praeventit rapidus densa per agmina ventos, fervidus hastam letalem quatiens manu;

dat cui non aliter turba locum leves quam flammis stipulae per nemus aridum aut caelum per apertum ventis dant nebulae vagis.

Pugnax perpetuo dum trepidos agit gyro, saevus uti Massylias leo per sylvas Numidasve imbelles agitat feras,

---

48 Garcilaso de la Vega, *Works: A Critical Text with a Bibliography*, ed. Hayward Keniston (New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1925), 299.
mater caesa dedit, dum puerum student
languentem eruere e visceribus, genus
hinc est caesareum, hinc est
 gaudens caede nova: putas

saevum funereo limine qui pedem
ad vitam imposuit, non ferat indidem
et caedis calidae sitim?^49

Once again, D has one or two better, or at least clearer, readings than the existing witness Mo. I have adopted D’s spelling variants of ‘praeventit’ for ‘praevertit’ (l. 10) and ‘gyro’ for ‘girio’ (l. 18), the latter of which had been corrected by Adolfo Bonilla. ‘Massylas leo’ (l. 18) was amended to ‘Marsylas’ by Bonilla, to ‘Massylius’ by Eugenio Mele and to ‘Massyllas’ by Keniston; Keniston’s hypothesis is confirmed here (although the copyist has corrected from ‘Massylas’). However, Keniston’s note stands that this is unmetrical due to the long y, and Garcilaso has possibly confused ‘Massylla’ with ‘Massilia’, which would give the correct vowel quantity.^50 Jay Reed argues instead that Garcilaso in fact intended the sense ‘of Marseille’, since ‘it scans correctly and points to a different sphere of Charles’ military aspirations (Garcilaso was to receive his mortal wound in Charles’ service on the road between Marseilles and Nice).^51

Bonilla reported ‘Homadasve’ in line 19 of Mo; this was subsequently emended to ‘Nomadasve’ by Mele and ‘Numidasve’ by Keniston, with reference to Ovid, Ars amatoria, 2. 183 (‘Obsequium tigrisque domat Numidasque leones’).^52 In fact, as pointed out by Reed, Mo does seem to have ‘Nomadasve’, and the same reading appears clearly in D. However, an adjective meaning ‘Numidian’ is required here, and ‘Nomadas’ elsewhere is always a noun, making Keniston’s ‘Numidasve’ preferable.

^49 [Title] Garsiae Lasi Ode ad Genesium Sepulvedam Mo; Garsilassii ode Ad Genesium Sepulvedam / Doctorem theologum, & regium Histo / riographum D. [l. 4] inter se ante corr. D. [l. 10] praevertit D; praevervit Mo. [l. 12] letalem Luque; laetalem D & Mo. [l. 18] gyro, D & Bonilla; girio Mo; Massyllas D; i supra add. D; Massylas Mo; Marsylas Bonilla; Massyllius Mele-2. [l. 19] Numidas Keniston; Nómadas Mo D. [l. 26] armaque D & Mo; r supra add. D. [l. 34] ferat Bonilla; serat Mo & D. [l. 35] ingentemque fuorem Mele-2; ingeneretque fuorem Mo & D.

^50 Garcilaso, Works: A Critical Text with a Bibliography, ed. Keniston, 301–02.

^51 Jay Reed, ‘Textual Notes on the Latin Odes of Garcilaso de la Vega’, Studia Aurea, 15 (2021), 475–84 (p. 479).

^52 Garcilaso, Works: A Critical Text with a Bibliography, ed. Keniston, 302.
None the less, both $Mx$ and $D$ share some errors. For example, in line 34 both have ‘serat’ (‘sow’). Bonilla transcribed ‘ferat’ (‘bring’) and was followed by later editors. The emendation is a judicious one, since the image of planting is inappropriate to the context: the women claim that the child’s birth by Caesarean section, or descent from someone so born, is the source of his rage (‘furorem’ [l. 35]) and thirst for hot slaughter (‘caedis calidae sitim’ [l. 36]). It is easy to see how the error would have occurred, needing only the omission of a stroke. The reading ‘ingeneretque furorem’ (l. 35) is also problematic, most importantly because it is unmetrical (the second and third short syllables of $ingeneret$ should be one long syllable, and resolution is not permitted). The verb ‘ingenero’ can mean ‘implant’ which, as discussed, is inappropriate to the context. Mele posited an error for ‘ingentemque’, which would be possible as correlative -$que$ ... $et$ is found in both poetry and prose. Although $ingens$ does not seem to be commonly used to qualify $furor$, the reading can be defended by analogy to, say, $ingens ira$ (for example at Ovid, Metamorphoses, I. 166, ‘ingentes [...] iras’). Given the necessity of emendation, I have adopted Mele’s conjecture.

[III] Venus ad Cupidinem

Sedes ad Cyprias Venus,  
cui centum redolent usque calentia  
thurae altaria sacro,  
sertis vincita comas, nuda agitans choros  
gaudet, cum puer appulit,  
derpromptis iaculis e pharetrea aureis,  
derpromptis quoque plumbeis,  
queis terras violens subdit et aequora,  
queis caeleeste sibi genus.  
5

Tum mater, miserans terrigenum simul  
divorumque vicem, prior  
demulcens leviter caesariem auream  
melliti pueri, incipit:  
‘Heu, nate, usque adeo flagitiis eris  
isti insatiabilis,  
non tantum ut miserum perditum eas genus  
humanum, excrucians modis  
indignis homines, verum etiam in deos  
ausis stringere spicula?  
Impulsu Altitonans saepe tuo induit  
quam turpem deo imaginem!  
Nunc taurus nivea conspicuus nota  
frontem, caetera candidus,  
imber nunc liquido virgineum aureus  
fluxu per gremium micat.  
20

Lunam per tacitum saepe silentium  
saxis sub Iove latmiis  
sopiti rapidis ignibus excitam  

---

53 I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer of the Bulletin of Spanish Studies for this explanation.
caeli culmine devocas.
Cessare ad Clymenen crinigerum facis 30
Phoebum, qui quasi negligens
terris officium solvere debitum,
auriga est habitus piger.
In me si scelers quid meditabere
matrem, ut mos tibi, perfide, est,
non aegre aut graviter perpetiar modo
figas nequitiae modum.
Sed quid, cum dominam figere Dindymi
laetaris, tibi vis, puer?
Longaeva atque parens paene deum omnium
cum sit nec ioco idonea,
illum caecus eo perpulit at furor
Attyn perdite ut arserit.
Cumque ignes penitus viscera permeent,
iunctis vecta leonibus 45
Idae per nemorum saxa virentium
fertur, quam volitans cohor
recta consequitur parsque micantibus
palmis tympana verberat
ingentique sonat voce nemus virens
cunctorumque simul fera
insanum rabies pectus agit. Prin
affectu tenero, ut decet,
mater cuncta timens (omen inane sit!)
tristi discrucior metu,
ne forte aut Cybele, si resipiscat, aut
haec pergat potius suo
insanire modo, saeva leonibus
te natum tenerum imperet
se coram ut lacerent namque erit aut sui
vindex aut animi impotens.’
‘Praesenti esto animo, mater,’ ait puer,
‘nec te sollicitet metus,
mitescunt adeo namque mihi feri
isti, quos metuis, iuba ut
prensa ritu equitis non trepide insidens
tergis hos agitem vagus;
caudis incipiunt, auribus et mihi
ad blandirier interim,
dumque ori digitos dumque manum insero,
reddunt innocuam mihi.
Postremo quid ego pecco tibi aut aliis
Si pulcherrima quae offerunt
Natura speciem gratam et amabilem
Fingendo optimus artifex
Seu vultus animo seu penitus nimis
Quae placet oculis, simul54

54 The context suggests this is ‘placent’, ‘please’ (with short a). It is worth noting that Garcilaso very rarely opens glyconics with a long syllable followed by a short syllable (rather than two long syllables); the only other extant case, apart from the corrupt line 35 of Ode II (discussed above), is line 28 of Ode IV, ‘Collis’. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer of the Bulletin of Spanish Studies for this note.
Et menti, rapio, concito, et effero
Pulchri pectora amantium.
In desiderium? fraus mea, mater, est?[55] 80
Haec somnis propero citus,
Quo leges placidae muneraque advocant
Naturae, hoc adeo nimis
Incusant homines, flagitiium ut meum
Vel tu mater abhorreas. 85
Num vis liber uti Mars tuus haud te amet 
Posthac nec redames eum?
Natus sum atque potens; impera et obsequar.

In re ut non superans, puer
Es nulla atque odio quam celer af
fi ci,
[56] [l. 3] altaria D & Mx: altaria ibi Reed. [l. 5] gaudet Luque; gaudebat D & Mx. [l. 18] etiam in deos D & Mele-1; etiam deos Mx. [l. 20] induit Mx; indidit D. [l. 22] nivea Mx & D; nigra in marg. D. [l. 26] Lunam D & Mele-2; Luna Mx. [l. 28] excitam D: excitat Mx. [l. 35] om. D. [l. 42] perpulit Mx & D; D post corr. [l. 44] permeant Mx & D; permeat Mele-1 & Mele-2. [l. 53] om. Mx. [l. 56] ne forte Cybele, si resipiscat aut Mx; Ne forte aut Cybele resipiscat aut D. [l. 30] Clym- Mx; Clim- D. [l. 40] Longaevae D; Longeva Mx. [l. 44] Cumque D & Mele-1; Cum Mx. [l. 56] ne forte aut Cybele, si resipiscat, aut Czepiel; ne forte aut Cybele resipiscat, aut D; ne forte Cybele, si resipiscat, aut Mx. [l. 69] adblandirier Mx; ablandirier D. [ll. 73–85] om. Mx; cum res sedulus offero / pulchras ante oculos monstrueo lucidis / pictas usque coloribus? / Vos iam desinate aut appetere omnia haec / aut sic obicere id mihi Mx. [l. 86] liber D. [l. [78]] mater, Mx. [l. 87] posthac D. [l. [80]] posthac? Mx. [l. 89–90] In re ut non superans puer / Es nulla atque odio quam celer affici, D; ulla in margine scripto D. [ll. 82–85] Nullae ut non superans, puer, / in re es, quin celeri bile etiam tumes, Mx; Nulla Mele-1.

55 Alternatively, this could be punctuated with a question mark at the end of line 72, and another at the end of line 80, making the apodosis of this conditional ‘fraus mea, mater, est?’ rather than ‘quid ego pecco tibi aut aliis?’ I have chosen to punctuate lines 72–80 as one question as this more closely resembles the earlier version, where ‘quid ego pecco tibi aut aliis’ is the apodosis. Once again, I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer of the Bulletin of Spanish Studies for the suggestions on punctuation here.

56 [Title] Venus ad Cupidinem. Eiusdem D; Garcilassi hispani Mx. [l. 3] altaria D & Mx: altaria ibi Reed. [l. 5] gaudet Luque; gaudebat D & Mx. [l. 18] etiam in deos D & Mele-1; etiam deos Mx. [l. 20] induit Mx; indidit D. [l. 22] nivea Mx & D; nigra in marg. D. [l. 26] Lunam D & Mele-2; Luna Mx. [l. 28] excitam D: excitat Mx. [l. 35] om. D. [l. 42] perpulit Mx & D; D post corr. [l. 44] permeant Mx & D; permeat Mele-1 & Mele-2. [l. 53] om. Mx. [l. 56] ne forte Cybele, si resipiscat aut Mx; Ne forte aut Cybele resipiscat aut D. [l. 30] Clym- Mx; Clim- D. [l. 40] Longaevae D; Longeva Mx. [l. 44] Cumque D & Mele-1; Cum Mx. [l. 56] ne forte aut Cybele, si resipiscat, aut Czepiel; ne forte aut Cybele resipiscat, aut D; ne forte Cybele, si resipiscat, aut Mx. [l. 69] adblandirier Mx; ablandirier D. [ll. 73–85] om. Mx; cum res sedulus offero / pulchras ante oculos monstrueo lucidis / pictas usque coloribus? / Vos iam desinate aut appetere omnia haec / aut sic obicere id mihi Mx. [l. 86] liber D. [l. [78]] mater, Mx. [l. 87] posthac D. [l. [80]] posthac? Mx. [l. 89–90] In re ut non superans puer / Es nulla atque odio quam celer affici, D; ulla in margine scripto D. [ll. 82–85] Nullae ut non superans, puer, / in re es, quin celeri bile etiam tumes, Mx; Nulla Mele-1.

57 Czepiel, ‘Garcilaso’s “Sedes ad Cyprias”’, 748.
However, it is also possible that a scribe has tried to supply the missing line.\textsuperscript{58}

\textit{D} contains a few errors. For example, it has the reading ‘indidit’ in line 20, where I have retained the \textit{Mx} reading ‘induit’ (\textit{cf}. Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses}, 2.850: ‘induitur faciem tauri’). This must be simply a copyist’s error. In line 22, the copyist corrects ‘nivea’ to ‘nigra’ in the margin, but this would be unmetrical. Indeed, the reading ‘nivea’ has also caused confusion among modern critics; I have suggested previously that it is a joke on Garcilaso’s part.\textsuperscript{59} Line 35 has been omitted.

The \textit{Mx} reading ‘Si forte Cybele’ in line 56 is unmetrical as a third long syllable is needed. Reed posited that \textit{forte} was an error for \textit{forsan}/\textit{forsit}, or that an elided monosyllable had been omitted. The latter appears in \textit{D}, where the reading is ‘Ne forte aut Cybele’. However, the copyist has omitted ‘si’ (‘if’), which makes the rest of the line unmetrical and loses the sense of the passage (‘if Cybele should come either come to her senses, or rather continue to be mad’). I have emended the line by adopting both \textit{D}'s ‘aut’ and \textit{Mx}'s ‘si’.

The greatest difference occurs towards the end of the poem, where the \textit{Mx} lines 73–77 are replaced by a longer passage of thirteen lines, and there are also small differences in \textit{D} lines 89–90 (\textit{Mx} ll. 81–82). The small changes of \textit{D} lines 89–90, as well as the fact that the portion occurs in the middle of a sentence, preclude the possibility that a portion of text was simply interpolated. Therefore, it is likely to have been either part of an early draft discarded later, or a later elaboration. One criterion that may help us is its relation to its model. As Table 1 shows, the longer passage does not correspond to the source material in Erasmus:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Line} & \textbf{\textit{D}} & \textbf{\textit{Mx}} & \textbf{\textit{Mx}} & \textbf{\textit{Mx}} \\
\hline
20 & indidit & induit & & \\
22 & & & nivea & nigra \\
35 & & & & \\
56 & Si forte Cybele & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Comparison of lines in different manuscripts.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{58} I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer of the \textit{Bulletin of Spanish Studies} for this suggestion.

\textsuperscript{59} Czepiel, ‘Garcilaso’s ‘Sedes ad Cyprias’’, 746. See also Mele, ‘Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega’ (1924), 46.
| **Mx** | **D** | **Erasmus**<sup>60</sup> |
|--------|--------|--------------------------|
| Postremo quid ego pecco tibi aut aliis cum res sedulus offero pulchras ante oculos monstroque lucidis pictas usque coloribus? Vos iam desinite aut appetere omnia haec aut sic obicere id mihi. Num vis, mater, uti, Mars tuus haud te amet posthac? nec redames eum? Natus sum atque potens; impera et obsequar. ‘Nulla ut non superans, puer, in re es, quin celeri bile etiam tumes, nostro haud subtrahē te, puer, amplexu; peto nil praeter id amplius.’ | Postremo quid ego pecco tibi aut aliis Si pulcherrima quae offerunt Natura speciem gratam et amabilem Fingendo optimus artifex Seu vultus animo seu penitus nimis Quae placent oculis, simul Et menti, rapio, concito, et effero Pulchri pectora amantium In desiderium[?] fraus mea, mater, est[?] Haec somnis propero citus, Quo leges placidae muneraque advocant Naturae, hoc adeo nimis Incusant homines, flagitium ut meum Vel tu mater abhorreas. Num vis liber uti Mars tuus haud te amet Posthac nec redames eum? Natus sum atque potens, impera et obsequar. In re ut non superans puer Es nulla atque odio quam celer affici, Nostro haud subtrahē te puer Amplexu, peto nil praeter id amplius. | Postremo quid ego pecco, quum res pulchras ut sunt, offero ac demonstrō? Vos ne appetite res pulchras: quare his de rebus ne in me crimen conferte. Num vis ipsa tu mater, uti neque tu posthac Martem ames, neque ille te? VEN. Ut es pervicax, et nullā in re non superas: attamen horum quae dixi, fac in posterum memineris.* The 1506 edition reads the erroneous ‘meminerit’, corrected in later editions to ‘memineris’. |

<sup>60</sup> The editions I am using are *Luciani viri quam disertissimi compluria opuscula longe festiuissima ab Erasmo Roterodamo et Thoma moro interpretibus optimis in latinorum linguam traducta* (Paris: Ascensius, 1506); *Luciani Erasmo interprete dialogi et alia emuncta* (Paris: Ascensius, 1514); and *Luciani opuscula Erasmo Roterdamo interprete* (Venezia: Aldus & Andrea Torresano, 1516).
This is not unprecedented, since Garcilaso’s thirteen-line opening to the poem is also a departure from Erasmus’ translation. I would therefore be inclined to think that this is a later amplification in the vein of the proem. Significantly, both sections elaborate on the figure of Cupid; for example, in the proem, Garcilaso refers to Cupid’s gold arrows (which inspire love) and his leaden arrows (which inspire hatred) (ll. 6–7). In these lines, the idea of providing beautiful things to love seems to have suggested a digression introducing Neo-Platonic ideas about love:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Si pulcherrima quae offerunt} \\
\text{Natura speciem gratam et amabilem} \\
\text{Fingendo […]} \\
\text{Seu vultus animo seu penitus nimis} \\
\text{Quae placent oculis, simul} \\
\text{Et menti, rapio […]} \\
\text{Pulchri pectora amantium} \\
\text{In desiderium[?] (ll. 73–80)}
\end{align*}
\]

(If by creating beautiful things which offer a pleasing and lovable appearance by their nature […], and faces which please either the spirit or the eyes […] and the mind with them, I seize […] the hearts of those who love beauty towards desire?)

Garcilaso is drawing our attention to the bottom rungs of the Platonic ladder of love: beautiful things generally, and more specifically beautiful faces, which please not only on a physical level but on a spiritual or intellectual level. Cupid then goes on to say that he is simply spurring on the work that Nature has already begun in human hearts: ‘Haec somnis propero citus, / Quo leges placidae muneraque advocant / Naturae’ (‘I swiftly hasten these things in dreams in the direction in which the laws and gifts of kindly Nature summon them’) (ll. 81–83).

It is also worth noting the changes in D lines 89–90 (Mx ll. 81–82). The opening clause of D is differentiated from that of Mx only by a change in word order; compare D ‘in re ut non superans puer / es nulla’ and Mx ‘nulla ut non superans, puer, / in re es’, in both cases meaning ‘since in nothing you are not superior, my boy’. (Note that D’s reading ‘ulla’ has been corrected to ‘nulla’ in the margin, and Mx’s reading ‘nullae’ was emended in Mele’s editio princeps.) The rest of line 90 in D reads ‘atque odio quam celer affici’ (‘and moved by hatred as quickly as anything’), whereas Mx has ‘quin celeri bile etiam tumes’ (indeed, even swell up with quick bile’). In fact, on a few counts, the Mx reading is superior: for example, Mx’s elision ‘re es’ is easier than D’s ‘re ut’; the exclamation ‘quam’ in D is awkward with the ut

---

61 Czepiel, ‘Garcilaso’s “Sedes ad Cyprias”’, 745–46.
clause which precedes it; and the Mx reading ‘bile [...] tumes’ echoes the Horatian ‘bile tumet’ (Carmina, I. 13. 4), an allusion which is lost in D. Perhaps the reference to ‘odio’ (‘hatred’) rather than ‘bile’ (‘bile’ or ‘bad temper’) is meant to pick up on the earlier references to the gold and leaden arrows and emphasize the idea of Cupid as a god of both love and hatred.

In D line 86 (Mx l. 78), the vocative ‘mater’, which is also found in Erasmus’ text, is replaced with the adjective ‘liber’ (‘free’). This is presumably due to avoid the repetition of the vocative ‘mater’ in line 85. The implication is that Mars would be free from the captivity of his love for Venus, which embellishes Cupid’s threat to withdraw his powers in Venus’ case if she continues to chide him.

In short, in the longer version of the poem in D, Garcilaso gives Cupid a longer defence incorporating some philosophical ideas, before ending on the same comic note as the shorter version, with Venus capitulating to Cupid.62

62 By contrast, Lucian ends his dialogue with Venus threatening her unruly son; see Czepiel, ‘Garcilaso’s “Sedes ad Cyprias”’, 749.

* Disclosure Statement: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.
Appendix I

Index of Titles and First Lines

M. Curtius, auctore Iacobo Sadoleto
   Ire per aeternos aevi venientes honores
   [348 lines]

Garsilassi ode ad Genesium Sepulvedam Doctorem theologum et regium historiographum
   Arcum quando adeo religiosis et
   [36 lines]

Eiusdem ad Petrum Bembum
   Intentos humilis Bembe sonus lyrae
   [56 lines]

Eiusdem ad Brasicanum Germanum
   Brasicane meis iure sodalibus
   [28 lines]

Eiusdem ad Tylesium
   Uxore, natis, fratribus, et solo
   [72 lines]

Venus ad Cupidinem. Eiusdem
   Sedes ad Cyprias Venus
   [91 lines, 1 missing]

L. ANDREAS RESENDIUS LUSITANUS
   Rursum tumultu Gallia turbido
   [32 lines]

In Christianorum principum bella
   Quis, oh, scelestos quis furor impius
   [32 lines]

In Mariam Mendozam
   Vix prima lux alma diem quae proxima Maio est
   [12 lines]

Falconis Valentini de adventu Philippi principis in Hispaniam
   Nona dies agit[ur], postquam tua classis in alto est
   [14 lines]
Eiusdem
   Cum modo ad Hesperiae remearet regna Philippus
   [10 lines]

Vota Lyconis Veneri Erycinae. D. Didaco Mendoza auctore
   O Dea, quae molli recubas Erycina sub umbra
   [6 lines]

Victoriae Colonae in coniugis Alpho[n] | si D’Avalos obitum
   Non vivam sine te, mi Brute, exterrita dixit
   [6 lines]

De morte Socratis, Ramirio auctore
   Viderat e cyatho sorbere aconita magistrum
   [4 lines]

Versum ex Menandro Honorato Ioannio auctore
   Si quis dicat deorum bonorum mihi
   [18 lines]

Nicolai Hegii Secundi de passere Glyceres puellae

   Hostili passer fellis raptat[us] ab ore
   [14 lines]

Appendix II

[I] To Thylesius

Having left behind my wife, children, brothers, and land
As an exile, I, a pupil of the Muses,
Forced to bear the pride and arrogant customs of barbarians
In cold places,
I have now learnt to alleviate my laments
Among the pathless rocks which echo
My cries and weeping
Beneath the hoarse murmur of the Danube.

Oh learned Thylesius, born to soothe a mind
Saddened by worries
And to support the heart of a friend
When matters press dreadfully upon him!

Now, now Apollo is propitious and readies for use
The lyre that was silent before;
The Nymphs running among the wandering currents of the Sebeto
Urge me to sing:
Now my desire for the illustrious city
With its beloved walls, which the river Tagus
Delights in clasping with its golden embrace,
Does not distress me beyond the mean in my mad grief.

Now the pleasant homeland of the Sirens pleases me,
And Parthenope beautiful in her cultivated land,
And it pleases me to settle by the spirit,
Or rather the ashes, of Maro.

Which of the gods, you ask,
Would bring help to the sick man, powerful through stored-up herbs,
And to alleviate the disturbance of the mind
With songs and the lyre?

The same man for whom the wandering rivers stop still at his music,
And for whom it is said the currents were silent at the bank,
And the roaring winds fell silent
In the high groves,

For he joined me to you with a cord
Which the Muses wove for me
With pleasing bonds. With what else
Could he so generously help me in my wretchedness?

The song of the man who sings of the golden shower from rich clouds,
And the girl with her white ankles
Bound by double fetters,
Complaining of her bridegroom with weary eyes,

So seizes my spirit and mind,
That all my burdensome cares and toils fall away,
And I fly above them
Lifted up on wings.

In your company, my dear Thylesius, the man encountered me
Whom I adore in the place of a father,
To whom I am not ashamed to lay bare my soul
As a sweet token of my love;

While he unlocks the secrets of the gods,
A frenzy deeply arouses his heart;
Whether he shows that the heaven-dwellers
Care gravely about the affairs of men,

Or that sons are tormented on account of the crimes
Of their parents, so that while they draw breath
They do not themselves indulge in luxury,
And no punishment is lacking to the parents;

All listen to these things
In particularly reverent silence: both my dear Marius,
And Placitus, full and mindful
Of many good things.
Hence this honest house receives all,
And free speech is born, but not with impunity,
For if you dare to make an argument
Tied up in twisted knots,

Hoping to draw us to your opinion
Rather by ingenuity than by truth,
At once the company falls upon you,
Just as the company of Cicones rushed at the singing man, Orpheus.

Did you really think that, insane and forgetful,
I would take the Tagus flowing with gold
And the meadows moistened by the watery courses
In exchange for my sweet friends?

[II]  To Genesius Sepulveda

Since so far the Muse has allowed only you, learned Sepulveda,
To draw the bow of religion and fierce warfare so far back,
That their curved ends
Do not refuse to meet,

And likewise since it falls to you
To speak of Africa trembling
Before the undaunted and pious king,

Who, riding a horse distinguished by marks,
Rapidly outstrips the winds among the dense throngs,
Violently shaking the fatal spear
In his hand;

Before whom the crowd makes way
Not otherwise than the light straw in a dry grove gives way to flames,
Or clouds yield before the roving winds
In an open sky.

While, warlike, he drives the trembling in an unbroken circle,
Just like the fierce lion
Puts in motion peaceful beasts
Through Massylian or Numidinian forests,

The wives recently deprived of their beloved
Sigh in their fearful breast,
Accustomed to gaze over the broad expanses of the plain
From high towers, and say:

‘Alas, young men,
Avoid the arms of and unlucky encounters with Caesar,
For your strength is unequal;
Since the mother who was cut open
Gave the name to her descendants,
While they tried to rip the feeble child from her womb,
Hence comes Caesar's race,
Hence a race which rejoices at fresh slaughter;

Do you think that he who took his fierce step towards life
Over a funereal threshold will not bring from the same place
Enormous rage
And thirst for hot slaughter?

[III]  Venus to Cupid

Venus, in her Cypriot dwelling,
For whom a hundred blazing altars
Are continuously fragrant with sacred incense,
Her hair bound with wreaths, nude and driving the chorus,
Was rejoicing, when her son approached,
Having put aside the gold darts from his quiver,
And his lead ones too,
With which he violently subdues earth and sea,
And the heavenly race.
Then his mother, taking pity at once on the fate
Of men and gods,
First gently stroking the golden hair of the honey-sweet boy, said to him:
‘Alas, my son, how long will you be so insatiable
In these shameful deeds,
That you do not only attack the wretched and hopeless human race,
Torturing men in cruel ways,
But you even dare
To draw your darts against the gods?
At your urging, the Thunderer often put on
An image so shameful for a god!
At one time he was a bull marked on his forehead with a snowy mark,
But white on the rest of his body;
At another, he flashes through the virginal lap
As a golden shower.
You often draw down the Moon through the quiet silence
From the peak of sleeping heaven
To the Latmian rocks beneath the sky.
You make long-haired Phoebus loiter with Clymene,
And, almost neglecting to perform the duty he owes to the earth,
He is considered a lazy charioteer.
If you are considering some wicked deed against me,
Your mother, as is your wont, treacherous one,
I will not bear it poorly or badly,
As long as your put an end to your naughtiness.
But what do you want, boy,
When you delight in transfixed the mistress of Dindymus?
Even though she is aged and the parent of almost all the gods
And not suitable for such play,
Blind frenzy has driven her
To burn hopelessly for Attis.
And since the fires pass deep into her heart,
Riding her yoked lions
She is carried over the rocks of the green groves of Ida,
And a fitting company
Follows her directly, and some with rapidly moving palms
Strike tambourines,
And the green grove resounds with a great noise,
And at once a fierce madness drives
The raging breast of all.
Therefore, with tender affection, as is appropriate,
And fearing all things as a mother (let it be an empty apprehension!),
I am tortured by sorrowful fear,
Lest Cybele, if she should come to her senses,
Or rather if she should continue
To rage in her way, should fiercely command her lions
To tear you, my tender son,
Apart before her eyes,
For she will either be her own avenger, or powerless over her own spirit.
‘Be of good heart, mother’, said the boy,
‘And do not let fear trouble you,
For these beasts which you fear
Become so gentle for me,
That taking their mane and sitting on their backs without fear in the
manner of a horserider
I can drive them wandering about;
Meanwhile they begin to fawn on me with their tails and ears,
And when I place my fingers and hand in their mouth,
They return it to me unharmed.
Lastly, how do I offend you or others
If by creating, as an excellent craftsman,
Beautiful things which offer
A pleasing and lovable appearance by their nature
And faces which please either the spirit
Or the eyes quite profoundly, and the mind with them,
I seize, rouse and carry off
The hearts of those who love beauty
Towards desire? Is that my deception, mother?
I swiftly hasten these things in dreams
In the direction in which the laws and gifts of kindly Nature summon
them;
And humans find so much fault with this,
That even you, mother,
Are averse to my shameful deed.
Or perhaps would you prefer that your Mars should be set free and not
love you,
And that henceforth you should not love him back?
I am your son, and a powerful one; command and I shall obey.’
‘Since there is no matter in which you are not victorious, child,
And moved by hatred as quickly as anything,
Do not withdraw, child,
From my embrace; I ask nothing more than that.’
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