

GARCILASO'S ECLOGUES: ARTIFICE, METAFICTION, SELF-REPRESENTATION

Howard B. Wescott
State University of New York College at Fredonia

In Book I, ch. xxv, Don Quixote tells Sancho: "Sí, que no todos los poetas que alaban damas, debajo de un nombre que ellos a su albedrío les ponen, es verdad que las tienen ... No, por cierto, sino que las más se las fingen, por dar sujeto a sus versos, y porque los tengan por enamorados y por hombres que tienen valor para serlo."

Garcilaso himself also calls attention to the fictional quality of his own work in his dedicatory verses to Eclogues I and III: "El dulce lamentar de dos pastores, / Salicio juntamente y Nemoroso / é de cantar, sus queexas imitando" (1981: I, 1-3); "De quatro nymphas que del Tajo amado salieron juntas, a cantar me offrezco" (1981: III, 51-54).

I would like to focus here on the manner in which Garcilaso's Eclogues are works of self-conscious artifice, that is, works of art that owe their ontology to other works of art and to literary traditions, and on the distance inevitably required for an author to use those traditions as a source of iconography and language in the creation of something new.¹

This problem of "otherness" may subvert the traditional interpretation of this poetry. Readers of Garcilaso's work have often regarded it as "a human voice out of the past, a voice which must somehow be brought to life."² Indeed, it often seems that Garcilaso's voice is brought too much to life. This tendency to believe that his work is both biographical in nature and somehow independent from our perception of it, has overlooked difficulties, not the least being the possibility that even biographical material can be made into artifice.

The oldest, and best known, approach views the Eclogues as three loosely related poems in the pastoral mode that depict the poet's emotional reactions to different moments in his presumed relationship with Isabel Freire. According to Keniston, Garcilaso, already married (possibly by Imperial fiat), first met and fell in love with Isabel Freire in 1526, a date that would have allowed three years for them to become acquainted before Garcilaso left Spain for the Emperor's coronation in Italy in 1529. In that same year Isabel was married to Antonio de Fonseca, lord of Toro. She died in childbirth sometime in 1533 or 1534 (79-84, 242-44). Thus critics have pointed to vv. 366-93 in Eclogue I as proof that Nemoroso's lament for Elisa refers to Isabel's death, and Salicio's lament over his rejection by

Galatea is said to represent Isabel's marriage.³ Luis Iglesias Feijoo points out that this traditional interpretation relies on the contradictory assumptions that Galatea was free to reject Salicio, while Garcilaso was presumably not free to reject an arranged marriage, and notes that there is some evidence of Garcilaso's genuine affection for his wife (75). This line of criticism attacks the notions that the Eclogues recapitulate biographical data and that their ideological underpinnings are to be found in the courtly love ethic. Yet even the biographical reading presupposes a notion of artificiality as a basis for interpretation, since it begins with the assumption that the shepherds are in fact nobles and literati in disguise whose normal activities have nothing to do with life as it is genuinely lived in the country. For a literary representation of authentic shepherds contrasted with life in the pastoral genre, we must turn to the apparently genuine shepherds surrounding Cervantes' story of Marcela and Grisóstomo (*DQ* I, xi-xiv). Garcilaso, moreover, creates two contrasts within the Eclogues themselves: the first when he combines in Eclogue II, narrated in epic form, events from the life of don Fernando de Toledo with the pastoral world of Albanio, and the second when he sets the traditional amoebaeon song of Thyrreno and Alzino as a "genuine" pastoral counterpoint to the ephrastic mythological tapestries that comprise the bulk of Eclogue III.

Another critical current argues that Garcilaso's relationship with Isabel Freire was not a major factor in his poetic endeavors, since the two may not in fact have ever met.⁴ Such a reading of the poet's life would seem to lead inevitably to a source of the Eclogues located either in Garcilaso's imagination or in other literature, and the Eclogues would thus be conventional pastoral exercises. Yet there is little doubt of the autobiographical content of Eclogue II, a poem in which several persons from Garcilaso's life are named outright, and which contains the epic narrative of the journey by Garcilaso and Fernando de Toledo to participate in the defense of Vienna. The possible generic problems in this Eclogue can be dealt with by seeking an ideological compatibility with the other two poems.

Still a third group of critics ignores the issue of Isabel Freire and the verifiability of a relationship with Garcilaso, choosing instead to locate the important, not to say critical, issues of the Eclogues in other places, usually in the rhetoric.⁵ In a reaction apparently based on Herrera's commentaries, Paul Julian Smith notes that, "even in the case of Garcilaso, Golden Age readers had little interest in sentimental biography" (50). The observation is surprising in view of the intense speculation Garcilaso's Golden Age commentators dedicated to the biographical/anecdotal aspects of the Eclogues and such incidental poems as Sonnet 22.⁶

Most recently this problem, which is also one of "sincerity," has

been clearly and thoroughly discussed by Daniel Heiple who locates the poetic "yo" in a Petrarchan rhetoric of emotion rather than in the person of the poet (3-27).⁷ In spite of dedicating his attention primarily to Garcilaso's sonnets, Heiple observes of the Eclogues:

In contrast to his early Petrarchan style, Garcilaso's late poems show a self-awareness of style and a conscious distancing of the authorial voice, and it is his late Latinate poetry, the eclogues above all, that is most famous. These poems show a deliberate and purposeful distancing of the narrative voice from that of the poet. Much of the Petrarchan poetry relies on a poetic "yo" who suffers unrequited love, whereas in the eclogues and the ode, the poet consciously removes the poetic voice from the person who suffers to that of a disinterested narrator. (23)

Garcilaso, like many another author, creates a lexicon of images using material drawn from his personal experience, but one may question whether his primary interest was the presentation of that material, and whether the anecdotal dimension can provide a satisfactory basis for a coherent interpretation of the Eclogues. The Eclogues are neither a true *roman à clef* nor a soap opera. On closer examination it appears, rather, that Garcilaso engages in a conscious manipulation of convention to make an ideological point. Namely, that there are two acceptable kinds of love, marriage and the purely spiritual, both of which find their justification in the Neoplatonic ideas current in Italy in the early sixteenth century, and which echo the calls to rational virtue in Stoicism and Epicureanism. Garcilaso uses the pastoral to illustrate the transition among the aristocracy from a courtly love ethic to a Neoplatonic one, and in the process opens the door to marriage as a fulfilling love relationship in poetry.⁸

Can it be said that the Eclogues are ontologically self-conscious, that is, metafictional, in the way these terms are currently used? May we, allowing for a small change in its wording, describe the Eclogues as exemplifying Robert Alter's landmark definition of metafiction? That definition reads:

A fully self-conscious narrative, however, is one in which from beginning to end, through the style, the handling of narrative viewpoint, the names and words imposed on the characters, the patterning of the narration, the nature of the characters and what befalls them, there is a consistent effort to convey to us a sense of the fictional world as an authorial construct set up against a background of literary tradition and convention. (Alter xi)

To take up the question of metafiction we must first read the

Eclogues as a sustained narrative: as a poetic effort that becomes entirely comprehensible only when seen as a series of texts whose full meaning is generated by reading them as a unified theoretical system with its own development. To achieve this we can utilize the strategies of the hermeneutic circle, asking whether our comprehension of the system follows upon an understanding of the individual parts, or whether it is necessary to understand the system in order to grasp the meaning of each of the components. As Seymour Chatman puts it, "every narrative is a structure with a content plane (called 'story') and an expression plane (called 'discourse')" (146).

The story content of the Eclogues is as follows: In Eclogue I the two shepherds take their flocks at sunrise to the fields and they sing. Salicio complains that he has been rejected by Galatea, who has gone off with another. This is followed by Nemoroso's lament on the death of his beloved Elissa. The shepherds then gather their flocks and leave as the sun sets. In Eclogue II Albanio grows up in the *locus amoenus* hunting happily with Camila, a virgin dedicated to Diana, and eventually falls in love with her. Rejected when he reveals his passion by using her reflection in a pool of water, he goes mad, raving to his own reflection. His friends, Salicio and Nemoroso, decide to take him to be cured by the magus Severo, who has cured Nemoroso (to 1140). The story of Severo provides the means for Nemoroso to narrate some history of the house of Alba, and particularly that of Fernando, later the Gran Duque, whose marriage, participation in the defense of Vienna, and return home to wedded bliss are detailed. After his narration is finished, Nemoroso and Salicio reaffirm their intention of taking Albanio to Severo, Nemoroso gathers both flocks and Salicio remains with the sleeping Albanio in order to take him home later. In Eclogue III four nymphs rise from the Tagus River and weave tapestries in a *locus amoenus*: Phillódoce weaves the tale of Orpheus and Eurydice; Dinámene weaves the story of Apollo and Daphne; Climene weaves the myth of Venus and Adonis; Nise weaves a tapestry showing a dead nymph ("degollada") surrounded by a group of grieving nymphs, one of whom carves an epitaph in a poplar:

"Elissa soy, en cuyo nombre suena
y se lamenta el monte cavernoso,
testigo del dolor y grave pena
en que por mí se aflige Nemoroso
y llama 'Elissa'; 'Elissa' a boca llena
responde el Tajo, y lleva pressuroso
al mar de Lusitania el nombre mío,
donde será escuchado, yo lo fío." (III, 241-48)

The sun is setting and the nymphs are resting from their labors when they hear the sound of two shepherds, Thyrreno and Alzino, who approach in a song "contest" in which Thyrreno sings in praise of Flérída using positive language: "El blanco trigo multiplica y crece; / produze'l campo en abundancia tierno / pasto al ganado; ... mas todo se convertirá en abrojos / si dello aparta Flérída sus ojos" (III, 337-44), and Alzino responds with negative verses in praise of Phyllis: "De la esterilidad es oprimido / el monte, el campo, el soto y el ganado; ... pero si Phyllis por aquí tornare, / hará reverdecer quanto mirare" (III, 345-52). The nymphs dive into the river.

Some evidence indicates that Garcilaso composed Eclogue II first, and then later changed the order of these poems when he prepared his works for publication. The story material—i.e. the content—which was arranged to show rejection in the pastoral [Albanio, helped by a cured Nemoroso]/success in the epic (Ecl. II), rejection/grief in the pastoral (Ecl. I), grief/transcendence in the pastoral (Ecl. III), was changed to read rejection/grief (Ecl. I), rejection/success (epic) (Ecl. II), grief/transcendence (Ecl. III). If indeed this is what happened, then the focus appears to change from the presentation of some events in Garcilaso's life to a focus on the development of Nemoroso as a character as he moves from grief through recovery to transcendence. This would be a clear change from a focus on story to one on discourse, and would also indicate a concern for an ideological agenda rather than an autobiographical one.

The thread of this narrative discourse can be found in the development of Nemoroso's character. In Eclogue I he is represented as lamenting the death of his beloved, with whom he innocently wandered through the countryside gathering flowers (I, 282-95; Roig 638). In Eclogue II he is Albanio's loyal friend who, having been freed from an amorous obsession by the magus Severo at some point in the past, is now preparing to help Albanio overcome the madness caused by his own thwarted desire (II, 1089-1128). Eclogue II thus establishes the ideological boundaries for all the positions on love presented in the Eclogues, which reinforces the notion that it may have been the first to be written. In both Eclogues I and III Nemoroso no longer looks back to an irretrievable past love, rather he seeks a reunion with his beloved in those realms beyond death reserved for lovers: the sphere of Venus and the Orphic dimension of poeticized nature (I, 394-407; III, 241-64).

If we measure the other characters against the standard set by Nemoroso's progression, we find that only Fernando, who is not a shepherd, finds genuine happiness in a requited love that occurs in the "real" world outside the pastoral universe that makes up the rest of the Eclogues.

We have then, two poles: requited love that is grounded in marriage in the "real" world, and a spiritual relationship in the pastoral world. Between these extremes Albanio and Salicio thrash about in madness and rage because they have injected physical desire into the pastoral world of Neoplatonic spirituality. If we read the poems as commenting on one another, then, they appear to recast in a form at once poetic and highly dramatic the ideas that appear in such Neoplatonic dialogues on love as Ficino's *In Convivium Platonis, sive de amore*, Bembo's *Gli Asolani*, and Castiglione's *Il cortegiano*, a text Garcilaso helped Boscán translate into Spanish (Keniston 124-25). Thus the Eclogues exist on three levels of artificiality, the first being the way in which they refer to Garcilaso's own life, the second being their intertextual relationship to other literatures, and the third being the ideological statement revealed by their relationship to each other and to Neoplatonism.⁹

As Jauss observes in his discussion of receptionist theory: "the philological question of how the text is "properly" to be understood, that is according to its intention and its time, can best be answered if the text is considered in contrast to the background of the works which the author could expect his contemporary public to know either explicitly or implicitly" (23).

But it is also useful to look at the content of the Eclogues in the order in which these were supposedly first written, focussing not on the events themselves, but on what they might signify in Neoplatonic doctrine. Eclogue II contains a story of sensual desire and rejection in the *locus amoenus* juxtaposed with a story of a love that is requited within the norms of marriage. Eclogue I contains the story of a rejected sensual desire juxtaposed with grief at the loss of a purely spiritual relationship followed by transcendence to the sphere of Venus. Eclogue III places that loss on a plane with great loves from classical mythology and notes the transformation of Nemoroso's grief into a reasonable hope for reunion with his beloved on the spiritual plane of an Orphically poeticized universal nature.

Whether we focus, therefore, on the Eclogues as a plot that develops Nemoroso's character—a person who lives the events through a narrator who "sees" those events, or whether we focus on those same poems as a series of polar oppositions, we must face the unavoidable fact that they are fictional constructs.

Seen in terms of the poles of requited love in the real world on one hand, and a celestial *locus amoenus* on another, Albanio, Salicio, Fernando and Nemoroso represent four different notes on a hypothetical Neoplatonic scale of love. In Book IV of the Boscán version of *El cortesano*, Castiglione's Bembo describes love as an activity of the intellect:

amor no es otra cosa sino un deseo de gozar lo que es hermoso, ...en nuestra alma hay tres formas de conocer, es a saber, por el sentido, por la razón y por el entendimiento; del sentido nace el apetito, el cual es común a nosotros con las bestias; de la razón nace la elección, que es propia al hombre, y del entendimiento, por el cual puede el hombre participar con los ángeles, nace la voluntad. (371)

The ideological structure of the Eclogues is presented in this passage. Albanio, and Salicio in Eclogue I, follow their senses and live in a world of frustrated appetite. Albanio and Salicio are rejected by Camila and Galatea because each has permitted his physical desire to overcome his reason. Of the shepherds only Nemoroso remains free from an earthly passion, and he is the only shepherd who can entertain a genuine hope of being reunited with his beloved. Fernando, the only major male figure who is not a shepherd, loves in a manner that is neither pure contemplation nor mere lust—he exists, after all, in the “real” world of epic discourse. Rather, he is the rational man of action who can love physically and spiritually within the confines of marriage, Ficino’s man who leads “an active and moral life” (Marcel 211-12; Jayne 119-20). And in Book III Castiglione defends conjugal relations for purposes of procreation (240).

Fernando’s story is set off from the others by being expressed in epic rather than pastoral terms and we must remember that from antiquity on the epic was the genre used for teaching cultural norms and exemplary behaviour (Jaeger 42; Mazzeo 24-25; Colie 22-23; Greene 54-56; Fowler 70-71, 99; Jenkyns 154-55). Thus Fernando’s story, by its presence as well as its nature, confirms the Eclogue’s self-conscious presentation of an ideological statement, as Garcilaso shows that requited love physically realized in marriage is impossible in so highly artificial a world as the pastoral.

We may describe these Eclogues, to use Rifaterre’s terms, as being constructed on a basis of polar oppositions (*Semiotics* 20; 41-44). The first of these is the contrast between the *locus amoenus* and the desperate emotional state of the shepherds who inhabit it. Within this general polarity are two more sets of oppositions: 1) Nemoroso’s Neoplatonically admirable spirituality versus the Neoplatonically undesirable lust exemplified by Albanio and Salicio; and 2) Neoplatonic relationships that remain voluntarily and involuntarily unfulfilled physically versus the Neoplatonic relationship represented by Fernando’s rational decision to marry and procreate. David Halperin observes that, “Pastoral achieves significance by oppositions, by the set of contrasts, expressed or implied, which the values embodied in its world create with other ways of life” (65-71); and Haber notes that:

In looking back at classical pastoral, however, I found not a stable origin from which later works deviated, but a mode that worked insistently against itself, problematizing both its own definition and stable definitions within its texts: from the beginning of the genre, presence, continuity, and consolation have been seen as related to—indeed as dependent on—absence, discontinuity, and loss. (1)

Garcilaso thus uses a rhetorical code of pastoral harmony / disharmony to clarify the shepherds' motives, thus clarifying the nature of the erotic problem.

Since *Theocritus* the pastoral has been artificial in nature. It has always been poetry supposedly of and about the country, written in fact by and for city folk. A. S. Gow notes that, "in the third century and for a learned audience, to write in Doric at all was something of a mannerism or conscious rusticity, and Theocritus ... presumably talked otherwise in conversation with his cultured and sophisticated friends in Alexandria" (I: lxxiii). Curtius observes that, "in most of his eclogues Virgil replaces [Sicily, long since become a Roman province,] by romantically faraway Arcadia, which he himself had never visited. Theocritus had sometimes introduced himself and his friends as shepherds (Idyll VII); Virgil brings into his pastoral world not only his own life, but also ... Roman history" (190). Bruno Snell notes, in relation to the "disciplined structural design" of Virgil's Eclogues that, "his poems, unlike those of Theocritus, are not small clippings from the panorama of life, but well-constructed and rounded works of art" (290). Haber discusses Theocritus' ironies and "Virgil's transformation of the pastoral into the extremely self-conscious, insistently self-reflexive form that poets of the Renaissance inherited" (8); (See also Kegel-Brinkgreve 389-93).

Garcilaso's *locus amoenus* in fact pertains to a tradition of nature that was literary in its earliest form. Snell (1953), Curtius (1963), Lawall (1967), Rosenmeyer (1969), Marinelli (1971), Leach (1974), Poggioli (1975), and Halperin (1983) agree that the pastoral landscape is idealized and interior in essence, existing only in the mind. Garcilaso's pathetic fallacy, the "monte cavernoso" that laments the death of Elissa and the Tagus River that calls her name, echos Virgil's own echoing woods (Kegel-Brinkgreve 136-43). Alzino and Thyrreno's amoebaeon song at the end of Eclogue III calls our attention to the classical literary ontology of the Eclogues and Garcilaso's dialogue with the past, while providing an ironic contrast of supposedly "real" shepherds who "invade" the *locus amoenus*, interrupting the creation of the tapestries by the obviously mythological nymphs.

As Johnson notes, "They (Alzino and Thyrreno) . . . force us . . . to

identify the Elisa-Nemoroso tapestry with the others, as poetic texts derived from previously existing poetic texts [i.e., Eclogue I], art from art, intertexts" (303). Thus the Eclogues are not only set within, but also against, the pastoral literary tradition; they create their own world of intertextuality in which the characters must be read through one another and against the double background of the pastoral's sub lunar *locus amoenus* and a celestial one. Garcilaso's creation of a deliberate ungrammaticality, the unhappy figures in an edenic setting, calls the reader's attention to their fictional nature.¹⁰ Linda Hutcheon has described it well:

As a reader begins a novel, he does indeed read referentially in that he refers words to his linguistic and experiential knowledge; gradually, however, these words take on a unity of reference and create a self-contained universe that is its own validity (and "truth"). ... This fictional universe is not an object of perception, but an effect to be experienced by the reader, an effect to be *created* by him and in him. (88)

It is precisely in this way that the Eclogues are metafictional. As the informed reader works his way through the poems, traces of the source material gradually become clear, and the conflation of the many traditions produces a text of great depth. This is the way in which we become aware that Nemoroso's chastity fulfills the requirements of a pure courtly love, a Neoplatonic spirituality, and the Christian demand that all relationships outside marriage be avoided. At the same time, the full meaning of this conflation is only possible by means of reading the Eclogues in reference to each other, and in this process the self-consciousness of the narrative is revealed. The artificiality of the pastoral mode creates the fictionality of fiction. To accomplish this Garcilaso had to be aware of the acute "otherness" of those authors, cultures and traditions, and therefore conscious of the historical uniqueness of his work, thus making the Eclogues inherently metafictional in nature, and raising again the question of who is represented in the person of the narrator. Garcilaso's "sincerity" is that expression of emotion which resonates in the mind and emotions of his public. The "yo" of the poetry, the narrator, is as fictional a construct as the poem: a discourse of the self that speaks for the complex polyphony of the aristocratic culture of his time, a fictional courtier straight out of Castiglione.¹¹

Notes

¹For a thorough discussion of this topic I refer the reader to Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy*, 81-100.

²I have borrowed the phrase from Richard E. Palmer and deliberately misused it out of context for my own purposes. Palmer's point is that the literary work is a human voice from the past and as such is not "a manipulatable object completely at our disposal" (7). My comments on the independence of Garcilaso's work from our perception of it (it is necessarily independent) are directed at the relentless insistence with which critics return to the supposed love for Isabel Freire as a basis for interpretation. Carroll B. Johnson admirably sums up my own thinking: "In the case of Garcilaso and Isabel we all seem to prefer the same story. We love it and we don't want to give it up . . . because it is so much like the *fictions* of beautifully hopeless love we all grew up on. Or didn't grow up. Giving up Isabel deprives us of more than one kind of illusion, but it also frees us to read Garcilaso as a strikingly modern poet" (304).

³Some of the more important works based on the notion that Garcilaso's poetry contains an autobiographical revelation are: Alborg 641; Alonso 51, 85-86; Altolaquirre 77-212; Arce de Vázquez 25-39; Bayo 85; Entwistle; Fernández-Morera 33; Gicovate 67-98; Green 138-60; Keniston 79-84, 242-44; Lapesa 130; López Bueno and Reyes Cano 104; Lumsden 261-62, 265-71; Macdonald 213; Martínez López; Mele 145; Navarro Tomás 1-2, n. 2; Rivers *passim*; Wardropper 148; Valbuena Prat 543-47; and Zimic. The idea appears in most standard histories of Spanish literature. In a serious attempt to prove the idea, Adrien Roig presents a summary of what was believed by Garcilaso's commentators, El Brocense, Herrera, et al., and a history of this idea. Enrique Martínez López seeks to establish a *converso* identity for Fonseca, while Stanislav Zimic reinterprets the characters' actions throughout the Eclogues using a somewhat different reading of their possible motives.

⁴Arguments that a relationship with Isabel Freire, if any, was not a factor in Garcilaso's writing are put forth by Iglesias Feijoo, Goodwyn, Jones, Lipmann, Ly, Quinn, and Waley. Iglesias Feijoo and Waley ("Legend"), also trace histories of the autobiographical interpretation in order to refute it. David H. Darst describes the development in modern scholarship of the Isabel Freire myth.

⁵Anne J. Cruz, for example, describes the biographical element as "traditionally . . . accepted" but "subsumed in the fictional narrative" ("Spanish Petrarchism" 88; *Imitación y transformación* 96-97). In "La mitología como retórica poética," Cruz treats Garcilaso's implicit use of the Hero and Leander myth as a case of metaphorical thinking, which is much the way I view his use of personal experience.

⁶For a brief review of the critical history of Sonnet 22 the reader is referred to the versions prepared by Gallego Morell and Rivers, as well as the comments of Gargano and Heiple as reviewed by Rivers in *Calíope*, and Bryant Creel's article in this issue of *Calíope*.

⁷Luis F. Avilés has captured Garcilaso's talent for self-invention very well in his "Contemplar mi'stado': Las posibilidades del yo en el Soneto I de Garcilaso." In 1958 Northrup Frye observed: "Another form of the same kind of fallacy is the confusion between personal sincerity and literary sincerity. . . . Personal sincerity

has no place in literature, because personal sincerity as such is inarticulate. One may burst into tears at the news of a friend's death, but one can never spontaneously burst into song, however doleful a lay. . . . If we ask what inspires a poet, there are always two answers. An occasion, an experience, an event, may inspire the impulse to write. But the impulse to write can only come from previous contact with literature, and the formal inspiration, the poetic structure that crystallises around the new event, can only be derived from other poems. Hence while every new poem is a new and unique creation, it is also a reshaping of familiar conventions of literature, otherwise it would not be recognisable as literature at all" (210-11).

⁸The Eclogues are certainly an example of Kristeva's "transposition of one (or several) sign system(s) into another" (59-60). Jonathan Culler's suggestion that: "Intertextuality ... becomes less a name for a work's relation to particular prior texts than a designation of its participation in the discursive space of a culture: the relationship between a text and the various languages or signifying practices of a culture and its relation to those texts which articulate for it the possibilities of that culture" (103) is also an apt description of the intertextuality of the Eclogues.

⁹In "The Idea of Love in Garcilaso's Second Eclogue," R. O. Jones concentrates on the presence of Castiglione's work in the text of the poem. Although he later expands his insights on the role of Neoplatonism in the Second Eclogue, he rarely applies those ideas to the other poems, and then only briefly. But he is the first to set in motion this train of thought and his work, which Waley and Fernández-Morera later support, is crucial to this study. Although Gustavo Correa also uses Ficino and Neoplatonism, he is primarily interested in the mythological elements. Rivers mentions, without pursuing, the Neoplatonic dimension of the Second Eclogue in "Albanio as Narcissus." In his "Theme and Imagery in Garcilaso's First Eclogue," (1948), A. A. Parker explored the Neoplatonic relationship between love and the harmony of nature. In his reinterpretation of Eclogue I, Zimic states his view that the rhetoric of a disruption of the natural harmony stems from Salicio's "muy alterado estado de ánimo" (6). Howard B. Wescott views this rhetoric as an example of Garcilaso's use of the *locus amoenus* as a language with which to comment upon the various shepherds' judgment, actions and emotional states; a means of demonstrating that the pastoral world is not the place for romantic, sensual love; and to show through the presence of death ("et in Arcadia ego") that his *locus amoenus* is not the celestial one (479-80). John Charles Nelson's *Renaissance Theory of Love* and Nesca Robb's *Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance* provide helpful overviews.

¹⁰Riffaterre means by "ungrammaticality" the sort of paradox represented by the presence of unhappy shepherds in an edenic setting, and also uses the term to iridicate an alteration in the literary representation of reality, "in a manner inconsistent with verisimilitude or with what the context leads the reader to expect" (2).

¹¹I am indebted to Professor Jim Swan of the English Department of SUNY @ Buffalo for the observation, made in his unpublished paper, "Wing-Tips, Power Ties, and the Real Thing: An Introduction to *The Book of the Courtier*," that, "the world imagined by Castiglione . . . is a *theater*." Or, as Swan notes: "The book was discovered to provide a method—or should I say a 'methodology'?—for the art of the self, or 'self-fashioning,' the term now current thanks to Stephen Greenblatt." Rosalie

Colie describes *Il corteggiano* as, "a book of education, cast in dialogue form," in which "a civilized man's activities, physical and mental, single and social, are viewed as arts by which he ... continuously civilizes himself" (112). This continuous civilizing of the self is in fact a process of self-invention, but the self invented in the poetry is that of "another." In "Self-Fashioning in Spain: Garcilaso de la Vega" Anne J. Cruz offers a new perspective on Garcilaso's life in which "Garcilaso's stance as a soldier-poet barely conceals his difficulties in balancing both roles" (523-24), and in which his "desire to control his own image, therefore, corresponds to his efforts in replying to social and historical conflicts" (538).

Works Cited

- Alborg, Juan Luis. *Historia de la literatura española: Edad media y Renacimiento*. Madrid: Gredos, 1970.
- Alonso, Dámaso. *Poesía española: Ensayo de métodos y límites estilísticos*. (4a ed.) Madrid: Gredos, 1962.
- Alter, Robert. *Partial Magic: The Novel as a Self-Conscious Genre*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1975.
- Altolaguirre, Manuel. *Garcilaso de la Vega*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1933.
- Arce de Vázquez, Margot. *Garcilaso de la Vega: Contribución al estudio de la lírica española del siglo XVI*. (2a ed.) Río Piedras: Ediciones de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1961.
- Avilés, Luis F. "Contemplar mi 'stado': Las posibilidades del yo en el soneto I de Garcilaso." *Calíope* 2.1 (1996): 58-78.
- Bayo, Marcial José. *Virgilio y la pastoral española del renacimiento (1480-1550)*. Madrid: Gredos, 1970.
- Bembo, Pietro. *Gli Asolani*. Trans. Rudolf B. Gottfried. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1954.
- Castiglione, Baltasar. *El cortesano*. Trad. Juan Boscán. Ed. M. Menéndez y Pelayo. Madrid: Revista de Filología Española, Anejo 25, 1942.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell UP 1978.
- Colie, Rosalie L. *The Resources of Kind: Genre Theory in the Renaissance*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1973.
- Correa, Gustavo. "Garcilaso y la mitología." *Hispanic Review* 45 (1977): 269-81.
- Creel, Bryant. "Garcilaso's Sonnet XXII: A Re-examination in the Light of Phenomenological Ethics of Values." *Calíope* 3.1 (1997): 51-70.
- Cruz, Anne J. *Imitación y transformación: El petrarquismo en la poesía de Boscán y Garcilaso de la Vega*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1987.
- _____. "La mitología como retórica poética: el mito implícito como metáfora en Garcilaso." *Romanic Review* 77 (1986): 404-14.
- _____. "Self-Fashioning in Spain: Garcilaso de la Vega." *Romanic Review* 83 (1992): 517-38.

- Culler, Jonathan. "Presupposition and Intertextuality." *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. 1981. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983. 100-18.
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. "The Ideal Landscape." *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Trans. Willard Trask. New York: Harper and Row, 1963. 183-202.
- Darst, David H. "Garcilaso's Love for Isabel Freire: The Creation of a Myth." *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 3 (1979): 261-68.
- Entwistle, William J. "The Loves of Garci-Laso." *Hispania* 13 (1930): 377-88.
- Fernández-Morera, Darío. *The Lyre and the Oaten Flute: Garcilaso and the Pastoral*. London: Támesis, 1982.
- Ficin, Marsile. *Commentaire sur le Banquet de Platon*. [Texte de manuscrit autographe] Trans. Raymond Marcel. Paris: Société d'édition «Les belles lettres», 1956.
- Ficino, Marsilio. *Commentary on Plato's Symposium on Love*. Trans. Sears Jayne. Dallas: Spring Publications, 1985.
- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1982. Frye, Northrup. "Literature as Context: Milton's *Lycidas*." (1958) *The Pastoral Mode*. Ed. Bryan Loughrey. London: Macmillan, 1984. 205-15.
- Garcilaso de la Vega. *Obras*. 1911. Ed. T. Navarro Tomás. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1963.
- _____. *Obras completas con comentario*. 1974. Ed. Elias L. Rivers. Madrid: Castalia, 1981.
- Garcilaso de la Vega et al. *Garcilaso de la Vega y sus comentaristas*, Ed. Antonio Gallego Morell. Madrid: Gredos, 1972.
- Gicovate, Bernard. *Garcilaso de la Vega*. Boston: Twayne, 1975.
- Goodwyn, Frank. "New Light on the Historical Setting of Garcilaso's Poetry." *HR* 46 (1978): 1-22.
- Gow, A. S. F. *Theocritus*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1965.
- Green, Otis H. *Spain and the Western Tradition*. Vol. 1. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1968. 4 vols.
- Greene, Thomas M. *The Light in Troy*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1982.
- Haber, Judith. *Pastoral and the Poetics of Self-contradiction*. Cambridge: CUP, 1994.
- Halperin, David M. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.
- Heiple, Daniel L. *Garcilaso de la Vega and the Italian Renaissance*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1994.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox*. New York: Methuen, 1984.
- Iglesias Feijoo, Luis. "Lectura de la Egloga I." *Garcilaso*. Actas de la IV Academia Literaria Renacentista. Salamanca: U de Salamanca, 1986. 61-82.
- Jaeger, Werner. *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*. Trans. Gilbert Highet. New York: Oxford UP, 1945. 3-57.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." *New Directions in Literary History*. Ed. Ralph Cohen. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1974. 11-41.
- Jenkyns, Richard. "Pastoral." *The Legacy of Rome: A New Appraisal*. Ed. Richard

- Jenkyns. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992. 151-175.
- Johnson, Carróll B. "Personal Involvement and Poetic Tradition in the Spanish Renaissance: Some Thoughts on Reading Garcilaso." *Romanic Review* 80 (1989): 288-304.
- Jones, Royston O. "Ariosto and Garcilaso." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 39 (1962): 153-64.
- _____. "Bembo, Gil Polo, Garcilaso: Three accounts of love." *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 40 (1966): 526-40.
- _____. "Garcilaso, poeta del humanismo." *Clavileño* 5 (1954): 1-7.
- _____. *The Golden Age: Prose and Poetry, The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. London: Benn; New York: Barnes, 1971. 36-47.
- _____. "The Idea of Love in Garcilaso's Second Eclogue." *Modern Language Review* 47 (1951): 388-95.
- Kegel-Brinkgreve, E. *The Echoing Woods: Bucolic and Pastoral from Theocritus to Wordsworth*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1990.
- Keniston, Hayward. *Garcilaso de la Vega: A Critical Study of His Life and Works*. New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1922.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia UP, 1984.
- Lapesa, Rafael. *La trayectoria poética de Garcilaso*. (2a ed.) Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1968.
- Lawall, Gilbert. *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals: A Poetry Book*. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Hellenic Studies, 1967. Distr. Harvard UP.
- Leach, Eleanor Winsor. *Vergil's Eclogues: Landscapes of Experience*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1974.
- Lipmann, Stephen H. "On the Significance of the 'Trance de Lucina' in Garcilaso's First Eclogue." *Neophilologus* 67 (1983): 65-70.
- López Bueno, Begoña and Reyes Cano, Rogelio. "Garcilaso de la Vega y la poesía en tiempos de Carlos V." *Siglos de Oro: Renacimiento*. Ed. Francisco López Estrada. Barcelona: Crítica, 1980. 98-113.
- Lumsden, Audrey. "Problems Connected with the Second Eclogue of Garcilaso de la Vega." *Hispanic Review* 15 (1947): 251-71.
- Ly, Nadine. "Garcilaso: une autre trajectoire poétique." *Bulletin Hispanique* 83 (1981): 263-329.
- Macdonald, Inez. "La segunda égloga de Garcilaso." *Boletín del Instituto Español* [London] 12 (1950): 6-11. Rpt. in *La poesía de Garcilaso: Ensayos críticos*. Ed. Elias L. Rivers. Barcelona: Ariel, 1974. 209-35.
- Marinelli, Peter V. *Pastoral*. London: Methuen, 1971.
- Martínez López, Enrique. "El rival de Garcilaso: «esse que de mi s'está reyendo» (Egl. I. 180)." *BRAE* 61 (1981): 191-281.
- Mazzeo, Joseph Anthony. *Renaissance and Revolution*. New York: Pantheon, 1965.
- Mele, Eugenio. "Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega y su permanencia en Italia." *Bulletin Hispanique* 25 (1923): 108-48.
- Nelson, John Charles. *Renaissance Theory of Love*. New York, Columbia UP, 1958.
- Palmer, Richard E. *Hermeneutics*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1969.
- Parker, A. A. "Theme and Imagery in Garcilaso's First Eclogue." *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 25 (1948): 222-27.

- Poggioli, Renato. *The Oaten Flute*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1975.
- Quinn, David. "Garcilaso's Égloga primera: Autobiography or Art?" *Symposium* 37 (1983): 147-64.
- Riffaterre, Michael. *Semiotics of Poetry*. 1978. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.
- Rivers, Elias L. "Albanio as Narcissus in Garcilaso's Second Eclogue." *HR* 41 (1973): 297-304.
- _____. "Garcilaso de la Vega and the Italian Renaissance: Texts and Contexts/Review Article." *Calíope* 2 (1996): 100-108.
- _____. *Garcilaso de la Vega: Poems: A Critical Guide*. London: Tamesis, 1980.
- _____. ed. *La poesía de Garcilaso: Ensayos críticos*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1974.
- _____. "Nymphs, Shepherds, and Heroes: Garcilaso's Second Eclogue." *Philological Quarterly* 51 (1972): 123-34.
- _____. "The Pastoral Paradox of Natural Art." *MLN* 77 (1962): 130-44.
- _____. trans. *Renaissance and Baroque Poetry of Spain*. New York: Dell, 1966.
- Robb, Nesca A. *Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance*. 1935. New York: Octagon, 1968.
- Roig, Adrien. "¿Quiénes fueron Salicio y Nemoroso?" *Actas del Sexto Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas celebrado en Toronto del 22 al 26 de agosto de 1977*. Eds. Alan M. Gordon and Evelyn Rugg. Toronto: Dept. of Spanish and Portuguese, U of Toronto, 1980. 637-40.
- Rosenmeyer, Thomas G. *The Green Cabinet: Theocritus and the European Pastoral Lyric*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969.
- Smith, Paul Julian. *Writing in the Margin: Spanish Literature of the Golden Age*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988. 1-77.
- Snell, Bruno. "Arcadia: The Discovery of a Spiritual Landscape." *The Discovery of the Mind in Greek Philosophy and Literature*. Trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer. Republication of *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought*. 1953. New York: Dover, 1982. 281-309.
- Swan, Jim. "Wing-Tips, Power Ties, and the Real Thing: An Introduction to *The Book of the Courtier*." Unpublished.
- Valbuena Prat, Angel. *Historia de la Literatura Española*. Tomo I (8a ed) Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1974. 543-47.
- Waley, Pamela. "Garcilaso, Isabel and Elena: The Growth of a Legend." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 56 (1979): 11-15.
- Wardropper, Bruce W., ed. *Spanish Poetry of the Golden Age*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1971.
- Wescott, Howard B. "Nemoroso's Odyssey: Garcilaso's Eclogues Revisited." *Hispania* 78 (1995): 474-82.
- Zimic, Stanislav. "Las églogas de Garcilaso de la Vega: ensayos de interpretación." *Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez y Pelayo* 64 (1988): 5-107.