

# BEYOND PETRARCH: GARCILASO'S THOROUGHLY MODERN GALATEA

---

Edward Dudley  
State University of New York at Buffalo

---

*¡O más dura que mármol a mis quexas  
y al encendido fuego en que me quemo  
más elada que nieve, Galatea!*

The invocation to Galatea with which Salicio begins his lament marks the *Égloga I* as a new discourse, one that brings into contention the ancient quarrel about male desire and a woman's right to say no. With this gesture Garcilaso was entering a troubled emotional cathexis at the very moment he was initiating a new poetic "vocabulary," one that would revolutionize the rhetoric of the Spanish Renaissance lyric. This cathexis of language and eroticism is at the core of Garcilaso's invention of such a vocabulary. In fact one should speak of the invention of a *vocabulary of rejected desire* rather than imply the priority of theme over rhetoric or the priority of rhetoric over theme.<sup>1</sup> We must begin by recognizing that the two terms are at the very least homologous, if not ultimately indistinguishable. This apparent dichotomy comes down to us from a venerable pattern of Greek thought, but it is undoubtedly much older than that, perhaps born of the binomial nature of language itself.

But with Garcilaso's poetic invocation of Galatea the original reader, probably without knowing it, was witnessing the invention of an unfamiliar expressive discourse, but at the same time, he or she *was* aware that the (new) discourse was useful for imitation. Richard Rorty defines such a situation as a precondition for identifying what we have come to call "genius" (28-29). The exact same discourse, if found unsuitable for imitation, would otherwise be dismissed as eccentric. Furthermore, Garcilaso's inventive vocabulary was precisely born out of the cathexis of energies that came to define the Castilian love lyric as an admixture of imperialism and autoeroticism caught up in a rampant surge of youth and power. The result was the installation of Garcilaso as the national icon of that hubristic era (Navarrete 124ff.; Hermida Ruiz).<sup>2</sup> Not surprisingly, Galatea was the erotic force that shaped the verbal product (Dudley "Goddess").

The interrogation of that verbal product is the object/subject of this essay, not from the study of its sources but from a discernment of precisely what Garcilaso rejected from his sources. The question is, how was his inherited rhetoric, as Rorty would put it, getting in the way of what Garcilaso was trying to say. And, equally important, why did his new language become the discourse to imitate? Why did he attract followers and why was he attacked by those who rejected him? What did his poetic vocabulary offer in the way of a new rhetoric of desire? Its popularity was due in part to its assumed Petrarchan heritage, then still very much in vogue. But Boscán's sonnets were closer to the Italian model than Garcilaso's, and they did not cause a fuss. Rather, Garcilaso's eclogues, and particularly the first one, sounded a clarion call of a new sensibility. In fact, we can see now that what Garcilaso provided was not just a rejection of the Italian master, but the crucial step *beyond* Petrarch. He was entering a new poetic terrain that we have come to call Mannerism.

What happened is that for his elite readership Garcilaso emerged as the high priest of a new lyricism, one that furnished the desired exemplar of the imperial Castilian voice anticipated by humanists as far back as Nebrija in 1492. Forty years later Garcilaso's readers were excited by the endless horizons of planetary imperialism projected by their youthful emperor (who was the same age as Garcilaso), and they must have found that Garcilaso's pastoral vocabulary provided a lot of useful imagery for their personal aspirations. They said to themselves, this is the way we lovers should sound in our fortunate and momentous times. Above all, they now had their Hispanic Petrarch to replace all other foreign models.

There is a famous American parallel to this phenomenon. In *The Green Hills of Africa* Ernest Hemingway wrote: "All modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called *Huckleberry Finn*. . . . All American writing comes from that. There was nothing before. There has been nothing as good since." Granted a certain amount of stylistic hubris, he was right. At least it appears that Hemingway felt free to write about Americans living in Europe who still sounded like Americans; they didn't have to sound like Henry James's angst-ridden expatriates. In fact, Hemingway's heroes and heroines didn't talk about their angst; they acted it out in their sex lives. In his first novel, *The Sun Also Rises*, his Americans don't really invent themselves until they get to Pamplona. There, in the midst of a traditional festival, they "come-into-being" as Americans standing out against other more ritualized structures of existence exemplified for Hemingway by the bullring. We find also that Garcilaso's two protagonists in the *Égloga I* don't seem to act or speak like Italians and don't even seem to have read Petrarch. As a result subsequent Spanish poets of the sixteenth century began situating their poetry either for or against the Garcilaso model. *Ergo*, they had to have read Garcilaso in

order to produce their own voice. In this sense, for imperial Spain, Petrarch's verse itself, the cause of all the fuss, had become history. He had been replaced by Garcilaso.

Richard Rorty defines *poet* etymologically as "one who makes things new" (13). The poet's key virtue is the ability to create a new *vocabulary*, whether in language, music, the plastic arts, science or philosophy. Rorty's triad of such geniuses is formed by Galileo, Hegel and the later Yeats; their new vocabularies initiated the development of science, post-Romantic philosophy and Modernism. To do this Rorty has amalgamated some of the terminology of Thomas Kuhn and Harold Bloom ("paradigm," "strong poet," etc.) and created his own lexicon. That said, let me utilize the term vocabulary for a Rortian look at the *Égloga I*.

Of the three super geniuses, the case of Yeats of course is closest to that of Garcilaso in that he is credited with introducing a new *maniera* into the poetry of his revolutionary times. Garcilaso belongs to the same generation that brought about what we call Early Modern Europe. For instance, he is a younger contemporary of Machiavelli, who did for history what Galileo did for science, inventing political science, a new synchronic view of what was going on in his world rather than producing just another diachronic evocation of historical precedents. (His achievement is basically what Saussure did for linguistics; he examined the spoken language of his own time rather than analyze it as an end product of a historical process.) For Machiavelli, this was a truly revolutionary approach because to a great extent Renaissance humanism began as a study of source materials from classical antiquity. I tend to see that this phase of Renaissance poetry climaxed in Garcilaso's sonnets; they are, fundamentally, the creation of a diachronic effort. The poet is at every instance imitating or rejecting Petrarch, that is, he is comparing his poetry to a foreign and deceased model. Heiple's masterful study of the sonnets traces this trajectory.<sup>3</sup> In contrast, as we will see in Garcilaso's eclogues, he took the fateful step beyond Petrarchan paradigms into the wildwood of Mannerism. In other words Garcilaso invented a new manner that allowed him to say things not found in the Petrarchan repertoire. The role of the Galatea icon with which Salicio begins his song thus has a complex agenda. First there is the invocation to her hardness that Salicio seeks to melt down with his song. But we find that he fails in a curious way: while his song does not move her, it does deconstruct the efficacy of the jeweled but static Petrarchan imagery with which he addresses her. And at the same time, it is his passion that turns cold. This interchange between the fate of the lovers and the fate of the poetry is a feature of the Mannerist self-conscious text.

In the same vein of thought, there are other connections between Garcilaso and the development of modern science. There is good reason

to call Garcilaso the first major poet of Early Modern Europe in the sense that he made the first successful moves toward Mannerism. Like Machiavelli, Garcilaso took a synchronic look at what was going on around him in poetry, and, more importantly, took a wry look at his own verse. Like Cervantes after him, his most important cultural school was his stay in Italy. Ingrid Rowland in her recent study *The Culture of the High Renaissance: Ancients and Moderns in Sixteenth-Century Rome* has brought into consideration the intellectual tenor and achievements of the papacies of Alexander VI (Borja), Julius II (della Rovere), and Leo X (de' Medici) (1492-1520). By this time Rome had become the new intellectual and artistic center of Europe. Rowland's quadrant of movers and shakers includes Julius II's papal secretary Tommaso Inghirami; the inventor of modern papal capitalism Agostino Chigi; the painter Raphael Sanzio; and "the less well-known but no less significant Angelo Colocci, humanist, publisher, and aspiring historian of science" (2-3).<sup>4</sup> Her study traces his significant but failed attempts to mathematize a history of mechanics, a feat not fully accomplished until Galileo. But what he did do is actualize a revolutionary way of looking about him at the ruins of Rome. Instead of, like Petrarch, evoking images of ancient Rome, he and Raphael were working on a book on the measurements of important classical monuments. In other words they were investigating Rome as a synchronic phenomenon. Raphael's in-scale drawings of the ruins were lost after his death at the age of 37 in 1520, and Colocci never finished the project. Copernicus may have met with Colocci during his 1511 visit to Rome. The web of pan-European giants meeting in Rome during these years is dazzling. Luther was also there at the time and certainly sensed with alarm the revolutionary neo-paganism at work within the papacy of Julius II. It is in this conflictive context that Raphael's *Galatea* was realized in 1514-15. There is no reason to think that Garcilaso, arriving in 1529, didn't respond to the ferment as well, particularly in his observation of Raphael's Vatican paintings (see de Armas's study of Raphael's impact on Cervantes), as well as viewing Raphael's final apocalyptic work *The Transfiguration of Christ*, hanging over the main altar in the Spanish Church of San Pietro in Montorio. These intellectual crosscurrents called forth several paradigm shifts, including the Reformation.

Galileo, Hegel and Yeats each achieved a new vocabulary after finding the inherited rhetorical resources inadequate for the task at hand. Rorty explains more of the process: "Revolutionary achievements in the arts, in the sciences, and in moral and political thought typically occur when somebody realizes that two or more of our vocabularies are interfering with each other, and proceeds to invent a new vocabulary to replace both" (12). We should note that the replacement vocabulary is *not* an amalgam of the previous vocabularies but a new more powerful metaphor capable

of manipulating new conceptual resources. Rorty continues: "For example, the traditional Aristotelian vocabulary got in the way of the mathematized vocabulary that was being developed in the sixteenth century by students of mechanics" (12). Colocci was just such a student of mechanics. He started his project by collecting ancient measuring devices used by the engineers of imperial Rome. In other words he started out as a pragmatic thinker and then stumbled when trying to develop a theory. Ingrid Rowland includes a photo of Colocci's notebook in which he is trying to organize his writing project for the book. Somehow his provocative diagrams could not be explained in his prose. In contrast, Copernicus achieved his new image of the universe by traditional theoretical means but ignored the new mathematics. That achievement fell to Galileo. Rowland in her study of the first decades of the High Renaissance in Rome emphasizes the parallel developments in both humanistic prose and the new mathematical "Algorisms" utilized in merchant banking, exemplified by the work of Tommaso Ingramini and Agostino Chigi respectively (113). This background makes clear the dual antecedents Galileo had to overcome in order to create his new vocabulary. The result was revolutionary because it provided a new discourse that could verbally handle both new mathematical concepts and the theoretical innovations of humanist prose. We can observe something of this kind of a revolution today in the development of "computerese," a language you can read only if you already understand its precepts. It seems to be easy for the generation after Bill Gates's but a definite stumbling block for older workers. It is in this sense that Galileo made a breakthrough and "invented" the discourse of modern science. In Kuhn's terms he provided the new paradigm. It should be noted that Galileo wrote his earth-shaking *Dialogo . . . sopra due massimi sistemi del mondo* in modern Italian, and not in the medieval Latin utilized by Colocci and Copernicus.<sup>5</sup>

This is another link to Garcilaso who was "translating" Petrarchan fourteenth-century metrics into the modern Castilian of his age. We must always remind ourselves that Petrarch lived 200 years before Garcilaso. Bembo and other humanists were invoking his achievement as a standard for Italian as a national language. That is why Sannazaro abandoned writing in the Italian of his youth, because he had been criticized for his Neapolitan dialect in his *Arcadia* and thus wrote his *Piscatory Eclogues* in classical Latin (for which he was praised).

Rorty continues his explication of the development of a new vocabulary: "Again, young German theology students of the late eighteenth century—like Hegel and Holderlin—found that the vocabulary in which they worshiped Jesus was getting in the way of the vocabulary in which they worshiped the Greeks. Yet again, the use of Rossetti-like tropes got in the way of the early Yeats's use of Blakean tropes" (12). This latter

problem was dissolved with the later Yeats's use of modern spoken English instead of nineteenth-century "poetic diction." It is this change that has earned him the name "The Father of Modernism." The famous final line of "Among School Children" expresses metaphorically the vocabulary dilemma of Yeats's Modernism with the question, "How can we know the dancer from the dance?" (123). How can we tell the poet from the poem? How can we tell the message from the metaphor? The same problem in Garcilaso is found in his struggle with the Petrarchan rhetoric set against the native *cancionero* rhetoric. The invocation of Galatea in the first lines displays, when set against the two earlier poetic traditions, the triumph of the meaning found in the First Eclogue itself. Rorty further explains the efforts leading to the creation of a new vocabulary:

The gradual trial-and-error creation of a new, third, vocabulary—the sort of vocabulary developed by people like Galileo, Hegel, or the later Yeats—is not a discovery about how old vocabularies fit together. . . . By contrast, someone like Galileo, Yeats, or Hegel (a "poet" in my wide sense of the term—the sense of "one who makes things new") is typically unable to make clear exactly what it is that he wants to do before developing the language in which he succeeds in doing it. *His new vocabulary makes possible, for the first time, a formulation of its own purpose.* . . . [It is] the contrast between the attempt to represent or express something that was already there and the attempt to make something that never had been dreamed of before. (*Contingency* 12-13; emphasis mine)

The last point is relevant to Garcilaso's creation of the eclogues, which represent an escape from the tight metrical prescriptions of the Petrarchan sonnet and the overly elaborate wordplay of the *cancionero* tradition. What he produced in its place was a fluid modern conversational Spanish, a language still recognizable to twentyfirst-century undergraduate students.

Furthermore I wish to show that the splendid opening invocation of Galatea does not fit the Galatea described in Salicio's lament. In other words his song begins with an ironic attitude on the part of the eclogue poet toward what Salicio is saying. It is this self-conscious stance that marks Garcilaso's step toward Mannerism, a discourse that examines its own attempts at representation. The latter point highlights the artist's *maniera* which in effect becomes the subject of the poem or painting. (This is equivalent to the experience of finding one of El Greco's paintings in a museum and saying "Oh look, there's an El Greco" and not saying "Oh look, there's a view of Toledo") Mannerism emphasizes *how* the artist paints and not *what* the artist tries to represent. So, once the poet's attitude toward his or her poem is established, the product begins to take shape. The style (*maniera*) or vocabulary makes possible the originality of

a new kind of meaning, one that enlarges on the ironic possibilities of any discourse, as we will see in re-reading Salicio's lament.<sup>6</sup>

Before addressing the poem we have to take a look at the Renaissance Galatea tradition. Her image first takes shape in Perugino's frescoes for the *studiolo* of Isabella d'Este (Thoenes). It is worth noting that of all his Renaissance patrons only Isabella D'Este prescribed the subject matter of the painting in her legal contracts. Presumably she had selected Galatea as an icon of a woman who could say no, a very suitable image for a woman who had such power. Certainly that message also underlies Raphael's *Il Trionfo di Galatea* in Chigi's villa on the Tiber. The title of the painting was invented by the public, not by Raphael. It is fair to say that Galatea's emergence as a heroine, a status she never had in antiquity, is due to Raphael's painting. Whatever the intent, the painting was read as the triumph of Margarita Gonzaga's refusal of Agostino's petition for her hand in marriage, just as Sebastiano del Piombo's portrayal of Polyphemus, which adjoins the Galatea panel, was identified with Chigi himself. Leaving aside the question of influence, the popular message of a supplicant Polyphemus and a triumphant Galatea anticipates the Salicio/Galatea situation. From Chigi's villa (now called the Farnesina), her *figura* metathesizes into a triumphant heroine in the poetic landscapes of Garcilaso, Cervantes, and Gongora (Dudley "Goddess").

The sudden importance of the Galatea metaphor at the beginning of the sixteenth century can never be fully explained, but it is a component of the vigorous neopaganism found most notably in Michelangelo's Sistine Ceiling in the Vatican and Donato Bramante's *Tempietto* in the courtyard of the Spanish church of San Pietro in Montorio. The latter was funded by Ferdinand and Isabella in commemoration of their victory over the Muslims in Granada and in many ways both the temple and the victory are important milestones in the rapid shift toward what we now call the culture of Early Modern Europe. The role of the Galatea icon must be seen against the shifting horizons of theological and political expectations of papal Rome and its many links to the planetary imperialism of Carlos V (see Dandele's *Spanish Rome* 34-52). When considering Raphael's painting we must also note the concerns of the Fifth Lateran Council (1512-17) in regard to the role of free will in Church doctrine. While the topic was not defined by Lateran V, it did impinge on the activity of the Council. For instance, in the decree on censorship there is talk about the danger of ancient errors, such as astrology. The topic of course became a major flashpoint after Luther and Calvin and was defined at Trent. Nevertheless, we can already sense an underlying sensitivity to free will in the painting. While Raphael was not a *litterato* when it came to theology, he nevertheless was personally active in the intellectual life of the city where works of Neoplatonists like Ficino and Pico della Mirandola spoke

of man's free will. Hence a reading of the painting on a popular level did engage the topic of *libre albedrío*, and of a woman's right to exercise it. The latter point is particularly important for the entire Galatea agenda in Spain.<sup>7</sup>

Hence, it was during these fateful discussions that Raphael's Galatea painting was produced. Two features of the painting are relevant to our topic: (1) technically it was one of the first paintings of Raphael to demonstrate his mastery over motion, as Galatea rushes to reject the overt sexuality of the scene (see "Goddess"), and (2) he created with Galatea an image of "a free standing woman," that is, a human figure, like Michelangelo's *David* (1502), that was not indigenous to an architectural form, and not bound to institutional values, as was the case with medieval sculptures and paintings. Similarly, if anything the villa itself represented an escape from Vatican chores and cares. It was in fact a playboy refuge for powerful unmarried men, many of them priests and cardinals, and even popes. Amidst all these innovative developments, Raphael's Galatea epiphany appears as the dynamic obverse of his motionless Sistine Madonna, and as an icon with which the artist initiates a new *maniera* that defines or re-defines his message. Furthermore, I am arguing that the Eclogues likewise signify a stylistic breakthrough. Garcilaso is no longer either for or against Petrarch but is now free to utilize what he has learned for his own purposes. In a certain sense, Galatea's escape from Salicio participates in the freedom of Garcilaso's newfound poetic vocabulary, and thus she becomes the presiding diva of a new discourse.<sup>8</sup>

In this context Ingrid Rowland's book identifies an underlying order for all the systems of thought that inform the pervasive ferment of early 16th century Rome. The breakthrough comes with Raphael and Colocci's contention that the various classical architectural orders, such as doric, ionic, and corinthian, form a meta-paradigm that governs all mundane matters. With this in mind she writes:

Unlike Pietro Bembo's restrictive Ciceronian regimen, Raphael's work with his old mentor, Bramante, and his new intellectual collaborators, Castiglione, Calvo, and especially, perhaps, Angelo Colocci, enabled him to lift their discussion of the classical orders—their own invention—to an architectural exploration of fundamental principles, of *order absolute* [ergo a symbolic example of God's presence in the ordering of the universe]. (233 ff; emphasis mine)

This means, in effect, that the same humanistic principles guided the production of artifacts in architecture and the visual arts, in literature, in mathematics and commerce, in music, and even in government, both secular and divine. It is not difficult to sense something of these ideas informing Julius II's bold decision to demolish old Saint Peter's to make



way for Bramante's domed basilica as a visual image of a divinely ordered Universal Church. Thus Raphael's charismatic *figura* of Galatea functions as a harbinger of a triumphant new age.

In these terms Garcilaso's Galatea is also a precursor of a new order of poetry, one that necessitates a re-ordering of negotiations between the sexes. With this hermeneutic in mind, we can re-address the opening lament of the bereft Salicio. Whether intended or not, his song lays out the features of the emotive and intellectual cathexis of all three eclogues. There is good reason to see Salicio as exemplary of the jilted male lover, the victim of feminine fickleness and perversity. The dualism suggested by the pairing of his lament with that of Nemoroso seems to contrast the suffering of the rejected lover with that of the suffering loss of the beloved by her untimely death. Lapesa correctly traced the antecedents of this view and argued that "*La Égloga I* marca la más alta cima de la poesía garcilasiana" (147). Nevertheless there are also good reasons, without disagreeing with this evaluation, not to read Salicio's lament as a critique of Galatea's behavior but as a critique of Salicio's selfishness and egocentrism.

This, of course, not only puts a different spin on Galatea's motives but re-organizes the thrust of Salicio's song within the decorum of the eclogue. For one thing, the primary literary antecedent for the song within the Galatea tradition is Theocritus's Polyphemus in *Idyll 11*. There, as Kathryn Gutzwiller has shown, the primary tone is comic. Only the ugly Polyphemus is blinded to his own deformities, both physical and psychological, the latter being seen as funny, but at the same time evocative of other kinds of meaning. Pastoral poetry as a genre was known for its comic use of irony and hidden meanings: "In Polyphemus' serenade we find the beginning of Theocritus' practice of lending to surface meaning potential underlying significances, here made subordinate to our amusement at the doltishness of a Cyclops" (110). She further points out that his comparison of Galatea to white cream cheese in his serenade comically linked together Polyphemus's obsession for eating huge amounts of cheese with his obsession for Galatea. Doltishness is a good term to describe Polyphemus's behavior as a male who is incapable of understanding a woman's point of view.

We must also remember that we have only Salicio's version of what transpired. There is no corrective commentary by the eclogue narrator or by Nemoroso, so the poem leaves open the question of whether or not Salicio is a reliable narrator. Lapesa observes that the damaged pride of the poet is only gradually "purified" by his acceptance of her rejection at the end of his song (133ff). However, he does not consider Galatea's reaction to his behavior. It is our task, then, to create a counter-reading of his complaints, and to construct what we can call a Galatea hermeneutic

as opposed to a Salicio hermeneutic.

The first stanza of his song establishes the rejection motif that defines the current status of their relationship: “pues tú me dejas.” This is the perennial complaint of the spurned lover, but Salicio has other problems. First and foremost he feels ashamed.

Vergüençã é que me vea  
ninguno en tal estado,  
de ti desamparado,  
de mí mismo yo me corro agora. (63-66)

In short Salicio suffers from a fatal ontological insecurity. He feels “desamparado,” vulnerable and without defenses. Worst of all, without Galatea he is suddenly incomplete. His own image has been defined by his relationship with Galatea; he has seen himself as an alpha male, and since he claims to be the best-looking shepherd, he must also be the beloved of the goddess of beauty. Galatea, after all, is the only generically identifiable figure in the first eclogue since she has appeared in the poems of Theocritus, Virgil, Ovid and Sannazaro. Garcilaso opens the discourse with her, and rhetorically she marks the lament as a pastoral poem, just as her acceptance of him confirmed his role as the best lover. In short she makes him appear sexy.

Secondly, Salicio’s complaint then turns to another common pastoral metaphor:

¿D’un alma te desdeñas ser señora  
donde siempre moraste, no pudiendo  
della salir un ora?  
Salid sin duelo, lágrimas, corriendo. (67-70)

The use of “salir” is a claim of ownership on Salicio’s part. She belonged to him and therefore she had no right to leave because it caused him pain. The situation is a poetic commonplace but Salicio’s complaint has a petulant edge to it which later becomes more noticeable. The same lament in the *cancionero* tradition would have had a slightly ironic ring to it. The poet and his lady would know they are playing erotic games, and the reader would know that the lover’s health is in no real danger. But Salicio seems genuinely disturbed because his self image is shattered. He has always seen her as an internalized component of his being; she was created to fulfill his emotive needs. This is the mindset of a stalker and Galatea has reason to be afraid of him. After all, Polyphemus, in the same situation, was capable of murder.

The second stanza depicts the order of nature as seen in a pastoral economy in which every form of life has its allotted place. “El sol tiende

los rayos de su lumbre / por montes y por valles, despertando / las aves y animales y la gente" (71-73). This scene shows that only Salicio is out of place in the cosmic order of nature. The effect on the reader initially is that Galatea is perversely to blame for this condition. She has no prerogative to go against this divinely ordered universe. In fact, as a woman, she is not free to make her own choice, and she must be grateful for his attention:

Y tú, desta mi vida ya olvidada,  
sin mostrar un pequeño sentimiento  
de que por ti Salicio triste muera,  
dexas llevar, desconocida, al viento  
el amor y la fe que ser guardada  
eternamente solo a *mí deviera*. (85-90, emphasis mine)

Here she is depicted as the misfit, the unknown creature that goes against the laws of nature, and heaven should punish her. This claim, however, doesn't jibe with Galatea's status as the goddess of beauty and love, the *figura* who marked the text as a pastoral discourse, and the *diva* who endowed him with status within the bucolic system. A tension has entered his complaint between an empowered and an unempowered image of Galatea, a tension that undermines the validity of his lament.

This contradiction becomes more overt in the next stanza. We remember that his original complaint was that she has violated her oath, "esta falsa perjura," and that heaven should punish her malice (see "perjuro" entry in Covarrubias). Six lines later, however, he changes the nature of her sins against him by claiming she has always deceived him:

!Ay, cuánto m'engañaba!  
!Ay, cuán diferente era  
y cuán d'otra manera  
lo que en tu falso pecho se escondía! (105-08)

This presupposes that she was never in love with him, not that she has changed. He is now saying there never was an eternal faith that united them. Since he has never seen her as an independent being, he cannot accept that she might have justifiably found him inadequate. This shift creates an ironic tension between Salicio's intended complaints and the actual relationship between Galatea and himself. Salicio has openly emerged as an unreliable narrator, and it becomes more believable that she could have found his lack of inner resources suddenly apparent when she met someone more mature. In fact, this defines his feelings for her as more of an obsession than a genuine expression of giving oneself to a beloved. This is another sign of a stalker, not a lover, of a man addicted to

a goddess figure in order to bolster his ego.<sup>9</sup> Galatea has reason to see Salicio as a confirmed egocentric incapable of love.

In one of his more imaginative strategies he tries to interpret a dream: “vi mi mal entre sueños” (115). He tells of taking his cattle to the Tagus for a drink and siesta, but once there, the river recedes before him and takes another course. Urged on by the summer heat “iva siguiendo / del agua fugitiva” (124-25). He takes all this as a “desvarío,” a meaningless sign, and ignores the recognition of the river as the habitat of a water deity like Galatea. (Technically she is a thalassic goddess, a coastal Nereid who also has land epiphanies.) In Salicio’s dream Galatea, as a river epiphany, not only withdraws from him but also fears his approach when he attempts to follow her “curso enajenado “ (124). Two stanzas later Salicio speaks of Galatea herself in exactly the same terms: “Cuando tu enajenada / de mi cuidado fuiste . . .” (147-48). The image of the fleeing Tagus recalls that of the escaping Galatea in Raphael’s painting. The identification of Galatea with the Tagus also has a political dimension relevant to Garcilaso as a member of the imperial elite in Toledo and the dedication of the eclogues to don Pedro de Toledo, the Viceroy of Naples.<sup>10</sup>

Since he doesn’t see Galatea as an independent being, it follows that Salicio would accuse her of being the difficult one. He also accuses her of providing an example of unnatural behavior, citing a traditional list of unnatural couplings following the example of Virgil in eclogue VIII, among others. The examples in Virgil, where the lovers are homosexual, have an ironic tone (see Rivers 280 and Cravens *passim*), but Salicio seems more seriously accusing her of an unnatural act in exchanging him for her new beloved. Immediately after the image of the fleeing waters, Salicio produces his most seductive vision of Galatea’s behavior. The literary antecedents here are a mixed bag. Her sweet talk in his ears, her blue eyes, her beautiful arms around his neck like a chain are topoi traceable back to myriad male poets of antiquity, including Homer, Hesiod, Horace, Virgil, etc. Rivers comments about her arms: “Pero es tópico corriente en la literatura clásica el peligro de los hermosos brazos femeniles” (277). The image here, however, evokes the gestures of a courtesan rather than those of a genuine beloved. Perhaps Garcilaso is remembering the famous minions of the Cupid panel in Chigi’s villa on the Tiber, particularly the naked beauty seen from the back. This figure is reputedly a portrait of Chigi’s famous mistress La Imperia. Whatever personal antecedents the stanza has, however, it is a case of Salicio playing Pygmalion by fantasizing an erotic display of feminine body language; but it is not a picture of a free standing woman expressing herself. And it is not the clinging vine role that Galatea chose to play, at least with Salicio. Furthermore, it leaves open the idea that she may have a very different kind of relationship with her new shepherd. In any case, this is the least Platonic

representation of Galatea in the poem, and helps explain why Salicio fails to gain her love.

Likewise, Salicio's elaborate boasting about his personal worth does not improve his chances. Again, the main literary antecedents are Theocritus, Virgil, Ovid, and Sannazaro. As we have seen the plentiful cheese in winter goes back to Theocritus's 11th Idyll. (Remember Quesada was one of the comic surnames proposed for Don Quijote.) Ovid adds Polyphemus's self-congratulatory comments about his own beautiful hair and bristles:

Come Galatea, lift up your shining head from the dark sea. Come,  
do not despise our gifts. I know my own value.  
I have been studying my own reflection in the water recently  
and I am pleased with what I saw (. . .)  
My thick hair comes well forward over commanding features  
shading my shoulders like a belt of trees.  
Don't hold it against me that my body has a dense covering  
of stiff bristles (. . .)  
What is a man without a shaggy beard and bristles?  
I have only one eye in the middle of my forehead, (Parker 164)

Garcilaso's intended audience would be expected to have read Ovid and Virgil above all other classical poets, and Polyphemus's comic love lament is not easily forgotten. Given this paradigm, what then is the effect of Salicio's self laudatory comments about his own worth? After the abundant cheese in winter bit, he adds:

No soy, pues, bien mirado,  
tan deforme ni feo,  
que aun agora me veo  
en esta agua que corre clara y pura,  
y cierto no trocara mi figura  
con esse que de mí s'esté reyendo;  
¡trocara mi ventura! (175-81)

What is Salicio's relationship to Polyphemus? Is he also blind to his own defects, physical or spiritual? In his edition Rivers comments on the problematic of seeing an image in a running stream (281), but we could postulate that Garcilaso wishes to emphasize that Salicio doesn't see himself clearly. Also, is her current lover really defective in personal appearance or character? Or is Salicio unable to judge him objectively? Oddly he then boasts of not being willing to exchange his looks with those of her current lover. He would only exchange his luck. In other words there are limits to what he would do to get her back. His own image comes first.

Is he then justified to question her motives in abandoning him? Is cruelty the only possible motive, or does she have the right to find him wanting as a lover? Three hundred and fifty years later, Emilia Pardo Bazán writes in *El encaje roto* of a young bride changing her mind about the groom while walking down the aisle to the altar. Doesn't any one have the right to change his or her mind about a lover? Is it a foregone conclusion that Galatea is to blame for rejecting a perfect Salicio? What would her image be if, like Cervantes's Marcela, she could give her version of the story? Perhaps the echoes of Ovid's lines suggest that Salicio is merely a better looking Polyphemus.

In this context, do Salicio's resentful questions in the next stanza deserve any favorable answer? Does all the blame fall on her "condición terrible"? (186). Is his complaint that he doesn't enjoy taking care of his sheep anymore really her fault? Is she obliged to marry him just to make him content with his sheep? Or is Garcilaso explaining why Salicio's love for Galatea, in contrast to Nemoroso's generous love for Elissa, is defective? Salicio's final complaint returns to the well known commonplace of his Orphic power as a poet being able to arouse sympathy from trees, stones and wild animals. Only Galatea remains unmoved: "Tú sola contra mí t'endureciste" (207). At this point the heat of his resentment has weakened and a tone of acceptance marks his lament. This is also the only stanza in which the *estribillo* is grammatically incorporated into the preceding sentence, a factor that suits his tone of surrender.<sup>11</sup>

The last stanza provides Salicio's first step toward a new phase of his life. His offer of surrendering his right to haunt the *locus amoenus* has been praised for showing his new generosity toward Galatea (see Lapesa 137-39 and Woods). There is, however, another interpretive possibility that hovers over his closing words if we consider how she might take his offer:

Yo dejaré el lugar do me dexaste;  
 ven sí por solo aquesto te detienes.  
 Ves aquí un prado lleno de verdura,  
     ves aquí un' espessura,  
     ves aquí un agua clara,  
     en otro tiempo chara,  
 a quien de tí con lágrimas me quexo;  
 quiça aquí hallarás, pues yo m'alexo,  
 al que todo mi bien quitar me puede,  
     que pues el bien le dexo,  
 no es mucho que'l lugar también le quede. (216-24)

For Lapesa this gesture is a sign of Salicio's purification, of his having overcome his feelings of resentment against Galatea (139). In a Freudian view the lament has functioned as a talking cure. While there has been an

evolution in his feelings, it might be overly optimistic to consider the “gift” of “their” *locus amoenus* an act of spontaneous generosity. Salicio’s emotional needs are too complicated for that. For one thing, the “lugar” is not his to give. Galatea is the presiding presence of the pastoral world. He is the interloper, the outsider, and she has rejected him because he is not a true shepherd. His idea of what love is has been shown to be egotistic and self centered, and he is not a lover in the Neoplatonic sense. Instead, he serves as a foil to Nemoroso, the ideal Platonic lover. Salicio doesn’t belong in her pastoral world and quietly leaving would be the most discreet gesture. But discretion is not one of his virtues.

What always motivates him is his ego. It never gets enough nourishment. He makes the offer in order to stake his claim on Galatea. She is to receive their “lugar” as an inheritance from him and as a reminder to shepherd X that she once belonged to Salicio. He is asserting his prior right to her by making a display of generosity. He is marking the place with his presence in her life. She and her lover will have to abide in Salicio’s world. It never occurs to him that she would like nothing better than to avoid a place of unhappy memory, of a reminder of an error in her life. He can’t imagine that anything to do with himself could be considered an error. “See how noble I am” is the eternal subtext of his lament. He still cannot see her as an individual with a God-given right to *libre albedrío*. Nor can he admit that Galatea has made good use of this capability by leaving him.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>I am adapting Richard Rorty’s term “vocabulary” as it applies to a new style that initiates a fundamental rhetorical renovation, one that signals a major literary or intellectual development. The term could be applied to Garcilaso’s work in general but I am focusing it on the First Eclogue in particular. While Lapesa recognizes the First Eclogue as the best of Garcilaso’s poetry, I am considering it as an original discourse that allows the poet to create a new kind of lyricism, in this case a post-Petrarchan eroticism. A shorter version of this paper was presented at the Fifth Conference of the SRBHP in Columbus, OH 2001. This article is an extrapolation from an ongoing book to be entitled *The Aesthetics of Power: The Galatea Epiphany in Raphael, Garcilaso, Cervantes and Gongora*.

<sup>2</sup>Navarrete’s book traces the vagaries of Garcilaso’s influence in the sixteenth century and shows that he became the benchmark to be reckoned with for later poets: “From an intertextual perspective, however, the first eclogue is just one more subtext which precedes this, as do the texts of Ovid, Virgil, Theocritus, and Petrarch from which Garcilaso takes the details that are illustrated in the first three tapestries. . . . The final tapestry is thus an object lesson in imitation and amplification. By cannibalizing own first eclogue as a source, Garcilaso represents himself as already a classic; by making his

tapestry the last in the series, he presents himself as the heir and culmination of the traditional" (122). In other words he makes himself the classic to be imitated. Hermida-Ruiz discusses in detail the shaping and re-shaping of Garcilaso's image as such an icon.

<sup>3</sup>In *Garcilaso de la Vega and the Italian Renaissance*; see particularly chapters III and IV for a careful study of his Petrarchan and anti-Petrarchan sonnets, though his concerns in the post-Petrarchan poems are mostly thematic. Likewise, while Heiple doesn't address Mannerism he does observe: "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" (23). See also his definitive discussion of the autobiographical questions in the first eclogue. He observes, for instance, that Galatea has never been identified with Isabel Freire (14ff).

<sup>4</sup>A basic emphasis in Rowland's book is the contention that there is an underlying connection among the developments in language, the visual arts, mathematics, theology, politics, etc. In part I am applying her thought to Raphael's *Il trionfo di Galatea* as an icon signaling multiple revolutionary changes.

<sup>5</sup>The impact of Galileo's vernacular prose contributed to the Church's decision to take legal action against him. Richard Tarnas comments on the power of his language: "Catholic authorities earnestly desired to avoid a new scandal that might further disrupt Reformation Christianity. Making the issue all the more threatening were the power of the printing press and *the lucid persuasiveness of Galileo's vernacular Italian*" (260; emphasis mine).

"See S. J. Freedberg for a concise analysis of Mannerism in the contrast between two portrayals of St. John the Baptist by Bronzino (ca. 1550) and Caravaggio (ca. 1600). The self-consciousness of Mannerism is clearly noted: "The past reigning style of Mannerism offers its characteristic conception of the theme of the young Baptist in a painting by Bronzino. This asserts a presence which in some ways seems as forceful as Caravaggio's on the affirmation of visual truth . . . However . . . Bronzino's whole figure gives the effect not of actuality but of artifice. . . . Bronzino has defined that form by graphic means conjoined with the means of plastic modeling, as if he meant to recreate for us less a body of palpable flesh than the image of a sculpture. . . . As we regard Bronzino's image we experience complex and ambivalent sensations, some of them internally contradictory, and our experience of it is diffuse and faceted. But it is Bronzino's initial approach to the representation of the form that results in such diffusion: the extreme acuity of attention focused on the description of each part is of necessity divisive—faceting and analytic. We are each moment made more aware of the operation in Bronzino's image of a complicated apparatus of intellect. The presence Bronzino's picture so commandingly asserts does not result from the reproduction that may be in it of nature; the reality it conveys is that of its powerful reality of art" (52). Bronzino and El Greco represent the high water mark of Mannerism. Thomas Hoving, the former head of the Metropolitan Museum in New York, once observed that El Greco's "View of Toledo" was "one of Mannerism's finest moments." Raphael and Garcilaso, of course,



are among the first to move in that direction.

<sup>7</sup>Anne Cruz, in her essay on "Self-Fashioning in Spain," bases her interpretation of Garcilaso's ontological self-consciousness in part on his familiarity with the thinking of Pico and Castiglione concerning man's exercise of his free will. She also addresses the question of woman's free will which is exemplified by her detailed analysis of the powerful role of the Empress Isabela in state affairs. This phenomenon was pre-figured by the dominant roles of the Italo-Spanish divas like Isabella d'Este and Leonor de Toledo. The latter was the daughter of don Pedro de Toledo, Viceroy of Naples and Garcilaso's patron and dedicatee of the First Eclogue. See also *Women Who Ruled: Queens, Goddesses, Amazons in Renaissance and Baroque Art*. This handsome volume has a full page reproduction of Bronzino's portrait of Lenor as the Duchess of Florence on the cover.

<sup>8</sup>A recent book on the history of medicine has found an important difference in the depiction of the human body in Greek and Chinese illustrated manuals. In *The Expressiveness of the Body and the Divergence of Greek and Chinese Medicine*, Shigehisa Kuriyama finds an underlying cultural difference of attitude toward the body. Vesalius shows the entire musculature of figures in motion. The Chinese had no word for muscle and showed men partially clothed and at rest. He attributes the difference to the Europeans' belief in voluntary actions, distinguishing natural body processes and freely chosen movements. Galen defined muscles as "the organs of voluntary motion." Kuriyama adds: "muscles allow us to choose what we do, and when, and how . . . Muscles, in short, identify us as genuine agents. . . . Specifically, in tracing the crystallization of the concept of muscle, we are also . . . tracing the crystallization of the sense of an autonomous will" (144). See chapter on "Muscularity and Identity." In this context Galatea's movement is the indicator of her freedom to act. Contrast Raphael's *Galatea* to Botticelli's static *Birth of Venus* a generation earlier. I am indebted to Professor James Bono of the SUNY Buffalo Department of History for the Kuriyama reference.

<sup>9</sup>Madonna and other media divas receive constant threats of this type and have to have body guards for this very reason.

<sup>10</sup>Howard Wescott's contention that the eclogues were addressed to the multilingual imperial elite—and not just to a Castilian audience—was a factor in Garcilaso's newfound stylistic freedom. See p. 58 of this issue.

<sup>11</sup>See my essay "'¡O más dura que mármol a mis quexas!': Presencia intertextual de Garcilaso en *La Galatea* de Cervantes."

### Works Cited

- Cruz, Anne J. "Self-Fashioning in Spain: Garcilaso de la Vega." *Romanic Review* 83 (1992): 517-38.
- Castiglione, Baldesar. *The Book of the Courtier*. Trans. George Bull. Baltimore: Penguin, 1967.
- Cravens, Sydney P. and Edward V. George. "Garcilaso's Salicio and Vergil's Eighth Eclogue." *Hispania* 64 (1981): 209-14.
- Dandeleit, Thomas J. *Spanish Rome, 1500-1700*. New Haven & London: Yale UP, 2002.

- de Armas, Frederick A. *Cervantes, Raphael and the Classics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Dudley, Edward. "Goddess on the Edge: The Galatea Agenda in Raphael, Garcilaso and Cervantes." *Caliope* 1.1-2 (1995): 27-45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "¡O más dura que mármol a mis quexas!": Presencia intertextual de Garcilaso en *La Galatea* de Cervantes." *Literatura y pensamiento en España: Estudios en honor de Ciriaco Morón Arroyo*. Ed. Francisco La Rubia Prado. Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, 2003.
- Freedberg, S. J. *Circa 1600: A Revolution of Style in Italian Painting*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.
- Garcilaso de la Vega. *Obras completas con comentario*. Ed. Elias L. Rivers. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1974.
- Gutzwiller, Kathryn J. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.
- Heiple, Daniel L. *Garcilaso de la Vega and the Italian Renaissance*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1994.
- Hermida-Ruiz, Aurora. "Rafael Lapesa y la 'raíz hispánica' de Garcilaso de la Vega cincuenta años después." *Caliope* 5.2 (1999): 5-26.
- Kuriyama, Shigehisa. *The Expressiveness of the Body and the Divergence of Greek and Chinese Medicine*. New York: Zone, 1999.
- Lapesa, Rafael. *La trayectoria poética de Garcilaso*. 2ª ed. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1968.
- Navarrete, Ignacio. *Orphans of Petrarch: Poetry and Theory in the Spanish Renaissance*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.
- Parker, Alexander A. "*Polyphemus and Galatea*": A Study in Interpretation of a Baroque Poem. Austin: U of Texas P, 1977.
- Rowland, Ingrid.D. *The Culture of the High Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Rorty, Richard. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Tarnas, Richard. *The Passion of the Western Mind*. New York: Ballantine, 1933.
- Thoenes, Christof. "Galatea: Tentativi di Avvicinamento." *Raffaello a Roma*. Roma: Elefante, 1986. 59-72, xxiii-xxx.
- Wescott, Howard B. "From Garcilaso to Argensola: The Cosmos Reordered." *Caliope* 10.1 (2004): 55-67.
- Women Who Ruled*. Ed. Annette Dixon. Ann Arbor: Merrell in association with the University of Michigan Museum of Art, 2002.
- Woods, M. J. "Rhetoric in Garcilaso's First Eclogue." *MLN* 84 (1969): 143-56.
- Yeats, William Butler. *Selected Poems and Four Plays*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Ed. M. L. Rosenthal. New York: Scribner, 1996.