Juan de Valdés,
Diego Hurtado de Mendoza,
and the Imperial Style
in Spanish Poetry

IGNACIO
NAVARRETE

Lorsque Valdés et son Diálogo de la lengua sont correctement considérés, la théorie poétique qu'ils impliquent apparaît comme une poétique destinée à l'empire de Charles V, appropriée au courtisan impérial, et ayant la capacité de contribuer à l'unification de la culture impériale. L'exemple le plus éclairant de cette poétique est les divers sonnets pétrarquistes d'un autre acteur de la cour impériale, Mendoza. Bien que ses affirmations directes et prosaïques au sujet de la préoccupation amoureuse manquent souvent d'intérêt pour le lecteur d'aujourd'hui, la poétique impériale de Valdés offre une herméneutique bien plus adaptée à leur appréciation.

The *Diálogo de la lengua* of Juan de Valdés is commonly misunderstood, due to the misperceptions that its author was naïve, that the work is a disorganized presentation of linguistic theory, and that it is a misguided attempt to apply Bembo's theory of literary language to Spanish. When Valdés' political savvy, his careful structuring of the *Diálogo*, and his debt to Castiglione are correctly assessed, his work and the poetic theory it implies—that verse should be like prose and prose like cultivated spoken language—can be read as an attempt to develop a poetics for Charles V's empire. In other words, Valdés offers both a theory of poetry appropriate for an imperial courtier, and a way that such a poetry can contribute to a unifying imperial culture. The bearing of the *Diálogo* can be seen upon reading the Petrarchist sonnets of another imperial agent, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza. While recognizably in the Petrarchist tradition, Mendoza's sonnets eschew the *agudeza* or wit that was characteristic of his contemporary Garcilaso de la Vega, and which became the foundation for the Baroque style of later Spanish poets. Mendoza's poems are a direct statement of the subject's love preoccupation, with a simile or example forming a communicative bridge to the reader. While it may seem bland or uninteresting, if compared to Garcilaso's, Mendoza's poetry

finds a stronger voice and heralds a greater achievement if read through the hermeneutic of Valdés' poetics.

Juan de Valdés and the Courtly Theory of Poetry

In his *Diálogo de la lengua*, the sixteenth-century Spanish courtier and religious reformer Juan de Valdés proposes a theory of poetry that moves away from the complex verbal, conceptual, and phonetic games of the preceding century. Instead, drawing on Castiglione's *Cortegiano*, he proposes a simpler, more direct lyric that is more prosaic and closer to everyday speech. Appreciation of the ramifications of Valdés' proposal is hampered by the misconceptions that he is a political *naif*, that the *Diálogo* is disorganized, and that his goal is to create a formal literary language for Spain, as Bembo attempted to do for Italy. The notion of his naiveté is based on his rash publication of *De Doctrina cristiana* in 1529, which brought on an immediate investigation by the Inquisition and precipitated his flight from Spain.¹ Yet the idea that he stumbled into trouble, unwittingly, is belied by the recent research of Daniel Crews, who has published important documents while delineating the political activities of the Valdés family. Juan's father, Fernando de Valdés, was *regidor* (alderman) of Cuenca from 1482 to 1520, when he turned the office over to his oldest son, Andrés; Fernando several times represented the city in the Cortes, where he was an ally in the various machinations of Diego López de Pacheco, Marquis of Villena, against Ferdinand the Catholic and his allies in the powerful Mendoza family. With Villena's covert support, Cuenca was one of the first cities to join the Comunero rebellion against the new king Charles V, but by the winter of 1520 the town *regidores* were already proclaiming their loyalty to and negotiating with the crown, while Villena too made his peace with Charles. As Crews points out, "The Comunero Revolt was successful in forcing Charles to reintegrate the urban patricians into the ruling elite and to hispanicize his imperial policies."² Subsequently, Fernando served the king as *procurador* at the 1523 Cortes, while the second son, Alfonso, joined the imperial chancellery under the sponsorship of the Chancellor Mercurino Gattinara, eventually becoming Latin secretary to the king. During the entire Comunero episode, Juan de Valdés was a member of Villena's household, where he was exposed to *alumbrado* (illuminist) doctrines, until he left for studies at the University of Alcalá in 1525.³

Thus when Valdés published his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in 1529, his action, rather than reflecting naiveté about the Inquisition, may well have represented a calculated gamble on the part of someone who felt himself politically protected—both through the dedication of his work to Villena, and

through his other family connections in the royal court. Moreover, while *De doctrina* was undeniably critical of the wordly pretensions of the Catholic church, it saw a far greater role for Charles's empire as a worldwide agent of reform.⁴ In this, *De doctrina* is not unlike the dialogues written by Juan de Valdés' brother Alfonso, and the criticism of the Church was not enough to keep him from quickly obtaining a position in the papal court of Clement VII when forced to leave Spain. Moreover, politically, this event tied him all the more closely to the imperial court, whose leaders were no longer just patrons, but protectors. Beginning in 1532, under the sponsorship of royal secretary Francisco de los Cobos, he held a number of positions in Naples, including archivist, secretary to the viceroy (Pedro Álvarez de Toledo), and overseer of fortifications.⁵ Valdés' relationship to Cobos is particularly important because it shows him as an astute political actor, even after the deaths of Alfonso and Gattinara. Because he was perceived as an effective intermediary, his intervention directly with Cobos was sought by Julia Gonzaga, and even by the viceroy himself, after the critical *visitación* by Pedro Pacheco, son of Valdés' former patron the Marquis of Villena, in 1539. In a 1541 letter, Cobos thanks Valdés for his recommendations and in turn asks him to use his influence with Villena and with the Papal court on behalf of another client, Gonzalo Pérez. The picture that thus emerges is of Valdés as "a highly regarded and influential imperial agent,"⁶ who would have been well aware of the political significance of his ideas, both in *De doctrina* and in the *Diálogo de la lengua*.

A second misconception about the *Diálogo* is that it is somehow a spontaneous exercise lacking in artistry, disorganized and superficial in its presentation of linguistic theory.⁷ In fact, there is a sequential exposition of topics in linguistics, from a theory of the origin of Castilian, through grammar, phonology, lexicography, etc. But the book's most significant structural feature is not exposition, but rather the play of dialogue among interlocutors that makes any monologic interpretation of the author's intentions tentative at best. The work (which has been best studied by Juan Bautista Avallé-Arce, Ana Vian Herrero, Lore Terracini, and most recently, Thomas Hart) has an intricate frame: at the beginning, the other speakers go to elaborate lengths to get the Valdés-within-the-dialogue to promise to discuss any topic of their choice; only after he has agreed do they reveal their interest in the Castilian language.⁸ They also plot to hide a scribe who will take careful notes on the conversation; at the end of the dialogue, his presence is revealed to "Valdés," who agrees to edit the notes and to translate the Italians' remarks. The work thus pretends to be a revision of a transcript, yet it contains preliminary and final discussion that the scribe could not have written down, and that "Valdés" would surely have removed in his editing process. Avallé-Arce

in particular sees this novelistic *mis-en-abîme* as an anticipation of techniques that would come to the fore in *Don Quijote*, while Hart connects this work to the Renaissance “revised dialogue” tradition, and in particular to Castiglione’s *Cortegiano*. The specific identity of the interlocutors is also important: Marcio is an Italian who already speaks Castilian but wants to improve his knowledge by learning how to write it as well, while Coriolano, a courtier and also an Italian, feels a need to learn the language in light of the Spanish political hegemony over Italy.⁹ Torres (also called Pacheco in some manuscripts and editions), on the other hand, is an uneducated native speaker who while “presumiendo saber la lengua tan bien como otro,” (“presuming to know the language as well as anyone”) has been unable to answer their questions.¹⁰ The two Italians thus exemplify the dissemination of Castilian into Italy, confirming the linguistic attitude of the emperor and fulfilling Nebrija’s predictions about the spread of the language abroad,¹¹ while Torres shows the dangers of an untutored aristocracy.

Together with Valdés himself, the speakers provide ample opportunity for irony, as when the questioners discuss a work “unknown” to Valdés-the-speaker. A more extended example of the difficulties of interpretation can be found in the responses to Valdés’ initial assertion of the relative inferiority of Castilian. The others are surprised to hear him say this, and Marcio rejoins, saying that if this is true, it is to the Spaniards’ shame that they have neglected a language “tan noble, tan entera, tan gentil y tan abundante” (“so noble, so intact, so courtly, and so rich,” 123). At face value, Valdés’ comments seem to be a clear indication of his sense of the inferiority of Castilian. This may be the case, but there is also an element of false modesty to the remarks, as they prompt a speech from Marcio in praise of Castilian; such praise, coming from an Italian, is much more effective than if it had come from Valdés himself, and the entire dialogue is of course carefully scripted by the authorial Valdés. Torres’ subsequent defense of Castilian, citing *Amadís de Gaula* and Nebrija’s dictionary, in turn allows the character Valdés to make disparaging comments about these two works. The net result of the exchanges is, at first, to praise the accomplishments of Petrarch and Boccaccio, and to suggest that there is nothing in Spanish literature that quite compares with them. Given the references that will shortly follow, this can be taken as a rebuke to the exaggerated claims of such Spanish apologists as Nebrija and Francisco Delicado.¹² At the same time, the Castilian language itself is praised, and by an Italian at that, for its nobility, gentility, etc.

This praise for a language in terms of its intrinsic qualities, rather than the achievements of its authors, leads to the third misconception about Valdés: his dependence on Bembo’s *Prose della volgar lingua*.¹³ The linguis-

tic discussion does indeed take as its point of departure a remark by Marcio about Bembo's *Prose*, in response to which Valdés declines to extend the same value to Castilian:

La tengo [i.e. la lengua castellana] por más vulgar, porque veo que la toscana stá ilustrada y enriquecida por un Bocacio y un Petrarca, los quales, siendo buenos letrados, no solamente se preciaron de scrivir buenas cosas, pero procuraron escrivirlas con estilo muy propio y muy elegante, y como sabéis, la lengua castellana nunca ha tenido quien escriva en ella con tanto cuidado y miramiento quanto sería menester para que hombre, quiriendo o dar cuenta de lo que scrive diferente de los otros o reformar los abusos que hay oy en ella, se pudiesse aprovechar de su autoridad.¹⁴

By alluding to Bembo, Terracini demonstrates, Valdés situates his dialogue in the preexisting Italian linguistic discourse, the *questione della lingua*, suggesting that the author will appropriate Bembo, and do for the Spanish language what the *Prose* had done for Italian.¹⁵ Yet the allusion is a red herring, for Valdés rejects Bembo's formalistic approach to linguistic illustration through literary models. The implications of this rejection become clear when Torres subsequently defends Castilian, pointing to the authority of Nebrija and the example of *Amadís*. As Eugenio Asensio suggested, these remarks recall Delicado's praise, in the preface to the Venetian edition of *Amadís*, of his fellow-Andalusian Nebrija, and they allow Valdés to associate Nebrija with Bembo as dependent on artificial literary models.¹⁶ Throughout Nebrija's work there is indeed a tendency to approximate Castilian to Latin, and Valdés criticizes the dictionary's focus on words with Latin roots. Similarly, he finds the *Amadís* full of archaisms and affectations meant to give it an air of antiquity. Neither is a fit guide to proper usage, and their influence is pernicious in that it convinces ignorant readers, like Torres, that Castilian is at an artistic peak.

But the problem with Torres's approach is not only his choice of inappropriate literary models; the approach is inherently wrong, for living vernaculars cannot be reduced to what Valdés calls *gramatiquerías*. Instead of the academic approach to linguistic sophistication, Valdés substitutes an alternative based on actual speech, "el estilo que tengo me es natural, y sin afetación ninguna escrivo como hablo" ("my style is natural to me, and without affectation I write as I speak," 233). The adoption of this standard has a number of important ramifications. First, it denies, as a norm for written composition, a literary language, whether it be the trecento writings of Petrarch and Boccaccio, the archaisms of *Amadís*, or the latinisms of Nebrija. Rather, the new standard is to be ascertained by means of *refranes*, proverbs representative of an oral tradition. Here is where the Bembist interpretation

of Valdés most errs, for the proverbs cannot be Valdés' functional equivalent of Petrarch and Boccaccio, selected because of the lack of other appropriate model writers. The use of proverbs as a model requires an approach fundamentally different to Bembo's championing of the great trecento writers. Petrarch and Boccaccio were promoted by Bembo precisely because, unlike Dante, they had aimed for timelessness by distancing their style from contemporary spoken Tuscan. As writers, moreover, they produced an objective, static body of work that could be disseminated by printing (recall that Bembo himself prepared the Aldine edition of Petrarch, published in 1500), against which contemporary writing could be measured. Had Valdés been interested in written models, it really would not have been impossible to select something to canonize. On the other hand, in their orality, proverbs have no existence other than as speech, uncanonical and in flux. To model one's writing on proverbs could not have meant to check one's diction against an established list of words, but rather to develop one's own sense of taste and style, freeing one's writing from the kinds of literary affectation that Valdés so abhors.

Valdés' second standard is the contemporary speech used by courtiers in Toledo. As Amado Alonso noted, this privileging of Toledo implies a recognition that the "best" form of Castilian is not necessarily the "purest" in the sense of that spoken by the rural nobility of Old Castile (and perhaps represented in the dialogue by the soldier Torres). Moreover, Toledan is defended as the standard not because of its ancient prestige, but because of the contemporary courtiers who come from there; like proverbs, this standard too (as Hart notes) "is constantly in flux, unlike the texts of Petrarch and Boccaccio that Bembo had chosen as models."¹⁷ Thus by choosing Toledo, Valdés demonstrates his conception of language as a social phenomenon, rather than a geographical or historical one, and furthermore accepts a specifically courtly standard of perfection as practised by the social cream of the nation, rather than a generally aristocratic one (which would have included the ignorant rural nobility), and much less a pedantically academic standard of speech (as in Nebrija). Although he is not always consistent in his rejection of literary models and their replacement with a standard both popular and courtly, this preference puts him much closer to the linguistic ideals promoted in Italian by Castiglione, and practised in the cosmopolitan imperial court. Like Valdés, Castiglione was a champion of eclecticism, not only for literary models but also for language (in which he preferred a courtly sociolect that made use of the best of each geographical dialect spoken in Italy), and even in the constitution of the ideal courtier, who was to imitate the best features of all other courtiers in his own quest for perfection. The only check on this eclecticism was the good taste of the courtier himself, who was to avoid

obvious affectation and instead practise the art of concealing art, displaying a *sprezzatura* that would make all his actions seem spontaneous.¹⁸

Valdés too seems to prefer undefined perfection over restrictive rule-making: judgment, he declares, is preferable to genius, writing should be like speech (again, a precept drawn from Castiglione), and *cuidado* emerges as the key stylistic trait, Valdés' equivalent of *sprezzatura*. Although *cuidado* ("care") may seem antithetical to *sprezzatura* ("disdain" or "nonchalance"), both imply self-conscious honing of speech and writing. As Terracini noted, the methodology implied by *cuidado* is Valdés' solution to the problem of Bembo's formalism, and in both Castiglione and Valdés the avoidance of affectation is the paramount goal.¹⁹ At the same time, the desire for an unaffected style also approximates Valdés, as Asensio argued, to the linguistic ideals of the Erasmists. Indeed, given the general Erasmist tendencies in Valdés' other writings, Terracini's recognition of Castiglione as the principal influence on Valdés' linguistic theories needs to be modified only with the observation of his desire to achieve Erasmist goals through Castiglione's means. The yoking of Castiglione with Erasmus becomes increasingly evident when one examines the nature of Valdés' literary judgments, many of which join linguistic, stylistic, and moral criteria. Valdés negates the efficacy of ornamental rhetoric, as when an elaborately worded, Ciceronian request from Marcio is dismissed with the comment, "si no adornárades esta vuestra demanda con tanta retórica, liberalmente me ofreciera a obedeceros" ("if you did not adorn this request with so much rhetoric I would freely offer to obey you" 118). Throughout, Valdés rejects verbosity, preferring, as an ideal, a statement employing as few words and syllables as necessary; brevity thus takes on an almost moral virtue. This taste for simplicity extends to subject matter as well. Of all prose works in Castilian, only two meet with his complete approval: a translation of Boethius's *Consolation*, and another of Erasmus's *Enchiridion*. Whatever the stylistic merits of these, it is clear he has chosen them for moral reasons as well. Valdés gives a similar critique of the *Celestina*. He approves of the characterization of Celestina and the servants, thus showing no aversion to the low style, but Melibea's speech and behaviour are criticized because a woman of her stature should not so easily have taken a lover. He also finds stylistic faults with the work, including over-Latinate and inappropriate words. Thus decorum, like brevity, has a moral value, and implies both a psychological and a linguistic dedication to the truth.

To summarize the argument thus far, Valdés came from a family with a strong tradition of political activity. He was exposed—through his family, his association with the Marquis of Villena, and his studies at Alcalá—to

religious and political views of a generally Erasmist nature that were critical of the worldly involvement of the Church, but supportive of a reformist role for the Spanish empire. His publication of his own reformist tract led to action by the Inquisition, but also to possibly stronger ties to the Crown, which protected him by providing him with employment in Italy, where he lived as an effective and influential imperial agent. The *Diálogo de la lengua* is an artfully structured exposition of Spanish linguistics and related topics, that in spite of an early citation of Bembo, more clearly follows Castiglione in eschewing a formalist, text-based theory of language. Instead, it opts for the dynamic model of oral proverbs and the speech of courtiers from Toledo. For *sprezzatura*, it substitutes the notion of *cuidado*, but the effect is the same: the rejection of overt artistry and the development of an individual standard of taste to separate the cultivated individual from both the ignorant and the affectedly learned.

Along the same lines, but going beyond Castiglione's silence on the subject, Valdés also develops a theory of poetry. Again, the primary virtues are grace and unaffected simplicity: just as prose should be like oral speech, so too, poetry should be like prose; it should have a good, clear meaning, with no excess of word or syllable. Valdés thus rejects the very *licencias* that the late 15th-century poet and theorist Juan del Encina had decreed were the special province of poets. This leads Valdés to reject courtly poems like *canciones* in favour of more popular, and simpler, *motes* and *villancicos*. These reflect the essential "gracia y gentileza" ("grace and refinement") of the Castilian language; to its shame, as Marcio stated in the introduction, it is inferior to Italian, but it retains nonetheless its proper decorum, and this consists of metaphor ("hablar por metáforas," 247) and polysemy ("equivocación de los vocablos," 211). These are precisely the special qualities of Castilian, as recognized by Castiglione: "Le facezie e i moti sono più presto dono e grazia di natura che d'arte; ma bene in questo si trovano alcuni nazioni pronte più l'una che l'altra ... Pare ancor che ai Spagnoli sia assai propio il moteggiare" ("Funny stories and witty remarks are sooner gifts of nature than of art, although when it comes to this some nations are readier than others are ... It seems too that the Spanish are suited at witticisms").²⁰

While Valdés never specifically raises the question of Petrarchist and Italianate verse versus traditional Spanish poetry, he praises the poet Garcilaso de la Vega—the leading practitioner of the new forms—although the context is not a literary one: "Huélgome que os satisfaga, pero más quisiera satisfacer a Garcilasso de la Vega, con otros dos cavalleros de la corte del emperador que yo conozco" ("I'm pleased to satisfy you, but I would rather satisfy Garcilaso de la Vega, along with two other gentlemen from the emperor's

court that I know," 172). Certainly the dialogue was written before the publication of the poetry of Boscán, Garcilaso, and the other Italianate poets, and certainly too Garcilaso came from Toledo, was famous as a courtier, and Valdés would have come to know him in that capacity in Naples. However, given the manuscript diffusion of Garcilaso's poetry before its posthumous publication, it is not unlikely that Valdés would have been acquainted with it.²¹ As Terracini noted, Valdés does not generally praise living writers, and so he may be reticent about mentioning Garcilaso's poetry; or, if the dialogue were written in 1535 as is generally supposed, he may have inserted this remark a year later, after the poet's death.²² But the context for this comment, while not a literary one, is still important. In the midst of a discussion of orthography, Valdés declares that he writes as he pronounces; the subsequent critique of Latinizers in the Valladolid chancery leads into the question of the true meaning of *plebeyo*. To Valdés it means those of "baxo ingenio y poco juicio" ("low skill and little judgment," 172), regardless of social class, wealth, or lineage. Thus to praise Garcilaso at this juncture is to attribute true nobility, and true courtliness, to him, and that in turn makes him precisely the kind of authority on language and style that Valdés most recommends; to acclaim him as a courtier is to pay the highest compliment possible in the *Diálogo*.

While the primary focus of the *Diálogo* is sociolinguistic, it completely alters the grounds on which a theory of lyric poetry can be based. Gone completely are the elaborate rules and exceptions that allow a poet to condense or expand to fit the requirements of the octosyllabic line. Gone too, with the emphasis on brevity, is the recourse to scholastic dialectic and Ciceronian rhetoric for treating the subject matter of the poem. Gone, finally, is the criterion of a poet's special knowledge of mythology and other topics. As Vian Herrero noted, Valdés does not write a rhetoric, or an *ars poetica*, like Encina's, because these compilations are antithetical to his approach.²³ In place of rules, Valdés longs for models and offers a somewhat romanticized preference for oral and popular forms such as the ballad and the *villancico*. Yet this predilection, and the associated acceptance of the mediocre style, is complemented by his insistence on *cuidado*, and his courtly standard for judging linguistic and aesthetic propriety. Mere education is no longer sufficient, or even desirable, but neither is hereditary nobility. The only certain standard is to be found in the self-polished speech of the courtier, "personas cortesanas" and well-spoken men, "hombres bien hablados" (196). As a practical matter, poetry is thus appropriated to a restricted group of courtiers surrounding the emperor, and the most exemplary of these is Garcilaso. Thus although Valdés likes some medieval poets and does not mention the new

forms, he opens the way for acceptance of the hendecasyllable by preferring poetry that is like prose, and by rejecting phonetic adornments in favour of more conceptual figures, such as simile and metaphor. Spaniards wishing to bring Castilian literature up to the same standard as that found in Italy are not provided with a relatively simple method for achieving this goal; the only route is care, self-improvement, and thus self-consciousness. Good writing can be like speech only once speech itself is like good writing, and the continuing need for editing and revision, asserted at the conclusion to the dialogue, shows how elusive the goal of perfection really is.

The theory of poetry is no more the main thrust of the *Diálogo de la lengua*, than the theory of dance or of cosmetics is the main topic of Castiglione's *Cortegiano*; rather, all are incidental examples of the main argument. Thus, another reason Valdés does not write an art of poetry is that poetics is not his principal interest. Instead he writes a dialogue on literary aesthetics, to argue how linguistic accuracy and stylistic simplicity as virtues are necessary for the efficacious exposition of moral virtue, as in the translations of Boethius and the *Enchiridion*. The *Diálogo* is thus not divorced from his other, more overtly religious writings; but neither are any of these divorced from his political beliefs and activities. Both his religious views and his aesthetic tastes are derived from currents that were widespread in Spain, and particularly in imperial circles, and in privileging courtly speech he is also designating, at least in the linguistic and literary realms, the ideal imperial servant. In this sense, the *Diálogo* is a testament to the notion of imperial poetics as a theory of poetry suitable to Charles's empire, recognizing the hegemony of Castilian as the language of the empire, its capacity as a medium for literature as prestigious as Italian, and the privileged role of courtier-writers as imperial agents. To see an example of this simple style at work in the service of the empire, one can turn to another imperial agent with a history and background very different from that of Juan de Valdés.

Diego Hurtado de Mendoza and the Imperial Style in Poetry

The idea of an imperial poetics suggests both that the Spanish empire is thematically invoked in the poetry, and that the writing of the poetry itself becomes a constitutive act of the empire and its making, thus, *poesis*. Any history of Spanish imperial poetics must in some way take into account Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, whose career placed him closer to the political centre of the empire than Valdés, Garcilaso, or any other of his fellow poets. The Mendoza had been, since the mid-fifteenth century, committed to humanistic learning, strongly monarchical policies, and a relatively tolerant attitude

towards minorities. This was the most literary family of the high nobility, and his illustrious ancestors included, in addition to other *cancionero* poets, his great-grandfather, the great poet Íñigo López de Mendoza, Marquis of Santillana.²⁴ Just as important is the pro-monarchical political program of the Mendoza, maintained across several generations. For example, almost alone among the major noble families in the late fifteenth century, the Mendoza stood by Henry IV after the rest of the nobility (led by the Marquis of Villena) tried to replace him with his younger brother Alfonso; yet however much this may have been motivated by loyalty to their relative Beltrán de la Cueva (first duke of Albuquerque, favourite of Henry IV and supposedly the queen's lover), their fidelity to and preference for a strong monarchy was ultimately recognized by Henry's successors, Isabel and Ferdinand. Under their reign, Don Diego's great-uncle, the Great Cardinal Pedro González de Mendoza, rose to become archbishop of Seville and later Toledo, and Chancellor of Castile. During the reign of the Catholic monarchs, the Mendoza accumulated wealth, titles, and offices, including duke of Infantado, marquis of Mondéjar, and governor of the Alhambra; among Diego's siblings, one inherited their father's titles and offices; another, Antonio, became the first viceroy of Mexico; and others attained high offices in the military and the Church. Finally, the Mendoza were generally lukewarm towards the Inquisition; in Granada, the family followed the same policy of tolerance towards the Muslim population as the city's new bishop, Hernando de Talavera (a policy later frustrated by Cardinal Cisneros), and Antonio was sent to Mexico in part to rein in the abuses of the first generation of *encomenderos*.

Erudition, tolerance, and commitment to a strong monarchy; we can find evidence of all three not just in the Mendoza family but in Don Diego himself. Born literally in the Alhambra in 1503 or 1504, he was thus a few years younger than Valdés, Garcilaso (to whom he was related), and the Emperor, and almost a generation younger than Boscán.²⁵ Don Diego himself, as a young man in Granada and then at the University of Salamanca, learned Arabic, Greek, and Latin; he later studied Averroistic Aristotelianism in Italy, collected rare books and manuscripts, and participated in philosophical and theological debates at the Council of Trent—intellectual activities well beyond the courtly requirements of *sprezzatura*. As for his attitude towards religious minorities, his Averroism led him to reject conventional religious categories; as he famously proclaimed in a letter to Granvelle's son Antoine Perrenot, the Bishop of Arras, in defense of the emperor's attempt to broker a reconciliation between Catholics and Protestants:

El Emperador puede disponer en el general, y el Papa dispensar, pero no puede forçar ni es possible en millares de años dispensar con los yndiuiduos desta generalidad. Y esto hablo como philosopho y como moro de Granada, o como marrano, que aun oy tiene la Ynquisicion mas que hazer en Spaña que el primer dia.

The Emperor may thus issue a general dispensation for all, and the Pope can give general absolution; but they cannot force anyone, nor is it possible in thousands of years to absolve individuals in this way. And I say this as a philosopher and as Moor of Granada, or as a Marrano, as even today the Inquisition has more to do in Spain than on its first day.²⁶

From an early age, Don Diego seems to have been present at some of the key events of his day, including a papal conclave (probably that following the death of Adrian VI, in 1523); the battle of Pavia, where François I was captured (1525); the *cortes* in Toledo later that same year; and Rome and later Siena in the fateful year 1527 (by the time of the infamous sack he had presumably already left the former, since he never mentions it). From 1532 he was in imperial service, and may have accompanied the Emperor to Vienna although we don't specifically know of his whereabouts until 1535 and the siege of Tunis, where Garcilaso was wounded. Above all, however, Mendoza was (as had been Castiglione before him) a diplomat. A brief list of his offices includes: an embassy to England to negotiate the possible marriage of Mary Tudor to Dom Luis, Infante of Portugal, 1537–1538; ambassador to Venice, 1539–1546; the Emperor's representative to the opening of the Council of Trent, 1545–1546; ambassador to Rome, 1547–1552; and concurrently, governor of Siena. During this time, Mendoza carried on an extensive correspondence with such important figures as the emperor's secretary, Francisco de los Cobos, and the ministers Nicolas de Granvelle and his son, the bishop of Arras, and even Charles V himself. These and other letters combined diplomatic business, personal matters, and news of state affairs; through them, Mendoza had access to and occasionally even influence on state policy at the very highest levels. As a diplomat and a man of the world, he was described in 1547 by Paolo Giovio as a man "d'arte di non arte" ("with the art of no art"),²⁷ a phrase with significant Castiglionic overtones. Throughout his life Mendoza collected valuable books and manuscripts, ancient coins and sculptures, exotic objects, and works of art. His friends in Italy ranged from Aristotelian philosophers, to the painter Titian and the pornographic writer Aretino (whom Mendoza, in his Venetian period, employed as a secret agent). His own literary works included a Latin translation and commentary on Aristotle's *Physics* and a Spanish translation of the *Mechanics*, the late historical work, *La guerra de Granada*, and of course the poetry. His poetry in turn is very varied, including *cancionero*-style poems, Horatian epistles

exchanged with Boscán and others, mythological narratives (*epyllia*), and Petrarchist and burlesque love lyrics.

Although the poems were not published until the seventeenth century, he had considerable fame as a poet in the century before, confirming the widespread circulation of his works. Three quite different witnesses attest to his reputation. Boscán exchanged poems with Mendoza, which he published in his volume of his own and Garcilaso's poetry; in the preface to his Italianate poetry, Boscán repeatedly cites Mendoza as one of the well-born and well-known "buenos ingenios" ("best minds") whose sanction of the use of the hendecasyllable line in Castilian poetry retroactively legitimizes Boscán's innovative use of those forms.²⁸ In this preface, Mendoza thus joins Garcilaso and the Venetian ambassador Andrea Navagero as members of the imperial court whose approval guarantees the aristocratic aura of the new verse forms, and who dispel any suspicion of affectation. A second example of Mendoza's reputation is the somewhat backhanded compliment in Cristóbal de Castillejo's "Reprensión contra los poetas españoles que escriben en verso italiano."²⁹ At the conclusion of the satire, a *trovador* is commissioned to write a poem in praise of the traditional forms; instead, he recites a sonnet in which the Latin and Italian Muses explain that they were brought to Spain by Garcilaso, Boscán, Luis de Haro, and Diego de Mendoza, of which only the latter is still alive; the implication is that with his death, the Muses and the forms will return to Italy for good. Castillejo had lived in Vienna for approximately 25 years when he wrote this poem, and although he corresponded with his fellow bureaucrats back in Spain, his knowledge of contemporary Spanish poetry was demonstrably not extensive. That being the case, it is particularly significant that he mentions Mendoza as the only living poet he knows who has composed Spanish poems in the new Italian forms.

The most significant praise for Mendoza, however, comes from Fernando de Herrera.³⁰ To begin with, Herrera places Mendoza in a very limited genealogy of Spanish poets he sees as predecessors of Garcilaso in the writing of sonnets, a list that also includes Santillana, Boscán, and Gutierre de Cetina. Moreover, although he qualifies Mendoza's achievements as that of someone who wrote sonnets "con más espíritu que cuidado" ("with more spirit than care"),³¹ Herrera also repeatedly quotes poems of Mendoza, along with his own, as parallels and analogues to Garcilaso's poems. That Herrera, living in Seville and even farther removed socially than geographically from the royal court, knew Mendoza's poetry well enough to quote it repeatedly, over three decades before its first publication, attests to its manuscript distribution. Herrera's use of Mendoza particularly irked "Prete Jacopín" (in reality Juan Fernández de Velasco, Constable of Castile and another Mendoza

relative), who placed Mendoza in rarefied company when he complained to Herrera that “sin respecto ni consideración ponéis vuestros versos con los del Petrarca, Ariosto, don Diego de Mendoça y otros grandes poetas, queriendo correr parejas con ellos” (“with neither respect nor consideration, you place your verses among those of Petrarch, Ariosto, Don Diego de Mendoza, and other great poets, wishing to equal them”).³²

The invocation of Mendoza by Boscán, Castillejo, Herrera, and Prete Jacopín may have been due to his social prominence as much as to actual appreciation of his poetry, but this is precisely the point: the inescapability of dealing with don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza as both imperial agent and poet in any account of imperial poetics. The stylistic features espoused by Valdés—prose-like simplicity with an absence of the complicated word-games typical of late fifteenth-century poetry—are typical of Mendoza’s verse, to a degree that makes him the most characteristic representative of imperial poetics. This can be seen in a typical poem:

Tibio en amores no sea yo jamás,
frío o caliente, en fuego todo ardido;
cuando va fuera el seso de compás,
ni el mal es bien, ni el bien es conocido.
Poco ama el que no pierde el sentido,
el seso y la paciencia deja atrás,
y no muera de amor sino de olvido,
el que en amores piensa saber más.
Como nave que corre en noche oscura
por brava playa en recio temporal
déjase al viento y métese al mar,
así yo, en el peligro del penar,
añadiendo más males a mi mal,
en desesperación busco ventura.³³

Several features of the poem allow it to be placed within the petrarchist love tradition: for example, the use of the sonnet form, the conception of love as a kind of folly, and the use of antitheses. However, Mendoza uses these features to neutralize each other and to distance himself from the condition they describe. For example, the initial and rather prosaic opening word of the poem sets an emotional register of Horatian moderation, and establishes a semantic field that contains and thus somewhat neutralizes the striking if conventional oxymoron of line two, where the paradox is dissolved through the conjunction *o* (“or”). At the same time, the subjunctive in the first line expresses the desire never to be a lukewarm lover, but also suggests that he may not currently (that is, in the indicative present) be a lover at all; in both instances, it works against the idea of the poet/lover as an unwilling victim of

his affliction. Similarly, the denial of identity in line four (*ni el mal es bien*) is mediated by its temporal conditioning in the preceding line; only when love drives the mind off kilter does this condition exist. Like *tibio* in the first line, the use of the prosaic *seso* and the almost technical *compás* likewise diminish the poetic effect. Through these devices, Mendoza moves the poem away from his subjectivity as a possible poet/lover, to an examination of the effects of love in general. This tendency is continued in the second quatrain, which continues to examine the effects of love, and like the first quatrain divides into two two-line units, tightly organized by their syntax.³⁴

The concluding tercets contain a feature that is highly typical of Mendoza's sonnets, the use of a comparison or *semejanza*: "like a ship that on a dark and stormy night flees from the shore and sets out to sea, so the poet, in danger of distress, piling sorrow onto sorrow, seeks his fortune through despair." The comparison of the lover to a ship in a storm has antecedents in March and in Petrarch, but its most important feature here is that it is not a classic simile in the sense of a metaphor with an explicit connective (*like, as, como, así*, etc.). Rather, the comparison functions more like an example: in classical, forensic rhetoric the comparison told a little story that served to sway the audience emotionally in favour of the accused; the audience is challenged to connect the terms and to derive pleasure from doing so.³⁵ Thus we get a mini-narrative about a ship too close to shore during a storm deciding to run the risk of being further out to sea, and the application to the poet who willingly, perhaps excitedly, courts even greater dangers, presumably in love. It is only in the final lines that the poet finally inserts himself into the poem as a loving subject; this self-introduction, and the sense of abandoning oneself to fortune, are all the stronger in these final lines because of their departure from the restrained moderation of the first half of the poem.

As remarkable as this poem's features, however, are the devices it doesn't employ. On the one hand, there is very little word-play: a couple of words are repeated, such as *seso* and *mal/males*, but there is no elaborate polysemy, no use of the same verb in multiple tenses. Similarly, there is no complicated syntax, nor the use of poetic licenses to attain the right number of syllables (although acute verses are used throughout and there is a polysyndeton in line six: "y ... y"). Finally, there are no traces of the semantic fields common to fifteenth-century poetry, such as love as service, a feudalistic relationship between lover and beloved, or sacred hyperbole. But if these features of *cancionero*-style poetry are absent, so too are the concrete, natural, and sensual (especially visual) images that we associate with the Renaissance: no descriptions of landscape, no nymphs in a stream, no metamorphoses. The poem cannot be located along Rafael Lapesa's paradigmatic

trajectory of Garcilaso's stylistic evolution, from conceptual witticisms and word-play to sensuous descriptions of nature and the use of metaphor;³⁶ yet if we think of Valdés' prescriptions, then this poem more clearly meets a reader's expectations.

Another Mendoza sonnet employs a comparison:

¡Si fuese muerto ya mi pensamiento
y pasase mi vida así durmiendo
sueño de eterno olvido, no sintiendo
pena ni gloria, descanso ni tormento!
Triste vida es tener el sentimiento
tal que huya sentir lo que desea;
su pensamiento a otros lisonjea,
yo enemigo de mí siempre lo siento.
Con chismeras de enojo y de cuidado
me viene, que es peor que cuanto peno
y si algún bien me trae, con él me va.
Como a madre con hijo regalado
que, si llorando le pide algún veneno,
tan ciega está de amor, que se lo da.³⁷

This particular poem employs the same comparison as a sonnet of Garcilaso's: "Como la tierna madre que'l doliente / hijo con lágrimas le está pidiendo" ("Like the loving mother whose son with tears begs her").³⁸ Garcilaso actually allows the comparison to take a more prominent role in the poem, devoting both of the quatrains to the narrative of the over-indulgent mother and the sick son, and then explicating the story in the tercets with an allegory in which the poet's "enfermo y loco pensamiento" ("sick and insane mind," the desiring subject in the poem) continues to clamour for what harms it, until the speaking subject of the poem gives in. These two subjects are then reconciled in the final phrase, "olvidando su muerte y aún la mía" ("forgetting his death and even mine"): the death of thought cannot occur without the poet's own death as well. Mendoza, on the other hand, imitating the same poem of Ausiàs March as Garcilaso, relegates the comparison to the final tercet, and thus it is never formally explicated; rather, its interpretation depends on the clarity of the situation implied in the preceding portion of the poem. The first quatrain, however, has very little specifically to do with the rest of the sonnet; rather, it expresses a generalized wish for death and for a sleep of eternal oblivion, impervious to suffering or glory, repose or torment. The most noticeable thing about these lines is that they express neither a Christian nor a classical view of the afterlife, and thus perhaps they reflect the Averroistic notion of the mortality of the individual intellect.³⁹ The second quatrain, too, begins with a general statement about the sorrow of those who

avoid what they most desire; then only in line eight does the poet speak for himself, “yo enemigo de mi siempre lo siento.” Even this final phrase, however, is less suggestive of an allegorically divided Garcilasian subject, who is both mother and child, than of an ambivalent desire for something harmful. The situation is explicated in the first tercet, but words like *lisonjea* and *chismería* move from the plane of abstract metaphysical desires to suggest a much more concrete and courtly social context suggestive of Renaissance Venice. By reducing the comparison to just three lines, and deferring it to the end of the poem so its impact is mediated by the preceding stanzas, Mendoza reduces its poignancy, as does his use of the explicit *veneno* in place of Garcilaso’s euphemistic “alguna cosa de la cual comiendo / sabe que ha de doblarse el mal que siente” (“something which she knows, when eaten, will double the pain that he feels”). The result is an emphasis on the mother’s blindness to consequences rather than an exploration of her divided will; Mendoza’s mother, “ciega de amor,” immediately complies with the child’s wishes, while Garcilaso’s mother struggles with her judgment. Once again, Mendoza’s poem avoids word play and polysemy, and reduces the elements of pathos and abstraction; in place of a moral failure leading to self-inflicted death, we have a witty commentary on the poet’s inability to attain his own good in a courtly social context.

A final example again draws on two parallel poems, by Mendoza and by Garcilaso:

Alzo los ojos de llorar cansados
por tomar el descanso que solía,
y como no lo ví donde lo vía,
abájolos en lágrimas bañados.
Si algún bien yo hallaba en mis cuidados
cuando por más contento me tenía,
pues que ya le perdí por culpa mía,
razón es que los llore ahora doblados.
Tendí todas las velas en bonanza
sin recelar humano impedimento,
alzose una borrasca de mudanza.
Como si tierra y agua, fuego y viento
quisieran castigar mi confianza;
yo suspiro, ardo y lloro y ya no siento.⁴⁰

Critics have not assigned a single model to Mendoza’s poem. It could well be modeled directly on Garcilaso’s: they share a number of themes, including incessant weeping, an unspecified offense, and a journey through an abstract landscape. Garcilaso, however, compresses the weeping into a powerful first line, “Estoy continuo en lágrimas bañado”(“I am continuously bathed

in tears”),⁴¹ compounds it with the violent sighs in the second, “rompiendo siempre el aire con sospiros” (“breaking the air with my sighs”), and then moves on to a direct invocation of his relationship with the poem’s implied reader, “y más me duele el no osar deciros / que he llegado por vos a tal estado” (“and it pains me most not to dare to tell you that I have reached this state because of you”). Mendoza, on the other hand, spreads out the force of the weeping over the first quatrain, and further dilutes it by making the absent *descanso* the cause of his despair, and by having his eyes quite plausibly bathed in tears, instead of his very self. Similarly in the second quatrain, Mendoza replaces the force of Garcilaso’s direct address, emphasized by a series of object pronouns (*seguiros*, *huiros*), thus distancing the poet himself from a direct presence in an I-thou love relationship, which is now only narrated to a third party, the reader. At the same time, the blame is shifted from the beloved to himself (the *hallaba/perdi* antithesis), and a missing *bien* that he used to find but now has lost, and that is the cause for the redoubled tears of line eight. The journey motif, which Garcilaso brings in from the very second stanza and which provides unity to the rest of the poem (and which is one of his favourite motifs, particularly in the early sonnets), is postponed by Mendoza to the tercets, and with a sea journey substituted for the land. Although this conclusion to the poem is reasonably effective, the allegory of a storm at sea is also fairly conventional, and it reinforces the sentiment, throughout the poem, of over-confidence challenged by a change of fortune. The polysyndeton of the four elements in line twelve gives the sonnet a rhythmic lift, repeated in line fourteen, where a subtle chiasmus links each aspect of the poet’s suffering (he sighs, burns, weeps, and feels nothing) to a corresponding agent (wind, fire, water, earth). In contrast we have in Garcilaso’s poem the extended allegory of the journey, culminating in the final metaphysical concept which is one of the greatest lines in Castilian poetry.

This, finally, is the most significant difference between the two poets: Garcilaso is above all a poet of *agudeza*, or wit, whether it takes the form of the metaphysical conceits of his early poems, or the visual impact of such poems as “Hermosas ninfas” or “A Dafne ya los brazos le crecían” (each of which ends with a verbal witticism).⁴² It is these *agudezas* that create the hermeneutic gap, that make Garcilaso interpretable because we have to interpret him. Mendoza by contrast is a master of a controlled style rather than of *agudeza*, and this is as true of his burlesque love poetry as of the Petrarchist. As Díez Fernández noted, the burlesque poems depend for their effect on either an overt obscenity, or a clearly implied but unnamed obscenity, or on an ambiguity between the implied obscenity and a non-obscene

meaning. These categories overlap with Valdés' preference for metaphor/comparison and polysemy, but none of Mendoza's erotic poems have the visual and narrative impact of the anonymous poems in, for example, the *Jardín de Venus* collection;⁴³ they are not about Mendoza's erotic experiences or even imagined experiences. In contrast to both the *Jardín* and to Garcilaso, Mendoza's poems defy interpretation, in the sense of reading meaning into them. As Díez Fernández puts it, "los versos de Mendoza, salvo alguna excepción, pasan rápidos bajo la mirada abúlica del paciente lector. Nada resalta, poco es lo personal."⁴⁴

It is important to recall that the inclusion of Juan de Valdés' stylistic prescriptions in the *Diálogo* was motivated by the Italians' question: why had the Spanish not produced writers with the stature of Petrarch and Boccaccio? His response was that this was due to the Spaniard's lack of care, *cuidado*. Care, then, was the necessary ingredient for Spain to produce a literary culture that could impress the Italians, and thus further the forging of an international empire. Whatever his ethical ends, the style that Valdés describes is essentially a social construction, based above all on the cosmopolitan experience and practice of the best courtiers, one that is simple and direct, possessing grace and lacking affectation. Even his emphasis on decorum, a concept that is meaningless outside a public context, reflects the social origins of his theories. As a diplomat, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza was at the heart of that empire creation, and to a remarkable degree his poetry too reflects the principles of empire-making *cuidado*. But ought one expect anything personal in this, the poetry of a consummate diplomat who knew (as we know from his extensive correspondence) the flaws of the empire and how to ignore them? Mendoza's poems are not the private communication of passion, but public expressions of his own sophistication. Valdés gives the reader another way of looking at Mendoza's poetry, and it is remarkable the degree to which Mendoza seems to illustrate Valdés' points. Mendoza's Petrarchan poetry shows the ability to maintain a cultured, careful style, without pedantry or licenses; one that approximates prose and even speech. However, by maintaining stylistic control and balance, Mendoza distances himself from the experience of the lover/subject. (This also occurs in Garcilaso's later poetry, where he too uses different techniques to establish a distance from the lover/subject.) Mendoza's ability to write this kind of poetry, to maintain decorum and display his cosmopolitan appreciation of Catalan, Italian, and Castilian models (and in other poems, Greek and Latin ones as well), not only illustrates Valdés' stylistic precepts, it also helps to constitute the empire by being worthy of it. We can't appreciate Mendoza's poetry if we seek sincerity or authenticity—what Ignacio Díez calls "lo personal." The poems need their own hermeneutic: one

that encompasses the theory of empire, of plain style, of sentiment mediated through form, and of a distancing of the desiring subject from the speaking subject of the verse.

University of California, Berkeley

Notes

1. Juan de Valdés (1490s-1541) was born in Cuenca around the turn of the century. In the 1520s he was part of the heterodox group surrounding the Marquis of Villena; he corresponded with Erasmus; he studied at Alcalá. After his flight from Spain, he was supported in part by his brother Alfonso (1490s-1532), secretary to the Emperor. In spite of his problems with the Inquisition, Valdés lived in Rome as a courtier to Pope Clement VII; he was on his way to see his brother at the imperial coronation in Bologna when the latter died in 1532. Valdés then returned to Rome where he remained until Clement's death in 1534. His status as an imperial agent dictated a subsequent move to Naples, where he served the viceroy while gathering around himself a group of Italian disciples, including the widowed countess of Fondi, Julia Gonzaga, whose adviser he became.
2. Daniel A. Crews, "Juan de Valdés and the Comunero Revolt: An Essay on Spanish Civic Humanism," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991), p. 238.
3. Crews, pp. 233-42; Alfonso de Valdés, *Diálogo de las cosas acaecidas en Roma*, ed. Rosa Navarro Durán (Madrid: Cátedra, 1994), p. 13.
4. Crews, pp. 242-43.
5. Pedro Álvarez de Toledo, son of the second Duke of Alba and uncle of the third, was a friend and protector of the poet Garcilaso de la Vega (c. 1500-1536), who dedicated the first eclogue to him and the third eclogue to his wife María Osorio. Garcilaso, himself a courtier, diplomat, and soldier, was the principal and most admired poet of the Spanish Renaissance.
6. Crews, p. 249.
7. Robert L. Surlés, "Juan de Valdés' *El Diálogo de la Lengua*: The Erasmian Humanism of a Spanish Expatriate," *College Language Association Journal* 35 (1991), pp. 224-35.
8. Juan B. Avalle-Arce, "La estructura del *Diálogo de la lengua*," *Dintorno de una época dorada* (Madrid: José Porrua Turanzos, 1978), pp. 57-72; Ana Vian Herrero, "La mimesis conversacional en el *Diálogo de la lengua* de Juan de Valdés," *Criticón* 40 (1987), pp. 45-79; Lore Terracini, *Lingua come problema nella letteratura spagnola del cinquecento* (Turin: Stampatori, 1979); Thomas R. Hart, "'Diálogo más que tratado': The Art of Juan de Valdés," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 78 (2001), pp. 301-10.
9. On the significance of the interlocutors, see Vian Herrero, pp. 47-72, and Terracini, pp. 7-13.
10. Juan de Valdés, *Diálogo de la lengua*, 6th ed., ed. Cristina Barbolani (Madrid: Cátedra, 1998), p. 119. All quotations of the *Diálogo* are from this edition, and will be cited in the text. All translations unless otherwise noted are my own.
11. "Siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio; y de tal manera lo siguió, que junta mente comenzaron, crecieron y florecieron, y después junta fue la caída de entrambos" (Language was always the companion of empire, and followed it such that together they

- began, together they grew and flourished, and later together they fell). Antonio de Nebrija, *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, ed. Antonio Quilis (Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1981), p. 97.
12. Harald Weinrich, "Das spanische Sprachbewußtsein im Siglo de Oro," *Spanische Literatur im goldenen Zeitalter*, ed. Horst Baader and Erich Loos (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1973), pp. 524–47; Terracini, p. 24.
13. Rita Hamilton, "Juan de Valdés and Some Renaissance Theories of Language," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 30 (1953), pp. 125–33; Angelo Mazzocco, "The Italian Connection in Juan de Valdés' *Diálogo de la Lengua*," *Historiographia Linguistica* 24 (1997), pp. 267–83.
14. "I hold it [the Castilian language] to be inferior, for I see that Italian is illustrated and enriched by a Boccaccio and a Petrarch, who, being good men of letters, not only prided themselves on writing good things, but made sure to write them in a proper and elegant style, and, as you know, no one has ever written in the Castilian language with enough care and attention, so that those who wish to show how they differ from others, or to reform the abuses they found in it, could take advantage of his authority," Valdés, p. 44.
15. Terracini, pp. 17–18.
16. Eugenio Asensio, "Juan de Valdés contra Delicado: fondo de una polémica," *Studia philologica: homenaje ofrecido a Dámaso Alonso*, ed. Alonso Zamora Vicente, vol. 1 (Madrid: Gredos, 1960), pp. 101–13.
17. Amado Alonso, *Castellano, español, idioma nacional: historia espiritual de tres nombres* (Buenos Aires: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, Instituto de Filología, 1938), pp. 74–77; Hart, p. 307.
18. On Castiglione's influence on Spanish literary aesthetics under Charles V, see Ignacio Navarrete, *Orphans of Petrarch: Poetry and Theory in the Spanish Renaissance*, Publications of the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies 25 (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 38–72; and Christine Orobitg, "De la escritura del exceso a la poética del justo medio: otra trayectoria," *Caliope* 10 (2004), pp. 19–54.
19. Terracini, pp. 142–43.
20. Baldassar Castiglione, *Il libro del Cortegiano*, ed and intro. by Amedeo Quondam, notes by Nicola Longo (Milano: Garzanti, 1981), pp. 182–83.
21. See Elias Rivers, "L'humanisme linguistique et poétique dans les lettres espagnoles du seizième siècle," *L'humanisme dans les lettres espagnoles*, ed. Augustin Redondo (Paris: Vrin, 1979), pp. 169–76, who points out that both Valdés and Garcilaso were in Naples at the same time, and connects what he calls the linguistic humanism of Valdés, Garcilaso, El Brocense, and Fray Luís de León, in contrast to the pedantic, encyclopaedic interests of Nebrija, and later, Herrera.
22. Terracini, p. 26.
23. Vian Herrero, pp. 72–75.
24. Santillana (1398–1458) in the mid-fifteenth century wrote the first sonnets in Castilian, in imitation of Petrarch and other Italian poets. However, these had very limited circulation and by the sixteenth century were largely unknown. On the Mendoza family, see Helen Nader, *The Mendoza Family in the Spanish Renaissance: 1350 to 1550* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1979); and, more recently, Inès Rada,

- “Les métaphores du corps dans la poésie de Diego Hurtado de Mendoza,” in *Le corps comme métaphore dans l’Espagne des XVI^e et XVII^e siècles: du corps métaphorique aux métaphores corporelles*, ed. Augustin Redondo (Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, Publications de la Sorbonne, 1992), pp. 275–84.
25. Juan Boscán (c. 1490–1542), friend of Garcilaso and first to publish his poetry (1542), claimed, probably in ignorance of Santillana’s earlier efforts, to be the first to write hendecasyllable sonnets in Castilian.
 26. Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, *Algunas cartas*, ed. Alberto Vazquez and R. Selden Rose, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), pp. 119–20. Translated in Erika Spivakovsky, *Son of the Alhambra: Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza 1504–1575* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1970), p. 216. *Marrano* is a derogatory term for a Christian convert who secretly maintains Jewish practices.
 27. Spivakovsky, p. 184.
 28. Juan Boscán, *Obras poéticas*, ed. Martín de Riquer, Antonio Comas, and Joaquín Molas (Barcelona: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Barcelona, 1957), p. 91.
 29. The “Reprensión” is a satire against those poets who write in the new Italian verse forms instead of traditional Spanish ones. Castillejo (c. 1490–c. 1550), a secretary to the emperor’s brother Ferdinand in his capacity as king of Bohemia, lived in Vienna from 1525 to the end of his life.
 30. Fernando de Herrera (1534–1597), the major Spanish poet of the late sixteenth century, spent his entire life in Seville. In addition to his poetry and other works, he published a massive and encyclopaedic commentary to Garcilaso’s works.
 31. Fernando de Herrera, *Obras de Garci Lasso de la Vega con anotaciones de Fernando de Herrera, Garcilaso de la Vega y sus comentaristas*, 2nd ed., ed. Antonio Gallego Morell (Madrid: Gredos, 1972), p. 314.
 32. “Prete Jacopín” [Juan Fernández de Velasco], “Observaciones del Licenciado Prete Jacopín, vecino de Burgos, en defensa del Príncipe de los Poetas Castellanos Garci-lasso de la Vega, natural de Toledo, contra las Anotaciones de Fernando de Herrera, Poeta Sevillano,” *La controversia sobre las Anotaciones Herrerianas*, ed. Juan Montero (Seville: Servicio de Publicaciones del Excmo. Ayuntamiento de Sevilla, 1987), p. 118.
 33. “Lukewarm in love may I never be, hot or cold while burning all afire; when love drags the brains out of tempo, the bad is not good, and the good is not known. Little does he love, who does not lose his sense and his brains and his patience he leaves behind, and let he who thinks he knows more about love die not of love but of oblivion. Like a ship, that on a dark night under a swift wind runs along a rugged shore, lets the wind carry it out to sea, so I, in danger of suffering, adding more maladies to my woes, in despair seek my fortune”: Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, *Poesía completa*, ed. José Ignacio Díez Fernández (Barcelona: Planeta, 1989), p. 80.
 34. These effects are clearest when the poem is compared to its model, Ausiàs March’s “Ja de amor tébeu jamés no sia!”; see Kathleen McNerney, *The Influence of Ausiàs March on Early Golden Age Castilian Poetry* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1982), pp. 39–40. Ausiàs March (1397–1459) was the best-known of the medieval Catalan poets, admired and praised by Santillana and imitated by Boscán, Garcilaso, and other contemporaries.

35. Robert Archer, *The Pervasive Image: The Role of Analogy in the Poetry of Ausiàs March*, Purdue University Monographs in Romance Languages 17 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1985), pp. 39–48; Patricia Heid, *Rhetoric, Gender, and Narrative in the Comentaríos Reales de los Incas*, Ph.D. diss. (University of California, Berkeley, 1997), pp. 20–36.
36. See Rafael Lapesa, *La trayectoria poética de Garcilaso*, in *Garcilaso: estudios completos*, rev. ed., Bella Bellatrix (Madrid: Istmo, 1985), pp. 9–210.
37. “If only my thinking faculty were dead, and thus I spent my life in the sleep of eternal oblivion, feeling neither pain nor glory, repose nor torment! For it is a sad life when the senses flee from experiencing what they desire; her thoughts are flattering to others, I, mine own enemy, always sense it. With annoying and worrisome gossip it comes upon me, which is worse than what I suffer, and if I feel any pleasure, with its arrival it is gone. Like a mother with a spoiled child who, with tears, asks for something poisonous, while she is so blinded by love, that she gives it to him”: Mendoza, *Poesía completa*, p. 79.
38. Garcilaso de la Vega, *Obra poética y textos en prosa*, ed. Bienvenido Morros, intro. by Rafael Lapesa, Biblioteca Clásica 27 (Barcelona: Crítica, 1995), p. 36.
39. See Spivakovsky, p. 40.
40. “I lifted my eyes, exhausted from weeping, to take their accustomed rest and, as I could no longer see it where I used to, I lowered them again bathed in tears. If ever I found some good in my cares when I held myself happier, having now lost it through my own fault, there is reason for me now to weep twice as much. I spread my sails to happiness without fear of any human impediment, but a storm of change arose as if earth and water and fire and wind sought to punish my confidence; I sigh, burn, and weep and no longer feel”: Mendoza, *Poesía completa*, p. 82.
41. Garcilaso de la Vega, p. 68.
42. Garcilaso de la Vega, pp. 32, 34.
43. Pierre Alzieu, Robert Jammes, and Yvan Lissorgues, ed., “Jardín de Venus,” *Poesía erótica del siglo de oro*, compilation by Pierre Alzieu, Robert Jammes, Yvan Lissorgues (Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1984), pp. 1–64.
44. “Mendoza’s verses, with a few exceptions, pass rapidly by the listless gaze of the patient reader. Nothing stands out, for little of it is personal”; Mendoza, pp. xix–xx.