

Author Accepted Manuscript
Hispanic Research Journal 16.3 (2015)
DOI: 10.1179/1468273715Z.000000000121

Paratextual Subversion: Herrera and his poetry in the *Anotaciones*

PAUL JOSEPH LENNON

University of Exeter, UK

1580 saw the publication of the *Anotaciones a las obras de Garcilaso de la Vega* by the critic and poet Fernando de Herrera (c.1534-1597). This study develops previous scholarship on the paratextual strategies employed by Herrera, especially with regard to the inclusion of his own poetry within the *Anotaciones*. Two Garcilasian sonnets, ‘D’aquella vista pura i ecelente’ (VIII) and ‘Si para refrenar este desseo’ (XII), in conjunction with Herrera’s poetic responses, lie at the heart of this investigation, representing two respectively dominant cultural currents of the period: Neo-Platonism and Classical mythography. It will be shown how Herrera exploits Counterreformation attitudes towards secularity and mythography to engage in a critique that goes deeper than the attacks previously noted by Navarrete’s 1991 study. Indeed, Herrera’s lyric occupies a central role in a complete re-evaluation of Garcilasian lyric that not only moves to subvert the supremacy of the Toledan but also the hegemonic rule of intellectuals from Castile. Herrera presents himself as a learned Andalusian model for Neoplatonic poetics and as *the* model for imitation for Spanish letters in the wake of the Counterreformation.

KEYWORDS: *Anotaciones*, paratext, Herrera, Garcilaso, subversion

Within the *Anotaciones a las obras de Garcilaso de la Vega* (1580) Fernando de Herrera (c.1534-1597) occupies an intermediary role in which he is portrayed, and indeed portrays himself, as closing the distance between Garcilaso's poetry and its appreciation by the reader. This position has garnered critical attention owing to the complex interrelations between his tripartite role as critic, commentator, and poet present throughout the text. In this study, however, I wish to approach Herrera's *Anotaciones* from a paratextual perspective. Previous studies, perhaps none more radical than that of Navarrete (1991), have until now overlooked the impact of Herrera's own poetry as part of the liminal texts in *Anotaciones*. Therefore, it is my intention to consider how the inclusion of poetry within the textual margins, in relation to Herrera's notes and the preface by Medina, shape the reader's experience and perception of Garcilaso's poetic corpus. Two sonnets and their accompanying poetic/paratextual responses will be the focus of study: these are Sonnet VIII and Sonnet XII, as their content is representative of two dominant cultural currents of the period: Neo-Platonism and Classical mythography. The examination of Herrera's poetic interactions with these themes, and with Garcilaso's texts, will offer a revelatory reading of his intention to create a space for himself within Spanish letters alongside that occupied by Garcilaso with the Herrerian poetic texts forecast as the new Spanish model for imitation.

The preface to the *Anotaciones*, penned by Francisco de Medina (1544-1615), engages with the subject of the Spanish language and may be considered to contain 'algunas de la claves fundamentales para entender las *Anotaciones*' (Montero, 1987: 18). In a manner that prefigures Genette's findings on the roles of the paratext (2001: 200), Medina is to be noted for his focus upon not only the intellectual usefulness of Herrera's writings in signalling Garcilaso's perceived oversights, but also the originality of his method: 'nos advirtió de los descuidos en que incurrió moderando esta censura en manera que, sin dexar

ofendida la obra del poeta, nosotros quedásemos desengañados i mejor instruidos' (Herrera, 2001: 200). Atop such claims there is the promise of the novel knowledge contained therein, 'declaró los lugares oscuros que ai en él; descubrió las minas de donde sacó las joyas más preciosas con que enriqueció sus obras; mostró el artificio i composición maravillosa de sus versos' (Herrera, 2001: 200), which acts as a form of *captatio benevolentiae* for the reader.

The image of literary mines with their precious jewels suggests to the reader the discovery of hidden elements within the Garcilasian text. Although Medina's understanding may prove superficial and reductive to a modern reader it is important to note that the uncovering of quasi-obscured, imitated sources that underpinned the greatest Spanish poet of the time would have been of immense interest, as well as the fact that imitated sources informed contemporary theories of composition that were in themselves based upon classical precedents (Pigman, 1980: 26). Herrera is perceived as solving a 'puzzle' via his delineation of imitated sources and that upon completion of such the critic has 'nothing left [...] to do but congratulate himself' (Iser, 1978: 4). Therefore, the portrayal of Herrera as a miner of Garcilaso could be interpreted as a hollowing out of the Toledan poet's Italianate poetic corpus to lay bare its inner workings, which within the contemporary literary environment would have earned praise for Herrera's intellect. Such a view runs contrary to Almeida's belief that Herrera never intended to 'agotar la poesía' in his mining venture (1976: 113), although Almeida's opinion fails to consider the prestige available to Herrera from the exploitation of Garcilaso's lyric.

In accordance with the contemporary practice of not highlighting one's own talent, this role was often offered to a noble of standing through the insertion of a preface to act as an intermediary and to admonish potential critics (García Aguilar, 2009: 160). This is perhaps best exemplified by Medina's mention of the rise of letters in Andalucía, the region from

which Herrera hailed: ‘Concedo también aver criado en poco años l’Andaluzía cuatro o cinco escritores mui esclarecidos por las grandes obras que compusieron’; however, he is clear that these works are defective due to their authors perhaps lacking ‘l’arte de bien dezir’ (Herrera, 2001: 190). Medina does not mention Herrera explicitly in this case; rather he later furnishes the reader with a detailed description of Herrera’s education to distance him from these authors before his declaration that ‘es suya propria la eloquencia de nuestra lengua’ (Herrera, 2001: 198). This has led García Puertas (1955: 60-61) to view such sentiment as a chiding of certain Castilian nobles for their pretensions; however, Navarrete (1991: 22) makes a convincing argument for the *Anotaciones* as an attack upon the perceived hegemony of the Castilian court more generally.

Along with Navarrete, I propose that the eulogy of the Herrenian text certainly invites such a biased reading. This bias invites a view of Herrera whereby he creates a space for himself to aid his elevation to a more prominent role (Navarrete, 1994: 142) despite the perceived domination of poets from Castile (Montero, 1997: 103). Indeed, the ambitious nature of the Sevillian intellectual circle to which he belonged, as well as his seclusion away from the court has been noted previously (Middlebrook, 2009: 141). Therefore the preface, with its acknowledgement of Herrera’s deep understanding of the art of composition, acts in conjunction with Herrera’s inclusion of his own poetry within the critical prose to present an image whereby he not only works to ennoble further the Spanish tongue via Garcilaso (López Bueno, 1987: 53) but all the while he safeguards it from the corruption of those less learned. He is to be viewed as *the* literary model for Spanish lyric, a fact made clear in Medina’s most explicit remark on the place of Herrera within Spanish letters: ‘si después de Garci Lasso pusiere a Fernando de Herrera en el segundo lugar, pues si su modestia no lo rehusara, no sé si devíamos dalle el primero’ (Herrera, 2001: 198). According to Medina, it is only the

modesty of the critic-poet that will save the reader from dethroning Garcilaso after reading the weighty tome they hold in their hands.¹

Herrera's editorial notes, which come to frame his lyric, may be considered to draw the reader to another textual periphery. Genette recognised them as paratext and acknowledges their optional status for the reader (2001: 324). It is probable that the reader in this case would have selected or borrowed the text over the previously available annotated editions of Garcilaso's poetry. This has led to a presumed educated reader with an interest in the field, as well as possibility that some read it for the novelty of the premise (Pepe & Reyes, 2001: 33). It is clear that an educated reader, or one engaged in the study of language, would be attracted to the text; however, the depth of critical analysis and the scholarly tone negate the argument for a casual readership (Montero, 1987: 18). Indeed, the frequent and extended explanations of myth may have been intended for those scholars less familiar with Greco-Roman sources rather than to solicit general consumption of the text. Once again, the reader is drawn from Garcilaso's poetry to the profusion of notes thereby increasing the reader's interaction with the paratext that shifts focus to Herrera's scholarship, linguistic ability, and his role within Spanish letters more generally. Herrera's notes are at times made even more accessible via the inclusion of Spanish language renderings of variable quality supposedly based upon original sources (Morros, 1997: 57). Indeed, Genette contends that the critical commentator often exceeds his role to the detriment of the underlying text (2001: 337), which may be what we witness in *Anotaciones*.

Such a view, however, has been contested with critics arguing that the notes contribute positively to interpretations of Garcilaso's poetic corpus (see Montero, 1987: 18;

¹ This is very similar to the strategy of the editors of Herrera's poetry in 1619 when they attempted to impose his corpus as a model superior to that of Góngora. On this, see Micó, 1997.

Almeida, 1976: 88). In the light of these views it is fair to say that the aforementioned critics are not incorrect in their assumption that *singularly* the annotations written by Herrera may be of value. Rather, it is their instructive, partisan manner (Almeida, 1976: 34), which in turn highlights presumed errors on the part of Garcilaso (Pepe & Reyes, 2001: 39) that then destabilizes Garcilaso's position as Spanish poetic paradigm and makes space for Herrera's lyric (Middlebrook, 2009: 139). Furthermore, the sheer volume and cumulative force of the notes (Navarrete, 1991: 25), which evidence Garcilaso's reliance upon imitation and aid in the comprehension of the poems (Núñez Rivera, 1997: 120), not only once more showcase Herrera's learned status (Almeida, 1976: 114) but also widen the field in which Garcilaso's poetry is considered. Thus the Herrerian paratext as a form of canonisation comes to take on a subversive quality (Navarrete, 1991: 21), whereby the apprenticeship associated with such profuse imitation of minor contemporary poets forces Garcilaso 'to compete in a broader canon' (Navarrete, 1991: 24-25) that unsettles his position as figurehead of Spanish letters and contributes to the space sought by Herrera. It is within this carefully crafted intellectual landscape that Herrera places his poems.

The inclusion of Herrera's own poetry, alongside the continued campaign to dislodge Garcilaso from prime position as poetic paradigm, must also form the subject of any paratextual study. A concerted effort has been made by both Herrera and Medina to achieve two distinct but complementary results: the heralding of Herrera as a learned model ripe for imitation within Spanish letters, and the critique of Garcilaso's canon via the insinuation that his poetry lies within a wide field of contemporary imitation. This did not go unnoticed by the nobles of Castile and a response to Herrera came in the form of the pseudonymous *Observaciones del Licenciado Prete Jacopín*. This invective epistle, most likely written by Juan Fernández de Velasco (1550-1613), Constable of Castile, lambasts Herrera for the

pervasive ‘Andalusianism’ that affects his exegesis of Garcilaso’s poetry (Bianchini, 1978: 223). For example, there is the framing of Garcilaso within a wider cannon populated by Andalusian poets and friends of Herrera, which serves simultaneously to elevate minor names while weakening that of Garcilaso (Navarrete, 1994: 144). Furthermore, although Jacopín never proposes a linguistic code to protect Garcilaso’s use of language (Morros, 1998: 287), he does attack Herrera’s for chiding Garcilaso’s use of Italianate style and neologisms. Herrera, claims Jacopín, employed similar techniques in his *Relación de la guerra de Chipre* (1572) (Morros, 1998: 288) and thus is hypocritical in his judgement of Garcilaso. The *Observaciones* are then met with the *Respuesta* (1586), a heated defence of the *Anotaciones* punctuated by vituperous comments on the nobles and intellectuals of Castile: ‘Porque no se puede sufrir, que la envidia Castellana [...] quiera dar a entender, sabiendo todos lo contrario, que no ái cosa buena en toda la grandeza de España, sino en el Reino de Castilla. Que piensen esto los inorantes i el vulgo, que siempre fue necio; i que calunien i vituperen las obras de todos los que no son Castellanos’ (Montero, 1987: 190). This response comes too late as the polemic had already died down (Morros, 1998: 300), but it ensures that there is no doubt with regard to the attack on the perceived hegemony of Castile.²

Much like the more familiar critical notes included by Herrera, the poems that he includes also act as paratextual notes by virtue of their clear relationship with a ‘definitive segment of text’, the particular poem by Garcilaso, and their ‘local character’ (Genette, 2001: 319), which could be in relation to a particular theme or rhetorical device within the poem Herrera interprets or wishes to comment upon. Therefore, in order better to understand how Herrera’s inclusion of his own poetry, alongside his critical commentary, resulted in such a

² For a fuller account of Prete Jacopín’s *Observaciones* and the *Respuesta* that followed, see Alatorre, 1963; Bianchini, 1978; Montero, 1987; Morros, 1998.

heated response from Castile, I will first give consideration to Garcilaso's Sonnet VIII and Herrera's accompanying response.

D'aquella vista pura i ecelente salen espirtus vivos i encendidos, i siendo por mis ojos recibidos, me passan hasta donde'l mal se siente.		Cuando en vos pienso, en alta fantasía m'arrebato i, ausente, me presento; i crece, contemplánd'os, mi alegría donde vuestra belleza represento;	
Encuéntrans'al camino fácilmente con los mios, que de tal calor movidos salen fuera de mí como perdidos, llamados d'aquel bien qu'está presente.	5	las partes con que siente l'alma mía, 5 enlazada en mortal ayuntamiento, i recibe'n figuras conocidas al sentido las cosas ofrecidas.	
Ausente, 'n la memoria la imagino; mis espirtus, pensando que la vían, se mueven i s'encienden sin medida;	10	Aunqu'en honda tiniebla sepultado i estó en grave silencio i ascondido, casi en perpetua vela del cuidado se m'adormecen, i en el bien crecido d'esta memoria con amor formado se vencen, i allí todo suspendido el espíritu os halla, i tanto veo	10 15
mas no hallando fácil el camino, que los suyos entrando derretían, rebientan por salir do no ai salida.		cuanto pide'l Amor i mi desseo.	

Garcilaso de la Vega (Herrera, 2001:
333)

Fernando de Herrera (2001: 336-37)

The majority of Herrera's notes on this text revolve around the Neoplatonic reception of spirits by the eyes, which a philosophic reading of Garcilaso's lyric suggests: 'Es el espíritu, que el griego llama ἄηρ, un cuerpo sutil causado i producido de la más delgada i tenue i apurada parte de la sangre del corazón' (Herrera, 2001: 334). This is further made clear via his reference to Plato as 'príncipe de los filósofos' (2001: 335) in his explanation of the receipt of the spirits by the eyes of the lyric voice. Herrera's exposition bears a striking resemblance to the description of these spirits in Boscán's 1534 translation of Castiglione's *Il cortegiano* (1528): 'Y envían fuera por los ojos aquellos espíritus, que son unos delgadísimos vapores hechos de la más pura y clara parte de la sangre que se halle en nuestro cuerpo, los cuales reciben en sí luego la imagen de la hermosura' (Castiglione, 2008: 500). Indeed, Castiglione's influence on Herrera's Neo-Platonism has been acknowledged by Vázquez (1983: 44), and the similarities shared by the descriptions in terms of the physical depiction of the spirits further strengthen this link. Herrera's Neoplatonic interpretation is then couched within an extended note on line three that also incorporates Plutarch and Plotinus in an effort to add weight to his reasoning in the eyes of the reader. However, such an interpretation could be considered misleading when the second line, with its use of the ambivalent adjective 'encendidos', is then integrated as part of the 'caldísima' gaze that 'atrae a sí con herviente espíritu los traspasamientos o trasmigraciones de los amores' (2001: 335). Indeed, Herrera's interpretation appears to negate the ambivalence attached to the explanation given in Plato's *Phaedrus* [251a]:

Whenever he sees a godlike face or some form of body which imitates beauty well, first shudders, feeling something of the fears he had before, then reveres what he sees like a god as he gazes at it and, if he were not afraid of appearing

thoroughly mad, would sacrifice to his beloved as if to a statue of a god. (Plato, 2005: 21)

The idea of an attraction based in part upon the physical is intimated by the corporeal imitation of beauty by the beloved in this passage. Therefore Herrera is seen to mute the quasi-sensual image of the excited Garcilasian spirits in favour of a somewhat reductive contemporary philosophical response that renders Garcilaso's approach more easily classifiable as a commonly recognised trope. This would appear to suggest that Herrera pre-empted the growing application of Christian allegory to silence incongruous sensual elements through their attribution to a purely spiritual role or source (Kluge, 2010: 54). This sanitized approach may serve to explain Heiple's labelling of Sonnet VIII as 'fully Neoplatonic' (1994: 238); however, more recent readings of Garcilaso's lyric, such as Llosa Sanz (2009), have revealed aspects of sensuality within his lyric.

Herrera's paratextual skewing extends to description of Garcilaso's spirits, which appear to mirror the same excited state as those of his beloved, as noted by the use of 'calor' in line six. This idea of heat is followed by a description whereby 'se mueven y se encienden sin medida' (l. 12) upon her presence whether physically or in his imagination. It is interesting to note how the poetic *yo* has displaced his desire onto the spirits that emanate from him without any express acknowledgement that they also form part of him; the lover is portrayed as helpless. Such an image then feeds into the chaotic effect induced by their unbridled, vital movement that fails to be captured or explained in the accompanying notes. The disordered state appears to stem from the exiting but overwhelming experience, 'salen fuera de mí como perdidos' (l. 7), which was common to Neoplatonic/Petrarchan tradition. However, it is worthy of note that the originality of Garcilaso's approach to the spirits

continues into the tercets where the poetic voice captures their fateful end and the anguish that accompanies it: ‘mas no hallando fácil el camino, / que los suyos entrando derretían, / rebientan por salir do no ai salida’ (ll. 12-14). With no resolution to his torment, now that the beloved is no longer present, the spirits ‘revientan’. Herrera understood this in his notes as the act of ‘Rompiendo en lágrimas o en suspiros’ (Herrera, 2001: 339). The possible foreshadowing of the use of hydropic imagery in Quevedo’s sonnet, ‘Bebe el ardor hidrópica mi vida’ (Quevedo, 1981: 261), builds upon the previous passionate image of the spirits as unbridled through its suggestion of tempestuous trapped excess with no route for escape. This very physical expression of desire for the female beloved is not subject to elucidation beyond an attribution to a rather short citation from Virgil: ‘nec se iam capit unda’ (Herrera, 2001: 339). Herrera’s approach in this case does not extend to an explanation of the image from the bisected line, nor does he offer a Spanish translation to facilitate the reader’s comprehension of the original: ‘nec iam se capit unda, volat vapor ater ad auras.’ [and now the wave contains itself no longer, and the black smoke soars aloft] [VII, 466] (Virgil, 2002: 34-35). A relationship between Garcilaso’s hydropic imagery and Virgil is clear upon consideration of the full line: the liquid boils over before turning to steam. However, Herrera fails to explain this to his reader or provides only a partial citation of the original Latin lyric. This image, which is partly echoed in Boscán’s translation of Castiglione, captures the uncontainable physical nature of the sentiment felt by the poetic voice, which clearly violates his adherence to the Neoplatonic approach attributed to Herrera (Sigel, 2007: 41-42) and thus partly explains the opacity of this annotation in order to maintain the overarching moral code applied by Herrera.

Herrera’s poem, in contrast to that of Garcilaso, suggests a different end to the commotion described: ‘se vencen, i allí todo suspendido / el espíritu os halla, i tanto veo /

cuanto pide'l Amor i mi desseo' (ll. 14-16). Here the spirits triumph in a tableau that sees them successfully exit the eyes of the male and wind their way to the female beloved. However, it is key to acknowledge that Herrera's lyric alters the parameters established in the Garcilasian text through a pre-emption of sight by the poetic *yo* who envisages the beloved via the imagination. This is demonstrated in the employment of 'en alta fantasía' and 'donde vuestra belleza represento' in the first octave. The beloved in Herrera's poem is sculpted through love and fire and is enduring unlike lesser sense impressions: 'mas las imágenes de los que aman, esculpidas en ella [la memoria] como inustiones hechas con fuego, dexan impressas en la memoria formas que se mueven i vienen i hablan i permanecen en otro tiempo' (Herrera, 2001: 336). Such an act of creation excludes more inclusive approaches to Neo-Platonism like that set forth by Nifo in *De amore* (1531), which suggests that one should embrace input from all the senses to perceive beauty in the imagination: 'ya que el amor debe ser deseo de disfrutar de belleza por tantos sentidos cuantos transmiten a la facultad imaginativa la imagen de lo bello' (Nifo, 1990: 189). Instead, Herrera's use of Plutarch's *Amatorius* [IX: 759c.] (Plutarch, 1961: 367) allows him to incorporate the desirous connotations of the heat and energy of the spirits, 'vivos y encendidos', and construe them as facets of the contemplative focus of the mind upon the female beloved free from the impact of any immediate physical presence. Thus the ambivalence of Garcilaso's lyric voice is forcefully resolved for the reader by Herrera's decision to privilege the mind's eye over any sense impression gleaned from the physical realm, which Garrote Pérez envisaged as his prizing of the soul as 'más bella que la física' (1997: 23). Indeed, Montori de Gutiérrez holds that Herrera sublimates physical beauty into spiritual beauty (1977: 80), which is in

accordance with contemporary Neoplatonic thought and the re-emergent emphasis on Christian allegory that formed part of the Counterreformation (Kluge, 2010: 19).³

Garcilaso's sonnet would appear to suggest that the lyric voice is thwarted in its attempt exclusively to contemplate the spiritual beauty of his beloved, thus negating its chances of transcendence. The poem lacks hope and concludes with a focus on the perceived facet that 'no ai salida'. Yet upon exposure to the accompanying notes and Herrera's poem, the reader is subjected to interpretations, like that of Aristotle, which explain that the imagination permits contemplation of the sensory simulacra by the soul:

Como piensa Aristóteles, es imaginación de aquellas cosas que avía hallado el sentido, como simulacro de aquéllas, de quien nació la imaginación; o es una fuerza o afeción del sentido común con la cual miramos en el ánimo, como si estuviéssse presentes (Herrera, 2001: 338).

When considered in conjunction with the sense of victory intimated in Herrera's poem, 'se vencen', it is not only the ambivalent interplay between the spiritual signification, as well as that of being overcome physically that is stripped away, but also the sense of frustration and hopelessness that characterises the poetic voice. The potential for transcendence is distilled throughout the paratext that accompanies Sonnet VIII and sculpts the imagination of the reader to dismantle the complexities of Garcilaso's text in favour of the poetic and quasi-encyclopaedic accompaniment (Vilanova, 1953: 575), reinforced not only by Medina's praise of Herrera's learned nature but also the rhetorical force of the classical sources cited. Thus, both Sonnet VIII and the accompanying paratextual response are shaped by Herrera to

³ This does not alter the fact that Herrera included more noticeably sensual poems in *Algunas obras* (1582); see Ruiz Pérez, 1997.

embody the contemporary current that sublimated incongruous elements, such as sensuality, in favour of Christian allegory and its accompanying message of morality.⁴

Another dominant trend in Renaissance lyric that became subject to re-evaluation was Greco-Roman mythology. Christian allegory had been superimposed upon classical mythology since the Middle Ages (Kluge, 2010: 98) and it is under the auspices of this re-emerging trend that I wish to consider Garcilaso's Sonnet XII on the joint subjects of Icarus and Phaeton and Herrera's accompanying paratextual contributions:

Si para refrenar este desseo	Dichoso fue'l ardor, dichoso el buelo
loco, impossible, vano, temeroso,	con que, desamparado de la vida,
i guarecer d'un mal tan peligroso,	dio nombre a su memoria esclarecida
qu'es darm'a entender yo lo que no creo,	Ícaro en el salado i hondo suelo.
no me aprovecha verme cual me veo, 5	I quien el rayo derribó del cielo, 5
o mui aventurado o mui medroso,	culpa de la carrera mal regida,
en tanta confusión que nunca oso	que Lampecie, llorosa y afligida,
fiar el mal de mí, que lo poseo,	lamenta en el hojoso i duro velo.
¿qué m'á d'aprovechar ver la pintura	Pues de uno i otro eterna es la osadía
d'aquel que con las alas derretidas, 10	i el generoso intento, qu'a la muerte 10
cayendo, fama i nombre al mar á dado,	negaron el valor de sus despojos.
i la del que su fuego i su locura	Yo más dichoso en la fortuna mía,
llora entre aquellas plantas conocidas,	pues al cielo llegué con nueva suerte,
apenas en el agua resfriado?	i ardí vivo en la luz de vuestros ojos.

⁴ On the idea of self-restraint as a virtue in Herrera's poetry and its role in the perception of nobility within the Hapsburg political regime, see Middlebrook, 2009.

Garcilaso de la Vega (Herrera, 2001: 355) Fernando de Herrera (2001: 364)

Garcilaso's knowledge of myth was most likely gleaned from non-Spanish language texts (Turner, 1976: 49). Given his experiences with the academy in Naples (Chinchilla, 2001: 65-82), it would appear that he engaged directly with the source texts or early Italian translations. Turner holds that these myths entered the Hispanic canon via translated manuals and that synthesis of Icarus and Phaeton into one myth was a side-effect of the literary focus upon their shared key image of flight toward the sun as a figure for transcendence through love (1976: 27), which with time produced a tangential focus upon the failure suffered as an artistic *caveat*. Additionally, there appeared poor translations into Spanish that altered imagery such that Icarus' wings were presented inaccurately burning rather than melting (Turner, 1976: 52). These details would suggest, with regard to Garcilaso's careful handling of the Icarus myth via the image of the wings as 'derretidas' in line ten, that he did indeed make use of unadulterated source material on the myth.

This attention to detail is thrown into sharp relief by Herrera's handling of the text. Although the critic did not fall prey to the synthesis of the two myths, for he includes a separate sonnet based solely upon the Phaeton myth (2001: 363), he does invoke an image of burning in relation to Icarus twice: 'Dichoso fue'l *ardor*, dichoso el buelo' (l. 1) and 'Yo más dichoso en la fortuna mía, / pues al cielo llegué con nueva suerte, / i *ardí* vivo en la luz de vuestros ojos' (ll. 12-14) [My italics]. Such a subtle deviation resultant from the corrupt Spanish adoption of the myths may not have been singled out by a Spanish reader of Herrera's text; however, it does raise doubts as to whether it is attributable to the questionable quality of the glosses often cited within the critical notes, or if the moralizing

focus reigned supreme and could therefore be linked to Herrera's use of contemporary glosses that fit with his intention for the *Anotaciones* over their accurate representation of original source texts.

Garcilaso's sonnet begins with a hypothesis signalled through the use of *si*, which immediately confers on the text a contemplative tone: 'Si para refrenar este deseo / loco, imposible, vano, temeroso' (ll. 1-2). The reader is invited to reflect upon the unflattering description of desire that currently affects the lyric voice owing to the caesurae within the opening lines. The move from contemplation to self-examination in the second quatrain, 'no me aprovecha verme cual me veo', appears fraught since the poetic *yo* finds himself occupying a dialectical position between 'atrevido' and 'medroso'. This perhaps illustrates the effect his beloved has upon him (*medroso*), as well as the desire to love he exhibits as a consequence (*atrevido*); a paradox that means that any construction of the self proves impossible for the lyric voice. The resultant inability to 'fiar el mal', as well as the mention of 'tanta confusión', suggests that the *mal* experienced is his own desire tainted by a perceived negativity linked to the jeopardy it may occasion for him, as per line three. We might imagine an overpowering physical desire or an urge to breach courtly convention. There is lack of coherence of the self, the lyric voice cannot define its state or decide upon action that would lead to resolution.

Anne Cruz notes how a shift by the lyric voice to contemplate Icarus closes the distance between the unstable poetic *yo* and the mythical escapee (1988: 80). Thus mythology serves as an anchor and method of self-realisation for the lyric voice; it becomes an allegorical embodiment of his own struggle. In his quest for resolution, he questions what he can learn from the story, for 'pintura' is also defined as 'la historia, porque la poesía es pintura que habla' in Herrera's notes (2001: 360). Ultimately, the poet performs a cost-

benefit analysis and finds that the eternal fame granted as a result of his transgression, the attempted attainment of the beloved, outweighs the fated ruinous retribution. This led Turner to consider the sonnet as a sign of defiance (1976: 55); indeed, the poetic *yo* acts upon his feelings and in doing so subverts a classical *caveat* by converting it into an *exemplum* and adding his own sacrifice to the tradition to move toward the establishment of a new trope: a trope of defiance.

Before the inclusion of his own poem on the Icarus and Phaeton myths, Herrera notes how Garcilaso's use of 'sinafelas' in the first quatrain is conducive to 'oración blanda i delicada'; however, it is clear that one cannot rely upon this to make a work great (2001: 355). Thus, before we encounter Herrera's own version of the poetic subject, in accordance with the presumed intention of the *Anotaciones*, he has demonstrated his learning and delineated a rhetorical feature of Garcilaso that is subsequently downplayed. Indeed, Herrera implies to his reader that Garcilaso relies excessively on elision, which weakens the sonnet and suggests Herrera would avoid such overuse of rhetorical features if he were the accepted model for Spanish letters. Indeed, the wording of such comments becomes more blunt over the course of his notes on this particular poem, which appears to fit with a previously noted preoccupation to highlight perceived errors in Garcilaso rather than to herald the excellence of his Italianate models (Estévez Molinero, 1997: 138): 'es demasiado común a los italianos, que no cansan en el contino trato i repetición d'ellos', 'son mui frecuentes a los poetas, que se sirven d'ellos', and 'Porque no ai alguno tan inorante que no conosca que la *nieve es blanca, el sol dorado, la luna argentada*' (2001: 356). Despite these comments supposedly focusing on Italian poetics, Herrera frequently recognises Garcilaso as an imitator of Italian sources and styles (Vázquez, 1983: 32). These comments surreptitiously gnaw at the reader's appreciation of the Garcilasian text, insofar as they function to position Garcilaso

within a newly broadened canon of writers, which ultimately strengthens Herrera's claim to serve as the Spanish poetic model.

Herrera's poem again differs in tone from that of Garcilaso. Despite the deaths of the mythical figures, Icarus is portrayed as happy to have attempted his transgressive flight in the first quatrain before the periphrastic opening of the second, 'I quien el rayo derribó', applies this sentiment to Phaeton too. This happiness may be linked to the theme of *osadía* that permeates Herrera's lyric (Ruiz Pérez, 1996/1997: 68). In light of the Neoplatonic sentiment attributed to Herrera's poetry on this subject (López Bueno, 1987: 51) this is unsurprising: they are deemed happy to have died in their attempts to reach their allegorical beloved. This tact would appear to pre-empt the subversion of the *caveat* in Garcilaso's version through its tacit insinuation to the reader that the myths were to serve as *exempla* from the beginning. The hopelessness and confusion of Garcilaso's lyric voice now seems out of place and its originality as part of the Spanish canon is eroded further to be replaced with the Herrerian model.

Despite the happiness of the ill-fated secular characters, Herrera's poetic voice further subverts Garcilaso's text since it does not envisage its fate as tied to either of the myths considered: 'Yo más dichoso en la fortuna mía, pues al cielo llegué con nueva suerte'. The success in his Christian venture is expressed through a play on 'vivo' in the closing line: 'i ardí vivo en la luz de vuestros ojos'. The poetic *yo* employs the word to signal not only the brightness of the flame with which he burns, a reflection of the 'luz' of the beloved's eyes that he has finally reached, but also the symbolic role of the sun as representative of his undying union with God. The same fate that befell the heathen Icarus and Phaeton has not claimed him and so he is not required to rely upon the solace offered by an enduring memory of the act as in Garcilaso's case. Indeed, the solace is devalued through a careful play upon

imagery of light within the poem. The memories are described as lesser sources of light when compared to the radiance of the sun proper: Icarus' memory is 'esclarecida' and a relatively unknown daughter of Apollo mourns the loss of her brother Phaeton. In a manner Kluge would hold as emblematic of 'Counterreformation re-moralization' (2010: 102), it is suggested that the lover is both Christian and contemplative in his desire to possess the beloved rather than reactionary, like the more savage secular figures. Therefore, although the mythological models might serve as *exempla*, the Christian lover has the capacity to avoid the fate of the 'carrera mal regida'.

It is thus that Herrera's indictment of the Garcilasian text can be shown to extend beyond linguistic criticism of the model to the moral content therein. The uncertainty of Garcilaso's poetic *yo* has been replaced by the indefatigable striving of a lyric voice that abides by the Neoplatonic contemplative approach to the beloved and is rewarded for such dedication. The reader is left with the perception of the success of Herrera's lyric voice with its eternal life shared with the female beloved, as well as the suggested superiority of his poetic model in comparison to the critiqued sonnet of Garcilaso. This is further made clear through the clever play on sources of light in Herrera's poem that ultimately frame the Garcilasian text as not only less successful in its role as a model for imitation in the field of Spanish letters but also in its comprehension and application of contemporary philosophical and religious tracts that came to form Neo-Platonism and part of the sanitized Petrarchism adopted by Spain. The Herrerian poem has accomplished its agenda.

In conclusion, it is clear that insertion of Herrera's own poetry was not simply a matter of vanity for the Andalusian critic. Indeed, from Medina's laudatory preface to the concerted silencing of El Brocense's contributions (Montero, 1997: 92), the *Anotaciones* would appear to have been carefully crafted ultimately to dislodge Garcilaso and permit the

elevation of Herrera from the role of an imitating author to that of an imitable model within contemporary Spanish letters. The reader is met with a barrage of notes, often unrelated to the exposition of Garcilaso's poetry and sometimes erroneous, that showcase a wide knowledge of poetics that makes Herrera deserving of such a position within what has been a field dominated by intellectuals from Castile.

Frequent criticism of quasi-secular Italian models and their use of rhetorical and poetic devices, and thus by implication the imitated Italianate models of Garcilaso, work to erode the reader's confidence in his handling of these models and his originality more generally. However, as has been demonstrated, we must move beyond this and note that it is Herrera's poetry that ultimately clinches this attack upon Garcilaso. These liminal texts are construed as templates: 'corrected' Christian models ripe for imitation in the wake of Counterreformation Spain that capitalise upon the moralizing trend of the era to reinforce his role as the basis for Spanish poetics above and beyond the influence of those intellectuals from Castile. Indeed, the poems clearly put forth a strict Neoplatonic agenda that rewrites, subsumes and derides incongruous elements of secular love and mythology to create a uniform and wholly acceptable Christian Counterreformation model for contemplation by the *literati* of the era. It implicitly 'resolves' many of the inherent tensions and moments of ambivalence underlying Garcilaso's use of language within his lyric; therefore, the often complex, darker moments of startling originality within the Garcilasian lyric are hijacked and subject to paratextual contortion by Herrera's 'improved' models owing to his exploitation of Counterreformation literary trends.

Bibliography

- Alatorre, A. 1963. Garcilaso, Herrera, Prete Jacopín y Don Tomás Tamayo de Vargas.
Modern Language Notes, 78(2): 126-51.
- Almeida, J. 1976. *La crítica literaria de Fernando de Herrera*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Bianchini, A. 1978. Herrera and Prete Jacopín: The Consequences of the Controversy.
Hispanic Review, 46(2): 221-34.
- Castiglione, B. 2008. *El cortesano*, trans. by J. Boscán. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Chinchilla, R. H. 2001. Garcilaso de la Vega, Catullus and the Academy in Naples. *Calíope*,
16(2): 46-65.
- Cruz, A. J. 1988. *Imitación y transformación: El petrarquismo en la poesía de Boscán y Garcilaso de la Vega*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamin Publishing.
- Estévez Molinero, A. 1997. Los descuidos de Garcilaso en la perspectiva crítica de Herrera
(con algunas notas sobre las 'necedades' en las *Anotaciones*. In: B. López Bueno, ed.
Las 'Anotaciones' de Fernando de Herrera. Doce estudios. Sevilla: Universidad de
Sevilla, pp. 135-56.
- García Aguilar, I. 2009. *Poesía y edición en el Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Calambur.
- García Puertas, M. 1955. *Humanidad y humanismo de Fernando de Herrera, el divino*.
Montevideo: [n.p.].
- Garrote Pérez, F. 1997. La belleza del retrato en Herrera. *Ínsula*, 610: 21-23.
- Genette, G. 2001. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. by J. E. Lewin. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- Heiple, D. L. 1994. *Garcilaso de la Vega and the Italian Renaissance*. Pennsylvania:
Pennsylvania State University Press.

Author Accepted Manuscript

Hispanic Research Journal 16.3 (2015)

DOI: 10.1179/1468273715Z.000000000121

Herrera, F. de. 2001. *Anotaciones a la poesía de Garcilaso*, eds. I. Pepe y J. M. Reyes.

Madrid: Cátedra.

Iser, W. 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. London: Routledge &

Keegan Paul.

Kluge, S. 2010. *Baroque, Allegory, Comedia: The Transformation of Tragedy in*

Seventeenth-Century Spain. Kassel: Edition Reichenberger.

Llosa Sanz, Á. 2009. El tacto invisible. Relectura erótica del soneto VIII de Garcilaso: del

eros fantástico a la fantasía erótica. *Hispanic Review*, 77(4): 413-25.

López Bueno, B. 1987. *La poética cultista de Herrera a Góngora: Estudios sobre la poesía*

barroca andaluza. Sevilla: Alfar.

Micó, J. M. 1997. Proyección de las *Anotaciones* en las polémicas gongorinas. In: B. López

Bueno, ed. *Las 'Anotaciones' de Fernando de Herrera. Doce estudios*. Sevilla:

Universidad de Sevilla, pp. 263-78.

Middlebrook, L. 2009. *Imperial Lyric: New Poetry and New Subjects in Early Modern Spain*.

University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Montero, J. 1987. *La controversia sobre las anotaciones herrerianas*. Sevilla: Ayuntamiento

de Sevilla.

Montero, J. 1997. *Las Anotaciones*, del texto al lector. In: B. López Bueno, ed. *Las*

'Anotaciones' de Fernando de Herrera. Doce estudios. Sevilla: Universidad de

Sevilla, pp. 91-106.

Montori de Gutiérrez, V. 1977. *Ideas estéticas y poesía de Fernando de Herrera*. Miami:

Ediciones Universal.

Morros, B. 1997. Las fuentes y su uso en las *Anotaciones a Garcilaso*. In: B. López Bueno,

ed. *Las 'Anotaciones' de Fernando de Herrera. Doce estudios*. Sevilla: Universidad

de Sevilla, pp. 37-90.

- Morros, B. 1998. *Las polémicas literarias en la España del siglo XVI: a propósito de Fernando de Herrera y Garcilaso de la Vega*. Barcelona: Quaderns Crema.
- Navarrete, I. 1991. Decentering Garcilaso: Herrera's Attack on the Canon. *PMLA*, 106(1): 21-33.
- Navarrete, I. 1994. *Orphans of Petrarch. Poetry and Theory in the Spanish Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nifo, A. 1990. *Sobre la belleza y el amor*, trans. by F. Socas. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- Núñez Rivera, J. V. 1997. Garcilaso según Herrera. Aspectos de crítica textual en las *Anotaciones*. In: B. López Bueno, ed. *Las 'Anotaciones' de Fernando de Herrera. Doce estudios*. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, pp. 107-34.
- Pepe, I & Reyes, J. M. 2001. Introducción. In: I. Pepe and J. M. Reyes, eds. *Fernando de Herrera, Anotaciones a la poesía de Garcilaso*. Madrid: Cátedra, pp. 15-85.
- Pigman, G. W. 1980. Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance. *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33: 1-32.
- Plato. 2005. *Phaedrus*, trans. by C. Rowe. London: Penguin.
- Plutarch. 1961. *Plutarch's Moralia in Fifteen Volumes: IX 697c-771e*, trans. by E. L. Minar Jr., F. H. Sandback, and W. C. Helmbold. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Quevedo, F. de. 1981. *Poesía varia*, ed. J. O. Crosby. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Ruiz Pérez, P. 1996/1997. La lírica de Herrera: mito y circunstancia. *Glosa*, 7-8: 49-71.
- Ruiz Pérez, P. 1997. Mitología del ascenso en los sonetos herrerianos. *Ínsula*, 610: 6-9.
- Sigel, S. 2007. *The Baroque Poetry of Fernando de Herrera, 1534-1597. Decoro in the Spanish Poetry of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Turner, J. H. 1976. *The Myth of Icarus in Spanish Renaissance Poetry*. London: Tamesis.

Vázquez, M. A. 1983. *Poesía y poética de Fernando de Herrera*. Madrid: Narcea.

Vilanova, A. 1953. Preceptistas españoles de los siglos XVI y XVII. In: G. Díaz-Plaja, ed. *Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas*, 6 vols. Barcelona: Vergara, III, pp. 565-692.

Virgil. 2002. *Virgil II. Aeneid VII-XII. Appendix Vergiliana*, trans. by H. Rushton Fairclough, rev. by G. P Goold. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

En 1580 el poeta y crítico Fernando de Herrera (c.1534-1597) publicó sus *Anotaciones a las obras de Garcilaso de la Vega*. Este artículo desarrolla estudios anteriores sobre esta obra en relación con las estrategias paratextuales empleadas por Herrera, sobre todo por lo que respecta a la inclusión de su propia poesía en el texto de las *Anotaciones*. Este trabajo se centra en dos sonetos de Garcilaso, ‘D’aquella vista pura i ecelente’ (VIII) y ‘Si para refrenar este deseo’ (XII), en conjunción con otros tantos textos poéticos de Herrera, teniendo en cuenta sus deudas con dos corrientes culturales contemporáneas: el neoplatonismo y la mitología clásica. Las actitudes hacia el amor neoplatónico y la mitología fueron explotadas por Herrera de una manera más profunda de lo que se suele creer. En efecto, la poesía de Herrera ocupa un papel central en la reevaluación completa de Garcilaso que no sólo subvierte la posición del poeta en el canon literario sino también la hegemonía de los intelectuales de Castilla. Herrera se presenta como un andaluz sabio y defensor de la poesía neoplatónica y como el modelo de referencia para la imitación poética en la nueva era que se abre con la Contrarreforma.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Anotaciones*, paratexto, Herrera, Garcilaso, subversión

Notes on contributor

Paul Joseph Lennon is Lecturer in Hispanic Studies in the Department of Modern Languages at the University of Exeter. His research interests revolve around the literature of the Spanish Golden Age, with particular emphasis on the importance of theories of love in amorous lyric in the Renaissance and the syncretism of Christian and pagan sources in both poetry and drama. In a recently published article in the *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* he offers a re-reading of Francisco de Aldana's approach to love in the posthumously published poetic fragment 'Medoro y Angélica.' His teaching interests include introducing students to the literary and visual culture of the Spanish Golden Age, the development of love and desire throughout the history of Spanish literature, and Spanish language with a focus on translation and grammar.

Correspondence to:

Dr Paul Joseph Lennon, Department of Modern Languages, University of Exeter, Queen's Building, The Queen's Drive, Exeter, EX4 4QH, UK. E-mail: p.lennon@exeter.ac.uk