

## **Garcilaso's 'Sedes ad cyprias': a new source and a re-appraisal**

Maria Elizabeth Czepiel

University of Oxford

[maria.czepiel@lincoln.ox.ac.uk](mailto:maria.czepiel@lincoln.ox.ac.uk)

7076 words

### **Abstract:**

Modern criticism has often neglected or been uncomplimentary about Garcilaso's third Latin ode 'Sedes ad cyprias'. This article presents a previously unidentified source for the poem, Erasmus' translation of one of Lucian's *Dialogues of the Gods*, and in the light of this offers a re-appraisal of Garcilaso's poetic skill in the ode. Firstly, I discuss Garcilaso's metrification and transformation of Erasmus' prose translation. I go on to argue that his eclectic allusions to other Classical texts and the major changes he makes to the beginning and end of the source serve as part of a strategy of competitive imitation through which he tries to outdo the comic effect of Lucian's dialogue.

**Keywords:** Garcilaso, Latin, ode, Lucian, Erasmus, imitation, Golden Age.

## **Garcilaso's 'Sedes ad cyprias': a new source and a re-appraisal\***

Maria Elizabeth Czepiel

*University of Oxford*

Ever since the sixteenth century, Garcilaso has been called the 'príncipe de los poetas españoles',<sup>1</sup> but his Latin poetry is often under-appreciated by modern criticism. In this study, I argue that this attitude is based on modern critics' misunderstanding of his eclectic and competitive strategy of imitation, and aim to illustrate the poet's sophisticated use of literary sources through a study of his Latin ode 'Sedes ad cyprias'. Firstly, I shall discuss Garcilaso's metrification and transformation of his main model, that is, Erasmus' prose translation of one of Lucian's *Dialogues of the Gods*, which has hitherto been unidentified as a source for the poem. However, I shall go on to demonstrate how the poet uses not only Erasmus, but also a variety of Classical sources such as Ovid, Lucretius and Catullus in an attempt to compete with Lucian's humorous narrative. In particular I shall show how, by alluding to serious Classical accounts of the characters whom he presents in the poem, he contrasts them to the humorous treatment the same characters receive in his own lyric ode, and how by alluding to Horace he further reinforces their new generic context. Finally, I shall discuss how the major changes Garcilaso makes to the beginning and ending of his source also create humour and serve as part of a strategy of competitive imitation.

Given Garcilaso's importance in the development of the Spanish Golden Age, the scarcity of critical attention to his Neo-Latin poetry might seem surprising. It is especially

---

\* I would like to thank Prof. Jonathan Thacker, Dr Oliver Noble Wood, Prof. Jeremy Lawrance and Stefan Kazimierz for their invaluable comments and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> Fernando de Herrera, *Obras de Garcilasso de la Vega con anotaciones de Fernando de Herrera* (Sevilla: Alonso de la Barrera, 1580), p. 13.

perplexing when one considers that nearly two hundred lines of his Neo-Latin poems survive, constituting a large part of his extant corpus (and almost certainly more of his Latin odes have been lost to us). One reason for the critical neglect of these poems is the very fact that they are written in Latin whereas, as Gray notes, criticism has often ‘tended to reinforce Renaissance attempts at dignifying the vernacular, with the consequence that the literary multilingualism of the Renaissance – most importantly, the continued use of Latin as a medium of literary expression – has often been forgotten’.<sup>2</sup> Tellingly, Garcilaso’s vernacular ‘Ode ad florem Gnidi’ has enjoyed much more popularity than the Latin odes.

The second reason for the unpopularity of Garcilaso’s Latin poetry lies in the fact that modern scholars have often been disparaging in their assessments of its quality. However, there is a stark contrast between modern views and those of Garcilaso’s contemporaries, who praised his Latin poetry effusively. Giovio wrote that he was ‘horatiana suavitate odas scribere solitus’, ‘accustomed to writing odes with Horatian sweetness’.<sup>3</sup> Boscán praises the poet for his ‘verso latino y castellano’.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps the most famous example of contemporary praise of Garcilaso’s Latin poetry can be found in a letter written by Bembo to Honorato Fascitelli in 1535 where, in response to the receipt of some of Garcilaso’s Latin odes sent to him by Girolamo Seripando, Bembo writes that the Spaniard is ‘un bello et gentil poeta; et queste cose sue tutte mi sonno sommamente

---

<sup>2</sup> Andrew F. Gray, ‘Garcilaso at Home in Naples: On the Neo-Latin Muse of the Príncipe de los Poetas Castellanos’, *Calíope*, 21:1 (2016), 5–33 (p. 6).

<sup>3</sup> Paolo Giovio, *Pauli Iovii Elogia virorum literis illustrium* (Basel, 1575), 146, cit. Mele, ‘Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega y su permanencia en Italia’, *Bulletin hispanique*, 25:2 (1923), 108–48 (p. 118), my translation.

<sup>4</sup> Herrera, *Anotaciones*, p. 21.

piaciute: et meritano singular commendatione et laude'.<sup>5</sup> He is particularly complimentary about an ode Garcilaso dedicated to him: 'Ma io sopra tutto ho con lui questo vantaggio: ch è me pare, che l'Oda, che egli a me scrive, sia etiandio piu vaga e piu elegante et monad et sonora et dolce, che le alter tutte non sono, che in que fogli sono'.<sup>6</sup>

By contrast, modern critics are scathing. Lumsden's criticism of the ode 'Ad Antonium Thylesium' is worth reproducing at length:

This composition, like the second, is an attempt to imitate the classical Horatian ode. It is written in Horace's favourite Alcaic stanza, but [...] it is difficult to find any technical felicity in these rough-hewn verses. The Alcaic strophe associated in Horace with the impressive 'state odes' such as those of bk. III is here made to clothe the wandering reminiscences of an exile. The construction is incoherent and the stanzas lack that powerful unity so typical of Horace. [...] such words as 'luxus' and the diminutive 'languidulus' are un-Horatian, while several more ('consternatio', 'subiacere', and the prosaic 'vel potius') are inconsistent with a poetic style. Particular echoes of Horace are practically absent'.<sup>7</sup>

She concludes 'The three Latin poems here discussed obviously do not provide a sufficient basis for a discussion of Garcilaso's merit as a Latin poet. [...] They reveal him as a rather inadequate imitator of Horace'.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> 'a fine and gentle poet and that all his pieces have given me unbounded pleasure and deserve unusual praise and commendation', trans. Audrey Lumsden, 'Garcilaso de la Vega as a Latin poet', *MLR*, 42:3 (1947), 337–41 (p. 337).

<sup>6</sup> 'But above all I hold in esteem the ode which he addresses to me; it appears to me lighter and more elegant, purer in style, sweeter and more harmonious than all the others that are in these folios', trans. Lumsden, 'Garcilaso de la Vega as a Latin poet', p. 337.

<sup>7</sup> Lumsden, 'Garcilaso de la Vega as a Latin poet', p. 339.

<sup>8</sup> Lumsden, 'Garcilaso de la Vega as a Latin poet', p. 341.

What is telling about Lumsden's criticism is how it is centred around a failure to recreate Horatian lyric. It is precisely by evaluating Garcilaso against a single poetic source that modern critics do him an injustice. During the Renaissance, although there was debate around whether imitation should be of a single source, many scholars such as Petrarch, Poliziano and Erasmus argued that successful *imitatio* consisted of the collection of many, varied sources and their transformation into a new literary product.<sup>9</sup> As Colombí-Monguió points out, this was also the approach adopted by Spanish poets.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, through this process of transformation, Renaissance poets often saw themselves as not merely following a model but as trying to surpass it.<sup>11</sup> While the form Garcilaso uses in his third Latin ode may be Horatian, as we shall see, he creatively exploits a wide range of Classical and contemporary authors to create meaning and thus create a new piece of work which can supersede his source in its comic effect.

Garcilaso's eclectic use of Classical allusion in his vernacular poetry, and his ability to manipulate it to his own ends, has long been recognised. Perhaps most notably, critics have frequently commented on the variety of generic and tonal shifts created by his engagement with diverse sources in *Eclogue* II. Rivers even describes it as 'an encyclopedic work of poetry, echoing the Western tradition from Homer to Ariosto' and 'simultaneously epic, tragic and comic'.<sup>12</sup> Scholars have often tried to reconcile the contrast between Albanio's pastoral suffering in the first half of the poem (which imitates Sannazaro's *Arcadia*) and Don Fernando's exploits in the second half (with a much more

---

<sup>9</sup> G. W. Pigman 'Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33:1 (1980), 1–32 (pp. 4–9).

<sup>10</sup> Alicia Colombí de Monguió, 'Teoría y práctica de la poética renacentista de Fray Luis a Lope de Vega', *Actas del VII Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas, Brown University, 22-27 de agosto 1983*, ed. David Kossof and others, 2 vols. (Madrid: Isthmo, 1986), II, 323–31 (p. 324).

<sup>11</sup> Pigman, 'Versions of Imitation', pp. 16–22; see also Fred J. Nichols, *An anthology of neo-Latin poetry*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), p. 15.

<sup>12</sup> Elias L. Rivers, *Garcilaso de la Vega: Poems* (London: Grant and Cutler, 1980), p. 51.

Virgilian flavour) and unify them into a coherent whole.<sup>13</sup> However, it may be that Garcilaso's use of these apparently ill-matched sources is itself meaningful. For example, Torres has argued that it may serve to illustrate his ambiguous attitude towards Spanish imperialism: 'The gaps the reader cannot easily close are a symbolic representation of the distance between the reality of individual human suffering, and the broader 'ideal text' of empire'.<sup>14</sup>

Recently, some critics have also begun to appreciate Garcilaso's masterful use of diverse allusion within the Latin odes. For example, Gray convincingly argues that while a cursory reading of Garcilaso's ode 'Ad Genesium Sepulvedam' suggests that the poet concurs with the addressee's views on "just war", his Classical allusions undercut this ostensible pose and actually suggest a critical attitude towards the horrors of warfare.<sup>15</sup> For example, the womens' laments at the advance of imperial troops in lines 25–36, reminiscent of Hor. *Carm* III. 2. 6–12, leave the poem on an uncomfortable note due to their placing at the end of the poem. However, the critic also explains how this effect is achieved through allusions to authors other than Horace. For example, when referring to the military exploits of the emperor Charles V, Garcilaso employs allusions to passages in the *Aeneid* which, tellingly, describe not the hero Aeneas, but his nemesis Turnus. Gray concludes that 'Garcilaso's poetics in the odes is so eclectic and transformative that uncertainties surround most attempts at identifying sources, and in several cases source materials are adopted only to produce ironic, even puzzling, reversals of their meanings

---

<sup>13</sup> See Audrey Lumsden Kouvel, 'Problems Connected with the Second Eclogue of Garcilaso de la Vega', *Hispanic Review*, 15.2 (1947), 251–71; Peter M. Komanecky, 'Epic and Pastoral in Garcilaso's Eclogues', *Modern Language Notes*, 86.2 (1971), 154–66.

<sup>14</sup> Isabel Torres, *Love Poetry in the Spanish Golden Age: Eros, Eris and Empire*, (Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2013), p. 45.

<sup>15</sup> Gray, 'Garcilaso at Home in Naples', pp. 18–23.

in the source texts'.<sup>16</sup> Far from causing Garcilaso to be an 'inadequate imitator of Horace', the borrowings from various sources - including non-lyric ones - and their manipulation are fundamental to the poem's interpretation and are precisely what makes it skilful and subtle.

However, Garcilaso's use of allusion from multiple sources and genres does not always serve to create ambiguous subtexts; it can also be used to create humour. For example, in the Latin ode *Ad Antonium Thylesium* we find an allusion to the death of the mythological figure of Orpheus, famously treated in Virgil's *Georgics* IV. 453–527. Whereas in *Eclogue* I. 197–210 the myth of Orpheus is appropriately evoked to express the shepherd's lament, its appearance in a lyric context once again demonstrates Garcilaso's eclecticism. In keeping with its new Horatian form, the allusion is not used to convey suffering, but rather as a humorous image which describes how the intellectuals of Garcilaso's new circle of friends descend on the perpetrators of sophistic arguments: 'haud tamen/ impune, nam, si tortuosis/ nexibus implicitum quid audes/ suadere, sperans ingeniosius/ quam verius nos pertrahere ad tuum/ sensum, statim agressa est cohors te,/ ut Ciconum irruit in canentem' ('but, if you tie yourself in knots trying to persuade us of something, hoping to convince us of your point of view with cleverness rather than truth, at once the company will attack you, just like the crowd of Cicones fell upon the bard', 62–68). In the rest of this study, I aim to demonstrate Garcilaso's poetic and comic abilities by analysing this eclectic and creative strategy of imitation in the ode 'Sedes ad cyprias'. In this humorous poem, Venus reproaches her son Cupid for shooting his arrows not only at humans, but even at gods (1–19): he causes Jupiter to take many shapes in pursuit of his objects of love; he makes the Moon descend to Mount Latmus to see her lover

---

<sup>16</sup> Gray, 'Garcilaso at Home in Naples', p. 24.

Endymion; he makes Phoebus linger with Clymene and neglect his duties as sun-god (20–33). Venus asserts that she would not even mind his effects on her, if that were the end of it; but recently he has even caused Cybele, the aged mother of the gods, to go mad for love of Attis (34–52). She ends her first speech by expressing her fear that Cybele will take her revenge on Cupid by ordering her lions to tear him apart (54–61). Cupid, in response, tells her not to worry, since the lions are gentle with him (62–71). He then humorously blackmails her by pointing out that she should not protest against his actions, unless she wants to lose Mars’ love (72–80). The goddess rapidly backs down, and states that all she wants is for Cupid to remain in her embrace (81–84).<sup>17</sup>

This ode was only unearthed by Eugenio Mele at the end of the nineteenth century, and we know little about its circumstances of composition. The Neapolitan Vicente Meola copied it from the papers of Seripando and wrote next to it that it was the ode that Bembo referred to in his letter to Fascitelli in 1535; however, as Mele points out, this is impossible, since Bembo specifies that the poem is dedicated to him, whereas this ode has no dedicatee. Nevertheless, it is not impossible that the ode formed part of the selection of Garcilaso’s work which Seripando sent to Bembo.<sup>18</sup> At any rate, it is clear that the poem was composed during Garcilaso’s ‘Neapolitan phase’, which spans from his arrival in Naples in 1532 to his death in 1536.

‘Sedes ad cyprias’ has been characteristically under-appreciated by modern critics; Keniston even wrote that it is ‘wholly without emotion’.<sup>19</sup> Lumsden is less virulent in her appraisal of this poem than in those of the other odes, since she concludes that ‘the

---

<sup>17</sup> The text I am using is *Garcilaso de la Vega: Obra poética y textos en prosa*, ed. Bienvenido Morros (Barcelona: Crítica, 2007), pp. 262–68.

<sup>18</sup> Mele, ‘Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega’, 1923, p. 137.

<sup>19</sup> Hayward Keniston, *Garcilaso de la Vega* (New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1922), pp. 275–76, as quoted by Lumsden, ‘Garcilaso de la Vega as a Latin poet’, p. 340.



subject and tone are Anacreontic and not to be paralleled in Classical Latin'<sup>20</sup> and thus does not seek to measure Garcilaso according to his fidelity to Horace. It is true that there are metrical errors in lines 3 'thure altaria sacro' (one syllable short)<sup>21</sup> and 5 'gaudebat cum puer appulit' (one syllable too many, vowel quantities wrong in the third, sixth, seventh and eighth syllables)<sup>22</sup>, which perhaps increases scholars' propensity to make uncomplimentary judgments about the poem. Unhelpfully, the transmitted text is also defective: since lines 52 and 54 are both Asclepiads, a lacuna must be posited where there should be a Glyconic.<sup>23</sup>

However, no critic has been able truly to appraise Garcilaso's skill in this poem since its source has until now been unidentified: for example, Morros calls the poem 'un juego mitológico sobre un tema erótico y de filosofía neoplatónica',<sup>24</sup> and Lumsden writes 'No particular influences are noticeable in this ode'.<sup>25</sup> In fact, the poem is a poetic rendering of Lucian's *Dialogues of the Gods* XX, 'Aphrodite and Eros':

APHRODITE: Eros, my boy, you must watch what you're about. I don't mean on earth, when you persuade men to work against themselves or each other, but in heaven too, when you make Zeus turn into shape after shape, changing him into whatever you choose for the time, and bring Lady Moon down from the sky, and sometimes keep the Sun-god lingering at Clymene's side forgetful of his driving.

---

<sup>20</sup> Lumsden, 'Garcilaso de la Vega as a Latin poet', p. 340.

<sup>21</sup> Jesús Luque Moreno thinks that the mistake is a hiatus between 'thure' and 'altaria' which results in an erroneous second syllable ('Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega: notas sobre métrica y crítica textual', *Estudios sobre literatura y arte dedicados al profesor Emilio Orozco*, II (Granada: 1979), 299); however, this would also require *altaria* to have a short second syllable and long final *a*.

<sup>22</sup> For possible solutions to this textual issue, see Luque Moreno, 'Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega', p. 308.

<sup>23</sup> See Eugenio Mele, 'Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega y su permanencia en Italia', *Bulletin hispanique*, 26:1 (1924), 35–51 (p. 47).

<sup>24</sup> Morros, *Obra poética y textos en prosa*, p. 262.

<sup>25</sup> Lumsden, 'Garcilaso de la Vega as a Latin poet', p. 341.

You may go scot-free for the liberties you take with me, your mother but you've had the audacity even to turn the thoughts of Rhea to love of boys and have her pining for that Phrygian lad—at her time of life, too, and she the mother of so many gods! Now you've driven her mad, and she's taken her team of lions and her Corybants, who are just as mad as herself, and is wandering up and down Ida; she keeps shrieking for Attis, while the Corybants slash their arms with swords, or let down their hair and rush madly over the mountains, or blow on the horn, thunder on the drums, or bang cymbals; it's just chaotic frenzy all over Ida. So I fear everything; yes, your mother's afraid of such goings on, for you're just one big nuisance, and I'm scared that one day Rhea, in a fit of madness, or, more likely, when still in her right mind, will tell her Corybants to catch you and tear you to pieces or throw you to her lions. That's what I fear, when I see you running such risks.

EROS: Don't worry, mother; I'm quite used to the lions already; I often get up on their backs, grab hold of their manes and have a ride on them, and they make a fuss of me, letting me put my hand in their mouths, and licking it all over, and then let me take it out again. But what time will Rhea have to devote to me? She's thinking of Attis the whole time. Anyway, what harm do I do by showing what beauty is like? It's up to you to keep your hands off things of beauty; so you shouldn't blame me for this. Or would you rather stop loving Ares and have him stop loving you?

APHRODITE: How smart you are. Got us all under your thumb, haven't you? But you'll remember what I've been saying one day.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> All translations of the Greek are taken from the Loeb.

As Zappala points out, the vast majority of Golden Age authors would have known Lucian via Latin or Spanish translations or ‘lucianistas contemporáneos como Erasmo’ rather than in the original Greek.<sup>27</sup> However, no vernacular translations of ‘Aphrodite and Eros’ existed until well after Garcilaso wrote his ode.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, we must look to Latin translations (in which the title ‘Aphrodite and Eros’ is replaced by the Roman equivalents ‘Venus et Cupido’),<sup>29</sup> and there are various considerations which lead us to conclude that Garcilaso used Erasmus’ 1506 translation of Lucian as a basis for his imitation.<sup>30</sup> The first is the pioneering nature of Erasmus’ translation: Thompson finds that, with a few exceptions not including ‘Venus et Cupido’, ‘none of the works translated by [Erasmus]... had been translated before’.<sup>31</sup> The Erasmian translation also seems to have retained its authority for a long time in Spain, as can be seen even in the following century in a marginal comment in a copy of Baltasar de Vitoria’s *Teatro de los dioses de la gentilidad* (Salamanca, 1620–23) which reads ‘Advirtiolo Luciano en el *Diálogo de Venus et Cupido* que traduxo Erasmo en Latín’.<sup>32</sup> The use of Erasmus’ translation as a source is confirmed by lexical considerations: for example, in the first line of Venus’ address to Cupid she chastises his ‘flagitiis’ (‘scandals’), as does Erasmus’ Venus (‘flagitia’), whereas Lucian does not use any noun to refer to Cupid’s actions and simply writes ‘ὅρα οἷα ποιεῖς’ (‘you must watch what you are about’). Furthermore, the last

---

<sup>27</sup> Michael O. Zappala, ‘Luciano Español’, *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 31 (1982), 25–42 (p. 25).

<sup>28</sup> Theodore S. Beardsley, *Hispano-classical translations printed between 1482 and 1699* (Pittsburgh, Pa.: Duquesne University Press, 1970), p. 150.

<sup>29</sup> In Garcilaso’s poem the Greek ‘Rhea’ is also replaced by the Roman equivalent ‘Cybele’.

<sup>30</sup> The copies of the 1506 edition which I have consulted are Oxford, Bodleian Library, Byw. E 1.9 and Oxford, Balliol College Library, ARCH B 09 05. It should be noted that some copies of the 1506 edition are missing two quires which contain the text of ‘Venus et Cupido’, including Oxford, Bodleian Library, Allen d.22, and Ghent, Ghent University Library, BIB.G.009093, which is the only digitized copy to date.

<sup>31</sup> Craig R. Thompson, ‘The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and S. Thomas More’, *Revue belge de Philologie et d’Histoire*, 18:4 (1939), 855–81 (p. 879).

<sup>32</sup> Cit. Michael O. Zappala, *Lucian of Samosata in the Two Hesperias: an essay in literary and cultural translation* (Potomac, MD: Scripta Humanistica, 1990), p. 154.

fourteen lines of Venus' first speech and the entirety of Cupid's are heavily dependent on Erasmus, as I shall discuss later.<sup>33</sup>

It is unsurprising that Garcilaso should have come across Erasmus' translation during his Neapolitan period, since there had been a boom in publication of the Dutch author's works in Italy during the 1520s. During the 1510s twenty editions of Erasmus' works were published; in the following decade this soared to ninety-two.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, Erasmus' philological works were particularly popular in Italy.<sup>35</sup> Although during this period Catholic theologians in Italy were attacking Erasmus as a Lutheran, his works would only begin to be censored at the end of the 1540s, so reading and using them was still not a dangerous activity.<sup>36</sup> Garcilaso may also have been influenced by Juan de Valdés, a fellow Spaniard who had fled Spain due to problems with the Inquisition as a consequence of his Erasmian ideas. Valdés had settled in Naples permanently by 1535,<sup>37</sup> and we know the two were acquainted because he refers to Garcilaso in his *Diálogo de la lengua*, written around the same year: 'Me huelgo que os satisfaga, pero más quisiera satisfacer a Garcilaso de la Vega'.<sup>38</sup> Indeed, the Accademia Pontaniana, which Garcilaso frequented during his residence in Naples, seems generally to have been too sympathetic

---

<sup>33</sup> See Appendix I. Erasmus's translation involves a curious change: instead of the Corybants cutting their forearm ('τὸν πῆχυν') as in Lucian (the text appears thus in Aldus' 1503 manuscript of Lucian, which was probably the version used by Erasmus), they cut off their penis ('penem'); this is perhaps a contamination from the story of Attis and Cybele in Catullus 63, where the protagonist castrates himself. However, Garcilaso omits the first two activities of the Corybants described in Erasmus' translation ('alius suum ipse penem ense desecat, alius demissa coma per montes fertur insanus') altogether. Since he thus refers neither to the forearm nor the penis this cannot be definitive proof of whether he used Lucian's Greek or Erasmus' Latin.

<sup>34</sup> Silvana Seidel Menchi, *Erasmus in Italia* (Torino : Bollati Boringhieri, 1987), pp. 338–40.

<sup>35</sup> Seidel Menchi notes that, whereas in the Iberian peninsula there were 84 editions of Erasmus' religious works and 37 of his humanistic ones (a ratio of around 2.5:1), in Italy the number of religious and humanistic works was around equal (p. 341).

<sup>36</sup> Marcella and Paul Grendler, 'The survival of Erasmus in Italy', *Erasmus in English* 8 (1976), 2–22 (p. 2).

<sup>37</sup> John E. Longhurst, *Erasmus and the Spanish Inquisition: the case of Juan de Valdés* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1950), p. 54.

<sup>38</sup> Juan de Valdés, *Diálogo de la lengua* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1976), pp. 71–72.

towards the reform movement encouraged by figures such as Erasmus for the liking of the Viceroy Pedro de Toledo, who would close it in 1542 as part of his attempt to impose religious orthodoxy.<sup>39</sup>

However, although Erasmus' translation is the principal source of the poem, he is not the only author on which Garcilaso draws. For example, Chinchilla points out that the ode 'presents a compelling example of a decisive presence of Catullan subtexts'<sup>40</sup>. As we shall see, throughout the poem Garcilaso also alludes to various other authors such as Virgil, Ovid, Lucretius and Horace. However, from the outset one is immediately struck by a wholesale change, that is, the addition of a thirteen-line proem which has no parallel in Erasmus' translation:

Sedes ad cyprias Venus,	1
cui centum redolent usque calentia	
thure altaria sacro,	
sertis vincta comas, nuda agitans choros	
gaudebat, cum puer appulit,	5
depromptis iaculis e pharetra aureis,	
depromptis quoque plumbeis,	
queis terras violens subdit et aequora,	
queis coeleste sibi genus.	
Tum mater, miserans terrigenum simul	10
divorumque vicem, prior	

<sup>39</sup> Shulamit Furstenberg-Levi, *The Accademia Pontaniana: a model of a humanist network* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), p. 131.

<sup>40</sup> Rosa Helena Chinchilla, 'Garcilaso de la Vega, Catullus, and the Academy in Naples', *Calíope*, 16:2 (2010), 65–81 (p. 69).

demulcens leviter caesariem auream

melliti pueri, incipit: (1–13)

In her Cyprian temple, Venus - for whom a hundred altars blazing with sacred incense continually fill the air with their aroma - naked and with her hair wreathed with garlands, was rejoicing and leading dances, when her son approached, with his gold darts taken out from his quiver, and his leaden ones too, with which he violently oppresses earth, sea and the heavenly race. Then his mother, taking pity on the misfortune of both mortals and gods, after gently stroking the golden hair of the honey-sweet boy, said:<sup>41</sup>

In this passage, Garcilaso introduces one of the multiple sources on which he will draw throughout the poem, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The contrast between 'aureis' and 'plumbeis' and the Ovidian repetition in 6–7 with the anaphora of 'depromptis' recalls *Met.* I. 470–471 ('quod facit, auratum est et cuspidē fulget acuta; | quod fugat, obtusum est et habet sub harundine plumbum', 'the one which causes [love] is golden and shines with a sharp point; the one which drives it away is blunt and has lead beneath its shaft'). Thus, we can see how even in the opening lines of his poem, Garcilaso is embellishing his source and making use of non-lyric material.

Garcilaso also varies his model by introducing additional mythological material based on the *Metamorphoses* in lines 20–33. Where Erasmus' translation only states that Cupid makes Jupiter assume various shapes ('varias assumere formas') for the sake of love, Garcilaso expands this with two mythological examples: the story of him turning into a white bull to seduce Europa (as narrated in *Met.* II. 833–875), and into a shower of

---

<sup>41</sup> Unless otherwise stated, translations from Latin to English are mine.

rain to seduce Danaë (referred to various times, such as at *Met* IV. 611: ‘Persea, quem pluvio Danae conceperat auro’, ‘Perseus, whom Danaë had conceived in a shower of gold’). He also expands the description of the Moon’s love for Endymion from Erasmus’ five words to sixteen words. Consequently, the *exempla* of Jupiter, the Moon and the Sun are each given four lines. The equal disposition of these mythological scenes followed by the much longer account of Cybele is reminiscent of his careful structuring in Eclogue III, where the tapestries of Filódoce, Dinámene and Climene each take up three stanzas (121–192) and pave the way for the longer description of Nise’s (193–264). In lines 22–23, Garcilaso also adds a comic note in his description of the bull (‘taurus nivea conspicuus nota | frontem, caetera candidus’, ‘a bull distinguished by a snow-white mark on his forehead, and for the rest part white’), which seems to echo Horace *Odes* IV. 2. 59 (‘Qua notam duxit niveus videri, | cetera fulvus’, ‘appearing snow-white where it bears a mark, and for the rest part tawny’), except for the fact that, while a tawny bull with a white mark makes sense, it would be impossible to see a white mark on a white bull!<sup>42</sup>

In general, excluding the proem, the first two thirds of the poem (14–52) follow Erasmus quite closely in content; however, Garcilaso transforms his source material by converting it into lyric poetry, specifically, into the Horatian metre of the Fourth Asclepiad. This part of the imitation is comparatively original; apart from the use of ‘flagitiis’ discussed above, it is mostly important narrative elements and proper names which coincide with Erasmus’ translation (‘Lunam’, ‘Climenem’, ‘leonibus’, ‘Idam’ etc). In this section, Garcilaso’s compositional process involves two steps: synonym substitution and metrification. In some cases, this is not entirely felicitous. For example, he adapts Erasmus’ ‘cessare aurigandi muneris oblitum’ (‘to delay, forgetting his office

---

<sup>42</sup> Mele assumes this is a mistake (‘Las poesías latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega’, 1924, p. 46).

of chariot-driving’) to ‘quasi negligens | terris officium solvere debitum, auriga est habitus piger’ (‘almost forgetting to fulfil his duty to the earth, he is considered a lazy charioteer’, 31–32), but the construction *est habitus* meaning ‘he was considered’ is prosaic and thus less appropriate for a poetic context. Likewise, Garcilaso changes Erasmus’ ‘Ociosus animo esto’ (‘let your mind be calm’) to ‘Praesenti esto animo’ (62); however, *praesens* is an unsatisfactory synonym for *otiosus*, since rather than meaning ‘calm, tranquil’ as the latter does (OLD 5) and thus conveying Cupid’s attempt to console his mother, it means ‘resolute, ready’ in mind or spirit (OLD 4) and when used of gods has the even more specific meaning of ‘bodily present’ (OLD 3). In some cases, the synonym substitution varies the source text but does not have any further function, such as the changes from ‘mortales’ to ‘genus humanum’ (16–17), ‘superos’ to ‘deos’ (18), ‘assumere... formas’ to ‘induit... imaginem’ (20–21), ‘solem’ to ‘Phoebum’ (31), ‘deorum tam multorum’ to ‘paene deum omnium’ (40), ‘discerpant’ to ‘lacerent’ (60), and ‘manum’ to ‘digitos’ (70).

Nevertheless, in other cases Garcilaso’s compositional technique is successful and even enhances the text. For example, he adapts Erasmus’ ‘anum’ (‘old’) to ‘longeva’ (literally ‘of great age’, 40). *Anus* would have been suitable in a lyric context as it occurs in Horace and Catullus, but *longaevus* is a richer choice since it has Virgilian associations (for example, ‘longaevos... senes’ *Aen.* V. 715, ‘longaeva sacerdos’ VI. 321, ‘miserere parentis longaevi XII. 44’). As we can see, the word recurs specifically in Virgil’s *Aeneid* and is often used to refer to figures which command respect such as the father (‘parentis’) and the Cumaean Sybil (the ‘sacerdos’ or ‘priestess’ of VI. 321). This increases the humorous effect of the word’s use here, since it emphasizes the epic dignity which the mother of the gods should have and thus contrasts it with her hopeless passion. Another



example of Garcilaso's successful adaptation of the Erasmian material occurs in 43–44, where he adapts Erasmus' 'adamet', 'depereat' and 'insanit' ('fall in love', 'perish', 'rage') to 'arserit' and 'ignes [...] viscera permeent' ('burns', 'fire seeps through her heart'). Naturally, the association of fire ties his version to the lexicon of Latin love lyric and thus is eminently suitable for the new poetic context. 'Permeent' is not the most poetic of words, but the idea of the fire of love seeping through the body is a commonplace of Latin erotic poetry (most famously of Dido, 'est mollis flamma medullas', 'the flame consumes her tender heart', Virg. *Aen.* IV. 66; also 'serpunt in viscera flammae', 'the flames creep into her heart', Ov. *Rem. Am.* 105). The adverb 'perdite' ('desperately') inserted by Garcilaso (43) also evokes Catullus' all-consuming love ('perdite amo', 45.3; 'perdite amarem', 104.3). *Pusio* ('boy') is rare and prosaic so Garcilaso did well to change it to 'Attyn' (43), although 'pusionem' would have been at any rate unmetrical.

From line 52 onwards there is a high rate of coincidence with Erasmus and although the process of metrification continues, there is little synonym substitution. Even whole phrases are reproduced almost verbatim:

<b>Erasmus</b>	<b>Garcilaso</b>
'Proinde cuncta timeo: metuo'	'Proin [...] cuncta timens [...] metu' (52–55)
'si [...] resipiscat [...] vel potius si pergat insanire'	'si resipiscat aut   haec pergat potius [...] insanire' (56–58)
'tergis, prehensaque iuba, equitis ritu insidens illos agitem'	'iuba ut   presa ritu equitis [...] insidens   tergis hos agitem' (65–67)
'manum ori insertam [...] mihi reddunt innocuam'	'manum insero,   reddunt innocuam mihi' (70–71)
'Postremo quid ego pecco, quum res pulchras [...] offero ac demonstro?'	'Postremo quid ego pecco tibi [...] cum res [...] offero   pulchras [...] monstroque' (72–74)
'Num vis [...] mater, uti neque tu posthac Martem ames, neque ille te?'	'Num vis, mater, uti Mars tuus haud te amet posthac? Nec redames eum?' (78–79)
'nulla in re non superas'	'Nulla ut non superans [...] in re' (81–82)

The fact that Garcilaso varies Erasmus' lexicon less frequently in this passage allows us to reconstruct what Garcilaso may have written in the missing line 53 by isolating the elements of Erasmus' translation which do not appear in Garcilaso's ode. Erasmus' 'Proinde cuncta timeo [...] ne tale quid accidat' ('Therefore I fear everything, lest such a thing should happen') has become 'Proin [...] cuncta timens [...] ne forte' ('Therefore fearing everything, lest by chance'), 'quandoquidem te produxi' ('since I brought you into the world') becomes the more economical 'mater' ('as your mother'), 'metuo' (I fear') is adapted to 'discrucior metu' ('I am tormented by fear'). This leaves Venus' description of Cupid as a 'malum ingens' ('great evil', perhaps 'great nuisance'), which would have been easy to expand into a Glyconic and which must have been of much comic value.

However, in lines 81–84 Garcilaso once again introduces a major variation to his source. In contrast to Aphrodite's threatening warning at the end of Lucian's text and Erasmus' translation of it, Garcilaso's Venus surrenders totally to her son:

Nulla ut non superans, puer,  
in re es, quin celeri bile etiam tumes,  
nostro haud subtrahe te, puer,  
amplexu; peto nil praeter id amplius.

Since there is no matter in which you are not victorious, my boy, and indeed you are quick to anger, do not leave my embrace, my boy; I ask for nothing more than this.

It is clear that one of Garcilaso's chief aims in the poem is to create humour. This is shown by the choice of model itself: Marsh points out that the comic aspect of the

*Dialogues of the Gods* was the reason they were not as popular with translators and imitators in the early Renaissance as other works by Lucian, since ‘Unlike Lucian’s longer works, the brief dialogues offer no moral lessons; instead, [...] their charm lies in parodying points of Greek mythology’.<sup>43</sup> As we have seen, Garcilaso sometimes creates humour by exploiting texts from solemn genres such as the *Aeneid* to produce a comic contrast to his present lyric light-heartedness. There are two other major examples of this kind of generic play which recur throughout this ode, specifically in Garcilaso’s use of his Classical predecessors in the portrayals of Cybele and Venus. In order truly to appreciate how the poet exploits other texts to create humour, it is necessary to look briefly at the most important previous poetic treatments of the Cybele myth in Latin, that is, in Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura* and Catullus 63, and how Garcilaso inverts them throughout his poem by placing them in a new generic context.

Lucretius’ account of Cybele in *DRN* II. 589–659 is written in dactylic hexameters, the metre of epic poetry, giving the description a solemn air. This solemnity is echoed in the content of his description: he names and explains Cybele’s attributes, such as the lion-drawn chariot, which represents her parental authority (‘officiis... parentum’, II. 605), and the crown of walls, which represents her protection of cities (‘sustinet urbes’, II. 607); what’s more, her image is carried ‘horrifice’ (‘causing awe or dread’). We know that Garcilaso was familiar with this book, and particularly its beginning, since its opening lines are the source for lines 3–4 and 13–14 of Sonnet 34.<sup>44</sup> He creates echoes of the Latin poet throughout his ode using very Lucretian compound words, such as ‘terrigenum’ (10) (cf. Lucr. V. 1411 ‘terrigenarum’, V. 1427 ‘terrigenas’),

---

<sup>43</sup> David Marsh, *Lucian and the Latins: Humor and Humanism in the Early Renaissance* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), p. 76.

<sup>44</sup> See Morros, *Obra poética y textos en prosa*, p. 64.

‘Altitonans’ (20) (cf. *Lucr.* V. 745) and the rare ‘crinigerum’ (30), none of which occur in Erasmus. The description of Cybele’s cohort in Garcilaso may also owe something to Lucretius: compare ‘**palmis tympana** verberat’ (‘strike drums with their palms’) to ‘**tympana** [...] tonant **palmis**’ (*DRN* II. 618).<sup>45</sup>

Catullus 63 is written in the galliambic metre, a genre used for hymns to the goddess sung by *Galli* (castrated priests devoted to her worship). In this case, the metre reflects how the protagonist Attis castrates himself in a moment of religious frenzy and then comes to regret his actions.<sup>46</sup> The figure of Cybele serves to emphasize the pathetic nature of his new and irreversible effeminacy by being needlessly harsh; she is described as ‘minax’ (‘threatening’, 63. 84) and sends one of the lions which pull her chariot to frighten Attis into coming back to the woods from the shore where he has been lamenting his state. Garcilaso’s knowledge of the poem can be shown by his use of the phrase ‘dominam Dindymi’ (‘the mistress of Dindymus’, 38) which occurs in 63. 91, and by the phrase ‘volitans cohors’ (‘flitting multitude’, 47) which derives from Catullus’ ‘volitare vaga cohors’ (63. 25).<sup>47</sup> The phrase ‘fera... rabies’ (‘wild rage’, 51–52) is also probably taken from Catullus 63 (‘rabie fera’, 63. 57) although it also has another appropriate parallel in Virg. *Aen.* VI. 49 where it also describes a raging woman, the Cumaean Sybil.

The allusions to these serious treatments of Cybele only serves to emphasize that Garcilaso has put her into a lyric poem and made her a humorous lyric figure. The description of her as ‘longeva atque parens’ (‘aged and a parent’) in the context of an ode

---

<sup>45</sup> Oddly, Erasmus has ‘tympano tonat’ (cf. Lucretius ‘tympana [...] tonant’); perhaps metrical demands made ‘tonat’ more awkward to incorporate so Garcilaso decided to maintain the Lucretian air by introducing ‘palmis’.

<sup>46</sup> Catullus refers to Attis using feminine pronouns and adjectives from the moment he castrates himself.

<sup>47</sup> The phrase ‘palmis tympana’ discussed earlier could also have a Catullan precedent, evoking the Bacchantes from Cat. LXIV (‘tympana palmis’, LXIV. 261).

makes her akin to the women Horace makes fun of for engaging in amorous activities when past their prime (such as in *Odes* III. 15 and IV. 13). Perhaps the most relevant example is that of Chloris (III. 15), a mother who according to Horace is too old to be living loosely. This poem is written in the same metre as Garcilaso's ode, and there is even a precise allusion in line 37, 'figas nequitiis modum' ('put an end to your wantonness'; compare 'nequitiae fige modum', Hor. III. 15. 2). Thus, Garcilaso has transformed Cybele from the serious goddess of Lucretius and Catullus to a Chloris-like character who ought to stop chasing after men.

A similar process occurs with Garcilaso's treatment of Venus through the major changes he makes to the beginning and end of the source text. Significantly, the proem he adds at the start of the poem may also be a nod to Lucretius, who opens the first book of *De Rerum Natura* with a hymn to the goddess. However, as we have seen, Lucretius' air is solemn, whereas Garcilaso's Venus will turn out to be held to ransom by her young son. Thus, the reader's knowledge of the intertext and its inappropriateness to the present context increases the comic effect of Garcilaso's revised ending. The reader is encouraged to expect such a deflation of the goddess' dignity through Garcilaso's use of a lyric metre, since there are precedents for this in Horace's work. For example, in *Carm* III. 3. 17–68, Horace devotes thirteen stanzas to a solemn speech by another important goddess, Juno, who prophesies the future of the Roman race. However, in the final stanza the seriousness of this speech is punctured when the lyric authorial persona steps in and chastises himself for his generic transgression: 'non hoc iocosae conveniet lyrae: | quo Musa, tendis? desine pervicax | referre sermones deorum et | magna modis tenuare parvis' ('This will not suit

my cheerful lyre. | Where are you going, my wilful Muse? Stop | retelling the talk of the gods and reducing | great matters to small measures',<sup>48</sup> 69–72).

In conclusion, although Garcilaso bases his ode on Erasmus' translation of Lucian's dialogue, through metrification, lexical variation and allusion to a wide variety of Classical authors he succeeds in surpassing his model, despite a few metrical and lexical slips. Even in the parts of his poem where he follows Erasmus' translation most closely, he embellishes it via allusion to Ovid, intensifies the portrayal of Cybele's hopeless passion through the use of the lexicon of Latin love lyric, and increases the comic effect of Cybele's love by describing her in epic Virgilian terms which are comically incongruous given her present indecorous behaviour. Furthermore, throughout the poem the figure of Cybele is transposed into a comic lyric figure through allusions to the Horatian trope of the flirtatious old woman and by contrasting her to the dignified treatment she receives in the Classical canon through allusion to Lucretius and Catullus. Finally, Garcilaso's treatment of Venus is more comic than Lucian's due to the introduction of a Lucretian hymnic opening which is later punctured by her total surrender in his adapted lyric ending, which is once again perfectly consistent with the new lyric context. Although by introducing this extraneous and eclectic material Garcilaso departs from the letter of the source text, he improves on its comic spirit: rather than introduce a note of foreboding at the end, he prefers to have Venus humorously overpowered by the little Cupid ('puer'). In short, Morros is right to a certain extent when he describes the poem as a 'juego', only the 'juego' in question is the generic game of transposing prose

---

<sup>48</sup> Trans. David West, *Horace Odes III: Dulce Periculum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 35.

characters into lyric ones and of trying to outdo Lucian's humour by introducing some Horatian irony.

**Appendix I<sup>49</sup>**

Garcilaso	Erasmus
<p>Sedes ad cyprias Venus, 1  cui centum redolent usque calentia  thure altaria sacro,  sertis vincta comas, nuda agitans choros  gaudebat, cum puer appulit,  5  depromptis iaculis e pharetra aureis,  depromptis quoque plumbeis,  queis terras violens subdit et aequora,  queis coeleste sibi genus.  Tum mater, miserans terrigenum simul  10  divorumque vicem, prior  demulcens leviter caesariem auream  melliti pueri, incipit:  “Heu!, <b>nate</b>, usque adeo <b>flagitiis</b> eris  istis insatiabilis, 15  non tantum ut miserum perditum eas  genus  humanum, excrucians modis  indignis homines, verum etiam in deos  ausis stringere spicula?  <b>Impulsu</b> altitonans saepe <b>tuo</b> induit 20  quam turpem deo imaginem!  Nunc taurus nivea conspicuus nota  frontem, caetera candidus,  imber nunc liquido virgineum aureus  fluxu per gremium micat. 25  <b>Lunam</b> per tacitum saepe silentium  saxis sub Iove latmiis  sopiti rapidis ignibus exscitam  <b>coeli</b> culmine <b>devocas</b>.  <b>Cessare</b> ad <b>Clymenem</b> crinigerum facis  30  Phoebum, qui quasi negligens  terris officium solvere debitum,  auriga est habitus piger.  <b>In me</b> si sceleris quid meditabere</p>	<p>VEN. Cupido <b>gnate</b>, vide quae facis  <b>flagitia</b>. Non iam de his loquor, quae <b>te</b>  <b>impulsore</b> mortales in terra vel in se  quisque; vel invicem alii in alios faciunt:  verum de his ago, quae apud superos  quoque; designas, qui quidem Iovem  ipsum cogis varias assumere formas, in  quodcumque tibi pro tempore visum  fuerit, eum vertens:</p> <p>tum <b>lunam</b> e <b>coelo devocas</b>.</p> <p>Quin et solem aliquoties compellis  lentum apud <b>Clymenem cessare</b>  aurigandi muneris oblitum:</p> <p>nam quicquid iniuriae <b>in me matrem</b>  committis, audacter ac tanquam tuto  facis.</p>

<sup>49</sup> For Garcilaso: Morros, pp. 262–68; For Erasmus: *Luciani viri quam disertissimi compluria opuscula longe festiuissima ab Erasmo Roterodamo et Thoma moro interpretibus optimis in latinorum linguam traducta* (Paris: Ascensius, 1506), fol. L<sup>v</sup>; *Luciani Erasmo interprete dialogi et alia emuncta* (Paris: Ascensius, 1514), fols XCVI<sup>v</sup>–XCVII<sup>r</sup>; *Luciani opuscula Erasmo Roterodamo interprete* (Venice: Aldus and Andrea Torresano, 1516), pp. 159–60.



<p><b>matrem</b>, ut mos tibi, perfide, est, 35 non aegre aut graviter perpetiar modo figas nequitiae modum. Sed quid, cum dominam figere Dindymi laetaris, tibi vis, puer? Longeva atque <b>parens</b> pene deum omnium<sup>40</sup> cum sit, nec ioco idonea, illam caecus eo perpulit at furor Atty n perdit ut arserit. Cumque ignes penitus viscera permeent, <b>iunctis</b> vecta <b>leonibus</b> 45 <b>Idae</b> per nemorum saxa virentium fertur; quam volitans cohors recta consequitur parsque micantibus palmis <b>tympana</b> verberat ingentique sonat voce nemus virens 50 cunctorumque simul fera insanum rabies pectus agit. <b>Proin</b> ... .. mater <b>cuncta timens</b> (omen inane sit!) tristi discrucior <b>metu</b>, 55 <b>ne</b> forte Cybele, <b>si resipiscat</b> aut haec <b>pergat potius</b> suo <b>insanire</b> modo, saeva <b>leonibus</b> te natum tenerum imperet se coram ut lacerent namque erit aut sui 60 vindex aut animi impotens.” “Praesenti <b>esto animo, mater</b>,” ait puer, “nec te <b>sollicitet metus</b>, mitescunt adeo namque mihi feri isti, quos metuis, <b>iuba</b> ut 65 <b>prensa ritu equitis</b> non trepide <b>insidens</b> <b>tergis hos agitem</b> vagus, <b>caudis</b> incipiunt, auribus et mihi <b>adblandirier interim</b>, dumque <b>ori</b> digitos, dumque manum <b>insero</b>,_____ 70 <b>reddunt innocuam mihi.</b> <b>Postremo quid ego pecco</b> tibi, aut aliis cum <b>res</b> sedulus <b>offero</b> <b>pulchras</b> ante oculos <b>monstroque</b> lucidis pictas usque coloribus? 75 <b>Vos</b> iam desinite aut <b>appetere</b> omnia haec aut sic obicere id mihi.</p>	<p>Verum tu quidem o deorum omnium confidentissime, Rheam insuper ipsam iam anum, praeterea deorum tam multorum <b>parentem</b>, eo perpulisti, ut pusionem adamet, atque in Phrygium illum adolescentulum depereat, ac tua iam opera insanit, iunctis et <b>leonibus</b>, adhibitis item Corybantibus, quippe qui et ipsi furore quodam sunt afflati, per <b>Idam</b> montem sursum ac deorsum oberrat, ipsa quidem Attis amore eiulans. Caeterum Corybantum alius suum ipse penem ense deseccat, alius demissa coma per montes fertur insanus, alius cornu canit, alius <b>tympano</b> tonat, alius cymbalo perstrepat: breviter, omnis undiquaque Ida tumultus atque insaniae plena est. <b>Proinde cuncta</b> <b>timeo: metuo ne</b> tale quid accidat, quando quidem te produxi, malum ingens, ut <b>si</b> quando <b>resipiscat</b> Rhea, vel <b>potius si pergat insanire</b>, Corybantibus imperet, ut te correptum discerpant, aut <b>leonibus</b> obiciant. Hic me <b>sollicitat</b> <b>metus</b>, quod videam tibi periculum imminere. CUP. Ocioso <b>animo esto mater</b>, siquidem leonibus etiam ipsis iam familiaris sum factus, ita ut saepenumero consensus eorum <b>tergis, prehensaque</b> <b>iuba, equitis ritu insidens illos agitem.</b> At vero illi <b>interim</b> mihi <b>caudis</b> <b>adblandiuntur</b>, ac manum <b>ori insertam</b> receptant lambuntque, deinde <b>mihi</b> <b>reddunt innocuam.</b> Porro Rheae ipsi quando tandem vacaverit, ut me ulciscatur quum in Atte sit tota?</p> <p><b>Postremo quid ego pecco</b>, quum <b>res</b> <b>pulchras</b> ut sunt, <b>offero ac demonstro?</b> <b>Vos ne appetite</b> res pulchras: quare his de rebus ne in me crimen conferte. <b>Num vis</b> ipsa tu <b>mater</b>, uti neque tu <b>posthac Martem ames, neque</b> ille te?</p> <p>VEN. Ut es pervicax, et <b>nulla in re</b> non <b>superas</b>: attamen horum quae dixi, fac in posterum memineris<sup>1</sup>.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Num vis, mater,</b> uti, <b>Mars</b> tuus haud te  <b>amet</b>  <b>posthac? nec redames</b> eum?  Natus sum atque potens; impera et  obsequar.” 80</p> <p>“<b>Nulla ut</b> non <b>superans</b>, puer,  <b>in re es</b>, quin celeri bile etiam tumes,  nostro haud subtrahe te, puer,  amplexu; peto nil praeter id amplius.”</p>	<p><sup>1</sup>The 1506 edition reads the erroneous  ‘meminerit’, corrected in later editions to  ‘memineris’.</p>
---	--