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Resumen
Se ofrecen notas críticas sobre el texto de las odas latinas de Garcilaso de la Vega.
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Abstract
Textual criticism of passages in the Latin odes of Garcilaso de la Vega.
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Three Latin odes by the Spanish poet Garcilaso de la Vega have come to light, each composed in the lyric meters of Horace’s *Odes*, apparently during Garcilaso’s service in Naples (1532-1535). A thorough critical edition of the three poems is needed, especially given the occasional typographical errors, inconsistencies, and other problems that mar the available editions, and the research project *Garcilaso de la Vega en Italia* headed by Prof. Eugenia Fosalba (website at https://pronapoli.com) is assembling the materials that will make one possible. The present notes are intended to aid the discussion and clarification of some problem passages.

All three poems originally circulated in manuscript copies at an indeterminate remove from Garcilaso’s originals, and copyists’ errors are unsurprisingly evident. Our primary source for Odes I and III is Neapolitanus Bibl. Nat. XIII AA 63 (respectively on fol. 62r-63r and 58r-60r), a collection of texts in different hands from the circle of the brothers Antonio and Girolamo Seripando, on which see Fosalba (2019: 50-79) and in Fosalba and Torre (2018: 297-321). I cite readings of this ms. from the digital images that are available at https://pronapoli.com/biblioteca-digital. The copies of Odes I and III in Vaticanus Lat. 2836 (respectively on fol. 260v-261v and 259r-260r) and of Ode III in Neapolitanus Bibl. Nat. V E 53 (fol. 47r-48v) are thought to derive from those in the Seripando archive (Fosalba 2019: 53 and in Fosalba and Torre 2018: 17). Ode II has a separate transmission in Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid MSS/5785 fol. 272r.

Garcilaso is also known to have written other Latin poetry. Cardinal Bembo, in letters of August 1535 to the Benedictine monk Onorato Fascitelli and to Garcilaso, singles out for praise an otherwise unknown Latin ode of Garcilaso’s addressed to Bembo himself; Fosalba speculates that Bembo kept that ode in

3. I follow the numbering used in the most recent editions.
5. For the readings of the three last-named mss. I rely on digital scans kindly provided by Prof. Fosalba. I am also grateful to her and to Prof. Juan Alcina for other points of information and references.
6. Travi (1992: 608) (“... a me pare che l’oda, che egli a me scrive, sia eziandio più vaga e elegante e monda e sonora e dolce, che le altre tutte non sono che in que’ fogli sono”) and 612 (“Ex iis car-
his own possession, while sending back to Naples the two that are preserved there (I and III). Also ascribed to Garcilaso is a Latin epigram addressed to Hernando de Acuña (last printed with Garcilaso’s work in Gallego 1972: 251), on whose authorship see the opposing views of Keniston (1922: 270-273) (against) and Pascual Barea 2002 (for). Fosalba (2016: 407) n. 43 (cf. 387-388 and 2019: 62-79) raises, but prudently declines to decide on, Garcilaso’s authorship for an anonymous Latin iambic poem and a Greek epigram on the death of Ariosto included in the Seripando collection in Naples.

Ode I

The poem, on Garcilaso’s recent exile and the intellectual comforts that Naples offers him, is addressed to the Italian humanist Antonio Telesio, himself a Latin poet. In both the Naples and Vatican mss. it bears the title Ode Tricolor tetras-trophos Ad Thylesium (referring to its Alcaic meter). Alone of the three odes it met with publication before the late 1890s: the editio princeps was in Daniele’s edition of Telesio, where it is titled Gascilassi de Vega Toletani ad Antonium Thylesium ode (Daniele 1762: 128-9). The poem was reedited by Savj-López and Mele 1897 (evidently from Daniele) on a suggestion by Cian (1894: 409) (cf. Mele 1924: 43); Mele (1924) is aware of the readings of the Naples and Vatican mss. (through the aid, he says, of Nicola Festa). On the interrelations between Garcilaso and Telesio and their literary outputs see Fosalba (2012) and Alejandro Coroleu in Fosalba and Torre (2018).

5-6 The whole sentence should run, “I have now learned under constraint to endure the arrogance and haughty manner of the [German] barbarians and to lighten my grievances among the pathless rocks ... under the hoarse noise of the Danube.” Both mss. (as well as Daniele) have iam didici, et invia / per saxa, which is unmetrical, et being the stumbling block. Savj-López and Mele (1897) delete et and print invia alone (cf. Keniston 1925: 298); Luque (1979: 305) offers the explanation that et was introduced by a copyist who misunderstood the syntax: he takes ferre (4, “endure”) as depending on coactus (literally “forced”), with the independent clause confined to didici ... levare (5-8, “I have learned to lighten ...”). I suspect rather that a copyist regularized the word order.

minibus, quae ad me pridem scriptist, et quantum me amares libentissime perspexi ... et quantus ipse esses in lyricis pangendis, quantumque praestares ingenii luminibus ... facile cognovi”).

8. An early 19th c. copy of Daniele’s edition with Spanish translation by D. Fernando de la Serna y Santander is preserved in Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid MSS/21291/7 pp. 1-8; it contains occasional corrections that usually correspond to later printed editions (e.g. 19 gestit). I owe my knowledge of this copy—which should be of interest for the history of the reception of these odes—to an anonymous reader for the Journal and to Prof. Fosalba.
of a postponed et, and I would follow Mele (1924: 43) in restoring invia et: both ferre and levare are dependent on didici, with et coordinating them and with coactus in a predicate construction (tantamount to “under constraint”).

18-19 aureo / nodare nexu gestit: “[the city that the river Tagus] longs to tie up in a golden bow.” In the Naples ms. the vowel in the verb ending could be a very narrow a or an i without a dot (not normal in this ms.); the Vaticanus has gestat, as does Daniele. That verb does not take an infinitive in any sense, and Savj-López and Mele (1897) correctly print gestit.

22 cultoque pulchra Parthenope solo: “And in lovely Naples with its cultivated soil”? The combination of the two ablatives in the mss. is awkward, and one might suspect an error for genitive pulchre Parthenope (i.e. -ae ... -ae) or pulchre Parthenopes, “on the cultivated ground of lovely Naples.” Daniele interprets the ms. reading as pulchra Parthenopae.

23 The unmetrical considère (“sit”) of the mss. may be Garcilaso’s own error, but Keniston (1925: 299) posited a miscopying of the synonymous consèdere, a compound verb that, “[a]lthough ... not found in Classic Latin,” occurs in the Vulgate.

41 The mss. have carmen canentis sic animus rapit / mentemque (“the spirit of the one singing so seizes the song and mind ...”), where the accusative animum printed by editors since Savj-López and Mele (1897) makes far better sense: “as he sings [of the aforesaid myths], his song so seizes [my] spirit and mind ....”. An anonymous reader for the Journal nicely suggests the accusative plural animos, which is paleographically closer. The accusatives in the foregoing stanza (referring to the themes of Telesio’s Imber Aureus, on the myth of Danaë) are the objects of canentis.

Ode II

This shortest of the odes, addressed to Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (whose Democrats, advancing arguments for the propriety of religious war, appeared in 1535), and looking forward to his history of Charles V’s African campaign, shifts from wonderment at its addressee’s militant theology to a vivid image of the emperor driving his Tunisian enemies before him (on the imagery and its intertexts see Cruz 2002: 198, Gray 2016). First printed by Bonilla (1899), it was preserved in a Madrid ms., unlike the other two odes (see above); there it bears the title Garsie Lasi Ode ad se Genesium Sepulvedam. Garcilaso himself may have conveyed it to Sepúlveda at the same time he did a copy of Luis de Ávila y Zúñiga’s Historia de la campañade Túnez (cf. Sepúlveda’s letter of January 1536 discussed by Keniston 1922: 139-140).

18-20 The ms. reads Giro, sæuus uti Maßylas leo / Per syluas; Nomadasue / Imbelles agitat feras. Keniston (1925: 215), emending the toponyms, corrected this to Gyro, saevus uti Massylias leo / Per sylvas Numidasve ... : “[Charles
drives his enemies] in a circle, just as through the forests of Marseille or Numidia a lion chases timid beasts.” His Massylas is a loaded term, as my translation suggests through its anomalousness: as referring to the ancient Massylian (Massylli) people of Numidia—immediately apt in sense because, of course, lions are found in Africa9—it is unmetrical (like the manuscript’s synonymous Massylas),10 since a choriamb-shaped word is required; as evoking Marseille (Latin Massilia), which does not actually sustain lions,11 it scans correctly and points to a different sphere of Charles’s military aspirations (Garcilaso was to receive his mortal wound in Charles’s service on the road between Marseilles and Nice). The philological dilemma posed here forces us to consider a wider imperial program.

Editors, starting with Bonilla, report Homadasue in 19. The initial letter in the ms. looks to me more like N (compare the H at the opening of 31, with its straighter horizontal); in any case Keniston is right to read a word for “Numidian.” The terms Nomadas (printed by Mele 1924) and Numidas are equivalent toponyms in this context, but according to Latin norms only the latter is suitable as an adjective with sylvas (see OLD s.v. Nomades 1a and Numida c).

34-5 Here the metrical problem is the converse of that of ms. Massylas in 18. The ms. reads non ferat indidem / ingeneretque furorem (“would not bring and generate rage out of that place [i.e. the womb whence Charles was putatively torn by Caesarean section]”). The prosody of ingeneretque (where the opening of this pheracatan requires three long syllables, no resolution permitted) is sufficient to condemn the reading, even were the coupling of the verbs not jejune. Mele (1924) is doubtless right to posit a scribal error for ingentemque furorem: “would not bring out of there both an immense rage [and a thirst for hot bloodshed].”

Ode III

The text was first printed by Mele (1898), who cites Neapolitanus Bibl. Nat. V E 53; by (1924: 45-48) he is aware of the primary Naples ms., XIII AA 63. This ode (untitled in the mss.) is unusual in that it is a third-person narrative of a confrontation between the deities of love, Venus and Cupid. In fact the dialogue between them that dominates the poem, occupying all but the introductory thirteen lines and the two-word transition between speakers at 62 (ait puer,

9. Cf. the “lion in Punic fields” (Poenorum ... in arvis ... leo) that figures in a simile in Virgil, Aeneid 12.4-6 and the “Numidian lions” (Numidasque leones) in Ovid, Ars Amatoria 2.183.
10. The Massylus of Mele 1924, modifying leo, reflects a misunderstanding of the syntax.
11. Note, however, that a lion figured on the ancient coinage and later heraldry of the city—which sits on the Gulf of Lion.
“said the boy”), constitutes a close versification of Lucian’s Dialogues of the Gods based on the Latin prose translation by Erasmus, a model that can inform our decisions about the text (see on 52-53).

3 thure altaria sacro, “altars [smoldering] with holy frankincense.” This line—being a pherecratean, whereas other odd-numbered lines in this poem are glyconics—is one syllable short. Luque (1979: 299), in saying that in the line, “además del hiato, tendríamos una segunda sílaba breve,” is evidently scanning it as a crude glyconic, thūrē altāriā sācro. Garcilaso is most unlikely to have perpetrated such a plethora of prosodic solecisms (cretic line opening, hiatus, -tār-, nominative plural in -ā). The evidence of the rest of the poem shows him well able to compose a glyconic, and we should certainly assume a lacuna, with text of a syllable (or two, in the case of elision) accidentally left uncopied: thure altaria <...> sacro. An adverb “there,” specifying the Cypriot setting indicated in the opening line (sedes ad Cyprias), would be welcome (e.g. ibī). In line 44 editors accept the cumque ignes (“and when the fires [of love]”) first printed by Mele (1898: 365) for ms. cum ignes, which through elision would otherwise leave the colon one syllable short (see Luque 1979: 309).

On a kindred lapse: in the evident lacuna at the opening of an epitaph on Garcilaso, possibly by Bembo, printed from a British Library ms. by López Grigera (1988: 306) (cf. 296), I would venture to posit a term for the love goddess, balancing the personification in Marte and completing a thematic polarity favored by Garcilaso himself (as in e.g. his Ode ad florem Gnidi): <Cypride> lassus erat, nunc clarus Marte quiescit (“he had been worn out by Love; now he reposes illustrious in War”).

5 gaudebat, cum puer appulit, “[Venus] was taking joy [in dancing], when her boy approached.” This odd-numbered line, conversely, has one long syllable too many. Emendation of the imperfect gaudebat to gaudet, an unremarkable historical present (like incipit in 13), would repair the meter, and Luque (1979: 308) (who also conjectures the unmetrical gaudebat, puer cum appulit, but ultimately considers neither solution “absolutamente justificable”) very plausibly suggests that a copyist made the reverse substitution.

30 The Clymene’ of the ms. (in the Vaticanus, Clymenē) should be interpreted as the normal Latinized Greek first-declension acc. form Clymenen (as in

14. As Christopher Parrott emphasized to me in April 2014.
15. In the Vatican ms. the word looks like gaudibat, but should probably be read as the normal form.
e.g. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.756), not a third-declension form *Clymenem* as commonly printed in editions going back to Mele’s *editio princeps*. In the primary ms. the same symbol can represent syllable-final *m* or *n*: for the latter see e.g. lines 16 and 66 *non*, 22 *frontem*, 40 *long(a)eva*, 53 *cuncta* and *omen*, etc. Garcilaso’s model Erasmus (1506) gives *Clymenen*.

52-4 *proin / < ... > mater cuncta timens*, “So < ... > mother, fearing all [these things] ...” These successive ms. lines in Venus’ speech are both lesser asclepiads, so a copyist has omitted a whole verse (a glyconic) between them, as Mele (1898: 365) already notes (cf. Gutiérrez 1952: 306 n.). Lucian’s original at this point has δέδια τοίνυν ἅπαντα, δέδια τὸ τοιοῦτο ἡ τὸ μέγα σε κακὸν ἐγὼ τεκοῦσα, which Erasmus renders *Proinde cuncta timeo. Metuo ne tale quid accidat quandoquidem te produxi, malum ingens ...* (“So I fear all [these things]. I am afraid that, since I brought you forth as a great trouble, something like the following may happen ...”). Words corresponding to “since I brought you forth as a great trouble” are lacking in Garcilaso; if we adapt the sense of *quandoquidem te produxi, malum ingens* to the syntax of Garcilaso’s *mater* and to glyconic meter, we might consider some such supplement as *ingentis quia sum mali / mater* (“since I am the mother of a great trouble”).16

56 In *ne fortē Cybele*, “lest perchance Cybele ...,” the false lengthening seems a rare metrical error on Garcilaso’s part, perhaps based on adverbs in -ē (compare the metrical question raised above on I.23), unless we should posit a scribal misreading of *forsan* (or Horatian *forsit*) or omission of some monosyllable like *et*, with elision. For the restoration of an elided monosyllable compare 18-19, where the mss. show *verum etiam deos / ausis stringere spicula* (“but you even dare to draw your arrows < ... > the gods”)17: a preposition meaning “against” seems required, and Mele, first in 1898 (cf. Keniston 1925: 303), prints *etiam in deos* (the meter is not affected there).

69 *adblandirier*: So Neapolitanus Bibl. Nat. XIII AA 6218 and the Vaticanus, correctly (compare Erasmus’ *adblandiuntur*). Some editions (beginning with Mele 1924; Mele 1898 has the nonsensical *abblandiries*) give *ablândirier*, the misspelling of Neapolitanus Bibl. Nat. V E 53.

72 *quid egō peccō tibi aut aliis*: The first-person singular ending in -ō (cf. 74

16. An anonymous reader for the Journal suggests also *immanis* or *inmeni* (for my *ingentis*), noting that they would avoid repetition with *ingentique ... voce* in line 50 (which is part of an expansion of Erasmus’ *tumultus*).

17. The scansion entailed by -ērē *spi*- is mostly alien to classical Latin verse, but occurs in Properius and Horace’s *Satires*, and once in Virgil (*Aeneid* 11.309). Cf. Odes I.65 *suaderē*, *sperans* and II.23 *tenderē suetae*. Garcilaso’s frequent elisions, including those of long syllables, also evince a metrical style closer to Horace’s *Satires* than to his *Odes*. His metrical practice fits within the broad range evinced by Neolatin lyric (on which see Charlet 2020: 151-228).

18. The first *r*, however, does not look like other *rs* in the scan of the ms.; it looks more like an *e* and may show signs of correction.
monstrōque, 84 petō; 70 offero and 73 offero occur at line-end and so are indeterminate) is a feature of post-Augustan Latin poetry. The long -ō in ego is found in ancient Roman comedy and only rarely later ([Virgil], Lydia 53; Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica 8.158); here an editor might be tempted to posit a scribal omission of correlative aut (so quid ego aut ...; see above on 56). But the concentration of un-Horatian features in this line (note also the synizesis in aliis, scanned as alīs) may conceivably involve a knowing metapoetic turn on its sense (Cupid’s rhetorical question to Venus, “how am I sinning against you or others?”).
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