Rewriting Longus:

A Naturalized *Daphnis and Chloe* in Renaissance Spain

Mary Lee Cozad
Northern Illinois University

While both the Greeks and the Romans cultivated the pastoral—one thinks immediately of the iconic Theocritus and Virgil—Greek pastoral literature was fundamentally different from the Latin pastoral. Whereas the Greek works of Theocritus, Longus and of minor Greek pastoral authors were ironic, distanced, and amusing, the works of Virgil and his many centuries of Western European followers were serious, subjective, and melancholy. Nowhere is that difference more obvious than in the Renaissance translations/adaptations of Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*. A case in point is that work's translation/adaptation by the minor sixteenth-century Spanish humanist Damasio de Frías, who transformed a witty and ironic Hellenistic work into a fully Virgilian Renaissance pastoral.

In its original form, *Daphnis and Chloe* is a beautifully written and superbly structured Greek romance from the Hellenistic Age of Classical Antiquity. A work of the so-called Second Sophistic, it was probably composed sometime between the second half of the second century and the first third of the third century CE (Hunter 3). The story has been variously characterized as a survival of a Sumerian fertility myth (Anderson), an exaltation of the god Pan and his mystery cults (Merkelbach) or of Eros (Chalk), or of Nature, as represented by the Nymphs who protect and nurture the young protagonists (Doody 53). Additionally, it has been characterized as a representation of the "never-ending reciprocities of Art and Nature" (Doody 45). The work itself, a supposed ekphrasis of a painting (Longus, ed. Morgan 22), has been seen as a sort of votive offering to the gods Pan, Eros, and the Nymphs, all represented within the text itself (Doody 45). For a modern Euro-American reader, irrevocably possessed of a Judeo-Christian sensibility, the clearly pagan *Daphnis and Chloe*'s religious meaning is somewhat belied by its narrator, sophisticated in both rhetoric and character, humorous, ironic, and if not lightly condescending, certainly hovering

Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée
CRCL DECEMBER 2012 DÉCEMBRE RCLC
0319–051x/12/39.4/353

over the narrative in a superior pose.

The story itself recounts in four books the growing love between Daphnis and Chloe, two children abandoned at birth, each raised by different peasant families on the island of Lesbos, and both watched over by the Nymphs, Pan, and Eros. In adolescence Daphnis becomes a goatherd and Chloe a shepherdess. They herd their flocks together, and as their physical attraction for each other grows, they unsuccessfully try to discover the mysteries of sex. Eventually, through a series of events that occur during a visit by the estate's master, they learn the identity of their respective true parents by means of the recognition tokens which had been abandoned with them. Daphnis's true father is the master himself, and Chloe's another wealthy inhabitant of Mytelene, the principal city of Lesbos. The two are restored to their families, and they marry, but choose to remain in the country as masters of the rural estate on which Daphnis had lived as a peasant-slave.

Symmetrically structured around the seasons, the tale includes such highlights as Daphnis's fall into a wolf pit and rescue by Chloe; the cowherd Dorcon's disguising himself as a wolf to try to abduct Chloe, but suffering injuries at the jaws of the children's dogs; the elderly peasant Philetas's discourse on Eros; two abductions—Daphnis's by pirates/cattle rustlers, and Chloe's by invaders from a neighboring city; Daphnis's sexual initiation by the former prostitute Lykanion; a grape harvest; a winter birdhunting; and the attempted procurement of Daphnis as a "boy-toy" by the parasite Gnathon, who, once Daphnis's true identity is known, redeems himself by rescuing Chloe from an abduction by one of her other suitors.

While we may never be able fully to comprehend how the Hellenistic reading audience understood this work, to the Renaissance reader and writer, enamored of Classical literature (Bolgar 275), and already familiar with Heliodorus's *Ethiopian History* (López Rueda 30), the Hellenistic Greek romance *par excellence*, Longus's plot would have been singularly attractive. Part sex comedy, part pastoral idyll, the storyline had been greatly influenced by the Greek new comedy (McCulloh 57), so popular with Italian humanists in its Latin imitators Plautus and Terence (*Catholic Encyclopedia on CD-ROM*).

Longus's two Greek manuscripts, one more complete than the other (Vieillefond xiii), had been available in the West, specifically Italy, since at least the early sixteenth century (Vieillefond xv). The work was first published in a French translation by Jacques Amyot in 1559 (Vieillefond xiv), although an Italian manuscript translation by Annibal Caro had been available since 1538 (Vieillefond xlix). The Italian translation, however, may or may not have circulated. A Neo-Latin adaptation by the Italian Lorenzo Gambara had been published in 1574 (Gagliardi 14; Hoffman 109). *Daphnis and Chloe* was supposed to have been unknown in any form in Spain during the sixteenth century and was not translated into Spanish in its entirety until Juan Valera's version of 1880 (Hardin 136).

Hence, although there were at least three available sources of the *Daphnis and Chloe* text in the sixteenth century: the Greek original, the Italian translation, and

the French translation, it is a bit of a surprise that a partial translation/adaptation of Books I and II should turn up in a Spanish manuscript romance of chivalry of 1568, *Lidamarte de Armenia*, by the minor poet and humanist Damasio de Frías y Balboa, who was employed in the household of the Admiral of Castile in Valladolid (Cozad, "Platonic-Aristotelian" 205).[1] The American-born Frías (Montero 84), however, was quite likely well-qualified either to translate one or more of the available texts or to adapt another's Spanish translation of a pastoral Greek romance. His education, which possibly or even probably included the study of Greek (Cozad xi), his subsequent humanistic writings, both dialogues (Cozad, "Platonic-Aristotelian"), and polemics (Salazar Ramírez; Montero); his Petrarchan/pastoral poetry (Ponz Guillén 155ss), and his incorporation of two other Greek romances in the *Lidamarte*—Heliodorus's *Ethiopian History* and Achilles Tatius's *Clitophon and Leucippe* (Cozad cxxiii)—reveal a mind that was apparently receptive to all things both Hellenistic and Italian.

However good a humanist and however likely a Hellenist that he may have been, the fact remains that among the several other not-especially-chivalric interpolated episodes of Frías's rather meandering *Lidamarte*, with its characteristically interlaced chivalric plot (Cozad xi; Vinaver 81), he included a somewhat altered version of *Daphnis and Chloe*. Frías integrated his partial translation into the larger narrative as a means of introducing one of his major characters, Liseo de España, who will be his Ruggiero-figure, à la Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*. Like Ariosto's Ruggiero (*Orlando furioso* II.51), Liseo, although initially disappointed in love, will marry one of the two Amazon knights and found a dynasty which will culminate, in his case, in the Admirals of Castile, just as Ruggiero had founded the family of Ariosto's patron Ippolito d'Este (*Orlando furioso* I.3).

In the *Lidamarte*, the reader first encounters Liseo/Daphnis, when the Caballero del Desamor, one of the work's two male protagonists, wandering the Black Sea area in search of his stolen shield, helps another knight (Liseo) defeat the disgruntled knights whom Liseo had bested in a tournament and who had then attacked him. Afterwards, Desamor insists that Liseo tell him his life story and explain how he happened to be wandering the world as a *caballero andante*.

Liseo's life story is the *Daphnis and Chloe* plot, with important changes, probably for reasons of length and culture. In Frías's version the children are not abandoned, as Longus's children were by their wealthy but avaricious parents, but are carried off by pirates. Presumably, the abandonment of infants, while still practiced (Bennassar 542), was no longer socially acceptable. The children grow up in Ethiopia, not Lesbos, which of course ruins the seasonal plot structure of the original.[2] Frías's children are a couple of years younger than Daphnis and Chloe when the action begins, presumably to make the lack of sexual activity more plausible, and because respectable Spanish 12-year-olds of different sexes might spend time alone together, but not 15-year-olds. Frías substitutes Achilles Tatius's "bee-sting" kiss for the grasshopper-in-the-bodice incident, probably as a less suggestive alternative. Frías's Leonisa is as resourceful as

Chloe. In the *Lidamarte* both Liseo and Leonisa fall into a wolf pit, here a lion pit.[3] But in this version a lion falls in after them—only a small one, Liseo notes. When Leonisa sees Liseo struggling with it, she takes off her belt (her breast band in the original), and strangles it with her "delicadas manos" (presumably because Frías, who lived in the age of the corset, did not know what a breast band was). In the Frías text the three abductions (pirates/rustlers, invaders from a rival city, a disgruntled suitor) are conflated into one with elements of each of the three in the original. In Frías's text Eros/Cupid, here called Amor, and the elderly Philetas character, here called Filotas, arrange for the children's return to Spain rather than giving them advice about love. But when Liseo and Leonisa are reunited with their parents, Leonisa's family marries her to a richer man than Liseo. The unhappy ending may reflect unfortunate love stories in other Renaissance pastorals, like Sincero's or Clonico's in Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, Salicio or Nemoroso's in Garcilaso's "Égloga primera," or more closely, Diana's marriage to Delio in Montemayor's *Diana*. It may also be a recognition of sixteenth-century reality. Or it may simply be necessary to explain why Liseo is wandering the world—there would be no need for a happily married rural Daphnis to wander.

But despite the plot alterations, there are many lengthy passages and even entire episodes in which Frías translates the *Daphnis and Chloe* text literally (Cozad, "Textual Translation/Textual Transformation"). In these translations, the translator's knowledge of both Classical Greek and contemporary French is apparent (ibid.), and yet the text does not read like a Greek pastoral or even a Greek romance. As one analyzes his text, it becomes clear that Frías has read (and translated) Longus through a western filter of Virgil, Sannazaro, Garcilaso, and Montemayor—with additional influences from Ovid and Petrarch (and possibly Boccaccio)—to produce a fundamentally different sort of pastoral than the original *Daphnis and Chloe*, even when he seems to be translating most directly and literally from the Greek text.[4]

Longus's pastoral may owe its detached, witty and ironic voice to the influence of the Hellenistic pastoral poet Theocritus[5] (Gutzwiller 123; McCulloh 52; Halperin 187; Alpers 146). In addition, in both Theocritus and Longus, one can detect a gritty rural poverty and culture of hard physical work barely beneath the surface of their pastoral world (Halperin 179-80; Morgan 6). Hunter's study has documented in great detail Theocritus's many influences on Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*.

By the time of Frías's immediate sixteenth-century Spanish predecessors Garcilaso and Montemayor, however, pastoral literature had become something quite different—serious, melancholy, nostalgic, full of unrequited love, infused with Neoplatonism and a subjectified Nature, and given to set pieces like the *locus amoenus* and the praise of the Golden Age. Garcilaso's pastoral depicted serious, subjective pastoral characters (Fernández-Morera 42), profound anguished sufferings of love (Close 6), nostalgia (Orobitg 179; Muñiz 180), a mood of melancholy (Fernández-Morera 100; Ferri Coll 65) and both Neoplatonic nature and love theory (Wescott, "Nemoroso's…" 475; Gicovate 69; Orobitg 175). In Garcilaso Neoplatonic Memory is

an entryway to a more "spiritual" realm and allows one to ascend to the world of Ideas (Orobitg 175). Montemayor, much influenced by Garcilaso (Montero XXXLX, XL), is equally melancholic, though in a slightly different way; his love melancholy "is the outward designation of a central bliss and vitality that are themselves a result of an essential goodness (goodwilling), a disposition to love."(Creel 15). His lovers' plights are characterized by solitude, misery and subjectivity (El Saffar 192-93). Characters tell their own stories in a series of first-person narratives (interpolations) (Alpers 352) before a "public of listeners and judges" (Egido 143). Memory is evoked (Mujica 121; Egido 144), often beyond the limits of verisimilitude. As we shall see, in his adaptation of *Daphnis and Chloe* Frías has transformed that independent, joyful Hellenistic romance into a melancholic *Diana*-style first-person interpolated pastoral episode.

What would account for the disparity in tone between the Hellenistic Greek pastoral works and the Spanish Renaissance pastorals of Garcilaso and Montemayor? And what would account for the disparity in both tone and structure between the original *Daphnis and Chloe* and Frías's sixteenth-century translation/adaptation? The key to those differences is the intervention of Virgil's *Eclogues*, Sannazaro's *Arcadia* and a Virgil viewed through the prism of Sannazaro and Renaissance Neoplatonism.

According to Alpers, "Virgil's transformation of Theocritean bucolic established pastoral as a literary form" (23, n. 21), a view shared by Halperin (5) and Walker (151). Although Snell's vision of a subjective, melancholy Virgilian Arcadia has been surpassed by more modern critics (Jenkyns, "Virgil and Arcadia," 26), the consensus of critical opinion is that unlike the Theocritean pastoral, Virgil's *Eclogues* are serious (Alpers 161), incorporating such themes as suffering (Breed 101, 103, 105, 118; Rudd 15); loss (Alpers 170, 172; Leach 138; Davis 63); pessimism (Williams 555), and consolation (Davis 63, 64). His pastoral works are more subjective than those of Theocritus (Otis 40; Snell 56; Leach 111; Wright 108; Breed 30, 115; Rudd 3), his tone more personal (Clausen XXX), his landscape more "elegiac" (Ettin 100) and melancholy (Leach 111; Breed 102).

But when speaking of the Renaissance, particularly the Spanish Renaissance, one cannot study Virgil in isolation. These non-Theocritean pastoral traits were enhanced, exaggerated, and augmented by Jacopo Sannazaro's *Arcadia* (1504). In addition to Renaissance authors' direct knowledge of Virgil's *Eclogues*, Virgilian pastoral was mediated for them by their reading of Sannazaro (Jenkyns, "Virgil and Arcadia" 10). Sannazaro not only saw Virgil's *Eclogues* as subjective and serious, as William Kennedy has pointed out in his fundamental study (30), but, if anything, he increased Virgilian subjectivity in his book, consciously putting himself into the work as the character Sincero (Saccone 77). Sannazaro's pastoral voice is melancholy, "dolorosamente elegiaca," in the words of Ettore Paratore (56), a reflection of his melancholy temperament (59) and tormented spirit (53). *Arcadia*'s mood is nostalgic, both personally, for Sincero's lost beloved and his longed-for Naples (Kennedy 16, 34), and societally, for a lost Golden Age: "un tempo incorrotto, ignaro de guerre e di 'rabbiose insanie,' dove anche l'amore non era guerra e follia, ma gioia, lietezza e

fede…" [an uncorrupted time, ignorant of war and rabid insanity; where love as well was not war and insanity, but joy, happiness and faith] (Saccone 78). To paraphrase Saccone (51), in fact, love was nearly the only Virgilian theme, and certainly the predominant one, which Sannazaro emphasized, a theme to which he subordinated all possible others.

Sannazaro's increased subjectivity, and the direction in which he took his explorations of love as a literary theme, may owe much to his incorporation of Petrarchan love poetry, Petrarchan imagery, the extremes of Petrarchan erotic suffering, and above all, to Petrarch's vision of love as an inspiration for *poetic* creation. For Alpers, Sannazaro's very significance within Renaissance pastoral is that he "grafts Petrarchan love poetry onto Virgilian pastoral" (26) and "assimilate[s] the Petrarchan lover to the literary shepherd" (349). As Kennedy notes, "The amatory songs of *Arcadia* are full of Petrarchan topoi" (37). "These include the familiar antitheses, oxymorons and paradoxes…the 'living death,' 'pleasurable ill,'" (ibid), "the beloved's 'sweet wrath, sweet disdain'" (ibid), among many others. For Saccone (53) Petrarch is omnipresent in *Arcadia*, an "authentic" Petrarch, "quello che darà il tono alla 'malinconia' dell' *Arcadia*, quello del piangere e i sospiri" (65) [one who will give a tone to the "melancholy" of the *Arcadia*, that of weeping and sighs].

But despite his constant hommage to Petrarch, Sannazaro departs from his model in some important ways that "pastoralize" Petrarchan themes. For Kennedy, Sannazaro added "a contemplative, meditative Platonic vein" to the Petrarchan model (59), and "To avoid imitative extravagance, and thus to make Petrarchist conventions amenable to pastoral, Sannazaro carefully modulated the emotional register of his sonnets and canzoni" (39).

In addition to his use of Virgil and Petrarch, Sannazaro is notorious for his synthesis of previous Classical, Italian, pastoral and non-pastoral influences. Critics have discussed his debts to Boccaccio (Greenwood 83; Kennedy 35ff), Dante (Kennedy 34), minor Latin and Neo-Latin pastoral authors (Kennedy 35), and Ovid (Paratore 54; Quint 52), among others. Of course, this eclecticism would have been part of his appeal for Renaissance readers, as humanistically educated Europeans would have experienced a pleasurable shock of recognition at the traces of beloved and authoritative authors of past generations. Sannazaro's complex, eclectic, yet fundamentally Virgilian pastoral certainly enables us to understand why sixteenth-century Spanish authors would have so different an understanding of bucolic literature than did Theocritus and Longus—and perhaps why Frías would not have been able to see Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe* as it was.

Frías himself has left for us his own opinion of pastoral literature in general and Montemayor in particular in the form of a critical treatise and commentary on the Spanish poet and pastoral author Antonio de Villegas's *Inventario*.[6] The treatise was composed c. 1566 (Montero, "Noticia," 83), close to the time in which Frías would have been writing the *Lidamarte*. In it he expressed praise, even veneration, for Garcilaso (fol. 166v), while admitting that even Garcilaso's work suffered from a

few *lunares* ("beauty marks" or minor defects). His opinion of Montemayor seems somewhat mixed. He alleges that Villegas's criticisms of Montemayor only make that author more admired (fol. 175), finds Villegas's scorn for Montemayor odd (fol. 118), but refuses to state his own opinion of Montemayor's work (fol. 118), perhaps because Montemayor's prose, like Villegas's in *Ausencia y soledad de amor*, would have overused epithets: "y començó luego vna tracalada de epítetos <poderosos reinos, caudelosos ríos> tan sin saçón, sino solo por leuantar en aquel llano pardo pensaua caminar vna mui alta cuesta llena de ueinte estropieços" (fol. 178v) [and then he began a lot of epithets <powerful kingdoms, overflowing rivers> so inopportunely, but only in order to erect on that dark plain he thought to traverse a very high slope full of twenty stumbles], used adjectives inappropriately ("imperuio," fol. 176v), and included descriptions for the mere purpose of setting mood, as in *Ausencia*'s opening lines "Arroxado de la uida…" (fol.176) [cast out of life], an impropriety for Frías, who appears to have disliked redundancies of all kinds, like "bajando acia auaxo" (fol. 179v) [going down downwards], or "con un mouimiento natural" (fol. 180v) [with a natural movement]. (Frías would appear to think that all movement is natural.)

Excellent pastoral prose for Frías, on the other hand, "vna prossa muy sana, mui casta, mui sin inchaçón" (fol. 178) [a very healthy prose, very chaste, very much without exaggeration], would be simple, elegant, and serious. He rejects illogical hyperboles like Villegas's "Caminé tanto, sin mudarme, que perdí de vista el mundo" (fol. 181-181v) [I wandered so much without changing place that I lost sight of the world], the ridiculous placement of a supposedly dead body, whose presence (both dead and apparently resuscitated) is taken in stride by the other shepherds (fol. 183-184), and the very unlikely scarcity of and danger in picking acorns (fol. 184v-185) in a pastoral setting. In short, what is most important for Frías is the preservation of pastoral decorum, or the appropriateness of style to subject, a rule against which Villegas is in continual violation (fol. 184v). Along with his praise of the Greek language (fol. 172v), Frías's clear idea of what pastoral prose should be would have made him a perfect candidate to attempt a Renaissance adaptation of *Daphnis and Chloe*.

That attitude also explains why Frías does not adopt Montemayor's prose style, although his very apparent debts to Virgil, Ovid, Sannazaro, Garcilaso and Montemayor otherwise govern his adaptation of *Daphnis and Chloe*. Adaptations include such major changes as the addition of Virgilian pastoral motifs not found at all in either Longus or even in Theocritus. Besides including a miscellany of Renaissance narrative topoi—fixed pieces such as a Dawn description (469), references to Latin mythological figures (448, 463), the depiction of an abstract Fortune as controlled by the Christian God (445, 461) and a narratee who comments on the story in aesthetic terms as did the narratees in Sannazaro's *Arcadia* (Tylus 117)—he replaces the very practical, work-intensive grape harvest, authentically characteristic of Mediterranean peasant society, in Longus's original with the more "literary" Virgilian/Ovidian/Sannazaran pastoral games. Françoise Lavocat has succinctly traced the history of literary pastoral (and epic) athletic contests from Homer and

Virgil through Sannazaro,[7] correctly noting the key position of Sannazaro's *Arcadia* for all later developments of this topos (68) and its subsequent modification in more "novelistic" works: "Most of the sixteenth-century's great texts that renew the pastoral tradition abrogate the traditional sequence devoted to ritualistic games. Yet this does not mean the games are forgotten. On the contrary, one finds mention of antiquity's athletic competitions, for example, in Montemayor's *Diana*…the motif seems to intervene regularly at the beginning of this work as if it contributed to the setting up of the pastoral décor and code" (69). A semi-independent set piece, as in Sannazaro, has become subordinate to plot.

Like Montemayor, who lists "tañer, cantar, luchar, jugar al cayado, bailar con las mozas el domingo" [to play (music), sing, wrestle, throw the staff (at a target), dance with the girls on Sunday] in Book I of *La Diana* as typical pastoral games in which, according to Sylvano, Diana's husband Delio does not indulge (Montero 33), and "correr, saltar, luchar y tirar la barra, poniendo por premio para el que victorioso saliere, cuales una guirnalda de verde yedra, cuales una dulce zampoña o flauta o un cayado de ñudoso fresno" (43-44) [run, leap, wrestle, shotput, putting up as a prize for whoever won, for some a garland of green ivy, for some a sweet shepherd's pipe or flute or a staff of knotty ash] in Selvagia's account of the festival of Minerva at which she met Ismenia, Frías briefly lists the games which his Daphnis (Liseo) and Chloe (Leonisa) had enjoyed watching: "Goçabamos otras beces de uer las competencias de otros pastores en luchar y saltar y en cantares amorosos" (450) [We enjoyed other times seeing the contests of other shepherds in wrestling, leaping and love songs]. His games have displaced Longus's grape harvest (II.1-3), only to play an identical role in the plot, a pretext for young people to flirt, and an opportunity for the Daphnis and Chloe characters to begin to notice the other's desirability in the eyes of the opposite sex, a development which contributes to the growing love and sexual attraction between the two. Unlike the sly Longus, however, Frías makes no mention of how pleased each is to be the object of such amorous attention—or of his/her jealousy (*celos*, not *envidia*) at the attention the other receives. He emphasizes instead his characters' innocence: "y como entrados en mayor edad, tratauan de le dar a entender su amor por terminos y maneras no permitidos en su simpleça y pura niñez, ni ella sabia entender dellos lo que querian quando asi la hablauan; y algunas ueces siendo dellos festejada, voluiase a mi rriendo e y tanbien me rreya con la misma ygnorancia. Acaesciame a mi lo mismo con algunas pastoras…" (450) [and as having been older, they tried to communicate their love in ways not permitted in her simplicity and pure childhood, nor did she know how to understand from them what they wanted when they spoke to her in that way; and sometimes being courted by them, she turned to me laughing and I also laughed with the same ignorance. It happened to me the same way with some shepherdesses]. He downplays any hint of sexual jealousy: "yo con un descuido muy de mi edad y de la ignocentia mia, dexandolas, echaba por otra parte del campo tras mi Leonisa, sin que ella de verme entre cien otras pastoras cosa se le diese, ni dello algun pesar sintiesse, como ni yo sentia quando con los demas

pastores la ueya hablando"[8] (450) [I, with a carelessness characteristic of my age and my innocence, leaving them, turned toward another part of the countryside after my Leonisa, without its bothering her to see me among a hundred other shepherdesses, nor did she feel any sorrow, as I did not when I saw her talking to the other shepherds]. Despite displacing the grape harvest in favor of pastoral games and despite a very non-Hellenistic prudishness, Frías clearly understood the role of that harvest as a plot device, although in Frías's case, even more so than in Longus, he used the episode to underscore his characters' innocence.

Frías's added motif of the Golden Age, lacking in Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*, also underscores the innocence and purity of the *liebespahr*, as well as of the Ethiopian pastoral environment. Frías anticipates the motif with a brief mention immediately following the episode of pastoral games: "Asi duramos en este trato y natural pureça bien como en Siglo de Oro" (450) [Thus we persisted in this relationship and natural purity much as in a Golden Age], hinting that for him both pastoral games and references to a past Golden Age were a necessary or at least natural component of pastoral literature. He reserves a fuller treatment of the theme for later, after the incident of Arsenio (Dorcon) in the lionskin (wolfskin), immediately following a positive critical commentary by the Caballero del Desamor (463) and a break for the end of chapter 28 of the *Lidamarte*.

Frías's treatment of the theme is a formal, though short, rhetorical discourse introducing chapter 29, and related not by Liseo but by the *Lidamarte*'s reliable narrator. He notes that Saturn and Jupiter were often invited to eat with the Ethiopians as Ethiopia was an exceptionally innocent and holy nation, and interrupts himself for a panegyric of the Golden Age of innocence:

> ¡Dichosa edad, dichosos siglos de oro quando el jouen moço y la doncella hermosa con puro amor, con affiction sencilla y animo innocente se tratauan, sin que malicia o vicioso deseo alguno los trugese recatados y secretos en su trato! Mas luego que, señor, a la pureça de aquellos siglos sucedieron las demas hedades estragadas, raras ya o ningunas ueces se halla entre los hombres un tal y tan puro amor que libre de toda malicia y bicio tenga algo de aquella sinceridad antigua. (464)

> [Fortunate age, fortunate centuries of gold when the young lad and the beautiful damsel with pure love, with simple affection and innocent spirit had dealings, without malice or any vicious desire's causing them to be cautious and secret in their acquaintance! But then, sir, when the purity of those centuries was followed by the remaining depraved ages, rarely or never is such a pure love found among men, a love that free of all malice and vice has something of that ancient sincerity.]

The discourse is followed immediately by the Filotas (Philetas) incident.

Although the *locus* of the Golden Age literary theme is Hesiod (Perkell 11), it was the Latin and Italian treatments of this topic, not all of them in pastoral works, which were to be the most influential in the Spanish pastoral, especially those of Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, Boccaccio and Sannazaro, among many others.[9] Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, even more so than Virgil's fourth eclogue, definitively linked the theme to pasto-

ral literature (Costa 69). Frías's treatment is of interest because it is apparently one of the few appearances of the theme as a formal rhetorical discourse in a work of Spanish prose fiction before Don Quijote's famous harangue to the goatherds (Stagg 80). Probably through the coincidental influence of Dolce's translation of Ovid (Stagg 81), it begins with nearly the same phrase.

In the many manifestations of the *topos* (Mazzocchi 373), a number of the individual motifs within the theme could be separated and recombined in different ways. Hence, it is possible to break the Frías discourse into several components, each from a slightly different tradition.

(1) For Frías, the Golden Age was the Age of Saturn, not Cronos, a trait he has in common with Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, Seneca, Martial, Juvenal, Lactantius, Prudentius, Boethius, Dante, Lorenzo de' Medici, Poliziano, Sannazaro, Guevara, and a number of minor Italian and Spanish authors (Stagg). He does not specify the number of succeeding ages, which, indeed, varied from author to author (Pizzani 12).

(2) Homer's *Iliad* was the *locus* for the feasting of the gods with the Ethiopians: "For Zeus went to the blameless Aetheiopians, at the Ocean / yesterday to feast and the rest of the gods went with him" (I. 423-424), who were portrayed there and elsewhere in the Classical Age as exceptionally virtuous: "Diodorus Siculus said the Ethiopians maintained that they were the first men and always lived godly, peaceful lives in the manner of the golden age. The Ethiopians were known as particularly beautiful and virtuous men through the works of Pomponius Mela, Dionysius of Alexandria, and others." (Duncan 195). Petrarch also located the Golden Age in Ethiopia (Costa 20), as did Antonio Tebaldeo in his "Egloga. Titiro e Mopso" (28).

(3) Frías's exclamation "¡Dichosa edad, dichosos siglos de oro!" like Don Quijote's, probably derives from Ludovico Dolce's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Stagg 81). Unlike the majority of Golden-Age representations (including Cervantes's), his does not emphasize a labor-free material abundance in a benevolent nature characterized by the ready availability of acorns (Stagg 85) nor the prevalence of justice and peace (Pizzani 15, 17). Instead, like many authors before him,

(4) Frías accentuates his Golden Age's innocence, a trait it shares with those of Virgil (Perkell 4), Seneca, Boccaccio, Coluccio Salutati, and Boiardo (comically), among others (Costa xviii, 23, 33, 60).

(5) And like several of his predecessors he has conflated the theme of the Golden Age with that of the Reign of Venus and with Renaissance Neoplatonism, to produce a world in which happy couples wander hand in hand in complete innocence and Neoplatonic purity. According to Costa it was Pontano who merged the Golden Age with Venus (69) and Bembo explicitly with Neoplatonic love (79), while Sannazaro (69) and Lorenzo de' Medici (Stagg 87) apparently combined all three, and are very likely Frías's immediate sources. Frías's "el jouen moço y la doncella hermosa con puro amor, con affiction sencilla y animo innocente se tratauan" (464) may reflect Sannazaro's

I lieti amanti e le fanciulle tenere
givan di prato in prato ramentandosi
il foco e l'arco del figlioul di Venere
(*Arcadia* VI. 103-106)

[The happy lovers and the tender maidens
went from meadow to meadow renewing in their minds
the fire and the bow of the son of Venus. (Nash trans. 68)]

while his "sin que malicia o vicioso deseo alguno los trugese recatados y secretos en su trato" (464), Sannazaro's "Non era gelosia" (VI. 106); and "mas luego que, señor, a la pureça de aquellos siglos sucedieron las demas hedades estragadas"(464), Sannazaro's

or conosco ben io che'l mondo instabile
tanto peggiora piu quanto piu invetera (VI. 110-111).

[Now do I well know that the unstable world
worsens so much the more, the more it ages. (Nash trans. 68)]

Frías's discourse may reflect as well Lorenzo de'Medici's *Selve d'Amore*, a fifteenth-century work not published until 1515 (Stagg 78), with its picture of chaste, abstinent lovers:

D'amore accesi senza passione,
speranza o gelosia non li accompagna:
un amor sempre, qual il ciel dispone
e la natura, ch'è sanza magagna.
Con questa simil de complessione
Soletti e lieti van per la campagna; (103. 1-5)

[Their ardent love was free of suffering,
nor were they plagued by jealousy or hope.
Since it was always in conformity
with God's and nature's will, their love was perfect,
and with their sort of temperament, they roamed
alone but happy through the countryside. (Thiem trans. 152)]

While Frías's exclamatory tone throughout his entire discourse may reflect Lorenzo's

Oh dolce tempo! Oh dolcissimi amori!
Oh vita sempre disiosa e queta!
ché l'accesso disio mai non tormenti,
né spento il corpo languido diventa (104.5-8).

[Oh that sweet season of most gentle love!
O life of ceaseless longing, yet content,
where burning passion never stung,
nor did the exhausted body become fatigued
(Thiem trans. 152, with corrections to last line)]

At any rate, regardless of exact sources, it is important to note that the commonplace themes of pastoral games and the myth of the Golden Age which appear in Frías's adaptation had been incorporated into Latin, Italian, and sometimes Spanish pastoral works. They did not appear in Greek pastoral (Stagg 71) and were not present in the *Daphnis and Chloe* original. Frías seems to have added them in order to have what would have been for him a more recognizably "pastoral" narrative.

Also more recognizably pastoral for Frías would have been the melancholy and subjective first-person narrative which he adopted, and in which memory played a major role—a configuration which, as we have seen, reflects the influence of Virgil, Sannazaro, Garcilaso, and Montemayor, among others. Frías's shift in point of view is inherently subjective. Liseo, like Sannazaro's Sincero, Garcilaso's shepherds of "Égloga I," and the protagonists of Montemayor's interpolated tales, narrates his own story, calling attention to the melancholy nature of his tale as he tells it: "Pero, ¿a qué boy yo, triste, acortando mis males, enuoluiendo en una breue y confusa narracion el quento de mis desuenturas?" (441) [But why do I go along attenuating my troubles, wrapping up in a brief and confusing narration the story of my misfortunes?] or "Vn gran sospiro dio a estas palabras el valeroso Cavallero de la Leona, no sin algunas lagrimas rrespondiendole: 'Ay señor, y ¡quánto mejor llamariades bienabenturança aquella si uien la uida que yo agora passo tubiessedes entendido!'"(445), [The brave Knight of the Lion gave a great sigh at these words, not without some tears answering him: "Oh sir, how much better you would call that good fortune if indeed you had understood the life which I now endure"]or "Parece…que estos sobresaltos y temores fueron agüero del triste fin y suceso de mi bentura"(457) [It seems… that these shocks and fears were a foreshadowing of the sad ending and event of my fortune]. We do not know what other characters in the interpolated tale are thinking or feeling except through their words to Liseo, like those of Leonisa, lamenting the coming of night when she must separate from him (447), or when the elderly Filotas remembers his love for his late wife Nisa (468), words reported by a third-person narrator in Longus.

There occurs a similarly subjectivized change in the reporting of other *Daphnis and Chloe* episodes in Frías's adaptation, along with increased sentiment, guilt, apprehension, and a reduction in irony. Longus's narrator, for example, tells us with a good deal of irony how Daphnis and Chloe's sheep seem to miss their masters:

> Then they went and inspected the goats and sheep. They were all lying on the ground, not grazing, not bleating, but pining, I think, for Daphnis and Chloe when they appeared and gave their familiar call and piped their familiar tune, the <sheep> got to their feet and began to graze, and the goats started to frolic, bucking as if for joy at the safe return of their familiar goatherd. (I. 32; Morgan trans. 51).

Contrast Liseo's more serious reporting of his own words to Leonisa in Frías's version:

> "Te juro," tornaba yo, "Leonisa, que ya parece que tanbien como nosotros, nuestras cabras sse aman y se desean; porque en llegando a este lugar, luego como las tuyas echan menos, parece que, sintiendosse solas, aguardan su conpañia; y sin que de aquí quieran pasar ni gustar la uerde yerua, no hacen sino, leuantadas las cabeças y balando,

> voluer los ojos atrás por ver si las tuyas viesen benir. Pues, ¿qué te dire del rregoçijo de mis perros quando los tuyos sienten ladrar?..." (447)
>
> ["I swear to you," I replied, "Leonisa, that it already seems that just like us, our goats love each other and desire each other; because upon arriving at this place, immediately, as if yours miss [mine], it seems that, feeling themselves alone, they wait for their company; and without from here wanting to pass or taste the green grass, they do nothing except, raising their heads and bleating, turn their eyes back to see if they could spot yours coming. Well, what will I tell you of the rejoicing of my dogs when they hear yours bark…?"]

More like a pastoral idyll than a Greek romance, Frías's narrative has not a shred of irony, but a great deal of sentiment. Yet interestingly enough, in an idyllic transference of feeling, infusing animals with human emotions, Frías's goats seem to miss each other, not Liseo and Leonisa.

Perhaps slightly more subtle, yet telling, is the difference in subjectivity and seriousness between the two Daphnis characters' reaction to having kissed Chloe/Leonisa. Daphnis's response is already a soliloquy in Longus, but the third person narrator gently mocks the silliness of Daphnis's musings: "τοιαῦτα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπελἤρει" ["he would chatter such following things at random to himself"] or as Morgan translates: "he would break into this sort of absurd soliloquy" (I. 18; Morgan 36-37). Daphnis's soliloquy is loaded with rhetorical questions and exclamations "Whatever effect is Chloe's kiss having on me?", or "Oh, unlucky victory! Oh, new sickness, to which I cannot even put a name!" Longus underlines its lack of sophistication by means of Daphnis's naïve comparisons: "Often have I kissed kids, and often have I kissed newborn puppies and the calf that was a present from Dorkon; but this kiss is different" (37). Formal rhetorical parallelisms abound: "How the kids frolic, and here I sit. How the flowers bloom, and I weave garlands…" In this mock formal discourse it is rather hard to take Daphnis's sufferings seriously, and it seems obvious that by Longus's time the contrast between seriousness of form and silliness of content was already a staple of Western literature.

Frías's Liseo, on the other hand, presents a lengthy remembered interior monologue following his remembered kiss, suffused with fear, shame, apprehension, guilt over a suspected sacrilege or profanation of a "divinity" (Leonisa, here a rather courtly love kind of lady), and repentence—very serious matters indeed. His reminiscences are permeated with religious language and comparisons: "Senti en mi alma un temor como si me vbiera atreuido a profanar alguna dibinidad, y puseme con gran arrepentimyento entre mi a pesar lo hecho" (451) [I felt in my soul a fear as if I had dared to profane some divinity, and I began a great repentance within myself by pondering what I had done]. The lengthy ruminations are followed by a formal soliloquy, more closely influenced by Longus, but devoid of humor: "'¡Ay triste!' comence entre mi llorando a decir, 'y ¿qué es esto que siento, yo aca dentro que me abrasa mis huesos y mi carne? ¿Qué ponçoña es esta que en sus lauios y boca tiene Leonisa que asi me hace arder?..." (452) ["Oh woe," I began to say to myself crying, "and what is this that

I feel, here inside that burns my flesh and bone? What poison is this that Leonisa has in her lips and mouth that makes me burn so?..."]; and the lengthy soliloquy by a dialogue between Liseo and Leonisa, which infuses a little humor into Liseo's plight, but by way of the pretended wasp bite from Achilles Tatius's *Leucipe and Clitophon* as a pretext for a second kiss. Until that point, however, Frías had indulged in a serious psychological and not altogether positive exploration of mental upsets caused by love—much as in other Renaissance pastorals—Sannazaro's and Montemayor's especially.

Liseo's emphasis on memory as a filter through which he recounts his story additionally coats his narrative with a film of nostalgia, as had the reminiscences of Sannazaro's, Garcilaso's and Montemayor's shepherds. Memory for Liseo is the abstract, very slightly personified Memory, much like the personified forces of Love, Fortune and Time in Sannazaro and Montemayor (Greenwood 109):

> pero en aquella edad quanto puedo uoluer atras con la memoria, gran tesorera de las cosas de nuestra niñez, cierto diria que nos amauamos con el mayor y mas estraño amor de quantos jamas se uieron en años como los nuestros (444).
>
> [but in that age as much as I am able to turn back with Memory, great treasurer of the things of our childhood, certainly I would say that we loved each other with the greatest and strangest love of however many there ever were at an age such as ours.]

Liseo invokes memory as well to contrast the innocence of youth with the experience of age and to reflect upon the controlling forces of Fate which seem to have replaced the Nymphs and Pan as the motivators of his tale: "y no puedo, agora con seso mas maduro y años mas entrados en experiencia lo considero, pensar sino que, cierto, alguna gran fuerça del cielo y de los planetas conformadas en esta vnion amorosa atasen y fuesen enlaçando de cada dia con mas fuertes e indisolubles ñudos esta nuestra aficion" (444) [and I cannot, now that with a more mature intelligence and having reached a more experienced age I consider it, think but that certainly, some great force of heaven and of the planets brought into line with this amorous union, had tied and were binding together every day with stronger and more indisoluble knots this affection of ours].

Unlike Memory, the Neoplatonism typical of Spanish pastoral is not so much added to Frías's version of *Daphnis and Chloe* as transformed. Frías makes Longus's underlying Platonism and Neoplatonism[10] more overt and gives it a Renaissance dress: "Tanta es la fuerça de la hermosura que ablanda qualquier animo duro y baruaro, y entrandose por los ojos, se hace por fuerça señora de la voluntad" (443) [Such is the force of beauty that it softens any hard and barbarous spirit]. The rays from the beloved's eyes penetrate the lover's soul: "Mirauame Leonisa dulcemente con aquellos ojos que tan adentro penetrauan con sus rayos por mi alma y alli me hacian sentir un dulce y bien auenturado contento" (448) [Leonisa looked at me sweetly with those eyes that penetrated with their rays so far into my soul and made me feel there a sweet and fortunate happiness.] A kiss is a union of souls: "Ni yo auia oydo nunca tal

cosa ni sauia como los amantes juntaban por alli los animos y coraçones. No entendia que era aquello vesarse las almas" (454) [Nor had I ever heard such a thing nor did I know how lovers joined through there their spirits and hearts, I didn't understand that that was the souls kissing each other.] Commonplaces of Neoplatonic imagery with their sources in Garcilaso (Heiple 239), Montemayor (Montero LXV n. 14), and ultimately León Hebreo, Ficino, Bembo, and Castiglione (Gilbert-Santamaría 750), these rather facile references to love as entering through the eyes and uniting two souls would appear to be for Frías yet another marker of a particularly Renaissance pastoral.

In his incorporation of commonplace Neoplatonic motifs, once again, Frías has drawn on a Latin, Western European tradition as represented by Virgil, Sannazaro (with Ovid and Petrarch), Garcilaso, and Montemayor. The effect of all of Frías's changes in *Daphnis and Chloe*, taken together, is to convert a subtle, humorous, ironic, and joyfully pagan Hellenistic work into a Renaissance pastoral—serious, subjective, melancholy, and at least within its fictional representation, communicated without irony.

Notes

1. Elsewhere I have studied the translation/adaptation linguistically ("Textual Translation/Textual Transformation of a Greek Pastoral Romance: Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe* in Golden-Age Spain," presented at the Central Renaissance Conference, University of Missouri, September 2005, forthcoming in *The International Journal of the Classical Tradition*). In that work I determined that Frías was using both the Greek original and the French translation, but apparently neither the Italian translation nor the Neo-Latin adaptation.

2. That change was perhaps suggested by the *Ethiopian History* or by the ancient name Aethiope which had at one time designated the island of Lesbos (Smith II 164, citing Strabo and Pliny). An even more likely influence is Virgil's reference to Ethiopians in *Eclogue* X. 68.

3. Probably suggested by Virgil's *Eclogue* IV. 22, a threat to cattle by lions, a source possibility reinforced by Frías's mention of Virgil's reference to an African lion in his "pastoral" treatise, fol. 169v.

4. The same is true, I believe, at least to some extent for Caro, Amyot and Gambara, as I hope to demonstrate in a future work.

5. E.L. Bowie makes an excellent case in "Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus" that the true father of Greek pastoral was Philetas (or Philitas) of Cos, whose character Lycidas Theocritus borrows for his "Seventh Idyll," and who is commemorated by Longus in the key figure of the elderly cowherd Philetas (72) who coaches Daphnis and Chloe on the nature of love.

6. I would like to thank Professor Juan Montero of the University of Seville for his generosity in sending me a pre-publication copy of his edition of Frías's critical treatise. In addition, Montero's "Noticias de un texto recuperado" concerning Frías's critique of Villegas, is an excellent summary of all known biographical information about Frías, and a succinct and insightful analysis of the critical ideas in this treatise, as well as its position within the entirety of Frías's surviving works.

7. There are also games in Ovid (*Metam*. I.44ff), but Olympic rather than pastoral. Virgil's games from *Aeneid* V are not strictly speaking pastoral either, although they influenced subsequent pastoral works. There are also athletic events in *Georgics* II.

8. A true rendering of this scene in *Daphnis and Chloe* into Spanish would have to await the equally sly Juan Valera.

9. The classical sources of the theme are treated extremely well by Christine Perkell, "The Golden Age and Its Contradictions in the Poetry of Vergil," as well as in Ubaldo Pizzani, "Età dell'oro e millenarismo nel mondo antico". Still essential for Italian treatments of the Golden Age is Gustavo Costa's *La leggenda dei secoli d'oro nella letteratura italiana*, while the superb article by Geoffrey L. Stagg, "*Illo tempore*: Don Quixote's Discourse on the Golden Age and Its Antecedents," treats the Classical, Italian, and Spanish antecedents of Don Quijote's speech, most of which would have been equally accessible to Frías. The mixture of traditions in the Cervantine discourse—also relevant to Frías—is treated by Giuseppe Mazzocchi, "'Dichosa Edad y siglos dichosos': Don Chisciotte e l'età dell'oro."

10. Longus's representations of love are often true Platonism based on Plato's *Phaedrus* (D&C Morgan ed. 150, 179), although presented very subtly. Detecting Longus's subtle intertextuality evidently postulates a detailed recall of the *Phaedrus* text on the part of the reader.

Works Cited

Alpers, Paul. *What Is Pastoral?* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.

Anderson, Graham. *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World*. London and Sydney: Croom Helm Barnes and Noble, 1984.

Ariosto, Ludovico. *Orlando furioso*. Ed. Dino Provenzal. 4 vols. Milan: Biblioreca Universale Rizzoli, 1955.

Bennassar, Bartolomé. *Valladolid au siècle d'or: une ville de Castille et sa campagne au xvi^e siècle*. Paris and LaHaye: Mouton et Co., 1997.

Bolgar, R.R. *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1974 [1954].

Bowie, E.L. "Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus." *The Classical Quarterly* 35 (1985): 67-91.

Breed, Brian W. *Pastoral Inscriptions: Reading and Writing Virgil's "Eclogues."* London: Classical Literature and Society, 2006.

Catholic Encyclopedia on CD-ROM. [1914] New Advent, 2003. <http://newadvent.org/Cathen/0462a.htm>

Chalk, H.H.O. "Eros and the Lesbian Pastoral of Longus." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 80 (1960): 32-51.

Clausen, Wendell. *A Commentary on Virgil. Eclogues*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1994.

Close, Anthony. "El infierno amoroso de Garcilaso y la libertad moral." *Caliope. Journal of the Society for Renaissance and Baroque Hispanic Poetry* 10.2 (2004): 5-19.

Costa, Gustavo. *La leggenda dei secoli d' oro nella lettera italiana*. Bari: Laterza, 1972

Cozad, Mary Lee. "An Annotated Edition of a Sixteenth-Century Novel of Chivalry: Damasio de Frías y Balboa's *Lidamarte de Armenia*, with Introductory Study." Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California, 1975.

___. "A Platonic-Aristotelian Linguistic Controversy of the Spanish Golden Age: Damasio de Frías's *Diálogo de las lenguas* (1579)." *Florilegium Hispanicum. Medieval and Golden Age Studies Presented to Dorothy Clotelle Clarke*. Ed. John Geary. Madison, WI: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1983. 203-227.

___. "Textual Translation/Textual Transformation of a Greek Pastoral Romance: Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe* in Golden-Age Spain." Central Renaissance Conference, U. of Missouri. Sept. 2005. Forthcoming in *The International Journal of the Classical Tradition*.

Creel, Bryant. "Aesthetics of Change in a Renaissance Pastoral: New Ideals of a Moral Culture in Montemayor's *Diana*." *Hispanófila* 33 (1990): 1-27.

Davis, Gregson. "Consolation in the Bucolic Mode: The Epicurean Cadence of Vergil's First *Eclogue*." *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*. Ed. David Armstrong, Jeffrey Fish, Patricia A. Johston, and Marilyn B. Skinner. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 2004.

Doody, Margaret Anne. *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1996.

Dover, Sir Kenneth J. Introduction to *Theocritus Select Poems*. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1994. [Repr. of Macmillan, 1971]. v-lxxii.

Duncan, Joseph E. *Milton's Earthly Paradise: A Historical Study of Eden*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1972.

Dunn, Peter N. "Garcilaso's 'Ode a la Flor de Gnido': A Commentary on Some Renaissance Themes and Ideas." *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 81 (1965): 288-309.

Egido, Aurora. "Contar en *La Diana*." *Formas breves del relato*. Ed. Yves-René Fonquerne. Madrid: Secretariado de Pubs. de la Universidad de Zaragoza, Casa de Velázquez, 1986. 137-155.

El Saffar, Ruth. "Structural and Thematic Discontinuity in Montemayor's *Diana*." *MLN* 86.2 (1971): 182-198.

Ettin, Andrew V. *Literature and the Pastoral*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1984.

Fernández-Morera, Darío. *The Lyre and the Oaten Flute: Garcilaso and the Pastoral*. London: Tamesis Books, 1982.

Ferri Coll, José María. "El malheur de Garcilaso." *Los tumultos del alma: De la expresión melancólica en la poesía española del Siglo de Oro*. Valencia, Spain: Alfons el Magnànim, 2006.

Frías y Balboa, Damasio de. "Carta escripta a Antonio de billegas sobre un libro que quería imprimir por vn cierto avtor." Ed. Juan Montero Delgado (unpub. edition). Codex #25 Fernán Nuñez Collection, f117v-191. Bancroft Library, U of California, Berkeley.

Gambara, Lorenzo. *De Navigatione Christophori Columbi*. Ed and intro. Cristina Gagliardi. Roma: Bulzoni Editore, 1992.

Gicovate, Bernard. *Garcilaso de la Vega*. Boston: Twayne, 1975.

Gilbert-Santamaría, Donald. "Love and Friendship in Montemayor's *La Diana*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 84 (2007): 745-60.

Greenwood, Pilar Fernández-Cañadas de. *Pastoral Poetics: Uses of Conventions in Renaissance Pastoral Romances: Arcadia, La Diana, La Arcadia, L'Astrée*. Madrid: Porrúa Turanzas, 1983.

Gutzwiller, Kathryn J. *Theocritus: Pastoral Analogies*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.

Halperin, David. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.

Hardin, Richard F. *Love in a Green Shade: Idyllic Romances Ancient to Modern*. Lincoln, NE and London: U of Nebraska P, 2000.

Heiple, Daniel. *Garcilaso de la Vega and the Italian Renaissance*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1994.

Hoffman, Heinz. "The *Expositi* of Lorenzo Gambara de Brescia: A Sixteenth-Century Adaptation in Latin Hexameters of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." *Fictional Traces: Receptions of the Ancient Novel*, Volume 1 (Ancient Narrative, Supplementum 14.1). Ed. Marília P. Futre Pinhiero and Stephen J. Harrison. Groningen: Barhuis, 2011. 107-125.

Hunter, R.L. *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

Jenkyns, Richard. "Virgil and Arcadia." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1989): 26-39.

___. *Virgil's Experience: Nature and History, Times, Names, and Places*. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1998.

Kennedy, William. *Jacopo Sannazaro and the Uses of Pastoral*. Hanover, NH: New Hampshire UP of New England, 1983.

Lavocat, Françoise. "Playing Shepherd: Allegory, Fiction, Reality of Pastoral Games." *Pastoral and the Humanities: Arcadia Re-inscribed*. Ed. Mathilde Skoie and Sonia Bjornstad Velásquez. Bristol: Phoenix Press, 2006. 65-77, 154-157.

Leach, Eleanor Winsor. *Virgil's "Eclogues": Landscapes of Experience*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1974.

Longus. *Daphnis and Chloe*. Trans., notes, intro. J.R. Morgan. Oxford: Aris &

Phillips, 2004.

___. *Pastorales (Daphnis et Chloé)*. Ed., trans., intro. Jean-René Vieillefond. Paris: Société d'Edition <Les Belles Lettres>, 1987.

López Rueda, José. *Helenistas españoles del Siglo XVI*. Madrid: Instituto <Antonio de Nebrija> C.S.I.C., 1973.

Mazzocchi, Giuseppe. "'Dichosa edad y siglos dichosos': Don Chisciotte e l'età dell'oro." *Millenarismo ed età dell'oro nel Rinascimento. Atti del XIII convegno internazionale*. Ed. Luisa Secchi Tarugi. Firenzi: Cesati, 2003. 371-388.

McCulloh, William E. *Longus*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1970.

Medici, Lorenzo de'. *Scritti Scelti*. Ed. Emilio Bigi. 2nd. ed. revised. Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torenese, 1965.

___. *Selected Poems and Prose*. Ed. Jon Thiem. Trans. Jon Thiem et al. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1991.

Merkelbach, Reinhard. "Novel and Aretology." *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Ed. J. [James] Tatum. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994. 283-95.

Montemayor, Jorge de. *La Diana*. Ed. and intro. Juan Montero Delgado. Barcelona: Crítica, 1996.

Montero Delgado, Juan. "Noticia de un texto recuperado; la invectiva de Damasio de Frías contra Antonio de Villegas y su *Inventorio* (Bancroft Library, Fernán Núñez Collection, Vol. 183, Fols. 117-190v." *Voz y Letra* 14.2 (2003): 79-98.

Mujica, Barbara. *Iberian Pastoral Characters*. Washington, DC: Scripta Humanistica, 1986.

Muñiz Muñiz, María de las Nieves. "Sannazaro nelle Egloghe di Garcilaso." *Strumenti critici* 111 (2006): 171-189.

Orobitg, Christine. *Garcilaso et la mélancolie*. Toulouse: PU du Mirail, 1997.

Otis, Brooks. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Norman and London: U of Oklahoma P, 1995. [Repr. of Oxford: Clarendon P, 1964].

Paratore, Ettore. "La duplice eredità virgiliana nell'Arcadia del Sannazaro." *Arcadia* (Rome) 4 (1961): 42-66.

Perkell, Christine. "The Golden Age and Its Contradictions in the Poetry of Vergil." *Vergilius* 48 (2002): 3-39.

Pizzani, Ubaldo. "Età dell'oro e millenarismo nel mondo antico." *Millenarismo ed età dell'oro nel Rinascimento. Atti del XIII convegno internazionale*. Ed. Luisa Secchi Tarugi. Firenzi: Cesati, 2003. 11-22.

Ponz Guillén, Carmen. "El manuscrito 570 de la Biblioteca Real y la obra de Damasio de Frías." Ph.D. Diss. Universidad Nacional de Educacion a Distancia, Madrid, 1990.

Quint, David. *Origin and Originality in Renaissance Literature: Versions of the Source*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.

Rudd, Niall. "Virgil's Contribution to Pastoral." *The Common Spring: Essays on Latin and English Poetry*. Ed. Niall Rudd. Bristol: Phoenix P, 2005. 1-24.

Saccone, Eduardo. "L'*Arcadia* di Iacobo Sannazaro: Storia e delineamento di una struttura." *MLN* 84.1 (1969): 46-97.

Salazar Ramírez, María Soledad. *Damasio de Frías. Controversias literarias en la corte vallisoletana*. Valladolid: Diputación Provincial de Valladolid, 2002.

Sannazaro, Iacopo. *Arcadia*. Ed. Francesco Erspamer. Milan: Gruppo Ugo Mursia, 1990.

___. *Arcadia & Piscatorial Eclogues*. Trans. and intro. Ralph Nash. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1966.

Smith, William. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*. London: John Murray, 1872. 2 vols.

Snell, Bruno. "Arcadia: The Discovery of a Spiritual Landscape." *Virgil. Critical Assessments of Classical Authors. Volume I: General Articles and the "Eclogues."* Ed. Philip Hardie. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

___. *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought*. Trans. T.G. Rosenmeyer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1953.

Stagg, Geoffrey. "*Illo tempore*: Don Quixote's Discourse on the Golden Age and Its Antecedents." *La Galatea de Cervantes cuatrocientos años después (Cervantes y lo pastoril)*. Ed. Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta, 1985. 71-90.

Tylus, Jane. "Silencing Partenope: The Origins of Culture in Sannazaro's *Arcadia*." *Reconsidering the Renaissance: Papers from the Twenty-First Annual Conference*. Ed. Mario DiCesare. Binghamton, NY: Medieval Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992. 109-123.

Vega, Garcilaso de la. *Obras completas*. Ed. Elias L. Rivers. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1974.

Vergilius Maro, Publius. *Virgil*. Ed. and trans. H. Rushton Fairclough; rev. G.P. Gould. *Vol. 1: Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid I-VI*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard UP, 1999.

Vinaver, Eugène. *The Rise of Romance*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1971.

Walker, Steven F. *Theocritus*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1980. (TWAS, 609)

Wescott, Howard B. "Garcilaso's Eclogues; Artifice, Metafiction, Self-Representation." *Calíope: Journal of the Society for Renaissance and Baroque Hispanic Poetry* 3.1 (1997): 71-85.

___. "Nemoroso's Odyssey: Garcilaso's Eclogues Revisited." *Hispania* 78.3 (1995):

474-482.

Williams, Gordon. "Theocritus' *Idyll* 7 from a Virgilian Perspective." *Innovations of Antiquity*. Ed. Ralph Hexter and Daniel Selden. New York: Routledge, 1992. 541-556.

Wright, J.R.G. "Virgil's Pastoral Programme: Theocritus, Callimachus, and *Eclogue* I." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 29 (1983): 107-160.