

HUMANIST GREEK IN LATE MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN SPAIN:  
STRATEGIES FOR ACCESSING TEXTS, ACQUIRING LANGUAGE, AND PROJECTING  
PRESTIGE FROM JUAN DE MENA TO FRANCISCO DE QUEVEDO

by

JULIA C. HERNÁNDEZ

(Under the Direction of Dana C. Bultman)

ABSTRACT

This dissertation reconsiders how ancient Greek was studied—and how its study was portrayed—among Spanish humanist authors ranging from the mid-fifteenth century to the early seventeenth. In previous scholarship on Greek studies in early modern Western Europe, Spain’s Hellenist legacy has frequently been overlooked; a narrative emphasizing certain historical limitations on Spanish humanists’ access to Greek has dominated scholarly discussion of Spain and this key area of “Renaissance” humanism. The present study, however, will argue that these very limitations forced Spanish humanists to develop creative textual strategies—often virtuosic displays of rhetorical misdirection—to convince readers that, despite these factors, they were both capable and consummate Hellenists. This project will consist of three case studies: (1) the poet Juan de Mena (1411–1456) and his 1444 text the *Omero romançado*, a purported translation of Homer’s epic in reality based on the Latin epitome known as *the Ilias Latina*—a fact that Mena cleverly spins to his advantage; (2) the grammarian Pedro Simón Abril (1530–1595) and his 1585

*Gramática de la lengua griega escrita en lengua castellana*, the first Castilian-language grammar of Greek that outlines a radical pedagogical platform designed to correct Spain's international reputation for deficient Greek studies; and (3) Francisco de Quevedo (1580–1645) and two of his Greek-related projects, the first his 1609 translation of the Anacreontic corpus, the *Anacreón Castellano*, famously lampooned by Luis de Góngora, in which the poet self-consciously presents himself as a philologist on par with prominent international Hellenists, the second his encomiastic prologue to his Hellenist colleague Vicente Mariner's translation of Julian's *In regem solem ad Salustium Panegyricus* —and Mariner's revealing "praise" of Quevedo's Hellenism in the same work. Analysis of these contexts will show that, precisely because of the limitations facing its Hellenists, Spain, rather than being a "dead end" in the historical narrative of ancient Greek's spread in the Western European "Renaissance," represents an ideal test-case in which to examine Greek studies as a tool for self-presentation and as an international signifier of humanist status.

INDEX WORDS: Early Modern Spain, Ancient Greek, Hellenism, Juan de Mena, Pedro Simón Abril, Francisco de Quevedo, Vicente Mariner

HUMANIST GREEK IN LATE MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN SPAIN:  
STRATEGIES FOR ACCESSING TEXTS, ACQUIRING LANGUAGE, AND PROJECTING  
PRESTIGE FROM JUAN DE MENA TO FRANCISCO DE QUEVEDO

by

JULIA C. HERNÁNDEZ

B.A. and A. B., College of Charleston, 2005

M.A., University of Georgia, 2014

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in  
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2019

© 2019

Julia C. Hernández

All Rights Reserved

HUMANIST GREEK IN LATE MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN SPAIN:  
STRATEGIES FOR ACCESSING TEXTS, ACQUIRING LANGUAGE, AND PROJECTING  
PRESTIGE FROM JUAN DE MENA TO FRANCISCO DE QUEVEDO

by

JULIA C. HERNÁNDEZ

Major Professor: Dana C. Bultman

Committee: Charles L. Platter  
Diana L. Ranson  
Elizabeth R. Wright

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
May 2019

τοῖς γονεῦσι τοῖς εμοῖς

“Griego o hebreo, como todos los que lo saben lo saben sobre su palabra,  
por solo que ellos dicen que lo saben, dílo tú y sucederáte lo mismo.”

—Francisco de Quevedo, *Libro de todas cosas y otras muchas más*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER	
1 WHO NEEDS GREEK IN EARLY MODERN SPAIN? .....	1
Prologue: Why Does Don Lorenzo Need Greek? .....	1
Locating Spain in the Historiography of Greek Studies .....	8
Greek Studies in Spain: Another Perspective?.....	16
The Purview of the Present Study .....	24
A Few Additional Considerations .....	33
2 JUAN DE MENA'S <i>OMERO ROMANÇADO</i> : ON (NOT) TRANSLATING HOMER IN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY SPAIN.....	37
Situating the <i>Omero romançado</i> .....	43
The Development of Mena's Rhetorical Strategies .....	51
Rhetorical Strategies in their Historical Context .....	58
The <i>Omero romançado</i> and Mena's Humanist Hierarchy.....	71
Conclusions .....	77
3 PEDRO SIMÓN ABRIL: RADICAL, REMEDIAL GREEK GRAMMAR.....	80
The Life and Times of Simón Abril .....	85
Simon Abril's Grammar within the History of Greek Studies .....	90
Radical, Remedial Pedagogy: A Manifesto .....	95
Selling the Program: Why Does Spain Need <i>This</i> Methodology? ....	99

	Authorizing the Program: Appeals both Ancient and Modern . . . . .	122
	Remedial Grammar for an Ailing Spain . . . . .	129
4	FRANCISCO DE QUEVEDO, VICENTE MARINER, AND HELLENIST SELF- PRESENTATION IN THE <i>ANACREÓN CASTELLANO</i> AND BEYOND . . . . .	130
	Part I: The <i>Anacreón Castellano</i>	
	The Anacreontic Corpus and the <i>Anacreón Castellano</i> . . . . .	137
	A Reading of the Paratexts . . . . .	148
	The Commentary . . . . .	158
	1609: The Ascent of Quevedo Philologus . . . . .	167
	Part II: Quevedo and Mariner, Hellenist <i>Elogiae</i> Refracted	
	Vicente Mariner and Julian's <i>In regem solem</i> . . . . .	177
	A Paratextual Portrait of Quevedo . . . . .	189
	Mariner's Praise of Julian and Quevedo . . . . .	197
	Quevedo's Moment in the Neo-Latin Spotlight . . . . .	200
5	CONCLUSION . . . . .	213
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	227

## CHAPTER 1

### WHO NEEDS GREEK IN EARLY MODERN SPAIN?

#### Prologue: Why Does Don Lorenzo Need Greek?

With the title of his 2002 cultural history of how ancient Greek has been studied in Western Europe, classicist Simon Goldhill poses the question “Who needs Greek?”. The question is a deceptively simple one, and one that Goldhill continually reformulates and nuances as he considers the language’s many cultural transformations in its journey from the ancient to the modern world. As Goldhill notes, to ask “Who needs Greek?” is to examine the varying cultural implications of what it has meant and what it continues to mean to learn ancient Greek as a second language.

Of the myriad geographic, historical, and cultural contexts about which we might ask the question “Who needs Greek,” a notable literary example not considered by Goldhill may be found in chapter 16 of *Don Quijote* part II. In the third sally, fresh from his defeat of the Caballero de Espejos, the protagonist and Sancho encounter a hidalgo splendidly dressed in green as he makes his way down the road. Don Diego de Miranda, whom Don Quijote dubs the “Caballero del Verde Gabán,” introduces himself and gives an accounting of his life. When he reaches the topic of his son, Don Diego becomes the quintessential father dismayed by the path his offspring has chosen to take in life. Although this scene reflects the timeless literary trope of the disappointed parent, what is interesting here is that, in Cervantes’s

particular iteration, Don Diego's lamentations center on his son's pursuit of classical studies, and, notably, the study of Greek.

The heir apparent of the Miranda family, Don Lorenzo, is a student at Salamanca who, according to his father, has spent six years "aprendiendo las lenguas latina y griega" at the university (154). Don Diego laments the fact that Lorenzo has so thoroughly given himself over to the study of the classics, to the point that, in the same breath that he introduces the fact that he has a son, he expresses that he might be better off without one: "tengo un hijo, que, a no tenerle, quizá me juzgara por más dichoso de lo que soy y no porque él sea malo, sino porque no es tan bueno como yo quisiera" (154). Don Diego's disappointment lies in the fact that his hope for his son in attending this great institution was that he study one of the "otras ciencias," but that, to his father's chagrin, "no es posible hacerle arrostar la de las leyes" as he had wished for him to do, or even theology, which he deems "la reina de todas [ciencias]" (154). His son has instead devoted himself to the study of poetry, represented by a long list of the canonical classical authors including Homer, Vergil, Horace, Persius, and Tibullus, and Don Diego doubts whether the study of poetry is even worthy of being considered a university subject, "si es que se puede llamar [la poesía] ciencia" (154). Don Diego's view of education is a practical one: the value of learning comes from its direct application to either professional or the spiritual pursuits. While he is not a Philistine, he ultimately prizes utility in education, holding that, for whatever aesthetic beauty poetry may possess, "letras sin virtud" are as useful as "perlas en el muladar" (154).

For him, poetry is akin to a state of drunkenness. He has found his son is “embebido” with poetry, but interestingly, not consumed by it in such a way that he becomes carried away by its content, as had another Salamanca student, Grisóstomo, who, as a parallel to Don Quijote, becomes so swept up in pastoral poetry that he ran off to become a shepherd in part 1 of the novel. In contrast to Grisóstomo, Don Lorenzo—as portrayed by his disapproving father—is swept away in the textual analysis of the minutiae of poetry. Don Diego’s characterization of his son’s poetic activities not only imparts a tone of disdain, but one of mockery. According to Don Miranda, his son passes the whole day attempting to determine “si Marcial anduvo deshonesto o no en tal epigrama; si se han de entender de una manera o otra tales y tales versos de Virgilio” (154). This expenditure of so much energy for what to Don Diego seem to be absurdities is underscored by his depiction of his son arguing not with these dead poets themselves, but rather, with their inanimate books—to the exclusion of other human contact—, as he states, “todas sus conversaciones son con los libros de los referidos poetas” (154).

With Don Diego’s speech, Cervantes plays two classic tropes for laughs, that of the father bemoaning his good-for-nothing son and that of the scholar obsessing over textual minutiae. Meanwhile, Don Diego also becomes the mouthpiece for a certain type of attitude towards classical learning: not one that is openly hostile or reactionary, but one that reflects a certain kind of conservatism that holds that higher education is valuable and that its value lies in practical disciplines learning of the law or pious ones such as theology, which he holds to be the greatest pursuit of all. Don Diego is, then, a pragmatist in his views on education, and his timeless

complaints can still be heard today from parents questioning the utility of liberal arts majors—classics majors in particular. In his appraisal of his son’s decision to study Latin and Greek poetry at Salamanca, Don Diego is, essentially, asking the question “Who needs Greek?” That is to say, “Does Don Lorenzo *need* Greek?”; “Why should Don Lorenzo study Greek when he could study something more practical?”

Don Diego, however, is a much more complex manifestation of the long-suffering father trope than his griping about the utility of classical studies might initially suggest. It is significant that Cervantes does not portray Don Diego as a philistine; he does not reject out of hand the idea that literature, poetry, or classical studies are inherently valuable. Upon first introducing himself, he prominently mentions that he has “hasta seis docenas de libros” of various genres in both Latin and Castilian, and he values books of “honesto entretenimiento, que deleiten con el lenguaje y admiren y suspendan con la invención” (154). For Don Diego, books *are* valuable: their value lies not only in their capacity to entertain and but also in their capacity to reflect their owner’s good taste—as well as his financial ability to amass such a large collection of them.

Moreover, despite his protestations, Don Diego’s protracted lampooning of his son’s pursuits itself reveals his own knowledge of the Greek and Latin canons. To begin, in mocking his son, he is able to deploy for comedic effect an impressive range of classical authors, significantly, the representatives of the genres that formed the pillars of classical education in the era: Homer and Vergil for epic, Martial for epigram, Tibullus for elegy. Moreover, in roasting his son’s “conversations” with texts, he reveals that he knows exactly the kinds of textual

problems someone engaged in this type of study would consider. Furthermore, with regard to the question of Greek, the order in which these authors and textual problems is placed is significant. Don Diego cites that, first and foremost, his son spends his day deliberating “si dijo bien o mal Homero en tal verso de la *Ilíada*” (154); he “correctly” places Homer at the top of his list according to Humanist hierarchies of classical authors and genres. Don Diego reveals, then, that he is educated enough to be able to discuss classical literature even if he disapproves of his son devoting himself to it entirely and to the detriment of other more practical pursuits.

Our original question of “Who needs Greek?” becomes more complicated when considered from Don Diego’s perspective. With regard to his son, the question is not “Does Don Lorenzo need Greek?”, but perhaps “Is Don Lorenzo studying too much Greek?” Related to this issue of prestige is another complaint of Don Diego’s. He laments that his son will not, as he had wished, be the “corona de su linaje,” which would have been a possibility if he had pursued the “correct studies,” as he explains, “pues vivimos en siglo donde nuestros reyes premian altamente las virtuosas y buenas letras” (154). That is to say, there is a literature that is useful and virtuous, and by studying that literature, rather than classical poetry, aesthetically pleasing though it may be, one is able to acquire a good position in society—even at court. He therefore acknowledges that there is a connection between literary studies and social advancement. The problem is that his son is just not studying what he deems to be the right kind. Although Don Diego does not specify what these “virtuosas y buenas letras” might be, and while we know that they certainly do not

include poetry, we might be left to consider the question “Is there a type of Greek Don Lorenzo *does* need for this type of social advancement?”

In this particular moment in the narrative, Don Diego is a mildly satirical figure, and with this episode, Cervantes invites the reader to reflect on the provincial hidalgo father’s somewhat stuffy views on education and its role in social advancement. Cervantes’s humor both highlights classical studies as something noteworthy while at the same time depends on the fact that they are also common enough to be relatable to the reader. That is to say, in order for this particular joke to land, the average reader of Cervantes’s day had to be reasonably able to recognize Don Diego and Don Lorenzo as types. That Cervantes is able to joke about a character who is too devoted to reading not only Latin, but also Greek, suggests that the reader has some opinion about not only Latin, but also Greek that they are willing to bring to bear in interpreting the characters. In crafting this parody and shaping his characters, it is clearly important for Cervantes to include Greek in addition to Latin, since he might just as easily have left this off of Don Lorenzo’s curriculum of studies. The Greek must add some kind of dimension—be it comedic value or verisimilitude—that will contribute to his character.

The series of issues elaborated here all coalesce into the question of “What does it mean to study Greek?” in Cervantes’s Spain and in early modern Spain more broadly. As is the case for any historical context about which such a query is made, this question will have wide-ranging implications that touch on the issues of cultural prestige, self-presentation, and national identity. However, when asked of early modern Spain, this question takes on various new dimensions. To begin, this

question places Spanish Hellenists in dialogue with the international humanist movement in which the study of ancient Greek played a central role. With its roots in late fourteenth-century Italy, humanism—and humanist Greek—would radiate out from that peninsula by the end of the fifteenth century and sweep across Western Europe, Spain included, throughout the sixteenth. Within the Iberian Peninsula, however, this time period roughly coincides with the consolidation of Castile’s power, the end of the Reconquista, the unprecedented expansion of Spain’s new empire, and Spain’s prosecution of the Counter-Reformation. As a reaction to these major historical shifts, the late fifteenth, sixteenth, and early seventeenth centuries see this new “Spain” continually working to establish a sense of “Spanish” identity within the borders of its multicultural and plurilingual empire—both internally within the Iberian Peninsula itself and globally in its new overseas conquests. It is, then, this era in which the very idea of “Spain” itself is first forged. And it is within this complex environment where debates of linguistic prestige and the legacy of the classical tradition become proving grounds for the contested idea of “Spanishness.”

The following study will explore the question of “What does it mean to study Greek in early modern Spain?” while taking into account the richness of this era in Spanish history. It will attempt to do so in a nuanced way, piecing together a cultural history of Spanish Greek studies from perspectives that have, up to this point, remained unexplored. However, as a first step in establishing the present study’s specific parameters, it will be necessary to begin with an overview of previous approaches in order to demonstrate that the seemingly simple question “What does

it mean to study Greek in early modern Spain?” is surprisingly difficult to pose in an objective way.

Locating Spain in the Historiography of Greek Studies:  
The thorny—but pertinent—history of a history

For modern readers of ancient Greek, the most basic interactions with the language—acquiring it, reading it, interpreting it, and teaching it—continue to be mediated through a framework that reinforces a particular narrative about Renaissance Humanism and its important subfield, Renaissance Hellenism. A case-in-point is the format of the modern critical edition with its defining feature, the visually distinctive *apparatus criticus*, or the space where the textual critic provides variant manuscript readings and previous editors’ suggested emendations. The modern *apparatus criticus* often reads as a who’s who of philologists past, not only the greats of the nineteenth-century “golden age” of *altertumswissenschaft*, but its precursor, the early modern “golden age” of Humanism, as the contributions of these first modern textual critics often remain relevant to the tradition. Aeschylus’s *Choephoroi* illustrates this effect nicely: highly corrupt and transmitted through a single manuscript exemplar, it is a text requiring a particularly robust *apparatus criticus* for basic comprehension, a fact evident, for instance, in A. F. Garvie’s edition. Here the *apparatus criticus* becomes a chorus, the voices of which include a pan-European view of philology: the French Henri “Stephanus” Estienne and Adrien “Turnebus” Turnèbe, the Huguenot exiles Joseph Iustus Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon, the Dutch Wilhelm Canter, and the Italian Francesco Robortello.

Moreover, in the case of many important critical editions, before the reader even reaches the main body of the text with its *apparatus criticus*, their experience of the Greek work at hand may have already been mediated through the lens of Renaissance humanism. Of the three major series of critical editions that classicists consult in their reading of Greek, the *Collection Budé*, named for the pioneering French philologist Guillaume Budé of the early sixteenth century, remains one of the three authoritative series of critical editions that professional classicists routinely consult.<sup>1</sup> Modern classicists thus find themselves frequently invoking the name of this progenitor of French Greek studies, and whether the reader explicitly acknowledges it or not, with his invocation of his authority in series' title, his presence still permeates the experience of reading a Budé edition.

Reading Greek in the twenty-first century is, therefore, an act both implicitly and explicitly tied to the act of reading Greek in early modern Europe—or rather, to a particular narrative of reading Greek. This narrative is one that places a series of “great men” as intermediaries in our conversation with ancient authors, a select group of interpreters who shape our experience even after more than 500 years. The limitations of this narrative, however, quickly become clear to the reader who begins to question what criteria form this elite group and who is determining its membership. This is particularly evident when one begins to search for Spanish members, who will not be found.

---

<sup>1</sup> The other two authoritative series of critical editions are the British *Oxford Classical Texts* (OCTs) and the German *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*.

The absence of Spanish contributors in *apparatus critici* and other elements of critical editions of major classical Greek texts creates a false sense of the absence of Spanish Hellenists in the project of early modern Greek studies. This is clearly a misrepresentation: Antonio Nebrija, a correspondent of Desiderius Erasmus, contributed to the international debate on the pronunciation of Greek; Francisco de Vergara's 1537 Greek grammar circulated for decades outside of Spain, reprinted in Paris until the 1580s and appreciated by Joseph Justus Scaliger;<sup>2</sup> Francisco de Quevedo corresponded with the great Hellenist Justus Lipsius, peppering his Latin with Greek phrases.<sup>3</sup>

It is true, however, that, for a variety of well-documented historical factors, Spain did not produce great textual critics in the early modern period, and based on this fact, it should not be surprising that they are absent from *apparatus critici* of modern editions. What makes this absence problematic is that it is perpetuated throughout narratives of the history of Greek scholarship where textual criticism is not at stake. Figures such as those mentioned above, among various others (Hernán Nuñez, the famous "Comendador Griego," or Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas, "El Brocense") do not appear in works that continue to shape classicists' narratives of their own discipline, for example, John Edwin Sandys's still-relevant 1903 *History of*

---

<sup>2</sup> See López Rueda (153) for the printing history of the *De Graecae linguae gramatica* and Scaliger's reception of it. Despite this praise, it is, however, important to remember that Scaliger was one of the chief voices denigrating the state of Spanish Hellenism, a fact that will be considered in greater detail later in the present study. See Roncero López for an outline of Scaliger's anti-Hispanism (50–51). For an overview of Spain's more general contributions in the area of humanism which seeks to address this absence in the broader sense that argues that "España no permanece al margen de esta revolución cultural," see Roncero López 39–41.

<sup>3</sup> See Astrana Marín's edition of Quevedo's *Epistolario* for the correspondence between the two, letters I–IV (1–9), which are also the earliest known letters of Quevedo.

*Classical Scholarship*, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's 1931 *Geschichte der Philologie* (updated in English by Hugh Lloyd-Jones in 1982), and L. D. Reynolds's and N. G. Wilson's *Scribes and Scholars*, the latter two of which are often assigned to first year graduate students in classics, and others. In fact, no Spanish name of any period appears in any of these works.

That the early modern figures deemed worthy of inclusion in these studies overlap with the names seen in *apparatus critici* suggests that the criterion used to evaluate one's place in the history of Greek studies is one's contributions to textual criticism. According to this criterion shaping these histories, Spain does not figure into the narrative of European Western European Greek studies. Moreover, as these histories of classical studies remain crucial resources for the reconstruction of the history of Greek studies, this exclusion of Spanish Hellenism from the narrative is perpetuated among classicists and even among historians of other disciplines.

This narrative's resistance to change, even as the study of Greek studies has moved beyond the purview of classicists, is due in part to the fact that more recent approaches are more focused in their scope. This is not a criticism; authors are clearly using an approach that allows them to hone in on a very specific area in order to be precise. Delimiting factors include geography, time period, and local case studies. For example Deno Geanakoplos's *Greek Scholars in Venice* (1962) provides biographical sketches of the particular Byzantine émigrés who relocated to that city, Paul Botley's *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396-1529* (2010) catalogues grammars, lexica, and classroom materials up to the third decade of the sixteenth century, and Anthony Grafton's case-study approach, both in his work with Lisa

Jardine in *From Humanism to the Humanities* (1986) as well as in his well-known *Commerce with the Classics* (1997), allows him to zero in on very specific contexts, such as his analysis of the surviving classroom texts of the little-known sixteenth century grammarians Ponticus Virinius and Bartolomeo Fonzio ( “The New Subject: Developing Greek Studies,” *Humanism* 99–121) or the very specific topic of one study in particular, “How Guillaume Budé Read his Homer” (*Commerce* 135–84).

When acknowledged, the absence of Spain in histories of Greek studies is often relegated to a footnote or an aside. Even historians working to challenge traditional narratives of the early modern period, such as Grafton and Jardine, acknowledge their omission as a limitation of their approach by anticipating the reader’s potential question “where is Spain?” in their narrative of Greek studies (xii). Nebrija alone seems to figure in the narrative if Spain is mentioned in recent discussions of ancient Greek, likely because of his higher profile for producing Europe’s first vernacular grammar. Nevertheless, these references are shallow and perplexing at best. E. Karantzola devotes space to discussing Nebrija’s vernacular grammar in his overview of early modern Greek teaching in A. F. Christidis’s *History of Ancient Greek*, although seemingly as a comparandum for similar vernacular Greek studies in the Byzantine East (1244), and in her outline of the history of Greek

studies, Eugenia Russell, also introducing Nebrija to highlight his vernacular grammar, mistakenly attributes a Greek grammar<sup>4</sup> to the author (587).<sup>5</sup>

This result of this exclusion of or, at best, minor tokenization of Spain in histories of European Greek studies has a powerful impact beyond the discipline of classics. The narrative of the Western European “Renaissance,” with the revival of Greek studies representing one of its defining elements,<sup>6</sup> continues to shape modern conceptions cultural identity everywhere Europeans have spread their legacy across the globe through colonialism. Additionally, while this silence on Spain is the problematic dominant trend in the scholarship, there is another perspective that must be acknowledged, as it has in many ways shaped how scholars of Spanish Humanism, particularly those working within Spain itself, have developed their own narratives of Spanish Greek studies.

While these studies’ silence speaks to a particular narrative about Spain, in his 1880 study on the Greek manuscripts of the Escorial Charles Graux explicitly states the following:

L’admiration de l’antiquité en a précédé l’étude: les humanistes ont paru avant les philologues. La plupart des représentants illustres de l’humanisme son italiens; la philologie est surtout française. Les hellénistes espagnols se rapprochent plutôt des humanistes que des philologues; ils ne se peuvent confondre ni avec ceux-ci ni avec ceux-là: ils forment un groupe à part. (Graux, 1)

---

<sup>4</sup> Nebrija’s only Greek grammatical work, the *De litteris et declinatione graeca quibus opus est latinis*, described by López Rueda as an “opúsculo” or “folleto,” is a short appendix to his *Introductiones in latinam grammaticam* which treats the Greek alphabet and its pronunciation and provides a brief overview of Greek declensions (López Rueda 151–2).

<sup>5</sup> One notable exception to this is Botley, who is to be credited including Vergara’s work in his catalogue of Greek grammars and mentions Nuñez in a few notes, but whose only references to it are in a handful of places in passing. See 266 and 270.

<sup>6</sup> See Kristeller; Burkhardt.

Graux's estimation of Spain is based in a narrative of nationalist hierarchies, of Spanish exceptionalism. For Graux the "humanisme" and "philologie" referred to here represent equally worthy but distinct projects (4-5); "humanisme" is the process of bringing to bear all of the evidence of the ancient world on clarifying classical literature—what his German contemporaries would designate *altertumswissenschaft*. Whereas "philologie" is the practice of textual criticism, the practice represented par excellence in France where, "avec les Henri Estienne, les Joseph Scaliger, les Henri de Valois, la philologie française brilla d'un vif éclat" (8).

As his argument continues however, his assesment of early modern Spanish Hellenism becomes more dire:

Qui étudiait alors en Espagne le grec pour lui-même? ou l'antiquité, pour la jouissance de revivre, en quelque manière, dans un monde si différent du nôtre? On pourrait répondre: personne. ... Mais il manqua à l'Espagne un Joseph-Juste Scaliger, qui lui apprit à embrasser d'un coup d'oeil d'ensemble et à parcourir succesivement, ave une pleine indépendance d'esprit, tout le domaine de la science de l'antiquité: et lorsque Scaliger fut venu, l'Espagne ne se rallia pas à lui. (Graux, 9)

Graux's explicit criticism of Spain, the source of its exceptionalism among other European nations (or rather, among the two that Graux recognizes as the most important to the exclusion of Holland, England, or Germany), is even harsher than the implicit one inherent in the histories discussed above. Whereas those implicit criticisms posited a criterion for inclusion based on contributions to textual criticism, here, Graux rejects Spain not only on the basis of textual criticism, but also on the lack of knowledge of the Greek tradition in general. Most damning, the final critique that he builds up to as his ultimate statement in the evaluation, is Spain's failure to produce a Scaliger or even to rally around him.

Graux's criticism is repeated almost a hundred years later in the only Anglophone study (at least that I have encountered), to treat the topic of Greek studies in Spain: Geanakoplos's above-mentioned work on Byzantine scholars in fifteenth-century Venice. The scholar's occasion to discuss Spanish Hellenism is his portrait of the Cretan scholar Demetrios Dukas, who, after working at the Aldine press, was invited by Cardinal Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros to teach at Alcalá and assist and lend his expertise to the polyglot bible project. Geanakoplos argues that even Dukas was not able to effectively promote the study of Greek in Spain:

[f]or the temper of Spain in comparison with that of the more secular Venice, Florence, and even Rome, remained fundamentally ecclesiastical and thus all too often unreceptive to the study of the Greek language per se, a factor that would continue to impede Greek studies in the sixteenth century, as he explains, due to Spain's "intense absorption" in the process of combating Protestantism. (Geanakoplos 254–5)

Geanakoplos's discussion of the Spanish "temper" for Greek studies at best reflects an unfounded bias and at worst bears tinges of latent racism. As for his assertion that his views are shared by "many historians," he only cites the opinions of Graux as expressed above. Moreover, despite perpetuating the nineteenth century nationalist prejudices expressed by Graux—prejudices with early modern roots in the "Black Legend" of Spain's obsessive prosecution of the Counter-Reformation, Geanakoplos ironically accuses early modern Spanish historians of proceeding with a similar, but reversed, prejudice. In their promotion of Hernán Nuñez as the father of Spanish Greek studies to the detriment of Dukas, he notes "[t]he zeal of Spanish historians to provide a secure place for their country in the movement of the

Renaissance, and especially to depict the development of Spanish humanism as the work of native Spaniards” (253).<sup>7</sup>

It is clear, then, that the scholarship that seeks to reconstruct a panoramic view of the history of early modern Greek studies has worked in both implicit and explicit ways to exclude Spain from the narrative. Scholars outside of Spain have created a subjective series of criteria that requires excellence in textual criticism and the creation of an internationally renowned “great man” representing the highest levels of Humanist excellence, qualities embodied, according to Graux, in the figure of Scaliger.

#### Greek Studies in Spain: Another Perspective

If these are the perspectives of classical scholars and Renaissance historians of Europe at large, what is that of those who are specialists in the history of Spain itself? Although Geanakoplos seems to imply an inherent nationalist bias on the part of Spanish historians, at least those working in the early modern period, the narrative presented by the major Hispanist scholars who have approached the questions of Spanish Greek studies is an equally pessimistic one.

---

<sup>7</sup> Geanakoplos is particularly hard on Nuñez, whom he accuses of being something of an anti-Humanist, hoarding texts for his own use rather than publishing them for the use of other scholars: “[Nuñez] manifested [an] utter indifference to so fundamental an aspect of Greek studies as the editing and publishing of original texts. Though the possessor, for example, of very rare manuscripts of Themistius containing several yet unpublished speeches, Nuñez made no effort to publish these, and the printed editions of Themistius’ orations thus remained for a long time incomplete” (254). Further reflective of Geanakoplos’s estimation of early modern Spanish humanists and the contemporary historians describing them is his reaction to Spanish historian Jacques Auguste Thaunus, who writing a hundred years after Dukas’ stint at Alcalá, mistakenly refers to him as Lukas. Geanakoplos seems to express genuine affront in presenting this fact in an aside, underscored by his use of an exclamation point (253).

To this date, the Hellenist pursuits of Spain's early modern Humanists remain understudied. The topic is almost exclusively addressed in three sources, the first being Luis Gil Fernández's *Panorama social del humanismo español* (1997), which traces Greek studies from the Middle Ages into the nineteenth century, the second and third of those being the works of his students, José López Rueda and Enriqueta de Andrés, who deepen Gil Fernández's work in two more focused monographs giving in-depth documentation for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>8</sup> López Rueda and Andrés, with their detailed archival research and analysis of relevant Hellenist literary works (specifically grammars and educational treatises), bring documentary evidence to bear in supporting the thesis that Gil Fernández originally set out in his 1967 famous essay "El humanismo español del siglo XVI" and further elaborates in his more lengthy *Panorama*. Gil Fernández's thesis is not that far removed from the one expressed by Graux and continued by Geanakoplos in the same decade that the Spanish historian and his students are working.

Gil Fernández's narrative is one of false starts, constant limitations, and precipitous decadence. In his description, after an initial flurry of activity in the early sixteenth century, evident in the founding of universities' *cátedras* of Greek studies—both at the new Alcalá and the hallowed Salamanca—knowledge of Greek became "relativamente extendido" (213) and there were in Spain "helenistas de cierta talla," namely Vergara and Nuñez (213). Even in describing this initial

---

<sup>8</sup> These works are conceived of as an informal series in which there is a third study by another student of Gil Fernández, Concepción Hernando (1975), covering the eighteenth century. See Andrés (7) for an explanation of the project by Gil Fernández's protégés.

blossoming of Greek studies, it is important to note the limits Gil Fernández places on Spanish Hellenism, clear in terms such as “relativamente” and “cierta talla.” Moreover, as he describes, during this initial “difusión” of Greek studies, Spanish Hellenists maintained epistolary relationships with major European Humanist figures such as Erasmus, although he warns against over-interpreting the likely formulaic praise these figures heap upon their Spanish correspondents for their knowledge of Greek, warning that reading too much into such praise creates an “imagen falsa de la realidad” (214).

Despite the diffusion of Greek studies, Gil Fernández maintains that from the start a dearth of printing houses capable of handling Greek type impeded the creation of Greek texts and learning materials. Although early sixteenth-century Spain saw an initial proliferation of Greek in university settings, by the second half of the sixteenth century, the effects of the Counter-Reformation and Spain’s economic crisis began to constrict Greek studies to the point that, by the seventeenth century, he deems them virtually non-existent (215). In addition to the constant specter the Inquisition—studying Greek could always bring one too close to the sun in terms of heretical Protestant biblical philology—a series of royal policies negatively impacted Spanish Humanism and Greek studies in particular: Philip II’s prohibition against Spaniards studying in foreign universities, Philip III’s prohibition of Spanish authors publishing abroad without specific royal licenses, and Philip IV’s limitation on the publishing of works deemed “superfluous” (214). For Gil Fernández, together, these measures cut the “cordón umbilical” between Spain and the rest of the European Humanist milieu and closed off interior “canales

de difusión” within Spain (214). As he argues, with Spain in economic decline, salaries for university professors dropped precipitously, and with it being more difficult to make a living out of teaching Greek, there was a concomitant drop in the level of education, as it became harder to attract talent into teaching positions (216–217). This economic decline, then led directly to the decline in the quality of Greek studies, such that by the seventeenth century the knowledge of Greek in Spain had reached “niveles accursianos”(216–217).

López Rueda’s extensive study, *Helenistas españoles del siglo XVI* (1973), seeks to elaborate this thesis with even more detailed documentation. Through analysis it possible to begin to piece together an idea of Greek studies in sixteenth-century Spain from the archival evidence unearthed so far. The focus of López Rueda’s work is primarily the university. With careful attention to institutional archives, he traces the spread of university Greek studies throughout Spain. The picture reveals a rapidly spreading curriculum that, in its earliest stage, found its home in both the most hallowed institution of the peninsula and in its most cutting-edge one: the first Greek cátedra was founded at Salamanca under Arias Barbosa in the last decade of the fifteenth century, and Cisneros created the one at Alcalá in 1508. Valencia followed with its establishment of a chair in 1524, Barcelona in 1544, and Toledo around 1550. In the Estudio General de Zaragoza, before the institution’s transformation into a university, a cátedra existed at least as early as 1557, and at the one at Valladolid dates from 1564.

López Rueda compiles an initial picture of Greek curricula followed by these institutions in practical terms. At Salamanca, for instance, around 1560, we know

that in the mid-century three Greek professors shared a total of five classes a day, two for lower levels, two for middle levels, and one for advanced. However, as López Rueda notes, by 1564, the university had eliminated one professorship, the one for beginners, and had therefore reduced the classes to four hours a day. López Rueda continues to track this contraction in terms of courses and personnel as part of his charting of the decline of Greek studies in Spain, noting that in 1588 Salamanca closed its *colegio trilingüe* (first opened in 1555). Valladolid eliminated its *cátedra* of Greek in 1591.

The main thrust of López Rueda's study is the reconstruction of the economic conditions faced by professors in the era; his overall narrative of decline in terms of the quality of Greek teaching is based almost exclusively on his tracking of the downward trends in salaries for *catedráticos* in the universities over the course of the sixteenth century, illustrating a decrease in pay that he believes reflects the universities' inability to attract quality scholars, or alternately, indicating that those who were teaching were stretched thin and had to supplement their income with external sources of revenue. Additionally, López Rueda's focus in documenting the university is almost exclusively on the professoriate; his lengthy study of the university system is organized as a chronological—and an exhaustive—series of biographical sketches of each *catedrático* at each institution.

Unfortunately, this means our glimpses of Greek from the students' perspective are very limited. These are predominantly found in his descriptions of life in the Alcalá and Salamanca *colegios trilingües*, live-in colleges within the university where students studying Latin, Greek, and Hebrew cohabitated. In

analyzing the regulations applied to students who had earned scholarships to participate in the *colegios trilingües*, López Rueda reveals that students were required to devote their days to a regimented system of written and oral practice with Greek, even spending their lunch period in small groups reciting Greek passages memorized in their classes. Whether students diligently followed such regulations cannot be known, but that these types of regulations existed for student life gives us some idea of life in such a *colegio*.

Despite the attention paid to documenting at least some aspects of Greek in the universities, other key areas of the education system that would have impacted many Spanish students not studying at the university level are under-addressed (although certainly much of the picture of Greek studies in the university system remains to be filled in as well). López Rueda's chapter on Greek teaching among the Jesuits focuses on the development of the order's educational curriculum, the *Ratio studiorum*, and the issues that they encountered when processes were brought against the order by the Inquisition in 1586 (269–286). The charges were eventually resolved in 1588 and Greek continued to be a part of the *Ratio studiorum* in its 1588, 1591, and 1599 versions (López Rueda 273).<sup>9</sup> In his conclusion on the Jesuits, López Rueda remarks on the powerful influence and the level of permeation of the order's control over education in promulgating Greek in the peninsula, but of all the topics treated in his study, the chapter on Jesuit Greek remains underdeveloped and even less documented. This area is one that deserves more scholarly attention, as the idea of the Jesuit classical curriculum continues to hold a

---

<sup>9</sup> See López Poza for an overview of the Greek curriculum in the 1599 *Ratio studiorum* (75–83).

powerful place in the minds of modern scholars. For instance, for scholars such as Luis Astrana Marín and López Poza's the very fact that Quevedo studied at the Jesuit Colegio de San Pedro y San Pablo in Madrid serves as sufficient evidence to argue definitively that he must have mastered Greek (Astrana Marín 17; López Poza 75–83). More concrete answers about the realities of Jesuit Greek education in Spain, however, will have to come from future studies that can provide the level of documentary analysis that López Rueda gives to the university system.

Finally, López Rueda's study, although it mentions Pedro Simón Abril, the grammar teacher who taught not only at the University of Zaragoza but also for various "estudios," or municipal schools across Castile, not much information is given about Greek instruction at this lower, non-university level. The facts of Simón Abril's own life, that is to say, that he was able to support himself by traveling from municipal teaching post to municipal teaching post in various townships, suggests that Greek instruction was taking place in Spain beyond universities and Jesuit institutions.

López Rueda's approach is also reflected in the structure and focus of Andrés counterpart study, *Helenistas españoles del siglo XVII* (1988), which continues his study and devotes a similar amount of attention to university contexts and to the major figures of the era's professoriate. The limitations of both studies' approach should at this point be clear: their focus on the best-known representatives of Hellenism, those who became *catedráticos* at major institutions, reinforce the "great man" narrative that requires a Scaliger for a nation's Hellenistic tradition to matter. This echoes Gil Fernández's comment, cited earlier, that Nuñez and Vergara, the

most famous Greek scholars of the century, were in his estimation “helenistas de cierta talla” (213), that is to say, Hellenists approaching a certain standard. He does not specify this standard explicitly, but we may infer that it is that of the international Hellenists, whose profiles, as he notes, in many ways correspond to these Spanish figures.

In recapitulating Gil Fernández’s narrative of obstacles and decadence, however, López Rueda and Andrés are both especially careful to note that they in no way blame Spanish Hellenists for their failure to live up to the standards of their European peers. For López Rueda, “dadas las desfavorables circunstancias” these Hellenists deserve to be praised for their “sostenido entusiasmo . . . a pesar de tan graves obstáculos” (420). For Andrés, the outcome of her study, which reveals the continued decline of Spanish Greek studies, is “lamentable,” and she affirms that “la responsabilidad inmediata” for the decadence she traces in the seventeenth century is the “desidia” or even “criminal torpeza de . . . [los] gobernantes” (389).

I believe it is important to note, again, for these three Spanish historians, just as was the case for their non-Spanish counterparts, that it is difficult to remove language of criticism and blame from the narrative of Spanish Hellenism. While those “external” critics seek to exclude or even to blame the Spanish Hellenists themselves for perceived failings, these “internal” critics seek to defend them, assigning blame to other figures who served to impede their success. The narrative of Spanish failure and decadence remains; it is only the perspective that has changed, and the guilty party.

## The Purview of the Present Study

As outlined here, the history of studying the history of Greek studies—admittedly a daunting subject when thus phrased—is at least as complex a story as that of Spanish Greek studies themselves. The logic of detailing the previous trends in scholarship in this way has been twofold. The first goal has been to provide the reader with the necessary contextual framework to situate the analysis that will follow. The second and more important goal has been to alert the reader to certain pitfalls and blind spots in previous studies. In returning to the query posed in the prologue, “Why does Don Lorenzo need Greek?”, it will now be important to identify the approaches that the following study will take in attempting to define more clearly what it meant to study Greek in early modern Spain, both practically and figuratively.

How do we begin to situate early modern Spanish Greek studies within the European Humanist context while avoiding the pitfalls of earlier approaches? What questions do we ask in order to set parameters for a useful analysis? I propose the following three:

(1) One way to begin would be to ask: “who studied Greek?”. In reflecting on this question, it is worthwhile to remember that students of Greek in Spain were not all Nuñezes, Vergaras, or Brocenses, nor were students of Greek outside of Spain all Ficinos, Erasmuses, or Scaligers. In fact, that Cervantes’s Don Lorenzo, as portrayed by his father, is in any way comedic speaks to the fact that there were in Spain enough Don Lorenzo-figures for the joke to land. Botley, working backward from his calculations about the number of Greek grammatical texts in circulation (assuming

one text per student), estimates that, by 1530, at least 100,000 people had undertaken the study of Greek in Western Europe, an incredible jump from the turn of the 15<sup>th</sup> century when we can only document ten such students (116). Even if we simply doubled this number to account for the rest of the sixteenth century and we were to only focus on the Scaligers and not the Don Lorenzos, we would be excluding thousands of students in Spain alone. Do these students' experiences learning Greek not matter simply because they did not become a Scaliger? In order to advance our understanding of Greek studies not only in Spain, but also throughout Europe, it is important to resist this past tendency to focus only on the "great men" of Greek studies. In an effort to recover these experiences, this study will focus on Hellenists who did not become "rock stars" of their day, either as philologists of the type that even today populate *apparatus critici* or as *catedráticos* of major institutions.

(2) Another important question might be "why study Greek?" The answer must necessarily be more complex than simply the Humanist party line that Graux expresses in his critique of Spanish Hellenists, that ideally, one studies Greek "pour lui-même" and "pour la jouissance de revivre, en quelque manière, dans un monde si différent du nôtre" (9). This romantic view of why one would undertake the study of such a challenging ancient language cannot serve as the *only* explanation for why early modern Europeans chose to do so. Here again the issue of the Don Lorenzos versus the Scaligers is pertinent. Returning to Botley's reflections on Greek students in Europe up to the 1530s, it is important to note, as he rightly does, that, while it is difficult to retroactively gauge competence, the majority of students "likely would

not have gone very far in their Greek studies” (116). Botley notes that the high proportion of introductory materials—Greek alphabets and pamphlets—among surviving Greek resources indicate a printers’ and teachers’ desire to “whet” a specific set of “appetites” (117), that is to say, a demand to acquire a certain level of basic Greek, but not necessarily to reach mastery. Botley is, however, careful to note, that the proficiency of these students is not the most important metric for evaluating the spread of Greek studies in this time period, as he states, “if the attainments of these students are inevitably modest, [this] is still an extraordinary transformation of the educational environment in Western Europe” (117).

Apropos of Botley’s comments are circumstances modern language teachers will likely recognize, namely, that the outcome of a student’s learning is closely tied not only to their motivation to learn, but also to their motivations for learning in the first place. Today’s language teacher may also recognize the urge to question the motives of a student with a low drive to learn, wondering “why are you taking this class if you aren’t here to master the language?”, while knowing full well that there are a host of reasons behind why a contemporary undergraduate might find themselves in a Spanish or another popular modern language class.

This will also be the case for Greek studies in the early modern period, for each student this answer will surely have varied, and the answers will go well beyond the humanist ideal of “to commune with the ancients.” Nonetheless, is there something we can divine about what would lead someone to undertake the study of Greek in early modern Europe in general, and in Spain in particular, even if they remained a Don Lorenzo, never becoming—or never even necessarily aiming to

become—a Scaliger? Are we able to finesse the question of “why study Greek?” and deepen our understanding of how Humanism resulted in such widespread Hellenism?

(3) A final question to consider is “What is special about studying Greek in Spain?” The historiographic narratives laid out above, whether those of Spanish historians or scholars from other fields and contexts, share one thing in common: they are narratives of exceptionalism. The idea presented is that Spain fails to conform to a standard otherwise maintained throughout Europe, as though the other nations of Europe are heterogenous among themselves or even within their own borders. Spain is not an “exception” to an otherwise uniform narrative about Greek; the development of Greek studies in Spain is simply different from those in other national contexts, as is the case for every national context in which Greek was studied. It is necessary to acknowledge, therefore, the historical factors that are unique to Spain and that do influence the trajectory of Greek studies therein. The documentable historical factors identified by Gil Fernández, López Rueda, and Andrés—that is to say, access to Greek printing resources, economic concerns, the Inquisition—are certainly one part of the story, and this story can continue to be filled in with additional archival research. What is important is that in working to reconstruct a fuller picture of Greek studies, we avoid a certain teleological narrative implicit in Gil Fernández, López Rueda, and Andrés Castellano’s approaches, one that sees the unique aspects of the Spanish context as “obstacles” or “hindrances” to Spain’s attaining what otherwise would have been a predetermined level of Greek studies and that we may summarize as: “if Spain had only followed

the correct trajectory, had overcome these obstacles, it could have produced a Scaliger.” Even more interesting is to consider how these factors, or limitations, to attempt a more neutral word, created unique responses or solutions to limited resources brought about by the specific circumstances of Spanish history.

In order to pull these three threads together into a cohesive argument, it is important to return to the question posed by Goldhill at the beginning of this discussion and to consider how he develops it as an analytical tool that can also be applied to the context under consideration here. In order for it to be more useful, Goldhill breaks the question down into the following series of related queries: “what does it mean to know Greek,” “who knows Greek,” and “[what does it mean to say] ‘I know Greek’” (7).

Goldhill’s book begins to tease out some of the complexities of these questions in various eras and cultural/geographic contexts. He examines the Syrian Lucian’s creation of a Greek identity for himself as a citizen of the Roman Empire, the “modernist engagement” with Greek in a controversial 1910 staging of Strauss’s opera *Elektra* in London, and, returning to Lucian, on the gradual nineteenth-century “de-Greek”-ing of the author, the roots of which lie in German Romanticism and its connections to German nationalism. Most importantly for the present study, however, is Goldhill’s study of Erasmus and various cultural and religious conflicts over learning Greek in the sixteenth century. Goldhill convincingly argues that Erasmus, with his international renown and powerful influence over the European intellectual field of his day, “made learning Greek sexy” (15). That is to say, under Erasmus’s purview, the study of Greek became an “important, politically charged,

socially relevant, and trendy;" "a fundamental element of a cultural identity" (15). For Goldhill, the idea that these early modern Hellenists passively "received" Greek, simply read and interpreted it in a neutral process, is far too simple. He speaks instead to Greek studies as a site of "dynamics of resistance and appropriation," "recognition and self-aggrandizement," key processes in the "drama of cultural identity" (206).

Goldhill primarily focuses on the intersection of Erasmus's views on Greek studies with the religious conflicts of the day. However, for Goldhill, Greek goes beyond merely serving as a marker of intellectual status, as a shibboleth for entry into a particular in-group. Asking the readers to put themselves in the position of the sixteenth century learner of Greek, he expresses the following about the real-world implications of wielding Greek in this way:

"Under [the] influence [of Erasmus], your relation to Greece, to knowing Greek, inevitably now played an integral part in your personal politics, in your engagement with religion, in your sense of self . . . [t]he conflicts of the Reformation and the power struggles around the monarch at court made your dealings in Greek a marker of your performance in the pursuit of authority and position" (59).

It is here that Goldhill's arguments about the symbolic power of Greek and its intersection with establishing one's "authority and position" within early modern society becomes particularly interesting for the context of Spain.

In many ways, Goldhill's arguments about the symbolic power of Greek run concurrent with those of Pierre Bourdieu, who elaborates a theory of the "cultural capital" attributed to practices such as literary production that do not necessarily produce a material gain but nonetheless serve to produce a symbolic one that is equally powerful—and which can in turn produce meaningful, material outcomes,

allowing artists to find patrons or to benefit materially in other ways.<sup>10</sup> Carlos Gutierrez in his study of the literary production of the early seventeenth century in Spain has mapped the Bourdiean model to the highly charged literary environment of the literary circles of the courts of Philip III and Philip IV, the poetic milieu of Góngora, Quevedo, and Lope de Vega. He identifies this literary context as what Bourdieu would call a “literary field” (24ff.) in which Góngora and Quevedo in particular competed for poetic prestige. As Gutierrez argues, this poetic prestige generated for these authors a cultural capital that would, in turn, produce real-world gains for them. In the court environment of the early seventeenth century, this allowed these and other authors to earn financial support through the patronage of the elite, who themselves earned cultural capital through their cultivation of the literary arts. In this particular historical moment, such cultural capital could also open a second avenue of material capital: successful authors could also reap the financial benefits of the book trade that printing had allowed to blossom. Authors competing for both cultural and material capital thus developed various literary strategies to establish the prestige to generate both.

While Gutierrez applies a precise version of Bourdieu’s model to this very specific historical context, it is possible to employ the Bourdiean conception of “cultural capital” and its real-world implications more broadly. When applied to questions about Greek in early modern Spain, the idea of “cultural capital” in literary

---

<sup>10</sup> For an overview of Bourdieu’s sociologic theories, see Gutierrez, who gives an informative and highly detailed summary of Bourdieu’s platform as developed over the course of three of his main works, *La distinction* (1979), *Les règles de l’art* (1992), and *Raisons pratiques* (1996) (Gutierrez 10–24).

contexts can serve as a powerful tool that complements Goldhill's arguments about the symbolic power of the language throughout history. Combining these two ideas, then, the following analysis will explore the study of Greek—and the richness of its symbolic power and cultural capital—in early modern Spain. Rather than focusing on the previously posed question “why did Spain not produce a Scaliger?,” it will build on Goldhill's original query, asking “who needs Greek in early modern Spain?” or, more precisely, “what does it mean to study Greek in early modern Spain?”

Exploring this question fruitfully requires going beyond a simple identification of the limitations Spanish humanists faced in studying Greek compared to their other European counterparts, beyond the groundwork that Gil Fernández, López Rueda, and Andrés Castellanos have laid. While such limiting factors may have impeded the development of Spanish Scaligers, nevertheless, they were overcome by many who became Don Lorenzos, and the stories of these Don Lorenzos have much to teach us about the symbolic power of Greek in early modern Spain and beyond.

In approaching this question, it is more fruitful, therefore, to recognize that this limited access to Greek texts and pedagogical materials itself fostered a unique creative environment. Faced with limited access to Greek texts and pedagogical materials, Spanish humanists devised various ways to compensate for the lack of these resources in order to present themselves as experts in Greek. Employing a wide range of textual strategies—often virtuosic displays of rhetorical misdirection—various humanist authors worked to convince their readers that, despite these limiting factors, they were, nevertheless, both capable and

consummate Hellenists. The present study will show that, precisely because of the limitations facing its Hellenists, Spain, rather than being a “dead end” in the historical narrative of ancient Greek’s spread in the Western European “Renaissance,” represents an ideal test-case in which to examine Greek studies as a tool for self-presentation and as an international signifier of Humanist status.

In terms of its structure, this study will consider three illustrative moments in the trajectory of late-medieval and early modern Spanish Hellenism, snapshots focused on a particular author and a particular text that reveal some of the clever strategies deployed by humanists to access the prestige of Greek studies while compensating for their lack of access to key Greek resources. These case studies will include the following: 1) the poet Juan de Mena (1411–1456) and his 1444 text the *Homero romançado*, a purported translation of Homer’s epic in reality based on the Latin epitome known as *the Ilias Latina*—a fact that Mena cleverly spins to his advantage; 2) the grammarian Pedro Simón Abril (1530–1595) and his 1585 *Gramática de la lengua griega escrita en lengua castellana*, the first Castilian-language grammar of Greek that outlines a radical pedagogical platform designed to correct Spain’s international reputation for deficient Greek studies; and 3) Francisco de Quevedo (1580–1645) and two of his Greek-related projects. The first is his 1609 translation of the Anacreontic corpus, the *Anacreón Castellano*, famously lampooned by Luis de Góngora, in which the poet, despite his lack of advanced Greek study, self-consciously presents himself as a philologist on par with prominent international Hellenists. The second is his encomiastic prologue to his Hellenist colleague Vicente Mariner’s translation of Julian’s *In regem solem ad*

*Salustium Panegyricus* —and Mariner’s revealing “praise” of Quevedo’s Hellenism in the same work.

These texts, each displaying a unique set of strategies for overcoming the limitations facing its would-be Hellenist author, serves as a witness to the prestige granted to Greek over the course of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries in Spain. Equally important, however, is the fact that each of these texts reveals an acute anxiety on the part of its author to use Greek as a means of connecting with broader milieux of European Hellenists, seeking to legitimize Spain’s place in the international conversation of European humanism. As the subsequent analysis will show, these humanists’ preoccupation with projecting a knowledge of Greek in and of itself suggests the language’s symbolic power as a marker of humanist prestige in late medieval and early modern Europe.

#### A Few Additional Considerations

Finally, before beginning the present analysis in earnest, it is important to address a few broader implications that might come to mind for the reader.

Returning to Goldhill, it is important to remember that he anchors his study of Greek in “arenas of battle” and “cultural conflict” (8). Goldhill is concerned with critical moments where debates about Greek have what we may call “life and death,” consequences, as they profoundly shape British colonialism, German national identity and racial politics, and, in the period under examination here, issues of religion with potentially fatal consequences for Greek scholars such as Erasmus’s friend, Thomas Moore.

The present study does not explicitly consider the same “life or death” conflicts over Greek. It focuses instead on ideas of cultural capital and symbolic power among a relatively elite group of Spaniards. That is not to say that the study of Greek did not intersect with “life or death” concerns, since it did intersect in so many ways with the concerns of the Inquisition. Simón Abril, for instance, did have a brush with the Church regarding his pedagogy, one that almost led to his excommunication. That particular case revolved around potential “Erasmianism” in his philosophical teachings, as Morreale argues, but not in his Greek courses (an issue to be considered more fully in chapter 2). Similarly, the great Hellenist El Broncense had repeated run-ins with the Inquisition, and in fact died while under arrest for charges of heresy related to certain issues of biblical interpretation—but not ones rooted in the study of Greek per se (436–445). It was the Jesuits who seemed to get in the most hot water, as López Rueda outlines, for their inclusion of classical Greek authors in their curriculum (López Rueda, 273). Nevertheless, although a process was brought against them, and several members of the order jailed in the 1580s, the issue was eventually resolved and the Jesuit teaching of Greek continued in Spain (López Rueda 274).

However, if we are considering “life and death” consequences of studying Greek, that is to say, those that profoundly impact the daily existence of humans in some way connected to the process, there are other issues to consider with regard to Spain, which for thousands of years had been a site of constant language contact: internally with centuries of contact between Romance, Hebrew, and Arabic speakers, externally in the Mediterranean with its conflicts with the Ottoman

Empire, and newly in the early modern period in its American and Asian colonies with all of the linguistic variety of the now-colonized cultures. In an era of forced conversions and eventual expulsions, of extreme economic fluctuations profoundly impacting the daily lives of the majority of Spaniards, and with the new Spanish colonial enterprise impacting the lives of millions in the Americas and the Pacific, any dialogue about language, identity, and prestige will impact language encounters. This is particularly true when these conversations are held by the elite. They are especially pertinent when one considers that the outcomes of these linguistic encounters, ever-present and ongoing in the early modern period, still continue to shape the lives of indigenous peoples whose languages have been subjected to the linguistic hegemony of the colonizers, many of whom are still fighting for linguistic autonomy today as a part of their cultural survival.

The reader will likely recognize that the classical tradition in general continues to shape how modern Westerners value other cultures, even in our own century. This issue is often thrown into high relief when Western observers process the news of violence and devastation in spaces connected to the classical past. One need only consider Western news outlets' treatment of ISIS's 2015 destruction of the Hellenistic Greek city of Palmyra, the famous UNESCO world heritage site in Syria. Notable in this case is the horror and outrage expressed by Western observers at the destruction of these remnants of classical antiquity—in addition to the sheer amount of media covered given to the story—far outweighing that granted to the devastating human cost of the terrorist group's actions in the region and the Syrian Civil War in general. A similar, more recent example highlights how this privileging

of the classical tradition continues to frame Western attitudes towards non-European languages, particularly those in formerly colonized contexts. After the complete obliteration of the Brazilian National Museum in 2018, in Anglophone news outlets, headlines repeatedly led with the story of the destruction of the museum's Graeco-Roman holdings, mentioning only briefly, if at all, the loss of its recordings of hundreds of Latin American indigenous languages, many of which are extinct and will now remain forever silenced.

I invite the reader to consider these implications, important for this and for any study of the classical tradition in Western Europe. In proceeding through the subsequent analysis, it is worthwhile to keep in mind the following words of Goldhill: "The question 'Who needs Greek?' is not a classicist's triumphalism or despair, but rather an injunction towards a self-aware and informed exploration of one's own place in history and in culture—one's own stake in cultural value. As far as I'm concerned, it's the *question* 'Who needs Greek?' that we can't do without" (207, emphasis in original).

## CHAPTER 2

### JUAN DE MENA'S *OMERO ROMANÇADO*: ON (NOT) TRANSLATING HOMER<sup>11</sup> IN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY SPAIN

In November and December of 1860, poet, translator, and classicist Matthew Arnold delivered a series of lectures at Oxford entitled “On Translating Homer” in which he attempted to address the challenges of rendering Homeric Greek into English. Roughly four hundred years earlier in the kingdom of Castile, another poet, translator, and classicist, the Cordoban Juan de Mena, had also addressed the challenges of rendering Homeric Greek into his own vernacular in the prologue to a work alternately entitled the *Omero romançado* and the 1444 *Iliada en romance*. Neither Arnold nor Mena would be the first or last to consider this issue: George Chapman, Dryden, and Thomas Hobbes<sup>12</sup> had preceded Arnold in reflecting on what the English translator of the ancient epics should bear in mind; Pier Candido Decembrio in his circa 1442 partial translation of the *Iliad* would weigh in on translating Homer into romance before Mena and Gónzalo Pérez would do so in the

---

<sup>11</sup> While I acknowledge the complexity of the long-debated issue of assigning “Homeric” authorship to the orally composed *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, for simplicity’s sake and in order to reflect Mena and his milieu’s pre-modern understanding of “Homer” and “Homeric” authorship, throughout this particular study, I will refer to the symbolic poetic figure of “Homer” in describing to the “author” of the *Iliad*. For an overview of the history of the “Homeric Question” with and twenty-first-century debates on unitarianist, oralist, and neo-analytical theories of these poem’s composition, see West (2011).

<sup>12</sup> See the prologues of Chapman’s *The Whole Works of Homer* (1616), the translation famously described by Keats in his 1816 Sonnet “On First Looking into Chapman’s Homer,” Dryden’s *Fables Ancient and Modern* (1700), which contains his translation of the first book of the *Iliad*, and Hobbes’s *The Iliads and Odysseys of Homer* (1675), completed when the author was 87 years old.

1550s in his translation of the *Odyssey*.<sup>13</sup> What distinguishes Mena and Arnold from these other critics is the fact that, while these other figures had, in fact, produced translations of Homer in part or in full, neither Arnold nor Mena had done so. Why then, one might ask, should we concern ourselves with the perspectives of these figures who had never set themselves to the task under discussion?

What makes Arnold and Mena's comments particularly notable are the ways in which they address—or do *not* address—the fact of their *not* translating Homer. Arnold addresses the fact head-on in the first sentence of his essay, in which he states: “[i]t has more than once been suggested to me that I should translate Homer. That is a task for which I have neither the time nor the courage” (Arnold, B1). Mena, however, is less forthcoming with the reader, while he expresses that his project is to “traduzir e interpretar tanto seréfica obra como la Yliada de Omero, de griego sacada en latín y de latín en la vuestra materna castellana vulgarizar,” a mere two paragraphs later he reveals that, in truth, his present text will not “interpretar de veinte y quatro libros que son en el volumen de la Yliada, salvo las sumas brevemente d’ellos” (154). Mena's work is not only *not* a direct translation of Homer's epic from the original Greek, but also not even a translation of a Latin translation of Homer's Greek. Although he does not explicitly name his source, Mena editors Maria Felisa del Barrio Vega, Tomás González Rolán, and Antonio López Fonseca have demonstrated that it is a prose translation of a Roman work entitled

---

<sup>13</sup> Decembrio's comments appear in the Latin prologue of his translation of the books 1–4 and book 10, completed at the request of Juan II and transcribed and translated by Pedro González de Mendoza circa 1442–1444 and have been reproduced in full in Serés “Pedro González” (50–54); Pérez appears in the prologue to his 1553 translation of the *Odyssey*, *La Ulixea de Homero* (Antwerp).

the *Ilias Latina*, a set of short verse epitomes of the *Iliad*'s twenty-four books, composed by the Neronian-era grammarian Italicus Baebius for use in teaching primary school-aged pupils about the Trojan Epic Cycle (*Iliada* 24ff). Mena's work, then, is, in effect, a translation of the ancient CliffsNotes to Homer, rendering his stated project to "traduzir e interpretar tanto seréfica obra como la Yliada de Omero" somewhat confusing: one either translates the *Iliad* or translates the epitomes of the *Iliad*, not both at once.

Unlike the straightforward Arnold, then, Mena buries the truth of his *not* translating Homer within his prologue. The author diverts attention away from—but in no way hides—this paradox with elegant rhetoric that distracts from his contradiction. While these elaborate rhetorical efforts make his text worthy of sustained literary analysis in and of themselves, it is the issue of textual access which connects them to the historical context in which they were created and makes them powerful tools for understanding the spread of Greek texts in fifteenth-century Spain. Therefore, the focus of this chapter is the importance of textual access as a preliminary step the development of Humanist Greek studies in Spain.

In framing this particular aspect of Mena's prologue, it is again useful to turn to Arnold. Despite their shared projects of *not* translating Homer, Mena and Arnold diverge in another key way: in their relationship to the Homeric text itself. The nineteenth-century, Oxford-trained Arnold had read Homer extensively in the original Greek, benefitting from direct access to a text he had "long studied" (B1). As he explains, for "one or two years the works of Homer were seldom out of [his] hands" (B1).

Unlike Arnold, Mena would have had neither the opportunity to learn Greek nor the Greek skills to read Homer. Moreover, Mena did not even have access to a full text of Homer; the only text of the *Iliad* that would have been available in the Castile of Mena's day—and it is not clear whether Mena had access even to it—was Pier Candido Decembrio's Latin translation of books 1–4 and 10, supplemented by passages from book 9 translated by Leonardo Bruni—a text whose history has been pieced together most recently by Guillermo Serés (*La traducción*) and that will be examined in detail as the present study progresses. This fact only increases the strangeness of Mena's claims to have access to the *Iliad* in the form of a “plenaria y estensa interpretación” (154).

While Arnold's description highlights the powerful material component involved in the handling of the Homeric text as a physical object, and while a study of the materiality of the Homeric book in the fifteenth century would be a fascinating one indeed and well worth scholarly attention, in the case of Mena, there is no material book to consider. In interpreting and contextualizing Mena's “Homeric” project, then, it is rather the absence of the Homeric text we must consider, and moreover the cultural weight given to the idea of a Homeric text.

While the major contemporary scholarship on Mena's “Homeric” text, namely, a series of studies by Guillermo Serés and the critical edition of María del Barrio Vargas, Antonia López Fonesca, and Tomás Rolán González have carefully traced the history of the first texts of Homer in mid-fifteenth century Spain and have worked to integrate Mena's work into this narrative, their approach to Mena's text has been more philological and ecdotic. That is to say, their work has focused on

reconstructing the immediate textual sources of Mena's projects and establishing potential historical links between his text and other Homeric materials circulating in Italy and Spain at the time. While these efforts have laid the necessary groundwork for further study of this unusual text, they have, nevertheless, left many questions about *why* Mena may have created such an unusual text unexplored. Moreover, in reconstructing this work's relationships to other contemporary Homeric translations, this scholarship has not addressed the central paradox that is effectively hiding in plain sight—that Mena's text is not Homeric translation. That is not to say that they do not recognize it to be a translation of the *Ilias latina*. It is, rather, that they have not commented on the significance of Mena's presenting his version of the *Ilias latina* as a Homeric translation. Building on their work, then, this study will foreground this curious and contradictory aspect of the Mena's "Homeric" project, exploring the implications of the author's textual "misdirection" regarding its source material. It will argue that this singular text represents the nexus of three greater historical narratives: the history of the Homeric texts in fifteenth-century Europe, the spread of Humanism from Italy into Spain where it evolved as "vernacular humanism," and the intellectual life of the turbulent court of Juan II of Castile. Juan de Mena's paradoxical non-Homeric Homeric text, then, in fact becomes a key document for understanding the role of Homer, in particular as the representative par excellence of the burgeoning humanist Greek studies, in this moment of intellectual transition in Spain.

In order to reconstruct this story of Mena's text and its historical implications, the following analysis will proceed in three stages. First, it will

examine in detail the rhetorical strategies Mena develops over the course of his prologue to justify his peculiar approach to *not* translating Homer. Next, it will contextualize these rhetorical strategies within humanist milieu of the Castilian court of the 1440s, reconstructing the historical realities of accessing the text of Homer's Iliad in this era to reveal the power of the idea of "Homer" as a stand-in for Greek literature itself. In order to promote himself, Mena had to address a key obstacle of access during this moment in the fifteenth century: an increasing desire among courtiers for vernacular translations of classical texts, particularly Greek ones popular among Italian humanists, despite the lack of the resources and skills among the literati in Spain to provide these. In order to overcome this problem, Mena produces a paradoxical text, turning a disadvantage—his lack of access to the Homeric text—into an advantage.

The analysis will conclude by considering how, in the process of presenting himself as an authority on Homer, Mena uses the prologue as a means of amplifying his own prowess among other Castilian translators of classical epic. This process hinges on Mena's development of a poetic persona whose claim to authority centers on his being the first to bring Homer to Juan II's court. Significantly, the specific metaphoric language Mena uses to establish his Homeric primacy mirrors that used in his *Laberinto de Fortuna* to describe his literary forbear, Enrique de Villena, who in 1428 had produced Europe's first vernacular translation of the *Aeneid*. This final phase of the analysis will explore how Mena's intertextual link between his two works projects a hierarchy of humanist translation based on Homer's superiority over Vergil, Greek's superiority over Latin, and by extension, Mena's superiority

over Villena. As this analysis will reveal, this hierarchy of translational prowess reflects the burgeoning model of authorial individualism that will eventually become a defining feature of early modern European literature in general and the Spanish Golden Age in particular.

### Situating the *Omero romançado*

Born in Córdoba in 1411 into a prominent family of minor noble standing,<sup>14</sup> Mena studied at Salamanca, where he earned the title of “master of arts,”<sup>15</sup> and spent time in Italy— most certainly in Florence and potentially in Rome<sup>16</sup>—before arriving in the court of Juan II around 1443. Upon returning to Castile, having established himself in the royal circle through his literary prowess, he was granted

---

<sup>14</sup> Our main biographical sources for Mena are the *Memorias de algunos linages antiguos e nobles de Castilla*, a text attributed (although not universally) to Mena (see Ghericke 123); Hernán Nuñez *De la vida del auctor*, which prefaced his 1499 commentary, the *Laberinto* (although this biographical sketch does not appear in the preliminary matter to the 1502 edition of Nuñez’s work, see Weiss and Cortijo Ocaña (186)); a verse supplement to Nuñez’s biography composed by his protegee, Valerio Francisco Romero, appearing as an appendix to the *Epicedio en la muerte de maestro Hernán Nuñez*, (Salamanca 1555); and Alonso García de Morales 17th-century *Historia y nobilario de Córdoba por un anónimo*. According to these sources, Mena’s family of “buenos hidalgos” included a prominent ancestor, Ruy Fernández de Peñalosa y Mena, who first served Córdoba in the role of Veinticuatro, a post which the poet’s father Pedrarias, brother Ruy Fernández de Peñalosa, and Mena himself would go on to occupy. In the mid-20th century scholars such as Lida de Malkiel (“Para”) and Americo Castro (569ff) posited a *converso* origin for Mena based on readings of contemporary literary sources’ references to the poet, but this has been contested by Street (151–2) others and is now considered disproven by Mena scholars (Ghericke 112).

<sup>15</sup> Although the data are contradictory, scholarly consensus is that he entered the university at the age of twenty-three, although this would have been somewhat later than usual (Ghericke 112). Street demonstrates that he had attained this level of study based on a copy of the *Omero Romançado* (BNE MS 3666) that refers to Mena as “dominum Iohanem de Mena” (Street 153).

<sup>16</sup> The detail that he spent time in Italy comes from Nuñez biography (186), and Nuñez places him in Rome. This has led to much scholarly debate and search for archival records confirming or denying this detail. Street posits that he spent time in Rome from 1427–1434 under the care of fellow Cordobans and family friends Luis Méndez de Sotomayor and Cardinal Juan de Cervantes (154), but there is no direct evidence of this. Beltrán de Heredia, on the other hand, maintains that Nuñez is wrong about the location of his stint in Italy and has found evidence in pontifical records that place him definitively in Florence at the papal court of Eugene IV under the protection of Cardinal Juan de Torquemada during the year of 1442 and that records show he had left this post in 1443 (“Nuevos documentos”). For a recent overview of the debate, see Cañas Gálvez (12–13).

the positions of Royal Chronicler and Secretary of Latin Letters to the king.<sup>17</sup> The details of Mena's time in Italy before coming to court and of his elevation once there to "Secretary of Latin Letters" will be of particular interest for the present analysis of his Homeric text.

In addition to his service to the Castilian monarch, Mena's close personal relationships with central court figures of the epoch, including Álvaro de la Luna<sup>18</sup> and in particular, Íñigo López de Mendoza, the Marqués de Santillana,<sup>19</sup> shaped his life and literary production. While he continues to be best known for his 1444 allegorical epic dedicated to Juan II, the *Laberinto de Fortuna* (alternately titled *Las trescientas*), Mena also penned a variety of widely-influential works including the *Calamicleos* (more commonly known as *La coronación*) in honor of Santillana in 1438 and the *Coplas de los pecados mortales* (alternately known as *Debate de la Razón contra la Voluntad*) in 1456. In addition to the Homeric work under consideration here, he produced a handful of prose texts including the 1446 panegyric *Tratado sobre el título de duque* for Juan de Guzmán, Conde de Niebla and Duke of Medina Sidonia, and the prologue to Luna's *Libro de las virtuosas é claras mujeres*.

While it is clear that Mena's life and work was intimately tied to the inner circle of the turbulent Castilian court of the 1450s, and although he held the official

---

<sup>17</sup> Nuñez gives these titles in his biography of Mena (187). Despite holding the title of "royal chronicler," he did not contribute to the chronicle, and it has been posited that this is because of the political situation between Mena's patron, Luna, and Juan II's successors (Ghericke 123). On the title of "Secretary of Latin Letters," see Cañas Galvez (14ff).

<sup>18</sup> It was Santillana, according to Nuñez, who paid for Mena's burial and tomb when he died in 1456 from a "dolor de costado" (187), although a secondary legend holds that he suffered a less dignified death after being thrown from a mule (Pérez Priego XIII).

positions noted above in addition to the Veinticuatro of Córdoba, his reputation among his contemporaries was that of the *letrado* separated from the vicissitudes of the political life and dedicated to his studies. Among his contemporaries he was revered as a master of Latin style and of the classical tradition in general. His reputation and legacy was such that, upon his death, no less than three colleagues, Gómez Manrique, Pero Guillén de Segovia, and Jerónimo de Olivares, each took up the task of completing his unfinished *coplas*.

Mena's reputation for poetic excellence and classical erudition continued to grow among subsequent generations, and he appears as one of the most frequently cited poetic authorities for Castilian style in Nebrija's grammar, a topic which has been explored in detail by Juan Casas Rigall in his 2010 study of Mena and Nebrija. His works were important enough that they received attention from sixteenth-century humanist scholars Hernán Nuñez and Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas, "El Brocense," who produced commentaries on his master work, the *Laberinto de Fortuna*. In the Spanish Golden Age he would go on to appear as the learned voice of reason as a character in a 1635 *comedia* attested to Tirso de Molina that treats the reign of Juan II, *La Próspera y Adversa Fortuna de Don Alvaro de Luna*.<sup>20</sup>

The work that would be central in shaping this legacy, the *Laberinto de Fortuna*, appeared in 1444, the same year as Mena's Homeric text, although it is unclear which came first. The year was a pivotal one for Mena, marking his return to Spain from a stay in Italy and the beginning of his court career. These texts, then,

---

<sup>20</sup> The play appears in the 1635 *Segunda Parte* of Tirso's *comedias* in which the author only claims to have composed four of the twelve *comedias*. See William McCrary for an overview of scholarly debate on the possible attributions of this particular *comedia*.

both dedicated to Juan II, appear at a moment when Mena is working to establish himself at court, and both seem to have played a significant role in establishing Mena's reputation: it appears to be the case that soon after their release, Mena would be appointed to the posts of "Secretary of Latin Letters" and "Royal Chronicler." Of the two works, however, the Homeric text has received less attention from critics, ancient and modern.

The text itself consists of a prologue with introductory remarks and a life of Homer, representing in many ways the traditional medieval scholarly *accessus ad auctorem*. This is followed by a translation arranged by books. The book circulated in manuscript form with six manuscripts surviving and was first printed in 1519 by Amaldo Guillen de Brocar as the *La Yliada de Homero en romance*.<sup>21</sup> The work is variously titled the *Sumas de la Yliada de Omero*; *Iliada en romance*, and *Omero romançado* (del Barrio et al. *Iliada* 81–3). Mena himself does not identify the specific *summas* from which he translates, leaving the source up for debate by modern textual critics. Alfred Morel-Fatio, one of the first modern scholars to explore Mena's "Homeric" work, originally posited that the text was likely based on the Homeric epitome known as the *Periochae*, falsely attributed to Ausonius in antiquity (112ff). However, in their 1996 critical edition of the text, del Barrio Varga, Fonesca, and Rolán González have argued convincingly through close textual analysis that Mena's source is in fact that of the *Ilias Latina*, and the trio of editors even publish the Latin

---

<sup>21</sup>Four are housed in the Biblioteca Nacional de España, of which three date to the fifteenth century (MSS 6052, 7099, 3666) and one (an incomplete copy that stops at chapter 26) to the seventeenth (8600). One is found in the Biblioteca Menéndez Pelayo (MS 96) and one in the private collection of Bartoloé March Severa in Madrid. See de Barrio et al. *Iliada* for descriptions (57–59).

work as an appendix to their version of Mena's text.

Of this source material, the *Ilias Latina*, we know the following details. Already in first century BC, Latin-language epitomes of the Homeric texts and related Trojan War myths began to appear as resources for students reading Homer as a part of the standard Roman educational curriculum. Over the course of the empire and into late antiquity, as knowledge of Greek among Latin-speakers declined, this genre proliferated as readers relied on these texts more and more directly as sources for the Trojan Cycle. Three such works survived into the Middle Ages: prose accounts of Dictys and Dares, the *Ephemeris Belli Troiani* and *De Excidio Troiae* respectively, and the version in verse, the *Ilias Latina*. Modern scholars attribute this poem, consisting of 1070 hexameters, to the Neronian-era poet and grammarian, Italicus Baebius, who likely composed the work as a resource for students under his tutelage. While often referred to as an epitome of the *Iliad*, despite what its reputation and title might suggest, the *Ilias Latina*'s relationship to the actual Homeric text is somewhat dubious. Although it has reached us in a form that mirrors the *Iliad*'s twenty-four book format, the divisions between the poem's twenty-four sections do not match up exactly to the books of the *Iliad*, and the text's author only "selectively" recounts, in the words of del Barrio in her study of the Latin text ("Introducción" 119), episodes that seem of interest to the *Ilias latina*'s author personally, neglecting or omitting others entirely. Del Barrio, López Fonesca, and Rolán González therefore consider the work an anthology of episodes (*Iliada* 24). In terms of the twenty-four-book structure in which the work reaches us, del Barrio, following Scaffai and other earlier critics, maintains that scribes, rather than

the text's original author, likely divided the text into this format during the copying process based on their own knowledge of the *Iliad* ("Introducción" 139).

Despite the fact that, in reality, the text is not a true epitome of Homer's Epic, as direct access to and knowledge of the original work declined, the *Ilias Latina* came to be so closely associated with the figure of Homer that in medieval sources it is almost ubiquitously referred to as the *Liber Homeri*, the *Homerus*, or even the *Homerulus* in reference to its brevity (del Barrio, "Introducción" 129).<sup>22</sup> It circulated widely, becoming, along with Dictus and Crates, one of the canonical accounts of the Trojan War and figuring in medieval educational curricula such as the *Libri Catoniani*. In their study of Mena and the *Ilias latina*, del Barrio, López Fonesca, and Rolán González argues that the Latin text may have directly influenced important medieval narratives that circulated in Spain regarding the Trojan War, most notably, the *Libro de Alexandre (Iliada 16)*. The poem's proliferation as a classroom text is further demonstrated by its widespread circulation, such that more than thirty manuscripts currently survive in libraries across Europe, three of which are found in Spain itself, and the text had already appeared in five printed versions by 1500 (Scaffai, *Baebii* 20).

Although it is clear that Mena is working from this text, he does not identify it as such. He acknowledges that he does not work directly from Homer's Greek, explaining that the text is "de griego sacada en latín y de latín en la vuestra materna

---

<sup>22</sup> Alternately, the text was attributed to one "Pindar Thebanus," an attribution proliferated by the medieval writer Guido de Columnis, who also proposed that the *Iliad* proper was the work of this particular Pindar. and mentioned Mena himself (158). See Scaffai ("Pindarus") for an overview of this curious textual history.

castellana vulgarizer” and his process is to “interpretar de veinte y quatro libros que son en el volumen de la Yliada, salvo las sumas brevemente d’ellos” (154). In considering what is at the heart of Mena’s textual paradox, that he admits this in the same breath as he claims to be translating Homer, it might be a reasonable question to ask whether Mena could have in some way been confused about the nature of his source text. After all, as del Barrio notes, the designation of “Homerulus” given to the text suggests that in the Middle Ages some considered the work to be a Latin translation of summaries that Homer himself had written of his own work (“Introducción” 129). Might it then be reasonable to assume that the contradiction lies in Mena’s own confusion, that he believes that he is in fact using a text prepared originally by Homer himself?

Evidence from his text suggests not. Interestingly, in justifying his use of *sumas* rather than a full text, Mena does refer to Homer engaging in the act of creating epitomes, only not textual ones. He refers to Achilles’ shield, which Mena mistakenly believes depicted a recursive image of the characters and events of the epic: “escribe Omero de las esculturas solas y varias figuras que eran en el escudo de Archyles de compendio, que hay en aqueste todo volumen” (154). If Mena believed his text to be Homer’s own epitomes, why would he look to justify his approach by arguing that Homer creates “*sumas*” within the *Iliad* itself rather than just authorizing his textual approach by naming Homer as its source? Furthermore, later in the prologue as Mena writes of the life of Homer, the author lists Homer’s works but does not include the *sumas* as one of Homer’s works. Interestingly, he mentions in addition to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the *Batrachomyomachia* (still believed at the

time to be Homeric), “Otras algunas obras atribuyen a él, pero dúdase por muchas razones que Omero las hiziese” (156). In his rejection of what he deems spurious Homeric texts unworthy of mention, Mena again follows a humanist trajectory that rejects the perceived inaccuracy of the medieval tradition. It seems more likely that Mena is simply downplaying the non-Homeric origins of his source, obfuscating the truth while not outright concealing it in a process we might call a rhetorical sleight of hand.

Scholarly interpretations of the prologue have not taken this aspect of Mena’s text into account. In analyzing the text, María Rosa Lida de Malkiel sees Mena’s elaborate, classicizing style as new type of ornamental prose with links to Alfonso el Sabio but more significantly to what Quintilian describes as the more purely artistic *genus demonstrativum*<sup>23</sup> (*Juan de Mena* 143). She argues that Mena’s prose, characterized by its Latin syntax and lexicon, and its show of classical erudition—in particular its elaborate geographical detail—are more rooted in classical antiquity than the bible (145). Miguel Ángel Pérez Priego agrees, finding it to be “una de las mejores muestras de la prosa ornamental y retórica” in Mena’s corpus (xxii). Fernando Gómez Redondo, on the other hand, focuses on how Mena’s rhetoric reveals an interest in the Castilian monarchy’s gradual consolidation of power in the era, a coalescing of a proto-Spanish identity. He states that there is “una dimensión de propaganda de la autoridad regia engastada en este prólogo,” a sense that Mena wishes to “salvaguardar” Juan II’s royal dignity (*Historia* 2736). The following close

---

<sup>23</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.11.

reading of the prologue, however, differs from past interpretations in its centering of the very contradiction of his translation, laying bare Mena's strategies for misdirecting his reader.

### The Development of Mena's Rhetorical Strategies

Mena's prologue begins with an address to his patron, Juan II, offering praise to the monarch and explaining that this text will be a gift most befitting a monarch of his status. In a lengthy geographic excursus, roughly 500 words of ornate, Latinate, neologism-studded prose, Mena outlines the types of gifts coming from all corners of the world that his will surpass. In the process he dazzles his readers—almost blinding them—with his arcane knowledge of classical and contemporary geography, flora and fauna, precious stones, and geological phenomena. This is precisely the aspect of the prologue that María Rosa Lida de Malkiel highlights (*Juan de Mena* 143) as the first example of the type of ornate, highly literary, classicizing prose that would come to characterize Renaissance writing and distinguish it from the medieval tradition. This is a prose focused on style as least as much as on content. However, even more importantly, through the use of classical rhetorical devices such as hyperbaton, Latin neologisms, and obscure references to the ancient world, Mena also demonstrates to the reader his mastery of the classical style and the classical world itself, in fact, almost overwhelming readers with it.

Mena's hypothetical journey finally builds to the greatest gift of all, that which he brings not from Ethiopia, not from Syria, not from Africa, but from closer to home. This gift, of the author's own creation, originates in his own maternal city, "cavellerosa Cordoba" (*Omero* 154). Mena presents himself and his work as the

result of a long literary tradition that links Córdoba to the Classical world, as the home of Seneca, Lucan and a multitude of other literary luminaries, so numerous, in fact, that Mena will refrain from enumerating them all, not because of lack of names to include, but rather out of “temor de causar fastidio,” the fear of boring his readers with the length of the list.

It is important to note that, at this point in the prologue, a full page and a half in del Barrio, López Fonesca, and Rolán González’s critical edition, before even identifying the content and nature of the text at hand, Mena has gone to great lengths to establish his own authority as a master of the classical tradition. His geographical excursus and his highlighting of the Cordoban—and specifically classical—literary pedigree of the work via its author, demonstrates Mena’s credibility as an authority on antiquity, priming the reader to believe any subsequent claims he may make on the topic of the ancient world and its texts before announcing the nature of his Homeric project.

Having thus situated his work among its Cordoban literary predecessors, Mena transitions into identifying the nature of his text. In comparing his work with those of his predecessors, he presents an elaborate metaphor for poetic production that comes from the world of insects. He explains that his predecessors create works in the way that silk worms do, “como hazen los gusanos, que la seda que ofreçen a los que los crían, de las entrañas la sacan y atrahen.” Mena himself, however, presents his gift as something that is “la que mío no es, bien como las abejas que roban la sustançia de las flores mellifluas de los huertos ajenas y la trahen a cuestras y anteponen a la su maestra” (*Omero* 154). This metaphor effectively creates a

rhetorical stance of false modesty: in a seemingly self-deprecating manner Mena cites the originality of his predecessors while emphasizing his own status as a robber of others' texts. However, as Mena subsequently expands on his insect metaphor, finally unveiling the nature of his project in the process, it becomes less and less clear how seriously the reader should take this humble posturing on the part of Mena and how it should guide their interpretation of what follows.

Mena finally reveals *what* the text he is dedicating to the king will be by explaining that it is the “flores que a vuestra señoría aparejo presenter, del huerto del gran Omero, monarca de la universal poesía, son” (*Omero* 154). He is, therefore, bringing the Castilian king not a work originating in his own literary genius, but in that of another, the king of universal poetry—Homer.

By delaying this announcement of the text, Mena not only builds narrative tension leading up to the “big reveal”, he also uses the opportunity to build up his own narrative persona and authority as interpreter of the classics, positioning himself not only as heir to Córdoba's classical tradition, but also demonstrating his mastery of classical style and knowledge of classical antiquity in the process. By establishing this authority before even introducing his subject as Homer, Mena convinces the reader to accept him as uniquely qualified to interpret the Homeric text. Although the metaphors of silkworms and honeybees suggest that he places his work on a level beneath that of his predecessors, by establishing himself as the honey bee, the intermediary between his Castilian readership and Homer, he elevates himself to a special position vis-à-vis the “monarca” of universal poetry. Although his textual product may not be the original composition of Córdoba's

ancient literary “silkworm” elites, by positioning himself in this way within the “Homeric Orchard,” he suggests that, just as they render their innate genius into a valuable commodity for consumption by readers, so too does he create a commodity of equal or greater value due to its origin in Homer. Thus, in building up to his Homeric connection over the course of the introductory sections of the prologue, Mena is able to maintain a pose of modesty in the face of his famous literary predecessors while simultaneously convincing the reader of his classical authority and subtly promoting his poetic status through his metaphorical proximity to Homer.

Although he has not stated this explicitly, with the metaphor of the honeybee and the Homeric orchard, Mena has subtly primed his reader to believe that he is, in fact, presenting his dedicatee with a translation of Homer. He positions himself as a direct intermediary, the honeybee who moves between the “Homeric orchard” of Homer’s text and the king, rendering poetic nectar into a commodity that can be consumed by his reader. That is why it is surprising that, in his next statement, in which he more specifically lays out his procedure for creating the text, Mena states that his method is to “traduzir e interpretar” the *Iliad*, and to “de griego sacada en latín en la vuestra materna y castellana lengua vulgarizar” (*Omero* 154). Here Mena makes clear, in fact, that he does not work directly from the Homeric Greek, but rather from a Latin translation of it. Contrary to what he proposes with his metaphor of the honeybee and the Homeric Orchard, he indicates that his work is actually two steps removed from Homer, having first passed through Latin and then from Latin into Castilian.

However, despite admitting to the fact that there is an intermediary step between himself and Homer's original text, he carefully constructs this revelation to emphasize the continuity stretching from Homer to Mena to the reader, presenting this as an advantage of the text. Mena's elaborate Latinate syntax, in which he orders his prepositional phrases in a build up to the verb in final position, visually confirms his claim that there is a direct line of continuity between Homer, himself, and the reader, despite the fact that he is now indicating that there is an additional intermediary step between himself and Homer.

Mena goes on to justify the need for this additional intermediary step by highlighting the imperfect nature of translating between these three languages, where something is lost at each stage due to an implicit linguistic hierarchy. As he explains, "Apenas pudo toda la gramática y aun elocuencia latina comprender y en sí recibir los eroicos cantares del vatiçinante poeta Omero pues ¡quánto más fará el rudo y desierto romance!" (*Omero* 154). Mena's reasoning seems to be, if Latin can't even perfectly capture Greek, how could Castilian?

Mena goes on to build upon this idea, expanding on this explanation with a metaphor, again based in that of the Homeric Orchard: "Dulçes y sabrosas frutas en la fin del verano, que a la primera agua se dañan y a la segunda se pierden. Así esta obra recibirá dos agravios: el uno en la traducción latina, e el más dañoso y mayor en la interpretación del romance que presumo y tiento dar" (*Omero* 154). With this metaphor of rain on fruit, Mena not only continues the argumentation about the hierarchy of languages, but also makes a subtle rhetorical turn to introduce a new line of reasoning that essentially backtracks on what he has proposed so far.

According to the logic of the delicate fruit of the orchard, when subjected to the rain of this double translation, first to Latin and then to romance, Homer's poetry is not merely damaged in the first step, but is also, in fact, lost entirely in the second. It is, according to Mena's logic here, essentially impossible to render Homer into Castilian.

Mena uses this argument to set up the final revelation regarding his methodology, the reality behind his text that he has been skirting up to this point: "E por esta razón, muy prepotente señor, dispuse de no interpretar de veinte y quarto libros que sonen el volumen de la Yliada, salvo las sumas brevemente d'ellos, no como Omero palabra a palabra lo canta" (*Omero* 154). Despite how he has initially presented his project, he is neither translating Homer's Greek directly, as he initially stated, nor working from a Latin translation of the text, according to his second statement, but rather working from *summas*, or epitomes, of the text.

In another move to subtly justify this decision while simultaneously elevating his own authorial persona, he cites his precedent for working with these "sumas" as Homer himself. As he explains, "Y más escribe Omero de las esculturas solas y varias que eran en el escudo de Archyles de compendio, que ay en aqueste todo volume" (*Omero* 154), referring (albeit incorrectly) to Achilles' shield Book 18, lines 478–608, the famous ekphrasis. By appealing to Homer himself as a precedent for his methodology, Mena creates an additional, airtight justification for his decision to translate to the *summas* rather than the text. As in his metaphor of the honeybee and the orchard, which proposes an intimate relationship that cleverly admits the difference in status between Homer and Mena while simultaneously elevating

himself as poet. This has the additional benefit of again drawing Mena closer to Homer by likening their two approaches.

The final element of Mena's methodological presentation brings the discussion back to the dedicatee of the work, Juan II. Mena explains that ultimately he has opted not to translate the *Iliad* due to, "mayormente no aviendo para esto vuestro regio mandamiento." Mena employs the rhetorical strategy of presenting himself as the dutiful courtier who hopes to pay respect to the king while not overstepping his bounds. Finally, he expresses the hope that these "sumas" will serve as "muestras," should the king "en finos paños açercar." If the king desires a full translation, Mena argues, he can order that Mena take on "otra plenaria y estensa interpretación" or let the text "quedar en su estado primero" (*Omero* 154).

We may chart as follows Mena's elaborate presentation and justification of his textual methodology, in which he simultaneously presents his text as being Homeric in origin while acknowledging its non-Homeric origins:

1. Mena, Cordoban poet with a unique relationship to Classical literature, will serve as an intermediary between the king and the words of the poet Homer.
2. There will, however, have to be an intermediary layer of Latin translation between Homer and Mena.
3. Furthermore, since rendering Homer's poetic language through this two-stage translational process will effectively destroy it, Mena, following Homer's example, will actually have to provide epitomes of Homer's text instead.
4. And finally, it's better to provide these epitomes anyway because the king has not ordered a full translation, meaning Mena is not overstepping his bounds in serving the king.

5. Nevertheless, Mena assures his sovereign that if he wants one, Mena can provide it.

Despite the contradictory nature of this argumentation, Mena nevertheless deploys it in such a way that he effectively glosses over the true nature of his process, eliding key figures involved and deflecting any potential criticism of his methodology.

### Rhetorical Strategies in their Historical Context

To understand the deftness of Mena's textual sleight of hand in promoting his non-Homeric translation as superior to an actual translation of Homer—and what his motivations for creating this singular text may be—it is important to take into consideration the greater historical context in which Mena created his text. This context represents the nexus of three greater historical narratives: the history of the Homeric texts in fifteenth-century Europe, the spread of Humanism from Italy into Spain, and the intellectual life of the turbulent court of Juan II of Castile.

In order to analyze this complex web, it is important to begin by considering the fate of the Homeric texts as Late Antiquity gradually gave way to the Middle Ages in Europe. A defining feature of Homeric reception in the Middle Ages was a decidedly anti-Homeric critical stance. With its roots lying in the Hellenistic era, the anti-Homeric tradition was always present in some form woven throughout Homeric criticism in the Greco-Roman world. With the advent of Christianity—and its concomitant rejection of most pagan authors—the anti-Homeric movement began to gather steam. By Late Antiquity, the tendency to reject Homer as an authority, combined with a new Christian perspective and coupled with the lack of

access to the Homeric texts themselves, had become the orthodox critical approach to the poet and his corpus.<sup>24</sup> The text directly related to the Homeric tradition—or at least connected to it in the minds of contemporary readers—in circulation was the *Ilias Latina*, the “Homerulus” taught in the standard curriculum (del Barrio et. al *Iliada* 18). Despite this “Homeric” text’s wide circulation, its reputation was quite negative, as evidenced in the treatise of Guido de Columnis in which this “Homeric” text was known but its author maligned. (del Barrio et. al *Iliada* 10; Serés “Pedro González” 13-14).

In contrasting themselves to this medieval trend of anti-Homericism, the vanguard of Italian humanists of the fourteenth century had reawakened an interest in the Homeric texts and the figure of Homer. Petrarch was the first to vindicate the Homeric works, rejecting the poet’s medieval reputation and tracking down in 1354, through the ambassador to the Byzantine court Nicolas Siquero, not only a copy of the Greek texts themselves, but also a Greek-speaking Calabrian, Leonzio Pilato, to help him read them. Despite his efforts, Petrarch was never able to acquire sufficient Greek through his study with Pilato to read his copy of Homer, and thus continued to rely on Pilato’s Latin translations of the text. Boccaccio had copies of Petrarch’s Greek texts made and he also studied with Pilato, but, much like Petrarch, never made it past the phase of relying on Pilato’s Latin translations. Petrarch and Boccaccio had sparked an interest in Homer, however, and while Petrarch and Boccaccio’s Greek texts remained the only Greek versions of Homer in Italy through

---

<sup>24</sup> See del Barrio, López Fonesca, and Rolán González’s in-depth discussion of heterodox and orthodox Homeric traditions in and after antiquity (*Iliada* 10–24).

the end of the fourteenth century, Pilato's Latin translations began to circulate in burgeoning humanist circles of the Italian—particularly Florentine—elite.<sup>25</sup>

Meanwhile, the new humanist turn towards the Greek classics in general—and towards the vindication of Homer in particular—radiated out from its Italian epicenter; in particular its dissemination picked up speed with the Council of Basel (1431–1445), where international delegates from throughout Europe rubbed shoulders with prominent Italian thinkers and Byzantine Greek scholars in the delegations from the Eastern Church. This contact only heightened after the council moved from its original site to the Italian peninsula in 1438.

The story of how the humanist Homeric texts—and as many have argued, the full force of Italian humanism itself (González Rolán et al. *Humanismo* 15)—first entered the Iberian Peninsula also begins at the Council of Basel, and specifically with Alonso de Cartagena, the famous Bishop of Burgos who represented the court of Juan II from 1434–1439 at its residencies at Basel, Ferrera, and Florence. It was during this sojourn in Basel that Cartagena befriended the Humanist archbishop of Milan, Francesco Piccolpasso, who in turn not only introduced him to Leonardo Bruni's translations of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, but also put him into contact with Bruni himself, with Poggio Bracciolini, and—most importantly for the present study—with Pier Candido Decembrio. Despite Cartagena's embrace of many of the new humanist attitudes towards antiquity, particularly those reflected in Bruni's

---

<sup>25</sup> For more on the early history of the Homeric texts and Pilato's translations for his students Petrarch and Boccaccio, see Agostino Pertusi classic study *Leonzio Pilato fra Petrarca e Boccaccio* (1965).

Aristotelian works, he would engage in a fierce polemic with these three humanists waged through correspondence, a debate known as the *controversia alphonsina* in which Cartagena defended the scholastic translational approaches deemed antiquated by his colleagues.<sup>26</sup> Over the course of the debate, Cartagena would be “converted,” evolving from a reactionary stance to one of complete devotion to Bruni (González Rolán et al. *Humanismo* 15), marking an important turning point not only in his own intellectual development, but in the development of humanism in Castile.

It would, however, be the deep friendship Cartagena developed with Decembrio in this process that would go on to directly impact the arrival of the humanist *Iliad* in the Iberian Peninsula. Having returned to Castile invigorated by his firsthand experiences with the Italian humanist milieu, Cartagena transmitted his newly updated perspective towards antiquity to his king, who already had a reputation as a man of letters with an interest in both the classics and Italian works. The king’s thirst for these is evident in his request that Cartagena translate on his behalf various works of Cicero and Seneca, in addition to Boccaccio’s *De Mulieribus Claris*, into Castilian.

Around this time, Cartagena also seems also to have transmitted to the king his humanist friends’ new attitude towards Homer. In a March 10, 1442 letter to Decembrio, Cartagena reveals that he has informed Juan II of Decembrio’s Homeric translation and that the monarch, being “studiosissimus princeps et studiosii

---

<sup>26</sup> See González Rolán, Moreno Hernández, and Saquero Suárez-Somonte’s study, and edition of the correspondence between Bruni and Cartagena surrounding the *controversia: Humanismo, teoría y traducción en España e Italia en la primera mitad del siglo XV* (2000).

exercitii amator studiosorumque virorum protector” (qtd. in Morel-Fatio 125)—the most learned of princes, lover of learned exertion, and protector of learned men<sup>27</sup>—was eager for a copy of Decembrio’s work, even if just a preface and sample of book 1 to start as “muestras,” to use Serés phrase (“Pedro González 18). As Cartagena expresses it, if by chance the whole work is too time consuming of an endeavor for Decembrio, if it seems reasonable to him, he could send at least the first book and a prologue: “[a]t si forsan totum opusculum plura tempora petat, si tibi videbitur, primum librum cum aliqua honestissima prefatione.” (qtd. in Morel-Fatio 125).

Decembrio, quickly responding in an April 30, 1442 letter, indicates that he will gladly comply with the king’s request, a promise he will eventually make good on, at least partially (Morel-Fatio 126). Cartagena confirms the arrival of the first installment in a brief, undated letter to Decembrio indicating receipt of the requested samples, a preface and translation of book 1. Cartagena also does not miss the opportunity in responding to Decembrio to reiterate his king’s desire for the full text, the “regio desiderio” for “totus homerus” (qtd. in Serés, “Iliada” 122), his restatement of the request adding further urgency to the matter.

Decembrio would go on to complete additional translations of books 2, 3, 4, and 10,<sup>28</sup> in addition to composing, apparently also at the king’s request, an extensive *vita homeri*. These books, the life of Homer, and some of the correspondence between Cartagena and Decembrio would be combined into a manuscript which still exists in the Ambrosian Library as D112. It remains,

---

<sup>27</sup> Latin translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

<sup>28</sup> Oddly, in a later letter, Decembrio acknowledges having translated six books, although the fate of this sixth book—if it did in fact exist—is unclear. See Serés (“Iliada” n10)

however, difficult to piece together when a copy of this expanded—but still partial—translation arrived in Castile and whether any copy of it ended up in the hands of Cartagena or Juan II. As Pilar Saquero Suárez-Somonte and Rolán González has shown, a manuscript of Decembrio’s work, one closely related to the Ambrosian MS, exists in Burgo de Osma, and although he posits that this is at least a copy of what Juan II received, if not the one sent by Decembrio himself, no further documents from Cartagena confirm or deny the receipt of further texts from Decembrio (323–5).

One thing is clear, however: regardless of whether Juan II received Decembrio’s initial efforts of books 1, 2, 3, 4 and 10, the *desiderio regio totius homeri* went unfulfilled and Decembrio never produced the full translation. Although it is unclear why Decembrio ultimately abandoned the project,<sup>29</sup> in the meantime, while Juan II was awaiting his full *Iliad*, the enthusiasm for Homer only continued to grow at court, spreading among the retainers. Hence the fact that when Decembrio’s partial translation can be definitively demonstrated to have arrived in Castile, it lands in the hands, not of the king, but rather, those of the Marqués de Santillana. In a letter which can be dated to sometime in 1446,<sup>30</sup> Santillana writes to his son, Pedro González de Mendoza, in residence at Salamanca, informing him that he has

---

<sup>29</sup> Serés gives some reasons, including confusion over the king’s death, a fact he notes is indicated in a marginal note in the Ambrosian manuscript (“*Iliada*” 122).

<sup>30</sup> See Serés (“*Iliada*” 126), who arrives at this dating. This relies on the terminus post quem of Mendoza’s arrival in Salamanca, in Decembrio’s having definitively finished his translation, as documents in the Pavian library indicate he had returned Petrarch’s manuscript that December, and the terminus ante quem of 1449, as in Mendoza’s prologue to the text he creates in response to this letter, he mentions his father’s *Prohemio e carta* written for Don Pedro de Portugal during his time in Castille starting in 1446 but before his death in 1449. The letter is reproduced in full by Serés, see *La traducción* (19–21).

come into possession of a codex containing Decembrio's translation of books 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10, now supplemented with Bruni's translations of passages from book 9 (the speeches of Achilles, Ulysses, and Phoenix 222–603).<sup>31</sup> Scholars continue to debate at length how Santillana came into possession of this book, and he himself reveals only to the fact that a "pariente y amigo" has just delivered it to him "este otro día."<sup>32</sup> For the present study, one of the most interesting aspects of this chapter in the Decembrio translation's story is that it reveals the complex duality of classical studies for figures such as Santillana. His letter reflects the contemporary elite's appetite for the classical erudition despite a lack of advanced Latin skills necessary to read more difficult examples of classical Latin, or even the classicizing Latin of a specialist like Decembrio. It is important to note that Santanilla's need for a Castilian translation of Decembrio's Latin is also one felt by Juan II himself. This fact is underlined by Cartagena's own words in his initial request to Decembrio: he explains that he will translate what Decembrio sends him for the king, as he explains, he will directly work with the text, "ut per me eí tradatur" (Morel-Fati 126).

Santillana, therefore requests that his son, Pedro González de Mendoza, translate Decembrio's Latin, lamenting that his Latin is not at a sufficient level to read the text himself. As Santillana explains to his son, "[el latín] no lo aprendí

---

<sup>31</sup> Saquero Suárez Somonte and Rólan González have traced the transmission of the texts and have identified the manuscript in the fifteenth-century codex 122 in the Santa Iglesia-Catedral of Burgo de Osma, as a potential copy of the text Decembrio originally would have sent to Juan II (329–331).

<sup>32</sup> Serés is quite adamant in his belief that Mena is this "pariente y amigo" responsible for procuring the text, although his argument is based on speculative evidence, namely, the fact that Mena had been in Italy up to 1444 and could therefore have potentially procured a copy of Decembrio's text and transferred it to Santanilla. See "Juan de Mena" (123 ff).

verdaderamente, creo,” and for him it would be “difiçil cosa sería agora que, después de assaz años e no menos trabajos ... porfiar con la lengua latina” (qtd. in Serés, *La traducción* 20). Moreover, Santillana acknowledges that his situation is not unique among his peers, stating that the translation will serve “por consolación e utilidad mía y de otros.” The younger Mendoza complies with his father’s wishes, either working on his own to complete the translation or entrusting the task to an underling. His translation of Decembrio’s text survives in in MS AD 21245 of the British Museum.<sup>33</sup>

It is important to note that Santanilla’s need for a Castilian translation of Decembrio’s Latin is also one felt by Juan II himself. This fact is underlined by Cartagena’s own words in his initial request to Decembrio: he explains that he will translate what Decembrio sends him for the king, as he explains, he will directly work with the text.

At this juncture, having pinpointed the definitive appearance of Decembrio’s text of Homer’s *Iliad* in Castile in the form Santillana’s copy and its subsequent translation by Mendoza, it will be useful to summarize the humanist *Iliad*’s story in Castile up to this point by dividing it into three phases: in phase I, Cartagena, working on behalf of Juan II, coordinated with Decembrio in 1442 to procure an initial translation of book 1. In phase II, between roughly 1443 and 1446, Decembrio continued to work on a fuller—although, ultimately, only partial— translation while

---

<sup>33</sup> As the dedicatory preface to the translation does not indicate its creator, and as the manuscript itself nowhere indicates its author, his (or her?) identity remains unclear, although scholars typically refer to Mendoza as the author with the caveat that it could be someone else. See Cátedra’s study of the manuscript for further discussion of the authorship of the manuscript and for its history.

the king and his court awaited his promised *totus Homerus*. Their continued eagerness is evident in the fact that, in phase III, circa 1446, the Marqués de Santillana procured his own copy of Decembrio's partial text and arranged for its translation into Castilian by the younger Mendoza.

It is in phase II, sandwiched between Decembrio's partial translation and the younger Mendoza's Castilian rendering of it, that is, between two "verdaderamente" Homeric works, in Serés words ("Pérez González" 28), that Mena's own non-Homeric "Homeric" text appears. In attempting to contextualize Mena's text within this complex history, past scholarship has focused on the possible relationships between Mena's work, Decembrio's partial translation, and Mendoza's translation of the Italian's Latin text. Receiving particular attention are passages in Mena's and the younger Mendoza's prologues. Mena refers to his having access to "otra plenaria y extensa versión" of the *Iliad* that he could translate for the king should he desire it; Mendoza states that his father has seen Mena's "pequeña e breve suma de aqueste Homero de latín singularmente interpretada a nuestros vulgares."<sup>34</sup> There has been significant scholarly debate over how to interpret the relationship between Mendoza and Mena's comments, and what they mean for understanding the relationship between the two translators' projects. Serés represents one approach that maintains that, taken together, the two comments suggest that Mena is working on a translation based on Mendoza's copy of Decembrio's Latin translation. He goes

---

<sup>34</sup> The quote reads: "Sé que vuestra señoría ha muy bien visto e leído una pequeña e breve suma de aqueste Homero de latín singularmente interpretada a nuestros vulgares por el egregio poeta Johan de Mena, por lo qual sin duda conosçerá cuánto el varón de Esmirna sobrepuja todo el género poetal" (qtd. in Serés, "Pedro González" 44). Serés reproduces the full dedicatory letter ("Pedro González" 44-50).

as far as to propose the possibility that Mena and Mendoza collaborated on the translation Decembrio's version and alludes to the hypothetical existence of a larger Salamantine intellectual circle collaborating on the translation ("Iliada" 140–41).

For Del Barrio, López Fonesca, and Rolán González, on the other hand, these quotes suggest the opposite: while Mendoza's quote shows that he had seen a version of Mena's translation of the *Ilias latina*, taken together, the two quotes suggest that Mendoza and Mena were working individually on their own translations of the Homeric itself. They posit that, while Mendoza used Decembrio's text, Mena's reference to a "plenaria y extensa version" that he can provide the king must necessarily mean that he had access to a hypothetical copy of Pilato's full Latin *Iliad*, a text that argue he must have been able to access to during his stay in Florence (del Barrio et al. *Iliada* (40–51).

Barring the discovery of new archival evidence elucidating these issues of textual access, these interpretations of the possible intersection of Mena and Mendoza's projects remain based in a great deal of speculation. This is particularly the case for the attempts to identify the nature of Mena's purported "plenaria y extensa" Homeric source. Nevertheless, up to now, these issues have dominated scholarly discussion of Mena's Homeric project. For the present study, however, it is more illuminating to consider not how Mena's *Omero romançado* may or may not relate to Decembrio's "verdaderamente" Homeric *Iliad*, to its antecedent, Pilato's full *Iliad*, or even to a hypothetical Mena translation of one or both of these *Iliads*, but rather, to consider why the text we *do* have, Mena's paradoxically non-Homeric "*Iliad*," was created in the first place.

It is not difficult to deduce, following Serés, that the opportunistic Mena, newly arrived at court and seeking to establish his position with the king, is inserting himself into the Homeric situation in an attempt to curry favor by satiating the *desiderio regio totius homeri*. Serés characterizes the state of Homeric desire at the court as an “avidez,” a “deseo,” that needed to be calmed and satiated (Serés, “Pedro González” 18), a “curiosidad del rey por conocer la obra de Homero tenía que ser saciada inmediatamente,” to the point that Mena whetted his appetite “con una muestra de su obra; el resto, para más adelante: (Serés, “Iliada” 121). Rolán González similarly expresses this anxiety on the part of Juan II: “este inquieto monarca estuvo interesado desde el primer momento por la labor traductora de Decembrio y muy especialmente por la que se relacionaba con Troya,” and describes the “ansiedad” reflected in his multiple petitions to Decembrio to send a text (del Barrio et al., “Iliada” 30).

It seems that this strategy may have worked. Having just arrived from Florence, Mena, in an effort to prove himself as a poet and scholar and advance himself at court, recognizes the new interest in humanism and, in particular, in Homer, and inserts himself into the situation. Not only does he dedicate his classicizing *Laberinto* to Juan II, he produces his “Homeric” text in order to whet the appetite of his monarch for some contact with the *Iliad*. Soon after, Mena seems to have been elevated by his monarch to the position of “secretario de letras latinas” and “cronista real.”

In his recent documentary analysis of Mena’s fulfilment of these two positions, Cañas Gálvez’s argues that this promotion is likely directly linked to his

Mena's successful literary output in 1444 (14). Although specific documents do not acknowledge the precise date of his assuming these titles, Cañas Gálvez argues it is safe to follow Nuñez's assertion that Mena was granted these titles in this same year (13). Cañas Gálvez's research into the nature of the post "secretario de letras latinas" has revealed little concrete detail of what holding this relatively undocumented post meant in Juan II's court. Nevertheless, based on its name, it seems reasonable to assume a link, if even a symbolic one, to the idea of classical authority and one whose very existence conferred a sense of prestige and legitimacy back onto the Crown itself (Cañas Gálvez 16). More concretely, Cañas Gálvez has found evidence that the post paid handsomely—5,400 maravedies annually—the same salary paid to other royal secretaries and scribes (Cañas Gálvez 16). While Cañas Gálvez attributes Mena's rapid ascension in the court bureaucracy specifically to the success of the more *Laberinto* which remains the more famous of Mena's two 1444 texts today, it is nevertheless reasonable to assume, particularly in light of Juan II's documented desire for a Homeric translation, that Mena's *Omero romançado* also contributed to this success. In conjunction with the *Laberinto*, this text allowed Mena to project himself not only as a talented poet, but also as a master of the Latin and Greek traditions, thus distinguishing himself from his literary peers. Mena's Homeric text thus forms a central element of the overall humanist persona the author was working to establish for himself upon arriving at court in 1444.

While it may initially seem surprising that Mena is able to parlay his lack of a Homeric text into advancement at court, as our analysis of Mena's elaborate rhetorical strategies have shown, it need not be. Mena deftly turns this disadvantage

into an advantage, using the opportunity to present himself as an authority on Homer in spite of his lack of access to Homer's text. Mena's entire approach hinges on his ability to sell his poetic authority as a sufficient substitute for direct access to the *Iliad*. His poetic connection to Homer allows his mere summaries to be superior to any translation, whether "plenaria y estensa" or otherwise. Mena thus cleverly makes do with the resources he has at hand, repackaging a source the king would have likely encountered or even had at his disposal, but in a new humanist guise. What is especially revealing about Mena's non-Homeric "Homeric" text, then, when considered in conjunction with his advancement within the court, is the fact that these elaborate textual strategies, seem to have paid off: Homer, or at least the idea of Homer, is already a powerful enough idea at Juan II's that the suggestion of a connection to the author can bring about real-world advancement.

#### The *Omero romançado* and Mena's Humanist Hierarchy

One final aspect of Mena's text that bears considering is how the author not only uses his *Omero romançado* to access the status associated with the Homeric text, but also to enhance his own poetic prowess. He achieves this by creating a distinct, authoritative authorial voice quickly developing as a characteristic of humanist literature in the fifteenth century. The distinctiveness of the voice that he creates derives from his efforts to place himself at the top of an implicit hierarchy within among Castilian poets, and, more specifically, among Castilian translators of classical epics, namely his predecessor Enrique de Villena, first vernacular translator of Vergil.

Mena projects this distinct authorial voice throughout the prologue, and places it more specifically in dialogue with his translational forbear both implicitly in his discussion of the relationship between Homer and Vergil as well as through an intertextual link with his other work of the same year, his *Laberinto de Fortuna*, an allegorical poem also dedicated to Juan II. A closer examination of key passages that point to Villena's Virgilian legacy will reveal Mena's strategies for establishing his own primacy as both classical translator and Castilian poet par excellence.

To begin, Mena's initial metaphor of the Homeric orchard hinges on the implied superiority of Homer as epic poet, a superiority which, in turn, reflects back on Mena, his translator. According to Mena, Homer's status is evident in the position of power and authority he holds over all other poets. In elaborating his metaphor of the "Homeric orchard" from which he draws his raw materials, Mena dubs Homer, the source of the poetic nectar in question, as the "monarca de la poesia universal" (*Omero* 154). In a subsequent passage, Homer's authority takes on another dimension when Mena expands his description to describe him as "el monarca padre de los poetas" (*Omero* 157). According to Mena, then, Homer is not the most illustrious poet of the entire known poetic tradition, he is in fact the progenitor and fount from which all poetry springs.

However, Mena further emphasizes the primacy of Homer by contrasting his work specifically with that of Vergil. He explains that Vergil himself considered Homer to be the superior poet, using the apocryphal legend in which Vergil responds to critics who accuse him of stealing from Homer. According to the legend

(reported in Donatus's life of Virgil although Mena does not give the citation<sup>35</sup>), Vergil argues that it would be an easier thing to steal the club from Herakles himself than to steal a line of poetry from Homer. As Mena himself expresses it, Vergil finds it, comparatively speaking, a "pequeña cosa es tentar de sacar la maça de la mano de Héroces," or, as he goes on to elaborate, that Vergil is in this case "haziendo ... de sí el tentador, y Hérocles de Omero" (*Omero* 155). Mena takes care to emphasize that in this instance, Vergil himself is establishing a hierarchy in which his is the puny mortal beside the Herakles that is Homer.

Mena's extensive elevation of Homer over the figure of Vergil draws an implicit comparison with the Latin poet's famed translator, Enrique de Villena, courtier to the same monarch, Juan II of Castile, to whom Mena dedicated his own work. Villena's translation was notable not only for its being the first translation of Virgil into a European vernacular, but also for its philological rigor and dense glosses, as Sol Miguel Prendes has pointed out (19–20). Moreover, according to Miguel Prendes, Villena is particularly novel for the way he infuses both this scholarly apparatus and the translation of Vergil itself with a clearly defined, unique authorial presence, manipulating traditional textual conventions for scholarly writing in order to establish his singular textual *auctoritas* over the Classical epic (21). This is particularly evident in his extensive exegetical proem and in his manipulation of glossing conventions, which to guide the reader to the most correct reading of the text: his own. Miguel Prendes argues that Villena's strong claim of

---

<sup>35</sup> *Vit. Verg.* 43. Donatus's version is generally believed to be close reworking of Suetonius's *Life of Vergil*.

personal *auctoritas* contrasts with earlier translational texts, which present material with much less emphasis on the person of the translator himself (24).

Miguel Prendes argues that Mena, working a generation later, expands upon Villena's strategy of developing personal *auctoritas* when rendering classical source material into Castilian, developing an even stronger authorial voice, but adding a new element to this approach (25). His *auctoritas* is not only that of textual interpreter, but also that of poet. She maintains that, in rendering Latin quotations into works such as *Laberinto de Fortuna*, Mena deliberately removes glosses and other scholarly apparatus, internalizing explanations of Latinism through techniques such as hendiadys in order to create a more fluid, poetic interaction between the reader and the classical source material. Mena's *auctoritas* is, therefore, not merely that of scholarly authority, as knowledgeable *interpretes* of Latin language and style, but also that of author in the modern sense, of someone who has mastered and fully internalized the classical language and style and can transmit them fluidly to his reader (31). This process of internalization represents an organic link between Mena and the essence of classical language that he wishes to capture in his poetry.

While Miguel Prendes does not apply this analysis to Mena's Homeric work, as the proem's metaphor of the silkworms and honeybee suggests, a similar conception of an organic, poetically-based *auctoritas* is key to Mena's strategy for establishing the legitimacy of his work. Moreover, in the proem to the text, Mena himself seems aware of the contrast Miguel Prendes observes between his own methodology and that of Villena. In particular, Mena is openly critical of the type of

scholarly textual apparatus that Villena famously perfected in his translation of the *Aeneid*. In describing his process for creating the text, Mena states that he will not attempt to render the *Iliad* “no como Omero palabra a palabra lo cantó” and not with “ostensiones y ornación de materias”, or ostensions and ornateness of materials” that would require a “gran aparato” to be comprehensible (*Omero* 153). With this rejection of bulky paratextual apparatus and cumbersome, overly ornate *ad verbum* translation, Mena seems to implicitly reject the translation style championed by Villena.

The implicit comparison that Mena seems to draw between his stream-lined poetic approach to translation, one intimately rooted in his Cordoban identity, and the highly technical, philologically focused one favored by Villena, is expressed more strongly in Mena’s masterwork, *Laberinto de Fortuna*, written two years later. In this elaborate allegorical poem Mena creates a complex web of interconnected hierarchies not only among Classical poets, but also among their translators. The poem is structured according to a schema of concentric rings depicted on the allegorical Wheel of Fortune. Individual figures, some mythical, some historical, some ancient, some contemporary, are portrayed within each the ring in a hierarchical order, with the most prominent or prestigious individuals occupying the highest positions in the rings.

The passage in question appears within the description of the ring of Febus Apollo, that of the liberal arts and sciences of divination. In the *copla* describing the array of poets within Febus’ ring, Mena places the Classical epic poets, Homer, Ennius, and Virgil, in the most prestigious positions, mentioning them first and by

name while relegating the remaining poets of other classical genres to an indistinct “montón de otros romanos” (*Laberinto* v.980). This arrangement immediately suggests the traditional classical and medieval literary hierarchy in which epic poetry occupies the most prestigious position. However, when taken with the subsequent two *coplas* of the poem, the passage suggests a second hierarchy. In these next two *coplas*, Mena introduces two additional figures in the following order: the “sabios valientes” of Cordoba (*Laberinto* v.989), with whom Mena associates himself, and Enrique de Villena, the only contemporary figure to appear in the ring of Febus (*Laberinto* vv.1000–16). The presence of Villena in such close proximity to the *copla* on classical epic would not seem to be coincidental. Taken together, these *coplas* suggest an interlocking set of hierarchies in which Homer is superior to Vergil and Mena, translator of Homer, comes before Villena, translator of Vergil.

The *copla* of the Cordoban poets in *Laberinto de Fortuna* forms a crucial intertextual link between poem and the proem of Mena’s earlier Homeric work. The city’s epithet in the proem, *cavallerosa*, is echoed in the *copla*’s description of the city as “la flor de la caballeria” (*Laberinto* v.990). Additionally, in both texts, Mena emphasizes his own ties to the famous Cordoban poets of the past, and, in both cases, Mena affects a pose of false modesty when in doing so. However, while in the proem Mena declines to name more than four Cordoban literary figures lest he bore his reader with the great multitude of the city’s luminaries, in the *copla*, his strategy has the added bonus of elevating his own poetic status among these figures. Here again Mena declines to identify any Cordoban poets by name, this time arguing that

to do so would be “sospechoso,” (*Laberinto* v.991) since, as he states, he is himself is an “hijo” of Cordoba, which he apostrophizes as “madre” (*Laberinto* v.986). By explicitly declining to mention the poetic tradition of Cordoba for fear that his audience won’t believe his praise, Mena draws even greater attention to the status of the city’s poetic pedigree while surreptitiously inserting himself among the hallowed poets of the ring of Febus.

For the reader familiar with both works, then, this intertextual discussion of Cordoba in *Laberinto de Fortuna* highlights the possible connections between Mena’s allegorical poem and his earlier Homeric project. What was hinted at in the proem is suggested more forcefully in these allegorical *coplas*, Mena’s placement of himself among the Cordoban poets in the ring of Febus brings him into close physical proximity with Homer within the hierarchy of literary figures on Fortune’s wheel. Moreover, Mena and the Cordoban poets appear higher than Villena in this allegorical arrangement. These *coplas*, then, may be read as an assertion that Mena’s status as Cordoban poet aligns him closely with the subject of his translation, allowing him to achieve an *ad sensum* rendering of the essence of the Greek work if not an *ad verbum* translation of the text itself. In this way, Mena affectively argues that his so-called translation of Homer, although not a truly translation, is nevertheless, a superior rendering of classical epic than that of his predecessor, Enrique de Villena.

### Conclusions

In a rhetorical turn befitting of the Homeric tradition considered here, this present analysis concludes by returning to the point where it began, with an

invocation of Arnold's title "On Translating Homer." This study has considered the implications of not of Mena's translating Homer, but rather of his *not* translating Homer. The fact that Mena's complicated text is *not*, in fact, a translation of the *Iliad* renders it all the more fascinating for what it reveals about the cultural significance of Homer, Greek literature, and the Greek language itself in the court of Juan II; moreover, the lengths to which Mena goes to justify his project of translating "not Homer" and the benefits he seems to have reaped from his efforts suggest the centrality of humanist knowledge as a burgeoning type of cultural capital in this period.

We may say, then, that the story of the *Omero romançado*, although a minor text that was not especially well read even in its time, in fact, reflects the story of much greater historical forces shaping Spain and Europe in the mid-fifteenth century. Regardless of his actual knowledge of or access to the Homeric texts in Greek or Latin, Mena's emphasis on language as a medium through which to connect to the figure of Homer, as well as his emphasis on Homer as the ultimate proxy for the classical tradition in general, reflects the broader changes in European attitudes towards the classics: the new push to engage directly with texts in their original language and the new emphasis on Greek sources rather than Latin ones. Mena's exploitation of his sovereign's interest in these new trends via his non-Homeric Homeric text, his use of Homeric translation as a means of self-aggrandizement, and in particular his textual strategies that align his persona as poet-cum-translator with Homer himself—potentially at the expense of his predecessor Enrique de Villena—

reflect the growing “Renaissance” focus on the authorial persona as a distinct and individual “I.”

Mena’s efforts to develop a distinct, authoritative authorial voice are not unique to his Homeric text. Lida de Malkiel, in fact, argues that Mena’s “individualism,” his “preocupación con la fama —reconocimiento y perduración en el mundo de valer del individuo,” is one of the key factors that distinguish the author from his medieval predecessors and that aligns him with his Italian humanist contemporaries (*Juan de Mena* 536). However, what is most striking here is the fact that Mena uses his projected relationship with Homer—and by extension Greek literature itself—as a strategy in this process of asserting his distinct authorial persona. His text, then, reflects the fact that the Greek literary tradition, if not the Greek language itself, is already becoming a tool for a distinct and emerging early modern type of self-fashioning, to use Stephen Greenblatt’s famous term. Of equal importance, Mena’s text reveals to us the level of cultural capital the idea of the Greek tradition had already amassed by the mid-fifteenth century in Spain. In turning his disadvantage, a lack of access to the Homeric text, into an advantage, Mena’s unique work suggests just how powerful Homer’s text had become as a cultural cypher: even in its absence, the very idea of the text was able to hold a powerful sway over the court of Juan II.

CHAPTER 3  
PEDRO SIMÓN ABRIL: RADICAL, REMEDIAL GREEK GRAMMAR

Pedro Simón Abril was an itinerant grammarian in the second half of the sixteenth century, teaching Greek and Latin for institutions as venerable the University of Zaragoza and as humble as the municipalities of Tudela and of Uncastillo outside of Huesca. In his professional wanderings, this “maestro errante,” as Margherita Morreale Castro has called him (47), traversed Castile from as far west as Rioseco to as far east as Valencia. We know that he was born in Alcaraz and died in Valladolid in 1595, lived for some time in Madrid and even spent two months at Philip II’s court at the Escorial, but otherwise, many important details of his early life, including the date of his birth and where he received his university training, remain unknown. While he is chiefly remembered as an advocate for pedagogical reform—his 1589 methodological work, the *Apuntamientos de como se deben reformar las doctrinas*, continued to be printed into the early nineteenth century<sup>36</sup>—he is also notable for an important first in the history of Spanish Hellenism: his 1586 publication of the first Greek grammar in Castilian.<sup>37</sup>

Various aspects of Simón Abril’s fascinating biography themselves speak to the status of Greek studies in post-Tridentine Spain. The mere facts of his life

---

<sup>36</sup> The last edition of the text was printed in Madrid by Don José Clemente Carnicero in 1817.

<sup>37</sup> The text appeared in two editions, the first printing in Zaragoza in 1586 by Diego Robles, the second in Madrid, 1587, by Pedro Madrigal.

complicate Luis Gil Fernández and José López Rueda's narrative of the penury of Spanish Greek studies under Philip II. That Simón Abril had to wander so far to find work would seem to reflect the fact that there was not necessarily an abundance of Greek teaching positions in every municipality in Spain and that the life of a grammarian was a difficult, economically unstable one. That said, the very fact that Simón Abril could support himself teaching Greek outside of the university at all, and that such a wide variety of municipalities were willing to contract with him to teach Greek at the elementary level—and that often he was paid handsomely and well-supported by these institutions, as Morreale Castro and Ricardo del Arco y Garay have shown<sup>38</sup>—suggests a different side of the story than these historians' university-based narratives have so far revealed.

Although a minor figure among Spain's coterie of humanists, Simón Abril has nevertheless been the focus of an interesting array of modern scholarship. Scholars such as Morreale Castro, Arco y Garay, and Luis de Cañigral Cortez have conducted detailed archival work to reconstruct the author's life and catalogue. His pedagogical methodologies have been explored in great detail in a series of studies by Manuel Brea Claramonte, who in particular has worked to contextualize Simón Abril's work with his humanist educational forbear, Juan Luis Vives, in a monograph comparing the two. More recently, his translational output has been explored; for instance, Paula Olmos Gómez has considered his treatment of logic in his

---

<sup>38</sup> For instance, during his time teaching at the Estudio in Tudela, Morreale Castro highlights that he was provided with lodging and given the option of hiring an assistant or auxiliar (35), while Arco y Garay notes that under this same contract he was paid a base salary of 80 ducets a year (236).

Aristotelian translations and José Antonio Beltrán Cebollada his translations of Cicero's *Ad familiares*; Javier Rubiera and José Carlos Miralles Maldonado have explored different aspects of Simón Abril's translations of Terrance and Florence d'Artois has contextualized these within the development of the *comedia*.

Simón Abril's Greek grammar, however, despite its uniqueness as an artifact of late-sixteenth-century Greek pedagogy, has yet to be the focus of a sustained study. While López Rueda and Morreale Castro provide the most in-depth analyses of the text, their work seeks primarily to contextualize the *Gramática griega* either within the development of Simón Abril's own corpus or within the history of sixteenth-century grammatical theory. While this is important foundational work that allows us to more fully understand the *Gramática griega*, it leaves aside a variety of pertinent questions. While this previous scholarship has filled in many details of *how* Simón Abril's text relates to other grammatical texts of the era, so far it remains to be seen *why* the author has taken a certain approach in promoting vernacular Greek studies and what his decision might imply for the state of Greek studies in general in his day. The following analysis will explore precisely these aspects of the *Gramática griega*, and in particular, the Greek educational platform Simón Abril establishes in its curious prologue, an essay entitled "La comparación de lengua Latina con la Griega."

Throughout his career, Simón Abril had produced various works promoting pedagogical methods, and to varying degrees, these were more or less innovative. His *Tablas de leer y escribir bien i facilmente* (1582), a primer of basic reading skills that is not extant but which is described by Simón Abril himself, for instance,

purportedly used a novel system of color-coding to teach letters (Cañigral Cortez 23). In his Greek grammar, however, his pedagogical approach is truly radical for the Spain of his day. The grammar differed from previous Spanish pedagogical works on Greek not only in its being written in Castilian rather than Latin, but also in its insistence that Castilian be used as the primary language of instruction in teaching both Greek and Latin *rather* than Latin. Moreover, he overturns generations of convention (and what might seem like common sense in a Romance-speaking context) by arguing that students should learn Greek *before* Latin and that instruction should not be based on oral production, but rather, should focus on developing reading and translation competency (*Gramática griega* 12).

In addition to being methodologically radical, in the prologue to the *Gramática griega*, Simón Abril presents his grammar as being remedial in various senses: not only will his back-to-basics approach to language teaching ensure student success, his system will serve as a remedy for the current ills of Greek pedagogy in Spain. What is, however, truly radical about Simón Abril's endeavor, is that its remedial qualities extend beyond the realm of language teaching itself. In the prologue as well as in a later letter to Philip II, the pedagogue presents his platform of Greek grammar studies—a gateway, as he suggests, to direct interaction with the Greek and Latin literary traditions—as the remedy to the ills of the Spanish state.

Simón Abril's radical, remedial Greek grammar, then, becomes an invaluable source for understanding the status of Greek in post-Tridentine Spain. In defining the uniqueness of his approach—by demonstrating how his methodology bucks the current system— Simón Abril creates a portrait of contemporary Greek studies,

although one always refracted through the perspective of this errant grammarian competing to secure his own place in the world. It is this very complexity that makes Simón Abril's life and most singular work such fascinating sources for piecing together what it meant to study Greek in this era.

The following study, then, will focus on Simón Abril's 1586 Greek grammar, beginning by contextualizing it within the history of early modern Greek language teaching in general and the history of this pedagogy in Spain in particular. The core of the study, however, will be a close reading of the "Comparación," the Greek grammar's prologue that lays out in detail a program of study that Simón Abril promotes not only for its pedagogical efficacy for the student but also for its very real potential impact on his own livelihood as a pedagogue and author. It will conclude by considering the ideological elements that also guide Simón Abril's promotion of his grammar and methodology, which reveal the author's concern about the relationship between the individual and the state during Philip II's reign and for Spain's reputation in an international community of scholars. In exploring this dimension of Simón Abril's Greek pedagogy, the final section will compare the "Comparación" to a letter the author pens to his sovereign in which he further advocates for his program of Greek study as a means of shaping the ideal Spanish citizen. As we shall see, for Simón Abril, it is always the study of classical languages, with Greek as the crown jewel in this education, that can serve as the best remedy for the various ills facing Counter-Reformation Spain.

### The Life and Times of Simón Abril: “Una vida errante y ajetreada”

As stated above, the details of Simón Abril’s fascinating, restless life in and of themselves serve as a significant resource in recreating what it meant to dedicate one’s life to Greek studies in post-Tridentine Spain. They are, therefore, worthy of considering in detail. Due to the spottiness of records in his hometown of Alcaraz, a small *pueblo* outside of Albacete in southern Castilla-La Mancha, we have little documentary evidence for the earliest parts of Simón Abril’s life, including the date of his birth. This means that much of his early personal life has been pieced together by his chief biographer, Margherita Morreale Castro, from the dedications of his works.<sup>39</sup> The first biographical notice we have of Simón Abril comes from his 1561 work *Methodus Latinae Linguae docendae*, in which he mentions that he is twenty-one years old, allowing us to calculate that he was born in 1540. In describing himself in this and other texts, Simón Abril reveals his hometown pride—and his delight in playing with language—by giving himself the epithet *craticulensis*: this Latin adjectival form, derived from the verb *craticulare*, “to grill,” indicating his

---

<sup>39</sup> Morreale Castro’s 1950 work remains the definitive work on Simón Abril’s life and the definitive catalogue and analysis of his corpus of works; contemporary scholars who work on Simón Abril have continue to rely in it. Morreale Castro’s work is especially useful as it reproduces key documents in the life of Simón Abril, such as the *proceso* described below. Arco y Garay’s 1950 overview of the archival sources for Simón Abril’s life is less-frequently cited by later Simón Abril scholars but supplements and deepens some of Morreale Castro’s claims, in particular giving significant levels of detail about the Estudio general of Uncastillo where Simón Abril worked during the *proceso* with the University of Huesca. There is still a great deal of work to be done in the area of Simón Abril’s biography using archival records made available since the 1980s to update these classic studies.

association with the Alcaraz *aldea* known as “La Parilla” (Morreale Castro 19 n2), although this wordplay would likely be lost on anyone not from his natal city. In terms of his family, we know from his writings that he came from a middle-class family: he refers to a paternal uncle, Alfonso Simón, who was a medical doctor in addition to being “doctus et honestus vir” (*De arte poetica*, qtd. in Morreale Castro 21 n1). He states in the same description that this uncle was particularly instrumental in instilling in the young Simón Abril a love of learning, that he “inflammaverat” him with an “amore litterarum,” imbuing the boy with a “in litterarum Latinis non mediocrem diligentiam” (*De arte poetica*, qtd. in Morreale Castro 21 n1).

Aside from this description of his early propensity for classical literature, the most significant details of his education remain unclear. In the 1561 *Methodus*, the twenty-one-year-old relates that he has spent “aliquot anni” studying Latin (qtd. in Morreale Castro, 22), but we remain in the dark about the nature of this study. In terms of his university education in particular we know little, despite much speculation by early twentieth-century scholars such as Marco e Hidalgo, Sánchez, and Arco y Garay, who respectively argue for Alcalá, Salamanca, and Valencia as possibilities. Morreale Castro suggests staying close to Simón Abril’s own works, which indicate the following about his university credentials: starting with the royal *privilegio* for his 1573 *Grammatica Latina*, he is referred to as Maestro Abril; various texts, including his 1586 edition of the Greek grammar, highlight him as both “maestro” and “catedrático” of various subjects, eg., philosophy, “letras humanas,”

Greek, at the University of Zaragoza, and, after 1589, all references, whether his own or by censors handling the licenses of his text, refer to him as “Doctor.”

The first real evidence documenting his life outside of his own works comes from his time at Uncastillo and concern a significant event in which the fate of Simón Abril’s professional and personal life intersect. This document is a 1570 legal document, a *proceso*, or formal complaint, brought against Simón Abril, identified as a “professor habitator Villae de un Castillo,” by the nearby University of Huesca.<sup>40</sup> Simón Abril’s infraction is cited as his violation of the University’s exclusive rights to teach according to a 1345 royal *privilegio* granted by the king of Aragón—and upheld by subsequent monarchs—that granted exclusive rights to the University to teach theology, civil and canon law, philosophy and rhetoric in the region.<sup>41</sup> Simón Abril, it is charged, has been teaching philosophy in Uncastillo in violation of this *privilegio*. The local diocese in charge of adjudicating the case, finds Simón Abril guilty of the University’s claims and threatens Simón Abril with excommunication should he continue his teaching of the subject, in addition to significant fines to be paid to the University: 22,000 *suelos jaqueses*, the coin of the Aragonese realm (Morreale Castro 28).

This case is interesting for a variety of reasons. Morreale Castro suggests that there might be something more to Simón Abril’s case that is not explicitly

---

<sup>40</sup> The *proceso*, reproduced by Morreale Castro in her appendix of documentary sources (249–57), is located in the Biblioteca Provincial de Huesca.

<sup>41</sup> Arco y Garay gives an in-depth view of the archival evidence documenting the tenuous relationship between the Estudio general of Uncastillo and the University of Huesca that also helps contextualize this complex situation with Simón Abril (226–232).

mentioned in the text of the *proceso*. To begin, she points to a scholarly debate over Simón Abril's potential *converso* origins, a fact that, if true, or if believed by those involved in the case, may have in some way impacted the situation (Morreale Castro 15–16). Beyond this, in analyzing various texts of Simón Abril's, she argues that he might be subtly referencing certain favorable attitudes towards the Erasmianism considered heretical by the Church. It might be the case, then, that the particular “philosophical” teachings that brought him under fire here may have been in some way viewed as problematic, but not necessarily enough so that the situation warranted the involvement of the Inquisition (Morreale Castro 29–34). The threat of excommunication does seem a potentially grave one for what, on the surface, seems to be something of an educational turf war.

It is true that teaching topics such as rhetoric and philosophy in unorthodox ways could have very real consequences for pedagogues, particularly those involved in teaching the classics. Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas, the classical scholar and Greek *catédrico* at Salamanca known as “El Broncense,” was processed by the Inquisition three times in the second half of the sixteenth century for heretical rhetorical teachings (Gil Fernández *Panorama* 436–445). High-ranking Jesuit educators in charge of implementing the order's classical curriculum, the *Ratio studiorum* of the order were not only processed but jailed during the 1580s (López Rueda 273). For now, until other evidence emerges supporting the theory that Simón Abril's teachings were processed by the Church because he walked too close to the line of the heretical is speculation, as Morreale Castro herself admits. This aside, the case does, however, reveal something of the competitive nature of education at

the time. The fact that the University takes so seriously Simón Abril's teaching of a subject that is supposed to be their exclusive domain suggests something about the state of higher education in this time. As elaborated in Chapter 1, Fernández Gil and López Rueda have painted a portrait of a failing university system with plummeting attendance rates mirroring the plummeting economy of Spain in these decades. That the University of Huesca is so concerned with one local instructor encroaching on their educational rights suggests they might have a real concern about his poaching potential students. Whatever the case may be, in this curious quarrel between Simón Abril and the University, we see that the stakes involved in teaching in the era were very high, both ideologically and economically.

After the events at Uncastillo, which were resolved in 1571, Simón Abril begins his vocational wanderings. A month and a half after the final verdict of the Uncastillo case, a contract reveals that he has moved westward and begun to teach in Tudela. In Tudela he was contracted by the city government to teach Latin for four years in the local school, or *Estudio*, and as Morreale Castro interprets it, his contract indicates the seriousness and respect with which the school took his work, housing him, giving him an assistant, and in disciplinary matters promising to support him "en todo y por todo" so that students "le tengan y acaten y veneren y honren por tal maestro" (35). We next find Simón Abril in Zaragoza in 1574, where he taught under contract with the Estudio General and where he produced several translations including of works by Aesop, Terrance, and Aristotle. As Morreale Castro argues, these works seem to have earned for Simón Abril a significant enough reputation as a scholar of note that he found himself invited to spend at least two

months in 1577 at the court of Philip II at the Escorial, as several letters and archival records confirm (Morreale Castro 40).

In 1578, Simón Abril returns to his hometown of Alcaraz, contracting with the local government to teach for the municipality's school, although by 1583 documents reveal that he has returned to teach in Zaragoza, which had by then been promoted to full University status. The last records of his time there indicate that he had likely vacated his post by 1586. Morreale Castro and other biographers of Simón Abril, although they are unable to account for his whereabouts with archival materials, posit that he spent the years between 1586 and 1594 in Madrid, as several of his works, including the two editions of the Greek grammar, were published there (Morreale Castro, 46; Cañigral 25). In 1594, Simón Abril contracts with the municipality of Rioseco to teach in the town's Estudio de la Gramatica, and this is his final post, as documents, including an inventory of his library, indicate his death in 1595. In summing up the itinerary of such a restless life, Morreale Castro exclaims, "Cuán errante y ajetreada fue la vida de nuestro autor" (47).

#### Simon Abril's Grammar within the History of Greek Studies

Historical narratives of ancient Greek language teaching in early modern Western Europe, not unlike histories of early modern Greek studies themselves, typically present the story, particularly in the earliest days of the practice's spread, as one of "great men" passing pedagogical techniques from teacher to student. The story is a familiar one to scholars of early modern Europe and central to the narrative of the "Renaissance": Byzantine refugees began trickling into Italy with the advancement of the Turks, and this trickle became a flood with the fall of

Constantinople in 1453. This coincided fortuitously with the renewed interest among Italian intellectuals in the study of Greek, allowing these newly arrived Byzantines to find work as Greek teachers. However, interestingly, this canon of great teachers often begins not with a Byzantine, but rather with the Calabrian Greek speaker and grammarian Leonzio Pilato, whose efforts to teach Boccaccio and Petrarch Greek were notably unsuccessful. Petrarch famously bemoans that, having acquired a Greek manuscript of Homer, he is only able to lovingly hold the book, as his Greek is such that the text remains impenetrable and he must rely on Pilato's translations. Pilato's efforts, although they represent a watershed moment in Western European's efforts to learn Greek, do not reflect, as it is often referred to, the "true beginning" of the story: the arrival of Byzantine grammarian Manuel Chrysolaras on the scene in Florence in 1397—often portrayed, as Federica Ciccolella notes, as a "deus ex machina" moment (xx). From there we see a transmission of Greek—and Greek teaching methods—passed from Chrysolaras to his student Guarino, who in turn instituted these methods in his own teaching of students at his school in Verona. This process is then mirrored in the teachings of other Greeks such as Lascaris, Mursurus, and many others, and so on and so forth as Greek studies followed these individuals and proliferated in Italy.

Often narratives of Greek teaching end at the period when Western Europeans began to become less dependent on Greeks to teach them, the moment also when Italy stopped being the central locus of Greek studies around 1520. Recently, Ciccolella and Paul Botley have attempt to reshape the narrative by considering the spread of specific grammars, and the methodologies contained

therein, rather than grammarians. Seeking the roots of Greek studies in antiquity itself, Ciccolella identifies key texts that continued to shape Byzantine teaching of ancient Greek, in particular the Hellenistic grammar of Dionysius Thrax, the *Τέχνη γραμματική*, in which the roots of the traditional catechistic method of grammar instruction can be found. In the textual examples she presents, one sees the grammarian asking the student to list the grammatical features of a particular word or phrase of the target language, which the student then recites. This system of question-and-answer grammatical teaching, or *erotemata*, dominated the teaching of Greek through the Byzantine era. However, by the Paleologian era it was becoming increasingly ineffective. Paleologian Greek now differed so much from its classical predecessor that, just as in the case of Latin in the Romance-speaking world of the West, it began to be most effectively taught according to principles of foreign language teaching. Nevertheless, the *erotemata* method remained, with the added challenge that the student was now reciting grammatical information *in the target foreign language itself*. This practice, then, relied on the presence of the teacher to ask the questions and provide the student with linguistic input to help them develop this oral proficiency.

As various scholars have argued, Chrysolaras' success in teaching Greek to Western Europeans derived from the fact that he had experience teaching ancient Greek as a foreign language to Byzantine students themselves, although it would have been a much easier process for them to acquire it (Ciccolella 101). The *erotemata* methodology, rooted in presenting Greek as a foreign language, was as beneficial for the Byzantine grammarians themselves as it was for Western

European students, as it helped to perpetuate the need for the native Greek-speaker in the classroom. The methodology placed the instructor at the center of the learning process as the mediator of grammar itself. Although the ultimate goal of the process was for the student to learn to read Greek, as this was an inherently oral, conversational approach to language learning, the pedagogue remained the indispensable font of the language, thus giving the first generation of Byzantine grammarians a certain level of job security. The centrality of the Byzantine teacher to the early Greek language-learning classroom is evident in the fact that the first grammars produced for teaching Greek to Western students were, in fact, compendia of these questions and responses written in Greek (5ff.) That is to say, they were manuals for use by Byzantine scholars in teaching their Western pupils. In order to develop reading skills, students worked with dual language texts which placed Greek beside a Latin translation and allowed students to work backwards from their knowledge of Latin to reconstruct the meaning of the Greek, and in doing so, learn Greek vocabulary and syntax. The process, then, also required a knowledge of Latin.

Even as the *erotemata*-style grammars began to be translated into Latin, thus making them a resource useful to pupils themselves, the preferred methodology of teaching Greek remained an oral, conversational one, mirroring how Latin was taught. The continuation of this practice found its most influential proponents in the figures of Juan Luis Vives and Erasmus (Brevamonte, "Translation" 276). It was not until the late sixteenth century when Hellenists such as Henri "Stephanus" Estienne began to advocate not only for using the vernacular as the language for instructing

Greek, but also against the use of conversational Greek as a pedagogical tool.

Estienne argued that, for necessarily non-native speakers of the dead language, this practice could only reinforce bad habits of usage that could interfere with the students' correct acquisition of a reading knowledge of Greek.

It is at this point in the story when Simón Abril introduces his grammar into the world of Spanish Greek pedagogy. Simón Abril's grammar was not the first to be published in Spain: in 1514 Demitrious Dukas had produced one for his students at Alcalá that would eventually be printed along with the Complutense Bible as an appendix; Francisco de Vergara's 1537 circulated widely throughout Spain and internationally and was printed four times in France, as had Valencian Pedro Juan Nuñez in 1555, Salamantine Greek professor Juan de Villalobos in 1574, and El Brocense in 1581.<sup>42</sup> However, Simón Abril's differed from these, not only in his use of the vernacular as the language in which the grammar was outlined, but also in his promotion of a methodology based in these new approaches popularized by Estienne that rejected the conversational approach ("Los antecedentes" 11"). Among scholars of Simón Abril, Brea Claramonte has elaborated in the most detail just how the author's proposed methodology for Greek study aligns with these newer approaches—and thus how much it differs from the traditional ones still dominating the Spanish Greek classroom ("Los antecedentes" 9–10"). He places Simón Abril's work in contrast with that of Vives in his study of pedagogical techniques, arguing that Simón Abril rejected the conversational methodology of Vives. According to

---

<sup>42</sup> Along with Simón Abril, these seven form the entire corpus of Greek grammars written in Spain in the sixteenth century. See López Rueda (152–156) for a descriptive catalogue of all eight.

Simón Abril's approach, Vives's conversational techniques, now the conventional methodology of Simón Abril's day, reinforced bad habits and resulted in an imperfect acquisition of grammatical concepts in the target language, issues that were difficult to unlearn ("Copia" 60). In this and in his use of the vernacular as the language of instruction, Brea Claramonte argues, Simón Abril follows contemporary Hellenists such as Estienne and Philip Melanchthon in recognizing the "deterioration" of spoken Latin that made its use for instruction equally problematic ("Translation" 144–5). It is important to note, then, that the "radical" aspects of Simón Abril's approach, his rejection of what had over the course of 150 years of Greek studies in Europe become the norm were not his own innovations. He bases his methodology on an emerging field of Greek studies with its chief proponents in France. Nevertheless, a close reading of Simón Abril's prologue reveals that, while the author may be presenting ideas developed by his non-Spanish contemporaries, his rejection of the conversational method—so central to the first generations of Western European Greek students—was nevertheless novel for Spain. Within his own national context, which he paints as being particularly conservative, this pedagogical approach remains radical, and it is this radical pedagogy that he believes will remedy various ills plaguing Spain.

### Radical, Remedial Pedagogy: A Manifesto

Simón Abril's *Gramática griega* appeared in two editions. In its initial printing 1586 version, published by Diego Robles in Zaragoza, the work consists of a dedicatory letter to the rector of the University of Salamanca, an introductory essay entitled "'Comparación de la Lengua Latina con la Griega,'" the text of the grammar

itself, a section of trilingual *sententiae* in Latin, Greek and Castilian, a dual-language version of the popular Greek pedagogical text, the *Tabula Cebetis*, a short Hellenistic philosophic tract attributed to a fifth-century associate of Plato, Cebes,<sup>43</sup> (with Greek on one page and Castilian on the facing page), followed finally by a Latin translation of the same text. The 1587 edition, printed in Madrid by Pedro Madrugal, differs from the 1586 in only one respect: it incorporates an additional phonological section that in 1586 had been published independently as the *Cartilla griega*, a brief tract teaching the Greek alphabet and including a short Greek text of a passage from the Gospel of Matthew with each syllable written out phonetically under the Greek as an introductory reading exercise.<sup>44</sup> In the 1586 edition, then, the potential buyer of Simón Abril's grammar would have had to purchase the section teaching the alphabet and phonology of Greek separately from the grammar itself, while in 1587 the two appeared together.

---

<sup>43</sup> The text consists of an ekphrastic description of a *pinax* dedicated at the temple of Cronos at Athens on which an allegorical representation of the human life-cycle is depicted. The text links to Neo-Platonism and Stoicism, in addition to the ease of its Greek, made it a popular pedagogical resource among Renaissance humanists, and it was frequently printed with pseudo-Phocilides Enchiridion. See Ruíz Gito for an introduction to the text and in particular for a history of its printing and circulation in Spain (39ff.) Additionally, see Sagrario López Poza's analysis of potential connections between the imagery of the *Tabula Cebetis* and Quevedo's *Sueños* that provides a potential intriguing link between this Greek pedagogical resource and the history of Quevedo's Greek studies that will be considered in Chapter 4.

<sup>44</sup> In 1988, Cañigral Córtez identified the separately printed *Cartilla griega*, published in 1586 in Zaragoza by Diego Robles, the same printer of the 1586 *Gramática griega*. One exemplar exists in the Biblioteca Nacional de España. The *Cartilla* is an unbound, sixteen-folio, quarto-sized *suelta*. I have examined it and can attest that it is in remarkable condition showing little wear-and-tear and bearing no marginal annotations, suggesting to me that this particular version was likely never used in a classroom setting.

Simón Abril's grammar, in comparison with the other two Spanish-produced grammars available for purchase in his day, those of Vergara and Sánchez de las Brozas, has, in general, a less "technical feel." That is to say, in various aspects, it is much more a textbook than a reference manual. The paradigms, for instance, are presented in a much clearer, more visually spaced-out layout, making them easier to read. Moreover, with the inclusion of the *sententiae* and *Tabula Cebetis*, and, particularly in the 1587 edition with the reading comprehension exercise now included with the added pronunciation section (originally published separately as the 1586 *Cartilla griega*), the work becomes a very practical resource for not only learning grammar, but also for practicing it in one volume.

While simply in terms of presentation and components Simón Abril's grammar stands out, it is in its content—specifically, that of the preliminary "Comparación," that his book truly differentiates itself from its Spanish predecessors. It is here that Simón Abril lays out his radical plan to reform the study of Greek in Spain. His prologue, in effect, becomes a pedagogical manifesto that simultaneously argues for change based on ideological concerns while also, in a very practical sense, it promotes Simón Abril's own published pedagogical materials as a necessary plank in this platform.

Simón Abril begins the "Comparación" with exactly what the title promises, an elaborate comparison of Greek and Latin based on his theory of the lifecycles and structures of Greek and Latin. Based on this analysis, next he argues to the reader that Greek is easier to acquire for the Castilian speaker than Latin, and, since there is such a wealth of valuable knowledge contained within the Greek literary tradition,

everyone should therefore learn to read Greek themselves as to avoid having to rely on translations. Simón Abril maintains that there are two central truths about Classical language teaching: first that it should take place through the use of the students' native language, "que es error el enseñar lenguas estrañas con artes escritas en las mismas lenguas," and secondly that it should be taught first through written exercise rather than conversational practice, that "es acertada manera de enseñallas es entender primero la gramatica de aquella lengua por arte escrita en lengua vulgar" (*Gramática* 7).<sup>45</sup>

Simón Abril goes on to elaborate in some detail his six-course curriculum for teaching Greek to young children, or "tiernos," demonstrating the validity of his text-based, rather than oral, pedagogy in the process. In the first class, children should learn all of Greek grammar, which Simón Abril defines as the mastering of the "facilidad del declinar (declinar?), del conjugar, del conocer los generos de los nombres, perfectos I supinos de los verbos, la orden syntactica" (*Gramática* 8). In the second, students will begin to learn in earnest "la leccion de libros, de donde se saca el verdadero conocimiento I uso de las lenguas" (*Gramática* 9), and this process should take place through texts such as Aesop's fables that are "acomodados a la edad I capacidad de los oientes." The third class is for "oracion dialogistica" that reflects "lenguaje comun y popular," and includes dialogues of Lucian, Plato, Aristofanes, and Euripides, the fourth for "oracion continuada," in particular "oracion epistolar," the fifth for poetry and the sixth for rhetorical instruction. Simón

---

<sup>45</sup> In reproducing Simón Abril's text from the 1587 edition, I have maintained the text's orthography with the exception of supplying "n"s and "m"s otherwise indicated by abbreviations in the original.

Abril ends the elaboration of this curriculum explaining that one of the most significant tools the student will need is the vernacular translation of the Greek text studied, translation of the type in which “lo Latino es Latino Hispanico i lo griego hispanico griego” (*Gramática* 13). These resources will further help the student to not rely on the oral production of the teacher, so that they can “llevar consigo traducciones hechas” and study at all hours, rather than relying on how the teacher has translated for them in the fleeting setting of the classroom.

The main thrust of Simón Abril’s educational platform may be summarized as follows: (1) Anyone who wishes to read the Greek classics—as he maintains everyone should—should learn Greek rather than relying on Latin translations, (2) Greek instruction should take place in the vernacular rather than in either the target language itself or in Latin (3) Greek is easier than Latin and therefore should be learned first and then used as a tool for acquiring Latin, and (4) Written translation, rather than oral production, is the best practice for mastering Greek.

#### Selling the Program: Why Does Spain Need This Methodology?

Central to Simón Abril’s manifesto for his radical new pedagogy is his platform’s goal of remedying the ills of contemporary Greek pedagogy. To successfully argue his point, he must establish what he perceives as its current failings, and in doing so he paints a portrait of a system suffering from two main ailments: bad teachers and bad pedagogical methodologies.

His assessment of his fellow language teachers is especially harsh. To begin, he recognizes a “mal” plaguing Greek instruction: that many teachers have “mas necesidad ellos de aprendallas que partes ni poder enseñallas.” For Simón Abril, the

solution is as follows: “este mal se remediara prohibiendo con graves penas al que por su propia autoridad se atreviere a hacer oficio de maestro ni en publico ni en particular sin ser primer examinado si es suficiente para ello i combibado con premios bastantes de onras y provechos a ombres de buenos entendimientos i bien enseñados a que quiera tomar esta fatiga.” (*Gramática* 6v)

Simón Abril’s comments here, despite the subjectiveness of their author’s designation of who is qualified to teach, nevertheless present a portrait in miniature of Greek teachers’ qualifications and about how and where Greek is taught. To begin, his comments suggest teaching contexts that exist both “en publico” and “en particular.” Here he is indicating that Greek instruction takes place both in institutional, classroom settings, likely the municipal estudio in which Simón Abril taught, if not the university itself, in addition to private arrangements for in-house tutoring. Moreover, it seems to be the case that if teachers are able to present themselves as holders of the “oficio de maestro” “por su propia autoridad,” there is little oversight in determining their credentials, a fact Simón Abril would like to see corrected through some type of examination system. It is unclear how he relates this term “maestro” to the university title that would require such examination, and whether he means that there are teachers going around falsely claiming a university education when they lack one, or whether he means that they simply are calling themselves “maestro” in a more general sense as “teacher.” He does, however, seem to allude earlier in the paragraph to those who have earned a title. They are “hombre[s] ignorante[s]” but are “autorizado con nombre de maestro,” which seems to equally cast doubt on the efficacy of the university system. On the other hand,

Simón Abril also considers the creation of quality teachers. His comments suggest that there is no incentive to push oneself to excel in language teaching, that is, for teachers to become “ombres de buenos entendimientos i bien enseñados,” an effort whose exertion he recognizes as a “fatiga” that should be rewarded.

He continually points to the lack of proficiency on the part of teachers, referring to those who “no tiene[n] habilidad para saber interpretar propiamente,” and therefore run the risk of infecting students with bad habits, teaching “so color que haze descuidados lo oientes,” something that for Simón Abril is a “calvamaia manifiesta” (*Gramática* 12v). In a similar vein, he speaks of the dangers of such teachers in the classroom with the metaphor of wine: these teachers do much to “henchir aquellos vaso limpios de [su] entendimiento ... del vino que en su viña se cojiere,” that is to say, with their own faulty knowledge. The children are empty vessels at risk of contamination by incorrect—or impure—knowledge. Of this type of teacher, he laments that there are so many, exclaiming dramatically, “pluguiesse a Dios no fuessen tantos” (*Gramática* 6v).

Finally, in a particularly evocative image, Simón Abril seems to reveal the competitive nature of language teaching among his contemporaries—while also taking the opportunity to present them as charlatans. With a lively metaphor, he warns the reader not to heed any criticisms of other language teachers who might find fault with his methods, as these figures are like the “mal pintor” who paints hens and roosters “groseramente” and so, when selling his paintings, has a young boy chase away real hens and roosters “porque con su presencia no desmostrasen la fealdad de su pintura.” (*Gramática* 12v). Simón Abril anticipates that his fellow

teachers will recognize the efficacy of his methodology and, in an attempt to protect their own inferior pedagogy, will disparage his to the public. This suggests something of the stakes of finding and keeping students among Simón Abril's peers.

The author's criticisms of what goes on inside the Greek classroom also give an idea of what kinds of teaching activities were prevalent. As mentioned, his methodology is unique among contemporary Spanish Greek and Latin teaching practices for its rejection of oral production in either of the target classical languages. He elaborates why this oral method is problematic in his description of a common paraphrasing practice, using an example from a Latin classroom. He explains that in this particular activity, students say "algunas oraciones en Latin que tengan tal sentencia" of the classical Latin authors who they are reading (*Gramática* 9). According to Simón Abril, it is important that students "den que de core los mismos libros que se leieren" and avoid using "los escritores maneras de hablar naturales de sus lenguas propias y Latinizadas." This is because as non-native speakers of the target language, if they simply paraphrase Latin authors in "bad," Castilian-influenced Latin, they will fall into what Simón Abril describes as "el pielago del barbarismo" because they have supplanted "las [palabras] de los que escrivieron en Latin" with their own versions (*Gramática* 9). The author argues that by using the target language, a classical language they are not learning from a native speaker, they are at risk of developing bad habits that will not be corrected and that will thus interfere with the acquisition of these languages according to the prescriptions of the classical written texts under study.

Simón Abril maintains that translation into the target languages, another practice he cites as being common, can also have the same effect. In describing his outline for teaching the epistolary genre, he argues that students should not participate, “como hazen agora,” in translating epistles “en buena lengua vulgar” into “su mal Latin,” but rather, should translate Greek and Latin letters into their “buena lengua vulgar” (*Gramática* 9v). This is because “la traducion no a de ser de la lengua que se sabe a la que se aprende”, since that will lead to the use of “terminos impropios i barbaras maneras de decir” (*Gramática* 9v). This emphasis, both in the written and oral contexts, on the problem of “barbarismo,” is notable. It reflects contemporary humanist pedagogical beliefs that one of the key goals of studying classical languages is to develop an elegant manner of writing not only in Latin but also in the vernacular. The risk of developing “barbarismo” in the target language seems to be of great concern to Simón Abril, potentially as it might even affect the “buena lengua vulgar” of the students.

Finally, Simón Abril takes umbrage with another aspect of the conversational approach used in the contemporary classroom, in which translations are not written out for students in either Latin or Greek for them to use as resources that they can continue to rely upon as study tools outside of the classroom. One of the changes Simón Abril advocates for as key pedagogical tools is the use of quality vernacular translations, that is to say, those produced by teachers who meet Simón Abril’s subjective criteria. Without such tools that the student can “llevar consigo,” they are left only with the memory of what the teacher translated “alli repentinamente” in the class.” However, Simón Abril contends that many “desdichados gramaticos” fear

producing these useful tools for students, because were they to write down their translations, “se echase de ver la rudeza de la [traducción] suya” (*Gramática* 12v).

In this way, Simón Abril works to differentiate and justify his radical methodology. It is important to remember the subjectivity with which the author presents this information, as he has a vested interest in promoting not only his own methodology, but also his own set of pedagogical materials that, as he points out, the readers can purchase for themselves. Simón Abril in fact dedicates significant space to establishing the resources he himself has created of the type described above, that is “accurate” vernacular translations that the student can use outside of the classroom. In addition, Simón Abril ends his teaching manifesto with a long list of materials—the list spans 1.25 pages (*Gramática* 13v–14)— that he has developed to be implemented in the six-class system. This list forms the final paragraph of the work and begins with the explanation: “Lo que io tengo trabajado para esta manera de enseñar es lo siquiente,” after which he goes on to list twenty-two works that he has translated for use in the classroom, the majority of which form the core of the six classes that he has outlined. The exception is for the fifth class on poetry, where he admits that “por ser poesía no se puede dar facilmente traducción” (*Gramática* 13v), and so he recommends the translations of Velasco for Vergil and Gonzalo Pérez for Homer. He ends the list by expressing his hope that, “con el divino favor se puede traduzir para utilidad de los que aprenden estas lenguas” (*Gramática* 14).

The catalogue of texts that Simón Abril lays out in his prologue seems to correspond to actual materials created for his educational system that actually exist and likely used by him in his classroom. Breva Claramonte argues that Simón Abril’s

publication of such a wide array of pedagogical works and translations reflects a practical need to provide books for the classroom (“Teaching Materials” 33). Furthermore, as Cañigral Cortéz notes, with the exception of a handful of these books, the majority are either extant or known to have existed in some form that would have been available for purchase along with the Greek grammar (Cañigral Cortéz, *Pedro Simón Abril* 15).

Moreover, in promoting these items, Simón Abril is not only doing a service for the pupil seeking resources, he is promoting items from which he has the potential to benefit financially. That we might attribute to Simón Abril the motivation of using this catalogue to sell additional books need not reflect a cynical or anachronistic approach. As Cañigral Cortéz notes, the publication of Simón Abril’s various works, including the ones listed in his grammar’s prologue, likely had a significant, tangible influence on his livelihood. He posits that the money he earned from his writing may have allowed him to take a break from teaching, providing the sole means of support that allowed him the “otium,” in Cañigral Cortez’s words, to continue his more time-intensive projects such as his entry into the juridical dispute genre, the “Arbitrio para el desempeño del estado real,”<sup>46</sup> and his Aristotelian translations, *Los ochos libros de república del filósofo Aristóteles* (1584) and the *Primera parte de la filosofía llamada la lógica* (1587) (Cañigral Cortéz, *Pedro Simón Abril* 23–4). There was likely, then, a material motive for Simón Abril in promoting

---

<sup>46</sup> Reproduced in Morreale Castro (258–267); the original located in the Archivo General de Simancas.

this system, since the sale of these recommended materials could quite literally support him financially.

Throughout the “Comparación,” Simón Abril employs a variety of textual strategies that suggest that he is working to promote his methodology and other works beyond what seems to be a general interest in improving pedagogy and classical learning for its own sake. In fact, some of the more puzzling elements of the text, if taken as attempts by Simón Abril to promote a program of study the reader can themselves engage in beyond the pages of the book in hand, begin to make more sense.

For example, one of the claims Simón Abril makes repeatedly is that it is easier to learn Greek than Latin. He states definitively early in the “Comparación,” after giving his outline of the life-cycle of language: ““la lengua griega es sin comparación más facil de aprender que la latina” (*Gramática* 3v). The idea of “facilidad” continues to appear in conjunction with Greek. After his lengthy excursus on why the reader should learn Greek, he claims that he will now explain to the reader “la facilidad en el aprendella” (*Gramática* 5v). He repeats the word “facilidad” again when describing the acquisition of the basic elements of Greek grammar, referring to the “facilidad del decliner, del conjugar, del conocer los generos de los nombres, perfectos I supinos de los verbos, la orden syntactica” (*Gramática* 8v). Moreover, Simón Abril comes across as a seasoned teacher when he anticipates the potential concerns of the reader nervous that Greek will be difficult to acquire. He reassures the reader that Greek can be acquired “no con tanta dificultad I resistencia, como se puede temer” (*Gramática* 6). His acknowledgement of the perceived

difficulty of the language—such as to induce fear in the learner—suggests that even in his day, Greek enjoyed the reputation that follows it today (cf. the saying “it’s all Greek to me” indicating something difficult or impenetrable). He continually assures the reader, however, that his method will demonstrate for them that Greek “se aprende en menos tiempo i con menos dificultad ... que el Latin” (*Gramática* 4v). With this particular phrase, which he uses to introduce his platform of study, Simón Abril particularly sounds like the consummate salesman with aggrandizing claims about what he is promoting: it is not just that his system is easy, it is also faster too. The potential student is getting twice the benefit from the program.

In working to convince his reader how easy Greek is, particularly when studied according to his methodology, Simón Abril makes some linguistic statements that may strike anyone with experience studying Greek as odd. In addition to his comments about the “facilidad del declinar, del conjugar, del conocer los generos de los nombres, perfectos I supinos de los verbos, la orden syntactica” (*Gramática* 8v), he conducts a cursory comparison of Greek, Latin and Castilian linguistic structures towards the beginning of the prologue. Here he argues that three key morphosyntactic features demonstrate that Greek and Castilian are the languages which are most similar of the three: first, Castilian and Greek use articles with nouns whereas Latin does not, secondly, Castilian and Greek use infinitive forms to indicate purpose, a feature lacking in Latin, and thirdly, Greek and Castilian lack the supine and gerundive forms of Latin, although he does admit to the lexical complexity of Greek (*Gramática* 2v). This seems to be an odd justification for why Greek is more similar to Castilian and easier for the Castilian speaker to learn than

Latin, considering the variety of forms and usages of Greek, even in the case of the features that he mentions. Greek is morphologically richer than Latin, has a more complex syntax for expressing the information conveyed morphologically by the supine, for rendering indirect speech, and for purpose constructions, and, most strikingly, contains more irregular and suppletive forms.

Taken at face value, then, this statement might initially puzzle anyone familiar with both Latin and Greek, and his reasoning might lead one to question Simón Abril's own knowledge of the two languages. It is interesting to note that other Simón Abril scholarship has not addressed the question of this odd statement, leaving it unclear how we might account for the fact that someone who spent his life teaching and translating Greek could express this sentiment that, while not necessarily being incorrect—as it reflects his opinion—nevertheless seems to be a simplistic approach given the relative complexity of the structures and lexica of the two languages. It also remains unclear what scholars at the time might have or did think of this, as we have no record of anyone responding to Simón Abril's perspective on the matter.

Moreover, if we consider that Simón Abril has a vested interest in convincing his reader that Greek is easy to master—and that his system of using Castilian to teach Greek before teaching Latin is the right one, it becomes possible to read this statement as a potential promotional pitch. His unique (and highly subjective) grammatical justification might serve to convince at least two types of potential readers of the efficacy of the approach. For readers who know Latin, likely then to be familiar with this metalinguistic vocabulary, Simón Abril's language here may

convince them not only of his argument, but that he is an authoritative pedagogue in control of the technical aspects of language teaching. For the reader who does not know Latin, even if this type of vocabulary is unfamiliar to them, it nevertheless serves a similar purpose; regardless of whether its exact meaning is understood, this is clearly technical jargon that presents Simón Abril as a master of his craft able to justify it with impressive language.

A potential reader without knowledge of Latin who might invest in his program is the parent purchasing the book for their child's instruction in Greek. As mentioned, Simón Abril outlines his program as one best suited for children in their "tiernos años." A factor that might appeal to such a parent are Simón Abril's indications throughout his text of his familiarity with teaching Greek to children and his practical applications of this experience to the development of his program. He takes on the tone of a veteran teacher when he advises not making one student recite for too long at a time, suggesting "repartiendo [la lección] por muchos oientes, por no cansar a uno demasiado, no será fatigoso de hazer" (*Gramática* 8v). Additionally, he emphasizes that introductory readings should be tailored to children of this age, explaining why Aesop specifically should be the first literary text read. In terms of linguistic difficulty, Aesop is "acomodado" "a la edad i capacidad de los oientes," and, moreover, the content is well suited to these learners because "la niñez es . . . aficionada a cosas de cuentos" (*Gramática* 8). He again appeals to the issue of keeping young learners engaged with content when he suggests that, in the fourth class, in order to break up the monotony of reading Thucydides, students read Lucian's *True Histories* "para quitalles a los oientes la

melancolia” (*Gramática* 10). All of this speaks to the practical realities of implementing the type of pedagogical program Simón Abril describes, assuring the reader that it has been tried and tested and that the author is an expert at gauging the needs of young learners.

Breva Claramonte has also noted the tone of the seasoned teacher that permeates the text, arguing that Simón Abril’s often comes across as figure of “confluencia de los principios sacados ... de sus multiples años de contacto con los estudiantes. De esa confluencia, surgen una serie de ideas con un interes y un enfoque practico que esbozaremos a continuación” (“Teaching Materials” 28).

However, of all Simón Abril’s strategies to promote his program, one of the most salient is his flashy use of rhetoric, particularly in the key moment in which he establishes a central proposition of his argument: why the reader should choose to learn Greek. In this section, Simón Abril carefully builds to the pivotal moment in his text, the introduction of his radical methodology, and he does so with the rhetorical flair of a showman. After his initial comparison of Greek and Latin, a break in the text indicates a transition to a new section, and the beginning of the next paragraph appears in all capitals, “I PARA.” Almost as if to say “and for my next trick” in the fashion of modern magicians, Simón Abril introduces the theme he will now develop: “I PARA que se vea el grande bien que deste nacera, relataré aquí la gran copia de escritores graves que aquella lengua tiene” (3). The author now goes on to display the for the reader, just as he has promised, the copiousness of the Greek canon in “cada ciencia,” and he does not disappoint. This section spans three pages (folios 3, 3v, and 4) and consists of a list of more than ninety Greek authors

representing various genres, from Homer to Church Fathers, such as Clement of Alexandria. Simón Abril even includes in this list hypothetical works he hasn't seen but that he posits circulate among powerful internationalist humanist circles, noting that there are “muchos escritos de mano en librerías esclarecidas” in France, in Rome, and even in Greece, whose notice has not reached him (*Gramática* 4). This expansive list is an example of *amplificatio* take to an extreme.

Having thoroughly demonstrated the impressive breadth of this “thesauro tan grande de doctrina i eloquencia” (*Gramática* 4) that is the Greek canon, Simón Abril introduces the next phase of his argument by dramatically turning up the rhetorical volume. He arranges a series of “por” phrases into a crescendo—“por poder pues gozar” this canon of texts, “por poder tratar con ellos I ver lo que ellos dizen,” “por no andar a parecer de interpretes”— finally building to the rhetorical question, “¿qué trabajo no se debe sufrir?” a question which is itself the first of three: “qué diligencia no es razon poner? ¿qué tiempo no es bien emplear?” (*Gramática* 4) It is here that Simón Abril reaches the crux of his argument: “quanto mas que enseñandose a una las dos lenguas Latina y Griega con aiuda de traduciones en la vulgar sin comparación se aprende en menos tiempo i con menos dificultad el Griego que el Latin” (*Gramática* 4v). Simón Abril has worked for four pages to sell his reader on *why* they should learn Greek, building to this moment in which he will finally tell them *how*. It is here that Simón Abril finally announces his pedagogical methodology: teaching Greek and Latin simultaneously using Castilian, in contrast with the traditional teaching of Greek through Latin. With his elaborate, even overblown, manner of introducing what will form the crux of the

“Comparación,” Simón Abril seems to be using his rhetorical skills for maximum effect, building tension before revealing his grand scheme. Should the reader remain unconvinced of the need for Greek studies or of the efficacy of Simón Abril’s program, they will nevertheless find it hard not to take note of his rhetorical ostentation.

#### Authorizing the Program: Appeals to the Ancient and Modern

In order to justify an approach which deviates so radically from the apparent norms of language teaching practice—at least according to Simón Abril, the author must appeal to credible authorities who can back up his methodology. In doing so, the author must potentially address the potential concerns of a variety of readers, whether they belong to the academic milieu of the dedicatee, the rhetor of Salamanca, other language teachers, or potential students (or a student’s parent) who, although not necessarily experts in pedagogy, must be assuaged that the approach is credible. Throughout the “Comparación, then, Simón Abril is careful to provide justifications for his deviation from the norms of contemporary Spanish pedagogy.

His primary strategy consists of appeals to both ancient and contemporary authorities. In the full title of the book itself, Simón Abril indicates that his method “conforms” to “el consejo de Quintiliano,” whose name, likely not by coincidence, catches the eye even upon a casual glance at the title page, as it is centered in the middle of the line in which it has been typeset, almost in the very middle of the page itself. As early as the dedicatory letter, Simón Abril assures his addressee and the reader that the following methods, based in teaching classical languages according

to the principles governing foreign language pedagogy, reflect the “modo de enseñar las lenguas, que tuvieron los antiguos confiriendo la lengua propia con las extranjeras” (*Gramática* 2v). Here he also justifies the brevity of his pared-down grammar, citing Horace’s injunction to brevity in the *Ars poetica*. As he explains, “en este genero de letras, como dixo sabiamente Horacio, una de las maiores virtudes, que se requieren es la brevedad” (*Gramática* 3v).

In the main body of the “Comparación,” Simón Abril again points to the fact that his approach is a “coza deduzida de los que antiguamente fueron tenidos por sabios” (*Gramática* 6). However, this more in-depth discussion of his methodology becomes much more specific, citing authors whose names will be recognized by both erudite scholars and more general readers: Cicero and Quintilian. He explains that Cicero advocates for this approach to learning Greek in various places throughout his corpus—that he even learned this way himself—and Simón Abril is careful to specify the works where this information appears in *De officiis* and in the *De oratore* in his comments on Lucius Crassus and discussion of translating the speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines from Greek to Latin. He also remarks that Plutarch claims to have learned Latin by the same process in reverse, reading Cicero’s translations of Demosthenes. Most importantly, reinforcing the source the full title of the grammar has cited, Simón Abril eloquently elaborates Quintilian’s recommendation that “las lenguas Latina I Griega vaian corriendo alas parejas” (*Gramática* 12v).

Seemingly of equal importance to the classical authors whom Simón Abril cites are contemporary ones, notably those *outside* of Spain. Italy, France, and

Germany—in both mentions given in that order—are places where “las letras humanas se tiene mas particular noticia que España” (*Gramática* 6). More specifically, these methods are those that are “aprobadas” by the specific powerhouse European institutions “como ... Paris, Bolonia, Lovaina, Tolosa,” and, furthermore, at “otras muchas celebres universidades” that Simón Abril *could* mention but won’t “por no ser largo” (*Gramática* 6v). These universities have tested and shown the efficacy of these methods; “an visto por la experiencia ser cosa de grandissima importancia para el aprender las lenguas antiguas” (*Gramática* 12v). Significantly within the “Comparación,” these contemporary examples are always set side-by-side with the classical authorities; they are positioned as parallel examples, even syntactically balanced within the sentence. This type of teaching is “cosa que los sabios antiguos advertieron i la tienen aprovada tales escuelas” (*Gramática* 6v) as the European universities listed above. Simón Abril’s methodology, then, is equally grounded in the practices of both the ancient and modern heavy-weights of pedagogical authority.

In one of his most elaborate justifications, however, Simón Abril does not merely appeal to classical authorities, but creates and elaborates an exceedingly scholarly argument to support his claims: he centers his reasoning in a detailed excursus of the lifecycle of languages. He in fact leads with this approach, providing at the very beginning of his text an academic justification that is carefully argued and balanced with classical and modern citations, one that will appeal to both scholarly readers familiar with his sources and lay readers who will no doubt be impressed with the details he provides, even if they do not recognize his sources. In

this section, he provides the analysis promised by the title, outlining a comparison of the development of Greek and Latin over the course of the centuries since they were spoken by the ancients.

The course he charts for Latin is one of change and decline. Following Quintilian, he explains that Latin reached its apogee in the Augustan era but that within the 100s it had already become, as Simón Abril phrases it, “*trocado*,” or transformed (*Gramática* 1–1v). The next factor which Simón Abril notes is the fall of Rome to Germanic or “barbarian” invaders in the fifth century CE and, and he claims that with subsequent rule by these Germanic invaders throughout formerly Roman lands and with the “*bárbaras y fieras costumbres*” of these people, the Latin language “*apadecio*” or suffered greatly. This process chiefly occurred through the process of writing in Latin authors, who, despite being “*graves*,” and having “*autoridad*,” wrote Latin incorporating non-Latinate words, in order to reach their non-latinate audience, or to “*cretizar con los cretenses*,” as he puts it. The result of this speaking Cretan among the Cretans is that, over time, the language has changed such that it would no longer be intelligible to an ancient speaker. As he explains, “*si viniera uno de los antiguos Romanos, oyera o leyera aquello, le parecería ya casi otra lengua*” (*Gramática* 1v). In this way, if one of the ancient Romans came and heard or read that language, it would seem to him now another language.

According to Simón Abril, then, contact over centuries with so called “barbarian languages,” irrevocably altered Latin, transforming it into an entirely new language. Latin’s history is one of diachronic mutation. Greek, however, has followed an entirely different trajectory over the course of its history. As Simón

Abril explains, it has been passed down from the classical era to his own, conserved as a complete and stable system: “la lengua Griega se a conferado i conserva en su entereza i perficion casi a tres mil años” (*Gramática* 1v). Although he admits that the tradition has lost the great authors of the classical period, the language itself is the same one these authors would have spoken; in his words it remains “tan rica and tan bien puesta,” as rich and as well-arranged, as it had in their era (*Gramática* 1v).

Simón Abril attributes the maintenance of a pristine state of classical Greek to two factors. The first is historically dubious. According to Simón Abril, unlike with Latin there are no barbarian authors in the ancient or medieval Greek canon, no “theologo barbaro, ni jurista, ni médico, ni filosofo” (*Gramática* 1v). Simón Abril expands upon this point with his second justification, arguing that, unlike Latin, Greek continues to have native speakers. As he explains, there are Greeks who are raised from their mothers breasts, or “desde los pechos de sus madres,” not only to understand the language, but also to use it in a way that is “natural” to its “elegancia y propiedad” (*Gramática* 2). Here again he uses the verb “conservarse” to describe the effect of these native speakers on the language, repeating it alongside the words “entereza and perfección” with which he began his excursus on Greek.

According to Simón Abril, the continued existence of native speakers with this innate sense of Greek’s “propiedad,” has preserved the language as the same complete and perfect system used by the classical Greek authors his audience hopes to use his book to read. In comparing and contrasting the histories of Greek and Latin, Simón Abril presents two models of how languages change over time. The first model, that of Latin, involves evolution over the course of centuries, an evolution

that, after a critical mass of changes have occurred, yields a new language unintelligible to ancient speakers. The second model, that of Greek, reflects a static, complete system handed down from generation to generation without change; by this logic, the language of Greeks in the classical era is the same as that of the Byzantine Greeks of the early modern period.

Applying modern linguistic terminology to Simón Abril's logic, we might say that Latin's historical trajectory is diachronic, while his perception of Greek might be considered, paradoxically, as synchronic in a certain sense: the language exists fixed in a state where at any given point during the 3000 years described by Simón Abril it will be the same. According to Simón Abril, these differences in the histories of the two languages are what affect their relationship to Castilian. Latin is a dead language preserved in writing, while Greek is a living language which continues to have native speakers who can directly transmit their knowledge of it. Likewise, there are contemporary teachers of Greek and there are still "escritores propios y elegantes" (*Gramática 2*). of the language. Simón Abril, who presents himself as being well-versed in contemporary Greek grammarians' approaches, is in turn able to transmit their knowledge to his Castilian readers. This shared vitality of the two languages allows Greek to be taught to children in the way that they learn Castilian, to teach Greek "en las lenguas communes" in the common languages, "como las lenguas se enseñaron desde el principio del mundo" (*Gramática 2*).

To justify his method of teaching Greek in Castilian, Simón Abril has fused two competing models of language transference and change, one for Latin, one for Greek. He creates a hybrid narrative in which some languages change over time

while others endure as complete, static systems handed down intact from generation to generation. Much as Simón Abril has derived his education system from the work of previous philologists, so too has he derived these two narratives of language history from previous works. On the one hand, he cites Italian humanist Flavio Biondo (1392–1463) as the source for his vision of Latin’s history. Deeply interested in exploring the relationship between Tuscan and Latin, Biondo had debated with Poggio Bracciolini and Leonardo Bruni over the famous *Questione della lingua* or “Florentine Debate,” to use Angelo Mazzocco’s term, regarding the relative purity and literary merit of different Italian vernaculars when compared to Latin(13).<sup>47</sup> Biondo had expounded this view of the decline of Latin, as summarized here by Simón Abril, in his influential *De verbis Romanae Locutionis* (Rome, 1435).

On the other hand, his narrative of the history of Greek, although Simón Abril does not state it explicitly as a source, has its roots in the *erotemata* of Manuel Chrysolaras pedagogical system promoted by the first century of Byzantine grammarians guiding Greek studies in Europe. As Christian Förstel has suggested, Chrysolaras and other Byzantine immigrants in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had a vested interest in promoting their native tongue as being the same language spoken by the classical Greeks. Förstel argues that their promotion of Byzantine pronunciation for classical Greek effectively linked their contemporary spoken language to the prestige of classical Greek, in turn bolstering their

---

<sup>47</sup> For a clear and concise overview of the major figures in this *Questione della lingua* debate, beginning with Dante and including, in addition to Poggio and Bruni, major fifteenth-century humanist figures such as Guarino Guarini and Francesco Filefo, see Mazzocco’s aptly titled introductory study “Dramatis Personae.”

credentials as teachers of the classical language to potential students (669). As Greek studies in Europe progressed and as European students simultaneously became more proficient at Greek and began to rely less on Byzantine teachers, the issue of Greek pronunciation became more controversial. Prominent humanists who had mastered the language, such as Erasmus, used their knowledge to begin to reconstruct a hypothetical pronunciation of classical Greek that differed from contemporary Byzantine form, and the question became a hotly debated topic among humanists<sup>48</sup>—one to which Nebrija himself would contribute.<sup>49</sup>

While Simón Abril's recommended pronunciation, as provided in the *Cartilla griega* in 1586 and in the Greek grammar itself in the same year, reflects the Erasmian method. It is therefore interesting to note, then, that in the "Comparación"

---

<sup>48</sup> Erasmus spent many decades corresponding with fellow humanists on the issue before stating his case against Byzantine pronunciation formally in the dialogue *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione* (1528). His reconstructed phonological system in most ways reflects what modern phonologists hold to be true of the language. Johann Reuchlin (1455–1522) represented the camp that argued in favor of Byzantine pronunciation, and his ideas were still promoted by his student Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560), interestingly, one of the grammarians who rejected the Byzantine and Erasmian conversational approaches to teaching Greek. The debate about Greek pronunciation revolved in particular around vowels and the phenomenon often referred to as "ioticism" a gradual reduction of Greek's seven vowel system to three, a change already beginning to be seen in the koine era, in which /u/ and /ε/ and various diphthongs merged with /i/.

<sup>49</sup> Nebrija had published a tract on the Greek alphabet that touched on some problematic issues of Byzantine pronunciation, the 1508 *De litteris et declinatione graeca quibus opus est latinis*, and in a 1516 appendix to his *Introducciones latinas* entitled "Errores Graecorum" addressed the issue in detail. Erasmus would praise Nebrija's contributions to the debate *Apologia respondens ad ea quae in Novo Testamento taxaverat Jacobus Lopis Stunica* (in his repudiation of Diego López Zúñiga, one of the contributors to the Complutense Bible project). See López Rueda for Nebrija's work in this area (157–66) and an overview of the pronunciation debate in Spain in general (167–77).

he promotes a view of language change that seems to uphold a contradictory view of the relationship between classical and Byzantine Greek. Despite his rejection of Byzantine pronunciation, Simón Abril promotes Byzantine Greek speakers' own narrative, that maintained that there was continuity in pronunciation.

Nevertheless, by fusing these two previous narratives about language change, themselves rooted in attempts to link contemporary languages to the prestige of their classical ancestors (although in very different ways), Simón Abril creates an unprecedented narrative for his own romance. The two opposing narratives of the histories of Greek and Latin tenuously coexist in Simón Abril's account, but in the end serve to bolster his greater goals of promoting Castilian language instruction of the classical languages.

#### Remedial Grammar for an Ailing Spain

As mentioned above, Simón Abril repeatedly justifies his methodology by establishing its roots in the Greek pedagogy of the humanist centers of Europe. Simón Abril is clear that, in terms of their approach to Greek teaching, and humanist studies in general, these countries outstrip Spain. In these countries, "las letras humanas se tiene mas particular noticia que en España". Spain, on the other hand, is outmoded in its approach. Comparatively, he recognizes that there is "alguna dificultad" for him in proposing his program because of the conservatism of his pedagogical peers; it will be a challenge for him to "refutar" their approach because it is a "cosa usada dende muchos años" (*Gramática* 6). Italy, France, and Germany have tested these methods "por la experiencia," on the other hand, and have "abraçado" (*Gramática* 12v) this approach. Whereas Spain rejects novelty, these

more progressive countries have been open to experiencing it and have welcomed it with open arms. It is interesting to note that, as the person bringing this pedagogy to Spain, Simón Abril is implicitly linking himself with the superior pedagogues of these other European nations; he is the one capable of relating their work and bringing it to the Peninsula, and so in a sense he takes on some of their authority, as he is able to recognize the value of their efforts.

Also interesting, however, is the fact that Simón Abril does not refer to any of these figures by name, although Brea Claramonte has worked to establish the close ties between Simón Abril's approach and those outlined by specific French authors, in particular Henri Estienne ("Los antecedentes" 11"). This is certainly not because of a lack of direct knowledge of these external authors' works or a lack of access to foreign books. As Beltrán Cebollada's analysis of the inventory of Simón Abril's library shows, his reading of foreign authors was extensive (87-8), although unfortunately Beltrán Cebollada, in defining the limits of his study in order to make it more manageable, specifically excludes grammar books from his accounting (86).

The lack of specificity in terms of contemporary foreign authors becomes especially notable in light of the fact that Simón Abril is careful to specifically cite the classical authors who have inspired him. In referring to their works, he refers simply to the names of various nations; in the case of the contemporary German-speaking lands, not a specific state even, but a more conceptual idea of a German nation. In comparing the pedagogical practices of his peers, he also refers not to specific individuals or even to a category of individuals such as the "maestros" and "gramáticos" named in other sections, but rather to the nation of Spain itself. The

comparison becomes, then, one in which pedagogical approaches are tied to national identities.

While this idea is spread throughout the “Comparación” in its various mentions of the international humanist context, it is most forcefully stated at the beginning of the work in the dedicatory letter, where Simón Abril defines the scope of his project in explicitly nationalist terms. In addressing the rhetor of the University of Salamanca, he explains that the subject of his work is of such great importance that, in order that all who encounter it be able to grasp its content, he forgoes writing the letter in Latin. As he explains, his breach of this academic protocol is because he is addressing a “cosa util para toda la nacion de España” (*Gramática* 2). He goes on to insist that the methodology he will lay out in the following pages is of the utmost importance, because with it Spain might be able to lose “el mal nombre que [tienen] los Españoles acerca de las otras naciones,” a reputation that the Spanish do not take pleasure in (*gustar*) “letras antiguas por falta de conocimiento i uso de las lenguas (*Gramática* 3). Here, Simón Abril argues that the lack of quality language studies has given the rest of Europe this impression and have created the “mal nombre” that Spaniards do not engage in classical studies. Simón Abril makes this issue a personal one for all Spaniards: his use of the first person plural in this proclamation—“que perdamos,” “tenemos los Españoles,” “no gustamos” (*Gramática* 3)—draws not only the addressee, the rhetor, into this space of shared identity, but also the reader. The author is thus appealing to a sense of shared identity that is threatened by the state of Greek studies. That these nations are not specifically named in this instance further enhances a sense of an “us against

them” dichotomy. Indeed, as Morreale Castro has noted, this text is, in many ways, is “dirigido a la Republic” (61), engaging in a certain type of “realismo colectivo” (44) regarding Spain’s reputation.

The issue of Greek, then, is not merely a matter of catching up to the rest of Europe, it is a matter of pride, of proving a point, of remedying Spain’s poor reputation abroad. However, Simón Abril’s deep concerns for the Spanish state—and his belief that Greek studies are a remedy—are nowhere better expressed than in a letter he writes to Philip II, a text in which he not only refers to his Greek grammar, but also recapitulates both his pedagogical platform and hope that it will serve to remedy various of Spain’s ills. In this letter, dated 4 October 1589, towards the end of Simón Abril’s life,<sup>50</sup> the pedagogue argues for why the classics should be taught in the vernacular, again advocating for the system of Greek education that he laid out in his grammar—and again subtly promoting his own role in this system as a producer of course materials and a teacher himself.

Simón Abril lays out an argument for the king to support his program of classical studies, in which the study of Greek is key. He justifies why the king should be interested in his proposal and suggests how the plan can immediately and, in the long-term, benefit the king by making the Spanish into good subjects by instructing them in the good doctrine of the classics. Simón Abril also slyly promotes his own interests by arguing that the king should invest in education at the local level in helping to support teachers such as himself, and also advocating for, as he did in his

---

<sup>50</sup> Morreale Castro, who reproduces this letter as an appendix to her biography of Simón Abril (266–7), posits that it may have been composed with the intention of including it as the dedicatory preface an edition of his *Ad familiares* (266 n1).

grammar, the translations he has published as pedagogical resources. Although he does not specifically allude to his *Gramática griega* in the text of the letter, key language is repeated that reiterates Simón Abril's approach in the "Comparación." Additionally, a feature of the letter itself indicates that contemporary readers of the letter—at least those in charge of cataloguing it within the king's correspondence—recognized links between Simón Abril's Greek grammar, Greek translations, and the platform elaborated in the letter itself. As Morreale Castro notes, the letter, which survives today in the Escorial as MS 5938, a copy of a codex belonging to Philip's court historian and antiquarian Ambrosio de Morales (1513–1591), bears the heading "Carta à Felipe Segundo sobre la gramatica y otras obras griegas que tenia traducidas" (266 n1).

In the letter itself, Simón Abril's argument for classical education centers on his concern that the Spanish are lacking in classical "doctrina," and he lays out a plan that proposes vernacular teaching of the classics in translation (interestingly, the opposite argument that he makes in the grammar). However, despite this change in his proposal, or rather, this change in focus in his proposal, as here he is not specifically speaking to Greek studies on their own, Simón Abril's discussion of his vision for Spanish pedagogy reflects the core beliefs put forward in his grammar. He argues that students need to use Castilian as the primary language of instruction, that it is regrettable that students "gastan en el aprender un poco de barbaro latin y una mala e inutil gramatica estrangera" ("Carta" 266) and goes on to repudiate instruction of the classics "por lenguas estrañas mal entendidas y peor usadas" ("Carta" 267), that is to say, through spoken Greek or Latin.

Again, while Simón Abril focuses on a more general program of classical “doctrina” in the letter, he nevertheless explains how the study of Greek fits into this plan, and argues that with this fundamental knowledge of the classics in the vernacular, students will gain a proper base from which to learn Greek and Latin: “pues, sabiendo los hombres las buenas doctrinas en su propia lengua, les serà facil por las mismas cosas entender la buena lengua Latina y la buena Griega en sus propias fuentes sin error ni barbarismo” (“Carta” 267). Here, Simón Abril has simply changed the order of his proposal, the gateway to Greek is vernacular reading. Significantly though, this rearrangement still emphasizes the place of Greek within his vision for education, for this statement is the final one of the letter, representing the culmination of his elaborate arguments throughout.

The highest goal of education is for students to be able to read Greek and Latin texts in their original forms. However, in addition to the repetition of his rejection of conversational pedagogy and his placement of Greek as the pinnacle of study, Simón Abril also closely ties his letter to the platform outlined in his grammar, repeating a central metaphor expounded in the “Comparación.” In the grammar’s prologue, in his final summation of his pedagogical platform, Simón Abril explains why young children in particular should be instructed in Greek at such an early age. Citing Quintilian as his source, he explains that young children are like seedlings, easier to mold so that “se enderece el arbol” before it becomes “endurecido” with a “mala figura” (*Gramática* 13). If instead the “tiernas i nuevas plantas” grow “so vergel de la doctriana,” they will turn out “en forma i figura hermosa” (*Gramática* 13).

In the letter, Simón Abril again presents this metaphor, in many ways repeating the phrasing almost identically:

V.M. en sus Bosques y Arboleadas los Arboles que yà hallò crecidos y endurecidos en mala figura, los deja estar asi, y los que se plantan de nuevo manda formar en figura hermosa, y poner por muy buena orden y concierto, tanto mas razon es mande formar bien los hombres, que como nuevas plantas pueden ser bien instruidos por ser tiernos: quanta diferencia hay de plantar Arboles al plantar hombres tales, que llegados à grandes seles pueda encomendar toda cosa grave por rason de su dotrina y su virtud. (“Carta” 267).

Older trees not manipulated in their youth develop a “mala figura” when they have become “endurecidos,” those who are guided in their youth develop a “figura hermosa.” However, the aspects that differ between the two presentations of this metaphor are significant. In the version in his letter, it is the king himself, addressed as *Vuestra Merced*, who personally makes decisions about the management of these forests; it is he who “deja estar asi” those already hardened and mature trees and he who “manda formar” that newly planted ones grow “en figura hermosa.” The image also emphasizes the monarch’s role in making everything straight, right and therefore correct, “poner en buena orden y concierto.” He is responsible for proper order, taking the metaphorical forest from a wild one to a manicured one. Moreover, he is clear to identify that these trees are his personal property, they are the trees that grow in “sus Bosques y sus Arboleadas.”

In the letter, then, Simón Abril’s metaphor transforms from one of simple tree growth to one of royal forestry: these are the king’s personal forests and he is personally in charge of managing their growth. These trees envisioned as part of the king’s “Bosques y Arboledas” are not tended to for aesthetic purposes, they are a natural resource planted and harvested for the benefit of the crown. By framing the

metaphor in these terms, Simón Abril argues to the king that his young subjects are just as much a valuable natural resource as the timber cultivated on his lands. Moreover, with his emphasis on the king's direct intervention in the management of his forests, he highlights the king's dominion over every aspect of his royal holdings, even down to the trees. In reality, this strategy effectively elides what were likely various layers of royal administration between the king and the management of his landholdings and natural resources. Yet with this collapsing of the bureaucracy, royal forestry becomes the exclusive purview of the monarch himself, and by metaphoric extension, therefore, so too does the education of his young subjects.

This metaphor has two effects. It praises the sovereign by acknowledging that he is all-powerful within his domain, while at the same time emphasizing that it is therefore his personal responsibility as monarch to care for those under his reign. Mixing metaphors somewhat at the end of this passage, Simón Abril indicates why this is of such importance. By cultivating his subjects in this way, he will produce ones who, when they have reached maturity—described as a “grande sel,” or pasture for cattle—they will be able to “encomendar toda cosa grave por rason de su dotrina y su virtud,” that is to say, because they have received the *proper* Simón Abrilian training in the classics.

While all of this is implied in the metaphor, it is expressed more explicitly in other places within the letter. For instance, he argues that, in reading Plato and Aristotle, an adult student will not only “aprender toda Buena dotrina” but also learn “lo que hà de menester saber un hombre discreto para rejirse bien asi à su familia, y à la Republica” (“Carta” 266). Children taught in this system will similarly

become “varones perfectos lo haga aptos para saberse regir en toda cosa grave” (“Carta” 267). We see an ordered system here, a hierarchy of responsibilities within the Spanish “Republica” in which the individual subject learns the proper place where he fits and the domain over which he has command within the system. This presumably male reader will learn from this “doctrina” that he rules over himself, “regirse,” and this position of individual dominion is contextualized within hierarchy of family, the members of which are subject to him as head of the household, and the Republic, headed by the monarch, to whom he himself is subject. Moreover, “tiernos” who begin learning this “doctrina” early in life will become “varones perfectos,” “aptos para saberse regir en toda cosa grave” (“Carta” 267). By the same token learning this “doctrina” when young will help prepare the Spanish youth to be good subjects who know how to rule themselves within their dominion—again the verb *regirse*—while existing as subjects within the greater dominion of the monarch.

Simón Abril positions the monarch as a central figure in ensuring that this education takes place. He argues that for the king to intervene personally in the administration of municipal schools is a “cosa dina de la prudencia de V. M.” and “dina de su Real autoridad” (“Carta” 267). This kind of intervention in local-level educational policy is not only prudent for the king, that is to say, it will benefit him by creating worthy subjects, but it is also an exercise of his royal authority. As monarch, it is within his power to carry out this kind of direct intervention, an authority that Simón Abril continually highlights throughout the text. In linking royal authority with educational administration and reform, however, one of Simón

Abril's most notable justifications for his appeal to the king comes in the form of a classical comparison. By intervening at the local level in school administration, he argues, the king will earn an "eterno nombre y alabanza," one that is "no menos que le diò al Emperador Augusto el haber hecho Escuelas Latinas;" he will be joining the eternally-remembered ranks of autocrats such as Augustus himself ("Carta" 267). Interestingly, with this comparison to Augustus, the enduring symbol of imperial authority, Simón Abril connects Augustus not only to the establishment of schools, but also to a particular methodology that lines up with Simón Abril's own, the use of vernacular translations. As he explains, Augustus had "puesto en aquella lengua la doctrina que antes solian aprendella de los Griegos." Here again Simón Abril projects a view of imperial authority in which the monarch personally controls very minor details about the management of his kingdom: Augustus himself is responsible for "el haber hecho ... puesto en aquella lengua" the "doctrina" in question ("Carta" 267). The wording suggests that Augustus himself is the translator producing texts for use in his new schools, rather than simply instituting a policy. By again collapsing the various layers of imperial administration, Simón Abril presents the monarch's singular and ubiquitous authority.

In this way, the study of classics—with the study of classical languages as its centerpiece—become an issue of the utmost importance for establishing the correct relationship between Philip and his subjects. Through correct "doctrina," one that eschews the problematic pedagogical methods of the past, particularly those that have warped the study of Greek and Latin, the Spanish subject can be straightened out and allowed to develop according to the "orden y concierto" necessary to

properly function within the state. Although Greek grammar plays a less important role in this scenario, as here Simón Abril is advocating for all types of classical education, it is important to note that he continues to exhibit the same anxieties expressed in the “Comparación,” a concern for the affairs of the “Republica” and desire that “esta nacion sepa cosas graves.” As he explains in the “Comparación,” remedying Greek pedagogy with this radical approach will have a cascading effect, in turn remedying Latin pedagogy, and from there, then, remedying teaching the classical tradition in general. Beyond that, it will then serve to remedy the reputation of the Spanish nation throughout Europe, and of equal importance as indicated in his appeal to Philip, to remedy the relationship between monarch and subject within the ailing Spanish state.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### FRANCISCO DE QUEVEDO, VICENTE MARINER, AND HELLENIST SELF-PRESENTATION IN THE *ANACREÓN CASTELLANO* AND BEYOND

In 1609, Francisco de Quevedo dedicated a collection of poetry, the *Anacreón castellano*, to his patron, Pedro Téllez-Girón, the third Duke of Osuna, which would circulate in manuscript form during the author's lifetime.<sup>51</sup> One of the seminal authors of the Spanish Golden Age, the prolific Quevedo remains best known for satirical treatises such as the five *Sueños y discursos* (1606–1623), his picaresque novel *El Buscón* (circa 1604–8), and his philosophical tracts such as the *La cuna y la sepultura* (1634). The *Anacreón* text, which we might loosely call a translation, takes as its source material the famous Anacreontic corpus, a compendium of Hellenistic and Late Antique Greek poetry spuriously attributed to the archaic Greek poet Anacreon. This work of Quevedo, then, is one of the many that showcase Quevedo's life-long devotion to the classical tradition. Indeed, both during his life time and today, Quevedo has remained famous for the vast classical erudition he displays throughout his body of works. To give the reader a sense of the scope of the classical materials woven into Quevedo's corpus, in a 2014 study, Francisca Moya del Baño devotes more than five hundred pages to cataloguing the various classical sources

---

<sup>51</sup> The work would not be printed until 1794 by Don Antonio de Sancha in Madrid.

Quevedo cites in his oeuvre, identifying no less than seventy-four ancient authors to whom Quevedo alludes over the course of his career.

Nevertheless, the *Anacreón*, even among Quevedo's classical texts, is unique. It stands out, for instance, from his other translations of Greek texts, namely, those of pseudo-Phocylides and Epictetus's *Enchiridion*, whose philosophical content was their main attraction for Quevedo, an integral figure in the development Spanish Neo-Stoicism. The Anacreontic corpus, on the other hand, is Quevedo's only entry into the translation of classical lyric poetry, and, as his own preliminary comments on his work reflect, his main interest in the text lies in its use of the Greek language, the eloquence and style of its his "gala" and "excelencia" (*Anacreón* [1981] 255). The work is thus an important witness to the Quevedo's literary identity, not merely as a classicist, but more specifically as a Hellenist. While the text remains central to our understanding of Quevedo's relationship to Greek literature, more importantly, it is integral to our understanding of his relationship to the Greek language itself. This in turn makes the text an invaluable resource for reconstructing the status of Greek in the early seventeenth-century literary milieu in which the author vied for accolades and patronage with other humanist writers.

Nevertheless, despite the *Anacreón*'s richness as a source for understanding Quevedo's profile as an early seventeenth-century Hellenist, several aspects of the text make it a difficult one to interrogate. Even describing the *Anacreón castellano* in terms of genre has proven tricky, as the work defies a simple designation as "translation." It is true that the author himself refers to the work as a "traducción" (*Anacreón* [1981] 255), and that this has been a label traditional Quevedo

scholarship has often applied to it. For instance, it appears among the section entitled “Traducciones de poetas y filósofos antiguos” of Aureliano Fernández Guerra de Orbe’s 1852 catalogue of Quevedo’s oeuvre in the foundational *Biblioteca de autores españoles* series, a designation followed by twentieth-century editors such as Luis Astrana Marín and José Manuel Blecua, as well as scholars who have examined the studied the work in detail, such as Josep María Ballcells.

However, the situation is complicated by the fact that Quevedo not only refers to his work as a “traducción,” but also uses the term “paráfrasi” throughout the text (e.g., *Anacreón* [1981] 251; 255). As scholars such as Lía Schwartz and Adrian Izquierdo note, this title indicates a traditional rhetorical practice of paraphrasing that differs greatly from the modern idea of translation (Schwartz, “Anacreón” 1177; Izquierdo 231). Additionally, as Donald G. Castanien has noted, his renderings of the texts in many instances differ from the source text, amplifying and extending passages in ways that reflect the poet’s own voice more than that of the original poets’ (“Quevedo’s *Anacreón*” 574–5). Moreover, Ballcells, citing Quevedo’s own admissions that he has closely consulted previous Latin translations of the text, argues that Quevedo did not work directly from a Greek text of the Anacreontic corpus at all, but rather patched together his own interpretations of various humanists’ Latin versions of the text (39).

Given the various intricacies of the *Anacreón*, then, it might initially seem unclear how we may best interpret the relationship between Quevedo’s title, the text itself, and his use of the Greek language. However, one of Quevedo’s contemporaries, in fact his greatest literary rival, Luis de Góngora, is able to

articulate certain perspectives on the text that, despite their inherent bias against the *Anacreón's* creator, nevertheless illuminate certain aspects of Quevedo's project that are of interest.

Over the course of various literary works, Quevedo and Góngora had attacked each other both on a personal level and for the quality of their poetic compositions, and their rivalry would be transmuted by later critics into the famous *conceptismo/culteranismo* literary debate, with Quevedo becoming associated with the former, Góngora with the latter.<sup>52</sup> In a 1609 invective sonnet, one of the most famous exchanged between the two, Góngora expends a remarkable amount of poetic energy criticizing the *Anacreón*.<sup>53</sup>

Góngora signals in the opening words of the first verse that his subject is Quevedo's Anacreontic work, addressing his rival as "Anacreón español" (634, v.1). Góngora's primary attack, however, comes in the third stanza, where he presents Quevedo as simultaneously inept and pretentious: "Con cuidado especial vuestros antojos / Dicen que quieren traducir al griego / No habiéndolo mirado vuestros ojos" (634, vv.9–11). Thus, according to Góngora, Quevedo desperately wishes to

---

<sup>52</sup> See Carlos Gutierrez (65–69) for an overview of the history of and recent scholarly approaches to this constructed literary polemic that came to be associated in the eighteenth century with these two authors, whose own perspectives on issues of literary composition are not fixed and whose works often reflect both approaches to the "debate." Scholars such as Gutierrez voice what is now the more established view, that these authors' constructions of antagonistic literary personas require careful and nuanced reading that avoids an anachronistic application of this "debate" to their poetic interactions. Also see Amelia de Paz for a similar articulation of this perspective that incorporates a discussion of Góngora's *Anacreón* sonnet (33–34).

<sup>53</sup> Blecua compiles Quevedo's anti-Góngoran sonnets under the section "Sátiras personales" in his edition; they are poems 825–841 in his numbering system (227–249). Maria Grazia Profeti has dubbed this group of poems as a "micro-género" of Quevedo's satirical poetry and provides a useful overview of their shared characteristics and of relevant scholarship.

translate Greek, despite having not, in fact, laid eyes on it. Moreover, Góngora's play on the word "antojo," here indicating Quevedo's desire to undertake a translation, evokes the phonologically similar "anteojo," thus becoming a jab at Quevedo's famous and ostentatious use of a pince-nez. Góngora maintains, then, that while Quevedo's use of glasses might suggest some particular acuity for the endeavor at hand, one cannot translate what one cannot see. Góngora's attack, then, portrays a pretentious Quevedo who desperately wishes to present himself as translator, but who, despite his ostentations of expertise, is unable to read Greek, and therefore this "Anacreón español" has failed in his *Anacreón castellano*.

The specifics of Quevedo and Góngora's various poetic quarrels aside, what is particular interest for the present study is that Góngora identifies in Quevedo's text a self-conscious effort on the part of the latter to project a certain image of himself as a competent Hellenist despite lacking the true credentials. According to Góngora, Quevedo's attempts at self-presentation have failed: his inability to translate Greek have made his efforts transparent, and therefore into fodder for Góngora's poetic attack. Despite its highly charged—and highly subjective—nature, Góngora's comments on the *Anacreón* allude to the fact that, in his contemporary literary circle, projecting an image of Greek promotion could serve as a tool of self-promotion; the idea of being a proficient Hellenist was powerful enough that it was worth projecting a persona based in one's Greek expertise, even if this persona might not line up with reality.

It is this issue of Hellenist self-presentation in the *Anacreón*, first raised by Góngora, that will be of central importance for the present study. The following two-

part analysis will begin with a close reading of the *Anacreón castellano*—in particular its intricate preliminary matter, paratexts, and commentary—in order to dissect the Hellenist persona Quevedo creates for himself in this work. This analysis will reveal a variety of strategies Quevedo employs to create an image of himself as a philologist on par with previous editors and translators of the text, in particular the text’s sixteenth-century discoverer, Henri “Stephanus” Estienne. Previous Quevedo scholars Lía Schwartz and Pablo Jauralde Pou have noted that the author uses these paratextual elements, in particular the commentary, to present, or, “forjarse, in Schwartz’s words, “una imagen ... de un docto escritor, filólogo y criticus...[para] pretender competir en el ámbito del humanism europeo” (“Las preciosas” 216).

However, these scholar’s assessments of the *Anacreón* are based on their readings of the text’s displays of its author’s mastery of all areas of Graeco-Roman antiquity, a reading that, for an author so focused on the classical tradition throughout his corpus, could be an equally valid one for any number of his texts. As the present study’s reading of the *Anacreón* will show, however, this text is unique in Quevedo’s corpus for its elaborate portrayal of author as a master not only of the classical tradition in general, but of the Greek language specifically. Having the reconstructed Quevedo’s specifically Hellenist persona in the *Anacreón*, it will next be possible to explore the question of why the young author, just beginning in 1609 to make a name for himself in a complex courtly literary world, chose *Greek* as the area in which he wished to distinguish himself—and what this in turn reveals to us about the status of Greek in this singular moment in Spanish literary history.

The second phase of the study will consider the reception of Quevedo's efforts to present himself as an accomplished Hellenist in the *Anacreón* by his peers and patrons beyond Góngora. One method of exploring this question will be to examine closely Quevedo's relationship with the most prominent Hellenist of his day in Spain, Vicente Mariner. Of all the figures populating the elite literary and courtly circles in which Quevedo participated, Mariner was the most qualified to evaluate Quevedo as Hellenist, the most capable of validating his Hellenist persona to other members of this milieu. In 1624, Quevedo would collaborate with Mariner on another translation of a Greek text, Julian the Apostate's fourth *Oration*, known in Latin as the *In regem solem ad Salustium Panegyricus*. In this case, however, Mariner served as translator and Quevedo as both dedicatee and prologist.

This text, with its own complex set of preliminary and paratextual elements, and its reception are just as important a source as the *Anacreón* for understanding Quevedo's Hellenist persona. This text is valuable because, in Quevedo's praise of Mariner, not only are we able to catch a glimpse of the former's conception of the ideal Hellenist, the type of Hellenist he himself strove to be in the *Anacreón*, but we are also able to determine how Mariner, held in his time to be the paragon of Spanish Hellenists, evaluated Quevedo.

Quevedo scholars such as Schwartz, Jauralde Pou, and Luis de Cañigral Cortez have commented on the relationship between Quevedo and Mariner as reflected in their individual contributions to the *In regem solem*. However, their more focused interpretations overlook the complex interplay the work's various paratextual elements, resulting in a reading of the author's mutual *elogios* that takes

too much at face value—particularly in the case of Mariner. The second half of this study, then, will consist of a close reading of these paratexts as a whole. In addition to placing Quevedo’s contributions to the *In regem solem* in dialogue with the earlier *Anacreón castellano*, this exploration of Mariner and Quevedo’s mutual textual portraits will provide a more nuanced idea of what it meant to Quevedo—not only in the realm of the literary, but also in that of social advancement—to present himself as an expert Hellenist.

## **Part I: The *Anacreón Castellano***

### Quevedo and the Anacreontic Corpus

The text known today as the *Carmina anacreontea*, or Anacreontic corpus, entered into the European Humanist tradition when it was “discovered” in 1551 by French Humanist Henri “Stephanus” Estienne, whose many philological contributions include the “Stephanus numbers” still used in contemporary Platonic editions. The seventy poems contained in this anthology are of various authorship and their dates of composition range from the Hellenistic to Byzantine eras.<sup>54</sup> As the name suggests, this corpus brings together a wide range of poetry in the style of the sixth-century Anacreon of Teos, one of the of nine canonical lyric poets so-identified by Hellenistic commentators and, as the anthology reflects, much imitated throughout the centuries of Greek and Latin literary production.<sup>55</sup> Poetry in the “Anacreontic” mode as found in the anthology focuses on the simple pleasures of

---

<sup>54</sup> For an overview of the chronology and dating for the various parts of the corpus, see David Campbell’s introduction to the Anacreontic Corpus in the Loeb Classical Library Greek Lyric Volume III.

<sup>55</sup> As Rosenmeyer indicates, various of these poems are found in other classical sources (2 n2).

life, love and wine, as Patricia A. Rosenmeyer describes it, “the best of the erotic and symposiastic worlds” (2). In terms of form, Anacreontic poetry uses straightforward language, is brief, and is composed in relatively simple hemiambs or anacalts. It is unclear when this corpus was compiled, but it survives in only one manuscript, the famous Palatine Anthology, where it is included as an appendix.<sup>56</sup>

Stephanus, visiting Louvain in 1551, claims to have borrowed a manuscript from his English friend John Clement in which he discovered this corpus. Scholars have concluded that the borrowed manuscript must have been the famous Palatine Anthology, although that manuscript was officially “discovered” in Heidelberg in 1606. Stephanus’s apograph of the corpus is so close to the one appended to the Palatine Anthology that it is almost undoubtedly a direct copy.<sup>57</sup>

Stephanus developed the theory that these poems were the work of Anacreon himself and in his 1554 edition presented them as such. Interestingly, while his original apograph reflects the corpus as it appears in manuscript, in his edition, Stephanus excised from the corpus various poems that in any way indicated an authorship other than Anacreon, placing them in an appendix of supposedly spurious fragments or omitting them altogether. Rosenmeyer refers to this editorial decision on the part of Stephanus as either “bad judgement” or “intellectual dishonesty” (4). Whichever the case may be, Stephanus’s attribution of the corpus to

---

<sup>56</sup> The Palatine Anthology is a Byzantine tenth-century codex, that, together with the fourteenth-century Planudean Anthology, forms what we know as the Greek Anthology today, a collection that remains the key source for lyric poetry.

<sup>57</sup> See John O’Brien for a detailed description Stephanus’s use of this manuscript, the history of the Palatine Anthology, and the Latin text of the letter he writes to Paolo Manuzio describing his discovery of the corpus (13–17).

Anacreon himself rather than to various Anacreontic imitators quickly became accepted among his Humanist peers—with the exception of Francesco Robertello, who would describe the work as the forged work of “some witless Greek” (qtd. in O’Brien 2). The corpus itself and Anacreontic poetry as a genre exploded in popularity in France and Europe at large in the second half of the sixteenth century.<sup>58</sup> As Rosenmeyer points out, in a recursive move, poet Pierre de Ronsard wrote anacreontics in praise of Stephanus’s very rediscovery of Anacreon (6).<sup>59</sup> Various translations would follow Stephanus’s edition, which also include Latin translations and notes. Notable among these are Elié André’s Latin translation of 1556 and Remi Belleau’s French translation of 1565, both based on Stephanus’s edition.<sup>60</sup>

Interest in the text continued unabated among European humanists for the next few generations, and roughly fifty years later, Quevedo too would add his name

---

<sup>58</sup> It would not be until the eighteenth century when philologists such as Johannes Cornelius de Pauw would argue that nothing in corpus belonged to Anacreon, and, having examined the original manuscript, then housed in the Vatican, confirmed that Stephanus had left out the first ode appearing in the collection that rather clearly demonstrates that the collection is inspired by, rather than composed by Anacreon. In this ode, the poet describes himself accepting a laurel crown from Anacreon in order to continue the older poet’s work (Rosenmeyer 7–8).

<sup>59</sup> See Astrana Marín for a detailed discussion of the new humanist trend of composing Anacreontic poetry in seventeenth-century Spain which Quevedo’s translation helped to fuel (see “Anacreonte” 564–567). A second translation of the Anacreontic corpus would appear in Esteban de Villegas 1618 compendium the *Eróticas*, a text which Schwartz has studied in detail in conjunction with Quevedo’s (“*El Anacreón*” 1181ff).

<sup>60</sup> Although celebrated as a paragon of classical Greek style in the early modern era, after philologists determined that the text was not written by Anacreon, scholarly opinion of the text turned, with famous 19th-century German philologist Ulrich von Wilamowitz Mollendorff stating, “wem diese matte Limonade nich unausstehlich ist, der soll nicht nach dem hellenischen Weine giefen,” or in Rosenmeyer’s translation, “he who finds such flat soda water palatable should not attempt to drink the pure Hellenic wine” (Rosenmeyer 1). In the second half of the 20th century this has changed as scholars have begun to take the corpus more seriously as a literary text to be examined in itself, hence the editions of West and Brioso Sanchez and the updated version in volume 3 of Campbell’s *Greek Lyric* Loeb edition, in addition to the studies of O’Brien and Rosenmeyer cited here.

to the list of Anacreontic translators. In the *Anacreón castellano*. Quevedo works closely with the translations of Stephanus, André, and Belleau, whose texts he cites throughout his notes. Quevedo's text follows Stephanus's order for the fifty odes of his main corpus and then selects two "fragments" from Stephanus's appendix of more questionable poems. In addition to Quevedo's versions of the odes, the *Anacreón* includes an extensive apparatus of notes and textual comparanda for many of the poems. While the eighteenth-century editor of the princeps separated these materials into two sections (a section containing all of the odes followed by a section containing all of the notes), in all of the seventeenth-century exemplars, the notes are interspersed with the poems, appearing after the odes to which they refer. The work also includes a rich body of preliminary materials. In addition to the title page, the reader finds an initial "Advertencia" addressing the controversial pagan nature of the content of the work, a lengthy life of Anacreon based on that of Gregorio Giraldi in his 1545 *Historia poetarum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum*,<sup>61</sup> a dedication to the Duke of Osuna, and three epigrams by contemporary poets, praising both Anacreon and Quevedo, and the translated odes interspersed with textual commentary.

The *Anacreón* circulated in manuscript form until its first publication by Don Antonio de Sancha in 1794. In terms of earlier versions of the text, seven manuscripts survive, six of which his most recent editor, Juan Manuel Blecua deems

---

<sup>61</sup> While Giraldi's text continued to be well-read into the sixteenth century, Schwartz suggests that Quevedo likely encountered this text of the life of Anacreon in Stephanus's own reprinting of it as part of the introductory materials to Anacreon's works in Stephanus's *Carmina novem poetarum* ("El *Anacreón*" 1174).

significant (*Anacreón* [1981] 244). The earliest and most important of these is a seventeenth-century copy in the Biblioteca Nacional (BNE 17529) which Bleuca designates as “A.” Additionally, Bleuca identifies a copy in the Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli as either an autograph or early apograph, however, there are significant differences between the content of this text and the rest of the exemplars, which Elena Gallego and Francisco Moya have studied in detail.<sup>62</sup>

In terms of interpreting the *Anacreón*, starting with Góngora and continuing to the present day, critics have questioned Quevedo’s ability to produce a translation of the Anacreontic text on the basis of his knowledge—or lack thereof—of Greek. Seeming to confirm the allegations of Góngora, the prominent late eighteenth-century critic and Greek *catedrático*, Casmiro Florez Canseco,<sup>63</sup> produced an excoriating analysis of the *Anacreón*, comparing Quevedo’s translations to the original Greek and assessing him to have had a very low Greek proficiency.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Gallego and Moya del Baño identify the key difference between N and the rest of the tradition as being that in the first seven odes, that translations of Greek and Latin are not given in the other manuscripts and the *princeps*, and that these appear in the N manuscript. This suggests that N reflects Quevedo’s going back and editing them later, likely during his time in Italy in 1618, which is how the manuscript ended up in Naples (“Las traducciones” 183).

<sup>63</sup> Flórez Canseco worked for the Consejo Real as a censor and was asked to evaluate the *Anacreón castellano* for potential inclusion in D. Ramón Fernández’s (the pseudonym of the abbot Pedro Estala) 1786–1808 multi-volume series, *Poetas españoles*. Needless to say, after Flórez Canseco’s scathing assessment in the official report, which José Simón Díaz has edited and examined in two studies, the licenses were not granted. See Simón Díaz “Flórez Canseco” and “Helenismo.” Additionally, Andrés (227) and Gil Fernández (550–51) have discussed Flórez Canseco’s report.

<sup>64</sup> To give the reader a taste of his assessment: “Tres cosas que, si se desempeñasen bien, cualquiera de ellas por sí sola bastaría para hacer utilísima y muy apreciable la obra y para colocar a su author un lugar muy distinguido en la República de las Letras. Pero, por desgracia, ninguna de ellas se encuentran. No veo ningún comentario ni copioso ni escaso. No veo que se presente el original, no solo más corregido, pero ni aun por corregir, pues solo se copia el primer verso de cada oda, y éstos con todos aquellos defectos en que es capaz de caer el que intenta formar los caracteres de una lengua que no entiende . . . Tampoco veo los mismos lugares declarados no advertidos jamás, que es otra de las ofertas que se hacen en la dedicatoria, a no ser que el traductor tenga por declaraciones nuevas y no advertidas hasta ahora, ciertos pensamientos propios que mezcla con los del poeta griego con tan poca o ninguna oportunidad, que le hace decir lo que seguramente no pensó” (qtd. in

Subsequent generations of critics have spilled considerable ink examining the question of “¿Quevedo helenista?”—that is to say, did Quevedo know enough Greek to translate the Anacreontic corpus. The most recent study to tackle the issue, a 2011 analysis by Aurelio Pérez Jiménez, addresses the crux of this ongoing dilemma in its very title: “Sí, el Quevedo del *Anacreón*, helenista.”

The debate over Quevedo’s Greek among modern scholars revolves around two questions regarding historical context: could Quevedo have learned sufficient Greek in his formal education to tackle such a project or could he have learned this in school, based on his educational background? Or, if his studies in these formal settings did not bring him to the necessary proficiency level, given the Greek pedagogical resources available at the time, could he have achieved it on his own working as an autodidact? In the mid-twentieth century, the assessments of Josep María Balcells and Sylvia Bénichou–Roubaud, who argue that Quevedo’s Greek proficiency must have been particularly low, began to dominate the conversation and remain frequently cited. Bénichou–Roubaud, for instance, argues that Quevedo relied almost exclusively on the Latin translations included with commentaries he cites (e.g., Estienne, Elia Andrés, et al.) (72), and that, based on his comments on the Greek text itself, might have not even had the original text in front of him (39).<sup>65</sup> Quevedo’s most recent biographer, Pablo Jaraulde Pou, is slightly more positive,

---

Andrés 227); Andrés speculates that his comments that there is no commentary that might reflect that he did not have a copy of the text including these (227). However, it might simply be the case that this is a hyperbolic comment on the quality of the commentary.

<sup>65</sup> Although, as José María Camacho Rojo and Jesús María García González, who agree with this assessment of Bénichou–Roubaud’s regarding the use of Latin, emphasize that Quevedo clearly had a Greek text in hand in writing (120), a somewhat obvious point considering that Estienne’s editions, so important in Quevedo’s own commentary, included Estienne’s edition of the Greek text (see O’Brien 13).

maintaining that Quevedo's Greek was not sufficient for him to directly translate the text, but that it was but was "suficientemente hábil como para enfrentarse a [el griego] cuando [tenia] un texto latin de apoyo" (179).

However, another vocal group has questioned of the validity of this line of inquiry that devotes so much scholarly focus to the question of Quevedo's Greek. Lía Schwartz, for instance, asks why Quevedo needs to be a "professional" level Greek scholar, such as his contemporary, Greek translator, editor, and pedagogue Vicente Mariner (1178), for his *Anacreón* to be worthy of our consideration. Many dispute the use of a modern definition of "translation" to describe Quevedo's use of Greek in the project. Following Castanien, scholars such as Schwartz, Pérez Jiménez, Antonio López Ruiz, and Adrian Izquierdo emphasize Quevedo's use of the word "paráfrasi" to describe his own work, nothing that this Renaissance practice of rewriting the content of classical authors—and that even the process of "traducción," the equivalent to the modern term—represent an "agenda cultural diferente" from the modern (Izquierdo 237).<sup>66</sup> Heriqueta de Andrés expresses a similar sentiment, finding fault with Flórez Canseco's more modern expectations that he find "en este *Anacreón castellano* una traducción literal, lo que no estuvo nunca en la mente de Quevedo" (Andrés 227).

---

<sup>66</sup> Leonardo Bruni first used *traducere* in place of the typical medieval *transferre*, *transvertere*, or *interpretari*, a term whose application to this context, Berschin claims, may be based on a misunderstanding of a passage of Aulus Gellius. For Bruni and subsequent humanists who adopted this term, the newer model of translation reflected in the new "traducere" model represented a style based on eloquence that captured the sense of the original text more elegantly (what Jerome generations before would have called "ad sensum") and what, according to Berschin, they associated with previous generations "slavery" and "blind submission to the letter," an "offense against the spirit of the classical Latin language" (276), Jerome's concept of "ad verbum" translation. See Berschin for a history of this word first by Bruni and then among later humanists (276ff).

For the present study, in weighing in on the seemingly eternal question of whether Quevedo knew enough Greek to translate the Anacreontic corpus, the jury will have to remain out based on the following evidence. As José María Camacho Rojo and Jesús María García González note, under-documented claims of biographers such as Antonio Papell and Luis Astrana Marín regarding the high level of Greek studies Quevedo would have received at Alcalá do not reflect the careful archival work of José López Rueda and Andrés's in-depth analyses suggesting quite the opposite (113 n19).<sup>67</sup> Regarding Quevedo's often-cited pre-university studies at the royal Colegio de San Pedro y San Pablo, a Jesuit institution, it is true that Greek was a mandatory part of the Jesuit *Ratio studiorum* forming the school's curriculum. However, evidence for how Greek studies were actually conducted in the Colegio and their level of efficacy remains an area less explored than the university context.

As mentioned, López Rueda and Andrés, the primary sources for archival evidence of Greek studies, do not examine the Jesuit school question in detail. Astrana Marín's (17) and Sagrario López Pozo's (75–83) analyses of the *Ratio studiorum*'s outline for the teaching of Greek serve as useful theoretical guides to what Quevedo might have studied at the Colegio, but as Paul Botley notes of Greek studies in general (116), a list of Greek textbooks cannot predict the proficiency of a student who uses those textbooks.

Putting aside the question of his classroom training, could Quevedo master Greek on his own? There is certainly no reason why he could not have done so.

---

<sup>67</sup> See Camacho Rojo and García González (112–13) for a discussion of this and for locations of these previous references to the specific courses of study at Alcalá.

However, with regard to our ever being able to answer these questions, even if we had a fuller archival record of Quevedo's access to Greek materials and methodologies Quevedo, this seems unknowable. Based on the evidence it seems best then, to follow Camacho Rojo and García González's assessment, which they deem "lo más prudente," in adopting a "término medio" somewhere between the polar extremes that Quevedo "[era] un helenista excepcional" and that he "desconocía por completa la lengua griega" (115–116).

The more interesting questions are perhaps those posed by the work of Schwartz, Izquierdo, and others: "Are we using the correct criteria to evaluate Quevedo's work?" "Are we applying an anachronistic understanding of how the author envisions his own use of Greek to render the poems in Spanish?" The value of this line of inquiry is clear: it is always important to be aware of our own presentist perspective in our analyses of the works of the past. The above-mentioned scholars are correct that it is always best to focus on an author's own method for describing their work and to attempt, as best as possible, to contextualize this within the contemporary standards of that author's world.

However, in the case of Quevedo's *Anacreón*, the author's description of the project he is undertaking is slippery, since even the title itself is presented in two ways in the text. As stated above, in the frontispiece it is the *Anacreón castellano con paráfrasi y comentarios*, but later when the title is reiterated before the first poem itself, it is given as "Paráfrasi y traducción de Anacreonte según el griego original más corregido con declaración de lugares dificultosos." (*Anacreón* [1981] 255).

These significant differences in description complicate the issue; in presenting the

work as both a *paráfrasi* and a *traducción*, Quevedo implies that the two terms are in some way different from one another and that one or both have to do intimately with the “original” Greek. For all the valuable work recent scholars have done in re-centering Quevedo’s own terminology for his project, this ambiguity in the two given titles is one that previous scholarship has *not* addressed, and which, I argue, is of the utmost importance to understanding how Quevedo wishes his reader to understand his project.

In particular, Quevedo’s emphasis on the “original” aspect of the Greek is notable here. With this phrase, Quevedo highlights his own direct, unmediated interactions with Greek—not only his close interpretive work with the language as its translator, but also his correction of Greek text when it has been corrupted by transmission. These are both claims that suggest a particularly outstanding mastery of the Greek language on Quevedo’s part, one that likely does not reflect his true level of proficiency, whatever it may have been. The phrase “según el griego original más corregido” thus problematizes the views of scholars who wish to dismiss the question of “did Quevedo know Greek?” as being entirely irrelevant or even presentist: with the phrase Quevedo himself seems to be placing the issue of his Greek expertise front and center.

While it is clear that to Quevedo himself the question of his own Greek expertise is central to the *Anacreón*, for modern critics of the text, the unanswerable questions “did Quevedo know Greek?” and the better-phrased “how much Greek did Quevedo know?” do not get us to the heart of the matter. A more apt question for

interpreting the curious text that is the *Anacreón* will be “how does Quevedo *present* himself as knowing Greek?”

In considering this question, Quevedo’s own words in his *Libro de todas cosas* are instructive: “Griego o hebreo, como todos lo saben, lo saben sobre su palabra, por sólo que ellos dicen que le saben, dilo tú y sucederá lo mismo” (qtd. in Moya del Baño, “Don Francisco” 209). That is to say, according to Quevedo, since we cannot know whether someone truly knows Greek, we must take their word for it. If by simply saying one knows Greek it seems true, then, knowing Greek becomes an act of performance; to truly know Greek is effectively to show that you know Greek.

As the following analysis of the *Anacreón castellano* will show, the text gives Quevedo the opportunity to perform this knowledge of Greek, regardless of his true proficiency level. He employs a variety of strategies to convincingly perform “philology.” In doing so he does not merely perform his knowledge of the classical world, but, more significantly, his total dominion over the Greek language and the Greek text, that is to say, not only his ability to *read* Greek, but also, significantly, to edit Greek. In this performance of philology, Quevedo seeks to place himself in a dialogue with the great international philologists of his day, who are cited almost constantly in his commentary. Moya, signaling the author’s desire to be at the level of the philologists admired in his text—Stephanus, Lipsius, Hensius—, dubs Quevedo a “filo-filólogo” (186). With few expert Hellenists around by the early sixteenth century to evaluate his text, Quevedo, philo-philologist, is able to construct a Hellenist persona that allows him to become the real thing: all he has to do is convincingly perform philology and “sucederá lo mismo” for him.

### A Reading of the Paratexts

From the first page to the last, Quevedo self-consciously presents his Anacreon text in ways that present him as a competent and credible Hellenist. This is particularly evident in the preliminary paratexts. It is clear that Quevedo has selected and arranged these to highlight specific aspects of his Anacreon project. Taken together, these paratexts create a portrait of Quevedo as a Hellenist of the same mettle as the international philologists whom he cites throughout the text. As the following close “reading” of the paratextual apparatus demonstrates, this self-portrait carefully walks a line of distancing Quevedo from the ode’s pagan, homoerotic content<sup>68</sup> while simultaneously centering Quevedo’s interaction with and evaluation of the Greek text. In this way, Quevedo presents himself as not just a translator, but more importantly, as master of the Greek language.

The frontispiece itself is a powerful toll in this process, shaping the reader’s first impressions of the text and its author. In the center of the frontispiece the reader encounters the prominently placed Latin motto “nihil ad me.” The phrase is a colloquial Latin expression found in Cicero, and also, notably, in the comic playwrights Terrence and Plautus, particularly popular in the sixteenth and seventeenth century in Spain and influential in the development of Golden Age theater.<sup>69</sup> This prepositional phrase, an ellipsis of the original “nihil ad me attinet,”

---

<sup>68</sup> Interestingly, although Quevedo throughout his biography of Anacreon works to rebut ancient allegations of Anacreon’s homosexuality, as Schwartz notes, he does not exclude the odes that make references to Anacreon’s male lover, Battylus, as fellow Spaniard Esteban de Villegas would go on to do a few years later in his *Eroticas*, a 1618 compendium of the poetry of containing a translation of the Anacreontic material (“El Anacreón” 1175).

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Mostell.* 941, Terence. *And.* 187, Cicero, *De Or.* 2.139.3.

phrase may be roughly translated as “it is of no concern to me,” and this phrase is placed prominently in the middle of the page in a provocative visual manner:<sup>70</sup>

Ad  
Nihil                      Me  
  
(*Anacreón* [circa 1609] fol.1r)

On initial reading, this phrase might evoke the tenets of the Neo-Stoicism of which Quevedo was one of the most famous proponents, the idea that the material world was of no concern to the author. The adaptation of this emblem in the *princeps* suggests an intriguing possibility for the interpretation of this phrase by readers familiar with Quevedo’s literary legacy as a Neo-Stoic, at least those in the eighteenth century. In the printed frontispiece, in the center of the motto appears the image of a transparent globe with the equator indicated and a cross at the top, the traditional iconography representing the secular world. Here, the printer and/or his emblem designer seems to have read the image and motto together as “the world is of no concern to me,” specifically the material world.

However, this phrase, placed so prominently under the work’s title, might also serve to distance the author from the very text itself. This may be an implicit example of one of the various buffers Quevedo places between himself and the dangerous content of the poems. Nevertheless, the phrase remains ambiguous and potentially multivalent, as is the Latin couplet that follows it, a translation of a fragment of the Greek Middle-Comic poet Amphis: “inest igitur, ut apparet in vino quo[que] ratio: Nonnulli vero, qui bibunt aquam, stupidi sunt.”

---

<sup>70</sup> Blecua does not indicate this arrangement in his edition.

The prominently placed “Amphydis,” centered above the quote and in a slightly larger size than the quote itself, is a Latin genitive indicating the author of the quote, the Middle-Comedy-era Athenian playwright Amphis (fourth century BCE). This prominent position and sizing draws attention to the name of this now-obscure poet, who texts only survives in forty-nine fragments.<sup>71</sup>

Quevedo’s choice of this particular poet and quote to represent his work on the title page, then, is one that suggests his vast knowledge of even the minutiae of the Greek canon. This fact, in and of itself, makes the couplet interesting, for interpreting the title page—and the text it foregrounds— even though its presence here so far has remained uncommented on by scholars. One particularly salient feature of Quevedo’s prominent presentation of the poet’s name, at least in manuscript A, considered by Blecua to be the earliest and most important exemplar, is its spelling. Properly, the name should appear in Latin as *Amphidis* in the genitive form. However, here, the name has been written with a “y” as “Amphydis.” This particular spelling has important implications, particularly for a reader who might not recognize the name of this obscure playwright: the use of this superfluous “y,” or “i griega” in Spanish, is a significant visual marker of the name’s “Greekness.”<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> This fragment, number 41, is preserved in Athenaeus of Naucratis’s late second-century CE *Deipnosophistae*. The original Greek reads: “ἐνῆν ἄρ’, ὡς ἔοικε, κάν οἴνω λόγος/ἔνιοι δ’ ὕδωρ πίνοντές εἰς’ ἀβέλτεροι” (Ath.2.44.a). See Edmunds 330 for more context.

<sup>72</sup> Determining more information about how this “y” entered the text is, for the moment, complicated by the fact that Blecua does not note that this “y” has been corrected to “I” in the princeps edition (*Anacreón* [1794] fol.1r), although it does appear in manuscript A, the reading Blecua retains in his text. As such, this textual feature does not appear as a variant he records for the other witnesses in the tradition as represented in his apparatus criticus. It is, therefore, currently unclear to whether the “y” appears in the other seventeenth-century manuscripts or whether it is a correction by the later eighteenth-century printer.

Even if this unique spelling happens to be an error on the scribe's part, following the principle of *lectio difficilior*, the addition of the "y" either indicates the original spelling of Quevedo or that the scribe, sensing the "Greekness" of the author and the quote, inadvertently supplied a transliterated Greek character, a fact that in and of itself suggests that Quevedo has effectively convinced the scribe of the overriding Greek character of his work.

In terms of its content, the couplet itself ("inest igitur, ut apparet in vino quo[que] ratio: Nonnulli vero, qui bibunt aquam, stupidi sunt") anticipates the reader's potential concerns about the sensitive nature of the pagan poems: they will be like wine, delightful and potentially slightly dangerous, but with something of value to those seeking knowledge; it seems to admonish those who would eschew the metaphorical wine of poetry in favor of less dangerous water, who run the risk in doing so of remaining fools.

This couplet presages, then, the following section, ominously entitled "Advertencia" (*Anacreón* [1981] 247), in which Quevedo seeks to shield himself from any backlash brought about by the lasciviousness of the text. Here Quevedo presents himself as hesitant, even "temeroso," to bring the word to light, noting that "los escrupulos" take him to be a "deshonesto" who is "lascivo" for the content (*Anacreón* [1981] 247). He is careful to identify himself explicitly as a Christian and to admit that in transmitting this information, he is blameworthy. However, he presents a potentially bold defense based in a certain kind of cultural and religious relativism that, "en él no hay pecado, pues ... escribio en tiempo en que religion no solo trata de embriagueces, sino sanctificar con ellas sus ídolos" (*Anacreón* [1981]

247). Despite the impiety of Anacreon's themes under the Christian worldview, the poet's subjects were not illicit under the religious system, and furthermore, reflect the author's piety under the rules of that system. These are not idle comments, as Gil Fernández notes of the *Anacreón castellano*, there was a very real danger of censorship for Quevedo in translating certain of Anacreon's odes with homoerotic content due to the Santo Oficio taking very seriously this "vicio nefando" (*Panorama* 493).

Quevedo's main defense for translating Anacreon's text, however, is a linguistic one, and centers on his wish to transmit the qualities of the Greek language rather than culture. As he states, his goal is to "comunicar a España la dulzura y elegancias griegas, y no las costumbres;" the content should affect the "crédito" of the author's merits for his "estilo ilustre" (*Anacreón* [1981] 247). Style rather than content is the reason the reader should proceed and why they should forgive Anacreon for questionable material and, more importantly, Quevedo. In this initial statement, Quevedo makes it clear to the reader that the Greek language itself, and the benefits of transmitting its style and elegance to Castilian, is at the center of his mission.

The importance of the Greek language, and Anacreon as its representative, to Quevedo's project is further emphasized throughout the dedication to the Duke of Osuna (*Anacreón* [1981] 255), which appears immediately after the life of Anacreon (*Anacreón* [1981] 249–54) that follows the "Advertencia." In addition to emphasizing the quality of Anacreon's poetry, Quevedo, refers to his "gala" and "excelencia" in the first sentence (*Anacreón* [1981] 255). Quevedo mentions the

ancient poet's reputation outside of Spain, noting that he is "famoso en todas lenguas," although so far "no visto en la nuestra" (*Anacreón* [1981] 255). Quevedo next describes in more detail the singularity of his own text and indicates the noteworthy aspects of how it has been produced. To begin, his work stands for being the first rendering of Anacreon into Castilian, a fact conveyed in his statement that the work is "no visto en la nuestra."

Of equal importance, however, is the fact that, out of all other versions of the Anacreon's works so far produced, Quevedo's text will have the most scholarly of scholarly apparatus, one with "más copiosos comentarios que hasta ahora ha tenido" and one whose "original" Greek is "más corregido" (*Anacreón* [1981] 255). Additionally, it will have "muchos lugares declarados," many difficult passages in the original clarified, and, most significantly, these passages will be ones that have not been addressed in past editions, that are "no advertidos jamas." In this way, Quevedo shows that he is doing the work not merely of a translator, but also of textual commentator and critic, and moreover, one who's work surpasses those of previous commentators and critics in terms of quantity, quality, and precedentedness.

In describing his Anacreon project to his dedicatee, then, Quevedo is careful to contextualize it within with the body of international Anacreon scholarship. In doing so, he lays the groundwork for a dialogue between himself and the international Hellenist milieu, a dialogue that plays out throughout his Anacreon text.

However, in contrast, the materials that immediately follow the dedication emphasize the importance of Quevedo's project within the context of Spanish humanism. Here the reader encounters a series of three Latin epigrams written by contemporaries of Quevedo's, fellow courtiers and humanists Luis Tribaldos de Toledo (1558–1636), Jerónimo Ramírez (fl.1570s–?), and Vicente Espinel (1550–1624).<sup>73</sup> The inclusion of this type of Latin poetic material is, according to Gideon Nisbet, one of the defining features of the humanist book, a feature that became more conventionalized among humanists as printing made especially significant and as authors now had relatively more control over how books were presented and prefaced than they had previously (384). Nisbet argues that such Latin played an important role in “massaging” readers’ expectations of the text that would follow, serving to “hype” the book at hand and its author from the outset (384–5).<sup>74</sup> In the

---

<sup>73</sup> Of these figures, Espinel is the best known, being the dedicatee of Lope's *El caballero de Illescas* (1602) and famous for his picaresque novel *Relaciones de la vida del escudero Marcos de Obregón* (1618). Tribaldos de Toledo, who appears in Lope's *Laurel de Apolo* (1630), held a cátedra in rhetoric at Alcalá and is known for being the first translator of Pompoius Mela's *De situ orbis* into Spanish. Biographical data is scarce for Ramírez, although he is mentioned in Nicolàs Antonio's *Bibliotheca Hispana nova* (1672). He is known to have at least been alive for the arrival of Ana of Austria at court in 1570, as his most famous work is *epithalamium* dedicated to the princess. See Serran Cueto (“El “Epithalamium””) for a discussion of the facts we do have for Ramírez, mostly constructed from attestations of his works.

<sup>74</sup> In the prologue to *Don Quijote Parte I*, Cervantes satirizes the practice of including such poems in the preliminary materials of books, and his insights on the perceived gravitas and authority these were intended to convey are revealing. In discussing his own predicament in writing the prologue itself, Cervantes refers to the inclusion of such poems as “la innumerabilidad y catálogo de los acostumbrados sonetos, epigramas y elogios que al principio de los libros suelen ponerse” (*Don Quijote I* 51) and laments that his more humble friends who could write him such poems will not create the desired effect of this practice because they are not “duques, marqueses, condes, obispos, damas o poetas celebérrimos” (*Don Quijote I* 54). The unnamed friend to whom he turns to advice in writing the prologue, suggests the following: “Lo primero en que reparáis de los sonetos, epigramas o elogios que os faltan para el principio, y que sean de personajes graves y de título, se puede remediar en que vos mesmo toméis algún trabajo en hacerlos, y después los podéis bautizar y poner el nombre que quisiéredes<sup>48</sup>, ahijándolos al Preste Juan de las Indias o al Emperador de Trapisonda, de quien yo sé que hay noticia que fueron famosos poetas; y cuando no lo hayan sido y hubiere algunos pedantes y bachilleres que por detrás os muerdan y murmuren desta verdad, no se os dé dos

case of the *Anacreón*, these three contributors, more established courtly and literary figures, serve to authorize the work, establishing the up-and-coming Quevedo's credentials as both poet, translator, and, more specifically, as Hellenist.

Of the three, Tribaldo's poem is a thirty-two-line apologia for Anacreon (*Anacreón* [1981] 256), whereas Ramírez's slightly shorter, twenty-one-line poem further defends Anacreon and praises Quevedo as poet (*Anacreón* [1981] 257). Notably, Ramírez engages in his own display of Hellenism, punctuating the end of his poem ostentatiously—and somewhat redundantly—with the Greek word *τέλος*.

Espinel's elegant, elaborately structured contribution, however, shows the most mastery of classicizing Latin and style, and, most importantly for our present purposes, praises Quevedo most specifically as Hellenist. In Espinel's poem, the translator and the translated merge into one another, as Quevedo becomes the Iberian Anacreon. As Espinel states, "Qui legit Hispanum, Anacreonta legit ... Noster Iberus Graecus; Graecus et alter Iber" (*Anacreón* [1981] 258). The overall effect of the introductory poems, then, particularly Espinel's, is to present corroborating evidence from Quevedo's peers of his excellence as a Hellenist, in addition, of course, to giving these poets the opportunity to show off their own skills at composing Latin epigrams.

Taken together, the paratexts up to this point in the preliminary materials of the *Anacreón* do indeed present the portrait of Quevedo as a classicist engaging in important humanist dialogues both at home and abroad as articulated by Schwartz

---

maravedís, porque, ya que os averigüen la mentira, no os han de cortar la mano con que lo escribistes" (*Don Quijote* I 54).

and Jauralde Pou (cited above). However, more specifically, in presenting this portrait, these paratexts highlight Quevedo as Hellenist, emphasizing the various ways his mastery of the Greek language has impacted the *Anacreón* project. All of these strategies are united, moreover, in the final paratextual element of the in the preliminary matter, the reiteration of the work's title that appears in the manuscript as a heading above Ode I. Whereas on the frontispiece of the work the title had been given as "Anacreón castellano con paráfrasi y comentarios" (*Anacreón* [1981] 247), here it appears as "Paráfrasi y Traducción de Anacreonte según el original griego más corregido con declaración de lugares dificultosos" (*Anacreón* [1981] 255). As discussed above, the ambiguity of these two titles has complicated scholarly discussion of the *Anacreón*, as in many cases, scholars such as Schwartz and Izquierdo, who focus on evaluating the "parafrási" nature of the text, have not considered the implications of "traducción" and "según el original griego" in the secondary title for interpreting the work.

However, it is not just modern scholars who have found the presence of these two titles challenging, as is reflected in the presentation of the title in Manuscript T and in the *princeps*. The eighteenth-century copyist of T, seemingly bothered by the redundancy of the two titles, opted to create a more streamlined version based on the second. As Blecua's edition notes, on the title page, this copyist designates the work as the "Anacreonte traducido y paraphraseado con breves comentarios, ya emendado, ya declarado el original griego" (*Anacreón* [1981] 247); having made this change, the copyist chooses not to repeat this or any other iteration of the title before Ode I (*Anacreón* [1981] 255). On the other hand, the work's first publisher in

1794 took a different approach, instead highlighting the distinctiveness of the secondary title. He places the secondary title on its own page, giving it the text the same size and formatting of the first title on the original title page. In this way, the eighteenth-century editor effectively creates a second frontispiece for the work.

It is clear, then, that the text's curious secondary title has played a significant role in shaping reader's interactions with it. For the present study, it therefore serves as an especially valuable interpretive tool for exploring Quevedo's project. Significantly, with this second title, Quevedo reiterates the central activities of his *Anacreón* project as they have been outlined in the previous materials. He effectively restates the three goals that he has discussed in various places in the earlier paratexts, and in recapitulating these here, he primes the reader to interpret the upcoming translation and commentary with them in mind. According to the title, in this text, Quevedo will achieve the following: first, he will provide a translation for which the author has used the original Greek, working "según el original griego"; second, Quevedo will show that he has emended the original Greek text, that it has been "corregido"; and finally, he will provide "declaración de lugares dificultosos," elucidations of difficult Greek passages.

This secondary title, then, like the paratextual materials preceding it, emphasizes Quevedo's expertise in working closely with Greek texts, suggesting, in turn, his mastery of the language. In the translations and commentary that follow, Quevedo will go on to demonstrate this expertise in a variety of prominent ways, working to confirm the image of himself as Hellenist he projected throughout the paratexts.

## The Commentary

Out of the fifty-five odes and the two fragments that Quevedo translates, twenty-two are accompanied by complex comments, which for simplicity, I will refer to as “notes.”<sup>75</sup> The longest of these notes follows Ode XVIII spans seven and a half manuscript folios (in Blecua’s 1981 edition, pages 291–3); the shortest of these, for Ode VII, is one manuscript folio (in Blecua, page 278). The majority, however, average from two and a half to five and a half manuscript folios.

The content of the notes can roughly be divided into three categories, and each of the three makes its own unique contribution to the overall portrait of Quevedo as a classical—and specifically Hellenist—authority on par with international philologists. The first category demonstrates the important philological activity of supplying of comparanda from throughout the classical canon that reflect similar ideas, themes, images, poetic devices, etc. For instance, in Ode I, in which the pseudo-Anacreon explains that his lyre will not allow him to sing about heroic topics, Quevedo begins by citing Stephanus’s list of various relevant passages from Ovid that use the topos of the reluctant lyre. Quevedo then goes on to expand this list with his own selection of relevant citations for this topos, a discussion which spans five manuscript folios (pages 265–7 in Blecua’s 1981 edition) and includes lengthy passages from Martial, Aristotle, Propertius, Statius, and Vergil. In similar notes, Quevedo puts on display his vast knowledge of even the most obscure entries in the classical canon in addition to various minutae of the ancient world, from his

---

<sup>75</sup> The odes which includes these notes are as follows: I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, X, XIII, XVIII, XIX, XXIII, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXII, XXXVI, XLI, XLIII, XLVI, LII, LV.

calculation on the quantity of wine the Greeks were accustomed to drinking as reported by the obscure Camaeleon Heracleota's *De ebrietate* (Ode XVIII, *Anacreón* [1981] 290),<sup>76</sup> to speculation about the association of the myrtle tree with lovers as described in Theophrastus (Ode IV, *Anacreón* [1981] 271–3).

The second category of note is one to which Quevedo himself refers in the secondary title of the work, that is, the “declaración de lugares dificultosos,” passages where effectively rendering the Greek into another language might prove challenging. In Ode XXIX, Quevedo reiterates this language of “declaración,” and indicates that this process is intimately tied to correctly interpreting the range of Greek's rich, idiosyncratic lexicon. Here he explains that in this ode, it has been “dificultoso declarar aquellos versos” in which the Anacreontic poet states that his lover Battylus's eyebrows are “κυανῶτερος,” literally bluer, than a serpent's” (*Anacreón* [1981] 306). Here we see just what Quevedo means by “declaración de lugares difíciles”: in justifying his translation of *κυανῶτερος* as “blacker,” Quevedo provides a labyrinthine explanation that incorporates, among other sources, a scholiast of Nicander who interprets the adjective similarly when used for serpents because “tienen los dragones grandes cejas ... bien que elegantes, por negras, pobladas y largas” (*Anacreón* [1981] 307).

It is in this “declaración” type of note that we begin to see how Quevedo places himself in dialogue with previous Anacreontic-corpus authorities, and in doing so, establishes his *own* authority over the Greek text. In elucidating such

---

<sup>76</sup> This text exists in fragmentary form in book X chapter 8 of the Athenaeus of Naucratis's late second-century CE *Deipnosophistae*.

passages, Quevedo references the commentaries and translations of previous translators such as Stephanus, Elia André and Remi Belleau, weighing the merits of their various arguments and indicating his own choices.

In Ode II, for example, he demonstrates his process of selecting the best term to capture the Greek word *φρόνημα*. First, he addressed Stephanus's translation of the word as "prudencia" (Quevedo's Castilian translation of Stephanus's original Latin). Here Quevedo evaluates and ultimately rejects Stephanus translation, based his reading of the same work in Phocylides. Quevedo disputes this, arguing that "[no] arguyó bien (con perdón de su buena memoria) el cuidadoso Hernico Estefano bien decir que ... sea prudencia," because this would go against the correct philosophical use of the term, "la verdadera filosofía," as seen in the Phocylides (*Anacreón* [1981] 265). Quevedo goes on to express that he is in agreement with André André, who captures the sense of *φρόνημα* with the two words rather than one, "esfuerzo" and "osadía," (Quevedo's translations of André's Latin). Quevedo goes on to provide an extensive justification through six manuscript folio pages, or pages 265–8 in Blecua's edition for André's argument and to further Stephanus's evidence using citations about strength, force, and reason found in Aristotle and Cicero. In such notes, then, we see Quevedo asserting his own knowledge of the Greek language while simultaneously bringing to bear evidence from a variety of classical sources to affirm that his renderings of Greek into Castilian are credible.

Finally, in the third category of note, we see Quevedo engaging in the process he suggested by his secondary title as "el original griego ... corregido." In such notes, Quevedo weighs in on issues of textual emendation. Ode IX provides a particularly

illustrative example. In this note, Quevedo begins by providing direct quotations from Stephanus's commentary on the poem, in which the latter explains three emendations he has made to the text to correct problematic passages: (1) He changes an otherwise confusing "τίς to "τί" based on a similarly worded passage in Theocritus in which the latter is used, (2) he deletes the final "ν" from the word "δένδρεσιν," where its presence impedes the meter, based on his recapitulation of the pertinent phonological rule about "ν" in word-final position that he has read in "cierto gramático," and (3), favors the phrase "καὶ δεσπότην ἔμοῃσι" over the text's original "καὶ δεσπότην Ανακρέοντα" because he argues that it is the emendation of a previous scholiast, and, in true humanist form, wishes to eliminate faulty readings and return the text to its pristine classical form (*Anacreón* [1981] 280–81).

With these three emendations, we see Stephanus displaying three different types of knowledge pertinent to the process of editing Greek: his knowledge of a variety of Greek texts to use as linguistic comparanda, his knowledge of grammarians and Greek grammar itself, and his knowledge of previous critics' readings. By bringing these types of knowledge to bear in his emendations, Stephanus demonstrate his mastery of the Greek language and concomitant authority as a textual critic.

Next, having cited Stephanus, Quevedo weighs on the validity of his first emendation, the change of *τίς* to *τί*. Quevedo opts for the original reading of the manuscript, arguing that *τίς* can be made to make sense in this case without altering the text. While he recognizes the merit of Stephanus's arguments, admitting that it "parece más corriente lección," he maintains that his arguments

for interpreting the meaning of the original reading “no es mala decir,” and that he prefers to “defender” the text as it is (*Anacreón* [1981] 281). Although he does not state this explicitly, Quevedo is arguing according to the principle of humanist textual criticism that favors original reading, or *lectio recepta*, in all but the most necessary of cases, in which stands in contrast to the type of *emendatio ope ingenii* according to the conjecture of the emendator. By providing his own reading and defending the text, he shows that he is able to compete in the ring of Greek textual criticism. However, by directly quoting Stephanus’s articulation of his own position and subsequently rejecting it, Quevedo places himself on the same authoritative philological footing as Stephanus.

However, regarding the two emendations of Stephanus’s that Quevedo quotes, it is notable that the latter does not, in fact, go on to contest them. Rather, Quevedo explicitly states that he does not find fault with them, saying simply that “[l]as demás notas son necesarias, y traduje por ellas.” Thus, of the three emendations directly quoted in Quevedo’s note, he only addresses one of them.

We might wonder, then, why Quevedo has fully quoted the other two. Since he agrees with them and follows them in his translation, they do not add any additional information to his own interpretation. It might make sense if, throughout his commentary, he had indicated each of the extensive list of emendations that Stephanus had provided in his own. However, this is not the case. Although, as mentioned above, Quevedo follows Stephanus’s ordering of the odes, and although he is clearly working closely with his commentary throughout his own work, he does not provide this extensive of information for each ode. In fact, of the eleven notes that

refer to Stephanus's notes, only seven, Odes I, II, III, IV, V, IX, and XXIII, reproduce Stephanus's quotations in lengthy, direct citations.

It is interesting, here, in this instance where Quevedo is addressing specifically the issue of textual emendation, that he includes what we might call "superfluous" emendations directly quoted from Stephanus. As mentioned, the three specific Stephanus quotes Quevedo provides create something of a mini-portrait of the range of expertise brought to bear by a textual critic like Stephanus. By including these citations, rejecting one, and deeming the other two acceptable, Quevedo by extension presents a parallel image of himself engaged in the same three processes. In truth, Quevedo is not a skilled textual critic and his rejection of Stephanus is a somewhat simplistic one. Moreover, as Moya del Baño has indicated, this is the location in the text where Quevedo most explicitly and ostentatiously weighs in on an issue of emendation (Filo-filólogo 193). With this "over-inclusion" of Stephanus's own emendations, then Quevedo takes the opportunity to suggest to the reader that, even though the work he has done in "corregiendo" the text "según el original griego" may not always be visible in the commentary, he is nevertheless conducting a constant evaluation of Stephanus's edition of the text.

This reading is further supported by Quevedo's comments in Ode III (*Anacreón* [1981] 268–70), where he presents a short note explaining a disagreement he has over Stephanus's Latin translation of a term. After explaining this, he goes on to address the issue of textual emendation, stating: "No pongo las demas notas de Henrico porque como yo he seguido en mi version sus enmiendas, y he leído con él lo griego, es poco importante" (*Anacreón* [1981] 270). As Quevedo

declines to quote Stephanus in the majority of the notes, and even in the case of the notes where he appears, he is not quoted in full, this should go without saying.

However, by including this, Quevedo is able to show by the work of implication that throughout the work he is continually evaluating the Greek text even when we don't see the direct results. In this way, he is able to confirm the claims made both in the dedication and in the secondary title that he is adding "más corregido" than earlier versions.

So far in this material regarding the general content of the commentary, we have gotten a general sense of the importance of philologists such as Stephanus for Quevedo's project, but the issue is, in fact, so central that it deserves more sustained attention. Throughout the text, Quevedo mentions no fewer than ten international philologists representing a wide array of the previous generation, particularly from the French tradition, Estienne, Elie André, Marc Antoine Muret (1526–1585), and also those who are his contemporaries, such as the German Protestant philologist Eilhard Lubinus (1565–1621) and the Dutch Daniel Heinsius (1580–1655). There are also fellow Spaniards such as Luis Tribaldo de Toledo (1558–1636), whose name we recognize from the preliminary *elogios* and, despite the support for Quevedo he shows in contributing to the present work, is nevertheless referred to in the commentary as being "modestamente docto" (*Anacreón* [1981] 304).<sup>77</sup> Francisco de Rioja (1583–1659) also appears, although he is referred to, in contrast to Tribaldo de Toldedo, as an "hombre en España de singular juicio" (*Anacreón* [1981] 274).

---

<sup>77</sup> Perhaps this damning with faint praise comes from the fact that, of the three epigrams included at the beginning of the work, only Tribaldo de Toledo's fails to offer any praise of Quevedo (*Anacreón* [1981] 256).

Of particular note are his frequent mentions of Scaliger, whom he rebukes in his *España defendida* (also of 1609). In various places in the *Anacreón*, he agrees with Scaliger, for instance, in the notes for Ode V, Quevedo is willing to side with Scaliger's opinions in "defensa de Homero contras las calumnias" (*Anacreón* [1981] 275). However, Quevedo reflects his characteristic scorn for the Scaliger in disagreeing with the philologist over a reading of Catullus VII, given as a comparandum for Ode XXXII, in which Quevedo rails against Scaliger's "acostumbrada hipocresía" (*Anacreón* [1981] 268).

The effect of these mentions creates in the text something a chorus of humanistic, philological voices. While Balcells has argued that the overall effect of this for the reader is to weaken their trust in Quevedo, showing that he is relying on these other scholars because his inferior Greek skills aren't up to the text at hand (39), Schwartz approaches it differently. For her, these many references are not an "índice de incompetencia lingüística," but rather an "alarde de rigor filológico," one which places Quevedo's "descubrimientos" in the areas of "morfología, sintaxis y antigüedades grecolatinas" ("El *Anacreón*" 1174) in dialogue with this most salient philological figures of the day. While the present analysis of the commentary has problematized the first two of these textual "descubrimientos" on Quevedo's part in the commentary, the third is certainly demonstrably true.

Out of this philological chorus of experts and within the international humanist on display in Quevedo's commentary, one voice in particular is the most prominent and most instrumental in Quevedo's project of crafting his Hellenist persona: Stephanus, the discoverer of the Anacreontic corpus and its first editor,

already explored in a preliminary way above. As mentioned, in addition to the note on Ode IX discussed above, Stephanus is referenced in another ten of Quevedo's twenty-two notes. Moreover, for seven of these eleven references, Odes I, II, III, IV, V, IX, and XXIII, Stephanus's own comments are reproduced in lengthy, direct citations.

The Stephanus quotations are important not only because their content allows Quevedo to place himself in dialogue with his predecessor, but also because of their impact on the visual structuring of the commentary itself. In each of these seven notes with direct citations of Stephanus's commentary, the Stephanus's quoted passage is separated from the rest of the text on the page and introduced with the visually distinct heading "Henrico Stephanus" prominently centered over it. On the other hand, throughout the text, Quevedo's notes are presented in a parallel format; each note is introduced with an identically placed heading of "D. Francisco Gómez de Quevedo." For these seven Odes then, the formatting of the text effectively creates two distinct notes, one for Stephanus, one for Quevedo. With their parallel formatting and alternating arrangement, then, these notes effectively set up a dialogue between the two commentators.

Moreover, for these seven pairs of notes, the Stephanus material precedes that of Quevedo. The latter thus appears to be updating the work of the famous philologist, whether he is amplifying Stephanus's previous work with additional comparanda, disagreeing with his interpretation of words/translations, or disputing his emendations of the Greek text. This visual presentation again reinforces the relationship between the Quevedo and his predecessor: Stephanus is the first and most authoritative critic of the text, a fact demonstrated in the formatting by his

coming first; Quevedo, who is updating his work, comes second, reiterating the fact that he is amplifying or even correcting the work of his predecessor, placing himself in a position of authority over this authorizing figure himself.

As this close reading has shown, throughout the *Anacreón*, this unique work's various elements work together to form an overall portrait of Quevedo as a classicist, and more specifically, as a Hellenist. Even at the level of the text's orthography and formatting, we find features that reinforce this image of the author. Moreover, his oft-commented references to a wide range of humanist experts contribute to this portrait. By indicating his own methods for using the Greek text—both implicitly and explicitly—he situates his own knowledge of the language within the international Hellenist textual and translational practices.

#### 1609: The Ascent of Quevedo Philologus

After this in-depth look at the ways in which Quevedo, “philo-philologist,” works to create a philological persona in the *Anacreón castellano*, the reader may wonder, did it work? Was Quevedo able to convince his reader of his status as a Hellenist and philologist? What kinds of clues do the historical context give us about the reception of the text? Moreover, can we determine anything from this historical context about why Quevedo may have been so interested in presenting himself this way? In other words, are we able to determine anything about what it meant for Quevedo, in the early sixteenth-century, to present himself as an expert Greek philologist? An examination of Quevedo's literary activity—and its intersections

with his life outside of his literary aspirations—gives us considerable insight into these questions.

In the first decade of the seventeenth century, Quevedo's star was still rising in the literary scene of Philip III's Madrid court, newly relocated from Valladolid the previous year. A significant number of his poems had been published in Espinosa's 1605 *Flores de Poetas Ilustres*, and his *Buscón* and the first of his *Sueños* were earning him a reputation in literary circles. Nevertheless, in the estimation of Jauralde Pou, Quevedo's next work, *Discursos de las privanzas* (1608), his first foray into the more serious genre of political treatise, was to be an unoriginal and lackluster effort compared to the more mature Quevedo's famous *Política de Dios y gobierno de Cristo* (1626), thus it failed to make an impression in the court of Philip III (178).

In the following year, however, Quevedo changed the trajectory of his literary output, rebranding himself as a Hellenist in accordance with what Jauralde Pou calls his newfound "vocación filológica" (163). The year 1609 would see Quevedo produce three works, each spotlighting his purported mastery of the Greek language in the guise of both translator and philologist: *Anacreón castellano*, *Phocílides*, and *España defendida*. The first two, signed the same day, April 1, 1609, and addressed to the same dedicatee, Don Pedro Girón, the Duke of Osuna, are translations of Greek texts spuriously attributed in Quevedo's day to classical authors known now to date to the Hellenistic and Roman eras respectively; the third, dedicated on September 20, 1609 to Philip III himself, is a passionate *laus Hispaniae* which relies heavily on etymological and linguistic analysis of classical sources to defend the Spanish nation

against foreign detractors. The texts are interestingly intertwined and thus advertise each other. In the *Anacreón*, Quevedo refers to translation of *Phocílides* (*Anacreón* [1981] 265) in refuting a reading of the text that Stephanus bases on the latter, and in the *España defendida* he mentions the *Anacreon* and the *Phocílides*, saying of his work that “osadía parece, o es temeridad, nombro a Anacreón mejorado en castellano por mi, y a Focílides en la parte griega” (*España defendida* 45). In addition, then, to their appearance within a brief six-month period, the three works seem to form a self-referential, interrelated constellation of texts, in all of which, in some way, Quevedo foregrounds his mastery of Greek.

That the *Anacreón* and *Phocílides*, both renderings of classical Greek texts into Castilian, fall into a natural grouping seems self-evident; the *España defendida*, however, might seem conceptually to be an outlier in relationship to its 1609 siblings. Nevertheless, the political tract’s heavy emphasis on the analysis of classical sources as justifications for Quevedo’s arguments relates it closely to the other two. Throughout the text, the author continually presents himself as an authority on Greek source materials, demonstrating his mastery of Latin, and particularly Greek, in his frequent recourse to etymological analysis, a phenomenon which has been studied in detail by Valeria López Fadul. The importance of philology to the overall project of the *España defendida* is clear from the beginning of the text, which Quevedo begins with a rebuttal of the criticisms lobbed against Spanish humanists by internationally renowned philologist heavyweights like Joseph Scaliger.

On the other hand, despite the decidedly Hellenistic bent of all three texts, the differences between the three and their approach to the Greek language and Greek-language source materials is also notable. For one, it is important to note that the *Anacreón* and *Phocílides* are very different translational projects. The former, as we have seen, includes a detailed commentary and extensive preliminary materials including a lengthy life of Anacreon and epigrams by Quevedo's contemporaries; the latter is introduced with a simple dedication and short life of Phocylides and renders 219 Greek hexameters into a significantly longer, amplified Castilian version of 519 hendecasyllabic verses.<sup>78</sup> It is important to note that, whereas the prologue of the former places the value of the original Greek source as lying in the beauty of its poetic language, that of the latter focuses on the moral value of its source, as he states that in the text, despite its pagan author, "se hallarán reglas para vivir cristiana, natural y políticamente; cosa Digna de singular admiración" (Phocílides 559).

We have, then, a mini-corpus of three texts, each of which, although linked not only by their time of dedication but also by their shared emphasis on presenting Quevedo as a Hellenist, differs in how it depicts the author's role as interpreter of classical knowledge. In the *Phocílides*, the author focuses on the moral value of the original Greek content; in the *Anacreón*, on the poetic elegance of the original Greek,

---

<sup>78</sup>In comparison with the *Anacreón* and the *España defendida*, the *Phocílides* has received less scholarly attention. It has been examined by Castanien in a brief companion study and Carlos Alcalde Martín has traced some of the earlier versions of the text and life of Phocylides Quevedo may have consulted in creating the work. Explicitly noting that of the three it was the least treated, leaving aside in-depth discussion of the other two 1609 texts, Jauralde Pou contributes a significant analysis of the text as a means of developing Quevedo's philological profile (181–185).

and in the *España defendida*, on the power of Greek sources and knowledge of the Greek language to authorize historical and political arguments.

Moreover, as Jaraulde Pou argues, throughout these three texts, Quevedo seeks to place himself in dialogue with the great philologists of Europe, “interviniendo activamente en las polemicas ‘intelectuales’ y filologicas de momento” (179). Scwhartz argues a similar position, noting Quevedo’s particular emphasis in the *Anacreón* and *España defendida* and the international focus of these works: by “citando [obras], aprobando lecturas o criticando las decisiones editoriales o las anotaciones de otros filólogos,” Quevedo “pretende competir en el ámbito del humanism europeo.” Así lo vemos actuar en la *España defendida* o en las notas de su *Anacreón castellano*” (216).

However, it is important to note that each of these texts differs in terms of its circulation and transmission, and therefore each has a distinct effect on the development of Quevedo’s reputation. The *Anacreón* seems to have enjoyed a significant enough circulation in manuscript form at court to have attracted the attention of Góngora and to have been sufficiently well-known that Quevedo’s rival could reference it in lampooning its creator in his famous sonnet. Blecua has shown that the manuscript circulated well at the time, although the work would not appear in print until the late eighteenth century. The *Phocílides*, however, does not seem to have circulated as widely at the time of its original dedication, the work would gain fame later in Quevedo’s career when it was published in conjunction with his famous translation of Epictetus, an edition which served to cement the reputation of the later-career Quevedo as the preeminent neo-Stoic of his day. Finally, the *España*

*defendida* does not appear to have circulated at all and exists in a single, 192-folio, autograph manuscript currently housed in the Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid (MS 9/805).

We may argue, then, that, although all three texts taken in conjunction reflect the centrality of Hellenism to Quevedo's 1609 literary efforts, the *Anacreón* seems to have had the most impact in shaping contemporary perceptions of Quevedo as Hellenist in 1609. In addition to its key role in solidifying Quevedo's Hellenist reputation early in his career, it is also the most self-consciously philological. That is to say, of the three, it is not only the one that gives us the most insight into how Quevedo wanted to be perceived as a Hellenist, but it is also the one that seems to have most affected his reputation as a Hellenist.

The issue of establishing such a reputation becomes key in understanding some of the pressing questions about *why* and *when* this "philological moment" occurs in Quevedo's career, two questions that Jaraulde Pao, Gutierrez, and López Ruiz all argue are intimately linked to each other as well as to the complex literary milieu in which Quevedo lived. According to Gutierrez's Bourdieuan analysis of early seventeenth-century Spain, being successful within this context required distinguishing of oneself, a process central to the Bourdieuan structure of the era's "literary field," a unique state of affairs in which a symbiotic relationship between the cultural capital of literature and material capital in the form of either book sales or elite patronage coalesced (24ff). In this environment, writers competed to amass the cultural capital—the literary prestige—necessary to secure themselves professionally and financially. In order to achieve this, authors needed to distinguish

themselves from one another, a process which led to authors affecting certain literary “poses,” constructing literary identities in a competition for prestige. Gutierrez argues that it is crucial to interpret Quevedo’s literature in these terms, arguing that in the first three decades of the 1600s, his writings developed into an “instrumento de su ansiedad de influencia” and his “perfil público” became “indisociable de su actividad como escritor en las tres primeras décadas del 1600” (“Las preciosas” 165).

This is how Gutierrez reads the famous rivalry between Quevedo and Góngora. This affected rivalry, in which the arriviste young poet challenges his senior according to Gutierrez, reflects a strategy on the part of Quevedo to make a name for himself early in his career, to distinguish himself by striking a pose in opposition to the old guard. Both Jauralde Pou and Gutierrez argue that, this 1609 “philological moment” represents another instance of Quevedo working to distinguish himself in this sense, here affecting a humanist, philological pose, his “vocación filológica” serving as a tool to further establish himself within the patronage network, especially after, as Jauralde Pou notes, his earlier political treatise seems to have not gained him any recognition or support. He had already earned a reputation as a satirist, but needed something more, as the biographer puts it, “se necesitan textos hebreos y griegos de los que partir: era lo más prestigioso”, even though “no domina bien estos ... instrumentos,” i.e., Hebrew and Greek themselves (179). Having been less successful than he hoped in his most recent guise as political theorist, Quevedo turned to the enterprise of philology. According to Gutierrez’s interpretation, this philological turn represents an attempt to access a

new kind of “capital simbólico,” an intellectual one that would earn him the legitimation of higher and more exclusive circles than his satirical-burlesque works, his “carta de presentación más efectiva hasta entonces,” had so far done (184).

In his reading of what we might call this philological turn, López Ruiz confirms the success of this endeavor in the material terms described by Gutierrez and Jauralde Pou. López Ruiz argues that we can see clear signs of Quevedo’s very specific efforts to secure patronage with this assortment of classically-oriented texts. Early in the first decade of the seventeenth century, he had benefitted from the support of the Duke of Osuna, after the Duke’s six year stay in the Low Countries. Yet, upon his 1608 return to court, it was difficult for Quevedo to gain access to this powerful patron. López Ruiz interprets the creation of the *Phocílides* and *Anacreón*, both dedicated to the Duke and dated only a few weeks apart, as efforts to “pronto recordar a don Pedro su existencia” (60). These texts then, which López Ruiz finds notable for not having previous Spanish editions and for being “más prestigiosos y exóticos” than other potential candidates, are attempts to get the attention of this friendly figure who was known for his interest in not only humanist letters, but specifically in classical ones (60). And indeed this gamble paid off: Quevedo would go on to gain the patronage of the Duke, accompanying him in to Naples later in the decade.

In terms of the less tangible—but intimately related—area of cultural capital, Quevedo’s strategy of performing philology also seems to have achieved the desired effect among his humanist literary peers as well. As Schwartz has noted,

with his various philological texts, and in particular with the *Anacreón*, Quevedo had effectively “forjado” the “fama de erudite entre los humanistas de su tiempo.” (214). However, whereas Schwartz argues that this reputation was intimately linked to his general expertise in all areas of classical philology, it is important to note that contemporary praise of Quevedo as a classicist tends to be much more specific than she recognizes. After this initial phase of his career, Quevedo would go on to be considered notable among Spanish poets for his mastery of both Latin and Greek.

His varied language skills, not the least of which his Greek skills, are repeatedly referenced in *elogios*, many of which are catalogued in Fernández Guerra de Orbe’s 1859 collection of Quevedo’s works in the *Biblioteca de autores españoles*<sup>79</sup>: in his 1616 *Defensa de Juan Mariana*, Tomás Tomayo de Vargas says of Quevedo that he was an expert in “omne genus Scriptorium Hebraeorum, Graecorum, Latinorum observationes” (qtd. in Camacho Rojo and García González 112”; Lope in a 1624 letter to Diego de Colmenares says of him that he is “tan adornado de letras griegas y latinas, sagradas y humanas , que para alabarle más, quisiera deberle menos” (qtd. in Fernández Guerra cxxii); in his 1628 *Defensa del Patronato de Santiago*, Juan Pablo Mártir Rizo praises his conocimiento de las lenguas italiana, francesa, latina, griega y hebrea” (qtd. in Fernández Guerra cxxiii). To what must have been Quevedo’s great pleasure, Lope notes in his 1628 *Laurel de Apolo* that Quevedo is the “Lipsio de España en prosa” (qtd. in Fernández Guerra cxxiii). This reputation would be sealed posthumously: Pablo de Tarsia in his 1663 biography of

---

<sup>79</sup> See Fernández Guerra de Orbe for a comprehensive list of seventeenth-century *elogios* of Quevedo cxxix–cxxxv.

Quevedo states, “estudió ademas de la latina, la lengua griega, la italiana, la hebrea, la francesa y la arabiga, con tanto primor que fue excelente en todas ellas y casi las hermano con la castellana” (qtd. in Cañigral “Un entusiasta” 19).

In performing the role of a great Hellenist then, just as Quevedo himself had said about acquiring Greek, that one needed only to say it for it to come to pass, the “philo-philologist,” succeeded in becoming the Spanish Justus Lipsius.

Among the various *elogios* of Quevedo that can be found in Fernández Guerra’s catalogue are a series of Latin epigrams by Vicente Mariner. Of all those who praise Quevedo for his knowledge of Greek—their praise likely rooted in the reputation he had garnered for himself with the *Anacreón castellano*—Mariner was in the unique position of being able to truly evaluate the quality of Quevedo’s Greek. Mariner is often considered the most prominent Hellenist of the day. A prolific translator of Greek texts, including Homer and Pindar, he is also one of a handful of Spanish Hellenists who appeared to produce Neo-Greek poetry (that at least is attested or that survives). He is the figure to whom Schwartz compares Quevedo, holding him as the standard for a “professional” level philologist, dedicated translator and teacher of Greek that we cannot have expected Quevedo to become (Schwartz 1178).

While various other sources on Quevedo cite his knowledge of Greek as particularly praiseworthy, Mariner, interestingly, is silent on the matter in these epigrams. Perhaps of even greater interest, these epigrams all come from the same source, a Greek translation, that of Julian’s *Εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Ἀλιὸν πρὸς Σαλύστιον*, in Latin the *In regem solem ad Salustium Panegyricus*, dedicated to Quevedo and in

which Quevedo himself provides a lengthy *elogio* to Mariner. This curious text, however, in addition to being dedicated to Quevedo, includes a variety of materials that seem to establish Quevedo's Hellenist credentials alongside Mariner's, most notably, letters sent to Quevedo by his philologist hero, Lipsius. An analysis of this text further develops the story of Quevedo's performing of knowledge of Greek. By placing his unique brand of "philo-philology" next to the more properly philological efforts of Mariner, we are able to deepen our understanding of what it meant to earn one's cultural capital through Greek in seventeenth-century Spain, whether by projecting the image of a philology or by actually engaging in the practice itself.

## **Part II: Quevedo and Mariner, Hellenist *Elogios* Refracted**

### Vicente Mariner and Julian's *In regem solem*

Vicente Mariner (?–1642) was born in Valencia, where he earned his *licenciatura* at the city's venerable university. At that institution Mariner had the good fortune of studying Greek under Pedro Juan Nuñez, one of Spain's foremost late-sixteenth-century Hellenists.<sup>80</sup> Mariner had relocated to Madrid by 1612, where he came under the patronage of the Sandoval family, working in their household as a tutor for their children, including Francisco de Sandoval, who would inherit the title of Duke of Lerma and continue to support Mariner upon assuming the title. Nevertheless, Mariner would continue to present himself throughout his writings as

---

<sup>80</sup> Much of the information we have for Mariner's life and works comes from seventeenth-century Spanish literary biographer Nicolàs Antonio's 1672 *Bibliotheca Hispana Nova* and the Valencian Vicente Ximeno's 1749 *Escritores del Reyno de Valencia*. The most recent biographical treatment of Mariner, which supplements previous scholarship with up-to-date archival research, is that of Juan de La Fuente Santo in the introductory study to his edition of Mariner's translation of the pseudo-Homeric *Batrachomyomachia* (2009).

constantly struggling to make ends meet and eternally in search of funds to publish his works. In his correspondence he frequently emphasized his perceived lack of fortune by signing his name alongside an epithet of his own coinage, *Tychechtrio*, from *τύχη* and *ἐχθερός*, or “enemy of fortune.”<sup>81</sup>

In his literary pursuits, Mariner applied himself to the work of translating various Greek texts—notably Homer, Theocritus, and Pindar—into Latin. In terms of modern scholarship, it is these works, particularly the translations of Homer<sup>82</sup> and Theocritus,<sup>83</sup> that have garnered the most attention. However, Mariner’s dedication to the use of Latin, in fact, ran so deep, that, in addition to producing these classical translations, he took it upon himself to translate an array of medieval Castilian and Valencian texts *into* Latin. Of these, Mariner’s translations of the Valencian-language works of poet Ausiàs March have been of particular interest to scholars of Valencian literary history such as Marco Antonio Coronel Ramos.<sup>84</sup> Mariner also composed an incredible corpus of panegyrics and epigrams for patrons—and for those whose patronage he hoped to elicit—, including a five-book Latin panegyric, the

---

<sup>81</sup> Biographer Nicolàs Antonio would interpret Mariner’s auto-epithet more gently than the Greek suggests as “parum fortunatus” (qtd. in Cañigral “Un entusiasta 15). See also García de Paso and Rodríguez Herrera (*La traducción* 30) for information on Antonio’s discussion of this epithet.

<sup>82</sup> María Dolores García de Paso’s and Gregorio Rodríguez Herrera have produced the largest body of work on Mariner’s Homeric translations, which remains the largest scholarly intervention into Mariner’s corpus. In addition to their co-authored monograph on the Homeric texts (1996) García de Paso has focused on different aspects of his Homeric corpus including other Neo-Latin sources (1995) he may have consulted and his approach to formulaic Homeric language (1997). Additionally, in his doctoral thesis Juan de La Fuente Santo has produced an edition and translation of Mariner’s Homeric texts (2001).

<sup>83</sup> José David Castro de Castro in particular has produced a large body of work on the Theocritus translations. In addition to his dissertation on translational techniques used in the work (1998) he has explored Mariner’s translation of related scholia (1996).

<sup>84</sup> See, for example, Coronel Ramos edition and study of the March translations (*La traducción Latina* [1994]) and explorations of translational techniques (“La modulación” [1996]; “Una cala” [1999]).

*Gusmaneydos libri quinque*, for Don Gaspar de Guzmán, the Conde-Duque de Olivares and *valido* to Philip IV, in hopes of earning his patronage.<sup>85</sup>

Scholars have frequently and colorfully noted the sheer volume of Mariner's literary output. In their study of his Homeric translations, María Dolores García de Paso's and Gregorio Rodríguez Herrera's deem his overall corpus of work to be notably "grueso" (36), while Enriqueta de Andrés, historian of seventeenth-century Spanish Hellenism, echoes Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo's words in dubbing Mariner the "Lope" of Spanish philologists for the "fecundidad" of his literary output (281). Mariner's extant works survive in thirty-seven manuscripts, currently housed in the Biblioteca Nacional de España.<sup>86</sup> During his lifetime his works appeared in three publications: the *In regem solem ad Salustium Panegyricus* and the *Panegyris serinissimum Ferdinandum* of 1624 and the 863-page collection *Omnia opera* of 1633. To understand the central place of Greek within this body of work, the reader need only consult Andrés's catalogue just of Mariner's Greek literary translations; this subset of his corpus alone spans fifteen catalogue pages (282–297).

While this prolific Neo-Latin output may not have earned Mariner the financial success he seemed to have longed for, it seems to have earned him the literary respect of his peers. Lope says the following of Mariner in the *Laurel de Apolo*, praising him for his poetic connections to the Greek and Latin traditions

---

<sup>85</sup> On Mariner's patronage-related panegyric works, see Francisco J. Bravo de Laguna Romero's edition and study of the first book of the *Gusmaneydos* (2002) and Antonio Serrano Cueto's exploration of Mariner's panegyric style (1994).

<sup>86</sup> After Mariner's death in 1642, his personal collection of manuscripts remained in the hands of the Trinitarios Descalzos, who in 1768 sold the collection for 6,000 *reales* to prominent philologist Juan de Iriarte working on behalf of the Biblioteca Real. (Andrés 272–3).

while also noting his lack of success in gaining the level of recognition he might have hoped:

“Y de Vicente Mariner laurea  
la sacra frente; pues a honrarte vino con el verso dulcísimo latino  
porque inmortal en tus riberas sea  
y provocando el Dórico Liceo  
las Musas Griegas le daran trofeo.  
Honre la tierra extraña  
a quien nunca premió su madre España” (qtd. in Cañigral “Un  
entusiasta” 15)

Astrana Marín expresses a similar sentiment—and one that should by now sound familiar—in assessing Mariner, noting “[n]i sus contemporaneos en gran parte, aun en aquel siglo tan floreciente en letras, se hallaban capacitados para juzgar a Mariner. En otro país habría obtenido la celebridad de un Casaubon, un Escaligero o un Justo Lipsio” (*Obras* 1672 n1). Instead, Mariner served out his final years, from 1633 until his death in 1642, as the librarian of the Escorial, a position whose title seventeenth-century biographer Nicolàs Antonio records as “bibliothecae regiae Escorialensis praefectus” (qtd. in La Fuente Santo, *Batracomiomaquia* xxx) and for which records show he earned a pension of 200 ducats annually (García de Paso and Herrera Rodríguez 30). Upon his death during a stay at the convent of the Trinitarios Descalzos in Madrid, his manuscripts were shelved in a corner of the monasteries library and largely forgotten and labeled with the phrase “Graecum est, non legitur” (Andrés 273). And, with most contemporary Mariner scholarship focusing either on his Latin translations of March, Homer, and Theocritus or, to a

lesser extent, on his panegyric *Gusmaneidos*, his Neo-Greek writings remain so today.<sup>87</sup>

In terms of Mariner's relationship with Quevedo, Cañigral notes the first evidence of their relationship is an epigram in Greek (accompanied by Latin translation), that Mariner dedicates to Quevedo in 1618, praising him somewhat generically for emitting the "Μυσάων φονά" from his lips and standing out for his "στίλβοντι νόω" and other somewhat boilerplate phrases indicating his relationship to Apollo and his daughters (qtd. in Cañigral "Un entusiasta" 16). As Andrés explains, significantly, much of Mariner's praise of his patrons and dedicatees is more than just interchangeable in a figurative sense: in his manuscripts, the names of those being celebrated are often crossed out and replaced with others (273). This observation makes it difficult to take positive comments Mariner makes about any of his peers without a grain of salt, and it is one that will be important to keep in mind in proceeding with the following evaluation of the relationship between Mariner and Quevedo.

The most significant literary interaction between the two authors comes in the form of what we might call their "collaboration" on Mariner's 1624 translation of the late-antique Greek text of Julian the Apostate's the *Εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Ἄλιον πρὸς Σαλύστιον*, frequently referred to by the Latin title *In regem solem ad Salustium Panegyricus*. The work, which appears in a series of ten orations written by the philosopher-emperor, is also referred to in English as the *Fourth Oration*. Mariner's

---

<sup>87</sup> Cristóbal Rodríguez Alonso gives a preliminary overview of Mariner's neo-Greek poetry in his study (1985).

translation of the *In regem solem* was first published in 1624 by Pedro Tazón and later reprinted in the *Omnia opera compendium* of 1633.<sup>88</sup> The 1624 octavo volume—a small and inexpensive format—consists of sixty folios, sixteen for the preliminary material and four for the concluding material. The work itself, although properly that of Mariner, is not only dedicated to Quevedo, but also permeated by the latter's presence: in addition to Mariner's dedicatory prologue, the work's paratexts, both before and after Mariner's translation, include various poetic *elogios* of Quevedo, copies of Quevedo's correspondence with Justus Lipsius,<sup>89</sup> and a prologue written by Quevedo himself. It is important to note that, in addition to Mariner's Latin-language translation of and notes on Julian's text, all of the supporting materials, and therefore Quevedo's prologue, appear in Latin.

By translating the *In regem solem* Mariner was contributing to an important body of humanist work to recover and translate Julian's corpus. Flavius Claudius Iulianus Augustus (330–363), given the nickname “Apostate” by church fathers, was born in 331 and reigned for a brief sixteen months between 361 and 363. In addition to being notable for his short-lived revival of the pagan religion, Julian is also remembered for his prolific writings, predominantly of a philosophical nature, which reflect his studies with the Sophist rhetorician Libanius and the Neoplatonic philosopher Aedesius, pupil of Iamblicus. Julian's connection to Neoplatonism

---

<sup>88</sup> Some differences appear in the order of certain paragraphs in Mariner's dedication between the two editions, but I have not found the changes to significantly change the present interpretation of the text.

<sup>89</sup> Quevedo had initiated the correspondence in September of 1604 and they exchanged four brief Latin letters between then and February of 1605, in which they praised each other and showed off their erudition with various classical quotes and in which Lipsius clarified some questions of Quevedo's regarding Lucan's Latin. See *Cartas I–IV*, pp. 1–10, in Astrana Marín *Epistolario*.

makes his legacy particularly important for Renaissance humanists such as Mariner and Quevedo.

Historian Stebelton Nulle expresses Julian's transformation into a figure of interest to humanists as the story of three Julians: Julian the historical figure, Julian the "evil incarnate" of the Church Fathers and of medieval hagiographers (cf. the influential *Legenda aurea* of Jacobus da Varagine), and Julian Redivivus, the rehabilitated Neoplatonic philosopher-emperor of early modern humanists ("Redivivus" 320–321). Starting with Ficino and his Florentine milieu,<sup>90</sup> the dawning of "Julian studies," to use Nulle's term for the humanist recovery of the emperor's legacy, ("Men" 324) spread northward and gained particular ground in the mid-sixteenth-century epicenter of Greek studies, France. There his works circulated among influential humanists such as Montaigne, who famously vindicates Julian in his "*De la liberté de conscience*," the nineteenth chapter in the second book of his 1580 *Essais*.

Writing more than seventy years later, Mariner's work appears to be the first humanist work on Julian in Spain.<sup>91</sup> Mariner's promotion of this author, one particularly problematic from a Catholic perspective, may be seen as novel, if not somewhat radical, in the Spanish context, where the Santo Oficio de la Inquisición

---

<sup>90</sup> See Nulle's "Redivivus" for a fascinating discussion of a 1489 play written by and starring Ficino's pupil Lorenzo de' Medici, *La Rappresentazione SS. Giovanni e Paolo*, in which Lorenzo, playing the emperor himself before friends and family on those saint's feast day, depicted Julian as a just and virtuous ruler whose one failing was his religious persuasion (324–327).

<sup>91</sup> In Spain, the medieval legend of a demonic Julian involved in human sacrifices lives on, a story integral in the hagiography of San Mercurio and perpetuated even in Vélez de Guevara's mid-seventeenth-century play about Julian (See Javier Moreno Pampliega 102). For a brief overview of Spanish medieval sources for the San Mercurio legend and Julian's Spanish reception, see Arturo Rodríguez López-Abadía's introductory study to the 2016 edition of the play (co-edited with William R. Manson, C. George Peale).

was notoriously suspicious of pagan authors in general. It is important to remember, however, that Julian's works did not appear in any versions of the Indices, and Mariner's work did successfully pass the censors to reach printed form.

Notably, Mariner's translation of Julian was novel not only for Spain, but also for the international context. In choosing this *particular* oration of Julian's, he is undertaking a task not even attempted by French philologists. In 1583 Charles de Chanteclair had printed the *editio princeps* of Julian's orations as the third volume of his complete series of Julian's works, but his version contained only the Greek text; over the course of the next decades, various of Julian's works would be translated into Latin, but it was not until 1614 when the French Hellenist Denis Pétau, a frequent correspondent of Mariner's (La Fuente Santo xxv) often referred to by his Latin Humanist name "Dionisius Petavius," would publish the first Latin translations of the orations in 1614 (Bidez 113–118). However, Petavius's volume of translations only contained up to the third oration (Nesselrath xx), meaning that up until 1624, when Mariner's version first appeared in Madrid, the fourth oration remained untranslated.

Mariner is himself is eager to point out the groundbreaking nature of his work. In his prologue, he highlights that his work contributes hitherto unavailable materials to the body of Julian resources. He refers to his French predecessors by name, specifically citing Chanteclair and Petavius in relation to his current project: "me primum hoc opus Latinitate donasse ... uti id planè Carolus Cantoclarus concedit, et doctis[simus] Dionysius Pevavius non inficiatur" (*In regem IXr*). Here Mariner emphasis his role in breaking new ground as the first to make this text

available. Moreover, it seems that others recognized the importance of this contribution. In initial section of official privileges and licenses, Egidio González Dávila, one of the censors in charge of evaluating the text for its *aprobación*, confirms the novelty of Mariner's project in bringing this particular work of Julian's to light and giving voice to the emperor-philosopher. As he explains, "[a] multis annis sub alto silentio tumulatum novissimè è Graeca in Latinum linguam translatum et in lucem erutum" (*In regem* IIv).

The *In regem solem*, then, as Mariner's contribution to both international and domestic Hellenist readership, is an important milestone in the Spanish humanism of the early seventeenth century. Moreover, its rich paratextual materials, Mariner's dedication, the various poetic *elogios* of Quevedo, copies of Quevedo's Lipsian correspondence, and the latter's own prologue—represent a wealth of resources for exploring the status of the classical—and specifically Greek—tradition in this era. In particular, the longest and most detailed of these paratextual materials, Mariner's dedication and Quevedo's prologue, represent significant sources for reconstructing these two prominent humanists' reciprocal evaluations of each other's Hellenist personas.

However, despite the rich potential of both Mariner's and Quevedo's contributions, to the best of my knowledge, neither has been the focus of sustained scholarly analysis. In terms of Quevedo's contribution, the prologue remains one of a handful of the author's texts written in Latin. Other examples come from Quevedo's personal correspondence. While one of these is addressed to fellow Spaniard Juan Jacobo Chifflet, the others indicate his interactions with international

figures, including his two letters to Lipsius, one to Flemish humanist Lucas van Torre, and one to Pope Urban VIII.<sup>92</sup> The significance of Quevedo's prologue to Mariner's text, then, goes beyond its importance as an example of Quevedo's Latin prose. It is his only known *published* Latin work, indicating that the text was intended for and circulated among a much-wider audience. Thus, in addition to its valued for analyzing Quevedo's Latin usage, rhetoric, and style, this text also has a variety of implications for Quevedo studies, both in terms of Quevedo's humanist-philological corpus in particular and in his overall literary oeuvre in general.

Quevedo's prologue has, counterintuitively, received the most attention from Mariner scholars, who frequently cite the text as evidence of the supportive professional relationship between Mariner and one of the most famous of his contemporaries, an approach reflected in García de Paso and Rodríguez Herrera's treatments (*Las traducciones* 26, *Breve antología* 31–33), as well as La Fuente Santo's (*Batracomiomaquia* xxii–iv). Among Quevedo scholars, however, the text remains understudied. In his monumental biography of Quevedo, Jauralde Pou devotes two paragraphs out of his nearly 1,000-page study of the author's life and oeuvre. Lía Schwartz gives a brief reading of Quevedo's text, in particular its lengthy enumeration of Mariner's corpus of translations, in order to introduce her study of how Quevedo constructs an ideal of humanist readers and humanist libraries: for Schwartz, Quevedo's ability to list Mariner's impressive range of translations

---

<sup>92</sup> For the 1604 and 1605 letters to Lipsius, see *Cartas* I and III, pp. 1–3 and 8–10; for the 1625 letter to Pope Urban VIII, see *Carta* LXXIX, pp. 142–4; the 1628 letter to van Torre, see *Carta* CIX, pp. 205–7; for the undated letter to Chifflet, see *Carta* LXXXIV, pp. 162–172.

displays not only Mariner's vast reading of the classics, but also his own ("Las preciosas").

On the other hand, Mariner's dedication has received the greatest amount of attention from Quevedo scholars, who are eager to interpret its contents as the most sincere of praise for the latter. Excerpts from the dedication, accompanied by the *In regem solem's* various encomiastic epigrams, appear in the section entitled "Elogios" in Fernández Guerra de Orbe 1852 cxxix–cxxxv collection of Quevedo's works in the foundational *Biblioteca de autores españoles* series. The most detailed analysis of Mariner's texts comes from Luis de Cañigral Castro, who interprets the work and the praise granted to its dedicatee as proof that Mariner, whom he dubs "nada suspecto de dorar superficialidades como eruditísimo" (19), held Quevedo to be an outstanding Hellenist. Cañigral maintains that this text reflects "el reconocimiento por parte de [Mariner] de un buen conocimiento de las letras humanísticas," and one that supports the "alabanzas sin cuento" of all of Quevedo's peers, with the exception of the "discordante Góngora" (19). Moreover, he argues that he hopes that his bringing to light this work of Mariner's will help clarify the polemic between modern scholars who share Góngora's assessment of Quevedo as a subpar Hellenist (19). This reading is supplemented by Schwartz's brief comments on Mariner's dedication which accompanies her examination of Quevedo's prologue ("Las preciosas" 215–16). Schwartz is willing to admit that in places the praise may be hyperbolic, a tactic she argues is in keeping with the rhetorical tenet of *captatio benevolentiae* (that is to say, that within the framework of the dedication's epistolary form, it follows the certain rhetorical formulae for praising the recipient

of a letter 215]). Nevertheless, her assessment of Mariner's praise is that it is generally a reliable reflection of Mariner's attitude towards his dedicatee.

The following close reading of the preliminary matter of the *In regem solem* will consider these texts in a more sustained and detailed manner than has so far been conducted. It will explore how this text, created by Mariner and centered on the work of Julian, nevertheless serves to create a particular image of its omnipresent dedicatee. It will show that despite this being Mariner's opportunity to have a moment in the international and Spanish humanist spotlight, the focus of the supporting materials falls neither on Mariner's scholarly efforts nor on the emperor who is Mariner's subject—the work does not even include a biography of Julian.<sup>93</sup> The first phase of the analysis, then, will first examine the arrangement of the paratexts and their specific contribution to the overall sense the work conveys that it is, as Jauralde Pou has expressed it, “un verdadero homenaje” to Quevedo (498), and in particular, Quevedo as Hellenist.

The second phase of the analysis will consider in detail both Mariner's dedication and Quevedo's prologue. It will differ from the previous analyses of Cañigral Cortez and Schwartz, the former of whom focuses on Mariner's text individually and the latter on Quevedo's, by examining both *together*. In exploring the intimate connections between Mariner's praise of Quevedo and Quevedo's corresponding praise of Mariner, in particular the details they choose to include—

---

<sup>93</sup> Although this may be to avoid too much discussion of the more potentially problematic aspects of the Apostate. Julian's religion is downplayed throughout the text and the focus remains, rather, on his literary style. The requisite discussion of the potentially thorny issue of his apostasy is addressed by Quevedo in his prologue in 14v-15r, where Quevedo acknowledges that Julian's religious choices are to be condemned but that his literature is nevertheless worthy of reading for its eloquence.

and significantly, those they leave out in their mutual assessments, this analysis will give us insight into how the two viewed each other as Hellenists. This exploration will conclude by considering the implications of these two texts—and their authors' reciprocal assessments of one another—within the humanist milieu in which the two authors moved.

### A Paratextual Portrait of Quevedo

Quevedo is nearly omnipresent in the text. He quite literally bookends the text of Julian, from the title page in which, as dedicatee of the work, his name is highlighted, to the final pages, which end with a letter written to Quevedo by the famed Belgian Humanist Lipsius (the second of two Lipsius letters to appear in the text).

On the title page itself, Quevedo's name, which appears below Mariner's, is in typeface of slightly larger size. Mariner is simply identified with the phrase "valentino interprete," which appears on the line directly below his name. Quevedo, on the other hand, is identified as dedicatee by his full range of titles, "ad Franciscum de Quevedo Villegas Equitam aureo torque de Iacobi insignitum, dominum villae quae vulgo vocatur de Iuan Abad," a phrase which takes up five lines of text in the center of the page and therefore, in terms of text, the majority of the visual space. Even larger, however, and taking up approximately a third of the page, is the coat of arms of the Quevedo family. Therefore, although the name of the author of the translated text appears at the top of the page in the first printed line and in largest typeface, Quevedo takes up the majority of the space, and the words and image relating to him dominate the space.

The preface, dedicated to Quevedo, is the first official section of the work (*In regem IIIr–VIIIv*)<sup>94, 95</sup> and here, it is not unusual that his name, appearing at the top of this section's first page, again with his title from the Order of Santiago, is in the most prominent position. Additionally, as dedicatee of this prologue, it is not unusual that Quevedo figures prominently in Mariner's introduction and description of Julian's work nor is the praise given him throughout. What is unusual, however, is what follows. With no introduction or explanation for its presence, the reader encounters the first of two letters written to Quevedo by Lipsius, which constitutes three pages of the text (*In regem IXr–Xr*). Interestingly, the letter, dated February 8, 1605, comes chronologically as the second in the series of two Lipsius would write to Quevedo (the first is dated October 15, 1604). It is, however, not difficult to see why this second letter of the two might have been selected to appear in this prominent position in the preliminary mater. While both texts are full of praise for Quevedo, this letter notably begins with the dramatic exclamation "O litteras tuas et amicas et sensibus argutas!" (*In regem IXr*). Throughout, Lipsius praises Quevedo's classical acumen, responding, for instance, to a question Quevedo had asked in an earlier letter<sup>96</sup> about a particular verse of Lucan with praise for Quevedo's keen

---

<sup>94</sup> Folio numbers are printed in the text only beginning with the first page of the translation itself (the recto of forty-fifth folio of the volume as a whole). In order to refer to the preliminary materials that lack printed page numbers, I have used Roman numerals starting with the title page as folio I. I have used capitols for these numerals so as to make clearer for the reader the distinction between these numerals and the indications of recto and verso pages with the abbreviations of "r" and "v."

<sup>95</sup> The requisite licenses and approvals appear on folios IIr–v and several reflect Mariner's reputation as a Hellenist. Johann Eusebius, the censor known as "Padre Nieremberg" one of two in charge of evaluating the work for its *aprobación*, notes that Mariner is possessed of an "eruditionem peritiam Graecae linguae" and that his work is one that "eruditi desiderabunt" (IIv).

<sup>96</sup> Carta III, pp. 5–7 in Astrana Marín's *Epistolario*.

observation about the passage, as he states, the question had been wisely posed, (“sagaciter inquiris” (*In regem Xr*). Of particular interest, however, is Lipsius’s use of Greek to praise Quevedo. He addresses Quevedo as “ὦ μέγα κῦδος Ἰβήρων,” (*In regem Xr*), the great glory of the Iberians. In order that neither this Greek-language praise nor Lipsius’s other use of Greek phrases, peppered throughout the letter be lost on the reader not versed in Greek, the Latin translation is given in the margin (*In regem Xr*). It is notable, again, that this letter, in which the established and internationally renowned Hellenist prominently praises the younger, aspiring Hellenist in Greek appears not only early in the paratextual materials, but also out of chronological order, with the earlier letter appearing at the conclusion of the text.

Following this text is an epigram from Mariner praising Quevedo with the dedication “Ad eundem Clarissimum Virum” (*In regem Xv*). Although Quevedo is here not mentioned by name, it is clear from the context, in that it follows Lipsius’s letter, and from the context of the epigram itself, that it is Quevedo. Mariner refers to him as “Hispanam linguam Musarum fontibus auges” (*In regem Xv*). In this epigram he praises Quevedo’s poetry in flowery terms; he begins “Musarum tu dives opum, tibi gaza redundant,” and ends comparing him to Vergil “Aeque et nomen habes Musarum et gesta Maronis, Proximus atque illio stant tibiserta sua” (*In regem Xv*), 1–44v

Next comes Quevedo’s letter to Mariner (*In regem XIr–XVIv*), beginning prominently with the salutation in larger letters under the addressee’s name “S.P.D”, *salutem plurimam dicit*, Cicero’s epistolary greeting of choice (*In regem XIr*).<sup>97</sup> Here

---

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *Ad fam.* 12.14.sa.1, 14.14.sa.3, 16.1.sa.1, etc.

Quevedo praises Mariner, giving a long account of his writings and translations and the providing something of a defense for Julian. Mariner's translation of Julian's text follows (1r–44v), along with Mariner's extensive commentary (45v–60v). Following this, epigrams written by two Italian statesmen, Michael Kelkeris (62r–63r) and Julius Caesar Stella (61r–v), with whom Quevedo had associated during his 1618 stay in Naples under the Duke of Osuna's viceroyalty there.<sup>98</sup> Finally, Lipsius's first letter to Quevedo (63v–64v), which, again, although appearing last, is chronologically first in the series of two letters the humanist had sent to Quevedo.

It is Quevedo, then, who comes across as the most salient figure in the work, more so even than its subject, Julian. The textual frame comprised of the two letters from Lipsius bookend the work by implicitly reminding the reader of Quevedo's own humanist credentials; the various epigrams throughout—both of those of Mariner and Quevedo's Neopolitan connections—combined with Mariner's own epigram following the dedication, explicitly reinforce this perception. In particular, those of the Neopolitan figures at the end form a coda suggesting, when taken along with the Lipsius's letters, Quevedo's international intellectual ties. Quevedo, then, serves as an authorizing humanist figure for Mariner's work, a curious situation in which we might have expected for the roles of the two to be reversed, considering Mariner was, in fact, the more accomplished humanist of the two.

However, this paratextual portrait of Quevedo—and its implications for the relationship between Mariner and Quevedo, becomes even more interesting when it

---

<sup>98</sup> See Jauralde Pou's discussion of Quevedo's Neopolitan visit and more on these figures and their ties to the viceroyal court (388–9).

is contrasted with the portrait of Quevedo painted by Mariner in his dedication. Mariner's own words about Quevedo, although on the surface seeming to be appropriately encomiastic (enough so to convince Cañigral Cortez, Schwartz, and Jauralde Pou, at least, of his sincerity), a closer look at what Mariner says—and doesn't say— in the course of praising Quevedo complicates this picture.

### Mariner's Praise of Julian and Quevedo

The following gives the reader a taste of Mariner's prose style and how he uses the dedicatory preface as an opportunity both to rehabilitate Julian and to show off his own erudition and Latin prose.

The praise of Julian, as expected, focuses on the style rather than the content and early on links the work to Plato. He explains that this work to the sun such "Graecae facundiae concinnit[as]" that he almost rivals the watery depths of hidden wisdom the ancient philosophy itself "arcanos antiquae Philosophiae exhaustiat gurgites" and draws on itself and the green meadows "viridantia Philosophorum, & Philosophorum prata" in his imitation of these writers (*In regem IIIv*). Mariner uses his vindication of Julian's eloquence as a chance to show off his own. In one particularly elegant metaphor, he affirms Julian's rightful place among philosophers with a metaphor of printing: in Julian's Greek prose, he explains, "praecipuus Philosophiae character exprimitur, & absconditus sapientiae typus palam prodit" (*In regem IVr*).

However, in subsequent, more elaborate metaphor, Mariner turns to the classical world in referencing the myth of Icarus, and it is here that he most self-consciously puts on display his mastery of classical style and source material.

Mariner explains that Julian, in his own Greek elegant prose style, effectively avoids “flying too close to the sun” in his imitation of earlier Greek models. It is here that Mariner’s prose is most classicizing, with his syntax more properly reflecting ancient conventions. This is the only instance in Mariner’s contributions to the work where we find him using perfect passive participles in the place of subordinate clauses, as in the case of the phrase “cereis pennis elatus superbam in Solem,” (*In regem IVr*). Notable, this is also the only instance of Mariner using the ubiquitous classical construction, the ablative absolute, when he describes the effect of the sun on Icarus’s wax wings: “ipsius Solis radiis liequescentibus alis” (*In regem IVr*). Mariner’s language also becomes more figurative, more mythological, and more classicizing. Icarus’s descent to the sea is described as a wrestling match with a sea-monsters; the waves are “Neptunian,” the sea is a “Nerean” torrent. Mariner’s terminology becomes highly poetic here, including his choice of “pelagus” (a favorite of Vergil and Lucan) for sea and the Ovidian adjective “spumiferus.”

After setting an appropriately erudite tone with his introductory remarks about Julian, Mariner next turns to the dedicatee of his work, whom he addresses as “charissime Quevedo” (*In regem IVr*). Mariner explains that he the present translation of Julian’s work to rest on the shelves of Quevedo’s library, specifically, the “magna tuae praeclarae bibliothecae scrinia” (*In regem IVv*), so in this way Julian’s praise of the sun will in turn become a source of praise for Quevedo, entering into the “in sublimmem tuarum laudum sphaerum” (*In regem IVv*). Interestingly, in this first mention of Quevedo, his library is foregrounded as the first

praise-worthy aspect of the dedicatee the reader encounters. In his first appearance in the text, Quevedo is a man notable for his relationship to books.

Mariner next remarks that Quevedo is also to be praised for his role in bringing about the present translation. Addressing Quevedo, Mariner explains that “*tuo equidem consilio hoc opus egregium aggressus fui, tuo auspicio absolvi, tuo nomine perfecti, tuo demum omine in ultimam mearum cogitationum metam penitus tradidi*” (*In regem IVv*). Quevedo is, therefore, not only the recipient of the text, but also the impetus for its creation. It has been brought into being under his advisement (*consilium*) and with his blessing (*auspicium* and *omen*). According to Mariner, he is an almost spiritual authoritative force guiding Mariner.

Mariner next praises Quevedo’s status among his Spanish contemporaries. He states that Quevedo holds the “*primas partes*” among his peers, thus being first and most outstanding for the “*famae magnitudine,*” and the “*sanguinis nobilitate*” (*In regem IVv*) Interestingly, Mariner defines the Spanish context in which Quevedo shines not only as Spain proper, but more specifically, as the broader “*Hispanus orbis*” (*In regem IVv*). Most importantly, Quevedo stands out in terms of his literary prowess, his “*ingenii et litterarum prestantia*”. It is this aspect of literary achievement that Mariner will go on to explore in detail with an extended solar metaphor which ties Quevedo more closely to Julian’s own praise of the sun—Mariner’s subsequent praise of Julian.

Mariner begins by arguing that it is appropriate to dedicate the work to Quevedo according to the following logic: the muses are the daughters of Apollo, who is the sun, and since the muses are the sisters of poets, like Quevedo, then

Quevedo by extension is the “alumnus,” the foster child of the sun. Moreover, just as Julian whose scepter as Roman emperor touched the whole world, so too is (“in totius orbis sceptro tenuit caput”) (*In regem Vr*). Quevedo is “inter poetarum principes” and therefore, the sun “in hoc musarum et litterarum imperio” and “in hoc divinarum cogitationum aetheru tu solus es” (*In regem Vr*). Quevedo is, therefore, not only like Julian himself, the author of the text who Mariner praises, but also like the subject of Julian’s praise, the sun. He is therefore, according to Mariner’s elaborate logic, thus doubly praiseworthy. It is important to note that all of the praiseworthiness of Quevedo rests on his literary prowess, it is his connection to the muses and Apollo themselves that make him the appropriate dedicatee for this work.

It is important to note here, that despite all of these praiseworthy features of Mariner’s dedicatee, Quevedo is not singled out for any specific skill as a classicist. He is a poet worthy of being praised using classical imagery, but he himself is not presented as an expert in any area of classical erudition—or classical language proficiency. Also notable is the fact that Mariner does not mention any specific work of Quevedo’s. The only thing, in fact, that seems like it might in any way apply to Quevedo personally is the description of his library, which Quevedo does seem to have had a reputation for. In his 1628 *Defensa del Patronato de Santiago*, Juan Pablo Mártir Rizo praises his “librería ... de los libros más preciosos que hay en todas facultades” (qtd. in Fernández Guerra de Orbe cxxiii). However, for both Mariner, and Mártir Rizo for that matter, even this might be a generic compliment that could apply equally to any learned individual of the era—having an enviable library would

seem to be a desirable trait for any humanist. In fact, the idea that one's library could serve as a key marker of humanist status is one that Schwartz central to Quevedo's own praise of Mariner in his prologue to the *In regem solem*. It is notable, then, that, whereas for Mártyr Rizo, Quevedo's library is special for its specific contents, notably, for Mariner, there is no specific explanation of what makes Quevedo's "praeclara."

All told, Mariner's praise of Quevedo reads as somewhat boilerplate. While it paints the portrait of an outstanding poet gifted with the favor of the muses, in its lack of specifics, it could be applied to almost any poet. In contrast to the combined effect of all the paratextual materials, which taken together present an erudite, internationally viable humanist and Hellenist, Mariner's dedication seems, in its failure to mention any specifics of Quevedo's professional profile, to erase any trace of this persona of his dedicatee.

#### Quevedo's Moment in the Neo-Latin Spotlight

Quevedo's portrait of Mariner, on the other hand, seems to present a very specific vision of his colleague. To begin considering Quevedo's own addition to the work, it is worth noting that, not unlike Mariner in his dedication, Quevedo takes the letter as an opportunity to show off both his level of classical erudition and his skills at composing Latin. Even the heading of the letter, which gives Quevedo's name and that of his addressee, Mariner, serves this purpose: prominently preceding the body of the letter itself in the same typeface and font size as the name of addressee Mariner, is the Latin abbreviation S. P. D, "salutem plurimam dicit," again a prominent reference to Ciceronian epistolary style (*In regem Xr*).

Quevedo sprinkles his section with classical quotes, immediately visually striking in that they are set apart from the body of the text and presented in italics. These include verse 4.607 of the *Aeneid*, an apostrophe to the sun (*In regem XIV*), and passages from Martial's epigrams 1.25 and 5.13 regarding the fleeting nature of life and the immortality of poetry (*In regem XIr*). These examples are relatively straightforward demonstrations of Quevedo's ability to cite classical sources to bolster his arguments.

However, the first classical quote that appears in the letter is of a somewhat more complicated provenance: "Ipse facis volitare per ora virum,/Hoc opus, hic labor est pauci quos aquas amavit/Iuppiter, aut ardens evexit ad aethera virtus." (*In regem Xv*). The second two lines are the words of the Sybil describing the process of descending into the underworld in book VI of the *Aeneid*. The first, however, is a reworking on Quevedo's part of a Latin phrase first composed by Ennius which survives as a fragment quoted by Cicero and which was reworked in the *Tusculan Disputations* and which was reworked by Vergil in *Georgic* 3.8.<sup>99</sup> However, here Quevedo creates a composite quote that, in its visual presentation on the page appears to be a complete unit taken from the text. Quevedo has cleverly combined these phrases in order to praise Mariner's Greek works: Mariner will make the Greek language fly through the mouths of men again, a work which only the bravest have been able to do. In combining, or "remixing" these classical quotes to do the

---

<sup>99</sup> The quote, labelled *varia* 18 of Ennius's fragments, is recorded in Cicero as "Nemo me lacrimis decoret nec funera fletu/Faxit. cur? voluto vivos per ora virum" (*Tusc.* 1.34.7-8). Vergil's phrasing is "temptanda uia est, qua me quoque possim/ tollere humo uictorque uirum uolitare per ora. (*G.*3.9.9-10).

work of praising Mariner, Quevedo shows not only his knowledge of classical material, but also his artistic license to manipulate it and make it work for him.

Quevedo is somewhat sly in his presentation of these quotes, leaving their provenance ambiguous, in contrast the other two examples in which he clarifies the source. While the casual reader who does not know the source material might simply be impressed with what are clearly set aside from the text as quotations from some kind of classical source, the reader who does know Latin literature well will likely recognize them, and in doing so, recognize that Quevedo is playing with the quotations. By not indicating a source, then, Quevedo avoids simply appearing to misquote sources the savvy reader might recognize, thus inviting them to engage with him in a textual game in which he playfully manipulates classical author's own words to praise Mariner.

In other places Quevedo plays with his own Latin prose in order to demonstrate his Latin skills, and this is most prominent, again, in his textual interactions with his classical antecedents, particularly Vergil. While there are various examples throughout the text, for instance, his citation of *Aeneid* 4.607 followed by his clever reworking of the line (*In regem XIr*). Other signals are subtler. One notable example has to do with his particular Latin word choice. Strikingly, Quevedo twice uses the *moles* to describe the work of Mariner and his project of translating Greek: it appears at the beginning of the text when Quevedo's praises the "moles" of Mariner's recovery of the "totus Graecae linguae thesaurus" (*In regem XIr*). and in the final sentence of the text, where he enjoins Mariner to keep up his scholarly work, applying his "oculorum acie" to the "moles" at hand (*In regem XIIIr*).

While *moles* in its most typical usage denotes a pile, mass, or any kind of bulky object, in the context of one of the most famous quotes from the *Aeneid*, it takes on a specific usage: “*tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*” (*Aen.*1.33), where it has the sense of “it was such a huge labor to found the Roman race.” By choosing to use this word in these contexts, Quevedo shows that, even at the level of his Latin word choice, he is proficient in interacting with this Vergilian tradition. Moreover, as a strategy for praising Mariner, this word choice subtly compares his colleague’s efforts to translate Greek for the Spanish audience to Aeneas’s efforts to found Rome.

#### Quevedo’s Praise of Mariner: Portrait of an Ideal Hellenist?

Quevedo, however, does not only take this opportunity to put his classical erudition and Latin on display. His praise of Mariner seems sincere and he chooses a variety of qualities to highlight in his *elogio*. Notably, in several cases, Quevedo’s praise of Mariner mirrors Mariner’s own praise of Quevedo, as Schwartz phrases it, using “*formulas retóricas paralelas*” to Mariner’s in his own response to the latter’s praise of him (“*Las preciosas*” 215). For instance, we see similar language highlighting Mariner’s outstanding erudition among his contemporaries. Quevedo refers to Mariner as the “*Hispaniae superbia*” and states that he is “*in quo uno doctissimorum virorum huius saeculi*” (*In regem Xr*). Additionally, Quevedo echoes Mariner’s own metaphor of the sun as a tool for praising for Quevedo; whereas Mariner had played on the Julian’s own praise of the sun by turning this trope on his dedicatee Quevedo, Quevedo in turn reflects this strategy back onto Mariner when

he affirms of Mariner that “Sol omnibus lucet, tu solus soli et omnibus tanto majorem, quanto praestantior” (*In regem* XIV).

Unlike Mariner’s praise of Quevedo, however, Quevedo’s praise of Mariner is in many places is significantly more personalized, with Quevedo citing specific, tangible achievements of Mariner’s. One of the most notable examples of this can be seen in Quevedo’s praise of the sheer volume of Mariner’s output, a unique feature of the author’s oeuvre that did, in fact, set him apart from his literary peers. Quevedo notes that this particular facet of Mariner’s profile is one of his most praiseworthy attributes in his initial remarks on Mariner at the opening of his text. Here he points out that his various writing would require a genuine effort to recount: “scripta tua numerare in me labor honestus” (*In regem* Xr).

Moreover, despite this initial comment about the “honestus labor” listing Mariner’s specific works will cause Quevedo, it is precisely this that Quevedo will, in fact, go on to do. After elaborating various praiseworthy attributes of Mariner, Quevedo reaches the final point he wishes to emphasize in his *elogio*. Returning to the issue of Mariner’s output, Quevedo explains that he will now enumerate Mariner’s works in order that reader come to know the textual offspring of his many studies and labor, as Quevedo expresses it: “ut innotescant labores tui ingenii placet hinc ascribere studiorum tuorum partus” (12r). Quevedo again uses hyperbolic language to express the sheer enormity of the task at hand by carefully limiting his task to only those works he can personally affirm exist; he stresses that his list can only attest to the ones he has seen, not those of which he has heard, “non quae audivi ... sed quae vidi profero” (*In regem* XIIv). Schwartz notes that in delimiting

the list this way, Quevedo takes the opportunity not only to show his admiration for the “incesante labor” of his colleague but also to show how well-read he himself is that he is able to confirm as a reader the existence of the texts (“Las preciosas” 215). However, taken strictly in a rhetorical sense as a strategy to praise Mariner, by introducing the list and defining its limits in this way, Quevedo makes what follows an even more impressive feat for Mariner.

This list spans almost three full pages (folios 12r–13r) and includes thirty-five works of translation, ranging from Homer to Theocritus to the Church Fathers to the medieval Ausiàs March, in addition to Mariner’s own compositions of Neo-Greek and Latin panegyric and epigram. As a visual feature in the text, this lengthy list is especially effective, the reader does not have to pore over every name on the list for its breadth to have an impact. Even for a reader who might not recognize these names or might not be inclined to carefully read through this amount of detail, the very fact that the author has decided to devote this much page-space to this list suggests that it is of central importance. Interestingly, the chronologically-arranged list ends with a notable final entry, the *In regem solem* itself. This meta-reference highlights the fact that this is only the most recent of Mariner’s works. By explicitly including this text as a terminus, a text whose existence would otherwise have been obvious to the reader, Quevedo points to the potential of the works to come, the present text is the last in the series ... for now.

The list, then, represents an especially effective—and visually striking—strategy for praising Mariner’s productivity. However, as the overwhelmingly Greek content included in the list also suggests, one of the most salient features of Mariner

that Quevedo sets out to praise is his commitment to the Greek tradition—and the Greek language itself.

In his initial address of Mariner at the beginning of the letter, he refers to him as “qui solus Graecorum non rivulos eloquentiae se imensum Oceanum exhauris et ebibis” (*In regem Xr*). Here, with “solus,” he emphasizes Mariner’s singularity in his Greek studies, that his level is not reached by others. He goes on to state later in the same lengthy, periodic sentence that Mariner is possessed of “linguarum peritam non aequatam sed superatum non sine invidia” (*In regem Xr*). His linguistic skill is not equaled and surpasses those around him who view this with envy.

However, it is with the extended metaphor that follows that he most elaborately articulates his praise of Mariner—and reveals something about how Quevedo conceives of the act of learning Greek, worth reproducing in its entirety:

“Tu, mi Marineri, totos Graecae linguae thesaruos antiquitate venerabiles, mole et magnitudine inaccessibiles, difficultatam tenebris involutos, tam caeca noctis caligine submersos et iam pene oblivionis inertia et malignitate sepultos deserto calamo eruis et. . .” (*In regem Xv*).

While Schwartz gives a brief reading of this metaphor in which she argues that through it Quevedo praises Mariner’s unearthing of what she refers to as the “tesoros venerables de la antigüedad” (“Las preciosas” 214). Schwartz acknowledges that Quevedo identifies the source of the loss of these “treasures of antiquity” as an “ignorancia de las letras griegas” (“Las preciosas” 214). However, she does not explore in detail how Quevedo specifically identifies the Greek language *itself* as what Mariner, both translator and Neo-Greek poet, has reclaimed. Quevedo’s masterful deployment of his Latin prose, which takes full advantage of

the rhetorical resources of the Latin language, allow him to expand upon Mariner's linguistics achievements while demonstrating his own in a virtuosic display of classicizing Latin style.

To begin, it is important to note that Quevedo specifically foregrounds Mariner's recovery of the Greek language itself, rather than a more broadly defined classical antiquity, as Schwartz phrases it, or even her more bounded idea of Greek letters. The metaphorical *thesauri* in question are those of the "Graecae linguae" rather than *litterarum*. This is significant because, while the phrase *Graecae linguae thesauri* does also suggest by extension the literature written in the language, the phrase specificity highlights the recovery of the language itself. In interpreting thesaurus, moreover, it is important to remember the term's primary meaning, first in Greek, and then in its calqued Latin form, of "storehouse" rather than the more semantically specific English derivative "treasure." Interpreted according to its primary classical meaning—a reading in-line with Quevedo's conscientiously classicizing prose, the Greek language itself becomes a repository. The recovery of the Greek language itself, then, becomes the necessary first step in recovering the things contained within it—i.e., its literature. The specificity of Quevedo's phrasing here emphasizes the importance of Greek itself as a tool to access Greek's textual tradition, and therefore the importance of Hellenist translators like Mariner (or even himself) who can access the language.

However, it is also important to note that Mariner was not only accessing texts as a translator, he was also composing Greek verse. While in the context of the prologue Quevedo does not allude to this fact explicitly, his emphasis here on

Mariner's recovery of the Greek language, when considered in conjunction with Quevedo's emphasis on both the *enormity* and the *entirety* of the Greek Mariner has accessed.

Quevedo's carefully chosen language also highlights the various difficulties of accessing this language—in turn highlighting the extent of Mariner's linguistic feats. His use of *totus* to describe the "Graecae linguae thesaurus," Quevedo emphasizes not only the vastness of the Greek language itself, but also the totality of it. Mariner's mastery is both impressive for its breadth and for its completeness: he is the master of all that comes under the purview of the Greek language.

The next phrase suggests another element of Greek's enormity: the metaphorical thesauri are "mole et magnitudine inaccessibiles," emphasizing the language's size and its bulkiness. This phrase thus suggests the challenging nature of the task of mastering the language, again, emphasizing the amount of work that goes into learning Greek and therefore the impressiveness of Mariner's mastery. This is, additionally, emphasized by the use of "difficultus;" in other words, one of the things making Greek inaccessible seems to be the language's own troublesomeness, its obstinacy. Moreover, as mentioned above, the use of *moles* to describe the work involved in making the Greek language accessible is significant, recalling the seminal Vergilian quote about the founding of Rome, "tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem" (*Aen.*1.33). By undertaking the laborious burden of mastering the *moles* of the Greek language, Mariner has become something akin to a humanist Aeneas.

As he continues to develop this metaphor, Quevedo's deployment of elaborate rhetorical techniques become a masterful display in which, while praising

Mariner's linguistic prowess, he simultaneously demonstrates his own. Quevedo's emphasis on the image of Greek's languishing in darkness is highlighted by the repeated imagery of vision being obstructed, not only by the "difficultatum tenebris," but also by the "caeca noctis caligine submersos," submerged in the blind fog of night, a phrase that is multi-leveled metaphor in which Quevedo really shows off his rhetorical skills. Here with the use of the verb "submergo" that equates darkness to water, the night itself becomes like a fog, and the use of the term "caeca" not only personifies the night, but also represents a transferred epithet which evokes the effect the fog has rather than the quality that it possesses itself.

The use of language associated not only with obstruction of vision but also with burial is also striking. Although "submergo" points to the image of water, it simultaneously suggests something underneath, therefore linking it to "sepultus," which more properly suggests under the earth. With the use of "eruo" as the verb, here "to dig," the metaphor is almost an archeological one, the common image of unearthing the buried past. However, the use of "sepultus" for buried, with its funereal overtones, adds another dimension, suggesting that Greek has almost been left to die, but has been resuscitated by Mariner. Other words used in this metaphor of burial also suggest the sense of neglect of Greek by human agents. While the metaphor of the "fog of night" might simply refer to the inevitable passage of time, the processes seem more deliberative. While the phrase "oblivionis inertiae" might suggest passive human processes initially—we might consider forgetting to be a passive process since by definition inertia suggests a lack of action— but put together in this way, they suggest a sense of the not making the effort to remember,

which is in itself an active decision. The use of “malignitas” as a secondary factor responsible for the “sepultura” attributes even more motivation—this time a negative one—to human agents in terms of the language; it is out of both lack of motivation to save Greek and of bearing it ill will.

In true humanist form, this metaphor is an indictment of earlier generations’—i.e., Scholastic thinkers’—attitudes towards Greek: here Quevedo accuses them of intellectual laziness. It also presents Mariner as the arch-humanist who has come to save Greek. He is not only here to dispel the darkness of previous, pre-humanist thinkers, he is also here to do a great deal of work and to overcome the laziness that has led to this forgetting. The image of the quill, the calamus, to unearth something so large and so deeply buried is oxymoronic, therefore evoking the power of the written word to uncover the past. This might refer equally both to Mariner’s translations, editing of texts, as it might to his use of neo-Greek. Mariner, armed with his calamus, tackling the *moles* of the Greek language, transforms into a Hellenist hero. However, interestingly, Mariner actually comes at the end of a long process that has brought all of this to light, and Quevedo is eliding a huge part of the humanist history of Europe in which others, not Spaniards, have done this work.

In comparison to Mariner’s portrait of Quevedo, then, Quevedo’s portrait of Mariner is striking for its almost hyperbolic level of specificity in terms of Mariner’s achievements not only as a humanist, but especially, as a Hellenist. His exhaustive list of Mariner’s works, simply as a rhetorical strategy, is a convincing display of the technique of *amplificatio* to the extreme. Moreover, his elaborate discussion of Mariner’s contributions to Greek studies paints his colleague as a Hellenist hero

almost solely responsible for the humanist resurrection of the language. In many ways, we might see Quevedo's portrait of Mariner, with his extensive body of serious philological interventions and mastery of the Greek language, as a portrait of the ideal Hellenist persona that he himself hopes to project in his *Anacreón castellano*. And interestingly, with a return to this work, it is possible to bring the discussion of Mariner's and Quevedo's collaboration full circle by linking it to the first part of this study.

As argued earlier, the *Anacreón castellano* seems to reflect a seminal moment for Quevedo in his quest to distinguish a unique literary persona for himself. As the previous analysis has shown, the *Anacreón* served to create a specifically Hellenist persona for Quevedo—an effort that seems to have paid off. As our survey of the contemporary and posthumous *elogios* of Quevedo compiled by Fernández Guerra de Orbe has shown, with the exception of Góngora, Quevedo appears to have convinced his contemporaries that he was an outstanding Hellenist, and that this reputation seems to have followed him after his death, at least until Flórez Canseco in the eighteenth century. Although the development of this Hellenist persona was not the only factor in Quevedo's literary and personal success (and he was very much subject to the vicissitudes of fate, particularly later in life), it is an element worthy of consideration in piecing together the author's story. Moreover, here as the dedicatee of Mariner's translation and as its Latin prologuist, Quevedo is able to cement this reputation; his association with Mariner's serious intervention into the international arena of Greek studies only serves to bolster his Hellenist persona, in addition to giving him the opportunity to show off his Latin skills.

On the other hand, in the case of Mariner, the less-fortunate Tychechtrio was never able to reach the same level of success or status as Quevedo, despite Mariner's level of expertise in classical studies and his Lope-esque output. It is worth noting of Mariner, however, that his decision to produce only works in Latin and Greek, even in a century when educated readers could manage Latin, was nevertheless not the most effective strategy at least to *sell* books at a Lope-esque volume.

What are we to make of the relationship between Quevedo, the more successful "philo-philologist," the dilettante, and Mariner, the less successful but truly skilled philologist? The disparity between the two authors, both in terms of success and in terms of philological skill, is one that Schwartz notes in her reading of the two authors' mutual praise in the *In regem*. As she observes, "como es bien sabido, las contribuciones de Mariner a la diffusion de la literatura griegolatina fueron, sin duda, muy superiores a las de Quevedo." For Schwartz, in praising Quevedo, Mariner's *elogio* reflects that with his various and well-received texts such as the *Anacreón*, Quevedo "se había forjado fama de erudite entre los humanistas de su tiempo" ("Las preciosas" 215).

What Schwartz hints at here but does not fully articulate is the fact that Mariner's praise might be strategic, as may be his choice to dedicate the work to Quevedo, to include Quevedo's prologue, and to intersperse the various encomiastic materials regarding the latter. Mariner, although the superior Hellenist, may be seeking to authorize his own Greek translation based on the reputation of his less-skilled, but more famous friend. Jauralde Pou's assessment of the project also points to this idea. He notes that Quevedo's attachment to the project likely is linked to

Quevedo's reputation among humanists, that "en la Corte se 'sentía' su imparable ascenso ... en los círculos cortesanos más altos" (498). One possible way to interpret Quevedo's omnipresence, then, is to consider Mariner's position in publishing and promoting his book. With Quevedo attached to the project, Mariner might be able to profit from piggybacking off of his more famous collaborator.

In this case, for Mariner, it becomes necessary to play to Quevedo's reputation in structuring the book to appeal to readers who have already been convinced of Quevedo's Greek prowess based on his performances of knowing Greek; Quevedo becomes a guarantor of the translation's validity—with his credentials from Lipsius on full display, granting the work its Hellenist bona fides. The combined effect of the epigrams, letters, and dedication create a portrait of Quevedo that reinforces his reputation Hellenist authority.<sup>100</sup>

However, the generic, even boilerplate nature of Mariner's praise, is striking, particularly in light of Quevedo's highly specific praise of Mariner. This lack of specificity is significant, and is a fact that neither Cañigral Cortez, Schwartz, or Jauralde Pou, who take Mariner's praise at face value, take into consideration. In and

---

<sup>100</sup> It is important to address here a potentially relevant issue raised by García del Paso and Herrera Rodríguez in their discussion the *In regem solem*, namely, the possibility that Quevedo may have funded the publication himself. These scholars state that the work was published "bajo el mecenazgo" of Quevedo, although they do not provide evidence for this interesting theory and is not one that Cañigral Cortéz in his more detailed study of Quevedo and Mariner considers (see "Un entusiasta admirador"), nor does La Fuente Santo in his study of Mariner for his *Batracomiomaquia* edition (see xxii–iv). Moreover, in the introductory study of their 2012 short anthology of Mariner's works, they do not raise this theory again (see *Breve antología* 31–33). If we are able to show that this is, indeed the case, I do not believe that it significantly influences the conclusions here, but rather, potentially adds another dimension in which Quevedo himself may be more instrumental in promoting the authorizing Hellenist persona developed in the text, a continuation of his efforts in the *Anacreón*. This theory deserves further consideration, but for now, in lieu of specific evidence, I leave it for future investigation.

of itself, this lack of specificity need not surprise us, as even Mariner's autograph manuscripts reveal his habit of writing interchangeable *elogios*. Knowing Mariner's penchant for interchangeable *elogios*, it is important to keep in mind that his praise is, if not entirely false, not necessarily sincere either.

Nevertheless, in the context of a work where multiple elements serve to highlight Quevedo and other encomiastic paratexts work together to form a portrait of Quevedo as an accomplished Hellenist, Mariner's silence on the matter is jarring. While Mariner seems to be willing to include these materials to indirectly support the popular image of Quevedo as Hellenist, he seems unwilling to explicitly do so in his text. Perhaps the Hellenist does not want to participate explicitly in bolstering a persona that he does not feel reflects reality. Whatever the case may be, in this fascinating collaboration, both authors' perspectives on each other create something of a refraction, with Quevedo, the successful philo-philologist, praising what he sees as his own ideal Hellenist in his colleague Mariner, and with Mariner, his generation's most skilled—but also struggling philologist, relying in turn on his Hellenist poseur of a colleague to promote his most novel entry into the world of international philology.

In the intersection of both of these figures, we see the stakes at play in the study of Greek during this era. Mariner and Quevedo share a “*vocación filológica*” and see the mastery of Greek—or at least the projection of the mastery of Greek—as a tool for amassing both cultural and material capital. While their trajectories and skill levels at Greek were different, in their collaboration, their mutual reflections on

each other's Greek in turn reflect the continuing prestige of at least projecting a Hellenist persona, if not living it, in the early decades of the seventeenth century.

## CONCLUSION

### Results of the Present Study

This study has set out to explore some of the possible answers to the question “What does it mean to study Greek in early modern Spain?” In asking the question “Who needs Greek?”, Simon Goldhill notes that in every culture and in every context—anywhere and everywhere—that Greek has been studied over the course of the language’s history, its meaning as a practice has been unique (11). Following this idea, the present analysis, in an effort to integrate Spain’s often-omitted Hellenist legacy into the history of European Greek studies, has worked to identify some of the unique implications of Greek studies in the Spanish context.

Frequently, because of a variety of historical factors that supposedly limited the Spanish in their studies of Greek, Spain’s Hellenist legacy is omitted from histories of European Humanism. This narrative has even been promoted by Spanish historians and thus has negatively impacted the amount of scholarly attention devoted to Spanish Hellenism in Spanish-language academic contexts. These “limitations,” best articulated by Spanish literary historian Luis Gil Fernández (214 ff.), include (1) a lack of printing presses in the Peninsula to proliferate Greek texts; (2) the constant specter the Inquisition, which during the Counter-Reformation considered pagan texts suspicious and believed Greek study could bring one dangerously close to Protestant biblical philology; (3) a series of royal interventions including Philip II’s prohibition against Spaniards studying in foreign

universities, Philip III's prohibition of Spanish authors publishing abroad without specific royal licenses, and Philip IV's limitation on the publishing of works deemed "superfluous"; and (4) economic decline, through which salaries for university professors dropped precipitously, resulting in a concomitant drop in the level of education in all fields, and, notably, Greek studies. For Gil Fernández, his proteges, José López Rueda and Enriqueta de Andres, and various international scholars, these specific factors impeded Spanish Greek studies, both in terms of their proliferation and the level of skills acquired by students of Greek, thus making Spanish Greek studies subpar in comparison with the rest of Europe.

Rather than viewing these factors as "limitations" or "impediments," this study has argued that these factors, unique to Spain, forced Spanish humanists to develop creative textual strategies—often virtuosic displays of rhetorical misdirection—to convince readers that, despite these factors, they were both capable and consummate Hellenists. The present analysis has taken as its subject a series of texts that put this phenomenon on display: Juan de Mena's 1444 *Omero romaçado*, Pedro Simón Abril's 1586 *Gramatica griega escrita en lengua castellana*, Francisco de Quevedo's 1609 *Anacreón Castellano*, and Vicente Mariner and Quevedo's collaboration in the 1624 *In regem solem ad Salustium Panegyricus*.

In his clever approach to overcoming a lack of access to the Homeric text, Mena would cleverly argue that his non-Homeric Homeric text was superior to a true Homeric translation. Simón Abril would employ elaborate rhetoric and linguistic argument to promote his own platform Greek pedagogy, despite the many factors complicating the life of a Greek grammarian in his day. Quevedo would use

an array of paratexts to project a portrait of himself as a master emendator of the Greek language, despite the fact that his Greek was not likely up for this philological challenge, and Mariner and Quevedo composed intricate *elogios* for one another in Latin reflecting each other's unique valuation of their counterpart's Hellenist profile.

The works studied here represent a span of time which saw Spain undergo massive political change, from the consolidation of Castile and Aragon under the Catholic Monarchs in 1474 to the end of the Reconquista with the fall of Granada in 1492 to the arrival of Columbus in the Americas in the same year; it saw the creation, expansion, and initial stages of decline of Spain's vast empire. One of the key features shared by these texts is an awareness of the intersection of Greek studies—one the seminal markers that distinguished humanism from the Latin, Scholastic past— with the idea of “Spanish” identity, both internally as constructed by Spaniards themselves and externally as perceived by Spain's European peers.

These texts are connected in their shared preoccupation with establishing Spain within the international dialogue of humanists. This is evident in Mena's and Juan II's court's eagerness to catch up with Italian Homeric studies by acquiring a text of the poet's *Iliad*; in Simón Abril's hope that Greek studies can remedy Spain's negative Hellenist reputation abroad and, at home, the ailing relationship between monarch and subject; in the elaborate textual dialogue Quevedo creates with a chorus of international Hellenists, and most importantly, Henri “Stephanus” Estienne; and in Quevedo and Mariner's inclusion of Justus Lipsius's letters to Quevedo as a means of establishing Quevedo's philological credentials.

By taking as its subject Mena, Simón Abril, Quevedo and Mariner, this study has also avoided another pitfall of historical narratives revolving around Greek studies, the tendency to focus on the “great men” of Hellenism. These are figures such as Stephanus, Isaac Casaubon, and, above all, Joseph Justus Scaliger, whose presence looms large in assessments of Spain’s Hellenist legacy, as Spain is deemed to have failed in its Hellenism for not producing its own Scaliger. Within the Spanish context, these “great men” include Francisco de Vergara, Hernán Nuñez, and Francisco Sanchez de las Brozas, figures so prominent for their reputations as classicists that the latter two continue to be referred to in Spanish scholarship by the monikers given to them in their own era, “El Comendador Griego” and “El Brocense” respectively (the latter being the Latinized “Brozas”).

In considering these figures, this study focuses on “lesser” figures, that is to say, less often studied figures, as in the case of Simón Abril or Mariner, or those less often studied for their Hellenism, such as Mena and Quevedo. The analysis has thus attempted to consider the range of experiences of Hellenists outside of these major *catedráticos* of Spain, who represent a particular university context that so far has received the most scholarly attention.

To reiterate the calculations of Paul Botley, by the 1530s alone, likely 100,000 Europeans had undertaken the study of Greek, a number which would have continued to grow exponentially through the early seventeenth century that is the terminus of this study (118). Only a tiny fraction of these figures would ever reach Scaliger, or even “Comendador Griego” or “Brocense” status. The experiences of the more quotidian Hellenists here (with the exception of the particularly skilled

Mariner), represent the majority of Greek students in Spain and in Europe more broadly, making their experiences particularly invaluable for considering the question of “what does it mean to study Greek” in this context.

### Final Reflections

One of the main goals of this study has been to show that no one—early modern Spanish Hellenists included—studies Greek in a vacuum. Returning to Charles Graux, whom we encountered in chapter 1, regarding this time period, the nineteenth-century French philologist notes that no one in Spain studied Greek “pour lui-même,” that no one studied Greek “pour la jouissance de revivre, en quelque manière, dans un monde si différent du nôtre” (9). Essentially, what Graux describes here, recapitulating the humanist ideal of Hellenism as articulated first by Petrarch himself, is studying Greek in a vacuum. That is to say, it conceives of Greek studies as a purely intellectual pursuit based only in the student’s desire to connect with antiquity, a practice untainted by the concerns of the outside world. If we apply *this* standard for Greek studies to the authors examined in this study, then we can certainly argue that this is true.

As our analysis of Mena, Simón Abril, Quevedo, and Mariner has shown, these authors studied Greek for a multiplicity of reasons, reflecting factors both personal and public, both national and international, some of which remained stable over time and some of which shifted over the course of a period of unprecedented historical change in Spain. In noting these various factors, however, I would like to affirm that this study in no way means to deny these authors their genuine passion

for Greek. I hope, rather, to restore to them the complexity and richness of their individual experience, to show them as more than one-dimensional figures in the history of Greek studies, and to affirm that their works are valuable, regardless of whether they became Scaligers, Comendadores Griegos, or Brocenses.

Moreover, as should be obvious, what is true of Spain—that its Hellenists did not study Greek in a vacuum—is true of Greek studies in any given context. As chapter 1 sought to demonstrate, this is also true of those who study the history of Greek studies themselves, Graux included. Whether they are or were willing to acknowledge it, Graux and others exploring the topic are just as influenced by various historical factors that shape their attitudes towards their subjects. These include historical currents themselves with roots in the early modern period, in particular the long legacy of the Black Legend of Spain among other Europeans, examined in detail by Walter Mignolo, Margaret Greer, and others. The result of this has been that Spain’s Hellenist legacy has not been fully integrated into histories of European humanism. Such histories, then, have themselves become part of a long historical narrative, a process which no historical project is able to avoid. This is a phenomenon that Simon Goldhill notes well in arguing that, even in the act of acknowledging the culturally-specific, contextually constructed idea of “Greekness,” “contemporary historians ... cannot help finding their own reconstructions ... becoming part of the history being related” (11).

The present study has sought to correct the imbalance of past historical narratives of Spanish Hellenism, but in doing so, I recognize its own participation in the process Goldhill describes. I therefore do not mean to judge previous historians

of the subject, both those past and present, for having blindspots, since; I myself and the present study surely have our own. In recognizing this, I again cite the instructive words of Goldhill, who addresses his reader provocatively as follows:

“[Y]ou and I are active participants—players—in the debate over “Who Needs Greek?” (and not just umpire or judge). Trying to recognize one’s own engaged self-positioning in the present, one’s own stakes in the past, and the shifting models of Greekness in the past and present means that the historian is placed, as it were, between two mirrors, in a play of multiple reflections.” (11)

In this spirit, I acknowledge for the reader that my own perspective cannot help but shape my approach to the history of Spanish Hellenism, and to Mena, Simón Abril, Quevedo, and Mariner themselves. In interpreting their place as early modern readers of Greek, I recognize the vast differences between their experiences with the language and my own. This is particularly true in considering the limitations they faced in accessing materials for their pursuits. In learning Greek in the twenty-first century, I have benefitted from a variety of resources the intervening centuries have brought to bear on Greek studies. These include the collective body of linguistic knowledge compiled by the science of comparative historical linguistics, the exhaustive lexica enriched by generations of philologists, and the radical changes digital humanities have wrought even in the course of my own professional career, in which once crucial resources, such as the concordances (?) have been replaced by digital corpus searches that would have certainly seemed miraculous for classicists only a few generations ago. In approaching the question of Mena, Simón Abril, Quevedo, and Mariner’s knowledge of Greek, then, I have tried to resist

evaluating their skills anachronistically—even if unconsciously—based on what these resources have made possible for me.

I also acknowledge my perspective as a woman who studies Greek. The study of classical languages, while changing, continues to be an area, as it was in these author's age, that is male-dominated. In choosing to study these male Hellenists, albeit ones whose understudied contributions to the practice I hope to recover, I am aware that I leave the voices of early modern women Hellenists neglected.

Finally, as a woman with Hispanic—and specifically Latinx heritage, I acknowledge how my own experiences in the field of Classics, where this demographic remains notably under-represented, shape my perspective. During my tenure as a classicist, I have encountered some of the attitudes towards Spain's Hellenist legacy outlined here firsthand, from those that are either neglectful of this legacy to those who are even openly hostile, as we saw in the case of Graux. To be fair, this is certainly not representative of all classicists, particularly those of more recent generations who are admirably working to bring equity and broader representation to the field. Nevertheless, there is still a great deal of work to do, and this attitude *is* one I have encountered and it certainly shapes my own motivations for the present study.

It is important to note here too that I am aware that this study does not consider the still under-explored realm of Greek in the New World and other Spanish contexts outside of the Peninsula. In particular, the presence of Greek studies in the Americas deserves further attention. Here we find Greek-trained Franciscan and Jesuits cataloguing and standardizing indigenous languages.

Moreover, we see Amerindians, criollos, and mestizos themselves, trained in the classical tradition at schools such as New Spain's Colegio de Santa Cruz in Tlatelolco, adapting "Golden Age" Spanish genres—ones rooted in antiquity and in humanism—to their unique cultural contexts. While the Latin tradition in their works and their Neo-Latin textual production has been explored by scholars such as Andrew Laird in the Nahuatl-speaking New Spain and Alan Durston in the Quechua-speaking Andes,<sup>101</sup> the impact of Greek in these areas remains a rich area for future study.

It is here, in closing, that we may return to the point at which we began, with Cervantes, his Don Diego de Miranda, the "Caballero del Verde Gabán" of Don Quijote part II (chapter 16), and Salamanca university student, Don Lorenzo. It is clear in Cervantes's gently satirical portrait of Don Diego, provincial hidalgo and father to the supposedly hapless and overly studious son, Don Lorenzo, that the author himself perceives some of the complexity of Greek studies that this study has tried to show. To conclude, I will highlight only a few of the many ways Cervantes's Don Diego reflects the factors influencing Greek studies studied here.

To begin, it is important to recall one of Cervantes's more subtle characterizations of Don Diego, one that is particularly effective in establishing his comedic value. Despite his denigration of his son's classical pursuits, Don Diego's protracted complaints reveal his own knowledge of the Greek and Latin canons. In

---

<sup>101</sup> Andrew Laird. "Nahuatl and Caesars: Classical Learning and Bilingualism in Post-Conquest Mexico; An Inventory of Latin Writings by Authors of the Native Nobility." *Classical Philology*, vol. 109, num. 2, 2014, pp. 150–169; Alan Durston. *Pastoral Quechua: The History of Christian Translation in Colonial Peru, 1550–1650*. Uof Notre Dame Press, 2007.

mocking his son's reading habits with a lengthy list of authors, he shows a knowledge of an impressive range of classical sources. Significantly, these are the key representatives of the genres central to university education and the humanist tradition in general, not the least of which is Homer, Mena's "monarca de poesía universal," whom Don Diego places first in ordering his list, and thus at the "correct" head of the humanist hierarchy.

Don Diego's knowledge of this canon suggests that he has at least a modicum of familiarity with the classical tradition, indicating that he himself has studied, likely with a tutor, in a local *estudio*, or even at the university level. Somewhere behind Don Diego's own erudition, then, exists a figure such as Simón Abril. Such grammarians, and even university professors who never reached the prominence of a Vergara, Nuñez, or Sanchez de las Brozas, played an integral role in proliferating Greek studies. Though they remain mostly invisible in literary sources, the education that Don Diego and his son Don Lorenzo display hints at their existence.

Finally, Don Diego's ability to joke that his son spends his days arguing "si dijo bien o mal Homero en tal verso de la Iliada" (154) indicates his familiarity with the scholarly practices of textual analysis. Similarly, he bemoans of his son that "todas sus conversaciones son con los libros de los referidos poetas" (154). Both of these comments indicate that Don Diego knows enough about the practices of philologists to mock them and suggests that even a provincial minor noble could recognize what these practices entailed. It is not unsurprising, then, that Quevedo would ostentatiously display these practices in his *Anacreón*, as Don Diego's comments suggest that it is not just "professional" philologists such as Mariner who will

recognize the significance of these practices: lay readers will understand what these practices are, and thus the right reader might potentially reward Quevedo for his efforts at them.

Another notable characterization of Don Diego is his prominent mention of his library, one of the first things he states in describing himself. He notes that his library contains “hasta seis docenas de libros” (154) of the best and most eloquent Castilian and classical volumes. Don Diego’s comments reflect the power held by books as material objects and status symbols, at least within certain circles.

Demand for Greek texts, not only as objects of scholarly study, but also as material objects, in many ways shaped the efforts of the authors under examination here. This is evident in the efforts of Juan II and his courtiers, including Mena, to procure a copy of Homer, a text which had in earlier held such power as a physical object for Petrarch that he had wept simply holding the text that, to him, was indecipherable. The absence of this text was central to Mena’s own elaborate efforts to provide the king with a non-Homer Homeric text as a stop-gap measure as the king awaited a fuller version from Alonso de Cartagena’s contact in Italy, Pier Candido Decembrio.

Over a hundred years later, in the 1580s of Simón Abril, Greek texts were easier to come by and to produce (although Gil Fernández has discussed their comparatively limited circulation in Spain compared to the rest of Europe). Simón Abril was likely able to sustain himself, as Luis de Cañigral Cortés has argued, for a period of almost ten years in Madrid through the sales of his translations and grammars alone. Interestingly, however, is a possibility raised by the pristine

physical state of the extant version of his *Cartilla griega*. The delicate, unbound pamphlet's condition suggests the possibility that Greek texts in this era were not necessarily used for their intended purposes, but rather potentially served as objects whose possession could indicate their bearer's erudition.

Additionally, we may remark here upon Don Diego's pride over the extensive and highly specific contents of his library—whose classical content he is careful to note. This might recall for the reader Quevedo's hyperbolic list of Mariner's extensive corpus of Greek, one that Lía Schwartz connects to the construction of the ideal humanist library, a key symbol of status among those projecting themselves as intellectuals.

However, an important factor observed in the present study that Don Diego notably does *not* recognize is also telling. Don Diego complains that his son's pursuits of classical poetry distracts him from a certain type of practical literary studies that will prepare him for his role as hidalgo and help advance him at court, that is, from "las virtuosas y buenas letras" that "nuestros reyes premian altamente" (154).

As our analysis has shown, Don Diego's assessment that Don Lorenzo's classical studies will not help him at court is not necessarily the case. Even as early as Juan de Mena, Juan II and the powerful members of his court such as Alonso de Cartagena and the Marqués de Santillana placed a high premium on the new Greek literature—represented par excellence by Homer—that was trendy among contemporary Italian humanists. Their interest in this literature was such that the minor noble Juan de Mena was able to parlay his Homeric work, along with his

Laberinto de Fortuna, into a prominent position at court as “Secretary of Latin Letters.”

In the case of Simón Abril, even this middle-class grammarian was able to capture the attention of Philip II with his successful Greek translations, earning him a two month stay at the Escorial court and the monarch’s ear in promoting Simon Abril’s educational reform. Quevedo too benefited greatly from his 1609 “philological moment,” with the most prominent of his three Hellenistic texts produced that year, the *Anacreón*, gaining the attention and support of the humanisticly-minded Duke of Lerma. Even the hapless Mariner, ever *tychechtrio*, recognized the power of projecting a Hellenist image for advancing one’s career, although he was never quite able to achieve this himself.

Cervantes himself certainly recognized the power of literature to advance one’s position, particularly in the upper echelons of the most powerful nobility. He was a veteran always in search of financial stability that he hoped to find through his literary output, both at court and in the popular literary market. However, his Don Diego reflects a more conservative attitude, likely reflecting his provincial status, that shows a lack of understanding of the early seventeenth-century court, likely for comic effect. Cervantes’s joke lands precisely because Don Diego is unable to recognize how the cultural capital of classical studies—and Greek studies in particular—could translate into tangible social, political, and financial advancement, not only in the early seventeenth century, but going back as far as the dawn of Spanish humanism in the mid-fifteenth at the court of Juan II.

Cervantes's Don Diego, then, both in what he recognizes and what he fails to recognize about the power of Greek studies, reinforces the findings of the present study. Cervantes's portrait of the provincial hidalgo confirms that even inhabitants of the early modern period were able to recognize the fact that no one studies Greek in a vacuum—that it is a culturally specific practice with highly-individual and ever-shifting implications. This study has used the lives and Hellenist works of Mena, Simón Abril, Quevedo, and Mariner to demonstrate some of the various historical and cultural factors that also uphold this fact. In doing so, it has shown that, just as much as Mena, Simón Abril, Quevedo, Mariner may have needed Greek, so too did both Don Lorenzo and even Don Diego himself.

τέλος

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alcalde Martín, Carlos. "Quevedo, traductor de las Sentencias de Pseudo-Focílides." *Musa Graeca tradita, Musa Graeca recepta. Traducciones de poetas griegos (siglos XV–XVII)*, edited by Aurelio Pérez Jiménez and Paola Volpe Cacciatore, Pórtico, 2011, pp. 85–102.
- Andrés Castellanos, Enriqueta de. *Helenistas españoles del siglo XVII*. Fundación Universitaria Española, 1988.
- Arco y Garay, Ricardo del. "El humanista Pedro Simón Abril." *Argensola: Revista de Ciencias Sociales del Instituto de Estudios Altoaragoneses*, vol. 3, 1950, pp. 225–246
- Arnold, Matthew. "On Translating Homer." *The Works of Matthew Arnold*. Edited by George William Erskine Russell, AMS Press, 1970.
- Astrana Marín, Luis. *La vida turbulenta de Quevedo*. Editorial "Gran Capitán," 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. editor. *Francisco de Quevedo. Obras Completas. Obras en Prosa*. M. Aguilar, 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Anacreonte, introducido en España por Quevedo." *Epistolario completo de Don Francisco de Quevedo Villegas*, edited by Luis Astrana Marín, Instituto Editorial Reus, 1946, pp. 558–57
- Balcells, Josep María. "Quevedo, traductor del griego." *Scriptura*, vol. 4, 1988, pp. 35–41.
- Beltrán Cebollada, José Antonio. "El conocimiento de la Antigüedad a través de los libros: apunte valorativo de la biblioteca del humanista Pedro Simón Abril (ca. 1540– 1595)." *Saldvie: Estudios de prehistoria y arqueología*, num. 11–12, 2012, pp. 85–96.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Que no huelga nada a la lengua latina'. La traducción por Pedro Simón Abril de las 'Epistulae ad familiares' de Cicerón." *Cuadernos de filología clásica: Estudios latinos*, vol. 31, num. 2, 2011, pp. 333–354
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pedro Simón Abril, traductor de las Epístolas Familiares de Cicerón (1589)." *Humanismo y pervivencia del mundo clásico. V: homenaje al profesor Juan Gil*, edited by José María Maestre Maestre, Sandra Inés Ramos Maldonado, Manuel Antonio Díaz Gito, María Violeta Pérez Custodio, Bartolomé Pozuelo Calero, Antonio Serrano Cueto, vol. 2, *Literatura humanística*, 2015, pp. 971–

87.

Beltrán de Heredia, Vicente. "Nuevos documentos inéditos sobre el poeta Juan de Mena." *Salamanticensis*, III, 1956, pp.502-508.

Bénichou-Roubaud, Sylvia. "Quevedo helenista: (El Anacreón castellano)." *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, vol. 14, num. 1/2, 1960, pp. 51-72.

Bidez, Jaques. *La tradition manuscrite et les éditions des discours de l'empereur Julien*. Eduourd Champion, 1929.

Botley, Paul. *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396-1529: Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series*, vol. 100, num. 2, 2010.

Bravo de Laguna Romero, Francisco. *Estudio, edición y traducción del libro I de los gusmaneidos libri qvinque de Vicente Mariner*. U de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 2002.

Breva Claramonte, Manuel. "Teaching Materials in Pedro Simón Abril (1530-1600)." *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, vol. 9, fasc. 2, 1987, pp. 27-39.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Translation in Pedro-Simón Abril's (1530-1600) Teaching Method." *History and Historiography of Linguistics: Papers From the Fourth International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHoLS IV): Trier, 24-28 August 1987*, edited by E. F. K. Koerner and Hans-Josef Niederehe, John Benjamins Publishing, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. "El uso y la copia en el método de Pedro Simón Abril (1530-1600)." *Revista española de lingüística*, num. 21, fasc. 1, 1991, pp. 47-64.

\_\_\_\_\_. *La didáctica de las lenguas en el renacimiento: Juan Luis Vives y Pedro Simón Abril: con selección de textos*. Universidad de Deusto, 1994.

"Los antecedentes de la didáctica de las lenguas en Pedro Simón Abril (1530-1600)." *La lingüística española en la época de los descubrimientos: actas del coloquio en honor del profesor Hans-Josef Niederehe, Treveris, 16 a 17 de junio de 1997*, edited by Beatrice Bagola, Buske, 2000, págs. 9-18.

Brioso Sánchez, Máximo, editor. *Anacreónticas. Texto revisado y traducido*, CSIC, 1981.

Camacho Rojo, José María and Jesús María García González. "La literatura griega en la obra en prosa de Francisco de Quevedo." *Florentia Iliberritana*, vol. 4-5, 1993-94, pp. 109-124.

- Campbell, David A., editor. *Greek Lyric, Volume II: Anacreon, Anacreontea, Choral Lyric from Olympus to Alcman*. Harvard UP / Loeb Classical Library, 1988.
- Cañas Gálvez, Francisco de Paula. "Juan de Mena, secretario de latín y cronista del rey: un letrado de la Cancillería Real al servicio de Juan II y Enrique IV." *Juan de Mena: de letrado a poeta*. Edited by Cristina García Moya, Tamesis, 2015. pp. 11–21.
- Cañigral Cortés, Luis de. "Un entusiasta admirador de Francisco de Quevedo: Vicente Mariner." *Homenaje a Quevedo*, Instituto de Estudios Manchegos, 1980, pp. 13–22.
- . editor. *Pedro Simón Abril: Textos de Humanismo y Didáctica*. Instituto de Estudio Albacetenses, 1988.
- . "La 'Cartilla Griega' de Pedro Simón Abril: una nueva edición." *Al-Basit: Revista de estudios albacetenses*, num. 23, 1988, págs. 149–69.
- . "Aportaciones a la bibliografía de Pedro Simón Abril." *Actas del VII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, vol. 3, 1989, pp. 393–398.
- Cátedra, Perdo-Manuel. "Sobre la biblioteca del Marqués de Santillana: *La Iliada* y Pier Candido Decembrio." *Hispanic Review*, vol.51, num.1, 1993. pp. 23–28.
- Casas Rigall, Juan. *Humanismo, gramática y poesía: Juan de Mena y los "auctores" en el canon de Nebrija*. U de Santiago de Compostela, 2010
- Castanien, Donald. G. "Quevedo's 'Anacreón Castellano.'" *Studies in Philology*, vol. 55, num. 4, 1958, pp. 568–575
- . "Quevedo's Translation of the Pseudo-Phocylides." *Philological Quarterly*, vol. 49, num. 1, pp. 44–52.
- Castro, Américo. *España en su historia. Cristianos, moros y judíos*. Editorial Losada, 1948.
- Castro de Castro, José David. "La traducción de los escolios a los "Idilios" de Teócrito de Vicente Mariner: algunas consideraciones." *Myrtia: Revista de filología clásica*, num. 11, 1996, pp. 71–86.
- . La traducción latina de los "Idilios de Teócrito" de Vicente Mariner. Dissertation. U de Murcia, 1998.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote Parte I*. Edited by Luis Andrés Murillo, Clásicos Castalia, 2010.

- . *El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote Parte II*. Edited by Luis Andrés Murillo, Clásicos Castalia, 2010.
- Christidis, A. F., Maria Agropopolou, and Maria Chriti, editors. *History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Cicciolella, Federica. *Donati Graeci: Learning Greek in the Renaissance*. Brill, 2007.
- Coronel Ramos, Marco Antonio. *La traducción latina en verso de la obra completa de Ausiàs March, realizada por el valenciano Vicente Mariner (Turnon, 1633)*. Dissertation, U de València, 1994.
- d'Artois, Florence. "Que toda la comedia o es narración o representación": Pedro Simón Abril y los modos miméticos en la teoría teatral renacentista en España." *La escondida senda: estudios en homenaje a Alberto Blecuá*. Edited by Eugenia Fosalba Vela, Gonzalo Pontón, 2012, pp. 181–205.
- del Barrio Vega, Maria Felisa. "Introducción: La Ilíada latina." *Diario de la guerra de Troya de Dictis Cretense. Historia de la destrucción de Troya de Dares Frigio*, edited and translated by Maria Felisa del Barrio Vega, Cristóbal López, José Javier Iso and José Luis Moralejo. Biblioteca Clásica Gredos, 2001.
- del Barrio Vega, Maria Felisa, Tomás González Rolán, and Antonio López Fonseca. *Juan de Mena, La Iliada de Homero: edición crítica de las "Summas de la Yliada de Omero" y del original latino reconstruido, acompañada de un glosario latino-romance*. Ediciones Clásicas, 1996.
- . "Juan de Mena y su versión de la *Ilias Latina*." *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, vol. 19, 1985, 47–84.
- Echeverría Gaztelumendi, Maraví. "La traducción latina de Ilíada IX, 222–605 de Bruni y su versión al castellano. Edición Crítica." *Cuadernos de filología clásica, estudios latinos*, num. 4, 1993, pp. 127–165.
- Edmunds, John Maxell, editor. *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*. Vol. 2, Brill, 1959.
- Fabiano, Carolina. "Pier Candido Decembrio, traduttore d'Omero." *Aevum*, vol. 23, 1949, pp. 36–51.
- Fernández González, Carlos and Sofía Simoes. "Nuevas aportaciones a la biblioteca de Francisco de Quevedo." *Manuscrpt.Cao*, num. 11, 2011, pp. 2–54.
- Förstel, Christian. "L'étude du grec à l'époque de l'humanisme." *History of the Language Sciences / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften / Histoire des Sciences du Langage: An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present*, edited by Sylvain Auroux, De

- Gruyter, Inc., 2008, pp. 666–673.
- Gallego, Elena and Francisca Moya del Baño. “Las traducciones de textos del Anacreón de Quevedo exclusivas del manuscrito de Nápoles.” *Lingua spagnola e cultura ispanica a Napoli fra Rinascimento e Barocco: testimoniazze a stampa*, edited by Encarnación Sánchez García, Tullio Pironti, 2013, pp. 181–199.
- García de Paso Carrasco, María Dolores. “Fuentes neolatinas de la Odyssea de Vicente Mariner: la posible existencia de una vulgate.” *Excerpta philologica: Revista de filología griega y latina de la Universidad de Cádiz*, num. 4–5, 1994–1995, pp. 183–196.
- . “Epítetos y fórmulas homéricas en la Iliás y la Odyssea de Vicente Mariner.” *Habis*, num. 28, 1997, pp. 235–251
- García de Paso Carrasco, María Dolores and Gregorio Rodríguez Herrera. *Vicente Mariner y sus traducciones de La Iliás y la Odyssea*. Servicio de Publicaciones Universidad de Córdoba, 1996.
- . editors. *Vicente Mariner: Antología breve*. Academia del Hispanismo, 2012.
- Garvie A. F., editor. *Choephorí*. By Aescylus, Oxford UP, 1986.
- Geanakoplos, Deno. *Greek Scholars in Venice: studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to Western Europe*. Harvard UP, 1962.
- Ghericke, Phillip O. “Juan de Mena 1411–1456.” *Dictionary of Literary Biography: Castilian Writers, 1400–1500*. Gale, 2004. 109–126.
- Gil Fernández, Luis. *Panorama social del humanismo español (1500-1800)*. Tecnos, 1997.
- . ““El humanismo español del siglo XVI.” *Estudios Clásicos*, vol. 11, 1967, pp. 209–297.
- Goldhill, Simon. *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*. Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Gómez Redondo, Fernando. *Artes poéticas medievales*. Laberinto, 2001.
- . *Historia de la prosa medieval castellana, 3: Los orígenes del humanismo: El marco cultural de Enrique III y Juan II*. Catedra, 2002.
- González Rolán, Tomas and Pilar Saquero Suárez Somonte. “Sobre La presencia en España de la versión latina de la «Iliada» de Pier Candido Decembrio. Edición

- de la 'Vita Homeri' y de su traducción castellana." *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica*, vol 21, 1988.
- Góngora, Luis de. *Obras completas*. Edited by Antonio Carreira, vol. 2, Fundación José Antonio de Castro, 2000.
- Grafton, Anthony and Lisa Jardine. *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth and Sixteenth-Century Europe*. Duckworth, 1986.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers*. U of Michigan P, 1997.
- Graux, Charles. *Essai sur les origines du fonds grec de l'Escorial: épisode de l'histoire de la renaissance des lettres en Espagne*. F. Vieweg, 1880.
- Gutierrez, Carlos M. *La Espada, el rayo y la pluma. Quevedo y los campos literarios y de poder*. Purdue UP, 2005.
- Hernando, Concepción. *Helenismo e Ilustración: el griego en siglo XVIII español*. Fundación Universitaria Española, 1975.
- Izquierdo, Adrian. "La traducción del Anacreón castellano de Quevedo en su tiempo." *Pictavia aurea. Actas del IX Congreso de la Asociación Internacional "Siglo de Oro" Poitiers, 11-15 de julio de 2011*, edited by Alain Bègue and Emma Herrán, Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2013, pp. 229-238.
- Jauralde Pou, Pablo. *Francisco de Quevedo (1580-1645)*. Editorial Castalia, 1999.
- Karantzola, E. "From Humanism to the Enlightenment: The Teaching of Ancient Greek and its Grammar." *History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, edited by A. F. Christidis, Maria Agropopolou, and Maria Chriti, Cambridge UP, 2001.
- La Fuente Santo, Juan de. *La version latina de los homericos realizada por Vicente Mariner. Estudio introductorio, edicion critica, traduccion, nota e indices*. Dissertation, U de Cádiz, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor. *Batracomiomaquia e Himnos homéricos*. By Vicente Mariner, Instituto de Estudios Humanísticos / CSIC, 2009.
- Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. *Juan de Mena: poeta del prerrenacimiento español*. Colegio de México, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Para la biografía de Juan de Mena." *Revista de filología hispánica*, vol. 3, 1941, pp. 150-4.

- López Fadul, Valeria. "Language as Archive: Etymologies and the Remote History of Spain." *After Conversion: Iberia and the Emergence of Modernity*, edited by Mercedes García-Arenal, Brill, 2016, 95–125.
- López Fonesca, Antonio. "La *Ilias Latina* en los manuscritos 5 III 16, Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial; 122, Archivo Capitular de Burgo de Osma; 72, Biblioteca Universitaria de Salamanca." *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios latinos*, num. 2, 1992. 42–56.
- López Fonesca, Antonio, Tomás Rolán González, and Pilar Saquero Suárez-Somonte. *La Tradición clásica en España (siglos XII-1V): bases conceptuales y bibliográficas*. Ediciones Clásicas, 2002.
- López Poza, Sagrario. "La Tabla de Cebes y los Sueños de Quevedo." *Edad de oro*, vol. 13, 1994, pp. 85–102.
- . "La cultura de Quevedo: cala y cata." *Estudios sobre Quevedo. Quevedo desde Santiago entre dos aniversarios*, edited by Santiago Fernández Mosquera, U de Santiago de Compostela, 1995, pp. 69–104.
- López Rueda, José. *Helenistas españoles del siglo XVI*. Instituto Antonio de Nebrija, 1973.
- López Ruíz, Antonio. "Sobre Quevedo Traductor de Poesía Clásica." *Traducir poesía: Luis Cernuda, traductor*, edited by Emilio Barón, Universidad de Almería, Servicio de Publicaciones, 1998, pp. 57-68.
- Mariner, Vicente. *In regem solem ad Salustium Panegyricus*. Pedro Tazón, Madrid, 1625. <https://books.google.com/books?id=InFnAAAACAAJ&pg=PP5#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
- . *Omnia opera*. Turin, Ludovico Phillet, 1633.  
<http://bivaldi.gva.es/es/consulta/registro.cmd?id=1496>
- Mazzocco, Angelo. *Linguistic theories in Dante and the humanists: studies of language and intellectual history in late Medieval and early Renaissance Italy*. Brill, 1993.
- McCrary, William C. "The Authorship of 'Próspera' and 'Adversa Fortuna de don Alvaro de Luna.'" *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 35, num. 1, 1958, pp. 38–40.
- Mena, Juan de. *Laberinto de fortuna*. Edited by John G. Cummins, Cátedra, 1984.
- . Omero romaçado. *Juan de Mena, La Iliada de Homero: edición crítica de las "Summas de la Yliada de Omero" y del original latino reconstruido, acompañada de un glosario latino-romance*, del Barrio Vega, Maria Felisa,

- Tomás González Rolán, and Antonio López Fonseca, Ediciones Clásicas, 1996, pp. 152–221.
- Miguel Prendes, Sol. "Translation, Authority, and Authorship in the Works of Enrique de Villena and Juan de Mena, the Vernacular Author in 15th Century Castile." *Allegorica*, vol. 17, 1996, pp. 17-31.
- Miralles Maldonado, José Carlos. "Pedro Simón Abril: sus traducciones de los Adelphoe de Terencio." *Teatro clásico en traducción: texto, representación, recepción: actas del Congreso Internacional, Murcia, 9-11 noviembre 1995*, edited by Ángel Luis Pujante Álvarez-Castellanos and Graham Keith Gregor, Editum, 1996, pp. 209–218.
- Morel Fatio, A. "Les deux Omero castillans," *Romania*, vol. 25, 1896, 111–29.
- Moreno Hernández, Antonio, Tomás Rolán González, and Pilar Saquero Suárez-Somonte. *Humanismo y teoría de la traducción en España y Italia en la primera mitad del siglo XV: edición y estudio de la controversia alphoncina (Alfonso de Cartagena vs. L. Bruni y P. Candido Decembrio)*. Ediciones Clásicas, 2000.
- Moreno Pampliega, Javier. *Encuentros, desencuentros y reencuentros con juliano: el emperador apóstata y sus secuelas a lo largo de la historia. Fortvnatae*, vol. 23, 2012, pp. 97–112.
- Morreale de Castro, Margherita. *Pedro Simón Abril*. CSIC / Instituto "Miguel de Cervantes," 1949.
- Moya del Baño, Francisca. "'Con pocos pero doctos'. Quevedo espejo de los clásicos." *Actas del XI Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, edited by Antonio Alvar Ezquerro, vol. 3, Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, 2005, pp. 345-418
- . "Don Francisco de Quevedo, 'filo-filólogo' clásico." *Humanismo y pervivencia del mundo clásico V: homenaje al profesor Juan Gil*, edited by José María Maestre Maestre, Sandra Inés Ramos Maldonado, Manuel Antonio Díaz Gito, María Violeta Pérez Custodio, Bartolomé Pozuelo Calero and Antonio Serrano Cueto, vol. 1, Instituto de Estudios Humanísticos, 2015, pp. 185-209
- . *Quevedo y sus ediciones de textos clásicos: las citas grecolatinas y la biblioteca clásica de Quevedo*. U de Murcia, Servicio de Publicaciones, 2014.
- Nesserath, Heinz-Günther, editor. *Iulianus Augustus: Opera*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 2015.
- Nisbet, Gideon. "Neo-Latin Letters: Epigrams and the Classical Tradition." *Brill's Encyclopedia of the Neo-Latin World*, edited by Philip Ford, Jan Bloemendal,

- and Charles Fantazzi, vol. 2, Brill, 2014.
- Nulle, Stebelton H. "Julian and the Men of Letters." *The Classical Journal*, vol. 54, num. 6, 1959), pp. 257–266.
- . "Julian "Redivivus." *The Centennial Review*, vol.5, num.3, 1961, pp. 320–338.
- Núñez, Hernán. "De la vida del auctor y de a intinción que le movió a escrevir y del título de la obra." *Glosa sobre las "Trezientas" del famoso poeta Juan de Mena por Hernán Núñez de Toledo*, edited by Julian Weiss and Antonio Cortijo Ocaña. 186–188.
- Olmos Gómez, Paula. Las "sentencias de un renglón" (1586) de Pedro Simón Abril: un repertorio al servicio de la gramática, la retórica y la dialéctica ... sin faltar a la moral." *Pandora: revue d'études hispaniques*, num. 7, 2007, pp.143–162
- . *Los negocios y las ciencias. Lógica, Argumentación y Metodología en la obra filosófica de Pedro Simón Abril (ca. 1540-1595)*. Madrid, CSIC, 2010.
- Paz, Amelia de. "Góngora... ¿y Quevedo?" *Criticon*, vol. 73, 1999, 29–47.
- Pérez Jiménez, Aurelio. "Sí, el Quevedo del Anacreón, helenista." *Musa Graeca Tradita Musa Graeca Recepta: Traducciones De Poetas Griegos (Siglos XV-XVII)*, edited by Aurelio Pérez Jiménez and Paola Volpe Cacciatore, Libros Pórtico, 2011, pp. 103-130.
- Pérez Priego, Miguel Ángel. "Introducción." *Obras Completas*, by Mena de Juan, edited by Miguel Ángel Pérez Priego. Planeta, 1989. pp. IX–XXXVII.
- Pertusi, Agostino. *Leonzio Pilato fra Petrarca e Boccaccio : le sue versioni omeriche negli autografi di Venezia e la cultura greca del primo Umanesimo*. Second Edition, Leo S. Olschki, 1979.
- Profeti, Maria Grazia. "El 'micro-género' de los sonetos de sátira literaria y Quevedo." *La Perinola*, vol. 8, 2004, pp.76–395.
- Quevedo, Francisco de. *Anacreón castellano con paraphrasi y comentarios*. Circa 1609, BNE MSS/17529. <http://bdh-rd.bne.es/viewer.vm?id=0000012565&page=1>.
- . *Anacreón castellano con paraphrasi y comentarios*. Madrid, 1794. <http://bdh-rd.bne.es/viewer.vm?id=0000089480&page=1>.
- . "Anacreón Castellano." *Obra poética IV: Teatro y traducciones poeticas*, edited by José Manuel Blecua, Editorial Castalia, 1981. 239–344.

- . “España defendida.” *España defendida con facsímil del autógrafo*, edited by Victoriano Roncero, Instituto de Estudios Auriseculares (IDEA), 2012.
- . *Epistolario completo de Don Francisco de Quevedo Villegas*, edited by Luis Astrana Marin, Instituto Editorial Reus, 1946.
- . “Phocílides.” *Obra poética IV: Teatro y traducciones poéticas*, edited by José Manuel Blecua, Editorial Castalia, 1981. 553–574.
- Reynolds, L. D. and N. G. Wilson. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*. Third Edition, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Riquer, Martín de. *Juan de Mena, Iliada en romance según la impresión de Arnao Guillén de Brocar (Valladolid 1519)*. Crítica, 1949.
- Roncero López, Victoriano. *El humanismo de Quevedo: Filología e historia*. Eunsa, 2000.
- Rodríguez Alonso, Cristóbal. “La poesía lírica en griego del humanista Vicente Mariner.” *Homenaje a Alvaro Galmés de Fuentes*, vol. 2, Editorial Gredos, 1985, pp. 435-446.
- Rodríguez López-Abadía, Arturo. “Estudio introductorio.” *Juliano Apóstata*. By Luis Vélez de Guevara, edited by William R. Manson, C. George Peale and Arturo Rodríguez López-Abadía, Juan de la Cuesta, 2016.
- Rubiera, Javier. *Para entender el cómico artificio. Terencio, Donato-Evancio y la traducción de Pedro Simón Abril (1577)*. Academia del Hispanismo, 2009.
- Ruíz Gito, Jesús M. *La Tabla de Cebes. Historia de un texto griego en el humanismo y la educación europea*. Ediciones Clásicas, 1997.
- Russell, Eugenia. “Greek in the Renaissance: Scholarship, Dissemination and Transition.” *Renaissance Studies* vol.25, num.4, 2011, pp. 585–589.
- Sandys, John Edwin. *A History of Classical Scholarship: From the Revival of Learning to the End of the Eighteenth Century (In Italy, France, England, and the Netherlands)*. Cambridge UP, 1908.
- Scaffai, Marco. “Pindarus seu Homerus: Un’ipotesi su titolo dell’Ilias Latina.” *Latomus*, vol. 38, num. 4, 1979, pp. 932–939.
- . editor. *Baebii Italici Ilias Latina*. By Baebius Italicus. Pàtron, 1982.
- Schwartz, Lía. “El Anacreón castellano de Quevedo y las Eróticas de Villegas: lecturas de la poesía anacreóntica en el siglo XVII.” *El Hispanismo*

*anglonorteamericano: aportaciones, problemas y perspectivas sobre historia, arte y literatura españolas (siglos XVI-XVIII), actas de la I Conferencia Internacional "Hacia un Nuevo Humanismo" C.I.N.HU., Córdoba, 9-14 de septiembre de 1997, Obra Social y Cultural Cajasur, 2001, pp. 1171-201.*

\_\_\_."Las preciosas alhajas de los entendidos' un humanista madrileño del siglo XVII y la difusión de los clásicos." *Edad de oro*, vol. 17, 1998, pp. 213-230.

Serés, Guillermo. "Pedro González de Mendoza y la 'grande Ilíada de Homero.'" *Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo*, vol. 65, 1989, pp. 5-54.

\_\_\_."La Ilíada y Juan de Mena: de la 'breve suma' a la 'plenaria interpretación.'" *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, vol. 37, num. 1, 1989, pp. 119-141.

\_\_\_.*La traducción en Italia y España durante el siglo XV: la "Ilíada en romance" y su contexto cultural.* Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1997.

Serrano Cueto, Antonio. "La vena poética de Vicente Mariner: observaciones en torno a la composición de los panegíricos." *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, vol. 3, 1994, pp. 579-584.

\_\_\_."El "epithalamium" de Jerónimo Ramírez en honor de la boda (1570) de Felipe II y Ana de Austria." *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, vol. 58, 2009, pp. 103-124.

Simón Abril, Pedro. *Cartilla griega.* Diego Robles, Zaragoza, 1586.

\_\_\_.*Gramática griega escrita en lengua castellana.* Pedro Madrigal, Madrid, 1587.  
<http://bdh-rd.bne.es/viewer.vm?id=0000096461&page=1>

\_\_\_."Carta a Felipe II." Pedro Simón Abril, edited by Margherita Morreale de Castro, CSIC / Instituto "Miguel de Cervantes," 1949.

Simón Díaz, José. "El helenismo de Quevedo y varias cuestiones más." *Revista de bibliografía nacional*, vol. 6, 1945, pp. 87-119.

\_\_\_."Flórez Canseco y el helenismo de Quevedo." *La bibliografía: conceptos y aplicaciones*, Planeta, 1971, pp. 294-306.

Street, Florence. "La vida de Juan de Mena," *Bulletin Hispanique*, vol. 55, 1953, pp. 149-173.

West, M. L., editor. *Carmina Anacreontea.* Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 1993.

\_\_\_."The Homeric Question Today." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 155, num. 4, 2011 pp. 383-393.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. *History of Classical Scholarship*. Edited with notes and introduction by Hugh Lloyd Jones, Duckworth Press, 1982.