

# TRANSLATION AND IMITATION IN RENAISSANCE SPANISH POETRY: A CASE STUDY OF PETRARCH'S SONNET, "S'AMOR NON È"<sup>1</sup>

Clara Marías Martínez  
*Universidad Complutense de Madrid*

Among the poems of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, Sonnet 132 ("S'amor non è") stands out as one of the most renowned. With its antithetical structure and analysis of the lover's mental state, it is particularly representative of Petrarch's distinctive style.<sup>2</sup> Translated into Latin by Salutati, imitated or rendered into English by Chaucer, into French by Scève and Guillot, and into German in the seventeenth century by Opitz,<sup>3</sup> Sonnet 132 was also analyzed in Petrarch's own country by the Florentine Academy, and imitated by Aquilano and Grotto. The present study focuses on the reception of this sonnet in Spain between the mid-fifteenth century and the end of the sixteenth century, and examines the traces that "S'amor non è" left in translations or imitations of that time.

- 
1. This study was carried out with funding from the Beca de Formación del Profesorado Universitario del Ministerio de Educación de España. I am grateful to Dr. Alonso Miguel of the Universidad Complutense for all that he has taught me about Italianate poetry, as well as his ever helpful suggestions and amendments. Tyler Fisher translated this article into English and provided the English prose paraphrases of the poems.
  2. As Forster notes, this sonnet, alongside "Pace non trovo" [I find no peace], is one of the most influential "and petrarchistic, almost as though Petrarch were parodying himself." It displays Petrarch's equipoise of antitheses: "the delicate balance of opposites, precarious and ever-endangered" (1969, 4). On Sonnet 132, see also Santagata's critical edition (1999), Diani (1972), Boitani (1986), and Melchionda (1975).
  3. On the English version, in addition to Wilkins's classic study, see Thomson (1959), Hainsworth (2007), and Melchionda (1975). On Opitz's German translation, see Cases (1975).

The body of works under consideration here comprises ten poems, reproduced in the appendix to this essay: an eleven-line octosyllabic strophe or *copla esparsa* by Pedro de Cartagena<sup>4</sup> under the heading "Otra suya y endereçala al amor" [Another (poem) of his, and he dedicates it to love]; a set of ten-line octosyllabic stanzas or *coplas reales* by Alexandre titled "Consideración de amores" [Amorous pondering];<sup>5</sup> and eight sonnets. The sonnets were penned by a variety of authors, including: Hernando Díaz;<sup>6</sup> Juan Boscán;<sup>7</sup> the Portuguese poet Jorge de Montemayor;<sup>8</sup> an anonymous contributor to the 1554 *Cancionero general de obras nuevas* [General anthology of new lyrical works];<sup>9</sup> the Sephardic expatriate in Italy, Salomón Usque; the Sardinian soldier-poet Antonio de Lofrasso; the chair of rhetoric at Salamanca, Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas (El Brocense);<sup>10</sup> and the Portuguese entrepreneur in New World silver, Enrique Garcés. This comparative analysis<sup>11</sup> dwells primarily on

- 
4. The poem appears in the *Cancionero General* (Valencia, 1511), and must predate 1486, the year of Cartagena's death. It is included in the only modern edition of Cartagena's poetry (Rodado Ruiz 2000).
  5. It appears in the *Cancionero de Gallardo*. See Moreno's codicological description in the *Cancionero virtual* ([www.cancionerovirtual.liv.ac.uk](http://www.cancionerovirtual.liv.ac.uk)). The only printed edition is that of José María Azáceta (1962).
  6. It appears in *La vida y excelentes dichos de los mas sabios filósofos que uvo en este mundo*, printed by Cromberger in Seville (1516). According to Griffin (1991), only one copy of the first edition is known to survive, described by Norton and now in Chicago's Newberry Library, and only one copy of a 1520 edition is held in the Biblioteca Pública del Estado de Toledo. I have consulted Cromberger's 1541 edition (BNM R 32171).
  7. Boscán's Sonnet 89, "Bueno es amar" [It is good to love], was first printed in *Las obras de Boscán y algunas de Garcilaso de la Vega* (1543).
  8. It appears in the 1554 edition of Montemayor's *Obras* (I consulted BNM U/744), and in a 1562 edition which contains only his secular poetry (BNM R/12964), as well as in manuscript *cancioneros*.
  9. Sonnet 152 in this *Cancionero* (1554, fol. 193). The only known copy is that in the Werner-Herzog Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. I follow Clavería's critical edition here.
  10. It appears in MS 2007, Biblioteca de la Universidad de Salamanca, and was first printed in the controversial supplement to the *Obras del Bachiller Francisco de la Torre* (Madrid, 1631). Carrera de la Red includes the poem in her critical edition of El Brocense's poetry (1985).
  11. Studies of systematic translations of the *Canzoniere* predominate, and tend to consider collections as a whole without giving detailed attention to individual poems (Manero Sorolla 1989 and Canals 2001 on Usque, Garribba 2005 and Canonica 2001 on Garcés), but other comparative analyses have considered various translations of single sonnets from the *Canzoniere*. Meregalli (1975) compares versions of Sonnet 134

three aspects, prosody, rhyme, and word choice, which exemplify the difficulty of poetic translation and imitation, and help to delineate the frontiers existing between them. Questions concerning the relationships between the different versions, the problems of authorship, and the sonnet's thematic transformations are left for a subsequent study.

#### STROPHIC ADAPTATION: FROM THE *COPLA ESPARSA* TO THE SONNET

A comparison of strophic patterns among these Castilian versions allows us to trace a line from the initial attempts at adaption of the sonnet to its full assimilation. In the first extant example, Pedro de Cartagena does not attempt to fashion a sonnet despite the Marqués de Santillana's earlier efforts in this form.<sup>12</sup> Instead, he renders the original's hendecasyllabic lines in octosyllables, and chooses a structure that is also bipartite (a six-line stanza and a five-line stanza or *quintilla*) but drawn from the Castilian tradition: the *copla esparsa*.<sup>13</sup> This would suggest that his intention was to imitate "S'amor non è" by incorporating it into Spain's *cancionero* tradition—an adaptation, as Jane Whetnall has noted, that implies a challenge since it demands a greater concentration of content within a briefer form (2006, 99-100).

---

by Usque, Garcés, and El Brocense. Muñoz Raya and Nogueras (1994) analyze modern translations of Sonnet 5 by Pentimalli, Crespo, and Cortines. Krebs Bermúdez (1995) considers versions of Sonnet 19 by Usque, El Brocense, and Garcés (1995). Canals (2007) studies versions of Sonnet 3 by Usque, Garcés, and Trenado de Ayllón, and Micó (2007) examines Usque's and Garcés's renderings of Sonnet 1. This is a richly fruitful field from the perspective of translation studies, as well as studies of Petrarchism and literary relations between Italy and Spain. Sonnet 132 is particularly interesting for the large number of known versions and for the way in which these vary between literal translation, free translation, and imitation.

12. Pérez Priego notes that the lack of continuation of Santillana's efforts in this vein may be due to the limited dissemination of his sonnets (1987, 189-98), which were generally not included in contemporary anthologies, with the exception of a group of 17 of the 42 sent to Violante de Prades which achieved greater renown in the Catalan-Aragonese region, where they appear in four *cancioneros*. Santillana preserves the pattern of two quatrains and two tercets, and tries to retain the hendecasyllabic line, though he alters the customary rhyme scheme of the first two strophes (*abab, abab* instead of *abba, abba*), as Baehr notes (1973, 394). Gutiérrez Carou has studied the formal elements of Santillana's sonnets in detail (1992, 1993).
13. According to Baehr (1973, 393), the roots of the sonnet form may lie in the *copla esparsa*, in which case Cartagena has not strayed so far from the traditions of the source poem.

Alexandre, likewise, does not try to reproduce the strophic structure of the original despite the fact that, as the author of ten sonnets, he had first-hand experience with the form.<sup>14</sup> He chooses instead the *copla real* or *quintilla doble*, the ten-line octosyllabic stanza — the same one into which Alvar Gómez translated Petrarch's "Trionfo dell' Amore" [Triumph of Love].<sup>15</sup> Alexandre's version is comprised of eight stanzas, an effort quite different from that of Cartagena, as it lengthens the sonnet sixfold.

Hernando Díaz, on the other hand, does attempt to fashion a sonnet, but with less than perfect results,<sup>16</sup> which suggests that Díaz may have been less familiar with Italian poetry than Alexandre, and perhaps possessed less poetic skill, or simply that Alexandre's text may be of a later date than Díaz's, and thus Alexandre had Boscán and Garcilaso as examples to follow. Díaz's poem is, in a way, a hybrid form, combining Italian versification and the meter of the triple cadence together with long-line verse or *arte mayor* from the Castilian *cancionero* tradition, preserving the bipartite structure of two quatrains and two tercets, but replacing the hendecasyllable with the dodecasyllable — a practice which is found in four of Juan de Villalpando's sonnets, although it is unlikely that these were Díaz's model since they were disseminated in only two manuscript verse collections.<sup>17</sup> What this shows, yet again, is that the path between Santillana and Boscán in the adaptation of the sonnet form was not without fellow travelers. The remaining versions may be considered fully adapted sonnets in terms of strophic features as well as meter.

---

14. The *Cancionero de Gallardo* includes ten sonnets and one amorous verse epistle in tercets by Alexandre, in addition to other experiments in the Italianate style, including three sonnets and another verse epistle in tercets by Soria, and early versions of two sonnets by Garcilaso.

15. It is particularly significant that Alvar Gómez's composition appears in the very same *Cancionero de Gallardo* and with the same amplification technique. The association between the *copla real* and Petrarch's *Trionfi* also figures in Juan de Coloma's translation of the "Trionfo della Morte," promulgated in the *Cancionero de 1554*.

16. To Díaz's attempt one might equally apply Carr's comment concerning Santillana's sonnets: "he was concerned not so much with transplanting the Italian metre, but the Italian form" (1978, 52). According to Baehr, this attempt at accommodating the Italian poetic form and a native metre form was unsuccessful (1973, 395).

17. On the Index Dutton, they are ID 2273, 2274 and 2275. They appear in the *Cancionero de Herberay des Essarts*, compiled around 1465 and with footprints of "pre-petrarchism", and in the *Cancionero de Módena* (c. 1475).

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF RHYME AMONG THE VERSIONS

The greatest difficulties of verse translation in the Golden Age stem from the fact that it aims to preserve as much as possible of the verse form of the original poem, reproducing not only the versification but also the metrics of each stanza, and sometimes the rhymes or even the rhyming words. Thus, whereas in a modern translation, like that by Jacobo Cortines, the objective would be not so much to transmit the sonnet's form as to communicate its content, in most of the versions analyzed here one perceives an effort to adhere to Petrarch's prosody, at times reproducing either his meter or certain rhyming patterns and rhyming words. While constituting a significant challenge, it is lessened by the formal proximity of Italian and Spanish.

Petrarch's Sonnet 132 uses the rhyme scheme *abba, abba, cde, dce*—the third most common rhyme scheme in the *Canzoniere*<sup>18</sup>—thus employing five different end-rhymes: *-ento, -ale, -glio, -arca, and -erno*. As Santagata notes (1999, 643), most of the rhymes constitute rich rhyme (*tormento, lamento; governo, verno*); only one is derivative (*seno, consento*). Eleven of the fourteen rhyming words are very similar in Italian and Castilian, especially in their final syllable; four are identical. This facilitates adherence to the original versification and strictly literal translation: *seno, siento; quale, cuál; mortale, mortal; tormento, tormento; lamento, lamento; vale, vale; consento, consiento; barca, barca; governo, gobierno; verno, invierno*. Only *doglio* (*duelo* in Spanish), *carca* (*cargada*), *voglio* (*quiero*), prove more difficult to translate without altering the rhymes. For this reason an analysis of rhyming techniques can serve to determine which authors aimed to achieve a translation of Sonnet 132, particularly if they undertook a literal translation, and which ones aimed, instead, to engage in *imitatio*—a creative imitation and adaptation—either as a stylistic exercise, an experiment in the Italianate forms, or driven by a desire to master the aesthetics and attitude towards love of Petrarch.

In the first two poems, those in which there is no attempt to fashion a sonnet, the rhyme scheme is likewise not reflected, as one would expect. The rhyme scheme of Cartagena's *copla esparsa* is *abcabc, dedde*, so that its form only coincides with Petrarch's in that there are five rhymes grouped into two blocks of lines: three rhymes in the first

---

18. It occurs in 66 sonnets, according to Baehr (1973, 395). The two most frequent rhyme schemes are *cde, cde* (in 120 sonnets), and *cdc, dcd* (in 117).

group, and two in the second, an inversion of the sonnet's pattern. Each of the eight stanzas of Alexandre's *copla real* follow the rhyme scheme *abbab, cddcd*.<sup>19</sup> It differs from the sonnet in that there are only four rhymes, but it approximates the pattern of the quatrains by employing *rimas abrazadas* or enclosed rhymes in the pattern *abba*, even though his stanzas conclude with an additional line. Cartagena does not use any rhyming word that would evoke Sonnet 132. Nor does he shift any rhyming word to the interior of the line. However, in Alexandre's first stanza there are three very similar rhyming words, and they occur in the same sequence: "siento" in line 6, which echoes "sento" of Petrarch's line 1; "mortal" in line 8, which corresponds to Petrarch's "mortale" (line 3); and "mal" in line 10 picks up "male" of the sonnet's seventh line. This suggests a certain intention, if not to translate the quatrains in part, at least to signal that they are Alexandre's source.

Hernando Díaz's dodecasyllabic sonnet does not take up any of Petrarch's rhymes. The first quatrain, in *abba*, does adhere to the Italian model, but the second, in *acaa*, deviates from the source by introducing a third rhyme never found in Petrarch's quatrains. Compared to the Marqués de Santillana's experimental sonnets, Díaz's only correlates with those which follow the *abba, acca* rhyme scheme of the *copla real* by its inclusion of the third rhyme. But Díaz does not preserve the *rimas abrazadas*. Nor does his poem bear any relation to another pioneering sonneteer, Villalpando, since Villalpando consistently follows the rhyme scheme of the first Italian sonnets, *abab, abab*, as does Santillana, usually. For the tercets, Díaz follows the rhyme scheme *ccd, ccd*, breaking the alternating rhyme that both Santillana (*cdc, dcd, or cde, cde*) and Villalpando (*cdc, dcd, or cde, dcd*) had followed. The only Petrarchan scheme it resembles is *cdd, dcc*, which only appears in four of the *Canzoniere's* sonnets (Baehr 1973, 393-95). With respect to the rhyming words, those of the first quatrain coincide exactly with their Italian equivalents, but already by the second quatrain the rhyming word of line 5 moves to line 7, that of line 6 moves to the interior of the line, and only that of line 8 remains in its original position. In the first tercet, the rhyming word of Petrarch's line 10 is shifted to the interior of line 11, and only the rhyming word of line 11 is maintained. In the second tercet the same thing happens: the rhyming words are shifted to the inte-

---

19. Baehr notes that it is the second most frequent type of rhyme in the *copla real* (1973, 298).

rior of the line, except in the last line. Díaz endeavors to capture the key words of Petrarch's sonnet, but the alterations indicate that he translates the lexis more faithfully than the word order.

Likewise, in Boscán's sonnet we do not encounter the rhyme scheme of Sonnet 132, though in its stead Boscán employs the *Canzoniere's* most frequent rhyme scheme, *abba, abba, cde, cde*, which is also the rhyme scheme most often employed by Garcilaso.<sup>20</sup> This seems a clear indication that Boscán is not aiming to produce a translation, a notion confirmed by the absence of any of the rhyming words of the original, not even any rhyming words shifted into the interior of the lines. However, Montemayor's version reveals a strategy which distinguishes it from its predecessors, for it also does not reproduce the rhyme scheme of the tercets, but rather replaces it with the second most frequent rhyme scheme in Petrarch's *oeuvre*: the two *rimas encadenadas* or interlinking rhyme in the pattern *cdc, dcd*. There is only one echo of Sonnet 132 among Montemayor's rhyming words: Petrarch's "consento" (line 8) as "consiente" in Montemayor's line 12. This paucity of resemblance in terms of rhyme indicates that this is an imitation rather than a translation. Clearly, in the anonymous sonnet of 1554, Boscán's is the preferred model, with tercets in *cde, cde*. This lack of commitment to Petrarch's rhyme scheme could indicate that there is no intention to translate it. Yet the presence of the same rhyming words in the first and last line of each quatrain, and in the first line of the final tercet, as well as the displacement of rhyming words in the first tercet ("barca" appears in line 9 instead of in line 10, and "gobierno" in the interior of line 11), do suggest techniques more germane to translation than to imitation. The same strategic choice emerges in Usque's translation, it does not maintain the rhyme scheme of "S'amor non è," following instead the most frequent rhyme scheme in Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, but does attempt to preserve the rhyming words, with exacting fidelity in the quatrains and greater liberty in the tercets, in which Usque preserves "gobierno" and "invierno" but shifts "barca" to the interior of the line, replaces "cargada" with "llena," and diverges markedly from the model in the two rhyming words that are most dissimilar in Italian and Spanish, "doglio" and "voglio."

Lofrasso follows the same rhyme scheme as Montemayor, and echoes two rhyming words among those used by Petrarch: the one of the first

---

20. See Baehr's observations, which also indicate that it is not the most frequent rhyme scheme in sonnets by Boscán, who generally prefers *cdc, dcd*, involving two rhymes in the tercets (1973, 396).

line, "siento," appears in the corresponding position, while that of Petrarch's line 4 is postponed to line 8. This technique suggests that Lofrasso's poem is an intentional imitation, preserving the initial rhyming word so that the model can be unequivocally recognized, but later departing from the model. It is El Brocense who first follows the rhyme scheme of the tercets in *cde*, *dce* rigorously enough for his poem to be considered a translation. Yet El Brocense's rhyming words do not display such a degree of proximity to the original as do Díaz's and Usque's, since he preserves the first and last of each quatrain, while in his tercets we find only "gobierno" and "invierno," with "barca" shifted to the interior of the line. Lastly, Garcés also reproduces the rhyme scheme of the original, so his translation is thus more faithful on this point than Usque's. Garcés preserves the rhyming words in the quatrains (although "quál" is moved to the interior of line 2), but the tercets only reproduce "gobierno" and "invierno," choosing synonyms for the rest.

To conclude this examination of rhyme, if we consider the versions that wholly assimilate the sonnet, the rhyme scheme of the quatrains is preserved, and there are three options in handling the tercets. The first is to maintain the rhyme scheme of "S'amor non è," as El Brocense and Garcés do; the second to replace it with the most frequent rhyme scheme in Petrarch's poetry, *cde*, *dce*, as Boscán, the anonymous poet of 1554, and Usque do; the third to replace it with the *Canzoniere's* second most frequent rhyme scheme, *cdc*, *dcd*, as Montemayor and Lofrasso do. In this regard, the most faithful translations would be those by El Brocense and Garcés. Comparison of the rhyming words brings two ideas into sharper focus. Firstly, the rhyming words most often preserved are "siento" (appearing in six versions—that is to say, all but Cartagena's, Boscán's, and Montemayor's) and "tormento" (in five versions, and moved to another position in the line in a sixth version), doubtless because the key positions of these words, in opening and closing the first quatrain, prompts translators and imitators alike who wish to advertise their source to retain them. Secondly, the most frequently recurring rhyming word, which figures in five of the versions, is "consiento," thus rounding off the second quatrain. "Lamento," the word that opens the second quatrain, and the words which close the tercets ("gobierno," "invierno") are preserved on four occasions each. The handling of the rhyming words "barca" and "carca" is particularly noteworthy. The first of these is repositioned to the interior of the line in four versions, and, in another, is replaced with a synonym, "nave," perhaps because the direct Spanish translation of *carca*, *cargada*, does

not produce a consonantal rhyme. This rendering of *carca* appears in the 1554 *Cancionero* and, repositioned, in Díaz's version. But Usque and El Brocense prefer "llena" (which El Brocense moves to the interior of a line), and Garcés opts for "grave," which explains why these two rhyming words are not frequently reproduced. Three other rhyming words, "quale" (line 2), "mortale" (line 3), and "male" (line 7), although their Spanish equivalents are closely cognate, only appear in two or three compositions. This could be due to the fact that using the closest Spanish equivalents for these words would produce acute rhymes, and the Spanish poets who followed the hendecasyllabic metrics resisted such rhymes—associated with the *cancionero* aesthetic—, resistance that increased throughout the century (Alonso 2002, 37-38). This would explain why the earliest translator, Díaz, does employ "cuál" and "mortal," since oxytonic rhyme was very frequent in the poetry of his time, whereas among the later poets, only Usque and Garcés, more concerned with translation than with the prevailing poetics of their time, preserve such words, adding a fourth acute rhyme, "val" (line 6 in both Usque and Garcés, concurring with "vale" in Petrarch's sixth line). The most difficult rhyming words to translate without formal changes, "doglio" y "voglio," are those most frequently omitted in the versions. And if we were to order the versions according to the number of rhyming words coinciding with Petrarch's, the closest to the original would be Usque's (which reproduces ten rhyming words, with an eleventh repositioned), followed by Garcés (9), Díaz (8, with an additional 4 words repositioned), El Brocense (6), the 1554 *Cancionero* (5), Alexandre (3), Lofrasso (2), Montemayor (1), and Cartagena and Boscán (0). This degree of frequency is highly significant in terms of charting the frontiers between translation (a designation most fitting for the first four or five of these versions) and imitation,<sup>21</sup> as well as between translation *ad verbum*, word-for-word, and *ad sensum*, sense-for-sense. Such frontiers can be further demarcated through an analysis of the word choices reflected in each version.

- 
21. Distinguishing between translations and imitations in Golden-Age poetry can prove to be a notoriously complex task. The following critics, among others, have drawn attention to the problems it poses: Terracini (1996, 953-54); Ruiz Casanova (2000, 231); and Micó (2002, 84). For a detailed analysis of Renaissance imitation, see García Galiano (1992) and Cruz's study of Petrarchism in Spain (1988). In the present study, on account of having ten extant versions to compare, it is possible to attempt to determine which category more accurately represents the poets' practice.

## LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE VERSIONS

The second fundamental challenge of poetic translation and imitation concerns the decisions a translator must take, within metrical constraints, in order to recast the words of the original while preserving syntax, phonic similarity, the sense of the original, or any one of these aspects. If we compare each poem line by line with Petrarch's sonnet, the conclusions drawn from the analysis of rhyme are corroborated, given that five of the poems (those of Díaz, the *Cancionero de 1554*, Usque, El Brocense, and Garcés) faithfully follow the original sonnet's substance and arrangement, except for the last two lines of the anonymous sonnet, which depart from the original to elaborate the image of a ship far from port—due perhaps to the influence of Petrarch's well-known Sonnet 189, "Passa la nave mia" [My ship passes].<sup>22</sup> The other versions do not lend themselves to a full, line by line comparison, for in the case of Cartagena, Montemayor, and Lofrasso, they correspond closely only to Petrarch's opening lines, while we find scattered traces throughout Alexandre's composition, as well as in Boscán's iterative reformulation of a single line from "S'amor non è." The less literal versions evince a greater independence as the lines progress.

The treatment of the sonnet's opening lines proves crucial to its subsequent development. Focusing one's attention on the first line reveals that all the versions imply an understanding of the question posed as not one concerning the existence of love, but of the lover's struggle to understand what he feels. This is significant since the ambiguity of Petrarch's formulation allows for both interpretations. Among the various versions, the first part of the line registers two approaches: the translations by Díaz, the anonymous poet of 1554, and Usque maintain the original syntax; Cartagena, Lofrasso, El Brocense, and Garcés place the accent on the negation, formulating the negative conditional as "si no es amor." In the second part of the line, there are three options: those versions that remain faithful to the source by translating it with some nuance;<sup>23</sup> those that simplify the question by considering love to be something good though its effects may be negative (Boscán and Montemayor);

22. Line 14 of Sonnet 189 describes the same state of mind: "tal ch'incomincio a desperar del porto" [so that I begin to despair of reaching port].

23. Díaz brings forward the pronoun "quel," Garcés insists on interiorizing the speaker's feeling, and only Díaz and Usque reproduce Petrarch's "dunque" in their use of "pues."

and those which portray love negatively (the 1554 *Cancionero* and Lofrasso). The most literal translation, then, is Usque's. In the second line, assuming his feelings are of love, Petrarch's speaker launches a desperate, two-pronged inquiry, punctuated by the expression "per Dio" — an inquiry concerning love's nature (elaborated in lines 3 and 4) and its effects (developed in lines 5 and 6). Only two of the authors, Díaz and Usque, preserve this structure, which has been compared to a scholastic *quaestio*, and only the Jewish poet Usque translates the exclamation "per Dio," while Díaz replaces it with the interjection "ay." The anonymous poet of 1554, El Brocense, and Garcés simplify the question. El Brocense introduces a new element, the imperative "sepamos," which endeavors to express the impatience of "per Dio." Whereas Cartagena does not register this part by moving ahead to the second part of line 3, Boscán proceeds to line 4, and Montemayor employs a similar technique, though he chooses to articulate a very *cancionero*-style question, "¿por qué no muero?". Lofrasso embarks on his solo flight in the second part of the line, distancing his poem from the model from this point onwards.

In addition to the sonnet's opening, likewise telling are the divergent solutions in the versions that follow Petrarch most closely, solutions which indicate that certain Italian expressions must have posed greater problems for those attempting to translate them. For example, the interrogative phrase "ond'é ... ?", which Petrarch repeats in lines 3, 4, and 5, effectively expressing in their parallelism the speaker's desperation, is formulated in various ways among the versions that reproduce it. Díaz translates it literally as "¿por dónde ... ?" (line 3), and in the following lines transforms it into "¿por qué ... ?". Usque, however, opts for the more expressive formula "¿a qué ... ?" (lines 3 and 5), replacing it with "¿cómo ... ?" in line 4, as does the version in the *Cancionero*. This latter alternative also represents the choice of both El Brocense and Garcés, who use it in both lines (lines 3 and 4 in both versions).

Another expression in which the translators differ is "s'a mia voglia" (line 5). Díaz and Usque choose the expressions "de grado" and the uncommon phrase "a mi grado," respectively, perhaps influenced by the presence of this formulation in Petrarch's subsequent line.<sup>24</sup> The anonymous contributor to the *Cancionero* prefers the expression "huelgo yo

---

24 This form, "de grado" was common in the poetry (1400-1600). See *Corpus Diacrónico del Español* (hereafter CORDE). "A mi grado" according to the CORDE, was rare, so it looks like an Italian calque.

de arder" (line 5);<sup>25</sup> El Brocense hews more closely to the original in selecting a volitional verb, but he deviates from Petrarch's wording by replacing "arder" with "padecer" (line 5); while Garcés chooses the phrase "de voluntad ardo" (line 5).

Again we observe various possibilities for the translation of "s'a mal mio grado" (line 6), ranging from the most literal in Díaz ("si a mal de mi grado")<sup>26</sup> and Usque ("Si a mal mi grado"),<sup>27</sup> to the 1554 *Cancionero*'s rendering, "si me pesa," El Brocense's, which reiterates, as in the preceding lines, the verb *querer* and Garcés's, "si a mi pesar." The expression "a gran torto mi doglio" (line 9), alongside the phrases just mentioned, is perhaps the one which gives rise to the most divergent solutions among those poets who faithfully adhere to the sonnet's form and substance. According to Cristóbal de las Casas's 1570 *Vocabulario castellano-toscano* [*Castilian-Tuscan Lexicon*],<sup>28</sup> "a torto" means "injustamente" [unjustly], an option that only Díaz captures literally with the phrase "no es justo el quejar," since El Brocense and Garcés prefer "sin razón me afano" and "sin razón me quexo," respectively. Usque here de-

- 
25. The construction using the verb "huelgo" followed by an infinitive seems to be rarer than the corresponding formulation using "grado." The *CORDE* registers only fifteen instances, all from the second half of the sixteenth century, except for an instance in Boscán. It is significant that one instance of this expression also appears in the 1554 *Cancionero*, in an octosyllabic poem attributed to Narváez, though this coincidence alone would not be sufficient grounds for assigning authorship of this anonymous sonnet to him.
  26. This rather unusual construction is attested in a few lyrical texts of the time. The *CORDE* registers its occurrence several times in Villasandino, in two additional contexts in the fifteenth century, and only once in the sixteenth century, in Castillejo.
  27. In the *CORDE* this construction appears only once in lyrical texts, in Garcilaso's Sonnet 4, which would lend support to the idea that it is an Italianism.
  28. Judging by the many editions of this work listed in the *Catálogo Colectivo del Patrimonio Bibliográfico Español* (Seville 1573 and 1583, and Venice 1576, 1582, 1587, 1591, 1597, 1604, 1608, 1613, 1618, and 1622), it must have met with resounding success and may well have been consulted by translators working after 1570. Of course, its very existence suggests that Petrarch's *Canzoniere* posed significant challenges for Spanish readers, due to the lack of complete translations (Usque's would scarcely have been known). In one of the encomiastic poems that preface the *Vocabulario*, Fernando de Herrera declares, "Ahora nueva vida Laura alcança / y a ti debe lo mesmo que al Toscano / pues reparas del tiempo la mudança" [Laura now attains new life, and owes as much to you as to the Tuscan poet, for you restore the vicissitudes of time]. This suggests, firstly, that difficulties of reading were due to the passage of time, that is, to the changes in meaning that some words underwent between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries; and secondly, that Casas took the poetic lexis into consideration.

parts from Petrarch's model for the first time, as he freely translates "mía es la culpa y pena" (line 9), which does reflect the sense of complaining unjustly, but underscores the lover's responsibility and the sonnet's moral tenor by introducing the notion of guilt.

As in the imitations, the versions which can be considered translations tend to depart from the model as the sonnet progresses, so that the varying solutions multiply in the final lines. A good example is the various handling of Petrarch's line 10, which breaks the string of questions and the flow of the lover's thought, introducing the sonnet's first image: that of the lover in a fragile boat with opposing winds. Díaz fuses the initial part of this line with the first part of the following line, bringing the verb forward and displacing the boat to the following line. The poet of the 1554 *Cancionero*, having brought "barca" forward, changes "vientos contrarios" into "fuerte tiempo" and adds an element not present in Petrarch but which fits the new context, "[con] muy gran fortuna" (an Italianism for *storm*). Usque translates closely, but changes the syntax and does not opt for *frágil*, the word that corresponds to "frale" according to Casas's *Vocabulario*;<sup>29</sup> nor does El Brocense, who prefers "débil."<sup>30</sup> El Brocense also inverts the syntax, and freely translates "si contrari vènti" as "vientos a porfía" (line 10). Garcés, likewise, does not adhere strictly to the original, for he eliminates "vènti" and "frale," and replaces "barca" with "nave"; both terms are identical in Italian, but the former term, in Spanish, is more appropriately meaningful in the poem's context. Line 11 sustains the image of the rudderless lover on the high seas.<sup>31</sup> At this point, Díaz introduces the image of the boat. Like Usque, he translates "frale" as "flaca," and he refines "barca" to "barquilla," a judicious alteration as the diminutive intensifies the sense of fragility. All of them translate "governo" as "gobierno" instead of something like *timón* (helm), perhaps to preserve the ambiguity of the word *gobierno*, which can be understood both as a helm or rudder in relation to the boat, as well as self-governing or self-regulation in relation to the lover's life.

- 
29. Casas offers seven possibilities for "flaco": "beccilo," "fievole," "macero," "macilente," "macro," "scarmo," and "smilzo." For "frale," Casas includes only "frágil," and for "frágil," "frale" or "fragile."
30. Casas does not include "débil" as a synonym for "frale"; nor does "frale" appear among the six Italian words offered as translations of "débil": "beccilo," "debil," "debbole," "fiacco," "fievole," and "fioco."
31. Casas offers "governo" as a translation of "timón," but not "timón" for "governo."

Synonymous variations again proliferate for line 13, as Díaz translates "lieve" as "ligera," while the anonymous poet of the 1554 *Cancionero* and Usque translate it as "liviana,"<sup>32</sup> El Brocense uses "vacía" (by which he highlights the sense of this confession), and Garcés has "falta," to the same effect. As for Petrarch's adjective "carca," the most obvious translation, "cargada,"<sup>33</sup> is the choice of Díaz and that of the anonymous poet of the 1554 *Cancionero*; and the synonym "llena" is the choice of Usque and El Brocense, while for Garcés it is "grave." This diversity of solutions, which shows how the translations become freer in the tercets while remaining faithful to the sense of the original, becomes even greater in the penultimate line, which reinforces the metaphorical link between the boat and the first-person poetic self-seen as beset by indecision and confusion: the one buffeted by winds, the other by contradictory feelings, thoughts, and desires (Manero Sorolla 1990, 238-39). Díaz replaces "voglio" with "quiero alcanzar" [I want to attain], underscoring in marked *cancionero* style the impossibility of love being within reach and the lover's position of inferiority. The remaining poets translate the meaning freely: Usque as, "que no comprehendo yo mis pensamientos," emphasizing love's irrational nature; El Brocense as, "que yo mismo no sé lo que me es sano," capturing the most moral sense; and Garcés as, "que no sé lo que digo, o lo que dexo," emphasizing the notion that the lover is beside himself. By contrast, the *Cancionero* disregards this line and elaborates the motif of the boat in a pessimistic vein.

More surprising are the divergences in rendering expressions that are, in principle, less problematic, such as the verb "vale" (line 6). Díaz, Usque, and Garcés reproduce it verbatim, though the latter two poets use the apocopated form *val* because of the need to rhyme with *mal*, a clear indication of their aim of translating literally.<sup>34</sup> But the poet of the 1554 *Cancionero* replaces "vale" with "presta,"<sup>35</sup> and El Brocense chooses this

32. This is the only Spanish equivalent that Casas offers for "lieve." For "ligero" he includes seven Italian adjectives: "agile," "celere," "isnello," "leggiero," "ratto," "snello," and "veloce." As Gil (2000) observes, Casas consistently offers several Italian alternatives for each Spanish word. This suggests the practical nature of his lexicon, designed to facilitate reading and translation.

33. For "cargado," Casas suggests "carco," "grave," "onusto," and renders "carco" as "cargado" or "carga."

34. In the *CORDE* this apocope rarely appears in the sixteenth century, in contrast with the fifteenth century.

35. In Clavería's edition, this line reads "y si me pesa lamentar, ¿qué presta?" but in the light of Petrarch's sonnet, it would make more sense to bring forward the initial question mark: "y si me pesa, ¿lamentar qué presta?"

same verb, despite the fact that it entails repeating the same rhyming word as in line 3, in which the homonym “presta” (brisk) appears. Also unusual are the varied versions to which Petrarch’s “come puoi tanto in me” (line 8) gives rise, compared with the more literal translations of “s’io no’l consento.” El Brocense and Garcés replace “come” with “quién,” but the subject of the verb “poder” in El Brocense is clearly love, so that the change, consequently, does not seem especially sound. El Brocense, like Díaz and Usque, calques the Italian form with “puede en mí,”<sup>36</sup> but keeps the intensifier “tanto,” at the cost of eliminating the first-person pronoun in order to preserve the hendecasyllable, while Garcés chooses the unusual formulation “te dio en mi poder.”<sup>37</sup>

Lastly, among the versions that do not adhere literally to the entire sonnet, those of Cartagena and Alexandre stand out. Although they only translate or paraphrase a few lines, there are formal connections with “S’amor non è” in the remainder of their respective texts, like their reiterated antitheses and parallelisms in addition to other devices that characterize the lyrics of the *cancioneros*, including anadiplosis, or the repetition of a word at the end of a line and the beginning of the next line, and polyptoton or wordplay. For Cartagena’s poem, the degree of proximity to Petrarch depends on the approach one takes to editing the text, which lacks punctuation in the *cancionero*. In the edition of this *Cancionero*, as well as in the modern edition of Cartagena’s complete poetry, the first three lines are understood as comprising a single question. But the following, alternative punctuation is also possible: “Si no es Amor, ¿quién me trata? / ¿qu’ es un dolor tan esquivo? / ¿de quién yo vencer me dexo?”, which would be in keeping with the rest of the sextet, in which each line presents a question, as well as reinforces the connection with Petrarch’s quatrains by employing the same interrogative pattern. If we compare the sextet, edited in this way, with the quatrains of “S’amor non è,” we see that the first line is an almost exact translation, in which “che dunque è quel ch’io sento” has been simplified as “¿quién me trata?” Cartagena’s second line continues the interrogation about his feelings, reflecting the potentially negative nature of love, which Petrarch posits in line 4, as “dolor tan esquivo” sets up a link with “ria” and “tormento.”

- 
36. The *CORDE* registers five instances of this construction in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. An instance in the writings of Garci Sánchez de Badajoz is particularly notable, for it appears in the same context, imprecating love.
37. No instance of this construction appears in the lyrical poetry of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries included in the *CORDE*.

The third line is comparable to Petrarch's line 8, wherein the speaker ponders love's power, which Cartagena poses with a martial analogy: "¿de quién yo vençer me dexo?" (line 3). The fourth line picks up on the first part of line 2 ("si es amor") and the second part of line 3, reformulating the phrase "effetto aspro e mortale" as another question, "¿por qué me mata?" The fifth line follows the pattern of rhetorical questions, bringing forward the oxymoron "viva morte" of Petrarch's line 7 in the form of an antithesis, and commencing the anadiplosis. The sixth line, continuing this device, reflects Petrarch's line 5, or the second half of line 6, and, with its use of the verb "quexar," opts for the same solution that Usque would later choose. As for the *quintilla* or latter set of five lines, traces of the sonnet can also be found here. "Quiero sofrir su pasión" could echo Petrarch's "e s'io'l consento," and the closing lines of the composition, most notably, express the same idea as the sonnet's two last lines, which posit a contradiction between reason and will, and the poetic speaker's incapacity to resolve the conflict between the two.

In the same way, the opening of Alexandre's *coplas reales* recalls Petrarch's sonnet because, like the eighth line of the original, it alludes to love's lethal effect, but more notably, lines 4 and 5 reflect Petrarch's line 7, particularly the antithesis "gozar de tu pesar" in relation to "dilettoso male." Line 6, "pues no se qu'es lo que siento," sets up a direct link with Petrarch's first question, and "hallo bien en el mal" expresses love's negative nature and the pain it causes, which the lover nevertheless enjoys, as in Petrarch's "se ría, ond'è sì dolce ogni tormento." The first five lines of the second stanza recall Petrarch's lines 5 and 6, and the five subsequent lines elaborate Petrarch's ninth line. The two stanzas that follow, using polyptoton and other *cancionero* devices, develop the antithesis between life and death which only Petrarch's phrases "effetto mortal" and "viva morte" would suggest. In the fifth stanza we again find traces of the sonnet: in line 2, "¡ay de mí, qu'es esto amor!", which echoes "ma s'egli è amor, per Dio," in line 3, "¿Quien me causa este dolor?," a nod to "effetto aspro e mortale," and in line 5, an allusion to Petrarch's first line that transforms "amor non è" into "desamor." Lines 8-10 seem to express the same conflicted confusion as the sonnet's penultimate line. The subsequent stanza again elaborates Petrarch's "o viva morte, o dilettoso male" ("¿Cómo lloro de plazer? / ¿Si vivo cómo estoy muerto?") and initiates another inquiry, parallel to Petrarch's questions, emphasizing the wordplay by means of polyptoton and derivatio. The penultimate stanza elaborates Petrarch's line about the confusion in which the speaker lives, deploying the image of the madman and recovering the sonnet's fi-

nal antithesis: “cuando su fuego no quema / viene a desenloquecer” (lines 69-70). The final stanza develops the image of the fire of love, which Petrarch suggests with the verb *ardere*, and concludes by reiterating yet again the antithesis between life and death, and the lover’s confusion: “¿qué haré? / ¿cómo me puedo sufrir?”, ultimately proposing suicide—an extreme solution which, in spite of the poetic speaker’s desperation, does not figure in the original sonnet: “Dejar aparte el vevir / peor es que no podré, / pues no me querrá el morir.”

Linguistic analysis of the various versions, then, provides a wealth of information about the challenges of poetic translation in the sixteenth century. It highlights the different possibilities poets found for rendering certain Italian words or expressions in Castilian, and about the sometimes hazy frontiers between translation and imitation, and between translation *ad verbum* and *ad sensum*. For in some cases, what begins as a closely literal translation is relaxed in the last lines (as in the version from the 1554 *Cancionero*); others vary their adherence to form and meaning (Usque, El Brocense, Garcés); and still others begin with a partial translation that culminates in an imitation (Cartagena, Boscán, Montemayor, Lofrasso). The extremes of both approaches are perhaps best reflected in, on one hand, Alexandre’s poem, which elaborates the sonnet at length, blurring the remnants of the original but leaving certain traces that allow readers to recognize the imitation, and, on the other hand, in Díaz’s, which most clearly complies with the dictates of translation. The analysis of word choices complements the analysis of rhyme, but contributes greater evidence for linking “S’amor non è” with poems that, on first reading, seem to bear so little similarity to it, like those of Cartagena and Alexandre.

## CONCLUSION

Throughout these analyses of the various versions of “S’amor non è”, the validity of Micó’s observation concerning Renaissance poetic translation seems to emerge with forceful clarity:

Hay pocos territorios más ferazmente fronterizos que el de la poesía del Siglo de Oro... Bastaría echar una ojeada al petrarquismo del siglo XVI en cualquiera de las lenguas europeas ... para comprender la dificultad de distinguir entre traducciones, adaptaciones e imitaciones ... La imitación compuesta fue ... en el siglo XVI, un modo habitual de creación poética, de manera que muchos poemas originales de los

mejores autores eran el resultado de la combinación y el zurcido de piezas clásicas, es decir, una suma de recreaciones que podía contener puntualmente la mera traducción de pasajes ajenos. (2004, 179)

[There are few territories of a more fiercely frontier character than that of Golden-Age poetry. A brief glance at sixteenth-century Petrarchism in any of the European languages is enough for one to appreciate the difficulty of distinguishing among translations, adaptations, and imitations. Hybrid imitation was, in the sixteenth century, a customary mode of poetic creation; many original poems by the greatest authors were thus the result of combining and embroidering classic texts—in other words, a totality of re-elaborations which could in fact contain mere translations of passages by other authors.]

Indeed, the “frontier” status of many of the versions analyzed here, as well as their nature as scattered texts, seems to have attracted little critical attention, despite the importance of some of them (Cartagena, Alexandre) for the history of Petrarchism or “Pre-Petrarchism,”<sup>38</sup> and of others for the history of translation and of Hispano-Italian relations, as Díaz’s poem could be considered one of the earliest translations of a Petrarchan sonnet, albeit much later than the first, attributed to Enrique de Villena.<sup>39</sup> The preponderance of comprehensive studies on translation (Ruiz Casanova 2000), anthologies of translations from the Italian which only consider authors’ complete works (Seco 1990), and histories of Spanish Petrarchism (Fucilla 1960, Manero Sorolla 1987) may help to explain why, despite awareness of the existence of numerous versions on the frontier between translation and imitation, focus has fallen mainly on those which belong more clearly to one camp or another, or on systematic translations.<sup>40</sup>

---

38. The term is Caravaggi’s (2007) and is highly fitting for the cases under consideration here.

39. This was a translation of Sonnet 116. See Carr’s article on the poem (1981).

40. This is the case, for example, of Seco’s study (1990), which considers only Usque’s and Garcés’s translations. Ruiz Casanova, who considers only late specimens by Usque, Garcés, and El Brocense, declares, “Durante cuatro décadas—en realidad, más—no existió la necesidad de trasladar los versos petrarquescos al castellano, lo cual no quiere decir que no fuesen leídos, admirados e imitados” (2000, 177) [During four decades—more, in fact—there was no need to translate Petrarch’s poetry into Castilian, though this does not mean that his poetry was not read, admired, and imitated]. More nuanced is Micó’s observation that Usque’s and Garcés’s translations “aparecen después de décadas de imitaciones, emulaciones, asimilaciones y traducciones parciales, evidentes o camufladas” (2004, 198) [appear after decades of imitations, emulations, assimilations, and partial translations, unmistakable as such or camouflaged].

Even scholars like Meregalli (1975), Krebs (1995), and Canals (2007), who have undertaken comparisons of different versions of other sonnets of Petrarch, almost always exclude imitations from their comparisons, despite the rich insights to be gained by considering them alongside translations, as Micó (2007) has done.

The sheer number of versions of “S’amor non è” is a clear reflection of the complex field of translation and imitation. They constitute part of the Renaissance experience in the translation practice that Micó describes as follows: “traducciones que ya no se harán sólo entre lenguas con diferente prestigio y jerarquía, sino entre lenguas equiparables, traducciones que no se emprenderán únicamente por justificadas razones de trascendencia religiosa, combate humanístico, rigor filológico, respeto histórico o voluntad divulgativa, sino que con el tiempo serán posibles por simple decisión creativa, es decir, por conciencia y con voluntad literarias” (2004, 178) [translations would no longer be undertaken only between languages of differing hierarchical prestige, but rather between languages on an equal footing—undertaken not only for reasons of religious transcendence, humanistic dispute, philological rigor, historical deference, or desire to disseminate certain texts; rather, in time, they would be viable on the grounds of mere creative choice, that is, for literary sensibility and inclination].

The versions by Usque, Garcés, Díaz, and El Brocense would fall into this class of translation, as seen in the analysis of their rhyming and linguistic techniques. But what sort of translations are they? To use the terminology suggested by Terracini (1996, 944-46), are they horizontal and centripetal or vertical and centrifugal? The earliest versions, those by Díaz and Usque, seem to fit the second category, for they rely more heavily on the source language, are more literal (perhaps because their authors did not possess a perfect familiarity with both languages), and endeavor to foreground the content more than the style, thus introducing few lexical and syntactic variations. El Brocense’s and Garcés’s renderings are more akin to horizontal translation, since they pertain to a period in which the Castilian and Italian languages shared a similar degree of poetic prestige, and endeavor to maintain the original’s style more than its vocabulary and syntax.<sup>41</sup>

---

41. This is not, of course, an exact dichotomy. Even if El Brocense and Garcés do not adhere as strictly to Petrarch’s language, they do manage to reproduce the original’s metrical form, and Garcés in particular echoes many of the rhyming words.

In keeping with Vives's Renaissance ideal, El Brocense and Garcés achieve a balanced treatment of form and content, following their own instincts,<sup>42</sup> and thereby resolving the translator's dilemma that Castillejo expressed as follows: "si quiere ir muy arrimado a la letra, pónese en peligro de hablar inpropriadamente y sin sabor; y si desvía más de lo justo, hace lo que no debe vendiendo lo suyo por ageno" (quoted in Ruiz Casanova 165) [if he opts to adhere closely to the letter, he puts himself in danger of speaking inappropriately and insipidly; and if he strays from the original more than is just and proper, he does what one must not do, passing off his own work as that of someone else]. But how well do these conclusions concerning Usque's, El Brocense's, and Garcés's translations dovetail with those of scholars who have studied their translations of other sonnets by Petrarch? Meregalli (1975, 62-3) calls attention to the fact that Usque's translation of Sonnet 134 is the most faithful in terms of syntax and rhyme, though this impairs its expressiveness; Garcés translates this sonnet more freely; and El Brocense introduces minimal variations which nevertheless affect the style—all of which coincides with the present analysis. Krebs (1995, 194) notes, regarding Sonnet 19, that El Brocense follows the original metrical pattern more closely, while Usque also reproduces all the rhyming words of the quatrains, just as occurs in their respective treatments of Sonnet 132. Canals (2007, 369-72), for his part, considers Garcés's translation of Sonnet 3 to be less inhibited, more sensitive to the beauty of the language than to fidelity in translation, while Usque hews closely to the Italian morphosyntactic mold, translating line by line, and his Castilian is hybrid and Italianate—qualities which do not wholly fit our observations about Sonnet 132, since Garcés faithfully translates "S'amor non è," and Usque's language is faultless.

- 
42. I allude to Vives's description of this approach in the chapter titled "Versiones seu interpretaciones" of his *De ratione dicendi* (1532): "Por lo que toca a la elocución, o bien se ha de seguir la del autor vertido si en él se ve fuerza y brío ... o, si no, síguete a ti mismo y obedece a tu propio instinto, que es tu guía más segura mientras estés convencidamente orientado. Si puedes, compite con tu original y devuélvele una elocución mejor que recibiste y por esto mismo más apta y apropiada al asunto y a los oyentes" (quoted in Ruiz Casanova 2000, 182) [As far as elocution is concerned, either one must follow that of the author being translated if one perceives force and vigor in him, or, if not, follow yourself and heed your own instinct, which is your surest guide as long as you are confident of your bearings. If you can, rival your original and reflect a better elocution than you received from it, an elocution by the same token more apt and fitting for the subject and audience].

The versions considered here also exemplify the difficulty of distinguishing translation from literary creation, a difficulty Micó describes in the following terms: “A las cuestiones de la interpretación y de la equivalencia estilística, la traducción de poesía añade el problema de la adaptación de la forma, de manera que el traductor está más cerca que nunca de la posibilidad de enfrentarse a un desafío verdaderamente literario y a la necesidad de afinar su conciencia creativa” (2004, 184) [Beyond questions of interpretation and stylistic equivalence, the translation of poetry poses the additional problem of adapting the form. The translator is thus closer than ever to the prospect of confronting a truly literary challenge and the need to hone his or her creative sensibility].<sup>43</sup>

Do any of the translators produce what might be called a literary creation in its own right? One could consider the version in the 1554 *Cancionero* a candidate for the sort of proximity Micó describes, for it is a translation in the main (more horizontal, less literal, than Díaz’s and Usque’s, though it preserves many rhyming words), but after the incorporation of other influences, the result is notably different from the original sonnet. It would stand, then, at the intersection that Ruiz Casanova delineates:

La tercera zona de intersección cultural en el Renacimiento la constituyen las traducciones e imitaciones que algunos poetas ... realizan de sus modelos líricos, latinos e italianos principalmente. En unas ocasiones se trata ... de traducciones ... ; en otras, de imitaciones de los motivos o temas del autor tomado como fuente ... más que de un propósito de traducción o la voluntad de verter al castellano a Petrarca, ... se trata de un proceso de incorporación del modelo o fuente a la lengua poética del autor que lo traduce. (2000, 231)

[The third area of cultural intersection in the Renaissance comprises translations and imitations that some poets produced from lyrical models, principally Latin and Italian. In some cases, these are translations; in others, imitations of the motifs or themes found in the author they take as their model; rather than an intent to translate or a desire to render Petrarch in Castilian, their practice constituted a process of incorporating the model or source into the poetic language of the author who translates it.]

- 
43. Castilian translations from the Italian were notoriously undervalued in Spain’s Golden Age for they were considered facile exercises. In the words of Don Quixote (II.62), it was a simple matter of “copiar un papel en otro papel” [copying one paper onto another paper]. The variations in the renderings of Petrarch’s sonnet, however, indicate that it was not such an automatic or simple exercise.

Finally, I would place the versions of Petrarch's Sonnet 132 by Boscán, Montemayor, and Lofrasso, as well as Cartagena's and Alexandre's pioneering versions, in the realm of imitation, for they seem motivated not so much by a desire to make Petrarch's poem known in Castilian as by an ambition to assimilate its form and style (in the case of Boscán, Montemayor, and Lofrasso) and its rhetoric (in the case of Cartagena and Alexandre). They learn from their model in order to create distinctly original poems of their own. The two poets who adhere most closely to the *cancionero* aesthetic undertake their imitation by means of an elaboration and adaptation of the motifs of "S'amor non è," whereas in the other three there is a notable tendency to imitate—nearly translate—the opening lines, and then depart from the model as the poem progresses. Such a strategy may evince less mastery in this vein than that displayed in Italy, where Aquilano and Grotto composed imitations of this same sonnet, reproducing its matter and manner without duplicating its words. By the same token, it could simply be the manifestation of these poets' desire to record an acknowledgement of their source and inspiration.

#### WORKS CITED

- ALONSO, Álvaro. 2001. "Garcí Sánchez de Badajoz y la poesía italiana." In *Canzonieri iberici II*, ed. P. Botta, C. Parrilla, and I. Pérez Pascual, 141-52. A Coruña: Universidade da Coruña.
- 2002. *La poesía italianista*. Madrid: El Laberinto.
- 2005. "Petrarquismo en octosílabos: Del *Cancionero de Urrea* al de Pedro de Rojas." *Cuadernos de Filología Italiana* 12:235-46.
- BAEHR, Rudolf. 1973. *Manual de versificación española*. Madrid: Gredos.
- BELTRÁN, Vicenç, ed. 2002. *Poesía española*. Vol. 2. Barcelona: Crítica.
- BIBLIOTECA NACIONAL DE ESPAÑA. *Biblioteca digital hispánica*, <http://biblioteca.digitalhispanica.bne.es> (accessed January 2011).
- BIBLIOTECA VIRTUAL MIGUEL DE CERVANTES. <http://cervantesvirtual.com> (accessed January 2011).
- BOITANI, Piero. 1986. "Petrarch's *Dilectoso Male* and Its European Context." In *Zusammenhänge, Einflüsse, Wirkungen: Kongreßakten zum ersten Symposium des Mediävistenverbandes in Tübingen*

- 1984, ed. Joerg O. Fichte, Karl Heinz Göller, and Bernhard Schimmelpfennig, 299-314. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- 1989. "O quike death: Love, Melancholy and the Divided Self." In *The Tragic and the Sublime in Medieval Literature*, 56-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BOSCÁN, Juan. 1543. *Las obras de Boscán y algunas de Garcilaso de la Vega repartidas en quatro libros*. Barcelona: Carlos Amorós.
- 1999. *Obra completa*. Ed. Carlos Clavería. Madrid: Cátedra.
- CANALS, Jordi. 2001. *Salomón Usque, traductor del Canzoniere de Petrarca: Estudio y edición crítica*. Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- 2007. "Tres traductores quinientistas frente al *Canzoniere* de Petrarca: Usque, Garcés y Trenado de Ayllón." In *La traduzione della letteratura italiana in Spagna (1300-1939): Traduzione e tradizione del testo: Dalla filologia all'informatica: Atti del Primo Convegno Internazionale*, ed. M. N. Muñiz Muñiz, 361-72. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona and Franco Cesati.
- EL CACIONERO DE GALLARDO*. 1962. Ed. José María Azáceta. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- CACIONERO GENERAL DE OBRAS NUEVAS (Zaragoza, 1554)*. 1993. Ed. Carlos Clavería. Barcelona: Delstre's.
- CACIONERO DE POESÍAS VARIAS (Ms. 617 de la Real Biblioteca)*. 1986. Ed. José J. Labrador Herráiz, C. Ángel Zorita, and R. A. DiFranco. Madrid: El Crotalón.
- CANONICA, Elvezio. 2001. "Il *Canzoniere* tradotto in spagnolo, nel Perù, dal minatore portoghese Henrique Garcés (1591)." In *Pétrarque en Europe XIV e XX siècles: Dynamique d'une expansion culturale: Actes du XXVIe congrès international du CEFI*, ed. Pierre Blanc, 337-46. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- CARAVAGGI, Giovanni. 2007. "Petarquismo, pre-petrarquismo y elaboración intertextual." In *El hilo de Ariadna: Textos, intertextos y variantes de autor en la poesía española*, 109-57. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga.
- CARR, Derek C. 1978. "Another Look at the Metrics of Santillana's Sonnets." *Hispanic Review* 46, no. 1:4-53.

- 1981. "A Fifteenth-Century Castilian Translation and Commentary of a Petrarchan Sonnet: Biblioteca Nacional, Ms. 10186, folios 196r-199r." *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 5, no. 2:123-43.
- CARTAGENA, Pedro de. 2000. *Poesía*. Ed. Ana María Rodado Ruiz. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- CARTAPACIO DE FRANCISCO MORÁN DE LA ESTRELLA. 1989. Ed. R. A. DiFranco, José J. Labrador Herráiz, and C. Ángel Zorita. Madrid: Patrimonio Nacional.
- CASAS, Cristóbal de las. 1570. *Vocabulario de las dos lenguas toscana y castellana*. Seville: Francisco Aguilar.
- CASES, Cesare. 1975. "Il soneto in Germania e le prime traduzioni di sonetti petrarcheschi." In *Traduzione e tradizione europea del Petrarca: Atti del III Convegno sui problemi della traduzione letteraria*, 65-76. Padua: Antenore.
- CRAWFORD, James Pyle Wickersham. 1916. "Notes on the Sonnets in the Spanish *Cancionero General de 1554*." *Romanic Review* 7:328-37.
- CRUZ, Anne J. 1988. *Imitación y transformación. El petrarquismo en la poesía de Boscán y Garcilaso de la Vega*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- DIANI, Dominique. 1972. "Petrarque: Canzoniere 132." *Revue des études italiennes* 18:111-67.
- DÍAZ, Hernando. 1541. *La vida y excelentes dichos de los más sabios filósofos que vuo en este mundo*. Seville: Cromberger.
- DURLING, Robert M., trans. 1976. *Petrarch's Lyric Poems: The Rime sparse and Other Lyrics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- DUTTON, Brian. 1982. *Catálogo-índice de la poesía cancioneril del siglo XV*. Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.
- ed. 1990-91. *El cancionero del siglo XV: ca. 1360-1520*. 7 vols. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- DUTTON, Brian, and Victoriano Roncero López, ed. 2004. *La poesía cancioneril del siglo XV: Antología y estudio*. Madrid and Frankfurt: Iberoamericana and Vervuert.
- EDIT 16. *Censimento nazionale delle edizioni italiane del XVI secolo*. <http://edit16.iccu.sbn.it> (accessed January 2011).

- ELECTRONIC CORPUS OF 15TH CENTURY CASTILIAN Cancionero Manuscripts*. <http://www.cancionerovirtual.liv.ac.uk> (accessed January 2011).
- FORSTER, Leonard. 1969. *The Icy Fire: Five Studies in European Petrarchism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FUCILLA, Joseph. 1953. *Relaciones hispanoitalianas*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- 1960. *Estudios sobre el petrarquismo en España*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- GARCÉS, Enrique, trans. 1591. *Los Sonetos y Canciones del poeta Francisco Petrarca*. Madrid: Guillermo Droy.
- 2003. *La prima traduzione completa del Canzoniere di Petrarca in spagnolo: Los sonetos y canciones del Petrarca, que traduzia Henrique Garcés de lengua thoscana en castellana (Madrid, 1591)*. Ed. Aviva Garribba. *Artifara* 3, <http://www.cisi.unito.it/Artifara/Rivista3/testi/petrarca.htm> (accessed January 2011).
- GARCÍA GALIANO, Ángel. 1992. *La imitación poética en el Renacimiento*. Kassel: Reichenberger.
- GARRIBBA, Aviva. 2005. "Aspectos léxicos de la traducción del *Canzoniere* por Enrique Garcés (1591)." *Cuadernos de filología italiana* 12:115-32.
- GIL GARCÍA, Teresa. 2000. "Variantes léxicas en el Vocabulario de Cristóbal de las Casas." *Cuadernos de filología italiana* 7:283-305.
- GRIFFIN, Clive. 1991. *Los Cromberger: La historia de una imprenta del siglo XVI en Sevilla y México*. Madrid: Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana.
- GUTIÉRREZ CAROU, Javier. 1992. "Métrica y rima en los sonetos del Marqués de Santillana." *Revista de literatura medieval* 4:123-44.
- 1993. "La influencia real de la copla de arte mayor castellano en los sonetos del Marqués de Santillana." *Revista de literatura medieval* 5:95-112.
- HAINSWORTH, Peter. 2007. "Translating Petrarch." In *Petrarch in Britain: Interpreters, Imitators, and Translators over 700 Years*, ed. Mar-

- tin McLaughlin and Letizia Panizza, 341-58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KREBS BERMÚDEZ, Víctor. 1995. "Las traducciones de un soneto de Petrarca en el Renacimiento español." In *La traducción en España: Siglos XIV-XVI*, ed. Roxana Recio, 191-220. León: Universidad de León.
- LOFRASSO, Antonio de. 1573. *Los Diez libros de Fortuna d'Amor*. Barcelona: Pedro Malo.
- MANERO SOROLLA, María Pilar. 1987. *Introducción al estudio del petrarquismo en España*. Barcelona: PPU.
- 1989. "La primera traducción de las *Rime* de Petrarca en lengua castellana: *Los sonetos, canciones, mandriales y sextinas del gran poeta y orador Francisco Petrarca* de Salomón Usque." In *Hom-enaje al profesor Antonio Vilanova*, Vol. 1, ed. M. C. Carbonell, 377-91. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona.
- 1990. *Imágenes petrarquistas en la lírica española del Renacimiento*. Barcelona: PPU.
- MANN, Nicholas. 2006. Introduction to *Cancionero*, by Francesco Petrarca. Madrid: Cátedra.
- MEDINA BERMÚDEZ, Alejandro. 2005. "La obra pastoril de Antonio de Lofrasso." Ph.D. diss., Universidad Complutense.
- MELCHIONDA, Mario. 1975. "Chaucer, Wyatt e le 'contrarietà dell'amoroso stato': Canzoniere CXXXII e CXXXIV nella letteratura inglese." In *Traduzione e tradizione europea del Petrarca: Atti del III Convegno sui problemi della traduzione letteraria*, 5-36. Padua: Antenore.
- MEREGALLI, Franco. 1975. "Sulle prime traduzioni spagnole di sonetti del Petrarca." In *Traduzione e tradizione europea del Petrarca. Atti del III Convegno sui problemi della traduzione letteraria*, 55-63. Padua: Antenore.
- MICÓ, José María. 2002. "Verso y traducción en el Siglo de Oro." *Quaderns: Revista de traducció* 7:83-93.
- 2004. "La época del Renacimiento y del Barroco." In *Historia de la traducción en España*, ed. Francisco Lafarga and Luis Pege-naute. 175-208. Salamanca: Ambos Mundos.

- 2007. “Fortuna española de un verso de Petrarca.” In *La Traduzione della letteratura italiana in Spagna (1300-1939)*, ed. María de las Nieves Muñiz, 373-82. Barcelona and Florence: Universitat de Barcelona and Franco Cesati.
- MONTERO, Juan. 2005. “La poesía del Siglo de Oro en sus antologías impresas: El *Cancionero general de obras nuevas* (Zaragoza, Esteban de Nájera, 1554).” In *En torno al canon: aproximaciones y estrategias: VII Encuentro Internacional sobre Poesía del Siglo de Oro del Grupo PASO*, ed. Begoña López Bueno, 413-47. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla.
- MONTEMAYOR, Jorge. 1554. *Las obras de George de Monte mayor, repartidas en dos libros*. Antwerp: Joan Steelsio [in colophon: Juan Lacio].
- MORENO, Manuel. “Descripción codicológica LB2: CsXV I: 276-358. Ms. Add. 33.382, British Library de Londres.” *Cancionero virtual*, [www.cancionerovirtual.liv.ac.uk](http://www.cancionerovirtual.liv.ac.uk) (accessed January 2011).
- “Descripción codicológica MN17: CsXV II: 79-102. Ms. 3993, Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid.” *Cancionero virtual*, [www.cancionerovirtual.liv.ac.uk](http://www.cancionerovirtual.liv.ac.uk) (accessed January 2011).
- MUÑOZ RAYA, Eva, and Enrique NOGUERAS VALDIVIELSO. 1994. “Tres versiones castellanas de un soneto de Petrarca (Sobre las traducciones recientes del *Canzoniere*).” In *Reflexiones sobre la traducción*, ed. Luis Charlo Brea, 445-59. Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz.
- NORTON, Frederick John. 1999. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Printing in Spain and Portugal, 1501-1520*. Mansfield: Martino.
- PÉREZ PRIEGO, Miguel Ángel. 1987. “Sobre la transmisión y recepción de la poesía de Santillana: El caso de las serranillas y los sonetos”. *Dicenda: Cuadernos de filología hispánica* 6:189-98.
- PETRARCH, Francesco. *Canzoniere*. Ed. Gianfranco Contini. Turin: Einaudi, 1982.
- 1999. *Canzoniere*. Ed. Marco Santagata. Milan: Mondadori.
- 2006. *Cancionero I y II*. Ed. and trans. Jacobo Cortines. Madrid: Cátedra.
- REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA. *Corpus diacrónico del español*. <http://corpus.rae.es/cordenet.html> (accessed January 2011).

- RECIO, Roxana. 1996. *Petrarca en la Península Ibérica*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.
- 2007. "Metodología y enseñanza de la traducción en el siglo XVI: Los textos de Castillo y Alvar Gómez." *eHumanista* 9:161-74.
- RUIZ CASANOVA, José Francisco. 2000. *Aproximación a una historia de la traducción en España*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- SÁNCHEZ DE LAS BROZAS, Francisco. 1631. "Si no es amor, ¿qué es esto que yo siento?" In *Obras del Bachiller Francisco de la Torre*. Madrid: Imprenta del Reino.
- 1984. "Si no es amor, ¿qué es esto que yo siento?" In Francisco de la Torre, *Poesía completa*, ed. M. L. Cerrón Puga. Madrid: Cátedra.
- 1985. *Obras II: Poesía*. Ed. Avelina Carrera de la Red. Cáceres: Institución Cultural El Brocense.
- SECO, Esperanza. 1990. "Historia de las traducciones literarias del italiano al español durante el Siglo de Oro (Influencias)." *Cuadernos para la investigación de la literatura hispánica* 13:41-97.
- SELIG, Karl Ludwig. 1960. "The Dante and Petrarch translations of Hernando Díaz." *Italica* 37, no. 3:185-87.
- TERRACINI, Lore. 1996. "Unas calas en el concepto de traducción en el Siglo de Oro español." In *Actas del III Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, ed. A. Alonso González, 939-54. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- THOMSON, Patricia. 1959. "The Canticus Troili: Chaucer and Petrarch." *Comparative Literature* 11:313-28.
- UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA LA SAPIENZA. *Biblioteca Italiana*. <http://www.bibliotecaitaliana.it> (accessed January 2011).
- UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA. *Projecto Boscán*. <http://www.ub.edu/boscan> (accessed January 2011).
- USQUE, Salomón, trans. 1567. *Los Sonetos, Canciones, Mandriales y sextinas del gran poeta y orador Francisco Petrarca*. Venice: Nicolao Beuilaqua.
- trans. 2001. *Canzoniere*. "Salomón Usque, traductor del *Canzoniere* de Petrarca: Estudio y edición crítica." Jordi Canals. Ph.D. diss., Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

- VIÑA LISTE, José María. 1991. *Cronología de la Literatura Española*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Cátedra.
- WHETNALL, Jane. 2006. "Las transformaciones de Petrarca en cuatro poetas de cancionero: Santillana, Carvajales, Cartagena y Florencia Pinar." *Cancionero general* 4:81-108.
- WILKINS, Ernest H. 1949. "Cantus Troili." *ELH: A Journal of English Literary History* 16, no. 3:167-73.

## APPENDIX

### I. Texts

#### PETRARCH'S SONNET 132

(Ed. Contini, 1982; English translation by Durling [1976, 270])

S'amor non è, che dunque è quel ch'io sento?  
ma s'egli è amor, per Dio, che cosa e quale?  
se bona, ond'è l'effetto aspro e mortale?  
se ria, ond'è sì dolce ogni tormento?  
S'a mia voglia ardo, ond'è 'l pianto e lamento?  
s'a mal mio grado, il lamentar che vale?  
O viva morte, o diletto male,  
come puoi tanto in me, s'io no 'l consento?  
E s'io 'l consento, a gran torto mi doglio.  
Fra sì contrari vènti in frale barca  
mi trovo in alto mar, senza governo,  
sì lieve di saver, d'error sì carca,  
ch'i' medesimo non so quel ch'io mi voglio,  
e tremo a mezza state, ardendo il verno.

[If it is not love, what then is it that I feel? But if it is love, before God, what kind of thing is it? If it is good, whence comes this bitter mortal effect? If it is evil, why is each torment so sweet?

If by my own will I burn, whence comes the weeping and lament? If against my will, what does lamenting avail? O living death, O delightful harm, how can you have such power over me if I do not consent to it?

And if I do consent to it, it is wrong of me to complain. Amid such contrary winds I find myself at sea in a frail bark, without a tiller, so light of wisdom, so laden with error, that I myself do not know what I want; and I shiver in midsummer, burn in winter.]

*Traducción moderna de Jacobo Cortines*  
(Ed. Cátedra, 1989)

Si no es amor, ¿qué es lo que siento entonces?  
Mas si es amor, por Dios, ¿qué cosa y cómo?  
Si buena es, ¿por qué es mortal su efecto?  
Y si mala, ¿por qué es dulce el tormento?  
Si a voluntad me abraso, ¿por qué el llanto?  
Si a mi pesar, ¿qué vale lamentarse?  
Oh delicioso daño, oh viva muerte,  
¿cómo, sin consentirlo, tanto puedes?  
Y no me he de quejar, si lo consiento.  
En frágil barca y vientos tan contrarios  
me encuentro en alta mar y sin gobierno,  
tan falto de saber, de error cargado,  
que yo mismo no sé ni lo que quiero,  
y tiemblo de calor, y ardo de frío.

**I. PEDRO DE CARTAGENA, *CANCIONERO GENERAL***

[Índice Dutton ID4167, 11 CG-156]

(Ed. A. M. Rodado Ruiz, Universidad Castilla-La Mancha y Alcalá de Henares, 2000. The proposed punctuation is my own.)

Si no es Amor, ¿quién me trata?  
¿Qu'es un dolor tan esquivo?  
¿De quién yo vençer me dexo?  
Si es amor, ¿por qué me mata?  
Si me mata, ¿cómo que vivo?  
Si bivo, ¿por qué me quexo?  
Quiero sufrir su pasión  
Tener mi fe en su esperanza  
Porque entre amor y razón  
Tales diferencias son  
Quel seso no las alcança.

[If it is not Love, who is dealing with me? What pain is so aloof? By whom am I allowing myself to be vanquished? If it is love, why is it killing me? If it is killing me, how is it that I am alive? If I am alive, why do I complain? I want to suffer its passion, place my faith in its hope, because between love and reason the differences are such that understanding does not apprehend them.]

**2. ALEXANDRE, CANCIONERO DE GALLARDO**

[ID2839\*. MN17-29, fol. 42]

(The edition is my own, from the paleographic edition of J. M. Azáceta, C.S.I.C., 1962)

*Consideraçion de amores*

Amor, bastarte debería,  
o acábame de matar,  
pero, ¿para qué acabar?,  
pues no hay mejor alegría  
que gozar de tu pesar;  
pues no sé qu'es lo que siento:  
la pena que desigual,  
aunque sea más mortal,  
no sé para que la miento,  
pues hallo bien en el mal.

Pues si del amor me quejo,  
y el amar no me conviene,  
siendo yo causa que pene,  
no sé por qué no le dejo,  
si qu'el a mí no me tiene.  
Pero ya que yo le dejé  
el mal sí habré de tenello,  
sé que pues procuré avello,  
justo es que de mí me queje  
pues tengo la culpa d'ello.

Veamos, ¿cómo el vevir  
lo tengo por crudo y fuerte?  
Sí, porque me cupo en suerte  
que no me quiera el morir,  
conviniéndome la muerte.  
Pues si la muerte me deja,  
¿qué mayor vitoria quiero?,  
¿qué pido o qu'es lo que espero?,  
pues la causa de mi queja  
me quita el mal de que muero.

Pues no sé ¿como no vivo  
si vida me dan mis males?  
Sí, que aunque muero en ser tales  
más nueva vida reçibo  
cuanto en mí son más mortales;

cuitado que siento yo  
si vivo con el deseo;  
dicen que vida poseo,  
qu'es triste si vivo estó,  
no sé, que muerto me veo.

Sí, que yo uno soy uno,  
¡ay de mí, qu'es esto amor!  
¿Quién me causa este dolor?  
¿Cómo me hallo en ninguno?  
¿Qué será si es desamor?  
Ères tú el que me repartes,  
¿qué será si es la fortuna?  
Mí persona solo es una,  
¿cómo estoy en çien mil partes  
y a veces en no ninguna?

Si estoy quedo ¿cómo ando?,  
esto ¿cómo puede ser?  
¿Cómo quiero en no querer?  
¿Cómo descanso penando?  
¿Cómo lloro de plazer?  
Si vivo, ¿cómo estoy muerto?  
Si es el amor que en mí mora,  
no que el amor enamora,  
desamor debe ser çierto  
el que amor desanamora.

Caído he de mi locura,  
mas no puede ser tampoco,  
sí, que çierto es lo que toco  
¿qu'es veamos la cordura?  
¿Cómo me ha tornado loco?  
Porque la causa suprema  
hace al hombre enloqueçer,  
y por cursos el querer,  
cuando su fuego no quema,  
viene a desenloqueçer.

Porqu'el amor no duela  
 y aplaque la pena esquivá,  
 habrá medio que reçiba  
 el que tiene la candela,  
 que en matalla queda viva;  
 pues, cuitado, ¿qué haré?  
 ¿Cómo me puedo sufrir?  
 Dejar aparte el vevir  
 peor es que no podré,  
 pues no me querrá el morir.

[Amorous pondering]

Love, you should be satisfied, or finish me off, but why put an end to me? For there is no greater happiness than enjoying your sorrow, for I know not what it is I feel; I know not why I belie the inordinate penalty, although it is more deadly, for I find good in the bad.

If I then complain of love, and loving does not suit me, since I myself am the cause of my suffering, I know not why I do not forsake it, if it does not have a hold on me; but now that I have left it, I will indeed have evil; I know that, since I endeavored to have it, it is only just that I complain about myself, for I am guilty of it.

Let us see how I consider living grievous and hard, since it is my lot that dying should not want me when death suits me; for if death grants me leave, what greater victory do I want? What do I ask or hope for, when the cause of my complaint removes from me the evil of which I am dying?

I know not, then, how I do not live, if my evils give me life, if, though I die, I yet gain more new life by their being such, inasmuch as they are more deadly for me; I feel afflicted if I live with the desire; they say I possess life: I know not what is sorrowful if I am alive, for I consider myself dead.

I am, in fact, only one; woe is me, that this is love that causes me this pain, since I find myself undergoing nothing like ever before: what will happen if it be unlove? You are the one who divides me: what will happen if fate should do so? My person is only one: how is it that I am in a hundred thousand places and sometimes in none?

If I am still, how is it that I walk? How can this be? How is it that I desire when not desiring? How do I rest when suffering? How do I weep with pleasure? If I live, how is it I am dead? If it is love that dwells within me—not that love enamors—it certainly must be unlove that extinguishes love.

I have fallen from my madness, but neither can it be madness if what I touch is certain, which is sanity, we shall see, since it has turned me mad; because

the supreme cause drives man mad; and loving, successively, when its fire does not burn, eventually restores sanity.

In order that love shall not hurt, and shall placate the elusive pain, he who has the candle which stays alive when snuffed out will have a means to bear it; afflicted, then, what shall I do? How can I suffer myself? It is worse that I cannot leave living aside, for dying would not want me.]

### 3. Hernando Díaz

[ID3540, 16DF2, 44r]

(Ed. *Proyecto Boscán: Catálogo de las traducciones españolas de obras italianas*. <http://www.ub.edu/boscan>; checked against the 1541 edition.)

Si amor no es aquesto: pues ¿qu'es lo que siento?  
 mas, ay, si es amor, ¿qué cosa es y cuál?  
 Si es buena, ¿por dónde el effeto mortal?,  
 si es mala, ¿por qué tan dulce el tormento?  
 Si ardo de grado, ¿por qué descontento?  
 Si a mal de mi grado, ¿qué vale el llorar?  
 O muerte muy biva o dulce lamento  
 ¿en mí cómo puede si yo no consiento?  
 Mas ya si consiento no es justo el quexar;  
 con vientos contrarios me hallo en el mar  
 en flaca barquilla, sin otro gobierno  
 ligera en saber, cargada en errar  
 que no sé yo mesmo qué quiero alcançar,  
 temblando en estío y ardiendo en invierno.

[If this is not love, what then is it that I feel? But, oh, if it is love, what is it, and what sort of thing? If it is good, whence its deadly effect? If it is bad, why is its torment so sweet? If I burn by my own will, why discontent? If against my will, what use is weeping? O vivacious death, O sweet lament, how can you wield such power over me if I do not consent? But if I do consent, complaining is not justified; with hostile winds I find myself at sea in a frail, little boat, without any other helm, light in knowing, laden with erring, for I myself do not know what I want to attain, shivering in summer and burning in winter.]

**4. Juan de Boscán, Sonnet 89**  
(Ed. Carlos Clavería, Cátedra, 1999)

Bueno es amar, pues ¿cómo daña tanto?  
 Gran gusto es querer bien, ¿por qué entristece?  
 Plazer es desear, ¿cómo aborrece?  
 Amor es nuestro bien, ¿por qué da llanto?  
 Da esfuerço amar, ¿pues cómo causa ‘spanto?  
 Por el amor el bien del alma crece,  
 ¿pues cómo así, por él ella padece?  
 ¿Cómo tantos contrarios cubre un manto?  
 No es el amor el que dolor nos trae;  
 la compañía que, a su pesar, él tiene,  
 también a su pesar nos hiere y mata.  
 El mal en él de nuestra parte cae;  
 él solo en nuestro bando nos sostiene  
 y nuestra paz continuamente trata.

[It is good to love: how, then, does it hurt so much? It is a great joy to cherish: why does it cause sadness? Desiring is a pleasure: how is it tedious? Love is our good: why does it cause weeping? Loving invigorates: how, then, does it cause dismay? By love, the good of the soul increases: how, then, does the soul suffer because of it? How does one cloak cover so many contradictions? Love is not what brings us pain; the company love keeps, in spite of itself, also wounds and kills us in spite of love. The evil in it befalls our lot; love alone on our side sustains us and is continuously engaged in our peace.]

**5. Jorge de Montemayor**  
(Ed. Antwerp, Iuan Steelsio, 1554. I have modernized the punctuation and spelling.)

Si amor es puro amor, ¿por qué me offende?  
 Si a dicha es desamor, ¿por qué no muero?  
 Si amor ni desamor, ¿yo cómo quiero?  
 Si no me ha de abrasar, ¿por qué m’enciende?  
 ¿Amor no me dirá lo que pretende?  
 Que yo no huyo de él, aquí le espero.  
 O debe ser muy flaco, o es muy fiero,  
 o yo no entiendo a él, o él no m’entiende.  
 Si ve que estoy contento con mi pena,

revuelve contra mí tan bravamente  
 que no sé si es Amor quien me condena.  
 Si triste me ve estar, no lo consiente,  
 mas ¡ay! que en mí sujeto Amor ordena  
 que venga el bien, o el mal por accidente.

[If love is pure love, why does it harm me? If perchance it is disaffection or unlove, why do I not die? If neither love nor unlove, how is it that I love? If it will not burn me, why does it inflame me? Will love not tell me what it seeks? Since I do not flee it, I wait for it here. It must be either very frail or very fierce; either I do not understand it, or it does not understand me. If it finds me contented with my punishment, it turns against me so ferociously that I know not if it is Love who condemns me. If it finds me sad, it does not allow it, but oh, Love ordains that good be, in my person, subject, or evil be accident.]

#### 6. Anonymous version from the 1554 *Cancionero general de obras nuevas*, Sonnet 152

(Ed. Carlos Clavería, PPU, 1993. The punctuation is my own.)

Si amor no es ¿qué mal es el que siento?  
 Y si es amor ¿qué cosa será ésta?  
 Si buena es, su efecto me molesta,  
 si mala, ¡cómo es dulce su tormento!  
 Si huelgo yo de arder ¿y me lamento?,  
 y si me pesa, ¿lamentar qué presta?  
 ¡O viva llama deleytosa y presta!  
 ¿Cómo me abrasas si yo no consiento?  
 En una débil barca mal parada  
 con fuerte tiempo y muy gran fortuna,  
 y sin gobierno en alta mar me hallo;  
 liviana de saber, de error cargada,  
 sin quedarme esperança ya ninguna,  
 si huviesse puerto de poder tomallo.

[If it is not love, what evil is it that I feel? And if it is love, what might this thing be? If it is good, its effect troubles me; if bad, how sweet is its torment! If I enjoy burning, why do I lament? And if it burdens me, what does lamenting contribute? O brisk, delightful, living flame! How is it that you scorch me if I do not consent? In a feeble boat, in poor condition, with rough weather and a mighty storm and rudderless, on the high sea I find myself;

lightly laden with knowledge, loaded with error, no hope is left me now of having a port in which to harbor.]

### 7. Salomón Usque Hebreo

(Ed. Jordi Canals, Universidad Autònoma de Barcelona, 2001 [tesis doctoral])

Si amor no es, ¿qué es pues lo que yo siento?  
 Mas si es amor, por Dios, ¿qué cosa y cuál?  
 Si buena, ¿a qué es l'efecto aspro y mortal?  
 Si mala, ¿cómo es dulce su tormento?  
 Si ardo a mi grado, ¿a qu'el llanto y el lamento?  
 Si a mal mi grado, ¿el quejarme qué val?  
 ¡O biva muerte! ¡o deleitoso mal!  
 ¿Cómo puedes en mí, si yo no consiento?  
 Y si yo consiento, mía es la culpa y pena.  
 En flaca barca en tan contrarios vientos  
 me hallo, en alta mar y sin gobierno.  
 Tan liviana en saber, d'error tan llena,  
 que no comprehendo yo mis pensamientos  
 y, temblando en verano, ardo en invierno.

[If it is not love, what is it then I feel? But if it is love, by God, what is it, and what sort of thing? If it is good, why is its effect harsh and deadly? If bad, how is its torment sweet? If I burn by my own will, wherefore weeping and lamenting? If against my will, what use is my complaining? O living death! O delightful evil! How is it that you can wield such power over me if I do not consent? And if I do consent, mine is the guilt and punishment. In a frail boat amid such hostile winds I find myself, on the high sea and rudderless. So lightly laden with knowledge, so full of error, that I do not understand my own thoughts, and, shivering in summer, I burn in winter.]

### 8. Antonio Lofrasso (Book II of *Los diez libros de la fortuna del amor*)

(Lofrasso, Antonio de, *Los Diez libros de Fortuna d'Amor [...]*, Barcelona: Pedro Malo, 1573)

Si no es amor, ¿qué mal es el que siento?  
 Y si es amor, ¿con qué podré vengarme  
 de la pasión que veo lastimarme

en los extremos de mi sentimiento?  
 Si acaso mudar quiero el pensamiento  
 solicita el dolor en maltratarme  
 diciendo que por fuerza he d'enterrarme,  
 en la causa de mi grave tormento.  
 Así que de amor remedio espero,  
 entreteniéndome en tal estado  
 que tanto esperar ya desespero.  
 Cómo podré dar fin a mi cuidado  
 si faltando el remedio triste muero,  
 en tinieblas de muerte tan penado.

[If it is not love, what evil is it that I feel? And if it is love, wherewith shall I avenge myself for the passion that I see injuring me in the extremities of my feeling? If perchance I wish to alter my thinking, the pain insists on mistreating me, saying that, by force, I must be buried in the cause of my severe torment. Thus I await a remedy for love, disporting myself in such a state that I am now losing hope with so much hoping. How can I put an end to my distress if I die sad for lack of remedy, so afflicted in shadows of death?]

### 9. Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas (El Brocense)

(Sánchez de las Brozas, *Obras II. Poesía*, ed. A. Carrera de la Red, Diputación de Cáceres, 1985. I have modernized the spelling and punctuation.)

Si no es amor, ¿qué es esto que yo siento?  
 Sepamos, si es amor, ¿qué cosa es ésta?  
 Si es buena, ¿cómo está a matar tan presta?  
 Si es mala, ¿cómo es dulce su tormento?  
 Si quiero padecer, ¿por qué lamento?  
 Si no lo quiero, ¿el lamentar qué presta?  
 ¡Oh viva muerte, oh alegría molesta!  
 ¿Quién puede tanto en mí, si no consiento?  
 Y si consiento, sin razón me afano.  
 Con débil barca y vientos a porfía  
 me hallo en alta mar y sin gobierno,  
 de errores llena y de saber vacía,  
 que yo mismo no sé lo que me es sano,  
 tiemblo en el estío, y ardo en el invierno.

[If it is not love, what is this that I feel? Let us know, if it is love, what thing is this? If it is good, how is it so quick to kill? If it is bad, how is its torment sweet? If I wish to suffer, why do I lament? If I want it not, what does lamenting contribute? O living death, O distressing happiness! Who can wield such power over me if I do not consent? And if I consent, I strive without reason. With a feeble boat and obstinate winds, I find myself on the high seas and rudderless, full of errors and devoid of knowledge, since I myself know not what is salutary for me, I shiver in summer, and burn in winter.]

### 10. Henrique Garcés

(Ed. Aviva Garibba, Revista Artifara, 2003)

Si no es amor, qu'es esto que'en mí siento?  
 Y si es amor, cuál es su natural?  
 Si bueno, cómo su effecto es mortal?  
 Si malo, cómo es dulce su tormento?  
 Si de voluntad ardo, qué lamento?  
 Si a mi pesar, el lamentar qué val?  
 O biva muerte, o deleitoso mal  
 Quién te dio en mi poder si no consiento?  
 Y si consiento, sin razón me quexo  
 Entre tantos contrarios va mi nave  
 Metida en alta mar y sin gobierno.  
 Tan falta de saber, de error tan grave,  
 Que no sé lo que digo, o lo que dexo,  
 Pues tiemblo de verano, ardo de invierno.

[If it is not love, what is this that I feel within me? And if it is love, what is its nature? If good, how is it that its effect is deadly? If bad, how is it that its torment is sweet? If I willingly burn, what do I lament? If in spite of myself, what use is lamenting? O living death, O delightful evil, who gave you power over me if I do not consent? And if I consent, I complain without reason. Amid so many contraries, my ship sails, consigned to the high sea and rudderless. So lacking in knowledge, so laden with error, that I know not what I say or what I leave, for I shiver in summer, I burn in winter.]

## II. Table of Authors, Dates, and Details of Publication

No.	<i>Author of Translation/ Imitation. Place and Date of Birth/Death</i>	<i>Date of Composition</i>	<i>Publication Details</i>
1	Pedro de Cartagena Valladolid (1457-1486)	Before 1486	Printed in <i>Cancionero General</i> (Valencia: 1511). First printed anthology of <i>cancionero</i> poetry. Dedicated to the Count of Oliva.
2	Alexandre (1490?-?)	1500-1550?	Manuscript: Ms. 3993, B. N. M. <i>Cancionero de Gallardo</i> , s. XVI <1550. Compilation of <i>cancionero</i> poetry with some Italianate poetry (sonnets and epistles in tercets).
3	Hernando Díaz Possibly resident in Salamanca, at least 1516-1520; had ties to the 3rd and 4th Marquis of Astorga and the 3rd Count of Feria.	Before 1516	Printed in <i>La vida y excelentes dichos de los mas sabios filósofos</i> (Seville: 1516; reprinted in Seville: 1541). Contains, at the back, a translation of a <i>canto</i> from the <i>Divina Comedia</i> and the sonnet of Petrarch. Dedicated to Pedro Álvarez de Osorio, eldest son of the 3rd Marquis of Astorga.
4	Juan de Boscán Barcelona (1487/92-1542)	1526-1543	Printed in <i>Las obras de Boscán y algunas de Garcilaso de la Vega</i> (Barcelona: 1543).
5	Jorge de Montemayor Portugal (1520?-1561?)	Before 1554	Printed in <i>Las obras de George de Monte mayor</i> (Antwerp: 1554). Dedicated to don Juan and doña Juana, Prince and Princess of Portugal.
6	Anonymous	Before 1554	Printed in <i>Cancionero General de Obras Nuevas: nunca hasta aora impressas, assi por ell arte española como por la toscana</i> (Zaragoza, Esteban G. de Nagera: 1554. 8º).
7	Salomón Usque Portugal? Italy? (?-1596) Spent time in Venice and in Constantinople.	Before 1567	Printed in <i>Los Sonetos, Canciones, Mandriales y sextinas del gran poeta y orador Francisco Petrarca</i> (Venice: 1567). Translation of the first part of the <i>Canzoniere</i> . Dedicated to Alejandro Farnesio.

8	Antonio de Lofrasso Cerdeña (Dates unknown)	Before 1573	Printed in <i>Los diez libros de Fortuna d'Amor</i> (Barcelona: 1573). Pastoral <i>novela sentimental</i> with intercalated poems. Dedicated to Luis Carroz y de Centellas, Count of Quirra.
9	Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas Cáceres (1523-1600)	1572 or earlier <sup>1</sup>	Manuscript: Ms. 2007, Biblioteca de la Universidad de Salamanca, with poems and notes in the author's hand. Edition: Supplement to <i>Obras del Bachiller Francisco de la Torre</i> , edited by Quevedo (Madrid: 1631). Dedicated to the Marquis of Toral.
10	Enrique Garcés Porto (ca. 1525-1599)	1570-1589 <sup>2</sup>	Printed in <i>Los Sonetos y Canciones del poeta Francisco Petrarcha</i> (Madrid: 1591). The first complete translation of the <i>Canzoniere</i> (omitting one <i>canzone</i> and the censured sonnets). Dedicated to Felipe II.

- 
- 1 The translation can be no later than 1573, since that was the year of the death of Juan de Almeida, who wrote the prologue to the supplement.
  - 2 Dates as according to the "Proyecto Boscán." Since his translation of Petrarch is praised in 1585 by Cervantes in *La Galatea*, in the "Canto de Calíope," it must have circulated in manuscript form in Spain, although Garcés was then in Peru, having dedicated himself to the mining industry.