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Published in 1588, Abraham Fraunce’s The Arcadian Rhetorike is one of the most influential rhetorical treatises written in English that followed the Ramist tendencies. Imbued thus with these rhetorical premises, Fraunce, like other rhetoricians, laid emphasis exclusively on the systematic classification of the figures of speech. To do so, he employed illustrations taken from the works of renowned poets of the Greek, Latin, Italian, English, and Spanish traditions. Particularly interesting is the presence of Spanish literature in the treatise. Focusing then on the circulation of texts from the Spanish literary tradition in Elizabethan England, this article attempts to examine the reasons why Juan Boscán’s and Garcilaso de la Vega’s compositions worked as valid vernacular paradigms suitable for rhetorical explanation, as Abraham Fraunce suggested in his manual.
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The relationship between Renaissance Spanish and English literatures is particularly alluring. In the case of Abraham Fraunce, this subject matter never ceases to be an interesting topic. In 1588, Fraunce’s The Arcadian Rhetorike was published in London by Thomas Orwin, and its popularity owed less to its innovation in methodology, than to its polyglot selection of literary fragments used to illustrate rhetorical devices. This is remarkable to the point that, more than a rhetorical treatise, Fraunce’s work seems—with the use of so many literary sources—what could be justifiably considered a poetical anthology, as Alessandra Petrina, for instance, among other critics, proposes (1999: 324). Due to this multiplicity of examples from diverse literary traditions, it plays a prominent role in the transmission of Renaissance Spanish literature within the Elizabethan literary scope. Allusions to the works of the Spaniards Juan Boscán and Garcilaso de la Vega, along with those to other classical and European poets,’ are permanent throughout the treatise.

As a result of Fraunce’s choice of these two authors, some questions arise concerning the presence of Spanish literature in Elizabethan England. One of the most significant is the exploration of the reasons why, and the channels through which, the works of

1. The classical poets included by Fraunce are principally Homer and Virgil, while the Europeans are, apart from Boscán and Garcilaso, Torquato Tasso, Guillaume de Salluste Du Bartas, Sir Philip Sidney, and Edmund Spenser.
Boscán and Garcilaso were introduced in the Elizabethan cultural cosmos. Equally important is the influence that they might have exerted on the development of English Renaissance poetry. Hence, the analysis I propose is twofold. On the one hand, I attempt to explain the causes that favoured the circulation of Boscán’s and Garcilaso’s works in sixteenth-century England; and, on the other, I mean to examine the reasons why their works were transformed into valid vernacular paradigms suitable for rhetorical explanation and expression, as The Arcadian Rhetorike proposes. In order to do so, it is indispensable to describe the nature of Fraunce’s work, and to proceed to a deeper analysis of the causes that led to the inclusion of the works of both Spaniards in Fraunce’s manual.

I

The success of the Spanish language in England was favoured by the political situation of the period. The economical prosperity that Spain enjoyed during most of the sixteenth century and its leading role in the Catholic question transformed it into a powerful empire. On the side of the Protestant reformation, England, the promoter of the Anglican Church, was one of its principal enemies. Catholic refugees from England found in Spain a place of safety. Likewise, many Spaniards moved to the Courts of other countries either to promote their political relations or to avoid religious persecution. In 1567, the Protestant grammarian Antonio del Corro, among others, fled to England, where he succeeded in promulgating propaganda against the Pope, and in the creation of the first Spanish Protestant Church (Ungerer 1965: 177). Paradoxically, Spain was a model in political, maritime, historical, and economical affairs for many European countries, and, as a result, much cultural exchange took place during that period. Ambassadors and diplomats from England and other European countries travelled to Spain in order to acquire a better knowledge of its military and maritime stratagems. William Cecil, who was at the head of the intelligence service and played an important role in the defeat of the Armada, is perhaps one of the most relevant figures in this respect, as he took advantage of his stay in Spain to prepare, in Gustav Ungerer’s words, “anti-Spanish propaganda” (1965: 180). In a similar way, the Oxonian Richard Hakluyt, for example, got interested in Spanish maritime treatises and encouraged the publication of those travel books in Spanish that could work as models for colonialist purposes.  

2. Ungerer gives detailed information about Hakluyt’s concern with this type of books, and he explains how his purpose was mainly the infusion of a colonialist spirit within the English nation following the example of the most powerful empire at the time: “He compiled and edited what has been styled the prose epic of English maritime expansion. He deserves to be remembered for having included several Spanish documents in the first and second edition of the Principall Nauigations, Voiages, and Discoueries of the English Nation (1589, vol. 1; 1598–1600, 3 vols.). Moreover, Hakluyt had the travels of Antonio de Espejo reprinted in 1586, when he was chaplain to the English Embassy in Paris. This book raises several questions . . . The point to be emphasized now is that it was a move in his colonial campaign, obviously not meant to reach a Spanish public, who had already been offered the text in the original edition of 1585, but to appeal to English readers and to incite them to action” (1965: 180–81).
The development of the Spanish empire undoubtedly encouraged the expansion of the Spanish language. Learning Spanish proved to be useful for international policy and affairs of state. Therefore, many Spanish military treatises enjoyed a broad circulation beyond the boundaries of the country. As Ungerer explains, “navigation and oceanic exploration were a further cause of the expansion of the Spanish language overseas” (1965: 180). He lays the emphasis on “the debt owed by English seamen to Spanish navigational science,” because all the manuals by the Spaniards Martín Cortés, Rodrigo Zamorano, Fernández de Enciso, José Toribio Medina, and Jerónimo de Chaves, among others, served to “enrich the annals of Elizabethan printing with a number of Spanish items” (1965: 180). Apart from all these maritime and colonialist pamphlets, other types of books in Spanish benefited from a wide distribution in sixteenth-century England. Books of occasional and didactic character, religious literature, and purely literary texts found their place on the Elizabethan shelves as well (Underhill 1899: 22). On top of that, as Ungerer vindicates, the printing of Spanish books was favoured by royal approval (1956: 48).

This Spanish influence punctually evolved into a matter of interest at some of the most celebrated universities, among which Cambridge and Oxford had the leading responsibility. Spanish was not a compulsory subject in the curricula, but it is certain that scholars gradually started to devote part of their studies to the learning of Spanish, mainly by means of translation into Latin and vice versa (Ungerer 1965: 178–79). By the last quarter of the century, several grammars for the learning of Spanish were already published. Antonio del Corro’s manual, Reglas gramaticales para aprender la lengua española y francesa, confiriendo la una con la otra, según el orden de las partes de la oratio latina, was published in Oxford and Paris in 1586, and promptly became one of the most celebrated books of its kind. The pedagogue of the Queen, Roger Ascham, in The Scholemaster, printed in 1570, takes a firm stand on the importance of Spanish in the education of children. Likewise, William Stepney in The Spanish Schoole-Master, issued in 1591, follows comparable parameters to those proposed by Ascham. Bilingual dictionaries grew pivotal as well, among which John Minsheu’s A Dictionarie in Spanish and English (1599) was exceptionally popular. The manual that really advanced the spreading of Spanish was Richard Perceval’s Bibliotheca Hispanica, which, published in 1591, worked as a kind of compendium of Spanish grammar and literature, and stimulated the interest in the Castilian language.

Scholars at Cambridge particularly succumbed to the attraction of the Spanish language. Most of these men read and translated Spanish poetry, and, in most cases, were the principal importers of Renaissance Spanish literature in England. By the first part of the century, Guevara’s works, Fernando de Rojas’ La Celestina, and many of the chivalric romances such as the Amadís saga had found echo within the English cultural atmosphere. The real influence of the Spanish letters, however, took part in the second half of the sixteenth century when the works of Montemayor, Boscán, and last but not least, Garcilaso started to impregnate with their refreshed Italianized mode the English poetry. It was a considerably quick phenomenon, as only one year after its publication, Montemayor’s Diana, for instance, was well known by the circle headed by Lord Burghley. It goes without saying that Sidney’s Arcadia finds most of its inspiration in Montemayor’s piece of work. Underhill stresses this interest that Sidney’s and Burghley’s group had in Spanish literature, and how they got acquainted with the texts in their original form: “Sidney’s group studied Spanish literature, they seemed to care for it, and to know it better than it was commonly known; Oxford’s possessed a casual interest in the subject, such as might very well be
shared abroad. Sidney’s group were familiar with the Castilian originals; Oxford’s with French and Italian” (1899: 292). Moreover, as Ungerer explains, it should be taken into account that Sidney, Burghley, Fraunce, and other components of the group had a good knowledge of Spanish and read the original texts in most of the cases: “The presumption that Sidney’s literary followers had a first hand knowledge of the Spanish language is attested and confirmed by Sidney’s own protégé. Abraham Fraunce made use of Spanish lyrics in the Arcadian Rhetorike (1588). The attempt to classify the ‘Precepts of Rhetorique’ was ‘made plaine’ by thirty-eight Spanish quotations from ‘both his semaines Boscan & Garcilassoes sonnets and Aeglogs’” (1956: 72). It is hardly surprising then that allusions and references to works in Spanish gradually started to occur in English texts. A clear paradigm of this trend is Abraham Fraunce’s The Arcadian Rhetorike.

II

I have intended to emphasise the fact that Fraunce's quotations of Boscán and Garcilaso are not an isolated event. Their works had reached the boundaries of Elizabethan England before they were included in Fraunce’s manual. It is definitely necessary then to track down as far as possible the way in which Fraunce got to know these texts. Scholar Hayward Keniston suggested that Fraunce chanced upon Boscán, and specially Garcilaso, through French literature. He pointed out that “bey ond the Pyrenees the earliest evidence of acquaintance with his [Garcilaso’s] work is an imitation of his second Eclogue, the Pastorale amoreuse (1569) of François de Belleforest,” and “a decade later, the Protestant poet, Guillaume de Saluste, seigneur du Bartas, mentions Garcilaso among the leading men of letters in Spain in his religious epic, La semaine (1579)” (1922: 426). Therefore, as Keniston hinted, “it seems probable that he [Fraunce] was led to his acquaintance with the work of the Spanish poet by his reading of La Semaine of du Bartas, for all the examples which he cites from foreign authors are from poets mentioned by the French writer” (1922: 430). Still I find several qualms in this respect, because, like Ethel Seaton, I am of the opinion that Fraunce came into contact with the works of Boscán and Garcilaso in a rather straightforward manner. It is very likely that, as Keniston proposed, Saluste Du Bartas might have played an important role in Fraunce’s familiarity with Garcilaso and Boscán, as the French writer is one of the poets that he most frequently quotes in his Arcadian Rhetorike. Yet it must also be taken into account that, due to his proximity with Sidney and his circle, it is very probable that he had read Boscán and Garcilaso before he read Du Bartas.

That Sidney and Fraunce had a good relationship is out of question. Even though Fraunce studied at St. John’s College, Cambridge, and Sidney at Christ Church, Oxford, both were imbued with similar humanistic tendencies. In fact, Sidney was his mentor during a long period. As a result of his friendship with Sidney, Fraunce got on a sociable footing with all the scholars that gathered around Lord Burghley, who was at that time Sidney’s protector. As mentioned above, these men assembled around Burghley were all

3. “Guevare, le Boscan, Grenade, et Garcilace, abreuvez/du nectar qui rit dedans la tasse de Pitho verse-miel, portent le Castilian” (Keniston 1922: 426).
Boscán and Garcilaso as Rhetorical Models in the English Renaissance

4. Yong’s translation of Montemayor’s Diana was accomplished in 1583, but it was not published until 1598.
To ascertain the causes that led Fraunce to include both Spaniards in his *Arcadian Rhetorike*, not only is it fundamental to trace his acquaintance with both poets, but it is likewise essential to analyse the nature of his rhetorical work. First of all, it should be taken into account that Fraunce’s *Rhetorike* was not actually a completely original piece of work. It was mainly a translation into English of Petrus Ramus’ *Rhetorica*, which dated from 1548. Fraunce’s treatise appeared as a direct result of the Ramistic movement within the English cultural scene. It was precisely among the intellectual circles of the University of Cambridge where the Ramistic rhetorical tendencies seemed to find the first echoes in Renaissance England. Gabriel Harvey, Thomas Nashe, Sidney, William Kempe, Dudley Fenner, and Abraham Fraunce, of course, were some of the most relevant figures in the Cambridge group who defended the Ramistic ideas.

As Ramists do, Fraunce stressed the role of rhetoric, making its ornamental nature its main focus. Ramistic rhetoric was limited to the field of eloquence understood as the embellishment of language. In 1584, Dudley Fenner started his book on rhetoric—merely a translation of Ramus’ *Rhetorica*—affirming that “Rhetorike is an Arte of speaking finelie. It hath two partes: Garnishing of speache, called Eloquution; and garnishing of the manner of utterance, called Pronunciation. Garnishing of speache is the firste parte of Rhetorike, whereby the speach it selfe is beautified and made fine” (1584: ch. 1). Similar to Fenner’s proposal was Abraham Fraunce’s opening paragraph to his likewise Ramistic treatise: “Rhetorike is an Art of speaking. It hath two parts, Eloquution and Pronuntiation. Eloqution is the first part of Rhetorike . . . It hath also 2 parts, Congruitie and Brauerie. Congruitie is that which causeth the speach to be pure and coherent . . . Brauerie of speech consisteth in Tropes, or turnings, and in Figures or fashionings” (1588: ch. 1).

Fraunce included within the scope of rhetoric only those functions rigorously connected to style, *elocutio* and *pronuntiatio*. These were the two courses of action that Ramists admitted as parts of the rhetorical procedure strictly speaking. Yet he drew special attention to the first one, in view of the fact that it enhanced language. Within elocution, he distinguished *congruitie* and *brauerie*. *Congruitie* was the part devoted to the grammatical arrangement of the discourse in order to make it articulate. As he explained, “congruitie is that which causeth the speach to be pure and coherent . . . Heere should all Grammatical rules (as they call them) be placed” (1588: ch. 1). However, rather than on Grammar, Fraunce focused his essay on the second part of elocution, what he termed

---

6. The attribution of this work to Ramus is dubious, as it has often been suggested that the real author of *Rhetorica* was Ramus’ partner Audomarus Talaeus (Omer Talon, 1505–1562).


braverie of speach and which consisted in the description of all the rhetorical devices used to improve the artistry of compositions. Following the traditional schemes, he made a distinction between tropes and figures: “A Trope or turning is when a word is turned from his naturall signification, to some other, so conuenientlie, as that it seeme rather willingly ledd, than drove by force or that other signification” (1588: ch. 1). “A figure is certaine decking of speach, whereby the vsual and simple fashion thereof is altered and changed to that which is more elegant and conceipted . . . In these figures especially consisteth the conceipted pleasance and delicacie of speach” (1588: ch. 12).

Akin to Ramus’ Rhetorica, Fraunce’s Arcadian Rhetorike underlined the relevance of rhetorical figures to which he devoted, stepping into the shoes of his predecessor, most of his work. The list of figures and methodology were absolutely identical in both books. The two rhetoricians enumerated the different figures and added citations taken from literary works to explain them. Nonetheless, The Arcadian Rhetorike included not only classical quotations to exemplify the rhetorical devices, but, divergent from Ramus’ Rhetorica in this respect, it also took account of literary fragments from vernacular languages such as English, French, Italian, and Spanish. If this was remarkable, the variety of vernacular authors collected by Fraunce to illustrate these rhetorical elements was equally interesting. For example, once both Ramus and Fraunce had described the metaphor in chapters 8 and 7, respectively, they gave several illustrations to epitomize the definitions. Ramus employed quotations from Virgil’s Aeneid and from Homer. Fraunce amplified the scope of the examples and included fragments from Homer and Virgil as well as from vernacular literatures. He cited fragments from Sir Philip Sidney, Torquato Tasso, Salluste Du Bartas, and Juan Boscán (1588: ch. 7). These quotations from vernacular authors made Fraunce’s treatise different from his forerunner’s and from the rhetorical manuals written at that time (Petrina 1999: 320). Most of these treatises were in Latin, because this was the academic language, and few of them had scarcely been written in English. Of those in English, George Puttenham’s The Arte of English Poesie (1589) and Henry Peacham’s The Garden of Eloquence (1577) stood out.

Peacham’s title was explicit in all respects, since it indicated from the very first moment that the manual was composed in his mother tongue, The Garden of Eloquence Conteyning the Figures of Grammar and Rhetoric . . . set foorth in Englishe by Henry Peacham Minister. The difference between Peacham and Puttenham is that the latter, apart from recognising the importance of his vernacular, also strived to match English to the most prestigious literary languages. When describing the metaphor, Puttenham exclusively employed English texts and one of these was “an Epitaph of our owne making, to the honourable memorie of a deere friend, Sir Iohn Throgmorton,” and “we vsue it for pleasure and ornament of our speach” (1970: 179). With the last phrase, “our
speach,” Puttenham emphasised the relevance of the English language as a literary one. This concern with the literary calibre of English was the main topic of the second chapter in the first book of Puttenham’s Arte. The title read as follows, “That there may be an Art of our English Poesie, as well as there is of the Latine and Greeke.” Here Puttenham defended the quality of English in relation to literary achievement as compared to classical languages, “and if th’art of Poesie be but a skill appertaining to vterrance, why may not the same be with vs aswel as with them, our language being no lesse copious pithie significatique then theirs, our concepts the same, and our wits no lesse apt to deuise and imitate then theirs were?” (1970: 5). Thus, as Gladys Willcock affirms in the introduction to her edition of Puttenham’s Arte, “the book is to demonstrate the capacity of the English vernacular for Art” (Introduction 1970: 85). The endeavour in Fraunce’s Rhetorike was analogous.

Fraunce’s interest in using literary samples in the vernaculars was founded on the new tendencies stemming from the last part of the century that conceded to modern languages a similar prestige to that of classical ones. If Latin had dominated the scholarly atmosphere, a general feeling emerged among scholars who upheld that English, like other prominent European vernaculars, should find its proper place in education, and should be used in the academic world with the same purposes as Latin or Greek. Warren Boutcher summarizes the idea, “by 1593, however, English culture had developed on emulative consciousness of Italian, French, and Spanish pragmaticians and their vernacular applications of classical themes and knowledge to the circumstances of sixteenth century Eurasian power politics” (2000: 48).

Fraunce had actually the desire to attest the literary value of English. Such was his interest that he did not hesitate, as also Puttenham endeavoured to do, to coin rhetorical terms in English which could work as equivalents to the Latin names. In the Arte, Puttenham established new English names for the rhetorical figures by translating these from Latin and Greek into English. Thus, the climax was, according to him, the marching figure; the hyperbaton, the insertour; and the epitheton, the qualifier. Fraunce, on his part, maintained the Latin terms, but he equally struggled to undertake a process similar to Puttenham’s when talking of “tropes, or turnings” and “figures or fashionings” (Petrina 1999: 326; my emphasis).

Though not explicitly stated in his text, Fraunce defended—with the use of so many examples in his vernacular, and especially Sidney—that a literary tradition similar to the classical canon and other vernaculars existed in English. In that way, Sidney and Spenser could compare to Homer and Virgil, and also to those writers of other European traditions like Tasso, Boscán, or Du Bartas. This was Fraunce’s contribution to the defence of English. Had he not considered English such a valid language as Latin, Greek, or French, he would not have included poems by Sidney and Spenser within the poetical anthology that he accomplished in the middle of his manual. Before he started explaining the second group of figures, Fraunce inserted a sort of poetical anthology where he compiled illustrations of the rhetorical sources previously defined in the treatise: “Before I leaue of to talk of these figures of words, I will here confusedlie insert a number of conceited verses, sith all their grace & delicacie proceedeth from the figures aforesaid” (1588: ch. 25). This poetical anthology functioned within the whole manual like a type of literary amusement rather than a mere rhetorical analysis, where the English tradition was embodied in the works of Sidney and Spenser.
The Arcadian Rhetorike was hence relevant as long as it advanced the importance of English concerning other European vernaculars and it endeavoured to place English among them. Fraunce’s interest in levelling the English tradition to the other vernaculars had a double function. On the one hand, it assisted the approximation of English to other traditions. On the other hand, it favoured the introduction and assimilation in England of other literatures and cultures, among which the Spanish one was of special relevance, provided that it indicated the level of literary prestige that this language had already acquired in England by the time Fraunce wrote his Arcadian Rhetorike.

IV

Now that some of the main points of this essay have been established, the last remaining argument is to elucidate the reasons why Boscán and Garcilaso worked as authors fit for rhetorical explanation. They acted as models and representatives of the literature of their country. To a certain extent, it is surprising that in representation of the Spanish tradition Fraunce chose Boscán and Garcilaso at a time when Montemayor’s Diana, for instance, enjoyed much more popularity. The Diana had a great impact on the Elizabethan letters, but, compared to Garcilaso’s eclogues, it shortly became old-fashioned. Garcilaso soon superseded Montemayor, and gained more acknowledgement. Nevertheless, though Garcilaso has enjoyed more prestige through the centuries, it was Boscán who first benefited from a wider popularity in the second part of the sixteenth century. It could be positively affirmed that Fraunce followed this tendency that praised Boscán. As Keniston suggests, “it is very interesting to find that he too regarded Boscán as the more important poet, if we may judge again by numbers, for he cites over two hundred of his verses” (1922: 430). But whether Fraunce preferred Boscán or Garcilaso is not as important as to ascertain the reasons why he chose these two poets.

Then the question at issue is why he selected Boscán and Garcilaso to work as rhetorical paradigms. The answer may partly be justified by the importance that literature acquired to explain the functions and goals of rhetoric. Literature came hand in hand with rhetoric, and it was, as Herrick explains, the best instrument for rhetorical description, “the ancients and their Renaissance disciples did not make such a mistake; they rightly regarded oratory and poetry as cognate arts, nourished by the same disciples of logic, grammar, and rhetoric. Plato treated poetry and rhetoric together in the Phaedrus. Aristotle repeatedly referred the reader of his Poetics to the Rhetoric, and vice versa. Cicero time and again drew upon poetry, including the plays of Terence, for illustrations of rhetorical principles” (1950: 8). Literature made possible that fashioning of language that Fraunce mentioned in the opening paragraph. By literature in the sixteenth century we should principally understand poetry. It is a question of literary genre. Renaissance scholars found in epic and lyric poetry the most adequate vehicle for the explanation of rhetorical principles. Drama was a minor genre, and prose limited the artistic and prosodic possibilities of language. There is no doubt that for Fraunce the distinction between prose and verse was of vital importance. It was verse that supplied poetical quality, and that differentiated epic and lyric from other types of literary creations, “the figure of words consisteth either in the iust dimension and measuring of sounds or words, or els in the pleasant repetition of the same. This dimension or measuring is either belonging to Poets, or vsed of Orators. Poeticall dimension is that
which is bound to the continuall observation of prescript spaces. Poetical dimension maketh either rime, or verse” (1588: ch. 13).

Epic and lyric were the genres to which Renaissance academics devoted their rhetorical analyses. Marvin Herrick emphasises the idea that in the Renaissance, rhetoric was still the principal mechanism to describe poetry and vice versa, “rhetoric, however, was still fundamental in the theory and practice of both oratory and poetry, for poetry was still regarded as rhetorical, and the tools for examining poetry were still primarily rhetorical” (1950: 11). What I try to highlight with this quotation is the idea that poetry for the Renaissance man was basically the display of rhetorical artifice. It was only through rhetoric that poetry could be analysed, because it was essentially the exhibition of a compendium of rhetorical dexterities which, as Fraunce affirmed, “the more the better: yet with discretion, and without affectate curiositie” (1588: ch. 36). In fact, Fraunce’s task in the *Arcadian Rhetorike* was precisely the analysis of all the rhetorical precepts that abounded in the composition of the classical and coetaneous poets that he selected. Poetry was principally the composition of an artistic and rhetorical speech, where language worked in a figurative sense. Fraunce justified this idea by saying that “this was first invented of necessitie for want of words, but afterwards continued and frequented by reason of the delight and pleasant grace thereof” (1588: ch. 1).

Fraunce’s words remind of a similar commentary that Fernando de Herrera introduced in his *Anotaciones* to the works of Garcilaso. Like Fraunce, Herrera focused on the idea that figurative and rhetorical language came first as a necessity due to a lack of suitable words until it was employed exclusively for the solely purpose of delight, as in poetry:

A todos los pueblos fueron siempre nativos los vocablos propios de las cosas, o fueron hallados por necesidad hechos luego, o por metonimia, ironía, metáfora, sinécdcoque. Licito es engendrar numerosos tropos. ¿Qué? ¿Las figures que están en las palabras y en las sentencias, por ventura no son communes de todas las gentes? Así creció la lengua griega, así como tierra nueva, hacerse fértil y abundosa con este culto y labranza . . . y crecer en la suma grandezza, donde por ventura no esperaron que pudiese llegar los de la edad antecedente. No hay lengua tan pobre y tan bárbara que no se pueda enriquecer y adornar con diligencia. Con este cuidado y estudio busca y rastrea el extraño de otra nación los pasos y pisadas de Tulio; y acrecienta y engrandece su lenguaje propio con las riquezas maravillosas de aquella divina elocuencia. No hay por qué desespere el amador de su lengua, si se dispone atentamente de la riqueza y abundancia y elocuencia de su habla. Con los más estimados despojos de Italia y Grecia, y de los otros reinos peregrinos, puede vestir y aderezar su patria y amplialla con hermosura, y él mismo producir y criar nuevos ornamentos, porque quien hubiere alcanzado con estudio y arte tanto juicio que pueda discernir si la voz es propia y dulce al sonido, o extraña y áspera, puede y tiene licencia para componer vocablos y enriquecer la lengua (1580: 574).

The similarity between both commentaries is useful as far as they are clear paradigms of the same notion regarding rhetorical language and its poetical effects. Though both commentators belonged to different traditions, the two of them coincided in the same proposal. Obviously, this was not new for them. There was a long rhetorical tradition that supported this suggestion. What is therefore important is that, apart from this parallel approach to rhetorical expression, both scholars happened to choose the same poet in order to exemplify the concepts defined in their works: Garcilaso de la Vega.
Even though Herrera’s *Anotaciones* was published in 1580, it is not likely that Fraunce had access to his work because it did not enjoy a broad circulation outside the borders of Spain. However, it is surprising that at certain points both authors employed the same quotations from Garcilaso to typify akin rhetorical devices. It is out of the question that Fraunce’s analysis was not as complete as Herrera’s. Fraunce’s use of Garcilaso was limited to those cases where he did not mention Boscán, cases where he had to describe the following figures: *metonymia*, *synecdoche*, *ironia*, *anaphora*, *paronomasia*, *poliptoton*, *exclamation*, *epiphonema*, and *addubitation*.

Thus, to define *metonymia*, Fraunce alluded to two different sections of Garcilaso’s first eclogue (1588: ch. 2; Garcilaso 1.2.21–26; 1.2.35–37). Herrera coincided with Fraunce in using part of these lines, “el árbol de victoria”, with the purpose of drawing attention to the *periphrasis* figure (1580: 410). In order to explain the concept of *anaphora* both rhetoricians alluded to Garcilaso’s sonnet 5 and the lines “por vos naci, por vos tengo la vida,/por vos he de morir, y por vos muero” (5.13–14) as samples of this figure (Fraunce ch. 19; Herrera 96). When they illustrated the *exclamation*, which Fraunce described as “an excellent instrument to stirre vp divers affections, sometimes wonder and admiration,” and “sometimes pitie and commiseration” (1588: ch. 27), the two rhetoricians employed the same lines from the first eclogue, “¡Ay, cuánto m’engaños! /¡Ay, cuán diferente era/y cuán d’otra manera” (1.8.105–07). Also from this eclogue, the two scholars used another instance to typify the *exclamation*, “¡Oh Dios, ¿por qué siquiera/pues ves desde tu altura/ esta falsa perjura/ causar la muerte d’un estrecho amigo/no recibe del cielo algún castigo?” (1.2.91–95; Fraunce, ch. 27; Herrera 420, 418). Lastly, to illustrate the *epiphonema*, which Fraunce depicted as “a kinde of exclamation when after the discourse ended, we adde some short acclamation, as a conclusion or shutting vp of all in wondering wise” (1588: ch. 27), and Herrera as “exclamación por la cual con más intensa pronunciación declaramos el movimiento de nuestro ánimo” (1580: 141), both Fraunce and Herrera made use of sonnet 13, “¡Oh miserable estado, oh mal tamaño,/que con llorarla crezca cada día/la causa y la razón por que lloraba!” (13.12–14; Fraunce, ch. 27; Herrera 95).

Just as Herrera wrote his commentaries on Garcilaso, Fraunce therefore chose Garcilaso and Boscán as a result of their reputation. Garcilaso was in fact a literary model in Spain before Fraunce issued the *Rhetorike*, as Herrera proved. Not only were the two of them paradigms in Spain, but also in France, where writers such as Belleforest or Du Bartas had started to imitate and translate them, too. Bartholomew Yong’s notes on the edition of Boscán and Garcilaso that he possessed highlighted “all the declamatory verse *letters of Leander and Hero*” (Boutcher 2000: 38), but Fraunce indicated “how he or any other rhetorically trained reader might have analysed them” (Boutcher 2000: 38), which noticeably underlined the appropriateness of Boscán and Garcilaso as rhetorical models.

---

8. It should also be taken into account that Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas, “El Brocense”, had issued the first amended edition of Garcilaso’s works in 1571. He added six sonnets and five ballads that had not been included in the previous editions. He also specified the different classical and Italian sources for each of the poems.
Besides this, both Boscán and Garcilaso, as stated earlier, were well known to Fraunce and his group, and their familiarity with the two Spaniards was a sound reason for their inclusion in Fraunce’s manual. This familiarity was similar to that which Fraunce exercised with the works of Sidney and Spenser. Perhaps in order to justify the coincidences between Fraunce and Herrera and the former’s selection of Boscán and Garcilaso it may be valuable, to a degree, to take into account Katherine Koller’s study on Fraunce and Spenser. Koller declares that Fraunce’s repetitive use of Spenser was due to his familiarity with the writer of the *Shepheardes Calender*, “the Spenser allusions which appear in the other works of Fraunce indicate the same points; he is quoting from poetry which he knows will be familiar to his readers, and which he feels is suitable in content. His choice indicates very clearly that he considers Spenser’s poetry the only English poetry, with the exception of Sidney’s, worth mentioning, and he places Spenser’s poetry on a par with that of Tasso, Remy Belleau, Boscán and the classics. In fact he refers to no other English poets except ‘Willy’ [sic] and ‘he that wrote Piers Plowman’” (1940: 111).

Thus, Fraunce decided to add in the authors who he considered to be more acknowledged within the different vernaculars. In the same way as he chose Spenser and Sidney as models for English, so he selected Boscán and Garcilaso to embody Spanish literature. This he did, notwithstanding, at a time when the works of Spenser and Sidney had been scarcely published, which obviously praised the English poets, as they were compared to the excellent versifiers of other traditions. *The Rhetorike* by this means would work as an enhancement and tribute to both writers, with whom Fraunce was especially conversant. As Koller affirms, Fraunce and his group were really interested in promoting the value of English literature, and *The Rhetorike* reveals itself as a suitable compliment, “a study of the works of Fraunce helps us to understand that Penshurst group who were actively concerned in improving English poetry, writing ‘usual’ English, the common speech, in trying new forms, and who never stopped believing in the high function of poetry” (1940: 119–20).

This belief in the high function of poetry was related to Fraunce’s rhetorical ideas. His method of working and thinking was extremely influenced by the Ramistic theories, which, as stated above, had been well rooted in Sidney’s and Lord Burghley’s circle. In *The Lawiers Logike*, Fraunce pointed out the tight connection between rhetoric, poetic, and logic. In that sense, he left undisclosed some Platonic inclinations, as he insisted on the importance of the poet regarding the acknowledgment of truth by means of poetry. Koller therefore asserted that “Fraunce . . . was following a good Ramist doctrine which, started by Robdolphus Agricola and Sturm, taught that young men should search in the poets and orators not only for matters of style and eloquence, but also for models of reasoning and for the art of thinking” (1940: 110). Fraunce’s purpose was “to instruct by simple language and delight by form and content” (Koller 1940: 110).

9. Koller insists on the idea that very early Spenser’s works were highly reputed: “The question of Spenser’s early fame is scarcely a debatable one any longer, and in these works of Fraunce and Webbe we have evidence not only of the acknowledgement of Spenser as the author of the *Shepheardes Calender* but also of an acceptance of the *Shepheardes Calender* as a work of great literary value and a model of form and content” (1940: 113).

10. When the *Arcadian* was printed, only *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Familiar Letters* had been issued (Seaton, Introduction to *The Arcadian Rhetorike* 1950: xix).
That is to say, poetry had a double function: formal and conceptual. It was used to teach both form and content, rhetoric and logic. Then, as Miller suggests, "if logic makes deliberative what is natural in the intellect, then productions of the best natural intellects, of the great poets, orators, and historians of classical antiquity, must be uneasy exemplifications of the use of logic. Each place, dichotomy, or argument, each axiom and syllogism, each law of method—all could be illustrated by the habitual practices of Virgil, Ovid, Cicero, and Livy" (1954: 145). Only by means of the best writers could rhetoric and logic be epitomized.

This Fraunce successfully did in *The Arcadian Rhetorike*. He had to select the best genius from each tradition. In the same way that he chose the classical masterpieces and the most acknowledged Italian and French poets, so he made Boscán and Garcilaso stand as representatives of the Spanish canon. Their worth had been attested in other countries. And, at a time when Sidney and Spenser were beginning to imitate these poets, and were well known among the Elizabethan scholars, England had to pay tribute to both Spaniards. It was Fraunce who fulfilled this task.

Nevertheless, Fraunce's task was exceptional, as Spanish literature had been rejected in England on many occasions for political reasons. The spread of Spanish was not aided by any English printer. Works such as the polyglot translation of Castiglione's *The Courtier* included other European vernaculars but Spanish. There was indeed a deep-seated anti-Spanish propaganda among the English. Thomas Kyd, for example, did not hesitate to parody the Spaniards in *The Spanish Tragedy*. There existed a collective aversion against Spanish culture in general, as a consequence of England's political hostility towards Spain. Obviously, this dislike put off the printing of Spanish works in England, as compared to works printed in other vernaculars. Ungerer states the reasons for this rejection: "The fact that no complete books were printed in Spanish before 1586 was not due to typographical incapacity. The reason for this delay must be sought in the break-down of the Anglo-Spanish alliance over the issue of England's entry into the Spanish Empire overseas and in the national hatred felt for Queen Mary's consort, whose sole aim had been the annexation of England to Spanish rule and to the Catholic Church. Since Philip's arrival in England, public feeling had run high against Spain" (1965: 186).

Despite this rejection of Spanish culture, it is certain that Spanish literature slipped in among certain groups of English scholars. Ungerer and Boucher have stressed the importance of Mexía's *Silva de varia lección* and Antonio de Guevara. Scholars such as Feuillerat and Landmann, as an instance, have put an emphasis on the direct influence of the latter on John Lyly's *euphuism*. Rastell had edited an English dramatic version of Fernando de Roja's *Celestina, Calisto and Melibea*, around 1525, and Sampedro's *Cárcel de amor* had been translated into English in 1549. In the 1560's, Antonio del Corro found himself "under the protection of the chancellors of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge" (Ungerer 1956: 70). At the time when Fraunce was writing his *Rhetorike*, the influence of the anonymous *Lazarillo* and Garcilaso's eclogues was evident in Sidney's *Arcadia*. Also, when Sidney started his studies at Oxford, the Spaniard Cipriano de Valera might have been there as a visiting lecturer (Underhill 1899: 265). As already affirmed, Sidney's group, to which Fraunce belonged, was acquainted with Spanish literature, because "Sydney's uncle was the patron of Thomas d'Oylie, the compiler of a Spanish grammar and dictionary (1590) which was incorporated in Richard Perceval's *Bibliotheca Hispanica* (1591). He also patronized John Florio's *His firste fruites* (1578), where he was
praised for his ‘continuall delight in setting foureth of good letters, and earnest zeale in maintaining of languages’ (Dedic.)” (Ungerer 1956: 68–69). But, regardless of these connections between English scholars and Spanish literature, there was a general feeling of rejection to Spanish. The aversion towards Spanish culture had encumbered the circulation and printing of Spanish texts. With reference to lyrics, for example, apart from the translation of Montemayor’s *Diana*, only Googe’s *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* included the translation of some Spanish lyric poetry, and only Fraunce quoted fragments in the original tongue (Underhill 1899: 242; 270). Therefore, England had endeavoured to dismiss the acknowledgement of everything that was related to Spain.

Finally, it should be recalled that during the Renaissance rhetoric was tightly connected to political and social recognition. They were sister disciplines, and declining one implied the denial of the other one. Thus, the political rivalry between England and Spain led the English to reject Spanish literature. It was not only a question of literary aesthetic; it was also a question of national identity. If the literature of a country was considered an important mode of a nation’s identity, it was not surprising then that the English objected to recognise the influence of Spanish writers. Poets such as Boscán and Garcilaso were emblems standing for Spain, and rejecting these meant the total exclusion of Spain and its powers. There were, however, Elizabethan scholars who endeavoured to profit from their enemy’s talents. Bartholomew Yong, as Ethel Seaton explains, travelled to Spain to study its history and poetry “with a view to their possible political and rhetorical applications” (Introduction to *The Arcadian Rhetorike* 1950: xv). Then, as Yong’s interest in Spain confirmed, there were Spanish rhetorical models to follow, but they had been discarded. These models, as Fraunce shown in *The Rhetorike*, were as valid rhetorical representations as the best poets from other vernaculars such as Italian, French, or English. It is clear that there was a European canon to which Boscán and Garcilaso belonged as representatives of Spanish literature. The presence of their works in other countries such as France or Italy bears witness to this. Fraunce just followed these literary tendencies, the canon being the basis for his rhetorical explanations. And he did not hesitate to offer the best examples in his treatise, defying the general aversion to Spain.
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