The Epic of America

An Introduction to Rafael Landívar and the *Rusticatio Mexicana*

ANDREW LAIRD

Contents

Prologue

Landívar, Latin and Colonialism

The coining of the term 'Latin America' some time in the middle of the nineteenth century had nothing to do with Latin. The name may have originated in France, when the French had designs for the economic and political development of Central and South America. The expression *América Latina* gained currency later at around 1898, after the Cuban War of Independence had inclined Spanish Americans to lay claim to origins that pertained to Europe more generally, than to Spain in particular. The idea of a *Latin* America was soon invoked again, in opposition to the Anglo-Saxon America of the United States, which became the next military power to threaten the former Spanish colonies. But Latin American identity was not conferred on all the inhabitants of these new nations and republics. It was supposed to exclude the large indigenous populations, the numerous descendants of African slaves and other groups, and it also obscured the Jewish and Arabic presence in Hispanic culture.[1]

The term 'Latin literature' has also involved exclusions (though of far less consequence than the chauvinistic naming of an entire continent). That term is commonly, if cliquishly, taken to mean only Roman literature. Until very recently, works of Latin poetry and prose – no matter how engaging or accomplished, no matter how important the issues they raise – were of little interest to classicists, if those works had been produced after antiquity. Even now, as Latin of the early modern period (roughly 1500-1800) is becoming the object of more systematic study, certain connoisseurish preferences or prejudices have endured. For example, some texts, simply because they were penned by major *vernacular* authors, persist in overshadowing others which in their time were far more influential. The Latin writing of Italy, France, and England always commands more attention than comparable material from other parts of Europe, including Ireland and Iberia. And remarkably for this day and age, authors from outside Europe continue to be ignored.

Rafael Landívar (1731-93) was one of the most outstanding poets from the Americas to write in Latin. In the fifteen books of the *Rusticatio Mexicana*, his most ambitious work, Landívar described the lakes, volcanoes, and wildlife of Mexico and of his native Guatemala, as well as the livelihoods and recreations of people in the Mesoamerican region. This panorama of nature, culture, and production is elevated both by its presentation in hexameter verse and by the use of numerous allusions and

illustrations from Greek and Roman literature. Although several eighteenth-century poets sought to emulate Virgil's *Georgics*, the *Rusticatio Mexicana* is exceptional because it offers a unique perspective on a crucial transitional period in the history of New Spain. Through this work, Landívar indicates the central place of labour in colonial society, demonstrates the value of indigenous knowledge and tradition, and gives some consideration to the historical significance of the Spanish conquest of Mexico. His poem is also unusual because it accommodates the aesthetics of the sublime and reflects more general trends in Enlightenment thought. In addition, elegiac and pastoral modes convey the exiled author's nostalgia for his American homeland: Rafael Landívar was expelled from the Spanish territories in 1767, so that his didactic epic was completed and published in Italy.

There have been four translations of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* into Spanish, including two in verse, and one English version by Graydon Regenos which is reproduced in Part II of this volume. Few, if any, European works in Latin from the 1700s have prompted so many vernacular renderings. On the other hand, Landívar's impressive prose oration and his two surviving short poems are little read because they have not been easily available. These texts, never before published together with the *Rusticatio Mexicana*, are here translated into English for the first time.

Landívar and his exiled compatriots wrote mainly in Latin because they had inherited, and continued to develop, a tradition of humanism in Mexico that stretched back more than two centuries to the time of the Spanish conquest. Early on, that tradition had responded to the indigenous languages and cultures, and absorbed new forms of knowledge in order to enhance the scholarship and learning transplanted from Renaissance Europe. And later, towards the end of the colonial period, Latin arguably provided Landívar and some other writers a means of demonstrating their Mexican (as opposed to Spanish) identity – in a way that the language of Spain could not. The abundance and diversity of Mexican discourses in Latin, the interaction of Latin with Spanish and also with languages like Nahuatl, and the changing role of Latin in the isthmus all involve ideological questions which cannot be divorced from issues of linguistic and literary history.

Landívar's work is introduced, presented and analysed here in order to highlight paradigmatically the appeal and the historical importance of Latin writing from Spanish America *in general*. For this reason, the first of the essay studies in Part I gives an account of the classical tradition in New Spain from the defeat of the Aztecs in 1521 to the time of the Bourbon Reforms in the mid-eighteenth century. Such an account, in only a few pages, of 250 years of cultural development and its broader historical context can only be selective and partial. But that overview should suffice to show that the phenomenon of Mexican humanism offers many lines of

enquiry for interdisciplinary research in the future. The existence of this field is not just of consequence for the history of scholarship: it challenges prevalent pictures of European literary and intellectual history as much as it dispels some widespread misconceptions about Hispanic American culture.

The second essay assembles from primary sources what little is known about Rafael Landívar's life, education, and the circumstances of his expulsion and exile. His shorter works are examined for the first time in terms of their immediate background as well as in relation to their literary models. The third chapter then offers a new presentation of the reception, themes and form of the *Rusticatio Mexicana*. While this account is certainly meant to be accessible, it also seeks to constitute a significant advance on previous treatments of the poem. Close reading of certain passages will be combined with due emphasis on Landívar's classical, Renaissance and Enlightenment sources. The coverage cannot be comprehensive, but the narrower focus of this discussion, after the narratival approach of the first two chapters, should demonstrate that the enigmatic content of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* rewards close and careful reading: each book of the poem could generate a range of historical interpretations as well as substantial literary commentary.

The detailed 'Notes on the Essay Studies' supply the further information and bibliography that might be required for a broader orientation in the classical tradition and intellectual history of colonial Mexico. Additional material can be found in the notes on the texts and translations and in the further commentary accompanying Landívar's own Notes to the *Rusticatio Mexicana*. The Indices and Bibliography are, again, more than usually extensive for this relatively small volume – in the hope that it can serve as a useful point of departure for any readers inclined to pursue their own explorations of a sorely neglected avenue of Latin studies.

However, this book and the texts it introduces are bound to meet with indifference from classicists who deem such material irrelevant to the business of interpreting or promoting the literary, historical and other legacies of Greece and Rome. Their assumption partly has its basis in the consistent omission of Latin America from histories of the classical tradition. Yet anyone who examines the presence of classical culture in colonial Mexico may end up reinterpreting various aspects of Roman (and sometimes Greek) literature and history. The study of humanism always engenders further, deeper knowledge of the ancient texts which humanists themselves studied or imitated – and this will be borne out by some of what is to follow. And with regard to *promoting* the legacy of classical antiquity, neo-Latin writing frequently highlights the centrality of classical learning for a number of disciplines. Besides, once the multivalent connections between the Greco-Roman tradition and the ethnically complex Hispanic American heritage are better understood, classical studies

literature: 'a conflict between ... cosmopolitan and nativist tendencies, between Europeanism and Americanism'.[5] Since Paz made this observation with regard to nineteenth and twentieth-century writing, its relevance to a Neoclassical author of the 1700s might be questioned – comparisons with figures like Jorge Luis Borges, Carlos Fuentes, and Gabriel García Márquez would seem too anachronistic to be of any use for characterising the nature of Landívar's achievement.

But such comparisons turn out to be rather illuminating: in a funeral address he delivers for a Guatemalan archbishop, Landívar involves the gods of pagan antiquity; and in the same speech he curiously recalls the Roman legend of a woman who breastfed her mother to save her from a sentence of death by starvation. And in an instructive verse treatise which was committed to the scientific principles of the Enlightenment and supported by learned footnotes, Landívar explains how beavers drive wrongdoers out of their communities; he describes how a normally peaceful mountain stream responds angrily to loud noises by turning into a raging torrent; and he informs his reader of a small bird with a gigantic beak which can cure an ailing heart with the touch of its tongue. These mythological, dreamlike or fantastic elements, some apparently derived from folk traditions, intrude almost unnoticed into what is predominantly serious or factual discourse. In this respect at least, Rafael Landívar anticipated the modern, quintessentially Latin American genre of magic realism.

1

The Circles of Time: Classical culture in colonial Mexico

(i) The early impact of Greece and Rome on the New World

When Hernán Cortés reached Yucatán in 1519, he discovered that a Spaniard, named Jerónimo de Aguilar, was already living on an island off the coast. The chronicler Bernal Díaz described the conquistadors' first impression of the castaway, who had been enslaved by the Mayas:

> When he arrived, several soldiers asked. 'Where is the Spaniard?' For they could not distinguish him from an Indian. His hair was cut like a native's and he had on one old sandal with the other tied to his belt. He wore a ragged cloak, and a worse loincloth. Tied up in a bundle in his cloak was a Book of Hours, old and worn.[1]

This curious figure, who was originally a clergyman from Écija in Andalusia, is frequently credited with being the first person to convey the Latin language to Mexico in 1511, after he had been shipwrecked on a voyage from Darién to Panama.[2] As Aguilar was in holy orders, he would have been obliged to recite each day the hymns and prayers contained in the battered breviary that he kept as his most treasured possession. Aguilar's singular bad luck had meant that Latin was very possibly the first European language to be sounded out loud in Mexico, a decade before the death of Montezuma and the fall of the Aztec city of Tenochtitlán in 1521.

As well as being the language of the Catholic church, and of legal and monarchical authority, Latin was the normal medium for education and all kinds of intellectual pursuits in Renaissance Europe.[3] But Latin also retained its powerful identity as the language of ancient Rome – an identity it continued to retain even after it passed across the Atlantic. The classical tradition in general had an early role, on the ground, in shaping the first direct perceptions of the Americas.[4] A fascination with Greek and Roman antiquity even prompted the conquistadors to re-enact scenarios from ancient history books: Cortés, for example, notoriously likened himself to Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, and other figures.[5] Roman imperialism in particular provided a kind of model for the Spaniards (though this model was not uncontested); and from the 1500s onwards, the achievements of the Incas and Mayas were compared to those of ancient Mediterranean peoples, and in one or two cases even attributed to the Carthaginians.[6]

The impact of Greece and Rome on the New World is most often considered in terms of the varied and conflicting European discourses about the Americas. Prominent among them are exchanges which constituted what is now known as the 'Controversy of the Indies'. This battle of books and speeches, conducted in Latin and Spanish, came to a head in Valladolid in Spain in 1550-1. The Aristotelian humanist Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda appealed to Aristotle's notion of the 'natural slave' to argue that the barbarian Indians should be subjected by the Spaniards; Bartolomé de las Casas, a Dominican who had spent much of his life in Cuba and Central America, held that all humans were equally rational, and, challenging the application of the term 'barbarian' to the Indians, he insisted that war and slavery should not be imposed upon them.[7] The debate did not just draw upon classical philosophy: the acceptability of the Roman empire as a historical precedent also played an important part in the arguments of both sides.[8]

Ethnographers like Peter Martyr, Bernardino de Sahagún, and Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo informed such debates by sometimes applying classical paradigms to the cultures they described.[9] This process could also be reversed: reports about the indigenous pagans from the new Spanish territories were occasionally used to shed light on practices in pre-Christian Greece and Rome.[10] But far more frequently, it was recognition of the classical past in the 'discovery' of America which found expression in European literature and poetry. The *Araucana,* a Castilian epic begun in 1569 by the Spanish poet Alonso de Ercilla, ennobled the vanquished Araucanians of Chile by comparing them to the heroes of Greek and Roman history and myth.[11] From the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, a number of European poems in Latin about Columbus appeared which were closely modelled on Virgil: Fracastaro's didactic epic *Syphilis* and Stella's *Columbeid* are the earliest and best known examples.[12]

However, there is little awareness of how rapidly – and how deeply – classical culture took root in the New World itself, and there is still less awareness of the classical humanistic tradition that emerged from *within* Spanish America. Much of its intellectual and literary output was in Latin. The vigorous production of Latin writing began in the early 1500s and it continued through the colonial period, at least until late in the eighteenth century – and in some quarters it carried on even after that. This body of Latin writing, still mostly accessible only in early printed books or in manuscripts, represents a vast and complex cultural legacy. Some of the texts that make up this extensive corpus were written by authors who were indigenous or who were *mestizos* ('of mixed race'); nearly all of these texts accommodate perceptions and experiences that are specifically 'American' – and classical illustrations are often used to convey those perceptions and experiences.

In order to sketch out the more immediate context for the work of Rafael Landívar, the following sections of this chapter will focus more specifically

on Mexico (or New Spain) where much of Landívar's education and intellectual formation occurred; his native Guatemala was an adjacent territory. It should be noted nonetheless that classical learning and humanism have also been prominent in other parts of Spanish America.[13]

(ii) 'Indian' Latinists in the 1500s

If study of the classical tradition is combined with the cultural history of colonial Mexico, an immense body of work in Latin is laid open: not only school texts, commentaries, and grammars, but also original works of poetry, letters, dialogues, and treatises on subjects ranging from indigenous languages to political philosophy and Platonism. The impact of the Italian Renaissance was as great on Mexico as it was on Spain, if not greater.[14] Books, ideas, and even individual scholars from Italy and other countries soon followed the conquistadors to the New World.[15] And the European learning that was brought to Mexico, was conveyed in Latin. Inevitably the Latin language adopted new expressions and fresh meanings as a result of its transplantation: 'the American words incorporated by [Mexican] writers, whether indigenous or Spanish, endow neo-Latin with a new tone, though they still seem alien ... this was the way by which neo-Latin in New Spain secured, in some of its best moments, attributes that were absolutely American.'[16]

Latin soon ceased to be a possession exclusive to the Europeans. Cortés himself realised that in order to legitimise possession of this new territory, Spain was obliged to evangelise its inhabitants. The Franciscan missionaries, who were themselves struggling to learn Nahuatl (the tongue of the Mexica or 'Aztecs') and other languages, saw that indigenous recruits were needed to act as interpreters, and no doubt – after the brutality of the conquest – they were also needed as cultural intermediaries to help convert the Indians to Christianity. Two colleges were set up early on for this purpose: San José de los Naturales in 1527, and Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco in 1536. There were other initiatives to educate the Indians and improve their circumstances: the Spanish humanist Vasco de Quiroga founded two *hospital-pueblos,* in Michoacán and in Mexico City. Quiroga apparently intended these communities to follow the blueprint of the ideal society portrayed in Thomas More's *Utopia* (1518) – and their ordinances were established less than two years after More's death in 1535.[17]

While the College of San José functioned to teach liturgical Latin, music, and art to children of the indigenous elite, the curriculum in the College of Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco was more ambitious: pupils drawn from the indigenous nobility of various regions of Mexico were selected to learn not only Latin but also rhetoric, philosophy, medicine, and theology. This institution, founded long before a number of Oxford and Cambridge colleges, could claim to be the first university in America. The languages of instruction were Nahuatl and Latin.[18] Spanish was omitted, not because

the pupils were unfamiliar with it, but in order to fulfil the aims of their education: to establish an order of indigenous clergy who could convey church doctrine and other knowledge in their own language.

Initial progress was slow but within two or three years the Indians were able to read and write in Latin: Fray Toribio de Benavente remarked that 'there are many among them who are proficient in grammar, who can compose lengthy, well researched speeches and verses in hexameters and pentameters'.[19] Not everyone believed such proficiency could be possible. Another Franciscan, Juan de Torquemada is one of the chroniclers to record this revealing anecdote:

> A priest who did not know a word of Latin had (like many others) an unfavourable view of the Indians and could not believe that they knew Christian doctrine, nor even the *Pater noster* ['Our Father'], although several Spaniards assured him that they did. The priest, still unconvinced, wanted to test out his lack of conviction on some Indian or other, and it was his fortune to bump into one of the students without realising he was a Latinist. He asked him if he knew the *Pater noster* and the Indian replied that he did. He told him to say it: the Indian recited it well. Not content with that the priest ordered him to say the Creed. After he recited it nicely, the cleric challenged a word the Indian had said: *natus ex Maria Virgine* ['born of the Virgin Mary'] and retorted that it should be *nato ex Maria Virgine* ['to/with one born of the Virgin Mary']. As the Indian insisted on saying *natus* and the clergyman on saying *nato*, the Indian student needed to prove his point by resorting to grammar, as he was right to corrrect the priest in this way, and he asked him (speaking in Latin): *Reverende Pater, Nato, cuius casus est?* ['Reverend Father, '*Nato*' – what case is it?']. As the clergyman did not know even this much, nor how to reply, he had to go on his way, ashamed and confused.[20]

And predictably enough, there were those, who though they recognised that the Indians *could* acquire such learning, did not believe that they *should* do so. The rapidity with which indigenous Mexicans came to master Latin could be seen as evidence of their demonic nature: Jerónimo López, a Castilian official, in a letter to the king of Spain, reported a priest's description of one of the Franciscan colleges, presumably Santa Cruz, as 'hell' and its students as 'disciples of Satan.'[21] But this fear was probably a cloak for a more substantial concern – that the possession of European knowledge might enable those who held it to question or challenge the authority of their Spanish rulers.[22]

Instruction of the Indians was not to continue in the same fashion. The introduction of the first printing press in Mexico in 1539 and the formal establishment of the Royal and Pontifical University in 1553 as a new centre of learning reflected a transition in the culture of New Spain, and the interests of Europeans took over from those of the indigenous population.[23] Yet the legacy of the Indian colleges had a key role in determining the evolution of humanism and the classical tradition in New Spain over

the course of the next two centuries. The Indians produced grammars, dictionaries, and sermons in indigenous languages; they translated works of classical Latin (Pseudo-Cato, Aesop's *Fables*) as well as Christian texts into Nahuatl. There are at least three Indian Latinists whose writings survive: Antonio Valeriano, a Latin orator; Pablo Nazareo, who translated from Latin into Nahuatl the cycle of lessons for the church year and numerous sermons; and Juan Badiano who rendered an Indian inventory of medicinal herbs into Latin (the Nahuatl original by Martín de la Cruz is now lost) as the *Libellus de medicinalibus indorum herbis* (1552): one of the many copies made of this text is in the library of Windsor Castle. The almost insufferably humble tone of Badiano's prologue illustrates his facility with Latin, while it also raises questions about the ways in which the indigenous scholars were seen, or saw themselves.[24] The specific entries in the book itself, which consist of recipes or prescriptions for a variety of conditions, constantly combine Latin and words in Nahuatl so that the resulting language has been characterised as '*mestizo*' in itself:

> Putrescentibus auribus radix maçayelli, herbae xoxouhquipahtli semen, aliquot tlaquilin folia cum salis mica in aqua calfacta instillata commodant plurimum. Et sub auriculis duarum arbuscularum frondes tritae illinantur. Arbusculae vocantur toloua et tlapahtl. Lapides pretiosi cetlahuitl, tlahcalhuatzin, eztetl, xoxohouhqui chalchihuitl cum arboris tlatlanquaye frondibus tritis in calfacta aqua attriti instillatique conclusas aures adaperiunt.
>
> For mouldering ears, the root of *macayelli*, the seed of the *xoxouhquipahtli* herb, some leaves of *tlaquilin;* all infused in warm water with a pinch of salt can be very helpful. The leaves of two plants may be ground and applied under the ears. The plants are called *toloua* and *tlapahtl*. The precious stones *cetlahuitl*, *tlahcalhuatzin*, *eztetl*, *xoxohouhqui chalchihuitl*, ground and infused in warm water, with the crushed leaves of the *tlatlanquaye* tree, open blocked ears.
>
> Badiano, *Libellus de medicinalibus indorum herbis*, folio 14 v.

The Mexican names are given for plants which have no European equivalents. But such New World knowledge of nature and its benefits is not only conveyed, but also legitimised by its expression in Latin. In this respect the Indian Badiano's *Libellus* represents an early – and significant – precedent for the *Rusticatio Mexicana*, which was written by a Spanish American two centuries later. Other precursors, both cited by Landívar, were José de Acosta (1540-1600) and Francisco Hernández (1517-87), the 'Pliny of New Spain', a Spanish physician and botanist.[25] Hernández's natural history in Latin was allegedly informed by the pictorial inventories of plants and animals made by Nezahualcoyotl, the 'philosopher king' of Texcoco.[26] Some Latin dialogues by Francisco Cervantes de Salazar constitute a further, more literary, model for the *Rusticatio Mexicana* from this early period: as well as portraying Mexico City, its environs, and the

University, the dialogues also describe such things as native fruits, trees, and customs of the Indians.[27]

The importance placed on the conversion of the indigenous nations in the sixteenth century meant that Mexican humanism developed a specific character. It did not simply lay emphasis on studying classical texts: it was a 'human humanism, vital, alive that gave pride of place to consideration of the human individual'.[28] Although the majority of Latin books were religious in nature, the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico was modelled on the University of Salamanca in Spain. There were a number of important Mexican Spanish humanists including Fray Juan de Zumárraga and Fray Alonso de la Veracruz, the first professor of philosophy at the University. Alonso de la Veracruz's most important work, *De dominio infidelium et iusto bello* ('On the government of non-Christians and just war') defends the rights of the Indians, and seems to have been influenced by the work of his mentor, Francisco de Vitoria.[29]

The boundaries of classical learning were radically expanded after the Jesuits arrived in Mexico in 1572 and founded a network of colleges. Their curriculum, known as the *Ratio studiorum*, ensured that pupils became adept at Latin poetry and prose through imitation of a wide variety of classical authors. Padre Vincenzo Lanuchi from the College of Rome, one of the first Jesuit scholars in Mexico, aimed to organise programmes of study in grammar, poetics, and rhetoric. He had the ambitious aim of publishing excerpts from a wide selection of Christian and pagan authors including Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, Martial, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, and Jerome, along with some humanists including Lorenzo Valla and Juan Luis Vives.[30]

At this point it is worth inserting a *caveat* – even into an account of the progress of classical learning as cursory as the one offered here: the history of scholarship can never be disengaged from the heavier history of power struggle and of economic and political change. The appearance of the Jesuits in New Spain in the wake of the Counter-Reformation was not all good. In the words of an authoritative modern historian, it led to 'the century of the Conquest [being] concluded with heresy-hunting and Baroque scholasticism dominating Mexican high culture.'[31] 'Baroque scholasticism' may not be the kindest designation for the Mexican literature of this period, but certainly it has to be conceded that the achievements to be adumbrated below were largely – though not entirely – the work of a privileged ecclesiastical elite.[32]

(iii) Baroque Latin literature in the 1600s

New Spanish society stabilised over the course of the seventeenth century, and numerous books – again principally on poetry, grammar, and rhetoric – continued to be published. A leading figure at this time was Bernardino de Llanos (1560-1669), a native of Ocaña near Toledo in Spain. His first

book, *Illustrium autorum collectanea* ('Anthology of eminent authors'), which was published in 1604, incorporated excerpts from rhetorical texts and treatises on poetics by Spanish and Italian humanists. A second book, *Solutae orationis fragmenta* ('Fragments of prose discourse'), now lost, was printed in the same year and incorporated selections of Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, Quintus Curtius, Aesop (in Valla's Latin translation), and Livy. But Llanos' 1605 anthology is of greater literary historical interest: *Poeticarum institutionum liber, variis ethnicorum, christianorumque exemplis illustratus* ('Book of poetic education, illustrated by various examples from pagan and Christian writers'). The first part advanced a definition of poetic practice, proposing a theory of the genres supported by a wide range of classical sources: Virgil, Catullus, Claudian, Silius Italicus, Ovid, Seneca, Terence, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, and Martial. The second part contained a comparable selection of Christian poets; the third presented the poems that Llanos' own students wrote as school exercises. Llanos himself authored verse in a markedly Virgilian style.

Latin poetry had already been composed in Mexico in the 1500s – the *Dicolon Icasticon* of Cristóbal de Cabrera was printed in 1540 – and much more was produced in the seventeenth century.[33] Horace's *Ars Poetica*, which went through more than fifteen printings in New Spain, disseminated Aristotelian poetic theory: Horace's treatise and the Italian humanist commentaries on it exerted an enormous influence.[34] But, as in Europe, it was Virgil who provided the fundamental model and enduring inspiration for Latin poetry in colonial Mexico. In addition to the poems in the 1605 anthology, a single manuscript preserves a number of further works by Llanos and other authors, some anonymous, which take the form of extended 'eclogues' and verse dialogues.

From the mid-1600s, three Latin poets stand out in particular: Juan de Valencia, William Lamport, and Mateo de Castroverde. Valencia, a Mercedarian friar based in the convent of Atlixco in Puebla, wrote a *Theressiad* in 350 elegiac couplets, in honour of Saint Teresa of Avila. The poem which was sent to Spain for publication is now lost. However a handful of verses were quoted by a contemporary chronicler of the Mercedarian Order, Juan de Pareja.[35] The only complete couplet to survive runs as follows:

> Signa te signa temere me tangis et angis
> Roma tibi subito motibus ibit amor
>
> Sign yourself with your signs, at random you touch me and torment me:
> Rome is for you suddenly in commotion; [your] love will advance.
>
> Juan de Valencia, *Theressiad*

This reference to Saint Teresa's miraculous stigmata is not easy to read, punctuate, or translate. That is because each of these two verses is a palindrome: the individual letters of each line when read from right to left

have precisely the same sequence as they do when they are read from left to right. The two other isolated verses Pareja preserved have the same property: the whole composition could thus have been read palindromically, from end to end. If Juan de Valencia did indeed complete this poem, its length would have made it a remarkable achievement, virtually unique in all of Latin literature.[36]

William Lamport, who was born in Wexford, Ireland in 1615, is less famous as a Latin poet than as a brigand, playboy, and adventurer who supposedly proclaimed himself king of Mexico.[37] Educated by Irish and Spanish Jesuits, he arrived in New Spain in 1640 as an agent of the Duke of Olivares, a chief minister to Philip IV. However, in 1642 Lamport was arrested and charged by the Inquisition of conspiring against Spain to liberate the Indians and African slaves, of associating with Indian sorcerers and studying astrology, and of plotting to establish himself as monarch of an independent Mexico. After being jailed for nine years, Lamport escaped briefly in December 1650 and flyposted the walls of Mexico City with denunciations of the Inquisition. He was promptly recaptured and imprisoned for another nine years before being burnt at the stake in 1659. It was during his incarceration that this Irishman wrote, in Latin, 918 psalms, a number of hymns, and some compelling devotional poems. These works still remain unedited, but William Lamport's imitation and adaptation of Horatian metres give ample proof of his expertise in classical prosody.[38]

Far less is known about Mateo de Castroverde (1595-1644), a Jesuit missionary, who at around 1645 composed in Latin a *Panegyric of the Conception of Mary celebrated in America*.[39] The Panegyric has not survived in entirety but seventy lines are incorporated into a predominantly Spanish composition: *El triunfo parténico* ('The Triumph of the Virgin') by Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora. Sigüenza y Góngora (1645-1700), whose maternal relative was the influential Spanish poet Luis de Góngora y Argote, was a major force in Mexican intellectual history – as a *belle-lettriste* and polymath.[40] In 1683, Sigüenza y Góngora published *El triunfo parténico*, a compilation of more than 500 other works, which he had presented to the University of Mexico for a competition to honour the Immaculate Conception. The following lines of Castroverde's *Panegyric*, canonised by Sigüenza y Góngora, were to be echoed by later New Spanish Latin poets, including Villerías y Roelas (see pp. 20-1 below), and Landívar:[41]

> Mexicus interea toto celeberrima mundo
> ingeniis, opibusque vigens, cui summa potestas
> cum summa pietate manet, cupit ultima amoris
> edere signa sui.

Meanwhile Mexico most renowned in all the world for her talents, flourish-

> ing in her wealth, for whom utmost power abides with utmost piety, desires to show forth the latest signs of her love.
>
> Castroverde, *Panegyric*

Sensuous and paradoxical diction endows Castroverde's subsequent hexameters with a distinctive quality, as they go on to describe an unsettling, apocalyptic *fiesta* in honour of the Virgin.

In the later part of the seventeenth century, the Virgin Mary became even more prominent in Mexican literature: it was at this time that testimonies of the miraculous appearance of the Virgin of Guadalupe – the event reputedly occurred in 1531 – began to abound. There have been various accounts of the apparition: historians of the tradition give priority to what is often regarded as the 'Urtext' for the miracle, the *Nican mopohua* ('Here it is recounted') published in Nahuatl by Laso de la Vega, vicar of Guadalupe in 1649.[12] Luis Becerra Tanco, a close friend of Sigüenza y Góngora, translated the Nahuatl version, doctoring it in places in the interests of supposed historical accuracy.

The story is well known. In December 1531, an Indian named Juan Diego was walking at dawn past the hill in Tepeyac, to the north of Mexico City, to attend mass. He caught sight of a colourful rainbow and heard the sound of beautiful singing. As he turned towards the sound, the Virgin Mary appeared and spoke to him, declaring that she was the mother of God, and that a temple should be established on the hill from where she might help him and all those devoted to her. She enjoined him to give a faithful account of this to the bishop. The bishop at first did not believe him and sought a sign. The Indian returned and unfastened his cloak, in which the Virgin had instructed him to gather flowers from the hill. The bishop then saw the image of the Virgin on the cloak and ordered a church to be built in the place she appeared – the very site where the indigenous inhabitants had once worshiped Tonantzin, an expiatory goddess whose name means 'our mother' in Nahuatl.[13]

Sigüenza y Góngora, whose best known work, the *Primavera indiana* (1668) was about the Virgin of Guadalupe, published the *Glorias de Querétaro* (1680) to mark the completion of the temple of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe in the provincial capital of Querétaro. These poems are just two examples of the extensive Guadalupan literature in Spanish.[14] The first known work in Latin to honour the Virgin of Guadalupe was published in 1669 by José López de Abilés: the *Poeticum viridarium* ('Poetic pleasure garden') in 210 elegiac couplets. It was in a book which was produced under the direction of Becerra Tanco and contained verses, including anagrams and acrostics, by Tanco himself and another author, Miguel Sanchez.[15]

A further Guadalupan poem in Latin, by Bernardo Ceinos de Riofrío, came out in 1680. This represents a more significant landmark in the development of Mexican humanist literature than many critics have realised.[16] As indicated by its full title – 'A Virgilian centonic monument of

the miraculous apparition of the Virgin Mary', this work is a *cento*, a medley of 365 verses, all hexameters or hemistichs recycled from Virgil, conjoined to narrate the miracle of Tepeyac. Although Riofrío follows Becerra Tanco's account of the miracle, his poetic version is difficult to follow. The Guadalupan theme tends to be most successfully conveyed when the contours of Virgil's discourse are followed *more* closely rather than when the original verses are broken up. For example, the speech of Aeneas to his mother, Venus, from *Aeneid* 1.327-34 ('*O quam te memorem Virgo ...?*) usefully furnishes Juan Diego with words to address his own divine Mother in verses 201-8 of the *cento*.

The primary meaning of the word *cento* in Latin is 'patchwork cloth or cloak' – as Riofrío states in his prose preface to his poem. The *cento* is thus an appropriate literary vehicle for his subject, given both the role of Juan Diego's cloak in the story and the significance of the Virgin herself as 'cloak of protection' for the people of Mexico. But the importance of Riofrío's *Centonicum virgilianum monimentum* for literary history was its aspiration to epic narrative. It pointed a way forward for the Latin poets of the next century who were to compose on a far more ambitious scale. Even when they do not treat the Guadalupan myth as a central subject, all of those poets, including Landívar, would incorporate the legend into their works.

The Virgin of Guadalupe is more than a generic hallmark responsible for the gestation of original Latin epic in New Spain: she was later to become a symbol of Mexican nationhood.[47] An affirmation of pride, at least in Spanish American humanistic achievement, can be found in the poem written to introduce Riofrío's Guadalupan *cento* by Bartolomé Rosales. Rosales' panegyrical epyllion was entitled *Aulica musarum synodus crisis apollinea in laudem authoris* ('The Aulic Synod of Muses and the Judgment of Apollo in praise of the Author'). It opens with Mercury's arrival at the abode of the Muses. Mercury informs Apollo that the ghost of Virgil appeared to him in a dream. We then hear Virgil explain that he has been resurrected in America:

> Nunc iterum toto celebrandus in orbe poeta
> pulchrior exurgo, faciesque reficta refulget.
> Nunc et in orbe novo resonat romana Thalia
> quae redimita rosis Indis caput extulit undis.
> O vos Pyerides vobis nova gloria surgit:
> nunc meus in *Rosea* vultus *Imagine* maior
> noscitur, auctus honos eludet tempora vivax.

Now I rise again, more beautiful still, as a poet to be celebrated all over the world and my features, refashioned, shine once more. Now Roman Thalia sounds again in the New World as she raises her head from the waters, garlanded with Indian roses. O you Pierides, your new glory is rising, now

> my countenance is greater in the image of the roses and my honour, enhanced and alive, makes mockery of time ...
>
> Rosales, *Aulica musarum synodus* 108-14

Mercury then tells Apollo that a *cold river* has quenched for good the flames that threatened the survival of the *Aeneid,* which Virgil had wanted to burn. 'Cold river' (*frigidus rivus*) is the meaning of *Riofrío* in Spanish. Thus, according to Mercury, the centonist Riofrío has saved Virgil's work (and the art of pagan antiquity) from the flames by enabling the tide of Latin verse to flow all the way from Helicon to Mexico – an idea echoed in later European Latin poetry.[18] In this short narrative sketch, Bartolomé Rosales sought to promote not only the work of Bernardo Ceinos de Riofrío, but also by implication the entire tradition of classical learning that was flourishing in New Spain.

Any review of that tradition in the late seventeenth century must take into the consideration the achievement of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, (1648-95) the poet and feminist *avant la lettre*. She is now a celebrated icon of Spanish colonial literature – and she also has a cameo in Landívar's *Rusticatio Mexicana*.[19] Sor Juana is best known for her Castilian plays and poems, notably the highly ornate *Primero sueño* which takes Baroque 'gongorism' to new levels. However the extent of her Latin writing has been largely unrecognised. Latin verses are worked into some of her *villancicos* – endeavours in an early Renaissance Spanish verse form with a refrain. The different levels of Latin intrusion into these compositions have been distinguished typologically as quotation, parody, collage, macaronic verse, etc., but Sor Juana's best Latin verses are embedded in her *Neptuno alegórico*. The poem was composed on the occasion of the entry into Mexico City by the Count of Paredes, the Marqués of Laguna, as the new Viceroy: a pun on *laguna* ('lake') explains the involvement of the aquatic deity Neptune. Sor Juana's other Spanish compositions also show the influence of a number of classical Latin authors, particularly Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Martial, and Ausonius. It is worth emphasising that there was a complicated traffic between Latin and Spanish literature in Mexico, just as in Spain: mannerist writing in Castilian was conspicuously Latinised, while the new Latin literature that was produced sometimes reflected the contemporary stylistic and aesthetic trends like *culteranismo* and *conceptismo* that competed in vernacular writing.[50]

(iv) The Golden Age of Mexican Latin in the 1700s

The eighteenth century saw several significant advances in Latin literature, philosophy, and other forms of learning. The time is widely regarded as the period in which humanist achievement in New Spain reached its peak. Francisco Xavier Alegre, José Rafael Campoy, Francisco Xavier Clavigero, and Diego José Abad, who were leading Jesuit scholars from the

later 1700s, merit at least as much recognition for their accomplishments as their now better known contemporary, Rafael Landívar. The reputation of this epoch as a floruit of Latin writing rests in no small part on some outstanding works that were mostly published in Italy, after the Jesuits were expelled from Mexico in 1767. But even before that, the Latin literature produced in New Spain had begun to show a preoccupation with Mexican or American cultural identity – a preoccupation which was to become increasingly pronounced.

The beginning of the eighteenth century marked a transition in literary taste and practice from Baroque Mannerism to Neoclassicism, as artificiality of style, allusiveness, and difficult conceits were supplanted by less ornate and more lucid forms of expression. This transition is best exemplified by José Antonio de Villerías y Roelas (1695-1728). Although Villerías was a secular layman, he had benefited from a Jesuit education, having mastered Latin and Greek before going on to study jurisprudence at the University of Mexico from 1714-24.[51] The poverty Villerías experienced and his failure to find an appropriate position, either as an academic or as a lawyer, in itself gives an indication of why so many Mexican writers from the colonial period were in religious orders. Difficulty in securing a place in the political or administrative hierarchy was common for *criollos* (the name now routinely given to people of European origin born in the New World), unless they had patronage or wealth of their own.[52]

In his short life, Villerías wrote in Latin, Greek, and Spanish. His works include a rendering of the Vulgate *Song of Songs* into Latin verse, *Victor* (a heroic poem of 300 hexameters), translations from Greek of various epigrams and of the ancient grammarian Corinthius' treatise on Greek dialects; as well as twelve original Greek epigrams. In Latin he also composed original epigrams, hymns, short poems, epithalamia, and a couple of prose works – a *Farrago* in two chapters, and a long pathological text addressed to a physician called Jacobo Stevenson. Only Villerías' Spanish texts went to press in his lifetime: the *Máscara*, a burlesque poem which describes a triumphal University procession, the *Llanto de las estrellas* ('Lament of the stars') detailing the funeral rites of Luis I, and the *Escudo triunfante del Carmelo* – a versified rendering of a devotional work by Gabriel Cerrada, a Carmelite friar. From a modern critical and historical perspective however, Villerías y Roelas' masterpiece was undoubtedly the *Guadalupe,* a Latin epic narrative in four books, a total of 1,755 hexameters.

The epic is concerned with the special destiny of New Spain as a dominion of the Virgin Mary. This is a full blown poetic account of the Guadalupan myth, but its conception and structure take after the *Aeneid*: Juan Diego and Bishop Zumárraga are the mortal protagonists; the divine agents include Pluto, as god of the Underworld, and the Aztec goddess Tonantzin who conspire to oppose Mary's divine plan for the future of Mexico.[53] The aversion that these pagan deities have to the Spaniards

(whom they plan to expel from the New World) recalls Juno's antipathy to the Trojans, and her resistance to the future ordained for Italy in Virgil's *Aeneid*. And, as is also the case with the *Aeneid*, the narrative of the *Guadalupe* offers both predictions and flashbacks which call attention to a larger historical panorama that extends beyond the story directly presented. Thus the opening book rehearses the European conquest and evangelisation of the Aztecs (1.63-112); in the second book the god Atlas, now exiled from Europe and dwelling in a secret part of the lake of Mexico, prophesies the Virgin's future role in Mexico (2.62-100, 222-59), and an *ekphrasis* of the murals in Atlas' grotto provides a resumé of the indigenous history of the isthmus (2.101-221).[54]

The *Guadalupe* is a triumph of patriotic syncretism: Cortés is praised at the same time as the courage of his indigenous adversaries is affirmed. For Osorio Romero who edited this text, Villerías' language is striking for its incorporation of Nahuatl words into the Latin hexameter.[55] One example is Pluto's proud enumeration of his minions in the angry soliloquy which (echoing Neptune's words from *Aeneid* 1.132-5) sets the story of the poem into motion:

> Namque habeo indociles Otomites, more ferarum
> sub Jove degentes, et terrae gramine pastos;
> Guastecos graveis, cultos sermone Tarascos,
> atque Matalzincas et pictos corpora Mecos,
> quos ego: Sed melius juvat hoc mox dicere factis.

> 'I have at my disposal the indocile Otomi, who subsist under heaven like beasts and live on the grass of the ground; the grave Guastecos, the Tarascans of refined speech; and the Matlalzincas and the Chichimecs with their tattooed bodies, whom I ... But it is better to speak this soon – with actions.'
> Villerías y Roelas, *Guadalupe* 1.126-30

Villerías' poem was never published in his lifetime. However, it may have been known to his contemporary, the bibliographer Juan José de Eguiara y Eguren who ranks Villerías among writers 'of consummate poetic skill'.[56] And in a survey of Guadalupan literature published in 1782, Francisco Xavier Clavigero, who was born three years after Villerías' death in 1728, claims to have seen a manuscript copy of his poem.[57] Thus the possibility that Villerías y Roelas had an influence on the later heroic poets of Clavigero's generation (including Landívar and Alegre) cannot be ruled out.[58]

Expression of a growing national pride was not confined to poetry and Guadalupan literature. Eguiara y Eguren's monumental *Bibliotheca Mexicana* is more than a bibliography: it represents both a demonstration and a dynamic assertion of Mexican intellectual achievement in several spheres of knowledge. Though never completed, it was designed to provide a comprehensive catalogue, entirely in Latin prose, of every Mexican

author from the conquest up to 1755 (when the first volume was published). Arranged in alphabetical order of authors' first names, the *Bibliotheca Mexicana* was preceded by a series of *anteloquia*, prologic excursuses, by Eguiara himself on the archaeology of pre-Hispanic cultures. Only those prologues and entries from A-C went into print before Eguiara died in 1763. His conception of the *Bibliotheca* had been motivated by one particular European polemic about the paucity of culture and learning in the New World. This was a Latin letter published in 1735 by a Spaniard, Manuel Martí, who was Dean of Alicante. Martí offered a bleak picture of cultural and intellectual life in Spanish America to a pupil named Antonio Carillo, who had thought about continuing his studies in Mexico:

> Quo te vertes apud indos, in tam vasta litterarum solitudine? Quem adibis, non dicam magistrum, cuius praeceptis instituaris, sed auditorem? Non dicam aliquid scientem, sed scire cupientem? Dicam enucleatius a litteris non abhorrentem? Ecquosnam evolves codices? Equas lustrabis bibliotecas? Haec enim omnia tam frustra quaeres, quam qui tondet asinum vel mulcet hircum. Eugepae! Abice has nugas atque eo iter converte, ubi et animum excolere queas et honestum vitae subsidium tibi parare et novos honores capessere.[59]

> Where will you turn in the Indies, a vast wilderness when it comes to literature? Whom will you go to? – I won't say 'which teacher will instruct you?', but whom will you find even to listen to you? I won't say 'will you find anyone who knows anything?', but will you even find anyone who *wants* to know anything? In a nutshell: will you find anyone who doesn't recoil from the study of literature? What documents will you unroll? What libraries will you consult? You'll search for all these things with as much success as someone who tries to shave an ass or milk a he-goat. Oh very good! Forget such nonsense – and put yourself on a path where you'll be able to cultivate your mind, make a decent living for yourself, and acquire new prestige.
>
> Martí, *Epistulae* 7.16

Martí's letter is quoted at length in the first prologue of the *Bibliotheca Mexicana*; much more of Eguiara's prefatory material consititutes a fascinating and informed response to his prejudiced remarks. Others responded to this provocation: it was the subject of a rebuttal in an inaugural lecture delivered in Latin at Mexico University by Juan Gregorio de Campos y Martínez in 1745, and published in the same year.[60]

A better known response to Martí's ludicrous charges is the *Aprilis Dialogus* by Vicente López.[61] López, himself a native of Córdoba in Spain, was also the author of some Guadalupan hymns and other poems in Latin. His 'April Dialogue' was written as part of the prefatory material to herald the *Bibliotheca Mexicana*. It presents a conversation between a Spaniard, a Belgian, and an Italian, conducted under a shady plane tree in a villa outside Mexico City. Leonardo Bruni Aretino and other writers of Latin dialogue in Renaissance Italy had been prone to adopt such *loci amoeni* or

'pleasant places' as venues in their dialogues, although the detail of the plane tree ultimately goes back to Plato's *Phaedrus*.[62] López's interlocutors in the *Aprilis Dialogus* specifically address – among other topics – access to books in America, the benefits of chocolate for intellectual inspiration, Eguiara y Eguren's enterprise, and the painting of the Virgin of Guadalupe.[63] The setting in April may allude to the month in which the first volume of the *Bibliotheca Mexicana* was published.[64] But Antony Higgins may also be right to suggest that this setting in springtime is meant to glorify Mexico: 'as a place in which humanist scholarship is being re-elevated to the state of vitality it enjoyed in Europe during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries ... the intellectual culture of New Spain is projected as a scene in which standards of erudition and eloquence similar to those set in motion by humanism in Western Europe are being attained'.[65]

However, in the later 1700s, Mexico was far from a *locus amoenus* in social and economic terms. The period was certainly no 'golden age' of political history, and the negative impact of events on New Spain's literary culture was the very least of its catastrophes.[66] Between 1759 and 1788, Carlos III of Spain began the reorganisation of the Spanish Empire, known as the 'Bourbon Reforms'. The objective of the ensuing legislation was to extend royal authority in New Spain, by reducing the region's autonomy whilst radically increasing fiscal revenue. The *Visitador General* in the 1760s, José de Gálvez, further alienated the role of the *criollo* elite from the administration, and the power of peninsular Spaniards in the high court and local government was thoroughly consolidated.

In order to restrain the social influence of the Catholic church, the Crown promoted royal patronage and sought to diminish the standing of the clergy: the consequent secularisation of parishes was disruptive and it particularly angered local populations. But perhaps the gravest policy of all was the expulsion of the Jesuits from all the Spanish territories in 1767. As a modern historian has commented, 'This decree was motivated in part by the notable successes the Jesuits had achieved all over the Spanish empire as well as their total obedience to the papacy. The decision would bring severe consequences, however, because of the opposition it provoked in New Spain's society.'[67]

In the climate of such increasingly overt social and political engineering from a geographically remote imperial power, it is hardly surprising that Spanish Americans had begun to see themselves as less European. The more revolutionary currents of post-Enlightenment thinking would also play a great part in Mexican intellectual history – and they are reflected in Jesuit writings of the time. Culturally as well as economically, the *criollos* began to perceive their interests as being more closely linked to those of the Indians and other groups. This may have been another factor that had led to the more or less self-conscious fashioning of an independent body of 'New World' knowledge to reflect a new level of intellectual autonomy.[68]

The Bourbon Reforms, more than anything else, determined the fortune of New Spanish humanism in the 1700s. The expulsion of the Jesuits – who by this time were the main torchbearers of classical learning – meant that Latin literary production in Mexico itself was all but extinguished. However, were it not for this expulsion, many Latin texts by Hispanic American authors in Europe would probably not have come into being. Nearly 700 members of the Society of Jesus were forced to leave New Spain in June 1767: Rafael Landívar was one of them. Most of these men eventually settled in Italy, but they suffered considerable hardship, and by 1773 more than 300 had died.

The conceit of forced migration to Hesperia has a ring familiar to readers of Virgil. But the Jesuits were bringing with them new Latin poetry and other writing on classical themes *from* the New World *back* to Europe at a point when Latin writing, even in Italy, had long gone into decline.[69] Landívar and his peers wrote about their homeland because they were in exile, and they expressed themselves in Latin in order to demonstrate to new European readers the universal, transtemporal value of Mexican learning. There is some irony in the fact that the repression of the Jesuits caused the final flowering of Mexican humanism: a number of outstanding works in Latin, Spanish, and Italian were written by Jesuit refugees in Europe, especially in Italy, in the 1770s and 1780s.[70]

Of those works, the *Rusticatio Mexicana* has enjoyed unique recognition – no doubt because in dealing with the country life of Mexico and Guatemala it is the only sustained Latin poem in New Spanish literature on an American theme. Landívar's life and work will be addressed in the next two chapters: here it remains to outline the fortunes and achievements of some of his contemporaries – most of whom he knew personally. Their thought and writing – particularly their accommodation of Enlightenment philosophy, science and natural history – also have a bearing on Landívar's work and on the context in which it was produced. Moreover, as noted above, they are important intellectual figures in their own right.

Padre José Rafael Campoy (1723-77) was an influential teacher who inclined the Jesuits of his generation to embrace Enlightenment ideas. From 1737-41 he studied philosophy in the Colegio de San Ildefonso in Mexico City (where Diego José Abad was one of his colleagues) and then entered the Jesuit novitiate at Tepotzotlán. In the 1740s, Campoy developed an enthusiasm for Aristotle and Cicero. He eventually entered the Colegio Máximo de San Pedro y San Pablo, by this time the central educational institution in New Spain. There Campoy met Alegre, Clavigero, Castro, Dávila and others who were to become prominent scholars, as well as Landívar himself. 'No one could write an encomium of any of these men' wrote a contemporary biographer of José Rafael Campoy, 'without frequently mentioning Campoy's name.'[71] Campoy had undertaken a commentary and Spanish translation of Pliny's *Natural History* which was lost

when the decree of expulsion took him by surprise in Veracruz. In exile, he lived in Ferrara and Bologna and continued his researches on Pliny. Although none of Campoy's writings survive, he mastered several disciplines and he made a radical contribution to the reform and expansion of the Jesuits' teaching in New Spain. Under Campoy's direction, their curriculum came to accommodate mathematics, Greek, modern languages, and, most significantly, the ideas of modern thinkers such as Descartes, Bacon (whose *De Scientarum dignitate atque incremento* was translated into Spanish by Castro), Gassendi, Locke, and Newton.[72]

The endeavours of Francisco Xavier Clavigero (1731-87) were in a similar spirit: according to Juan Luis Maneiro, he was the first to present a taught course, in Latin, which provided systematic coverage of contemporary philosophy – first in Morelia in 1763, and the following year in Guadalajara.[73] But his influence was to extend far beyond Jesuit circles. Among the works Clavigero continued to produce in exile was an extensive *Ancient History of Mexico* (1780), originally published in Italian. The *History* was in part a counterblast to an astonishingly polemical book in French, entitled *Recherches philosophiques sur les Américains* (1768), by a Dutch cleric named Cornelius de Pauw. De Pauw, commending the achievements of Newton, Leibniz, Descartes, Locke, and others, held that no book worth reading had ever come out of America. He characterised the indigenous Americans 'as a race of men who have all the faults of a child, as a degenerate species of humanity, cowardly, impotent, without physical force or vigour, and without elevation of spirit'. The calendars and magnificent buildings of the Aztecs could be explained away as the fabrication of cynical, unscrupulous Spaniards. De Pauw partly rested his arguments on the thesis of a French naturalist, George-Louis Leclerc Buffon who had argued that America was an immature continent in geological terms: consequently all forms of life (including human beings) which inhabited it were deficient, and weaker than those in Europe.[74]

It is not impossible that such an attack on American nature prompted Landívar's *Rusticatio Mexicana,* much as the *Bibliotheca Mexicana* of Eguiara had been incited some years before by Martí's defamation of American culture.[75] Certainly De Pauw's absorption of Buffonish reasoning explains why Clavigero's *History* is prefaced with a natural historical description of Mexico. Clavigero went on to distinguish the civilised Peruvians and Mexicans from other American peoples – and affirmed from his own experience that the Indians were capable of learning all the sciences. He observes (as Cicero did for Latin) that although classical Nahuatl has no equivalents for Greek philosophical categories of matter, substance, and accidents, the language can accommodate the full meaning of the Bible as well as advanced mathematical calculations (*Disertación* 6.6-7).[76] Clavigero had himself produced a grammar of the 'Mexican language'.[77] Addressing the charge that the Mexicans no longer possessed the calibre of their ancestors prior to the conquest, the Jesuit historian responded with a pointed analogy:

> It cannot be doubted that present day Mexicans are not at all like their ancient forbears, just as the modern Greeks are not like those who lived in the times of Plato and Pericles (Clavigero, *History* 1.17).[78]

Greece was then under the rule of the Ottoman Turks: in comparing the indigenous Americans to the Greeks, Clavigero is also aligning imperialist Spaniards with the Turks. That comparison alone was probably enough to prevent his history from being published in Spanish, until after Mexico secured independence from Spain in 1821.[79] Clavigero was praised for his defense of American culture in an accomplished poem of 110 Latin hexameters (probably composed by Maneiro).[80]

Enlightenment thought and the need to respond to a different kind of European polemic also help to characterise the achievement of another major Jesuit author from New Spain: Diego José Abad. Abad, who was born in Michoacán in 1727 and died in Bologna in 1780, wrote a substantial didactic epic in 43 short books, the *De Deo, Deoque Homine Carmina Heroica* ('Heroic Verses on God, and on God as Man'). This impressive poem reflects its author's wide-ranging interests in philosophy, science, and letters.[81] Abad absorbed Greek, Roman, and Renaissance sources, as well as later literature in Spanish and in Latin – Melchior De Polignac's *Anti-Lucretius: De Deo et Natura* is recalled in his poem's title and evoked throughout the work itself.[82] But although Abad celebrated the scientific advances of the Enlightenment in his *De Deo*, he condemned any progressive ideas which might constitute a threat to Catholic doctrine.[83]

The *De Deo* contains a number of references to Mexico which point to its author's attachment to his native country.[84] The pseudonym – *Labbe Selenopolitanus* – under which Abad published the 1773 and 1775 editions of the poem is also very telling in this respect. That assumed name was explained by the poet's friend and biographer, Manuel Fabri:

> *Labbeumque*, se, paullo immutato nomine, et *Selenopolitanum*, seu Urbis Lunae [id est enim patria lingua Mexicus sonat, ut plerique credunt] Civem appellavit.[85]

> He called himself *Labbe* by changing his own name slightly, and *Selenopolitanus*, or 'Citizen of the City of the Moon' – that is what 'Mexico' means in the language of his fatherland, as most people believe.
>
> Fabri, *Specimen vitae auctoris*

The adoption of a hellenised version of a Nahuatl name is a powerful way of describing oneself as a Mexican; at the same time *Labbe Selenopolitanus* eschews any Spanish constituents: *L'abbé*, the French for 'abbot', is the meaning of *Abad* in Spanish.

Abad used the same *nom de plume* for his other surviving work in Latin: the *Dissertatio ludicro-seria* (1778) – a witty but trenchant response to an allegation made by Giambattista Roberti that 'only Italians could write

Latin properly.'[86] 'Just as some Italians were annoyed that Spaniards dared to speak to them about music', explains Miguel Batllori, 'others took offence that they considered themselves just as accomplished Latinists as the natives of Italy'.[87] The belief was that the Spanish Baroque, along with the influence of 'decadent' classical authors from Spain, like Lucan, Seneca, Martial, and even Quintilian had led to a spread of bad taste. Clementino Vannetti, another Italian who had been conspicuous in this anti-Spanish campaign, did however recant – and this recantation seems to have been prompted by his own recognition of Abad's talents. Vannetti admitted Abad as a member of the exclusive Accademia Rovoretana in Trento, and fulsomely praised the Mexican's poetic achievement in a letter to the poet: 'it can be said not that you have been graced by the Muses, but that the Muses have been graced by you.'[88]

José Mariano Iturriaga and Andrés Diego de la Fuente were other Latin poets exiled to Italy. Iturriaga is credited with authoring a Latin hexameter narrative about Salvatierra, a Milanese Jesuit, and his courageous mission in the late 1600s to the inhospitable territory of California.[89] Fuente wrote an ekphrastic Guadalupan epic in three books published in Faenza in 1773.[90] However, the most proficient literary scholar and poet of this generation was Francisco Xavier Alegre, whom Landívar himself characterised as 'learned in the art of Apollo.'[91]

Alegre, who also settled in Bologna, was born in Veracruz in 1729. After studying at the University of Mexico, he joined the Company of Jesus at Tepotzotlán and mastered Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Italian before becoming Professor of Literature at the Colegio Máximo de San Pedro y San Pablo. He also learnt French and English, and taught in Cuba and Yucatán, returning to Mexico City in 1765. Alegre's output prior to his exile two years later included his lost *Lyrics and Georgics in Praise of Blessed Mary of Guadalupe* and another Latin work: a translation of the Homeric *Batrachomyomachia*.[92] His history of the Jesuit movement in New Spain was completed after his expulsion from Mexico, along with his literary works which will be discussed here for their bearing on Landívar. After Alegre died in 1788, his extensive studies of ethics on theological principles, the *Institutiones Theologicae*, were published in seven volumes in Venice between 1789 and 1791. That magisterial work shows its author's commitment to progressive Enlightenment social and political thought: Alegre upheld popular sovereignty and rejected slavery out of hand.[93]

Very probably Alegre had begun in Mexico his annotated Spanish translation, or rather elaboration, of Boileau's *L'Art poétique* which was finished in Bologna, in 1776.[94] The *Arte poética de Mr. Boileau* offers a form of comparative criticism as it seeks to integrate Spanish literature with the traditions of classical antiquity and with other vernacular literatures. Although its basic approach is grounded in Horace and Aristotle, a number of references to the notion of the 'sublime' may well have been absorbed

directly from Longinus' *On the Sublime* (as well as from Boileau's treatise and his French translation of Longinus).[95] These principles seem to have influenced Landívar: a similar kind of literary cosmopolitanism, along with an application of Longinian sublimity, can be discerned in the *Rusticatio Mexicana* which was completed only a few years later.

Alegre also published a Latin verse rendering of Homer's *Iliad* in Forlì in 1773. Italian humanists such as Andreas Divus and Angelo Poliziano ('Politian') had produced such translations of Homer in the Renaissance, but Alegre's accomplishment can still command respect even if it is of little benefit to modern readers. The *Alexandriad*, Alegre's original Latin epic in four books about the capture of Tyre by Alexander the Great – possibly written as a school exercise – was eventually printed together with his *Iliad* translation.[96] The poem's historical sources include Quintus Curtius, Josephus, and Diodorus Siculus. Although his epic diction is decisively Virgilian, Alegre's use of decorative conceit unites his early poem more obviously to the *culteranismo* of the Spanish Baroque than to the apparently Neoclassical style of Abad and Landívar. The *Alexandriad* can also be read as an historical allegory: there are some grounds for believing Alexander may be a prototype for Cortés, as the 'Carthaginian' city of Tyre might be aligned with Tenochtitlán.[97] At any rate, directly after Alexander's slaughter of the Tyrian leader Ninus, a river symbolically connects these locations, enabling the epic to close with an explicitly Mexican theme:

> Hactenus Aemathios Vatem memorasse triumphos
> Sit satis, arboream recubat dum lentus ad umbram,
> Qua per Mexiceos liquidus perlabitur agros
> Anthius, ac placidis foecundat jugera limphis,
> Et Guadalupaei surgunt felicia templi
> Culmina, pinnatoque minantur in aethera clivo.
> Fors olim tua, Diva parens, graviore cothurno
> Signa canam, laudesque tuas procul ultima Thule
> Audiet, ac positis numen venerabitur aris.

> May it be enough for the Poet to have commemorated the Emathian triumphs to this extent, while he reclines peacefully under the shade of a tree where the liquid Anthius flows through the fields of Mexico, and makes the hills fertile with its peaceful waters and where the turrets of the Guadalupan temple rise and push into heaven on a winged ascent. Perhaps one day, Divine Progenitor, I will sing of your signs in a more serious style, and distant Thule will hear your praises, and put up altars to venerate your godly power.
>
> Alegre, *Alexandriad* 4.578-86

This appeal to the Virgin of Guadalupe simultaneously echoes *Eclogue* 10.70-4 and the end of *Georgics* 4, as well as other verses by Virgil, Politian, and Sannazaro.[98] Alegre addresses the matter of his general debt

to Virgil in a Latin letter to an 'Antonius'. This text serves as a preface to the *Alexandriad*, and it effectively constitutes another treatise on poetics:[99]

> Fatemur inquam nimiam quandam, ac verbo dicam, puerilem Virgilio adhaesionem toto in opusculo relucere. Quis tamen hanc eandem in omnibus illis non videat, qui aliqua cum laude post decimum tertium saeculum scripserunt? Etenim Francisci Petrarchae Africa; Pontani Hesperides, Darchii Canes Venatorii, Fracastorii Siphylis, Vidae Poema de morte Christi, Jacobi Sannazarii Virginis Puerperium, Rapini Horti, aliorumque Scriptorum opera plurima Virgilium undequaque redolent. Quid? Virgilius ipse totus quotus est, nonne, ut Lilius Giraldus ajebat, ex optimorum imitatione evasit?
>
> We certainly admit that there is an excessive, or to be honest, childlike dependence on Virgil throughout this little work. Who though would not see the same in all those who have, with some distinction, written since the thirteenth century? For Francesco Petrarch's *Africa,* Pontano's *Hesperides,* Darcio's *Hunting Dogs,* Fracastoro's *Syphilis,* Vida's Poem on the death of Christ, Iacopo Sannazaro's *Virgin Birth,* Rapin's *Gardens* and very many works by other writers smack of Virgil on every side. So? Is it not the case that Virgil himself, for all that he is, has, as Lilio Giraldi said, come out from imitation of the best?
>
> Alegre, *Antonio suo*

Narrative epic is Alegre's main concern, in an essay which refers to a wide range of other classical authors and vernacular poets including Camoens, Tasso and Milton. But this excerpt shows that Alegre is seeking to inscribe his own work in a tradition of canonical humanist poetry, much of which is didactic. And it also indicates the range of the Latin poetry that was available to Alegre and his peers in Italy, if not in Mexico: most of the authors listed in the excerpt given here are echoed, quite unmistakably, in the *Rusticatio Mexicana.*[100] Here – as in his *Arte poética* – Alegre might be pointing to some views that his friend and contemporary, Landívar held as well.

In fact, the exiled Hispanic Jesuits in Italy formed a very close-knit community. The Jesuit historian Decorme records that Landívar occupied the same house as Alegre, Clavigero, and Dávila in Bologna: it can be surmised that exchanges of ideas between these individuals would have been routine.[101] Knowledge of the texts and ideas that circulated among these individuals and their predecessors affords the best means of understanding Rafael Landívar's particular achievement. His work is very much a product of the complex, multicultural tradition of humanism that has been sketched out in the preceding pages.

The expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767 severely ruptured the continuity of the classical tradition all over Spanish America, but it did not put an end to it. It is true that through the 1800s, there was a decline of classical culture in the seminaries: some actually preferred the Latin of Christian

authors like Aquinas, Bonaventure, and even Fulgentius to the classical styles of Cicero, Sallust and Tacitus.[102] Nonetheless, Spanish translations of ancient Greco-Roman authors began to proliferate at this time, and Mexican works in Latin and Spanish were collected and catalogued by bibliographers including José Mariano Beristáin de Souza, José María Lafragua, and a Chilean, José Toribio Medina. The historian Joaquín García Icazbalceta (1825-94) was another important editor and translator of a number of humanist texts. In the past century, poets, translators and scholars contributed in a variety of ways to the study of Latin writing in New Spain.[103] Their endeavours have enabled modern philology and literary criticism to join forces with the Mexican tradition of humanism which, though it has diminished, has never disappeared.[104]

2

Devotion and Exile: Rafael Landívar and his earlier compositions

(i) A life in Guatemala, Mexico and Italy

In the early 1700s, Pedro Landívar y Caballero, a young nobleman from Navarra in Spain, came to Guatemala 'with no more capital than a sword'.[1] Settling in the prosperous city of Santiago de los Caballeros (now Antigua), he eventually managed to secure an annual income of ten thousand pesos a year from a government gunpowder monopoly, and married a *criolla* from El Panchoy, Doña Juana Xaviera Ruiz de Bustamante. The birth of their son Rafael on 27 October 1731 was recorded in the baptismal records of the parish church of San Sebastián.[2] Pedro Landívar had two brothers in Spain who were in religious orders: it is likely that he came to want more for his talented son than a future in explosives.

Very little information about Rafael Landívar's life is available. The known details are mostly derived from data in public records and Jesuit catalogues.[3] There is, however, a brief biography. This is one of an unpublished series of lives of Jesuits exiled to Italy, by Padre Félix Sebastián (1737-1815), a Spanish missionary who also settled in Bologna.[4] While Sebastián provides a couple of anecdotes and some revealing insights on Landívar's character, his narrative often reads like a hagiography which seeks to emphasise the exemplary piety of its subject. The account is quite unlike the detailed and substantial intellectual biographies – in Latin – of Campoy, Castro, Clavigero, Abad, Alegre, and others, by Juan Luis Maneiro and Manuel Fabri. Unfortunately those more thorough chroniclers did not devote a specific study to Rafael Landívar, even though Maneiro, who returned to Mexico in 1799, did take with him an autograph copy of Sebastián's work.[5]

Schooling for the elite in the Spanish colonies almost inevitably consisted of a Jesuit education: the young Landívar attended the College of San Francisco de Borja, probably from the age of seven.[6] He became a Bachelor of Philosophy on 16 February 1746: rhetoric, and very possibly, astronomy and geography, would have been on his curriculum as well.[7] He graduated to the University of San Carlos in Guatemala to read theology and received a Master of Arts degree. In 1749, the year of his father's death, Landívar went to Mexico; he entered the Jesuit novitiate at the renowned seminary of Tepotzotlán in February of 1750.[8] There, according to Félix Sebastián, 'he made great advances in the humanities, advances

which later brought so much honour to him as he was an eloquent rhetorician and a very lucid poet."[9] He proceeded in 1753 to the Colegio Máximo de San Pedro y San Pablo where he was formally examined in philosophy and theology – to great acclaim. This led to Landívar's appointment at the Colegio del Spírito Santo in Puebla as a *maestro de Sintaxis*, before he was recalled to the Colegio Máximo to teach rhetoric: it is likely that here he would have worked alongside Campoy, Alegre, and other influential figures. In 1755, at the age of 24, Rafael Landívar was ordained, and celebrated his first mass in the church of Tepotzotlán.[10]

After thus spending eleven years in Mexico, Landívar returned to Guatemala as Professor of Grammar and Instructor in Rhetoric at San Borja. In 1764 he became Prefect of the Congregation in the College. The following year he made a solemn vocational vow – to commit himself to educating the young.[11] The circumstances in which this obligation was to be fulfilled could not have been foreseen. Landívar had already become Rector of his Jesuit seminary when the arrest and expulsion of the Jesuits was enforced on 26 June 1767, the feast of the Sacred Heart. Something of the draconian quality of Carlos III's decree is betrayed by the monarch's own words:

> Moved by very grave causes ... and other urgent, just, and necessary reasons, which I reserve in my royal mind ... I have ordered that the Jesuits be expelled from all my dominions of Spain, the Indies, and Philippine Islands, and other adjacent regions, priests as well as coadjutors or lay-brothers, who may have made the first profession, and the novices, who may wish to follow them; and that all the properties of the Society in my dominions be taken ....[12]

The Jesuits and those loyal to them were surrounded by troops and deported without warning, and without the chance to contact friends and relatives outside the Society. The consequences were catastrophic: altogether 5,000 Jesuits were driven out of Spain and its empire; Don Rafael de Zelis recorded the names and particulars of the 678 (including himself) who were exiled from Mexico and Guatemala. In New Spain and the Captaincy of Guatemala, 39 colleges and eight missions were vacated. The departure of the twelve members of the Society from Guatemala alone deprived between 300 and 400 children of an education.[13] And worse still, the perilous journey of the refugees left a trail of corpses: by August 1768, 102 members of the Society had perished.

Félix Sebastián outlines the consequences of these events for Landívar:

> Placed entirely in the hands of Divine Providence, he left his college, country, relatives, and all that he held most precious in life and was forced to take the hazardous journey to the Fort of San Felipe on the dangerous coast of the Gulf of Honduras. Once there he embarked for Havana, from that place to Cádiz, from there to Cartagena in the east, and then to Corsica, where he

> was stranded in the port of Ajaccio. Here he remained for six months, and marooned once again by the French invaders of the island, he secured a passage to the Italian mainland.[14]

Some have left more detailed firsthand accounts of the harrowing transatlantic journey. López de Priego described in a letter to his sister, a nun in Puebla, the destitution of his Mexican comrades in Corsica: Landívar was among them. 'Of our members who had already arrived there', writes López de Priego, 'some were living under stairways, some in kitchens, others in stables.'[15]

Landívar joined the large community of Spanish Jesuits in Bologna, where he became the director of a Jesuit centre of study, which became known as 'La Sapiencia'; from 1770 he occupied a house with Clavigero, Alegre, and Dávila. Sebastián describes Landívar's 'acute sorrow at the Brief of Suppression of his beloved Mother, the Company of Jesus' – this refers to the papal brief of Clement XIV, issued on 16 August 1773 at the instigation of the Spanish ambassador, José Moniño.[16] Landívar's natural mother died alone in Guatemala in the same month two years before; his only sister, Doña Rita Josefa, had died as a widow when he was already bound for Italy. No less painful would have been the news – within the same month again – that an earthquake had devastated Santiago de los Caballeros on 29 July 1773.[17] After the dissolution of the Society in Bologna, Landívar's means of subsistence diminished still further, and he was obliged to reclaim his mother's inheritance. This led to a troublesome lawsuit which was only resolved some years after his own death.[18] A need for money might have been one of Landívar's motivations for composing the *Rusticatio Mexicana*.

The first ten-book edition of the poem was published in Modena in 1781. This may have been a strategic decision, because Modena was the city with which Gerolamo Tiraboschi, a Jesuit savant, had long been associated.[19] Tiraboschi had been one of the many Italian scholars to criticise the *seicentismo* of Spanish writers. That Italian term for seventeenth-century stylistic mannerism has connotations comparable to those of 'euphuism' in English. Tiraboschi also maintained, along with Roberti, Bettinelli and others, that Spaniards could not write Latin as correctly and elegantly as Italians.[20] Landívar's poem gave the lie to this – and its refinement of style came to be extolled by Tiraboschi himself. The definitive edition of the poem in fifteen books, with an appendix, came out in Bologna the following year.[21]

Landívar succumbed to an unidentifiable illness in the spring of 1793: the archive of his parish of Santa Maria delle Muratelle records that he was unable to assist in celebrating mass at its patronal festival of the Annunciation on the 25 March. He jovially diagnosed the complaint to his friends: morir, y presto! The record of the deceased in his parish states that he died on 27 September at 1 pm.[22] The last sentence of Sebastián's account is as follows:

> His Corpse was buried in the Parish Church of Santa Maria delle Muratelle, of whose Parishioners he was at that time Rector; and his memory remained impressed on all who knew him, as they loved him for his goodness, they revered him for his holiness, and esteemed him for his kindness, tokens by which they said he could be recognised as a worthy Jesuit.[23]

Very possibly Landívar did not set much store by his literary activity. Félix Sebastián certainly does not present a biography of a poet or author, but rather a portrait of a devoted clergyman: 'his life can be summed up in two words: Prayer and Study'.[24] Landívar's writing is treated only in a brief paragraph:

> To entertain himself somewhat, he wrote, in Latin verse, for which he had a great facility, one Work, which he gave to the Press with the title *Rusticatio Mexicana, seu rariora quaedam ex agris Mexicanis decerpta* [*Life in the Mexican Countryside, or some scattered things gathered from the fields of Mexico*]. A work which has been much appreciated by the Scholars of Italy, whose Critics have bestowed praise on it, of which the said work is deserving, as it is unique in its class [*línea*]. This pursuit occupied him only for a short while, since he took it up to occupy his mind, as he always devoted his attention to his real concerns: Holy Scripture, Theology, and Asceticism.[25]

If Landívar did indeed put so little time into his writing, his achievement is all the more impressive. The *Rusticatio Mexicana* suffices to display its author's breadth of ability by incorporating a variety of subjects and poetic styles that others would be hard pressed to harmonise within a single work. Three earlier literary pieces penned by Rafael Landívar also survive: a 'Funeral Declamation' in Latin prose that was published in Mexico, and a Latin ode and Spanish sonnet that were printed in Italy. These shorter works have received barely any critical discussion, but they reward careful reading. As well as informing our assessment of the author of *Rusticatio Mexicana* by giving a fuller impression of his circumstances, training, and abilities, the compositions certainly command appreciation for their own merits.

(ii) Pagan scripture and a Christian funeral

For many readers today, the prospect of a lengthy oration – especially the eulogy of a bishop who died in Guatemala nearly three centuries ago – is unlikely to be enticing. But this address contains more than a few surprises. 'In the speech', Joaquín Antonio Peñalosa has remarked, 'there is not one single quotation of Holy Scripture or of the ecclesiastical writers – quotations that were required in church oratory of the time'.[26] Instead, Landívar adroitly deploys ideas and modes of expression from classical Greek and Latin sources to enhance the emotional effect of his words: we are powerfully reminded that this kind of panegyric has its origins in Roman antiquity.[27] Before commenting on the Declamation itself, it is

necessary to say something about the more immediate background to this text.

There are few sources of information about Francisco José de Figueredo y Victoria, the second Archbishop of Guatemala, to whom the Declamation is devoted.[28] Figueredo was born in the Nuevo Reyno de Granada, now Colombia, no later than 1685, as he was over eighty years old when he died. In 1740, he became bishop of Popayán, an important city in the New Kingdom of Granada during the colonial period. He was made Archbishop of Guatemala in 1751, arriving there two years afterwards. In spite of his advanced age and frail health (he was blind at the end of his life), he conducted episcopal visits of his vast diocese: a primacy which would have extended southwards from Chiapas, to León in Nicaragua, covering the present territories of Belize and El Salvador. Figueredo was fond of the Jesuits and he was an active benefactor of their College in Guatemala. Before his death on 24 June in 1765, he asked to be buried in the church of the College. A few more details of the Archbishop's character and of the support he gave to the Jesuits can be gleaned from Landívar's Declamation: Figueredo's exemplary conduct, humility, and capacity to provide comfort and consolation (*Declamatio* 1, 2); his study of Grammar in his early youth at the Jesuit College of Popayán which led to his fondness for the Society (4); his work for its benefit in Popayán (3); his immediate attention to those in need and his allocation of funds to the College of Guatemala to ensure its survival after his translation there (7, 9); his donation of a cupola and of other costly items for the temple (10); and his defence of the Society from opponents and detractors (11).

The Dean of the Cathedral of Guatemala granted permission for Figueredo's funeral to be held in the church of the Jesuit College of Saint Luke instead of the Cathedral, and he decreed that the Jesuits would be responsible for preaching at the occasion. Landívar tells us (5) that Figueredo wanted to be buried in his black Jesuit cassock, but the Dean stipulated that his archepiscopal decorations should be worn as well so that 'the humble soutane will be exalted by pontifical dress'.[29] The lavish funeral was attended by both the diocesan and Jesuit chapters, the staff of the Royal University, other clergy, monks, and members of the local population. The Vigil was held at 4 pm on 7 August 1765, when Landívar delivered his oration in Latin. On the following day, at 9 am, a mass was celebrated at which Padre José Ignacio Vallejo preached in Spanish. The details of these arrangements were recorded in a small volume published in Puebla de los Angeles (now Puebla, Mexico) by decree of the Vice Provincial of the Society of Jesus in New Spain, Padre Pedro Reales. The date of publication for this book of 39 leaves – amounting to 73 printed pages – is given as 26 February 1766.

It is in this publication that Landívar's funeral declamation was first preserved. The long title of this short book will here be abbreviated to *El llanto de los ojos* ('The Weeping of the Eyes').[30] The title goes on to herald

Father Francisco Xavier Molina's account of the funeral, but no indication is given there of the other two discourses the book contains: Landívar's oration and Vallejo's Spanish sermon.[31] In his elaborate description of the funerary honours accorded to Figueredo, Molina mentions the Latin oration without naming Landívar:

> [When] the solemn Vigil ended with the final lesson which the Priest intoned, a Jesuit made an eloquent declamation in the Latin language.[32]

But Landívar's name *is* given in the extended title of his actual speech.[33] However its omission from the title page of *El llanto de los ojos* helps to explain why this prose oration has been so rarely read.[34]

The Declamation can still be admired as a literary endeavour, even in translation. It met an obligation – deeply felt by the Guatemalan Jesuits – to honour their defender and patron. Latin funeral orations were a common form of commemoration in New Spain:[35] Landívar explicitly says his aim is to ensure 'that the cause of our great grief may not ... lie hidden from posterity in all future ages' (2). The speech was meant to be appreciated long after the occasion of its twenty minute recital at the Vigil, and the period of just over six weeks between Figueredo's death and the funeral would have allowed good time for this address to be prepared – and it may well have been further refined for publication.

The Declamation has a traditional rhetorical structure: a formal preface or *exordium* (1) is followed by the elaboration of the reasons for the Society's grief. These constitute the main body (*narratio*) of the speech – which is carried forward by four major classical *exempla* or analogies (4-11). The text concludes with a forceful *peroratio* (12) incorporating a series of *apostrophes* or direct addresses – to Figueredo himself; to the Society of Jesus; to Libitina the Roman goddess of death; and finally, again, to the Society deprived of her son. That conceit – of Figueredo's relation to the Society as akin to the relation between a child and its parent – pervades the whole speech. The theme is introduced early on when Landívar says the Society has lost its 'best *son*' (2). The comparison is then complicated: Figueredo has also fulfilled the duties of the 'best of *parents*' (3). But the idea of Figueredo as child is what predominates, so that the Society, embodied by the audience of the oration, can be figured as a bereaved mother: *Societas* is a feminine noun in Latin.[36]

Two sustained classical *exempla* are determined by this general theme. The story of a mother killing herself after her son has been executed (6) is an illustration of *maternal* love to answer the questions Landívar has just posed to his audience at the end of the previous section: 'Should the Society not then recognise a man like this as a son? Should she not grieve at his most bitter passing? And will she not shed continuous tears?' (5). The next major illustration from ancient Rome involves *filial* love and piety. Landívar rehearses the famous story of a daughter who secretly breast-

feeds her mother to save her from dying of enforced starvation (8).[37] The connection of this narrative to the argument of the speech is engineered by a kind of multiple correspondence. Landívar's avowal that 'Figueredo deserves to have a monument consecrated to him in the hearts [of the Jesuits] for ever, as *Pietas* did long ago' (7) leads directly into the opening of his second story: 'Antiquity ensured that an ancient temple was built to Piety' (8). Aggravated by poverty and starvation, the Society of Jesus in Guatemala was 'on the very point of perishing' just as the condemned mother in Rome was 'wasting away with hunger'. The fact that Figueredo relieved the Society 'at his own expense' parallels the ingenuity and generosity of the daughter's action in sustaining her mother. Figueredo has 'well earned eternal commemoration' while the Roman daughter is 'surely worthy of immortality'.

We also discover Figueredo had drawn his own inspiration for his acts of filial piety from quite a different realm of classical learning altogether: Plato's saying that 'each man ought to realise that everything he possesses belongs to those who brought him forth and brought him up'(9).[38] The Declamation also involves a network of less developed conceits – notably the outpouring of grief is visualised as a flood (1); the flood is conjoined with imagery of war and physical disease (2), eventually becoming a torrent which breaks its banks (12).

Overall, the language is markedly classical; its style *resembles* Cicero more than it echoes him, although diction and devices from the *Catiline Orations* – a common model in this period – are echoed in places.[39] Landívar's speech exhibits the thorough absorption of a Latin idiom which, for the orator and his peers, was very much alive. The choice of appropriate words and expressions suggests genuine fluency rather than a laborious attempt to stitch together an array of phrases of ancient provenance. However, the two occasions on which classical authors are explicitly cited indicate that a conscious creative method is at work in the use of sources. The first is Figueredo's quotation of Plato (9), mentioned earlier. Landívar does not specify the source of that quotation, which comes from Plato's *Laws*:

> Next after these gods [of Olympus, of the State and of the Underworld] the intelligent man will offer worship to the daemons, and after them, to the heroes (*herôsi*). Following these are private shrines customarily dedicated to ancestral gods; and after those, the honours to living parents. To them, righteous law requires that *the debtor should pay back his first and greatest debt, the longest standing of all obligations, and he should consider that everything he has acquired and possesses belongs to those who brought him forth and brought him up*, so that he ought to be disposed to serve them to the utmost of his ability ....
>
> Plato, *Laws* 717b-c

The words Figueredo liked to quote are in italics – but the *whole* of this

passage must have been known to Landívar because Plato's advocation of reverence to heroes and ancestral gods seems to influence the direction the speech takes next. The Declamation proceeds to lay stress on the importance of celebrating the Archbishop's memory (10), and describes Figueredo's tomb as a place where 'reverent homage' (*prosequi reverentia*) can be paid to him. Thus Plato's recommendation that heroes and ancestors should be glorified, though not actually quoted by Landívar, still underlies what he goes on to say – and the sentiment will be amplified by consideration of the honours bestowed on military heroes in ancient Rome.

This point leads into the second explicit citation (at 11) of an antique author: the fourth-century AD Christian poet Aurelius Prudentius:

> Ijs, Prudentio teste, summam Roma reverentiam praestabat, eos laudibus efferebat, eosdem divinis non nunquam honoribus cumulabat.
>
> As Prudentius attests, Rome bestowed the highest reverence on these heroes, sounded out their praises, and on many occasions heaped divine honours upon them.
>
> Landívar, *Declamation* 11

Prudentius is then quoted, though not precisely. The first word italicised below marks an indisputable deviation from his original phrasing, and the next two words in italics indicate variant readings which are also significant:

> Et tot templa Deum (*inquit*) quot in *urbe* sepulchra
> Heroum numerare licet: quos fabula Manes
> Nobilitat, noster populus *veneratur*, adorat.
>
> 'There are as many temples of Gods', *he says*, 'that one may count as there are heroes' tombs in the *city*. Our people *venerates*, adores the dead who are glorified by legendary fame.'
>
> Landívar, *Declamation* 11

Here are the verses of Prudentius' poem as they appear in modern editions of the text:

> Et tot templa deum *Romae* quot in *orbe* sepulcra
> Heroum numerare licet, quos fabula Manes
> Nobilitat, noster populus *veneratus*, adorat.[40]
>
> There are as many temples of gods *in Rome* that one may count as there are heroes' tombs in the *world*. Our *reverential* people adore the dead, who are glorified by legendary fame.
>
> Prudentius, *Against the Oration of Symmachus* 1.190-2

Viewed together, these differences are critical, given the purpose and context of the original verses. Prudentius' poem was a forceful retort to a tract written by a proponent of paganism, Quintus Aurelius Symmachus in the 380s AD.[41] As prefect of Rome, Symmachus had argued that the Altar of Victory should be restored to the senate-house.[42] But Prudentius, who was a Christian, vigorously opposed this, and his opposition extended to the whole apparatus of paganism – and the veneration of heroes and ancestors to boot. The invective tone of his polemic makes that very clear indeed, as it leads up to the lines Landívar manipulated:

> This rumour or mistake [that it was the god Mars and not a nobleman who had raped Rhea Silvia] inclined our Italian ancestors to celebrate the rites of Mars on the field of Romulus, to inscribe on the Capitol (which was founded on the rocks of the Palatine) the names of their 'forefather' Jupiter and of the Greek goddess Pallas, to summon Juno from her seat in Carthage: these gods were related to Mars. This misapprehension also caused their leaders to fetch the nude figure of Venus from Mount Eryx, to carry the Phrygian mother of the gods from Mount Ida in Phrygia, and to import the Bacchic orgies from leafy Naxos. The majesty of earth-born divinities thus had one single residence [in Rome]: *there are as many temples of the gods in Rome that one may count as there are heroes' tombs in the world. Our reverential people adore the dead, who are glorified by legendary fame.*
>
> Prudentius, *Against the Oration of Symmachus* 1.180-92

Landívar completely reverses the late antique poet's original message and he positively encourages his audience to *revere* the memory of Figueredo. It is conceivable that Landívar simply reproduced the verses as he encountered them in an anthology. But in the case of an author like Prudentius, the substitution of *inquit* for *Romae* at least, is not so likely. Prudentius and other early Christian Latin writers had been commonly read since the Middle Ages and were prescribed to indigenous students of Latin in Mexico in the 1500s.[43] Prudentius' vehement opposition to idolatry would have found a new significance in the Indian colleges. The fact that Prudentius himself was a patriotic Roman who came from Spain, may have further enhanced his importance for New Spanish humanists.[44]

There are two indications that Landívar himself tampered with his source here. The first is circumstantial: Landívar exhibited knowledge of the original context of his previous classical citation from Plato (and copies of the *Laws* were rarer than texts of Prudentius). The second indication is internal: *inquit* ('he [Prudentius] says') is a definite modification of the original text. The word *inquit* is fitted into the hexameter verse, but that intrusion of 'he says' of course signals that what we are hearing cannot possibly be what Prudentius actually wrote. Such customisations of a passage to meet the needs of an occasion are not uncommon in humanist writing: this is a rhetorical declamation with social and religious objectives – not an academic treatise that needs to display scholarly precision.

Landívar is able to indulge an enthusiasm for the culture of pre-Christian Rome which Prudentius would not have shared. In this funeral address – a formal part of a Christian vigil – Landívar refers to Libitina (the Roman goddess associated with death) on three occasions (2 and 12), quotes from the Twelve Tables (11), and makes a pagan exclamation (5) *me hercle*: 'By Hercules!' He even compares Figueredo to Phoebus Apollo (9). Ancient pagan funeral practices are also commended, and the rites of the indigenous Guatemalans are described as well (3). That sole reference to aboriginal Americans in the Declamation is brief but, in a speech of this kind, it amounts to a meaningful recognition. It anticipates the kind of benign ethnographic observation to be found in the *Rusticatio Mexicana* – a work which relates Mesoamerican culture to European traditions of knowledge in a variety of ways.

While the Spanish sermon of Vallejo preached on the occasion of the funeral itself would have been comprehensible to a range of social groups in the congregation, Landívar's Latin oration would have been designed more exclusively for an ecclesiastical audience. The content of this address therefore had to complement that of the traditional sermon rather than reduplicate it. Landívar's elegant deployment of his learning and his capacity to endow the classical past with a palpable presence make the *Declamatio Funebris* a humanist *tour de force*.

(iii) Poetic monuments in miniature

José Ignacio Vallejo (or 'Ballejo'), who had preached at Figueredo's funeral as Superior at the Seminary of San Borja, also settled in Bologna.[15] There he wrote a life of Saint Joseph, and a study of Saint Joachim and Saint Anne, the parents of the Virgin Mary.[16] In 1779, Vallejo's *Vida de la Madre de Dios y siempre Virgen María* ('The Life of the Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary') was printed in Cesena. Rafael Landívar composed a Latin ode and a Castilian sonnet in honour of this biography of the Virgin. Both poems were presented on page 9 of Vallejo's published book.

The Latin ode establishes a delicate parallel between Vallejo and God himself. God, in his role as *workman* (*Opifex Deus* 13) offers Mary as a Virgin and Mother free from original sin (2-3), while Vallejo has produced a work (*opus* 22, 26) that cannot be sullied or defiled (24-8). The concision of the poem and its alcaic metre point to the model of Horace's *Odes*. But Landívar's composition does not follow the structure or central theme of any particular Horatian ode, and might well draw more direct inspiration from a later source.[17] However, at the end of his ode, Landívar assures Vallejo that his biography will secure his reputation for posterity:

> tuumque, Joseph, illustre nomen
> marmore perpetuabit Orbis.

> And the World will perpetuate in marble your own illustrious name, Joseph.
> Landívar, *Ode* 27-8.

That may well be a glancing reference to Horace's poetic characterisation of his own achievement:

> Exegi monumentum aere perennius
> regalique situ pyramidum altius,
> quod non imber edax, non Aquilo impotens
> possit diruere aut innumerabilis
> annorum series et fuga temporum.
>
> I have constructed a monument more enduring than bronze, higher than the regal setting of the pyramids, which neither the corroding rain nor the impotent North Wind can ever destroy, nor the countless series of years, nor the flight of time.
>
> Horace, *Odes* 3.30.1-5

This apparently tenuous echo of Horace might be confirmed by consideration of Landívar's accompanying sonnet.

The sonnet is the sole example of any writing by Rafael Landívar in Spanish. The superlative praise it bestows on Vallejo exemplifies the literary mannerism that was still prevalent at this time. The poem opens by asserting that the biographer's portrait of Mary is superior to anything that the fabled Greek painters Apelles and Protogenes could have achieved. Although such *ut pictura poesis* comparisons – derived from Horace, *Ars Poetica* 361 – were very common, this application of the topos here may specifically allude to the divine image of the Virgin on Juan Diego's cloak in Villerías' epic *Guadalupe*. That image was described as superior to 'anything impressive once accomplished by Zeuxis with his brush, or Protogenes of Rhodes or Coan Apelles' (4.101-2: *Quicquid periculo quondam admirabile Zeuxis,/Protogenesque dedit Rhodius, vel Cous Apelles*).[18]

Landívar describes Vallejo's *pluma* ('feather', 'quill') as following the flight of the Eagle of Saint John of the Apocalypse – John appeared to portray the Virgin Mary in the biblical book of Revelation. Vallejo's brush is so dextrous that it has been able to infuse the image of Mary with a life and soul. Landívar's Latin ode had also referred to Vallejo's 'brush' (*penicillo* 23), which adumbrated Mary's virtues, as Clio, the Muse of history, infused fire into the biographer's own soul. Both poems give Vallejo's Christian name in its Hebrew form, *Joseph*, in order to highlight its connection with Saint Joseph, the spouse of the Virgin.

There is an ode of Horace in which the poet's hope for literary immortality is conveyed by his imagined metamorphosis into a bird – with feathers growing from his shoulders (*nascunturque leves ... umerosque plumae* Horace, *Odes* 2.20.11-12). However, a well-known sonnet by the peninsular Spanish poet Luis de Góngora (1561-1627) provides a more

obvious model for Landívar's conceit of the *pluma.*[49] Góngora's sonnet, entitled *Para la cuarta parte de la 'Pontifical' del Doctor Babia*, was also written to celebrate a pious biographical endeavour – the lives of three popes completed by Luis Babia, chaplain of the Royal Chapel of Granada. In the sestet, a quill pen is also raised to celestial heights, and transformed:

> Pluma, pues, que claveros celestiales
> eterniza en los bronces de su historia,
> llave es ya de los tiempos, y no pluma.
>
> The quill, then, that renders heavenly keys eternal in the bronzes of its history, is now the key to times past, and not a quill.
>
> Góngora, *Soneto* 26.9-11

This may recall the indestructible records of the Fates in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, but Góngora's metaphor of the 'bronzes of history', in which the keys of heaven are forged, more obviously evokes Horace, *Odes* 3.30: the composition subtly echoed in Landívar's own Latin ode.[50] Thus Góngora and Horace are conjoined to provide a further, more recondite connection between Landívar's two poems. That conjunction of influences is of considerable interest. Horace's prescriptions on poetry were the essence of Neoclassicism.[51] Góngora, on the other hand, embodied the excesses of Baroque *seicentismo* so deplored by Tiraboschi and his fellow Hispanophobes: the particular verses evoked by Landívar are a celebrated example of that very tendency.[52] But it is worth noting that Alegre, though he was generally critical of Góngora, compared another of his sonnets – favourably and pointedly – to an ode by Horace.[53] Landívar's juxtaposition of the two poets becomes more significant in the light of this contemporary parallel.

That inclination to publish a Gongorine sonnet along with a Horatian ode should prompt pause for thought. Landívar is usually regarded as a Neoclassical author, but literary historical classifications should never be applied too rigidly – and European protocols of period and style are not always best applied to non-European writers. The review of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* to follow will underline the pluralistic quality of Landívar's poetics – a pluralism that is quite exceptional for eighteenth-century literature. But even if they are taken alone, the earlier writings surveyed in this chapter give ample proof of Rafael Landívar's ingenuity and technical accomplishment.

3

The Recollection of Arcadia: Conception and design in the *Rusticatio Mexicana*

(i) Reception of the poem

Prior to a *coup d'état* orchestrated by the United States' Central Intelligence Agency in 1954, Guatemala had enjoyed an exceptional decade of democracy and reform.[1] During those 'Ten Years of Spring', Rafael Landívar's contribution to his nation's literary heritage was officially recognised. Jorge Luis Arriola Ligorría, ambassador and champion of the 1944 revolution, located the poet's remains in Santa Maria delle Muratelle, and arranged their return from Bologna to Antigua. The year 1950, declared an *Año Landivariano* in honour of this event, saw the publication of a facsimile of the 1782 edition of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* in Guatemala and the foundation of a periodical dedicated to the study of Landívar.[2]

The *Rusticatio Mexicana* could have done little to establish its exiled author's reputation in his own lifetime, but Alexander von Humboldt referred to the poem in his *Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain*, printed in London in 1811 – less than twenty years after Landívar's death. Humboldt remarked that the eruption of the volcano of Jorullo in Michoacán was 'sung in hexameter verses by the Jesuit father Rafael Landívar'.[3] And in 1806, Juan María Maury had quoted a passage from the *Rusticatio Mexicana* in a note to his short narrative poem, *La agresión británica*, which was published in Madrid.[4] The Spanish literary historian, Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, claimed that his childhood reading of Maury's poem had aroused his 'immense curiosity to acquire and read' the *Rusticatio Mexicana*.[5] The work fully lived up to Menéndez y Pelayo's expectations. In his *Antología de poetas hispanoamericanos*, Spain's most eminent critic praised Rafael Landívar at length:

> He is one of the most excellent poets to be encountered in the domain of modern writing in Latin. We shall not hesitate to recognise in Father Landívar the astonishing qualities of a poet, who, in my judgement, failed only by not writing in the vernacular, so as to steal the palm from all the American poets in that category ... Not even in Rapin and Vanière do we find such fresh and ingenious inspiration, so great a richness of descriptive imagination, and so great a variety of forms and poetic resources ... The *Rusticatio* should not be considered as a poem that is restricted to agricultural themes like the four divine books of Virgil's *Georgics* ...it embraces

> much more, by providing a complete picture of nature and country life in Northern America: a rich and extensive assembly of physical peculiarities and social customs that are not known in Europe.[6]

There are indications that the Bologna edition of Landívar's poem had been circulating in Mexico by the early 1800s, though it was probably Menéndez y Pelayo's influential commendation that more or less directly led to a number of excerpts from the *Rusticatio Mexicana* being translated into Spanish verse towards the end of the nineteenth century.[7] The first complete renderings were both produced in Mexico in 1924: a prose version in a bilingual edition by Ignacio Loureda and Federico Escobedo's popular verse translation entitled *Geórgicas Mexicanas* – the 'Mexican *Georgics*'.[8]

Rafael Landívar is still regarded as an important poet in Guatemala, and a university has been named after him, even though the subject of his principal work was *Mexican* country life. The playfully rococo subtitle of the 1781 edition also lays emphasis on this: 'Some rather scattered things gathered from the fields of Mexico and arranged into ten books by Rafael Landívar'.[9] The poet explained in his prefaces to both editions of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* that he had chosen his title because the poem was mostly about Mexico. 'But it is also', he added, 'because I realise that all of New Spain is commonly called by the name of 'Mexico' in Europe, with no account taken of the different kingdoms.'[10] In fact the poem will refer to various parts of America: the third book is entirely devoted to Guatemala; and Landívar's verse dedication is addressed to his birthplace, the former Guatemalan capital, Santiago de los Caballeros. Those dedicatory verses, which convey the poet's nostalgia for his city (envisaged as a phoenix rising from the ruins of the 1773 earthquake) have been translated from Latin into the indigenous American languages of Quiché, Cakchiquel, and even Quechua, as well as into French, German, and Italian.[11]

A sense of pan-Hispanic cultural pride, which goes beyond any particular national enthusiasm, helps to account for the attention given to the *Rusticatio Mexicana* in the Spanish-speaking world.[12] Indeed the mistaken assumption that Landívar originally wrote the work in Spanish is not at all uncommon. The poem has certainly received far more critical acclaim than any other Latin text composed in the colonial period, and no assessment of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* can disregard its author's origins or the territories that are its subject. As a consequence, attempts to establish the work's merit on purely artistic grounds are bound to beg the question of whether a disinterested critical verdict is conceivable in a case like this. A major purpose, perhaps *the* major purpose, of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* was to impress upon European readers the wonder, beauty, and wealth of its author's American homeland. Even today the poem's literary value is to some extent bound up with its success in achieving that end.

(ii) Ancient and early modern influences

Shortly after Landívar begins his poem, he asserts that his themes are new and unprecedented. This assertion is made in an invocation to Apollo which could not be more classical in style:[13]

> Tu, qui concentus plectro moderaris eburno,
> Et sacras cantare doces modulamina Musas,
> Tu mihi vera quidem, sed certe rara canenti
> Dexter ades, gratumque melos largire vocatus.

> You who play with an ivory plectrum and teach the holy Muses to sing in rhythmic measures, you are at my right hand side as I have called you to bestow on me a sweet melody, as I sing of things which are in fact true but indeed strange.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.28-31

This novel subject matter – the geography, wildlife, traditions, and forms of production in the American countryside – will be enhanced by the poet's elegant display of humanist classical learning and Enlightenment scientific knowledge. The *Rusticatio Mexicana* draws from an astonishingly wide range of Greek and Roman authors including Homer, Hesiod, Lucretius, Horace, Ovid, Lucan, Pliny, and Apuleius; from prominent Renaissance humanists like Petrarch, Fracastoro, and Thomas More; and from later Latin writers as diverse as Melchior de Polignac and Athanasius Kircher. In his annotations to the poem Landívar also makes reference to Spanish vernacular poets, to natural historians of Europe and the New World, and to a number of other Jesuit scholars – some of whom were his compatriots or contemporaries.

The *Georgics* of Virgil provide the most obvious model for the idea of the *Rusticatio*. Virgil's classic accomplishment was at once a didactic poem about country life, a celebration of the land of Italy, and an ideological and ethical vision for Rome. Landívar's endeavour is comparably didactic: it imparts natural historical knowledge and techniques of cultivation and manufacture. And it is also driven by a moral commitment – to scientific investigation in tandem with Christian piety – which is tactfully conveyed throughout. But in place of Italy, Landívar commends the region of 'septentrional' America to the Italian readers of his own time.

Other features of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* were suggested by the *Georgics*. Like Virgil, Landívar devotes each individual book to a specific topic, and like Virgil, he is also prompted by those practical subjects to consider some broader concerns: urban life, war, miraculous events, and natural disasters. For Landívar, as for Virgil, mythology intrudes into the realm of lived experience: classical deities are invoked, and figures like Phoebus, Vulcan, and Bacchus personify aspects of the phenomenal world.[14] Landívar's presentation of the society of beavers in Book 6 of the *Rusticatio*

Mexicana exhibits an obvious debt to the description of the social life of bees in *Georgics* 4.149-250. Last but not least, Virgil provided Landívar with a poetic language, metre, and form. Federico Escobedo praised Landívar's imitation of Virgil's hexameters in the prologue to his 1924 translation: 'the imitation ... is not servile, but free and unencumbered.'[15] The *Rusticatio Mexicana* actually absorbs many more words and phrases from Virgil's *Aeneid* than it does from the *Georgics*.[16]

The Guatemalan critic José Mata Gavidia firmly dismissed what he called the 'the Virgilian myth': the view, prompted by Menéndez y Pelayo's assessment, that Landívar was an 'American Virgil'. For Mata Gavidia, who took into account the respective contexts in which Virgil and Landívar worked, such a comparison was far from apt:

> Virgil in the *Georgics* is the poet of the ideal of what the Roman citizen *ought to be* as he returns to farming; Landívar is the poet of the American countryside as it is. Virgil in the *Georgics* seeks to bring the Romans to a life in the country that is already lost, as he wants to incline them to the glorious agricultural past. Landívar does not sing of what ought to be, but of the excellences of the present of Northern America, and its countryside, which is superior to the marvels of the old world. Virgil writes his work in the midst of comfort and his patrons' generosity; Landívar creates a work born of the bitterness of an exile.[17]

These observations check the temptation to compare Landívar directly with Virgil, but they do not in any way diminish the importance of the *Georgics* for the *Rusticatio Mexicana*. An impression of their influence can be modified, however, by consideration of some related Latin texts which would have affected the way a poet like Landívar read and regarded the *Georgics*.

Four Roman prose works on agriculture survive from antiquity: Cato the Censor's utilitarian but chaotic treatise *De agri cultura*, dating from the 160s BC; the *Res Rusticae* ('Country Matters'), an engaging dialogue composed in 37 BC by the polymath Marcus Terentius Varro; the twelve books of Columella's *Res Rustica*, produced in the 60s AD; and fourteen books by a sixth-century writer, Palladius Rutilius Taurus Aemilianus. These ancient agricultural authorities, who became known in the Renaissance as the '*scriptores rei rusticae*', were first published together in Venice in 1472, and that collection went through several reprintings. Cato and Varro were also independently anthologised in New Spain. Varro, praised in antiquity by Quintilian as the 'most erudite Roman of all', was especially venerated in the middle ages and the Renaissance: Petrarch hailed him as the third great luminary of Rome, after Cicero and Virgil.[18] Unexciting as these studies of farming from Roman antiquity may seem today, the classical idealisation of rustic life fascinated early modern readers and inspired a strong tradition of humanist Latin poetry on aspects of agriculture and country living.

A seminal text in that tradition was the *Rusticus* ('The Countryman'), published in Florence during the 1480s by Angelo Ambrogini Poliziano, or 'Politian', the most renowned scholar of the Medici circle. The *Rusticus* was one of his *Silvae,* a series of Latin hexameter poems on literary subjects. Politian's work was evidently known in Mexico from the later 1500s: the *Silvae* in particular were widely read in European countries including Spain, and their popularity continued well into the eighteenth century.[19] Politian made a collation of the 1472 *editio princeps* of the *scriptores rei rusticae* from a codex in the library of San Marco in Florence – and Cato, Varro, and Columella supplemented Virgil and Hesiod as the key sources for his *Rusticus.*[20] As the *Rusticus* described and praised the life and activities of the countryman through the different seasons of the year in only 569 verses, the text was more morally didactic than technically instructive. Some scientific observation is communicated, but Politian's achievement really consists in his poetic virtuosity and knowledge of ancient literature about rustic life.

The portrait of the countryman in the *Rusticus* is an important model for the *Rusticatio Mexicana* in some more detailed respects. First, the *Rusticus* synthesised the prescriptions of Virgil's didactic poetry with the 'bucolic' or 'pastoral' modes of his *Eclogues*: the shepherd Tityrus (who represents Virgil) passes Politian a pipe and asks him to renew the 'Ascraean song' – the archaic verse of the Greek didactic poet Hesiod.[21] Landívar likewise blends didactic with pastoral (along with elements of epic) in his own composition: numerous phrases from Virgil's *Eclogues* are recalled, and some of those allusions are developed and sustained.[22] Secondly, Politian set a precedent for Landívar by accommodating a cosmopolitan range of sources in prose and verse which went far beyond Virgil, Hesiod, and the Roman *scriptores rei rusticae*: Lucretius, Pliny, Claudian, Julius Pollux, and Politian's own Italian poetry are among the influences involved.[23] And rather in the way Virgil originally professed to apply Hesiod's *Works and Days* to a new Roman scenario by composing the *Georgics* in the first place, Politian grafted the classical accounts of farming onto an idealised vision of the Tuscan countryside.[24] Landívar goes further still by transplanting ancient rustic lore to an exposition of country life in the New World.

Other humanist poets of the Italian Renaissance whose didactic works would have been known to Landívar include Giovanni Pontano and Marco Girolamo Vida.[25] However, two later neo-Latin poems, both published in Paris by French Jesuits and both read in New Spain in the 1700s, were very important for the *Rusticatio Mexicana*: René Rapin's four book poem on gardens, *Hortorum Libri IV* (1665), and Jacques Vanière's *Praedium Rusticum* ('The Country Estate'), which first appeared in 1707.[26] Though it followed Virgil's *Georgics* in form and structure, Rapin's *Horti* took into account the gardening fashions in his own time, as well as earlier developments in France in the mid-1500s. An idea of the sublime seems to have

informed the close of Rapin's third book on the decorative use of water, where 'great sheets of water, and canals like rivers' are associated with a 'majesty' – which turns out to be the *majestas* of the Louis XIV himself.[27] Landívar too associates waterfalls with his own *criollo* appropriation of sublimity (discussed below at pp. 62-4).

Rapin's work is less redolent of the weightier Roman *scriptores* than the sixteen books of Vanière's *Praedium Rusticum* – although Vanière ranged far beyond his sources (which included Charles Estienne's earlier *Praedium Rusticum*, a Latin prose treatise on gardening produced in the later 1500s).[28] In the course of composing his verse *Praedium*, Vanière gradually came to eschew mythological illustrations and anecdotes. The tone of his poem is more solemnly didactic than that of the *Rusticatio Mexicana*, but alone of Landívar's literary influences Vanière has the special distinction – denied even to Virgil – of being openly acknowledged as a model. The epigraph on the frontispiece of the 1782 edition of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* was taken from the first book of the *Praedium Rusticum* and a second tribute is paid to Jacques Vanière in the actual text of Landívar's poem:[29]

> Quis tamen has memoret, postquam Vanierius omnes
> Providus implevit pretioso munere chortes,
> Aoniamque tulit, Phoebo plaudente, coronam?

> Who may tell of these [hens], now that provident Vanière has filled every poultry-yard with the generous gift of his song and carried away an Aonian crown, to Phoebus' applause?
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 13.23-5

Landívar's apparently unprepossessing title, which can be translated awkwardly as 'Mexican Country Living', is supposed to signal both a debt to the earlier writers who addressed rustic subjects and an aspiration to contribute to a potent and vital current of early modern literature. Even if this brief survey of prototypes for the *Rusticatio Mexicana* can only give a limited impression of their presence in the poem, the complex genealogy of Landívar's project should at least be clear: it involves much more than the imitation of Virgil's *Georgics*. It is worth emphasising again that Landívar also draws from sources in modern vernacular languages as well as in Latin. The influence of those scientific sources is first made evident in the prose preface which complements the literary tone of the initial verse dedication. The expression of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* lies somewhere between the divergent styles of these two short prefatory texts, which will now be considered in turn.

(iii) Dedication to Guatemala City

At the beginning of this short composition, the poet visualises Guatemala from afar: 'how I enjoy rehearsing your delights in my *mind*' (*Quam juvat*,

Alma, animo pervolvere dotes 3); 'Now I *seem* to see your leafy mountains' (*Jam mihi frondosos videor discernere montes* 5). Landívar is recollecting features of his native territory that provide him with 'sweet relief in dire circumstances' (*inque arctis rebus dulce levamen* 14).[30] Such expressions in elegiac couplets recall the way Ovid envisaged Rome in his exile poetry.[31] An Ovidian resonance is especially conspicuous when Landívar snaps out of his reverie:

> Sed fallor: placidam, Ah versant ludibria mentem,
> Illuduntque animo somnia vana meo.
>
> But I am deceived: my tranquil mind is shaken by the taunts of empty dreams that play with my heart.
>
> *Urbi Guatimalae* 15-16

These lines themselves play a trick on readers familiar with the Roman poet. Anyone who detects this reminiscence might expect Landívar to turn (as Ovid would at this point) to the hardships of his exile. But Landívar does not mention his absence from his city. Instead he is concerned with the disappearance of the city itself, which is now 'a heap of stones', with no houses, no temples, no streets full of people. An earthquake destroyed Santiago de los Caballeros in 1773: a brief but harrowing account of the event is given later in *Rusticatio Mexicana* 3.47-60. Here in the dedication, the disaster is likened to everything being 'struck by the winged fires of Jove' (*Jovis alatis ignibus icta forent* 22). The comparison is appropriate enough, and probably rather more so than Ovid's use of similar words in *Tristia* 1.3.11 (*qui Jovis ignibus ictus*) to convey how he was *emotionally* affected by the decree which relegated him to Tomis from Rome.

Landívar's next verse takes another unexpected turn: 'But why do I grieve at this?' Expectations of a reference to exile are frustrated again. The poet's answer to his own question could not be more uplifting: 'Rising from the tomb are high buildings, lofty temples are soaring into the sky' (*Surgunt ... sepulcro* 24). This suggests Christian resurrection, and other religious intimations are latent:

> Jamque optata venit civibus alma quies.
>
> Now comes the bountiful peace the citizens longed for.
>
> *Urbi Guatimalae* 26

The theological import of the famous words *Jam redit et Virgo* ('Now returns the Virgin'), from Virgil, *Eclogue* 4.6 might be in play – that pagan coinage acquired a Christian significance because Virgil's fourth 'Messianic' Eclogue was long thought to have predicted the birth of Christ. The word *alma* ('bountiful') which has associations with maternity, was earlier used of Guatemala in verse 3. The poet's 'dear Parent, sweet Guatemala'

(1) is, like Mary, a 'parent coming back to life' (*rediviva Parens* 29), and, in the phrase 'a manifest triumph *born* from sudden death' (*clarum subita partum de morte triumphum* 31), the word *partum* connotes childbirth.

The theme of maternity was prominent in Landívar's funeral declamation for Archbishop Figueredo, and the Virgin Mary was the subject of his short poems. But further associations are made here between the city of Guatemala and the Virgin Mary. The Assumption of the Virgin, which commemorates the passage of Mary's body and soul to heaven – one of the most important feast days in the Roman Catholic calendar – falls on 15 August. The hopeful significance of the Assumption, only two weeks after the 1773 earthquake on 29 July, would not have been lost on survivors of the catastrophe. Two years before, Landívar's own mother had died during the octave of that feast, on 18 August 1771 – something which could well be relevant to this composition. There is a more delicate connection to the Virgin in these lines of the *Urbi Guatimalae*. A description of newly built temples rising up to the sky and an image of springs swelling into a river had also been conjoined in Alegre's verses to the Virgin of Guadalupe at the end of his *Alexandriad*:

> Anthius, ac placidis foecundat jugera limphis,
> Et Guadalupaei surgunt felicia templi
> Culmina, pinnatoque minantur in aethera clivo.
>
> And [the river] Anthius makes the hills fertile with its peaceful waters, and the turrets of the Guadalupan temple rise and push into heaven on a winged ascent.
>
> Alegre, *Alexandriad* 4.581-3

Landívar would have known these verses about the construction of the temple to the Virgin in Mexico.[32] Possibly they prompted him to hail the city of Guatemala as a 'spring and source of life' (*vitae fons, et origo* 2), and a connection between the Virgin and running water is made much more fully in Book 12, on *Fontes* ('Springs'). There, a description of the healing powers of the salt springs near the shrine of the Virgin of Guadalupe is followed by an account of their role in the Virgin's miraculous apparition (12.12-56).

A number of thematic elements in the *Urbi Guatimalae* recur in the *Rusticatio Mexicana* – Landívar's implicit references to his exile are among them. This opening poem is thus endowed with a programmatic significance. The resurrection of his city as 'Mother' is a 'manifest triumph' (*clarum ... triumphum* 31), born out of sudden death which the poet seeks to celebrate on his lyre (*plectrum ... Accipe* 33-4). That is echoed in the *Appendix* by the celebration of Christ's resurrection, before God as 'Father':

> Tu sola Omnipotens summi Sapientia *Patris*,
> Provida quae toto terrarum ludis in orbe
> Cuncta regens uno mundi confinia nutu,
> Dextra fave, dum *plectra* manu percussa trementi
> Certa tui celebrant *clari* monimenta *triumphi*.
>
> You alone, Omnipotent Wisdom of the supreme *Father*, who are providently at play in all the lands of the earth, ruling over all the confines of the world with a single nod, be gracious, as my *plectrum*, struck by my trembling right hand celebrates the unfailing memorial of your *manifest triumph*.
>
> *Appendix* 16-20

In this and other ways the supplementary beginning of the work is linked to the account of the Cross of Tepic in Mexico at the end.[33]

The term 'Appendix' belies the importance of that final section, as it brings the whole composition to a formal close and also recalls the dedication which first heralded it. Taken together, the dedication and *Appendix* nicely epitomise the spatial and topical range of the entire poem: the city of Guatemala offers a contrast to the rural location of Tepic, which has no large or impressive buildings (*App.* 33-43). Other features shared by these opening and closing texts characterise other aspects of the *Rusticatio Mexicana*: a strong devotional element (*App.* 11-20); reference to the poet's own sorrows – and to song as a remedy for them (*Urb. Guat.* 33-4, *App.* 101); and the benign hopes expressed for his addressees – the poet who promised the inhabitants of Guatemala City a peaceful future (*Urb. Guat.* 23-34) later urges a youth to cast aside past ideas in favour of 'new' Enlightenment thought (*App.* 94-112).

Finally, the curious action of beginning a study of the countryside with the mention of a *city* has a very significant precedent: Tityrus' enthusiastic description of Rome to Meliboeus, in the first of Virgil's *Eclogues*. Indeed an observation on the *Rusticatio Mexicana* by Antony Higgins – that it was 'presented as the fruit of a humanist labour to be offered in the service of a city envisaged as the capital of a state' – could just as well apply to that encomium of Rome in Virgil's pastoral poem.[34] Even so, Mexico City generally looms large in the poetry of New Spain. In particular, it was the subject of *La Grandeza Mexicana* (1604), a celebrated vernacular panegyric in eight 'chapters' by Bernardo de Balbuena.[35] It is no accident that the history of the *Urbs Mexicus* (1.32) is the very first topic to be addressed in the first book of the *Rusticatio Mexicana*.

(iv) The defences in the Preface

The scholarly tone of Landívar's prose preface stands in contrast to the more personal expression of his poetic dedication. The poet first explains his use of the word *Mexicana* in the title (see (i) earlier in this chapter) before laying stress on the veridical quality of his work. What he will

relate, he says, he has either seen himself, or ascertained on the authority of reliable eyewitnesses. This assertion is strikingly similar to one that can be found in the preface to another book on the natural history of Chile, by another Spanish American Jesuit, Juan Ignacio Molina:

> I have seen and observed constantly the things that I state. Not content with my own judgment, I have consulted impartial writers, worthy of respect for their knowledge, who have been [to America], and they endorse all my observations.[36]

Molina's *Saggio sulla storia naturale del Chili* came out in Bologna in 1782 – the very same city and year in which the second, extended version of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* was published. Molina's preface was a pointed response to the criticisms of America by Europeans, including De Pauw, who had never travelled there – and his essay was effectively a *defence* of Chile and the Americas. Landívar is more tactful, just as he was in giving his reason for his choice of title: he merely hinted at European ignorance of New Spain. Nonetheless, his appeal to the value of eyewitness accounts indicates that he, like Molina, saw autoptic testimony as the best response to the anti-American polemics of Buffon, De Pauw, and others.[37]

Next Landívar expresses two caveats. The first is an admission that he could have said more about mines. Mining did have an important role in the economy and society of colonial Mexico and had also come to be a common subject of neo-Latin didactic poetry, but still this remark is odd.[38] Few would expect a detailed treatment of the industry in a poem about *rusticatio* – i.e. country living or husbandry. The account of gold and silver mining in Book 7 and the subsequent book, on processing the metals, appear to provide adequate coverage. Landívar's second caveat is no less curious:

> Lector benevole, te monitum velim, more me poetico locuturum, quoties-cumque inanium Antiquitatis numinum mentio inciderit.
>
> Kind Reader, I would like you to be advised that I will be talking in a poetic way every time mention is made of the meaningless divine powers of Antiquity.
>
> *Monitum*

As Greek and Roman deities had adorned Christian humanist poetry since the 1300s, such a proviso seems rather unnecessary. One possible reason for this declaration could be that Landívar is seeking to mark the divergence of his own poetic practice from the more literal style of his predecessor, the Jesuit didactic poet, Jacques Vanière.[39]

The last part of the *Monitum* is concerned with the way in which the poem's content is to be expressed. The writer emphasises that he has above all striven for clarity in his ambitious attempt to convey difficult material

in Latin verse, and that he has reworked or 'recalled to the anvil' his coverage of subjects that are more widely known. The image of the anvil and Landívar's characterisation of his procedure here ('making several changes, adding some things, removing others') reflect precisely the methods of composition recommended by Horace:

> Quintilio si quid recitares, 'corrige, sodes,
> hoc', aiebat, 'et hoc'. melius te posse negares
> bis terque expertum frustra, delere iubebat
> et male tornatos incudi reddere versus.

> If you were to read anything out to Quintilius, he would say 'Correct this, if you don't mind – and this.' Should you say you could do no better after making two or three vain attempts, he would ask you to destroy them and take your badly turned verses back to the anvil.
>
> Horace, *Ars Poetica* 438-41

Horace also attacks 'ambitious ornament', ambiguous phrasing, and obscurity a few lines later (*Ars* 447-9). Landívar is aligning his own poetic principles with those advanced in the *Ars Poetica* – that text had come to be a talisman as much as a manual of Neoclassical poetics. The *Monitum* closes with two elegiac couplets quoted from a 'Golmarius Marsiglianus' which lament the difficulty of conveying topics in a metre that might resist the subject matter.[40]

The general principles of the *Monitum* are reflected in Landívar's poem; and its academic tone is echoed in the poet's own annotations to the text. Those notes can explain references by adding further details of nomenclature and topography, they can affirm the writer has seen the things he describes, or else they cite – often at length – respectable authorities to substantiate certain observations: the *Dictionnaire raisonné universel d'histoire naturelle* published in 1768-9 by Jacques-Christophe Valmont de Bomare is a favoured source.[41] Occasionally, the notes justify or explain Landívar's Latin usage – again this seems to be in order to anticipate and avert possible criticism – and they clearly display the writer's close knowledge of the language.[42] Through those annotations, which originally appeared as footnotes below the pages of the actual text in the 1782 printing, the author probably sought to regulate, to some degree at least, the responses of readers to his poem.

(v) Epic structure and scientific form

The strategies Landívar used to win over his readers in Italy evidently succeeded: the second edition of the poem appeared only one year after the first. A coda to the 1781 text indicates that the poet had anyway planned to extend the original length of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* for the second edition, from ten books to fifteen.[43] The *Appendix* of 112 verses was also

added. The sequence of topics of the books in that definitive second edition is curious at first sight: Mexican lakes, volcanoes, Guatemalan waterfalls, cochineal and purple, indigo, beavers, silver and gold mines, processing of silver and gold, sugar, horses and cattle, flocks and herds, springs, birds, wild animals, and games.

All that can be discerned from such a list are certain clusterings: features of physical geography in Books 1-3; processes of production and manufacture in 4-9 with the exception of 6 (though the beavers treated in that book are industrious creatures); animals in 10-14 (with the exception of 12 which is about springs) and a description of local sports and games in 15. The system of organisation can be explained by a comparison of these contents with those of the first edition of the poem:

First edition: Modena 1781	*Second edition: Bologna 1782*	
	Dedicatory verses to Guatemala City	
Monitum: Preface (4 paragraphs)	*Monitum*: Preface (5 paragraphs)	
	Librorum Index: Titles of books	
	Argumenta: Summary of poem	
	Errata	
Book 1: Mexican Lakes	Book 1: Mexican Lakes	[*Lacus Mexicani*]
Book 2: Jorullo (volcanoes)	Book 2: Jorullo (volcanoes)	[*Xorulus*]
Book 3: Guatemalan Waterfalls	Book 3: Guatemalan Waterfalls	[*Cataractae Guatimalenses*]
Book 4: Cochineal and Purple	Book 4: Cochineal and Purple	[*Coccum, et purpura*]
	Book 5: Indigo	[*Indicum*]
Book 5: Beavers	Book 6: Beavers	[*Fibri*]
Book 6: Silver and gold mines	Book 7: Silver and gold mines	[*Fodinae argenti atque auri*]
Book 7: Silver & gold refining	Book 8: Silver & gold refining	[*Argenti, atque auri opificium*]
	Book 9: Sugar	[*Saccharum*]
	Book 10: Horses/Cattle	[*Armenta*]
	Book 11: Herds/Flocks	[*Greges*]
	Book 12: Springs	[*Fontes*]
Book 8: Birds	Book 13: Birds	[*Aves*]
Book 9: Wild animals	Book 14: Wild animals	[*Ferae*]
Book 10: Games	Book 15: Games	[*Ludi*]
	Appendix: The Cross of Tepic	[*Crux Tepicensis*]

The first edition roughly followed a tripartite scheme (Landscape – Production – Zoology/Ethnography), which was loosened by the addition of extra books for the second edition. It may be relevant that other full length poems in Latin by Landívar's Mexican contemporaries set little store by traditional conventions of length and arrangement: Abad's *De Deo* was also composed in instalments, and Alegre's *Alexandriad* breaks from standard classical practice by treating its martial subject in only four short books.

In any case, the *Rusticatio Mexicana* should certainly not be regarded

as a farraginous assemblage. The poet specifically indicates the order of his narrative (*RM* 1.7-17; 7.1-5; *App.* 1-10), as if he is taking his addressee on a virtual excursion. The text is supposed to be read in a linear way, in the sequence in which it is presented, like a lecture course in which elements of information are presented, neither chronologically nor according to their actual importance, but so that they can be best enjoyed and comprehended by those listening. The first few books soon establish some crucial points of reference. They provide a basic mapping of Mexico and Guatemala, with details of flora, fauna, history, and culture. The important tales of the two cities of Mexico (1.32-6) and Guatemala (3.11-60) are told early on (with some formulaic parallels between them); the city of Oaxaca is described as well (4.12-15).

At least one thematic device in the poem works to give the impression of an overarching structure. *Katabases* or journeys to the world of the dead mark the midpoint of the stories of Homer's *Odyssey* and Virgil's *Aeneid*. The third of the six books of Lucretius' didactic poem *De rerum natura* ('On the Nature of Things') is also concerned with death and the mortality of the soul. Landívar pays homage to these distinguished precedents by inserting a journey to the Underworld in a central book of his own poem. The introduction to the account of gold and silver mining is as follows:

> Nunc coelum linquo, nunc terrae lapsus ad ima
> Aggredior cantu, Plutonis regna, fodinas;
> Regna refulgenti semper radiata metallo,
> Et quae divitiis complerunt prodiga mundum.
> Tu, qui pennatis telluris viscera plantis
> Saepe subis, clara munitus lampade dextram
> Advenias, monstresque viam, lumenque ministres
> Obsecro ...

> Now I leave the light of heaven, now descending to the lower parts of the earth with my song, I come upon the realms of Pluto, the mines, realms ever gleaming with shining metal, and which abundantly supply the world with wealth.
>
> You, as you often go down to the bowels of the earth on winged feet, I beg you to come equipped with a clear torch, to show the way and provide a light...
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 7.6-13

Virgil's invocation of the gods of the underworld in *Aeneid* 6.264-7 appears to be echoed in these lines, and the darkness of the mine will enable Landívar to recall further poetic devices from the sixth book of the *Aeneid*. His account of mining correspondingly constituted the *sixth* book of the original 1781 edition of the *Rusticatio Mexicana*. The figure of the torch-bearer addressed in the passage quoted above also sustains this evocation of the classical Underworld. By his winged feet, the figure is recognisable as Mercury, who functioned as the mediator between the dead and the

living; appropriately enough, the god also supervised the circulation of goods and commodities.[14] But Landívar's plea to the torch-bearer most obviously recalls the invocation of Epicurus from the proem of Lucretius' book on death:

> E tenebris tantis tam clarum extollere lumen
> Qui primus potuisti inlustrans commoda vitae,
> Te sequor, O Graiae gentis decus, inque tuis nunc
> Ficta pedum pono pressis vestigia signis
>
> You, who out of such great darkness first managed to raise so great a light, illuminating the benefits of life, I follow you, O glory of the Greek race, and I now firmly plant my own steps along the trail you laid down.
>
> Lucretius, *De rerum natura* 3.1-4

This metaphor of illumination is quite appropriate for Landívar, given that the Epicurean scientific principles advanced in the *De rerum natura* had such importance for the Enlightenment. And that particular Lucretian evocation is especially appropriate to headline a book about the excavation of precious metals, since Lucretius had emphatically declared in the very same proem (*De rerum natura* 3.12-13), that Epicurus' words were *golden* (*aurea dicta, aurea*). The close of Landívar's *katabasis* on mining also sustains his own application of Lucretius' mock-heroic mode, by listing the crimes of those who occupy a new version of Tartarus: the wayward occupants of this subterranean realm are all very much alive (7.302-19).[15]

A basic structural feature is also discernible in the individual books of the *Rusticatio*. The books are informally divided into smaller blocks of verse of uneven length, mostly consisting of between 10 and 25 hexameters. In the 1782 text, a paragraph indentation marks the beginning of each such segment. Later editors, including Regenos (in this volume), set apart these groupings of verses, as if they were stanzas. This is justified because Landívar himself conceived of these groupings in a lengthy analytic breakdown of the whole poem.[16] An impression of this can be given by an excerpt from the first part of the *Argumentum* for Book 14:

> *Facta propositione, & invocatione, a v.* 1. *ad* 8. *sylva describitur, a* 9. *ad* 14.
> *Bobis jubati* (Cibolo) *descriptio, ejusque furoris, a* 15. *ad* 35. *eum venandi ratio, a* 36. *ad* 50.
>
> *Propositio* and *invocatio* pronounced, from verse 1 to 8. A wood is described, from 9 to 14.
> Description of the maned ox (*bison*), and of its fierce temper, from 15 to 35. Method of hunting it, from 36 to 50.

Vernacular equivalents (in Spanish, Italian, or Mesoamerican languages) of some Latin words are the only data in the *Argumenta* which are not

always supplied in the poem. As they are of thus little benefit to English readers, the *Argumenta* have not been included in this volume.

However, the technical terms – *propositio* and *invocatio* – which are employed in Landívar's analytic resumés, to anatomise the opening verses of each book, offer a very important general insight. A *propositio* was the term for the statement of what was to be covered or proven in a lecture or treatise; the *invocatio,* to a god, muse, or tutelary deity, is a common feature of poetic literature.[17] The beginning of every book in the *Rusticatio* thus initiates a dialectic between two kinds of writing: the intellectual discourse of science and natural history on the one hand, and the artistic and more subjective discourse of poetry on the other. This paradigm for the individual books reflects the way the work as a whole fluctuates between the sober protocols of the introductory *Monitum* and the more emotional tone of the dedicatory elegiacs to Guatemala City.

The opening of Book 4 nicely illustrates the complexities of interaction between the knowledge conveyed and the art which conveys it. First, the *propositio*:

> Postquam Neptuni vitreos invisimus agros,
> Regnaque Vulcani tremulis armata favillis,
> Visere fert animus roseum cum Murice Coccum,
> Ac totum fixis oculis lustrare laborem.

> Now we have seen Neptune's crystal fields and the realms of Vulcan armed with restless embers, my spirit moves me to view the rosy cochineal and murex, and to fix the gaze of my eyes on their toil.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 4.1-4

The language referring to the volcanos and waterfalls of the preceding books is conspicuously elevated. The expression *fert animus* ('my spirit moves me') echoes the first verse of Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*[18] Conversely, the subsequent *invocatio* to the goddess Minerva, though it includes a reference to the myth of Arachne, soon turns to some rather technical questions:

> Tu, quae puniceo, Tritonia Virgo, colore
> Intextos auro Regum perfundis amictus,
> Et Lydam laetaris acu vicisse puellam;
> Dic mihi, quae dederit regio tibi provida fucos
> Atque orbem Cocco, tyrioque impleverit Ostro;
> Quis legat haec campis, quae mittant semina terrae,
> Et quo nascantur regalia germina cultu.

> You, Tritonian Maiden, who perfuse with a purple hue the garments of kings interwoven with gold, and who delight in having defeated the Lydian girl at the needle, tell me what region provided your dyes and filled the world with

> cochineal and Tyrian purple, tell me who gathers them in the fields, what lands put forth the seeds, and by what process these regal shoots may grow.
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 4.5-11

The *propositiones* and *invocationes* are subject to as much fluctuation as the material they preface. The literary allusion to Arachne's downfall in this invocation (the Lydian maiden lost a weaving contest with Minerva, who turned her into a spider) will bear on the technical content of Book 4.[49] It is emphasised later (4.94-123) that the vengeful spider, actually referred to as *Arachne* (4.116), poses the most constant, lethal threat to the precious cochineal beetles.

The two features of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* that have been highlighted here – its oscillation between technical and poetic modes and the subdivision of its constituent books into small segments – are designed to secure and maintain the reader's attention as the poem adheres to its educational agenda. The fluctuation between the two modes provides ornament and variety, whilst the segmentation of the text achieves a cinematic effect, allowing the same subjects to be treated from different perspectives – from distant historical or spatial vantage points, as well as in 'close-up'. The segmentation also allows the poet to abandon a topic briefly, and then return to it: adversative words (*sed*, *tamen*, *interea*) often mark the beginning of such smaller units of the poem.

Although Landívar offers many compelling vignettes, there are no stories comparable to the mythological digressions in Roman didactic poetry – such as the Aristaeus epyllion in Virgil's *Georgics* or the Andromeda interlude in Manilius' *Astronomica*.[50] However, a sustained narrative is used in the second book of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* to convey the effect of a volcanic eruption.[51] An unknown old man appears in the region of Jorullo to prophesy its destruction. Some of his words echo Virgil: 'I see rocks of fire, horrid rocks of fire, rolling across the fields' (*RM* 2.76).[52] The seer's white beard and coarse clothing bring to mind the image of an Old Testament prophet: he is later compared to Jonah (2.92-3), who was also unknown in Nineveh.[53] The stranger's prediction is couched in classical language (2.71-7). At the same time, this very use of calendrical knowledge recalls the methods of divination practised in Mesoamerica before the Spanish conquest. So it is appropriate that the *indigenous* countrymen (*indigenae*) pay heed to the stranger's words, which are spread through neighbouring towns and cities by the winged figure of Rumour. But none of this impresses the *criollo* landowner (*colonus*). In his own speech, which is based on Ascanius' reproach to the Trojan women in *Aeneid* 5.670-3, he rebukes the natives for their 'feminine' cowardice in seeking to leave behind their ancestral homes and gods (2.104-11). The landowner's oration has barely finished when the earth is heard to groan and the fearful catastrophe begins (2.114-27). A priest makes the third and final speech (2.151-6), urging the people to obey heaven's will and avoid

imminent death by taking flight.[54] The narrator's factual account of the eruption that follows (2.184-94) is supported by the empirical observations in Landívar's notes to this passage.

This miniature epic is principally modelled on Virgil's account of the fall of Troy, although other classical sources – notably Lucretius, Lucan, and Pliny – heighten its impact.[55] The speaking personages are there to offer a succession of human perspectives on the natural catastrophe: Landívar artfully does not give them names or flesh out their identities. The dramatic narrative is subordinated to the argument of the second book – and it is telling that readers never seem to feel the absence of speaking characters in the other books of the poem. The combination of pace and variety removes the need for elaborate digressions or dramatic interludes in the *Rusticatio Mexicana*.

(vi) Exile and the poet's voice

Landívar's poetic persona is a construction of elegant simplicity, inconspicuous enough to facilitate engagement with some very technical topics. The narrator is sometimes explicitly located in Italy (2.301, *App.* 100), sometimes implicitly (e.g. 1.32, 12.277-82, 14.17). On other occasions he situates himself in an American location: for example in Book 13, he seems to be directly encountering the birds he describes. Occasionally, the poet seems to place his addressee in the settings he conjures up, and the use of the second-person singular is particularly dense in some books, e.g. 7 and 14. As well as securing, again, a rich variety of approaches to the subjects addressed, these rhetorical modifications make the voice of the poet more enigmatic and harder to fathom. In this regard, it is worth considering the extent to which innovative use of the first person had long been a characteristic of vernacular Spanish poetry and prose.

Rafael Landívar is often regarded as a writer of exile poetry. This could be because awareness of his historical position – as a victim of colonial oppression – has affected the assessment of his literary achievement. The Spanish word for an 'exile', *destierro,* literally means 'one who is torn from the land': a word which has all the more poignancy when applied to the writer of a poem *about* land. Nonetheless, it is important to realise that the issue of exile is never very directly addressed in the *Rusticatio Mexicana*.[56] Landívar does not write autobiographically, and he certainly does not indulge in the mannered self-fashioning that is so characteristic of Ovid's plangent poems from the Black Sea. Instead he refers in more general terms to his 'grief' or *cura*, and always counterbalances such references by immediately turning to the more heartening consideration of his poetic enterprise – implying that it is the solution to his predicament. (1.18-27, 12.277-89, *App.* 94-101). This bears out a common observation about the condition of exile: 'habits of life, expression, or activity in the new environment inevitably occur against the memory of these things in

another environment ... both the new and the old environments are vivid, actual, occurring contrapuntally'.[57]

The latter part of Book 2 of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* provides an example of this 'contrapuntal' interaction. Having recounted the disastrous effects of volcanic eruptions on the valley of Jorullo, the poet describes how – as he was composing verses by the river Reno in an attempt to distract himself from his preoccupations (2.300-1) – he witnessed the city of Bologna being overturned by an earthquake. The ensuing chaos and panic offer a parallel to the aftermath of the calamity in Mexico described earlier. Landívar seeks to explain the new Italian catastrophe in poetic terms: Mount Vesuvius is characterised as 'begrudging' Bologna's stability, after having laid Naples to waste so many times. This aetiology is then underlined by a more scientific argument. Vesuvius, we are told, directs his fire, personified by Vulcan, to follow a vein of sulphur through a series of subterranean passages until it reaches a cavern beneath Bologna. The combustible gases compressed there are then ignited. The theory resembles some Greco-Roman accounts of volcanic activity, which had been synthesised by early modern scholars, including the seventeenth-century German Jesuit polymath Athanasius Kircher – an enormously influential thinker in New Spain.[58]

However, Landívar substantiates his theory by appealing to a precedent witnessed in Mexico: the volcanic mountain of Colima became dormant only to send a stream of fire underground which prompted Jorullo to erupt seventy miles away. Book 2 ends with a prayer to the Virgin Mary, petitioning her to provide help and comfort to the people of Bologna. Landívar's use of 'we' and 'our' (2.312, 341) in relation to the Italian city has been overlooked: here the poet clearly signals his involvement with the fortunes of his adopted home.[59] This could not stand in stronger contrast to the way Ovid distanced himself from Tomis and sometimes caricatured its inhabitants.[60] Landívar's experience of a calamity in the New World has informed his intellectual understanding of a natural disaster in Europe, as well as deepening the sense of compassion that would be engendered by such a catastrophe: the earthquake in Guatemala had occurred only eight years before the seismic activity which shook Bologna in 1781.

Exile poetry can be determined by literary convention as well as by individual experience: 'exile, far from rendering the writer impotent ... allows the purest functioning of the writer as a writer.'[61] In the case of Ovid, this functioning was largely accomplished by the poet's formulation and reformulation of personal responses to his predicament. Landívar, on the other hand, seeks to write rather more directly and referentially about the processes and phenomena which he is no longer able to witness or perceive. This quality of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* can be aligned with the paradox of poetic representation itself – which has been understood since antiquity as an attempt to render present what is absent. For Rafael

Landívar, exile has far more importance as a creative mechanism than it does as a subject or theme.

(vii) Functions of the sublime

It was noted in Chapter 1 that Landívar's Mexican contemporaries Francisco Xavier Alegre and Agustín Pablo de Castro were familiar with the ancient Greek rhetorical theorist known as 'Longinus'. Longinus' account of genius ventured to explain why 'divine' writers abandon precision of detail to seek excellence: nature (*physis*) itself implants in our minds 'an irresistible desire for what is great and, in relation to ourselves, supernatural (*daimoniôterou*)'. Longinus continued:

> The universe therefore is not wide enough for the range of human speculation and intellect. Our thoughts often travel beyond the boundaries of our surroundings. If anyone wants to know what we were born for, let him look round at life and contemplate the splendour, the grandeur, and beauty in which it everywhere abounds. It is a natural inclination that leads us to admire not the little streams, however pellucid and however useful, but the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, and above all the Ocean. Nor do we feel so much awe before the little flame we kindle, because it keeps its light clear and pure, as before the fires of heaven, though they are often obscured. We do not think our flame more worthy of admiration than the craters of Etna, whose eruptions bring up rocks and whole hills out of the depths, and sometimes pour forth rivers of the earth-born, spontaneous fire.[62]

These remarks are not in complete harmony with the message of the *Rusticatio Mexicana*, but there are some obvious affinities. The travel of thoughts – from one location to another – is a fundamental element of the poem. Whilst bathetic descriptions of small creatures, humble livelihoods, or local topography show Landívar's capacity to see the world in a grain of sand, the accounts of lakes, volcanoes, and waterfalls in the first three books of the poem present majestic and sometimes terrifying geographical features. The poet strives to excite wonder in his readers at unusual, extraordinary phenomena – even when, as he declares at the end of the *Monitum*, it is a challenge to convey them in poetic language.

Longinus' treatise not only illuminates Landívar's poetic activity; it may have done much to inspire it. For Longinus, sublimity was both a condition for, and an index of, greatness in poetry or prose which enabled a writer or speaker to stun or transport his audience. *On the Sublime* is principally devoted to an exposition of the *sources* of sublimity. The two most important sources are both endowed by nature: great thoughts and noble emotion. Longinus then identifies the effective use of rhetorical figures, of diction, and of arrangement as the three technical sources. Although the idea of sublimity has its origin in earlier Greek and Roman rhetorical theory, it is without a precise parallel in classical thought:

Longinian sublimity extends beyond oratory to provide a criterion of quality for literature more generally, and considerable emphasis is placed on the importance of individual talent.

During the eighteenth century the sublime gathered a new momentum and new meanings, quite disengaged from Longinus' original formulation. The enlarged category of the sublime helped poets and other literary authors to articulate the sense of wonder engendered by awe-inspiring scenes and natural phenomena, which were too unruly or irregular to conform to the order and unity that constituted the classical idea of beauty.[63] And in the wake of Edmund Burke's *Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas on the Sublime and the Beautiful* (1757) and Kant's *Critique of Judgment* (1790), the sublime facilitated the individual's disinterested contemplation of both art and nature.[64] It thus helped to bring about a transition from conformity to poetic norms (the hallmark of Neoclassicism) to a more individually oriented aesthetic (which characterises Romanticism). The ideological bearing of such later cultural and intellectual developments of the sublime on the literature of colonial New Spain in general, and on the work of Landívar in particular, has been explored in depth by Antony Higgins.[65]

Nonetheless, Alegre and Landívar were still bound by something closer to the ancient formulation of sublimity, whether or not that was mediated to them by their reading of Boileau's 1672 translation of Longinus.[66] These Jesuits would have thus regarded the sublime as an adjunct to Neoclassical Horatian poetic theory, and not as something that destabilised it. At the same time, other influences would have been in play. First, Landívar would have aligned Longinus' natural sources of sublimity with *ingenio*, the Baroque concept of authorial talent and wit – derived from the Latin *ingenium*, which Horace himself contrasted with a poet's training and technique.[67] Secondly, Rafael Landívar is bound to have been alert to the *theological* significance of the sublime, as it was indicated, on more than one occasion, by Longinus – who though a writer of pagan antiquity apparently quoted from the book of Genesis (*On the Sublime* 9.9) and also declared that 'sublimity raises us towards the spiritual greatness of god' (*On the Sublime* 35). In his *Appendix*, Landívar fuses the apprehension of the sublime with religious revelation. This is highlighted by the simile he uses to convey the effect of seeing the natural formation of a cross outside the village of Tepic. With its artful word order, the simile aspires to the sublimity of the phenomenon it seeks to illustrate:

> Ceu quondam celso sublata cacumine montis
> Arbore laeta viret, lucoque obscura nigranti
> Tot tibi densa cruces offert, quot robora, sylva.

Just as a forest, exalted on a lofty mountain peak, joyfully green with trees

yet darkened by its black grove, presents you with crosses, as many as there are tree trunks in its dense foliage.

Appendix 53-5

The juxtaposition of *celso* ('lofty') with *sublata* ('exalted') reinforces the suggestion that these two words have a reflexive, metapoetic significance. Rafael Landívar's own experience of the natural world must have affected his response to Longinus' account of sublimity. Very probably he connected *physical* nature quite directly with the 'natural' sources of sublimity. This is not unwarranted by a reading of Longinus' text: cognates of the same Greek word, *physis*, are used for both conceptions, and illustrations from the natural world are frequently employed to characterise successful effects in classical poetry and oratory.

Landívar is as much concerned with the awe that nature can inspire as he is with any practical purposes it may serve. His explanation for the appearance of a rainbow over the waterfall at San Pedro Mártir ends with Phoebus' *admiration* of its effect: *ostentat varios, Phoebo mirante, colores* (3.267). This is followed by an account of the water's progress out of a cavern and over a steep precipice on its course to the Pacific Ocean. Every year at winter the 'noble' youth of Guatemala hurry to wonder at the sight (3.278-80).[68] The intensity of the contemplation of the scene by the young men is given considerable emphasis:

> Concava suspenso perlustrent lumine saxa.
> Omnia mirantur, montemque, amnemque, specusque.
> Ore tamen presso nutus, et signa sequuntur,
> Sive salutatum pubes exoptet amicum,
> Seu velit ad tectum prono jam Sole reverti.

They scan the vaulted chamber by the light of a hanging lantern. They admire everything: the mountain, the river, the cavern. But they suppress their voices and follow only nods and gestures, if a young man should desire to greet a friend or to return home at sunset.

Rusticatio Mexicana 3.283-7

Here the apprehension of natural wonder renders spoken language unnecessary, even undesirable. The idea of silence leads associatively to the peroration that closes the book. The poet urges the peoples of Egypt to 'keep silent' about their green fields enriched by the Nile (3.288-9) and he also insists that the ancient world in general should keep silent about its seven wonders (3.290-1): the Guatemalan valley is what provides the ultimate *locus amoenus*.

The preference Landívar expresses here for his native country over the region of the Nile is significant. On two previous occasions in Book 3, he used illustrations from Egypt to convey the splendour of the natural features he was describing: the man-made pyramids of the pharaohs could

not match the grandeur of the natural cavern (3.165-70); and the fearful noise of the adjacent cataract – which also makes conversation both impossible and impious (cf. 3.285 above) – was compared to the Egyptian river (3.192-208). These alignments of Guatemala with ancient Egypt have further ramifications, but the key point here is that it was Longinus himself who had claimed that 'natural inclination' led to admiration of the Nile.[69] Landívar boldly asserts the greater sublimity of the Guatemalan scenery and its supremacy over the wonders of the Old World – and possibly he is also hinting at the American landscape's capacity to generate poetry as well as birdsong (293-5).[70] In this way, the end of Book 3 closes the triptych of books in the *Rusticatio Mexicana* which are devoted to grand natural features connoting the sublime.[71]

(viii) Literary history, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and Cornelius Gallus

An important passage from the first book affirms that the contemplation of nature in the New World, with its silence and tranquillity, can directly lead to poetic expression:

> Discurrunt placidi per amoena silentia ripae,
> Queis cordi tranquilla quies, quos cura fatigat,
> Et quos facundae juvat indulgere Minervae.
> Tunc capti tacita rigui dulcedine ruris
> Littora concentu replent quandoque Poetae.

> They move placidly over the silent and delightful retreats of the lakeside and find tranquil peace of mind. As they are exhausted by care, they find pleasure in giving play to eloquent Minerva. Then captivated by the soundless sweetness of this well-watered countryside they fill the shores with melody, ever as Poets.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.273-7

These lines herald a pantheon of writers from New Spain, in a scenario somewhat reminiscent of the *bella scuola* of ancient classical poets in the fourth canto of Dante's *Inferno*. However, Roman authors like Virgil and Propertius might have offered a more direct model with their elevated surveys of Latin love poetry in hexameter or elegiac verse.[72] In his prose preface to the *Rusticatio Mexicana*, Landívar had declared 'there will be no place for fiction [*fictio*], if you except that which brings on the poets singing by the Mexican lake'. This licence allows past and present authors to appear more or less in alternation and it enables the author's contemporaries to be shown in Mexico singing poetry which they more probably completed under the duress of exile (*cura*).

This panorama was probably designed to convey something of the richness and diversity of the literature of New Spain to European readers.

Landívar's annotations to 1.278-89 make this obvious because they presuppose that readers will not be familiar with the writers he mentions. Their works in Latin and in the vernacular range from devotional poetry to epic, lyric, and comic drama. But in the main text of Book 1, five of the seven poets listed have their achievements characterised in some detail. We are told that one of them, Diego José Abad, was 'fired by the holy gadfly as he sang *sublime* praises to the Lord in verse' (1.281-2). The choice of the word 'sublime' as a commendation is unlikely to be accidental. Some years before the *Rusticatio Mexicana* was first published, Clementino Vannetti, secretary of the Italian Accademia Rovoretana had praised Abad's *De Deo* (1773) for being written in such a form 'that the *sublimity* of the images and the profundity of the ideas, correspond marvellously to the divinity of the argument.'[73]

Landívar's survey culminates in a fanciful depiction of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, who has long been regarded as Mexico's greatest literary figure.[74] Landívar says her melodic verses immobilised the tide of the lake, stopped birds in mid-flight, and moved rocks (1.289-92). These are very conventional figures of the 'pathetic fallacy', Ruskin's term for crediting nature with human feeling – a device which abounds in the *Rusticatio Mexicana*.[75] But the particular figures employed here were also very conventionally applied in classical literature to the mythological poet Orpheus and, in Virgil, to the Roman poet Cornelius Gallus, who is credited with the invention of Latin love elegy.[76] An association between Sor Juana and Gallus is delicately sustained in the following verses:

> Ne vero Musas livor torqueret amarus,
> Ipsa Aganippaeas jussa est augere Sorores.
> Non sic argutis florentia prata Caystri
> Insonuere modis, niveus cum littore Cycnus
> Alterno moriens miscet suspiria cantu.
>
> And so that bitter envy should not torment the Muses, Sor Juana herself was bidden to increase the number of the Sisters of Aganippe. Not even the flowery meadows of Cayster sounded with such music, when, along its bank, the snow-white Swan blended his dying sighs with song.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.293-7

The first sentence here (293-4) plays on the epithet attached to Sor Juana herself: 'Tenth Muse'.[77] In his song of Silenus (*Eclogue* 6), Virgil had Gallus being welcomed by the Muses. Landívar underlines that affinity between Sor Juana and Gallus by his using the epithet *Aganippaeas* (294) for the Muses: Aganippe was the goddess of their Aonian spring and daughter of the river Permessus – where (in *Eclogue* 6.64-6) the Muses receive Gallus. Aganippe is also associated with Gallus in Virgil's tenth *Eclogue* (10.9-12).

The second sentence in the passage quoted above (295-7) affirms that

Sor Juana's singing excels the swan song of Cycnus. Virgil's version of the myth of Cycnus (*Aeneid* 10.189-93) connected him with *poetry*: mourning for his beloved Phaethon, Cycnus 'sang and solaced his sad love with the Muse' under the shade of Phaethon's grieving sisters who had been turned into poplar trees. Cycnus then turned into a swan and left the earth, following the stars with his voice.[78] That story also turns out to be linked to Gallus by Virgil: Silenus, the rustic Arcadian of *Eclogue* 6, sings of the metamorphosis of Phaethon's sisters into trees (*Ecl.* 6.62-3) immediately before he turns to Gallus' warm reception by the Muses (*Ecl.* 6.64-6) – to which Landívar has already alluded.[79] Cycnus' transformation into a bird also bears on Sor Juana, who was known to her contemporaries as the 'Phoenix of Mexico'.

There is some historical basis for such an association between Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and Cornelius Gallus. Landívar would have known the tradition that Virgil's fourth *Georgic* substituted an account of Orpheus for a eulogy of his friend Gallus, who was compelled to commit suicide after his pride led him to offend the Emperor Augustus.[80] The events which occurred in the latter part of Sor Juana's life are comparable in some respects. The most scholarly woman in Spanish America was actually tricked into writing her intellectual manifesto of 1691, the *Respuesta a Sor Filotea de la Cruz* ('Reply to Sor Filotea').[81] It turned out that the tract which provoked Sor Juana's defiant rebuttal had not been penned, as she had believed, by a fellow nun – but by the Bishop of Puebla himself, Manuel Fernández de Santa Cruz.[82] The unintended offence caused by Sor Juana led to her being forced to write a statement of self-condemnation in blood. She was also compelled to stop writing, and to surrender her musical and scientific instruments as well as her library, which reputedly contained 4,000 volumes. After two years of penance, ministering to nuns afflicted by a fatal epidemic, Sor Juana died in 1695. As may have been the case with the learned Cornelius Gallus, it was an excess of confidence in the face of a despotic authority which brought the erudite Mexican poetess to a kind of martyrdom.

Sor Juana's most conspicuous feature in Landívar's imaginative portrayal is her capacity to interfere with the natural world. This is all the more striking given that his poem has the natural world as its subject. As the preceding section of this chapter sought to show, various parts of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* suggest that the sublimity of nature can have an impact on poetry. But in this scene in Book 1, that pattern is uniquely reversed. The greatness of Sor Juana's individual talent can act on land, water, and wildlife – exemplified by the waves, rocks, and birds that are in thrall to her enchanting song. That reversal has been seen as an affirmation of the *criollos*' actual power over their own environment.[83] But it might simply be a straightforward expression of the poet's admiration for Sor Juana: in a note to this passage, Landívar informs the reader that

she was 'rightly to be counted among the Muses' on account of her 'very graceful poetry' (*elegantissima carmina*).[84]

At a time when the enthusiasm for the elaborate poetry of the seventeenth century had steadily declined in Spain and New Spain alike, Landívar's celebration of its figurehead is exceptional. Sor Juana was far from conspicuous in the Mexican humanist literature of the later 1700s: she is never mentioned by Abad or Alegre. Indeed Alegre's critical tastes are strongly Neoclassical (though he does recognise Góngora's achievement) – and in the first lecture he gave in Mexico, the *Prolusio grammatica de syntaxi* (1751), Alegre urged his students to communicate in plain, direct language.[85] Moreover, the decadence of Spanish *seicentismo* was even more despised in Italy where Landívar was writing.[86]

In fact the *Rusticatio Mexicana* is generally seen as standing in stark opposition to the *conceptismo* and *culteranismo* of Baroque poetics. The very opening lines of the poem have lent a good deal of weight to this prevalent view:[87]

> Obtegat arcanis alius sua sensa figuris,
> Abstrusas quarum nemo penetrare latebras
> Ausit, et ingrato mentem torquere labore;
> Tum sensum brutis aptet, gratasque loquelas;
> Impleat et campos armis, et funere terras,
> Omniaque armato debellet milite regna.

> Let another conceal his thoughts in arcane figures, whose obscure hidden meanings no one would dare to penetrate, and torment his mind with unrewarding labour. Let him then give sense and pleasant utterances to brutes; and let him fill the fields with arms and the lands with death, let him make war on every kingdom with armed soldiers.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.1-6

The first of these exhortations does indeed look like a round repudiation of obscure Baroque poetry. However, as is often the case with Landívar, things are more complicated than they first appear. What the lines suggest about the place of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* in literary history actually challenge the standard view of Landívar as a straightforwardly Neoclassical poet.

Landívar's insistence on leaving 'arcane figures' and 'abstruse meanings' to others recalls the rhetorical device of *recusatio* in classical love elegy – whereby a poet expresses his reluctance to address more serious subjects. But these very lines themselves become obscure and enigmatic. What does Landívar mean here by '[giving] sense and pleasant utterances to brutes' (4)? The 'brutes' could literally be dumb animals – or warriors to whom other previous epic poets have ascribed motives and eloquent speeches. The fact that the expression 'in the manner of brutes' (*brutorum more*) is used at the very end of the work (*App.* 106) provides a clue. There

the expression is used to characterise a lazy person who has no interest in science.

The next exhortation in this opening passage 'let him fill the plains with arms' may contain a very recondite echo of the beginning of a Renaissance Latin epic: Petrarch's *Africa*.[88] Petrarch had used a similar phrase to refer to another poet in turn – Lucan – in order to compare Lucan's war poem with his own:

> Ille autem Emathiam Romanis ossibus implet.
> Ipse ego non nostri referam modo temporis acta.
>
> That poet [Lucan] fills Emathia with Roman bones. I myself [Petrarch] will not just recount things done in our own time.
>
> Petrarch, *Africa* 1.52

The line in which Landívar subtly echoes Petrarch is as follows:

> Impleat et campos armis, et funere terras.
>
> Let him fill the fields with arms and the lands with death.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.5

Something else is achieved by the pairing of the words *campos* ('fields') and *terras* ('lands'). The same pairing occurs again two verses later, when Landívar characterises his own endeavour:

> Me juvat omnino, *terrae* natalis amore,
> Usque virescentes patrios invisere *campos*
>
> Out of love for my native *land*, I enjoy most of all visiting the ever green *fields* of my country ...
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.7-8

The parallel is clear enough: between the poet's *own* beloved land and fields, and those lands and fields subjected to those 'armed soldiers who conquer every kingdom'. Landívar is right to claim that he avoids celebrating war, though he does mention it on occasions. But his suggestion that he also avoids conveying hidden meanings is demonstrably false. These opening verses themselves display a capacity for allegorical or figurative expression which will be shown in many of the books to follow.

(ix) Allegories of ethnicity, conquest and colonialism

The existence of allegory in the *Rusticatio Mexicana* is effectively proven by the account of the beavers in Book 6.[89] It was remarked earlier that this account is modelled poetically on Virgil's presentation of the bees in

Georgics 4.149-250. Landívar's beavers, who are anthropomorphised as peaceful and virtuous lovers of freedom (6.39-54), govern themselves on principles which are even more pronouncedly utopian than those of Virgil's bees:

> Ut vero finem tectis posuere superbis,
> Privatae studio vitae nudata caterva
> Tota sodalitio rursus se prompta resignat.

> When [the beavers] have finished building their impressive homes, the whole group discards its inclination for a private existence and readily commits itself once again to a community life.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 6.195-7

As well the utopian writing of the sixteenth century, later books like Tomasso Campanella's *City of the Sun* and Bacon's *New Atlantis* had currency in Mexico.[90] Arnold Kerson has also pointed out some ways in which the ideas of eighteenth-century Enlightenment thinkers like Rousseau, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Morelly, and the Abbé de Mably might have influenced Landívar's description of the beavers.[91] But the beavers' rotation of labour (6.190-4) and their patterns of domestic organisation (6.224-37) have a particular resemblance to the practices adopted by the citizens of Thomas More's *Utopia*.[92] Remarkably, the beavers' mud-daubed dwellings (6.174-6) with their front and back entrances, one on the water (6.133-5), are like the houses which More described in the second book of his fictional dialogue:

> Nulla domus est quae non ut ostium in plateam ita posticum in hortum habeat. Quin bifores quoque facili tractu manus apertiles ac dein sua sponte coeuntes quemvis intromittunt; ita nihil usquam privati est. Nam domos ipsas uno quoque decennio sorte commutant ... aedes initio humiles ac veluti casas et tuguria fuisse, e quolibet ligno temere factas, parietes luto obductos. Culmina in aciem fastigiata stramentis operuerant. At nunc omnis domus visenda forma tabulatorum trium ...
>
> Every house has a front door to the street and a back door to the garden. The double doors, which open easily with a push of the hand and close again automatically, let anyone come in – so there is nothing private anywhere. Every ten years they exchange the houses themselves by lot ... [Originally] the first houses were low, like cabins or peasant huts, built slapdash out of any sort of lumber, with mudplastered walls. The roofs rising up to a central point, were thatched with straw. But now their houses are all three storeys high and handsomely constructed ...[93]
>
> More, *Utopia* Book 2

The *Utopia* had begun to circulate in Mexico in the 1530s, when the Spanish humanist Vasco de Quiroga was already attempting to apply principles ostensibly derived from More, Plato, and Lucian, in the commu-

nities he established for the Indians near Mexico City and in Michoacán.[94] While Quiroga saw Catholic teaching as axiomatic, he also believed the Indians were morally superior to the Spaniards and that the peoples could live together without the Indians acquiring Spanish vices. The beavers of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* could then be aligned to the Indians – whom Quiroga had idealised and whom he had compared to the Christian apostles in their simplicity and humility.[95] Landívar uses the word *natio* for the community of beavers (6.231) – and later in a note to 15.336 he uses the same word – *nationes* – to designate the status of the Nayarits, Tarahumaras and other peoples from northern Mexico. But the beavers' social organisation might also represent the Jesuit ideal of people inhabiting a world independent of earthly states and monarchies.[96] The emphasis on community life among the beavers can be viewed, for instance, in the light of Landívar's constant invocation of the concept of the Jesuit Society (*Societas*) in his funeral oration for Figueredo. In the end, the significance of the allegory of the beavers is impossible to establish – it is complex and perhaps deliberately open-ended.

Another allegorical sketch towards the end of Book 13 may yield a firmer interpretation. This is how an endearing description of a parrot begins:

> Sed jam desertis humanae vocis imago
> Saepius in sylvis resonat, meque ipsa vocavit.
> Quas ego dum reputo voces, et lumina circum
> Volvo, garrit honos nemoris resupinus in alno
> Psittacus.

But now the image of a human voice quite often resounds in the deserted woods and has itself called me. While I reflect on these sounds and turn my eyes around, the pride of the forest, a parrot, chatters, relaxing in an alder tree.

Rusticatio Mexicana 13.293-7

The description abruptly takes a grim turn:

> Cum vero garrit, plauditque sibi ipsa volucris,
> Arripit incautam, plumasque et viscera vellit
> Praepetibus pennis, armatusque unguibus ales.
> Subter enim frondes habitu formosa superbo
> Alituum Regina ferox, et gloria sylvae
> Regnat avis, pedibus, rostroque insignis adunco.
> Illa nigro totum corpus fucata colore,
> Intextis variat plumis candentibus alas,
> Quas pandit volitans bis senas lata per ulnas,
> Et curvis digitos, ac longis unguibus armat.
> Incolit obscuro nigrantes robore lucos
> Sepositosque agros, avibus praedaque frequentes.
> Ut tamen hostili ventrem saturare rapina

> Ardet avis, castrisque suis optata propinquat
> Praeda, nemus subito linquit Jovis armiger atrum.
>
> As this winged creature chatters and applauds itself, a bird armed with swift wings and claws snatches it up unawares and tears out its feathers and bowels.
>
> For under the leaves, fine in her proud attire, the fierce Queen of winged things reigns, also the glory of the wood, a bird renowned for her feet and hooked beak. Her whole body is coloured in black and her wings, which, when she stretches them in flight are twelve cubits wide, are interspersed with gleaming white feathers, and she arms her toes with long curved talons. She inhabits groves which are black with dark oak, and distant fields thick with birds and prey. And when she burns to glut her stomach with inimical plundering and the desired prey approaches her camp, the armbearer of Jupiter suddenly leaves her black grove.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 13.304-18

Aspects of this encounter recall a well known classical fable which originated in archaic Greece: the story of the hawk and the nightingale recounted in Hesiod's *Works and Days*.[97] There, the hawk, having seized the nightingale in his sharp talons and carried her into the air, adds insult to injury by informing his victim that even though she is a singer, she is subject to his wishes. The moral and purpose of the story has been much debated, but Hesiod begins by addressing the tale to kings, who, he says, already know it. All that throws interesting light on a brief note Landívar appends to 13.313, the verse which describes the eagle's talons:

> Inter plures Aquilas, quae Americam incolunt, praestantiorem elegi. Aquilam regiam vulgo dictam.
>
> Among several eagles which inhabit America, I have chosen the more conspicuous one, the eagle commonly called 'royal'.

An Iberian bird of prey known as the 'Imperial eagle' functioned as a regal emblem in Spain.[98] That apparently routine observation endows the surprising and gruesome killing of the parrot with further significance. A parallel between parrots and the indigenous human inhabitants of the New World – both vulnerable to the violence of European invaders – was drawn in a famous Latin poem of the Renaissance: Girolamo Fracastoro's poem *Syphilis*, published in Italy in 1530.[99] Thus the tension in this passage between the eagle as 'glory of the wood' (*gloria sylvae*) and the indigenous Mexican parrot which was also 'pride of the forest' (*honos nemoris*), symbolises a violence which involves more than different species of bird. A clue to this is the curious metaphor characterising the parrot as the 'visual image of a *human* voice' (*humanae vocis imago*).

One consideration might appear to threaten the interpretation of this passage as a historical allegory. The eagle had also been revered a potent

symbol among the indigenous Mexicans: the sighting of an eagle perched on a nopal cactus devouring a serpent was the famous omen which led to the foundation of Tenochtitlán. However, any awkward ambiguity here is dispelled by the introduction of another bird which eats snakes – the *cenchris*, or hawk:

> Sin vero pedibus serpentem sustulit uncis,
> Unguibus, et rostro discerpit corda furentis,
> Dum rabiem vita ponat, fugiatque sub umbras.

> If with his clawed feet he has carried off a serpent, with his talons and beak he plucks out the heart of the raging creature, until it lays aside its rage along with its life and flees down to the shades.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 13.353-5

The hawk kills its victim in Aztec style by ripping out its victim's heart – and the diction of this account poignantly recalls Aeneas' ruthless despatching of Turnus in the closing verse of Virgil's *Aeneid*.

Another more general significance may be attached to the poet's account of one of the last stages involved in the processing of gold:

> His ita continuo vulgi sudore peractis,
> Argentum tractum, tractumque examinat aurum
> Praepositus curis Hispano ab Principe missus.
> Hic parvos globulos lamnam glomerabit in unam,
> Indeque mordaci convulsum forcipe frustum
> (Quod sibi pro digna curae mercede reservat)
> Igne probat, quantumque rapax absconderit auri
> Argentum proprio commixti pondere, noscit.

> When the crowd of workers have finished their long sweated labour, an official sent by the Spanish king weighs up the extracted silver and gold. He will roll the small lumps into one piece, and then, after using his sharp pincers to prise off a little chunk (which he keeps for himself as a well deserved reward for his trouble), he tests it in the fire and ascertains how much gold the greedy silver has hidden away, mixed with its own weight.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 8.268-75

How do we interpret this portrait of the Spanish prefect? There is obviously some irony about his inspection being described as 'trouble' (*cura*) – as this vignette directly follows an account of the really arduous work done by the young men at the furnaces. The metaphor in which the 'greedy silver' has hidden the gold away is not exactly reassuring in this context. It seems to predicate this official's behaviour as corrupt – the implication might even be that this corruption is a general attribute of officials from peninsular Spain.

The issue of Spanish hegemony is first raised very early in the poem, when mention is made of the *Hispani* who aggressively imposed their rule

on Mexico in a passage which echoes the proems of two Latin epics: Virgil's *Aeneid* and Villerías y Roelas' *Guadalupe*.[100] Landívar does not present the Spanish conquest as anything other than as a transfer of power, and there is no attempt to whitewash it as an opportunity to spread the Christian faith:

> Urbs erat occiduis procul hinc notissima terris
> Mexicus, ampla, frequensque, viris, opibusque superba,
> Indigenis quondam multos dominata per annos:
> Nunc vero Hispani, populis, Mavorte subactis,
> Sceptra tenent, summaque urbem ditione gubernant.

> There was a city far from here in the western lands, Mexico, very famous, large, and populous, distinguished for its men and resources. It was once ruled for many years by its indigenous inhabitants, but now the Spanish hold the sceptres, having conquered the people in war, and they govern the city with their supreme authority.
>
> *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.32-6

The subsequent account of the later invasion and settlement of Guatemala City (3.24-6) is very similar in tone. If anything, it makes such interference on the part of the Spaniards look even less legitimate. The ensuing natural disasters (3.27-8, 3.47-60) that occur shortly after the Spaniards' incursions might even represent a kind of nemesis for their usurpation of Guatemala.

Throughout the *Rusticatio Mexicana,* and in his annotations to the poem, Landívar exclusively reserves the term *Hispanus* for Iberian Spaniards. Apart from *colonus* ('settler'), there was no Latin word at his disposal for *criollo,* the once derogatory term now commonly used by historians to specify American-born Spaniards in the colonial period. Instead the adjective *Mexicanus* is routinely used for both Spanish Americans (like Landívar himself) and indigenous Americans.[101] There are more specific regional designations: in the poet's notes *Michoacanensis* and *Veracrucensis* are applied respectively to Diego José Abad, who was born in Michoacán, and to Francisco Xavier Alegre, who came from Veracruz.[102] Forms of the Latin for 'Indian', *Indus* (as well as *indigenus*) are also used of indigenous Americans: *Indus* is tellingly applied to Juan Diego, for instance, in Landívar's account of the miracles associated with the Virgin of Guadalupe (12.38-56). But Landívar very frequently refers to indigenous Mexicans and Guatemalans simply as 'people', 'boys', 'youths', or 'men', according to context. In short, his usage always discriminates between European and American Spaniards, but it does not consistently seek to distinguish between Spanish and indigenous Americans.

But in the end, few of the apparent instances of political and historical allegory in the *Rusticatio Mexicana* can be interpreted decisively. This is not necessarily because Landívar meant to be evasive in his approach to

questions which involve the interests of different social or ethnic groups.[103] It is more probably due to the fact that texts from a colonial epoch are very prone to generate diverse or contradictory readings. The various indigenous American peoples, *mestizos*, *criollos*, Spaniards, and other Europeans would all have had different stories to tell, and different morals to draw, about their respective histories and about matters of ethnic identity.

(x) Afterword

Those who attempt to provide even the most straightforward description of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* are faced with several challenges. Its poet acknowledges customary oppositions between art and science, only to follow the didactic tradition by fusing 'objective' discourses like zoology and ethnography with the subjectivity of personal response and recollection. Oppositions and differences between Europe and America may have led to the conception and creation of Landívar's work, but the resulting text does not belong exclusively to either continent. The spatial and temporal position of the speaker of the poem is maintained in a state of flux throughout: sometimes he addresses his reader from the actual locations he describes; at others his observations are framed as vivid reminiscences conjured up from exile in Italy.

Though very much a product of the Enlightenment, the *Rusticatio Mexicana* ultimately resists periodisation: its conceits and allegorical modes evoke the Baroque; its diction is classical; and its construction of an individual poetic voice through an enthusiasm for nature prefigures sentiments that were to be expressed in later Romantic poetry. The poetics of the sublime conjoin with reflections of a theological nature to point to a unique conception of transcendence. Future literary assessments of the text will also need to take cognisance of the potential influence of Castilian and Spanish American *vernacular* literature and poetics on Landívar: Bernardo de Balbuena's *La Grandeza Mexicana* is just one important antecedent, of which only the briefest notice has been given here. The scientific and geographical content of the *Rusticatio* could be considered for its bearing on actual phenomena and environments, as well as for its relation to other early modern authorities. Landívar's poem also provides some exceptional insight on the cultural and intellectual history of New Spain and Guatemala in the 1700s. Its implications for contemporary understanding of colonial society and its tensions – briefly indicated in the Preface to this volume – have only begun to be explored.

A sense of all these potential points of departure has made me nervous about the extent to which the present chapter has been preoccupied by literary matters and by Landívar's use of classical sources. It is difficult for anyone with an interest in Latin studies to see beyond the edifice of *Quellenforschung* (now renovated by theories of intertextuality) which

still stands at the heart of the discipline. Even the most progressive Latinists may be startled to discover that the only monograph in English on the *Rusticatio Mexicana* – Antony Higgins' *Constructing the Criollo Archive* (2000) – refers to Virgil's *Georgics* on only two occasions. That apparent negligence is salutary for classicists, who are prone to regard early modern Latin texts merely as forms of homage to Cicero, Virgil and other ancient authors. In the colleges and seminaries of eighteenth-century Mexico, Landívar and his peers wrote in Latin with the same facility as they wrote in Spanish. The circumstances which prompted them to continue to use Latin – as they taught and worked in a wider society which they readily acknowledged to be multicultural and multilingual – raise a number of questions. Those historical questions must be more pressing than the business of establishing precisely which ancient sources informed the Latin diction of these writers.

Much more remains to be said about Landívar – and indeed about Mexican humanist literature as a whole – than could possibly be conveyed in these preliminary chapters. Landívar's works possess many virtues, but ultimately their most appealing characteristic (which applies to the Funeral Declamation and to the short Marian poems, as much as to the *Rusticatio Mexicana*) is the considered optimism that underlies them. Such optimism is the more remarkable given the difficult circumstances in which all of these texts were produced. It is only to be hoped that the achievement of Rafael Landívar and of other Latin authors from Latin America will be more widely recognised, as English-speaking scholars come to realise that the United States was far from the first American nation to accommodate and transform the European classical tradition – or indeed to take up any other form of literate learning.[104] Histories of humanism need to incorporate the rich classical culture in Spanish America, just as the boundaries existing for the humanities today need to be redefined, in order to admit the abiding centrality of Latin writing in the early modern age.

Notes

Prologue: Landívar, Latin and Colonialism

1. Pym (2000), 191 (citing Gallego Morell (1990), 52): ' "Latin" America was thus an identity defined by negation, being both duplicitously non-colonial and impeccably non-Anglo-Saxon.' Habinek (1998), 31, discusses the circumstances of the original nomenclature, with further bibliography at 176.

2. The essays in Bolaños and Verdesio (2002) make important advances and constitute, with Gustavo Verdesio's lucid opening chapter, a good introduction to the theoretical issues confronting colonial Latin American studies. The work of Walter Mignolo (1993, 1995) among others, has been very influential in the USA. The interdisciplinary journal *Chicomóztoc* – established in Mexico in 1988 – is devoted to the role of *descolonización* in the humanities (cf. Téllez 2003).

3. Knight (2002), xvii is salutary: 'Some of the supposedly "new" cultural history involves a semantic repackaging of older ideas and topics. "Subalterns" for example, were once called workers and peasants ... So I think I write "subaltern history" [in this book] just as I write prose, though I do not make an issue of it.'

4. Bolaños (2002), 40: here epitomising Higgins (2002).

5. Paz (2001), 60.

1. The Circles of Time: Classical culture in colonial Mexico

1. Bernal Díaz del Castillo 1.29, ed. Ramírez Cabañas (1944), 130.

2. Méndez Plancarte (1944), 6-7; Osorio Romero (1991a), 7; Herrera Zapién (2000), 3-4; Téllez (2003), 97 attach significance to this episode. The essays in Gray and Fiering (2000) address a variety of important issues raised by the interactions between European and American languages in the western hemisphere during the colonial period.

3. Waquet (2001) is a stimulating, though very partial and negative, account of the role of Latin in early modern Europe.

4. E.g. Greenblatt (1991), (1993); Grafton, Shelford and Siraisi (1992); Todorov (1984). Leonard (1992) is a seminal survey of the literature read by the conquistadors. Gruzinski (2002) considers some of the larger implications of European Renaissance culture on Latin America.

5. Macc. Armstrong (1953); Bosworth (2000); and Lupher (2003), 9-13 etc. Identification of Alexander with Cortés is implicit in Alegre's eighteenth-century Latin *Alexandriad* (pp. 28-9 in this volume).

6. The *mestizo* historian, the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (1539-1616) compared the Incas to the Romans: MacCormack (1998). The Croatian Dominican Vinko Paletin argued in the 1550s that the Mayan inscriptions at Chichen Itza were in Punic and that the Carthaginians had once possessed the Indies. Thus the Roman Empire had proper title to these Punic territories, which, via the Papacy, could pass to the Spaniards: Lupher (2003), 167-86. This can be compared to the later claim of a Spanish Dominican, Gregorio García in the early 1600s: the natives of America were descended from the lost tribes of Israel. But García's insistence that

the Carthaginians had constructed the Incan and Mayan monuments was meant to suggest that Spaniards and natives had common ancestors. See Brading (1991), 195-200, 382; García (1980) (= 1607).

7. Las Casas (1967), Sepúlveda (1951).

8. Lupher (2003), 43-188.

9. Eatough (1998), (1999a) on Martyr; Sahagún (1981), León Portilla (2002) on Sahagún; more generally, Lupher (2003) and Mason (1994).

10. Juan Luis De La Cerda's commentary on Virgil occasionally shows how the conquest of America could bear on the routine exegesis of ancient texts. See Laird (2002), 190-1. In a Spanish translation of the *Georgics* (1596), the Galician Juan de Guzmán, supposedly resident in the New World, offered a *silva de varia lección* of indigenous American words by way of comment on 48 verses of Virgil: Morreale (2002).

11. On Ercilla, see Quint (1993), 131-210, Kallendorf (2003), and Lupher (2003), 298-316.

12. For Fracastoro, see edition of Eatough (1984) as well as Eatough (1999b) and Haskell (1999); Hofmann (1994) treats a number of Latin epics about Columbus including Gambara, Stella, and Carrara.

13. See e.g. MacCormack (1991), (1998) on colonial Peru; Rivas Sacconi (1993) on later humanism in Colombia; Miranda Cancela (2003) on the later classical tradition in Cuba.

14. Taylor and Coroleu (1999) illustrates the range of peninsular Spanish humanism; Rubio (1934).

15. See Micheli (1976-1977) on Italian interactions with New Spain; Peconi (1978) on Italian books and presses, Torre Villar (1973) on Belgian books in Mexico; Leonard (1992), Millares Carlo (1986), Griffin (1991) and Osorio Romero (1980) all address the circulation of European titles.

16. Osorio Romero (1991a), 8.

17. Accounts of Vasco de Quiroga's project include Zavala (1955) and Gómez (2001). Acuña (1988) is a text of *De debellandis indis,* a work attributed to Quiroga.

18. Téllez (2003) describes a trilingual vocabulary of Spanish, Latin and Nahuatl from the early 1500s, modelled on the Spanish humanist Nebrija's renowned Spanish-Latin dictionary: Téllez notes that the indigenous copyist appears to be better versed in Latin than Spanish.

19. *Historia de los indios de la Nueva España*, trat. 3, ch. 12, §389 quoted in Osorio Romero (1990), xxvi = Motolinía (2001), 243. (Fray Toribio is known as 'Motolinía', a kind of nickname given to him by the Indians.) Compare an account by the chronicler Bernardino de Sahagún who himself taught at Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco: Sahagún (1981): book 10, ch. 27. Abbott (1987) explores traditions of rhetoric and oratory in pre-Hispanic Aztec culture.

20. Juan de Torquemada (d. 1629), *Monarquía indiana* 5.43 quoted in Osorio Romero (1990), xxvii. The same story is attested by Gerónimo de Mendieta, *Historia ecclesiastica indiana* book 4, ch. 15, and by Motolinía (2001), 243.

21. Jerónimo López's letter is quoted in Osorio Romero (1990), xxxix.

22. Jerónimo López himself evidently had political anxieties: Lupher (2003), 229-34.

23. Griffin (1991) is a history of the Cromberger Press in Seville and Mexico in the 1500s. As Brading (1991), 299 notes, the University of Mexico eventually came to compete with the best in Europe at the time: Irigoyen Troconis (2003) assembles some important essays on the university culture of New Spain.

24. Herrera Zapién (2000), 33-4 discusses this passage from the *Libellus*. The

transcription can be found in Cruz (1991), 12: the excerpt quoted next follows there at 26.

25. For Acosta, see Landívar's Notes 2 and 3 to *RM* 1.145 and 1.190 respectively (pp. 262-3 below), and Acosta (2003). It was Landívar's contemporary, the historian Clavigero (or 'Clavijero') who first called Hernández, 'el Plinio de la Nueva España': Clavigero (2003), 14. See Landívar, Note 5 to *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.220 on the *centzontlus* bird (p. 264 below), and Hernández (2003), 5-51.

26. Editions of Francisco Hernández's *Rerum medicarum Novae Hispaniae thesaurus seu plantarum animalium mineralium mexicanorum historia* include a printing in Rome, in 1649. For Clavigero's account of Hernández and Nezahualcoyotl, see Brading (1991), 458 and Clavigero (2003), 160 and *passim*; the importance of natural history for Clavigero is further discussed on p. 26 below.

27. Francisco Cervantes de Salazar, who had a chair in rhetoric, was one of the first professors at the University of Mexico. A speech he delivered in Latin for the inauguration of a plan of studies for the University established his reputation. In 1554 he published some Latin dialogues by the Spanish humanist, Luis Vives, along with some of his own in the same volume: León Portilla (2001) is a facsimile edition of part of the 1554 volume, with a Spanish translation by García Icazbalceta.

28. Méndez Plancarte (1994), xi: 'un humanismo humano, vital, vivo e integral, que eleva al primer plano la consideración de la persona humana.'

29. Heredia Correa (2000a); Redmond and Beuchot (1987).

30. Herrera Zapién (2000), 66; Osorio Romero (1980), 107 gives bibliographical details. Mack (2005) assesses the place of Vives' *De ratione dicendi* (1533) in the history of Renaissance rhetoric.

31. Knight (2002), 51.

32. Difficulties and ethical problems involved in reading historical and literary texts from the colonial period are discussed in Bolaños and Verdesio (2002).

33. The *Dicolon Icasticon* is given in full in Herrera Zapién (2000), 29-30.

34. Méndez Plancarte (1937) is a full study of Horace in the Mexican classical tradition; Herrera Zapién (1991) is another treatment.

35. See Pareja (1883), 96-8, cited in Osorio Romero (1990b), 28-9 and Herrera Zapién (2000), 80-1.

36. Pareja quotes the opening line of Valencia's poem (*Asseret e Roma nisi lis in amore Teresa*) and another isolated verse (*e, Roma sit era rogo, cogor aretis amore*). Such compositions are more properly known as *versus retrogradi*: Sarolli (1971), part 2, sv. 2 (b). They find their origins not in antiquity but in medieval poetry: actual medieval examples of *versus retrogradi* tend to be no longer than 40 lines. Newton (1973) is an edition of the epanaleptic elegiacs of Laurence of Amalfi; Enzinger (1998) is a miscellaneous collection of Latin palindromes on the internet.

37. Troncarelli (2001) is an account of Lamport's colourful life.

38. A selection of these works is edited in G. Méndez Plancarte (1948).

39. Zambrano (1965), 107-13 gives some biographical details.

40. Leonard (1929) is still a good account of Sigüenza y Góngora; Beltrán (1975) summarises the Mexican savant's achievements in mathematics, astronomy and natural history; Mayer (2000-2) is a comprehensive survey. The influence of the Spaniard Luis de Góngora y Argote on Landívar's sonnet is discussed in this volume on pp. 41-2.

41. An echo of the description of Carthage in Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.12-14 is also at work in Landívar, *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.32-3: *Urbs erat ... notissima .../Mexicus,*

ampla, frequensque, viris, opibusque, superba ('Mexico was a renowned city, large and popular, distinguished for its men and resources') as it is in Villerías y Roelas' characterisation of Mexico before the conquest in the proem to his *Guadalupe* epic. Landívar's stichometric correspondence with Villerías' verses (*Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.32-3; *Guadalupe* 1.32-3) draws further attention to the community between these verses of Virgil and Castroverde. Other historical associations between Mexico and Carthaginians, are given in n. 6 above.

42. Brading (2001) and Poole (1995) are useful introductions to the extensive literature on the *Nican mopohua*.

43. This unsettled the missionary-ethnogapher Bernadino de Sahagún. The appendix to his *Historia* (*c.* 1576) is in Sahagún (1981) 3, 352. See also pp. 79-80 n. 53 below on Tonantzin.

44. Peñalosa (1987) is an anthology of seventeenth-century texts; Peñalosa's other volumes assemble literature from subsequent centuries: *siglo XVIII* (1988); *XIX* (1985); *XX* (1984). Francisco Cabrera recently published a new Latin epyllion on the theme: *Laus Guadalupensis: Latino carmine expressa* (Cuernavaca, 1990): for Cabrera's contemporary Latin poetry, see p. 82 n. 104 below.

45. These works are edited in Peñalosa (1987). López de Abilés is discussed in Osorio Romero (1991b), 128-32.

46. Osorio Romero (1991b), 134 refers to the cento as a 'Horatian monster' and cites the negative verdict of the later eighteenth-century critic, José Ignacio Bartolache. Laird (forthcoming) assesses Riofrío's endeavour more positively.

47. Knight (2002), 185. Brading (2001) is a full account of the importance of the Virgin of Guadalupe for Mexico's political history.

48. The opening of the *De mentis potu* (1689) published in Naples by Tommaso Strozzi has Apollo and the Muses flee from the Turkish barbarians – to a new Parnassus in Mexico. See further Haskell (2003), 87, and p. 80 n. 54 below on Atlas.

49. *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.289-97: see Landívar's Notes on this passage and pp. 64-7 above. The authoritative edition of Sor Juana is by Alfonso Méndez Plancarte (1994) in four volumes; the critical account of her achievement in Paz (1988) has been enormously influential.

50. *Conceptismo*, which is best represented by Francisco de Quevedo, involved puns and a kind of wit (comparable to the 'conceits' of English Metaphysical poetry). The poetic principles of *conceptismo* were promoted in a celebrated 1642 treatise, *Agudeza y arte de ingenio* ('Sharpness and the art of talent') by the Spanish Jesuit, Baltasar Gracián. *Conceptismo* is often conceived as being in virtual opposition to *culteranismo* – originally a pejorative term for the intensive use of erudite classical language and allusion in the tradition of Luis de Góngora. However, conceit and wit, like classical allusion, are generally widespread in European poetry of the seventeenth century. For definitions of these Spanish terms: Ward (1978), 128-9 and 143-4; Preminger (1965), 175-6 (sv. 'cultism'); and Leonard (1983), 31. Leonard's study is a comprehensive account of the role and context of the 'Baroque' in seventeenth-century Mexico.

51. Giard (1995).

52. Israel (1975) and Knight (2002), 279-83 provide accounts of the earlier background.

53. Tepeyac, where the Virgin appeared, was the site of Tonantzin's worship. In *Guadalupe* 1.147-8, Tonantzin is the daughter of Pluto: *nataque quam patria lingua dixere Tonanthin, /nostra, quod (infandum!) Mater sonat ore latino* ('his

daughter whom in their native tongue they called Tonantzin which – unspeakably! – means "our Mother" in the Latin language'). Speakers of Nahuatl still refer today to the Virgin Mary as 'Tonantzin'. Sigüenza y Góngora's *Primavera indiana* octave 24 had already aligned Pluto with the evil forces of indigenous religion and, significantly, presented Tepeyac as the original domain of *Pluto*, rather than Tonantzin.

54. Atlas' translation to the Lake of Mexico in Villerías plays on an association between Atlas and Gabriel (the angel who in Guadalupan iconography bears the Virgin on his shoulders). The association was already made by López de Abilés, in the *Poeticum viridarium* 152: *Coeli fortis Atlas iste mihi Gabriel* ('Heaven's strong Atlas is my Gabriel').

55. Osorio Romero (1991a), 38. Osorio Romero (1991b) provides not only a commented edition and Spanish translation of the *Guadalupe* at 259-375 but also a full study of Villerías himself and the literary precedents to his poem.

56. '*politissimis multis, Sariñana, Rinconio, Cardenas, Villeria, Zamora aliisque permultis, omnibus numeris in re poetica absolutissimis*': Eguiara y Eguren in *Anteloquia* 18 of the *Bibliotheca Mexicana*, ed. Millares Carlo (1996), 183.

57. Clavigero in his *Breve Ragguaglio della Prodigiosa e Rinomata Immagine della Madonna de Guadalupe del Messico* (1782), published in Cesena, Italy, mentions Villerías and Andrés Diego de la Fuente (pp. 20-1, 27 above) as two Latin epic poets who treated the theme of the Virgin of Guadalupe. Clavigero wrote: 'We have further seen a long Latin poem in manuscript by Giuseppe Villerías, a Mexican poet': Osorio Romero (1991b), 201.

58. In addition to the curious stichometric correspondence between Villerías' *Guadalupe* and the *Rusticatio Mexicana* observed in n. 41 above, a possible echo of Villerías in Landívar's Castilian sonnet is identified in this volume at p. 261 (n. 10).

59. Manuel Martí, *Epistularum libri duodecim* (Amsterdam, 1735), vol. 2, book 7, letter 16, quoted in Millares Carlo (1996), 56-7.

60. Brading (2001), 131, 154-5, 235 details further responses offered in Spanish to Martí's remarks: by José de Mercado in 1744, the influential preacher Ita y Parra (1743), the Franciscan José Torrubia in 1744, and the nineteenth-century bibliographer José Mariano Beristáin de Souza in 1816. Torrubia noted that Martí had merely echoed the earlier Spanish bibliographer Nicolás Antonio who affirmed in 1663 that 'in the Indies all is traded save books'.

61. A Latin text is in Vargas Alquicira (1987).

62. Compare the opening of the second book of Bruni, *Ad Petrum Paulum Histrum Dialogus* composed in the early 1400s: Garin (1952), 76. A plane tree is in Plato, *Phaedrus* 230b-c.

63. Haskell (2003) examines a poem on chocolate, the *De mentis potu, sive De cocolatis opificio*, by the Neapolitan Jesuit Tommaso Strozzi: n. 48 above.

64. The viceregal *imprimatur* for the *Bibliotheca Mexicana*, dated 28 April 1755, precedes the original text of the first volume.

65. Higgins (2000), 34.

66. Knight (2002), 202-331 relates these events, which eventually led to insurgency and Mexican independence.

67. Guedea (2000), 280.

68. This '*criollo* archive' of knowledge is explored thoroughly in Higgins (2000). It was Immanuel Kant himself who gave currency to the term 'Enlightenment' (*Aufklärung*), with his influential definition first published in a Berlin newspaper in 1784, entitled *Was ist Aufklärung?*: Kant (1963), 3.

69. The mathematician and scientist Jean Le Rond d'Alembert (1717-83)

abandoned Latin for French in his famous *Encyclopédie*. Waquet (2001) is a wide-ranging though partial account of the tensions between Latin and the vernacular in Europe from the fifteenth century onwards.

70. Batllori (1966). Deck (1976), 96-9 is a short bibliography of Jesuit works published in Italy at this time. For material in Italian archives, on or by exiled Mexicans, see Guzmán (1964) and Revelli (1926). Torre Villar (1980) is an essential handbook for sources in European collections.

71. Maneiro (1988), 276-95 is a Spanish translation of Juan Luis Maneiro's life of Campoy in his three-volume work, *De vitis aliquot mexicanorum* (Bologna, 1791-2).

72. Navarro (1983), 111-33 and Beuchot (1998), 138-76 survey philosophy in eighteenth-century Mexico.

73. Maneiro (1988), 452-4.

74. Roger (1970).

75. Browning (1985), 30 argues the poem was prompted by these factors and points out in a note that Landívar and Clavigero (whose *Historia Antigua* vigorously defended Mexico against such criticisms) occupied the same house in Bologna with twelve other Jesuits: see also the works cited in n. 101 below.

76. Clavigero (2003), 769-75.

77. Clavigero's 'rules of the Mexican language' are in Clavigero (1974), and translated into English in Clavigero (1973).

78. Clavigero (2003), 65.

79. Brading (1991), 454.

80. For Osorio Romero's Latin text and Spanish translation of the poem (preceded by a prose letter), see Maneiro (1988), 56-65.

81. Beuchot (1998), 153-6 decribes Abad's philosophical interests.

82. De Polignac's popular *Anti-Lucretius* was published in 1742, but written in the 1600s.

83. *De Deo, Carmen* 19 celebrates scientific achievement, but other parts of the work (e.g. the attack on Epicurus' successors in 42) chastise contemporary *philosophi*: Kerson (1988); Leeber (1965).

84. Passages in the *De Deo* mentioning or alluding to Mexico include: 1.62 (*gens ignota diu*), 3.16 (*Orizabaeus ... mons*), 9.119, 15.12-25 (description of climate), and 18.184; 23.109 (Christ's Nativity introduces the Mexican passion flower); 42.613-29 (the Virgin of Guadalupe); 42.608-9 (Montezuma and the last Inca). See further Laird (2004a).

85. Manuel Fabri, *Specimen Vitae Auctoris* in Fernández Valenzuela (1974), 84. A relevant Latin annotation to an edition of Abad's *Dissertatio* is given in Kerson (1991), 364.

86. Kerson (1991), 364 in the introduction to his text and translation of the *Dissertatio*. Heredia Correa (2000b) also offers a text, Spanish translation and notes.

87. Batllori (1966), 35 is quoted in Kerson (1991), 357 n. 2. See also Deck (1976), 32-5.

88. Vannetti's *Epistula ad Abadium* quoted in Fabri's Latin biography, *Specimen Vitae Auctoris*, in Fernández Valenzuela (1974), 86. Vannetti's five books of letters, *Epistularum libri*, were published in Padua in 1795.

89. The poem is conventionally titled the *Californias*: Castro Pallares (1979) is a text and Spanish translation. On Salvatierra and on the Jesuit missions to California, see Venegas (1929) and Crosby (1994) respectively.

90. Fuente (1971) is a facsimile of the *Guadalupana B. Mariae Virginis Imago, quae Mexici colitur, carmine descripta* originally printed in Faenza, Italy in 1773.

91. Landívar, *Rusticatio Mexicana* 1.285.

92. Bush Malabehar (2002) is an edition of Alegre's *Batrachomyomachia*.

93. Alegre, *Institutionum Theologicarum Libri XVIII*, vol. 3, 289-90 (lib. VI, *propositio* 11, no. 32).

94. In his 'translation' Alegre generally substitutes Spanish authors for French; he eliminates Boileau's fourth book, but provides extensive commentary in his notes to the text: see further Kerson (1981) and Deck (1976). The text is included, along with other unpublished writings by Alegre, in García Icazbalceta (1889), an edition of 150 copies.

95. In his Latin biography of Agustín Pablo de Castro (another Mexican Jesuit scholar who went to Italy), Juan Luis Maneiro records that he read Longinus, Hermogenes, Lucian and other rhetoricians 'very avidly' with the intention of translating them into Spanish: Maneiro (1988), 511. The role of Longinian sublimity in the *Rusticatio Mexicana* is examined on pp. 61-4 of this volume.

96. In a prose preface to the *Alexandriad*, Alegre says he composed the poem twenty years before its publication. Buelna Serrano (1994) has a text of the poem.

97. This case is made in Laird (2003).

98. Notably *Aeneid* 1.441-8 describing the construction of the temple to Juno in Carthage: Laird (2003), 171-2 and above, n. 41. The passage of Alegre's *Alexandriad* quoted here has some resemblance to Politian's *Ambra* 590-625: a text is in Bausi (1996) and in Fantazzi (2004).

99. Pimentel Álvarez (1990), 1-10 contains a modern Latin text (and Spanish translation) of the letter on the *Alexandriad*. Kaimowitz (1990) is an English translation of the 1776 edition, with introduction. The proper Latin title of Giovanni Darcio's 1543 poem is *Venusini canes* ('Dogs of Venosa'); Girolamo Vida's *Christias* was first published in 1535; Iacopo Sannazaro's *De partu Virginis* dates back to 1526. Alegre's views have much in common with the theories of imitation espoused by Petrarch and later Italian humanists: McLaughlin (1995) is an illuminating study of *imitatio* in the Renaissance.

100. For the literature available to the Mexican Jesuits in Italy, see Deck (1976), 31-45; Landívar's absorption of Petrarch, Fracastoro, Vanière and others is indicated in Chapter 3 of this volume. Battista Spagnoli (known as 'Mantovano'), Sannazaro and Vida, and the late antique poet Juvencus, were anthologised in Pedro de Salas' *Thesaurus Poetarum*, which was published in Mexico City in 1641: cf. Osorio Romero (1980), and n. 15 above.

101. Decorme (1941) vol. I, 456; Ronan (1977), 94.

102. As Herrera Zapién (2000) notes at 210-11, clerics like José Ramón Arzac who deemed the style of Fulgentius preferable to that of Cicero were clearly confusing content with form.

103. The achievements of Gabriel Méndez Plancarte (1905-49), Agustín Millares Carlo (1893-1980), and, more recently, Ignacio Osorio Romero (1941-91) merit particular mention.

104. Twentieth-century Latin poets in Mexico include Federico Escobedo, translator of Landívar; Thomas Twaites Varmington (who was born in Coventry, England in 1870, and died in Mexico City in 1959); and Francisco José Cabrera (born 1918) whose epyllia or short epic '*cantos*' include *Mexicus-Tenochtitlan, Angelopolis, Quauhnahuac, Laus Guadalupensis* (n. 44 above), and *Quetzalcóatl CMXCIX–MCMXCIX*. The former three poems – each on a Mexican city – are now available in Cabrera (2004). Beuchot (2001), 33-5 has a short biography of Cabrera.

2. Devotion and Exile: Rafael Landívar's life and earlier compositions

1. Villacorta (1931), 6.

2. The actual text of the entry is given in Chamorro (1987), 9. Landívar's date of birth is also given in the Catalogue of the members of the Jesuit order expelled from Mexico in 1767, compiled by Don Rafael de Zelis (who was himself among them) in Cuevas (1944), 231-93.

3. Villacorta (1931) combines archival information with a reconstruction of social historical background; cf. Scheifler (1950a) and the more colourful if sometimes unreliable account in Mata Gavidia (1950), 9-19. Zambrano and Gutiérrez Casillas (1977), 31-2 is a reliable chronology with bibliographical sources. Chamorro (1987), xiv cites the following (which I have not been able to consult): Batres Jáuregui (1957), Carboni (1951), and a sequence of articles from 21-27 October 1931 in the Guatemalan newspaper *El Imparcial,* including an account of Landívar's ancestry (22 October), his life in Bologna (26 October), a text of his will (24 October).

4. The part of Sebastián's *Memorias de los Padres, y Hermanos de la Compañia de Jesús de la Provincia de Nueva España* devoted to Landívar (vol. 2, 247-55) was printed in Pérez Alonso (1950).

5. Pérez Alonso (1950), 24-5. Zambrano and Gutiérrez Casillas (1977), 98-9 and Osorio Romero in Maneiro (1988), 7-25 give further details of Maneiro's life.

6. Sebastián §2 in Pérez Alonso (1950), 25; a confusion in Villacorta (1931), 41 between Colegio San Lucas and the Colegio San Francisco de Borja is corrected in Scheifler (1950a), 33. San Borja was named after Francis Borgia, the Third General of the Society of Jesus in the sixteenth century. Borgia directed the order to teach the laity, and thus secured its footing in the courts of France, Spain and Portugal.

7. Lanning (1956), 161 notes that botany and astronomy were popular in Guatemala, even before they became a formal part of the curriculum at the University of San Carlos in 1793. Cultivation of these particular sciences had also been a characteristic of the pre-Hispanic Mayan civilisation.

8. Zelis' 1786 *Catálogo,* reproduced in Cuevas (1944), 262-3.

9. §5 in Pérez Alonso (1950), 26.

10. Villacorta (1931), 58.

11. Scheifler (1950a), 36 n. 19 notes a translation of the Latin autograph of the vow.

12. Moses (1919), 104-6 gives the full text in English.

13. The estimate is in Scheifler (1950a), 37: Scheifler n. 25 quotes the Rector of the University of Guatemala speaking a decade later in 1778: 'the absence of the professors at the College is felt each day'.

14. §14 in Pérez Alonso (1950), 29. Ferrer Benimeli (1994) explains the historical and political complexities which led to the movement of the Jesuits from Corsica to Italy.

15. 'Carta de un Religioso de los extintos jesuitas a una Hermana suya' in Cuevas (1944), 19-80.

16. Cross and Livingstone (1997), 498 on 'Dominus ac Redemptor'.

17. The effects of this are described in Landívar's dedicatory verses to the city which precede the *Rusticatio Mexicana* and in 3.47-60.

18. Scheifler (1950a), 37; Chamorro (1987), xxxiii.

19. Bertoni (1937), Batllori (1966).

20. See Scheifler (1950b), and pp. 26-7 n. 81 above.

21. A facsimile of this edition is in Mata Gavidia (1950).

22. Landívar's death notice, written by Caietano Tomba, parish priest of Santa Maria delle Muratelle, is given below, pp. 283-4.

23. Sebastián §21: Pérez Alonso (1950).

24. Sebastián §16: '*La vida, que entabló en su austero retiro está dicha en dos palabras: Orar, y Estudiar*': Pérez Alonso (1950), 29.

25. Sebastián §17 in Pérez Alonso (1950), 30: this testimony's reliance on the authority of others' verdicts on the *RM* (and its laborious transcription of the poem's title) could suggest that Sebastián did not feel equipped to assess Landívar's literary competence for himself. Possibly if Sebastián himself set little store by Latin verse, he assumed the same of Landívar. Landívar's modesty, frequently evident from the rest of his account, might have given rise to such an assumption.

26. Peñalosa (1998), 273.

27. MacCormack (1975) is a detailed treatment of Latin prose panegyric in late antiquity, including an account of its origins in the *Laudatio funebris* of the Roman Republic at 146-8.

28. Juarros (1936), 209, cited in Accomazzi (1961), 20-1 n. 2 bis.

29. Peñalosa (1998), 272.

30. The full title on the first page of the volume consists of 22 centre-justified lines divided as follows: 'EL LLANTO/ DE LOS OJOS DE LOS JESUITAS/ DE GUATHEMALA/ EN LA MUERTE DE SU LUZ,/ EL ILLMO. Sr. DOCTOR/ D. FRANCISCO JOSEPH/ DE FIGUEREDO, Y VICTORIA,/ Obispo, primero de Popayan, y despues Arzobispo/ Dignissimo de Guathemala./ Quien bajo la alegoria de una Antorcha Luciente sobre el/ Candelero en su vida, se llora apagada en su muerte./ *POR EL P. FRANCISCO XAVIER MOLINA,/ de la Compañía de Jesus,*/ Describiendo los Funerales obsequios, que como â su Benefactor/ Insignissimo le hizo, y celebró en su Templo/ EL COLEGIO DE LA COMPAÑIA DE JESUS./ Quien para monumento perpetuo de su gratitud los saca â luz publica,/ DEDICA, Y CONSAGRA/ AL MUY ILUSTRE VENERABLE Sr./ DEAN, Y CABILDO/ SEDEVACANTE DE LA SANTA IGLESIA METROPOLITANA/ DE GUATHEMALA./ CON LICENCIA/ En el Colegio Real de San Ignacio de la Puebla de los Angeles/ Año de 1766.'

31. Molina's text is printed on folios 9-21 (reverse); Landívar's Declamation occupies fol. 22 recto – 28 recto; Vallejo 30 recto – 38 recto. Copies of the volume can be found in the Biblioteca Palafoxiana in Puebla, Mexico, and the Bancroft Library in Berkeley, California: BANCxF1207.E8.v.3:7. A self-standing impression of Landívar's text is in an untitled anthology of funeral speeches compiled by the bibliographer José María Lafragua (1813-75), in the Fondo Reservado of the National Library of Mexico: BNM Libros raros y curiosos 1358 LAF.

32. 'Cerrada con la última lección, que cantó el Preste la solemne Vigilia, declamó con eloquencia en idioma latina un Jesuita', quoted in Accomazzi (1961), 15. The page of Molina's account from which this comes follows Landívar's speech apparently at random in Lafragua's anthology (n. 31 above).

33. See the title text of the Declamation below at p. 97 – equivalent to folio 22 (recto) of *El llanto de los ojos*.

34. Peñalosa (1998), 267-8 complains that scholars have continued to cite the speech erroneously as a self-standing work of Landívar (proving either they have not read it or that they have read it in Lafragua's compilation) whilst others disregard it altogether. The misattributions in Mata Gavidia (1950), 18, and

Zambrano and Gutiérrez Casillas (1977), 32 are rooted in Beristáin de Souza (1980-1 = 1816-21) and Sommervogel (1893), vol. 4, 1457 [both key bibliographical resources for the study of Mexican humanism]. However the edition of Accomazzi (1961) was not known to Peñalosa, whose own Spanish translation and edition of the Latin text was produced in 1998.

35. Latin oratory continued in New Spain for well over a century after the Jesuit expulsions. Osorio Romero (1976) which reviews Cicero's influence in the *aulas*, in the Royal and Pontifical University and in Jesuit Colleges, treats funeral orations (151-64) – with a bibliography (165-216) of printed editions of 86 separate Latin speeches. These were composed between 1603 and 1895. Landívar's Declamation in *El llanto de los ojos* is numbered 54 (at 199).

36. Figueredo himself 'called the Society his Mother' (4): *Ab illaque die Ignatium Parentem nominare, Societatem Matrem vocitare.*

37. Landívar's diction indicates that he draws closely on the two Roman sources for this story, Valerius Maximus and Pliny: see n. 13 to my translation on p. 260 below. However, the possibility of Landívar encountering the episode in an anthology or later sourcebook cannot be excluded. It suits the design of the speech to follow the version of the story in which a girl saves the life of her mother (and not of her father as in other traditions).

38. Landívar does not specify the dialogue. The quotation is actually from Plato, *Laws* 717b.

39. Compare e.g. Cicero, *Catiline* 2.1 (*abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit*) and Landívar, *Decl.* 4 (*extendit, audaxit, cumulavit*); *Catiline* 1.5, 4.11 and Landívar, *Decl.* 6 (*Quae cum ita sint*); *Catiline* 4.1 (*deos immortales!*) and Landívar, *Decl.* 7 (*Deum immortalem!*). Other resemblances include: *Decl.* 2 (*absit verba invidia*) and Livy 9.19 (*absit iniuria verbo*); *Decl.* 12 (*infixus animo haeret dolor*) and Virgil, *Aeneid* 4.4 (*harent infixi pectore*). Osorio Romero (1976), 163-4 quotes the *exordia* of two Latin orations delivered in Mexico within the same year (one by Vicente Antonio de los Ríos in 1761, and the other by Ildefonso López de Aguado in 1762) to show how closely they are modelled on the *exordium* of Cicero's first oration against Catiline (*Catiline* 1.1).

40. This is quoted from the edition of Lavarenne (1948), 143 which converges with the text in Bergman (1926). Lavarenne's apparatus records *urbe* in some key seventh- to ninth-century manuscripts: *urbs* and *orbis* were often associated, and frequently confused by copyists. However, the argument here is primarily concerned with Landívar's substitution of *inquit* for Prudentius' *Romae*.

41. Symmachus, *Relatio* 3. The text is in Barrow (1973).

42. Matthews (1996) has bibliography on the controversy.

43. Osorio Romero (1980), 64 and (1990).

44. Spanish and New Spanish Jesuits exiled in Italy found themselves having to defend the quality of Hispano-Roman authors. See pp. 26-7 above.

45. According to Zambrano and Gutiérrez Casillas (1977), (16), 614 (sv. 'P. Vallejo, José'), Vallejo was born in Jalostotitlán in the Mexican diocese of Guadalajara in 1718. After joining the Jesuits in 1741, he studied humanities at the renowned Jesuit seminary of Tepotzotlán in 1745 (as did Landívar ten years later) and theology in Mexico City. Ordained by 1751, he taught grammar in the College of Chiapas before becoming professor of philosophy at the Colegio de Guatemala in 1755, where he remained until 1767, having become prefect of the Congregation (1761) and teacher of theology there (1767) as well as Superior of the Seminary of San Borja (1764). Vallejo was in Spain before joining the Jesuits in Italy. He died in Bologna in 1785 and was buried in the church of Santa Maria della Puritá.

46. *Vida del Señor San Joseph* (Cesena, 1774); *Vida de San Joaquín y Santa Ana* (Cesena, 1774).

47. Horace had many imitators in New Spain: Méndez Plancarte (1937). Piastra (1994) surveys Renaissance Latin Marian poetry in Italy. The Virgin of Guadalupe prompted an abundance of such poetry in Mexico: see p. 79 nn. 44-5 above.

48. For Villerías' *Guadalupe*, see Chapter 1 (iii) above. The text was known to Landívar's compatriot – and housemate – in Italy, Francisco Xavier Clavigero: pp. 81-2 nn. 75 and 101 above.

49. The poem is numbered 26 in Ciplijauskaité (1985), 83-4. I am extremely grateful to Biruté Ciplijauskaité for drawing this sonnet of Góngora to my attention: its evocation by Landívar could have implications for the poetic programme of the *Rusticatio Mexicana*: see pp. 64-8 above.

50. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15.810: Jupiter tells Venus she may herself inspect 'the events [recorded on] tablets of bronze and solid iron' (*ex aere et solido rerum tabularia ferro*).

51. The *ut pictura poesis* principle (*Ars Poetica* 361) functions metapoetically in Landívar's sonnet and ode: that Horatian coinage is cited by Alegre in his *Arte poética de Mr. Boileau* to support the assertion that the sublime should be clear and unaffected: Alegre in García Icazbalceta (1889), 28; cf. Higgins (2002), 128.

52. *La 'Pontifical' del Doctor Babia* had been singled out for praise by Baltasar Gracián in his 1642 manifesto for Baroque poetics, *Agudeza y arte de ingenio* 'Sharpness and the art of inventiveness': Ciplijauskaité (1985), 83-4.

53. Alegre in his *Arte poética de Mr. Boileau* concedes that Góngora sometimes shows 'a sublimity of talent (*una sublimidad de ingenio*) equal, if not superior to the Greeks and Romans' and compares Góngora, *Sonnet* 17 (*Oh, claro honor de líquido elemento*) with Horace, *Odes* 3.13 (*O fons Bandusiae, splendidior vitro*): García Icazbalceta (1889), 23.

3. The Recollection of Arcadia: Conception and design in the *Rusticatio Mexicana*

1. The *coup* led to the longest civil war in Latin American history: Handy (1996).

2. Ordoñez Mazariegos (2003), 103. The facsimile is in Mata Gavidia (1950); the periodical *Estudios Landivarianos* was published through the 1950s.

3. Humboldt (1811), 211 cited in Nemes (1971), 299. The second book of the *Rusticatio Mexicana* (*RM*) treats volcanic and seismic activity.

4. Maury (1806), 32 quotes *RM* 7.163-5, 169-70 (on the use of gunpowder in mining) to gloss his own verse *Miro, peñascos estallar deshechos*: 'I gaze, as rocks are blown apart'. Born in Málaga in 1772, the Neoclassical vernacular poet Juan María Maury y Benítez was exiled to France in 1814.

5. Menéndez y Pelayo (1958), clxvi.

6. Menéndez y Pelayo (1958), clxv-clxix.

7. Gómez Álvarez and Téllez Guerrero (1997) list a copy in the library of Antonio Bergosa y Jordán, who was Bishop of Oaxaca from 1802 to 1817.

8. Loureda (1924), Escobedo (1969). Valdés (1965) and Chamorro (1987) are more recent translations. Couttolenc Cortés (1973), a study of Escobedo, offers a useful account of classical and literary culture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Mexico at 23-49.

9. Unless otherwise specified, this chapter refers to the longer Bologna (1782) edition of 15 books. The full titles of the two original editions are as follows: *Rusticatio Mexicana, seu rariora quaedam ex agris mexicanis decerpta atque in*

libros decem distributa a Raphaele Landivar, Mutinae 1781; and *Rusticatio Mexicana, editio altera auctior et emendatior, Bononiae 1782.*

10. Leaving aside the anti-American and anti-Hispanic intellectual currents with which Clavigero and Abad were concerned, Landívar's comment may be in response to the ignorance routinely encountered by Spanish Americans in Italy. López de Priego, reports that the first Jesuits to arrive from the Americas were regarded by the Italians as a 'different species': his barber asked if the sun was the same colour in the Indies; others jibed that 'over there' no one knew the nominative case: Cuevas (1944), 56-7.

11. Mata Gavidia (1950), 103; Suárez (2003), 86.

12. Henríquez Ureña (1945), Chamorro (1987), and Suárez (2004), studies by scholars from the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, and Argentina respectively, show that interest in the *RM* is by no means confined to Guatemala and Mexico.

13. Landívar's diction here could be connected to a number of classical Latin sources including Propertius, *Elegies* 2.1.9 (*sive lyrae carmen digitis percussit eburnis*), 3.2.9 (*Apolline dextro*); Ovid, *Fasti* 1.6 (*en tibi devoto numine dexter ades*); Statius, *Silvae* 5.5.31 (*eburno pollice*); *Aetna* 4 (*dexter venias*).

14. On intertextuality and Landívar's use of classical mythology see Suárez (2004).

15. Escobedo (1969), xviii.

16. See further Gil Alonso (1947), 117-22. Fracastoro's *Syphilis* is another neo-Latin poem modelled on Virgil's *Georgics* which echoes the *Aeneid*: see now Hardie (2004), as well as Eatough (1984) and Eatough (1999b).

17. Mata Gavidia (1950), 29. Landívar's poetic reflections on exile are discussed here on pp. 59-61: the amount of critical attention given to those reflections outweighs the relatively moderate emphasis given to them in Landívar's actual text.

18. Quintilian, *Institutio* 10.1.95: *vir Romanorum eruditissimus* (cf. Plutarch, *Romulus* 12.3); Petrarch, *Trionfo della Fama* 3.38: *il terzo gran lume di Roma* (cf. Petrarch, *Familiares* 24.6.). These commendations of Varro, as well as his work, would have been known in New Spain: Millares Carlo (1986); Osorio Romero (1980).

19. Laird (2004b), 27; Coroleu (1999), (2001) on Politian's influence in Spain.

20. Fantazzi (2004), xiv.

21. Fantazzi (2004), xiv; Politian, *Rusticus* 5-6.

22. Gil Alonso (1947), 117-24 and throughout.

23. Politian's own *Stanze per la giostra* is echoed in his *Rusticus*: Bausi (1996) provides a detailed inventory of sources for the *Silvae*.

24. See Mynors (1990), 125 on Virgil, *Georgics* 2.176.

25. Pontano, *De Hortis Hesperidum* ('On the Gardens of the Hesperides') a poem about growing oranges, and Vida, *De Bombycum Cura et Usu* ('On Keeping Silkworms'). Vida may have been a model for the account of cochineal beetles in *RM* 4.28-205. Both are listed in Kerson (1990), 150 (along with the *Rusticus*, *Horti*, and *Praedium Rusticum*) as significant precedents for the *RM*, and a less well known work by Girolamo Lagomarsini, *De Origine Fontium* ('On the Source of Springs') which was first recited in Rome in 1726: cf. *RM* 3 on springs. Compare the inventory of modern Latin poetry given by Landívar's friend Alegre, quoted at p. 29 above.

26. Haskell (2003), 17-60 provides excellent coverage of both these poems; Osorio Romero (1980), 81 refers to their reception in Mexico. Both Rapin and Vanière make mention of the Americas in their compositions.

27. See the text of Rapin in McDonald (1932), 162.

28. See further Haskell (2003), 38.

29. The epigraph is from Vanière, *Praedium Rusticum* 1.21-2: *Secreti tacita capior dulcedine ruris: / Quod spectare juvat, placuit deducere versu.* ('I am captivated by the silent loveliness of the remote countryside. As it is a joy to behold, so has it been a pleasure to render in verse.'). Valdés (1965), 24 identifies two possible echoes of Vanière by Landívar: (i) four verses from *Praedium Rusticum* 1 (beginning *Composito glomerare gradu* on horse-taming) in *RM* 10.71-5; (ii) some verses from *Praedium Rusticum* 12 (beginning *Colla rigent hirsuta jubis/Dira rubent*) in *RM* 15.47-58. Verses are not numbered in any of the editions of the *Praedium Rusticum*.

30. Compare *artis in rebus* from Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.2.25-6: *arctus* is an alternative form of the adjective *artus*.

31. Compare e.g. Ovid, *Tristia* 4.2.57, *haec ego summotus qua possum mente videbo* (the poet imagines himself witnessing a Triumph in Rome); *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.8.19-21: *hunc ego cum spectem, videor mihi cernere Romam;/fallor ...* .

32. See Landívar's Notes on the *Rusticatio Mexicana*, sv. Book 1, n. 9 (on *RM* 1.285) at p. 265. Alegre's *Alexandriad* was first published in Forlì in 1773, some years before the first edition of the *RM*, as it had been composed by Alegre prior to his exile. A manuscript version of the *Alexandriad* is also preserved in Mexico.

33. The end of Landívar's *Appendix* (106) also recalls the proem of *RM* 1.1-6: see pp. 67-8 above.

34. Higgins (2000), 120-1. Virgil *Ecl.* 1.19: *Urbem quam dicunt Romam, Meliboee* ('The city they call Rome, Meliboeus').

35. Although *La Grandeza Mexicana* ('The Greatness of Mexico') is in Spanish, it shows the evident influence of classical sources, notably Virgil, Ovid and Lucan. Balbuena (2001) is a modern edition. A full account of the cultural importance of cities in Spanish and colonial Spanish American culture is provided by Kagan (2000); Rama (1996) has been a very influential and adventurous interpretation of the subject.

36. Translated and quoted in Browning (1985), 13.

37. Browning (1985); Chapter 1, pp. 25-6 above.

38. Brading (1971). For Jesuit poetry on mining see Haskell (2003) and Mariano (forthcoming) on the *Brasilienses Aurifodinae* ('The Gold Mines of Brazil'), a Latin didactic poem of 1,823 verses composed by Basílio da Gama in the 1760s.

39. Vanière had made explicit his decision to refrain from employing themes from classical myth: Haskell (2003), 38-60. The incorporation of classical myth into humanist poetry had been much debated in the Italian Renaissance and preoccupied Petrarch, Boccaccio, Salutati and Pontano among others. Spagnoli ('Mantovano') adorned his biblical poems with pagan deities, forcefully defending this practice in his *Apologeticon*, first published in 1488: a text is in Marrone (2000). The debate acquired fresh momentum in Mexico during the 1500s, where polytheism was seen to pose a practical threat to Christian teaching: Gruzinski (2002), 91-106; Lupher (2003), 229-34, and 273-88 on 'pagan survivals'.

40. I have not been able to locate this poet: possibly Golmarius Marsiglianus has been invented to bamboozle readers, and the elegiac verses are really Landívar's own.

41. Jacques-Christophe Valmont de Bomare (whom Landívar refers to as 'Bomare'), a mineralogist and natural historian, was not an original thinker, but an extraordinarily successful writer and lecturer: Burke (1976).

42. See the following Notes by Landívar: Book 3, Notes 3 and 4; Book 4, Notes 3 and 5; Book 8, Note 2.

43. Before the word *Finis*, the 1781 Modena edition has these words: *Quae huic complendo carmini desiderari possunt, alias fortasse dabimus, vita comite* ('The things possibly required for this poem to be finished, we shall perhaps provide another time, if life is kind.')

44. Mercury escorts souls to the Underworld in Virgil, *Aeneid* 4.242-4; cf. Horace, *Odes* 1.10.16-20. Ovid, *Fasti* 5.681-90 presents the Roman god as patron of cheating merchants, a role which is also appropriate here (*RM* 7.287-319). Hardie (1986), 278 discusses the attributes of Mercury, with useful bibliography.

45. *RM* 7.302-19 can be compared to *Aeneid* 6.608-28. Kerson (1990) distinguishes the 'mock-heroic' mode from the 'miniature epic' form in the *RM*, examining the sketches of cochineal worms in Book 4 as an example of the former, and the account of the volcanic and seismic activity in Book 2 for the latter. Even neo-Latin poets opposed to Lucretius' Epicureanism were prone to imitate his parodic or mock-heroic style: see Yasmin Haskell's discussion of Tomasso Ceva and other Jesuit didactic poets in Hardie (forthcoming). In the same volume Eric Baker assesses Lucretius' bearing on Kant and the European Enlightenment. For another possible echo of Lucretius' proem to his third book, see n. 68 below.

46. The *Argumenta Totius Carminis* come after the *Monitum* and the general table of contents in the Bologna edition: (1782), viii-xxviii.

47. Chamorro (1987), xxxviii-xxxix tabulates the sequence of divinities invoked at the beginning of each book of the *RM* and notes: 'the poet opens the performance of his song by invoking the propitious assistance of the leader of the Muses [Apollo], and culminates it with a command for silence from the Delphic bard, as he invokes the 'Almighty Wisdom of the Supreme God' [*Appendix* 16] to help him herald the brilliant triumph of the Cross.'

48. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.1; Lucan, *Pharsalia* 1.67.

49. The canonical version of the story of Arachne is in Ovid, *Met.* 6.1-145: Feeney (1991), 190-4 discusses the metaliterary implications of the Ovidian episode. Kerson (1990), 160 considers the mock-heroic qualities of the inimical spider. Valdés (1965), 116 proposes a connection between *Lydam ... puellam* in RM 4.7 and the figure in Acts of the Apostles 16:14 ('one who heard us was a woman named Lydia ... a seller of purple goods, who was a worshipper of God'), but it is not clear what the significance of such a connection would be.

50. Virgil, *Georgics* 4.315-558; Manilius, *Astronomica* 5.538-630. The preface by Vanière apologising for the inclusion of mythological metamorphoses in the earlier books of his *Praedium Rusticum* may have influenced Landívar's practice: p. 88 n. 39 above.

51. This occurred in September 1759, in Jorullo.

52. Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.86-7 (the Sibyl's grim prediction to Aeneas): *Bella, horrida bella/et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno* ('I see wars, horrific wars, and the Tiber foaming with streams of blood').

53. Jonah 3:3-8.

54. Higgins (2000), 149: 'This demonstration of ecclesiastical practicality identifies the cleric as the incarnation of the more pragmatic form of priestly agency developed by the Jesuits, particularly in their interventions in overseas contexts.'

55. Kerson (1990), 151-7 helpfully examines this 'mock epic' narrative in relation to passages in Lucretius and Virgil. George (1998) refers to Edward George's own unpublished teaching text on the classical sources in relation to *RM* 2 for use in the contemporary classroom.

56. Higgins (2000), 113: 'The small body of criticism written about Landívar's poem prior to the last twenty years tends to reconstruct the work as the exile's expression of nostalgia for his homeland.' Exile is also a theme in some more recent discussions cited by Higgins at 253 n. 11: Chamorro (1987), xxxii, xxxviii, and Osorio Romero (1989).

57. Compare Said (2000), 186. Ellen Finkelpearl drew my attention to this essay and to other discussions of exile. Cheney (2002), 15 notes that the application of 'career criticism' to literary texts has given further prominence to 'the idea of travel, the metaphor of journey, and in particular the writer in motion.' Claassen (1999) considers various presentations of exile by Greek and Roman authors.

58. Sigurdsson (1999) is a history of theories about volcanoes from classical times. Kircher – best known for his studies of Egypt, the Orient, Lull's logic, and magnetism – published his *Mundus Subterraneus* in 1664, having visited Vesuvius and Etna in 1638. Osorio Romero (1993) assembles the correspondence between Kircher and some New Spanish scholars between 1655 and 1677. A handwritten inscription in an edition of the *Mundus Subterraneus* in the Biblioteca Palafoxiana in Puebla, indicating the book was acquired in 1761, proves Kircher's volcanology enjoyed currency in New Spain more immediately prior to the expulsion of the Jesuits. The sixteenth-century account of American volcanoes in Acosta (2003) must have been known to Landívar, whose Notes draw from other parts of Acosta's work: see my comments on Landívar's Note 3 to *RM* 1 at p. 263 below.

59. Contrast the use of *nobis* ('for us') at 13.17. In Book 13 the poet constantly positions himself in the American location he describes – although 13.357-8 hint at his relocation. It is tempting to read the account of the healing powers of an unnamed bird in 13.375-80 as a veiled reference to the author's predicament of exile: by drinking the same water the creature's tongue has touched the sick man can relieve a 'broken heart' (*dirum fracto pellit de pectore morbum*). See also p. 64 above and n. 70 below.

60. E.g. *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.13. Habinek (1998), 198-69 and (2002), 59 propose that Ovid performs as a 'colonising subject' in his exile poetry, 'do[ing] the work of empire': Davis (2002) offers powerful criticism of this position.

61. Hardie (2002a), 296. Claassen (1999) analyses literary devices pertaining to exile in Cicero, Ovid, Boethius, and Dio Chrysostom.

62. *On the Sublime* 35.3-36.1 (tr. D.A. Russell): Russell and Winterbottom (1972), 494. Laird (2006) contains discussion and bibliography on Longinus and his influence. The Longinian passage quoted here is evidently echoed in Kant's *Critique of Judgment* §28 (= Kant (1987), 120): 'Consider bold, overhanging, and as it were, threatening rocks, thunderclouds piling up in the sky and moving about accompanied by lightning and thunderclaps, volcanoes with all their destructive power, hurricanes with all the devastation they leave behind, the boundless ocean heaved up, the high waterfall of a mighty river, and so on. Compared to the might of any of these our ability to resist becomes an insignificant trifle.' Kant's *Critique* was published in 1790 – not long after the *Rusticatio Mexicana*.

63. Ashfield and Bolla (1996); Monk (1960).

64. Burke (1987); Kant (1987), book 2, 'The Analytic of the Sublime'. The remarks from Kant's *Critique of Judgment,* quoted above in n. 62, had they not been published a decade later, might have been regarded as a prescription for the *RM* – as a poem which gives prominence to thunderstorms, volcanoes, earthquakes, rock formations, and to human vulnerability in face of nature's power. Landívar's conception of sublimity is *not* the same as Kant's, but the pervasiveness of Longinus' influence on all kinds of writers in this period is very evident.

65. Higgins (2000), (2002).

66. On Boileau and Longinus, see Brody (1958). Early Latin translations of Longinus include those by Domenico Pizzimenti *De Grandi Orationis Genere* (first printed Naples, 1566), Pietro Pagani, *De Sublimi Dicendi Genere* (Venice, 1572 reprinted with Pizzimenti in Venice, 1644), Gabrielle dalla Pietra, *De Grandi sive Svblimi genere orationis* (Geneva, 1612, with reprintings 1638-63); Da Falgano produced a manuscript Italian translation, *Della altezza del dire* in 1575: Weinberg (1950) gives bibliographical details. However I have discovered nothing to indicate these versions of Longinus were available in New Spain. If Alegre, Landívar or Agustín Pablo de Castro read Longinus in Mexico (p. 82 n. 95 above), it would have been in Greek: Robortello's *editio princeps* (Padova, 1554), the Aldine text of Paulus Minutius (Venice 1555), or possibly Franciscus Portus (Geneva, 1569).

67. Horace *Ars Poetica* 408-52. Higgins (2002), 126 notes that 'as the discourse of *gongorismo* became more dominant, [late seventeenth-century] Spanish American thought would accord greater importance to the concept of *ingenio*, according a stronger role of agency to the author'.

68. The site is best visited in winter: Landívar explained earlier (3.133-4) that in summer it is plagued with flies, gnats, and poisonous spiders. The word *nobilis* might convey the *sensibility* of the young men (cf. Longinus 9.1-2 for association of sublimity with innate greatness) as opposed to their social status. But Higgins (2000), 164 holds that the sublimity of this scene is appropriated by Landívar 'as a symbol of *criollo* patrimony' – although there is nothing to suggest that the youths are not indigenous.

A possible articulation of sublimity in Seneca, *Quaestiones naturales* 5.15.1-3 offers a striking parallel to Landívar's vignette. Seneca relates that men sent by Philip II of Macedon to explore an abandoned mine found vast reservoirs of water held in the generous embrace of the earth: a sight which prompted a sensation of *horror* for those who beheld it but of *voluptas* for Seneca as he read of it. Likewise, Landívar conjoins fear and pleasure in the earlier part of this description: the words *horreret, terret, horrendum* and *terrere* are employed in *RM* 3.239-54 of a place which also captivates birds with its 'sweetness' (*RM* 3.236)! Jim Porter sees the influence of the Lucretius 3.28-9 on this passage of Seneca: *His ibi me rebus quaedam divina voluptas/ percipit atque horror* ('At these things a kind of divine pleasure and a horror take hold of me'). Although Bailey (1947) iii, 992 interprets Lucretius' expression in terms of Roman religious emotion, compare Kant's claim (n. 62 above) that the apprehension of nature's might is 'all the more attractive the more fearful it is, provided we are in a safe place' with *RM* 2.10-11!

69. In Landívar's dedicatory poem, the old city of Guatemala was compared to the Egyptian phoenix, as his expression *Phariae volucri* ('the bird of Pharos') indicates: *Pharius* was a common transferred epithet for 'Egyptian' in imperial Roman poetry. (The phoenix is connected with Egypt in Herodotus, *Histories* 2.73 and Tacitus, *Annals* 6.28.) For Sigüenza y Góngora's associations between Mesoamerica and Egypt which drew from the *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (1652-4) of his contemporary Athanasius Kircher, see Brading (2001), 115, and my comments on Landívar's Note on *RM* 10.115, pp. 272-3 below. Kant in his *Critique of Judgment* §28 (Kant (1987), 108) considers the the Egyptian pyramids in relation to 'aesthetic comprehension', but not the Nile: for Longinus' remark about the Nile, see n. 71 below.

70. Landívar's possible allegorisation of the healing power of poetry as a bird in 13.375-80 may be relevant: n. 59 above.

71. Compare Russell (1964), xlvi: 'L[onginus]'s remarks in 35 about man's natural inclination to admire the grander works of nature – Nile, Danube, Rhine, Ocean, Etna – nourished the notion that there were certain topics in themselves sublime.' As well as Kant's *Critique of Judgment* (1790) §28 quoted in n. 62 above, Ann Radcliffe's contemporaneous novels exemplify this: *A Sicilian Romance* (1790); *The Romance of the Forest* (1792); *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794).

72. Virgil, *Eclogues* 6.61-86, 10.1-15; Propertius, *Elegies* 2.34.61-94; cf. Ovid, *Amores* 1.15.

73. *Etenim videbantur non solum tersa, plena, poetica; sed etiam eiusmodi, ut Imaginum sublimitate, gravitate sententiarum, Argumenti Divinitatem mirifice subsequerentur.* Vannetti, *Epistula ad Abadium* in Manuel Fabri, *Specimen vitae auctoris*, in Fernández Valenzuela (1974), 86. Compare p. 27 above on Vannetti.

74. Menéndez y Pelayo (1958): 'For our purposes, Mexican poetry of the seventeenth century can be reduced to one name which is worth many: that of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz.'

75. Ruskin's discussion of the pathetic fallacy is in ch. 12 of *Modern Painters* (1856), but such forms of personification go back to Homer. An impressive instance is *RM* 12.290-316, where the fallacy operates in both the tenor *and* the vehicle of a sustained simile: the spring of Ixtlán, which recoils in apparent fright from anyone who seeks to examine it, is compared to the 'sensitive plant' (which modestly folds its leaves when suddenly touched). Landívar's Notes 9 and 10 to Book 12 (p. 276 below) indicate he accepts the evidence for both phenomena.

76. Ovid, *Tristia* 4.10.53 confirms Gallus as creator of the genre: Courtney (1996) has further information and bibliography.

77. The first volume of Sor Juana's collected works published in Madrid in 1689 was entitled *Inundación castálida de la única poetisa, musa décima* ('Castalian inundation of the unique poetess, the tenth muse'). The expression 'Tenth Muse' originates in a Greek epigram in praise of Sappho: Palatine Anthology 9.506. In antiquity this epigram was attributed to Plato.

78. Cycnus is *not* associated with poetry on the occasions he appears in Ovid *Metamorphoses*. Harrison (1991), 121 is an important note on *Aeneid* 10.191: *maestum Musa solatur amorem* 'he solaced his sad love with the Muse'. Harrison (i) compares a similar phrase Virgil uses of Orpheus (*Georgics* 4.464), who has long been identified with Gallus by Virgil's readers and (ii) notes 'the use [in *Aen.* 10.191-2] of the themes of singing in the shade and songs of unhappy love irresistibly recalls both the style and content of the *Eclogues*'. The network of intertexts here in *RM* 1.289-97 underlines that association, but the notion of poetry as consolation for sorrow is also crucial to Landívar's poem: see the discussion of exile at pp. 59-61 above.

79. These allusions to *Eclogue* 6 could suggest Silenus is here playfully adopted as a *porte-parole* by Landívar: Virgil characterises Silenus as a didactic poet who sings to his students, the shepherds, of nature and of surprising phenomena.

80. Suetonius, *On Grammarians* 16 and *Life of Augustus* 66.2; the comments of the Servian corpus on Virgil, *Eclogue* 10, and *Georgics* 4, would have been known to Landívar as they had enjoyed a wide circulation since the Middle Ages. Raaflaub and Samons (1990), 423 is a good recent treatment of Gallus' condemnation and suicide.

81. The *Respuesta* is in vol. 4 of the *Obras Completas* of Sor Juana: Méndez Plancarte (1994). Sayers Peden (1997) is an excellent anthology of Sor Juana's work which includes a Spanish text and facing English translation of the *Respuesta*.

82. Leonard (1983), 173-92 recounts these events.

83. Higgins (2000), 142: 'amid the favourable surroundings of the lake and its shores, the poets, in turn, are held to have enhanced its pastoral order and harmony with their measured verse... Landívar canonizes [Sor Juana's] unique talent by again placing Mexican cultural production within the framework of classical humanism'.

84. Landívar's Note (13) on Sor Juana is the most commendatory of those on Mexican authors in this part of the work.

85. On this lecture by Alegre and its pedagogical implications, see Van der Poel (1990). Deck (1976), 23 notes that the clarity advocated in the *Prolusio* was 'in accord with the Rules for Preachers and with the Constitutions of the Jesuit Order'.

86. See pp. 27, 33 and 42 above.

87. Compare e.g. Nemes (1971), 303; Higgins (2000), 130-1.

88. In his letter on the *Alexandriad*, Alegre, Landívar's Mexican contemporary in Italy, refers to Petrarch's *Africa*. The relevant passage was quoted above, p. 29.

89. The term 'allegory' is taken broadly here – simply to denote one meaning being conveyed by another: see my discussion in Boys-Stones (2003), 151-75.

90. José Rafael Campoy, who taught at the Colegio Máximo, would have exposed Landívar to these and other modern thinkers such as Descartes, Locke and Newton; see p. 24ff. above, and Navarro (1983), 111-33.

91. Kerson (1976); cf. Higgins (2000).

92. More's *Utopia* ed. Logan, Adams, Miller (1995), 112.

93. Logan, Adams, Miller (1995), 119-20.

94. Zavala (1965) assembles Silvio Zavala's essays on More and Vasco de Quiroga in Spanish, French and English. Further works are cited in n. 17 on p. 77 above.

95. *Colección de Documentos Inéditos del Archivo de Indias*, Madrid 1864-89, xiii, 420, quoted in Zavala (1965). The famous *Apologética Historia* of Las Casas was an attempt to ennoble the Indians; in Landívar's time, Clavigero's *Ancient History of Mexico* (book 1, ch. 17) suggested that the Mexicans were less avaricious than the Spanish: Clavigero (2003), 64. In a modern history of the Aztecs – a people who lived on waterways – Vaillant (1965), 122-34 emphasises their strong community spirit and notes at 34 that 'personal fortunes were non-existent'.

96. Compare Higgins (2000), 183.

97. Hesiod, *Works and Days* 202-12 discussed by West (1978), 204-5 and Daly (1961); compare the story attributed to Aesop and the later Latin fable: numbered 4 and 567 in Perry (1952), 322, 612.

98. See my comment on Landívar's Note (5) on 13.313, p. 278 below.

99. Fracastoro, *Syphilis* 3.151-99. Eatough (1984), 182 notes on this passage: 'The violence which is here inflicted on those lovely innocent creatures mirrors the violence that was to be inflicted on the Indians. It is an irony that the Indians in Columbus' procession at Seville carried parrots in cages. Parrots were involved in that first fateful exchange of gifts between Indians and Spaniards at which Columbus noted the natives' potentiality for "service".'

100. This passage echoes *Aeneid* 1.12-14 and *Guadalupe* 1.16-40, including 1.33-4: *Dives opum, dives pictai vestis, et auro/ Dives* ('[Mexico] rich in resources, in coloured cloth, rich in gold'.) The stichometric correspondence between *RM* 1.32-3 and *Guadalupe* 1.32-3 was noted above, p. 79 n. 41. The fact that Landívar and Villerías are both recalling Mateo de Castroverde's Latin panegyric adds to

the complex layering of allusion in this passage. On Castroverde's surviving verses, see pp. 16-17 above.

101. The *criollo* writers Zapata and Alarcón are each classed as *Mexicanus* in Landívar's Notes 10 and 12 to Book 1; as are the indigenous *voladores*: see Landívar's Note 2 on 15.236.

102. See Landívar's Notes 7, 8, 9 and 11 to Book 1.

103. Landívar's indisposition to question the employment of African workers on sugar plantations has elicited conflicting readings: Mata Gavidia (1950), 69 regards the poet as compassionate, partly on the basis that Landívar requested in his will that his mother's slaves should be freed; Haskell (2003), 315-16 does not. However, Alegre argued against slavery in his *Institutiones Theologicae*: Deck (1976), 22-3. The Mexican poets exhibit far more humanity in this regard than Jesuits from other nations, who still depended on slave labour: the *Brasilienses Aurifodinae*, composed in 1762-4 by the Brazilian Basílio da Gama is unquestionably complacent about slavery (p. 88 n. 38 above). The endeavours of the Peruvian Juan Pablo Viscardo y Guzmán (1748-98) at least show that the Jesuits could play a politically progressive role with regard to Spanish American independence: Batllori (1953) and Viscardo y Guzmán (2002).

104. Leonard (1983), 157-71 offers a salutary comparison between the respective reading habits in the colonies of New England and New Spain, in a lively account of the American book trade in 1683.