

The Interpreter and the Expert: *Auctoritas* Devices in Two Letters by Damião de Góis

El intérprete y el experto: dispositivos de *auctoritas* en dos cartas portuguesas de Damião de Góis

O intérprete e o especialista: dispositivos de *auctoritas* em duas cartas de Damião de Góis

AUTOR

Luiz César de Sá Júnior¹

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil

luizdesajunior@gmail.com

RECEPCIÓN
29 agosto 2014

APROBACIÓN
13 marzo 2015

DOI

10.3232/RHI.2015.V8.N1.01

One of the most prolific examples of Sixteenth century Portuguese literary practices Damião de Góis (1502-1574). Among the various rhetorical genres he employed throughout his activities, one stood out: the epistolary. This article proposes an analysis of two of his letters, investigating their most recurrent *auctoritas* strategies from the perspective of the art of discourse in which they were written and their originally intended destinations. The article argues that it is legitimate to elaborate on them based on a criterion that would respect important axes in which Góis chose to operate his *ethos*. Therefore, the first part of the article deals with the production of *auctoritas* based on *humilitas*; the second, with the amplification of the auctor as *especialista*, rhetorically dedicated to the praises of the Portuguese conquests overseas.

Key Words: **Damião de Góis; Epistolary Correspondence; *Auctoritas*; *Amplificatio*; *Ethos*.**

Las prácticas letradas portuguesas del siglo XVI tuvieron en Damião de Góis (1502-1574) a uno de sus representantes más prolíficos. Entre los diversos géneros retóricos empleados en su actividad, se destacó el epistolar. En este artículo se propone un análisis de dos de sus cartas mediante el análisis de sus estrategias de *auctoritas* más recurrentes desde el punto de vista de la técnica de expresión en el que fueron escritas y los lugares donde se asignaron originalmente. Se argumenta que es legítimo hablar de ellas a partir de un criterio que respeta ejes importantes donde Góis decidió operar su *ethos*. Por lo tanto, la primera parte se basa en la producción de la *auctoritas* de la *humilitas*; la segunda, en la amplificación del *auctor* como *especialista* retóricamente dedicado a alabar los logros portugueses en el extranjero.

Palabras clave: **Damião de Góis; Epistolario; *Auctoritas*; *Amplificatio*; *Ethos*.**

As práticas letradas portuguesas quinhentistas tiveram em Damião de Góis (1502-1574) um de seus representantes mais prolíficos. Dentre os vários gêneros retóricos que empregou ao longo de sua atividade, um destacou-se: o epistolar. Este artigo propõe uma análise de duas cartas do epistolário ativo goisiano, averiguando suas estratégias de *auctoritas* mais recorrentes do ponto de vista dos lugares aonde originalmente se destinavam. Argumenta-se que seria legítimo discorrer sobre elas a partir de um critério que respeitasse eixos importantes nos quais Góis escolheu operar seu *ethos*. Assim, a primeira parte trata produção de *auctoritas* baseada na *humilitas*; a segunda, da amplificação do *actor* enquanto *especialista* retoricamente dedicado aos elogios às conquistas portuguesas no ultramar.

Palavras-chave: **Damião de Góis; Epistolário; Auctoritas; Amplificatio; Ethos.**

Introduction

Sixteenth-century Portuguese literary practices had in Damião de Góis (1502-1574) one of its most prominent representatives. Góis, who served d. Manuel I and d. João III as a diplomat and High Guardian of the Torre do Tombo National Archive, lived most of his adult life outside of Portugal -at the Portuguese *feitoria* in Flanders, in Erasmus of Rotterdam's house in Freiburg, around the circle of Pietro Bembo in Padua, and also in Louvain². He applied himself to the publication of texts based on various rhetorical techniques, which, grounded on criteria that refract the emulative activity in which all literate, in that context, belonged. One of the higher yielding devices within that list of practices was surely that of epistolary correspondence. It was through this device that Damião de Góis sought to establish his *auctoritas*, investing in continuous contact with scholars in what was conventionally called *Respublica litteraria*, in order to have his *ethos* considered an authoritative voice to praise the kingdom, the Greco-Latin Letters, and therefore, himself.

The correspondence of Damião de Góis is quite rich. Composed of 147 letters, divided among 37 sent and 110 received³, it attests to significant participation in various relevant discussions in the fields of politics, religion, and the *Respublica litterarum*. They indicate the different rhetorical-poetic procedures employed throughout Góis's life; these were aimed mainly at two objectives.

First, to gain recognition within what was then called *Respublica litteraria*, that is, the scholarly community that gathered around Erasmus to extol the Greco-Latin Letters as a repertoire needed to combat "barbarism"⁴. Formed by "humanists" from various realms, this "fictitious republic"⁵ had high regard for knowledge of ancient languages and the mastery of rhetorical techniques that were used with special care in epistolary contact, *Respublica litteraria's* main body of operation⁶. Second, Góis sought to establish his ties with the monarchy, with the dual purpose of being recognized by important figures, such as Cardinal d. Henrique and king João III,

and to avail himself of his prestige in the kingdom in order to have more weight in the *Respublica litteraria*. The relationship between Letters and politics is crucial in this context because it is understood that the best rhetorician or poet will be the one who “sings the deeds” most important. Thus, so that he could capture the interest of Erasmus or Pietro Bembo, Góis invested in epistolary dialogues that would bring him prestige in Portugal, so that he could establish his ethos in a way to tune the personal contents of his “experiences” (written as rhetorical topics) with overseas expansion. To these representations of his hierarchical rise the name *auctoritas* was given.

Auctoritas was a technical device designed to produce the presence of hierarchies. It did not mean “the reality of the individual psychology of a man who has possession and ownership”⁷ of a given text, but rather his association with the “names” considered superior in a certain rhetorical-poetic genre through the management of publically and anonymously shared topics. In this sense, the political orientation of Góis’s letters was not limited to the “true account” of his own life; it also signaled to “posterity”, for success in narrating the Portuguese feats and gaining respect along with the most relevant members of the *Respublica litteraria* could carry him to his establishment as *auctoritas* for future scholars, who would turn to his writings in order to emulate them.

Given the need for brevity, this article proposes an analysis of two letters from the Goisian active correspondence, based on the critical edition by Amadeu Torres⁸, to ascertain their most recurrent *auctoritas* strategies from the viewpoint of the art of discourse in which they were written, and the audiences and places for which they were originally intended⁹. It is argued that they are highly representative of the strategies adopted by Góis to construct his *ethos*. Thus, the first part of the text discusses the production of *auctoritas* based on humilitas, consistent with the period in which Góis began his quest for recognition; the second, the amplification of the *auctor* as an expert, *especialista*, illustrated by a letter written by Góis after having maintained contact with Erasmus and Bembo, when he tried to present himself as prepared to write about the Portuguese successes overseas. The hope is to strengthen the understanding that any sense for the *corpus* from which both epistles are extracted can only be assigned, beyond its empirical communicative intentions, in a rhetorical, political, and theological regime¹⁰, providentially encoded in order to realize, in the epideictic wording of the letter, the glorious destiny anticipated for Portugal and its scribe.

Auctoritas of the interpreter: humilitas

The first letter from the Goisian correspondence, dated 1531, and was addressed to John Magnus Gothus, prelate of Adrian VI in Upsala¹¹. In it, Góis, then a young secretary in the Portuguese *feitoria* in Antwerp, sought to propagandize religious conquest by narrating the visit of one of Prester John’s ambassadors to the court of d. Manuel I. The general structure of the letter reveals the use of a medium style, which affects a dialogue between hierarchically evenly-matched correspondents and indicates the production of persuasive evidence through the

speaker's *ethos*¹². Following the terms of the popular epistolary writing technique of Erasmus, the *Very brief and highly summarized formula for epistolary preparation*, published in 1521¹³, the style of this and of other letters by Góis is set at the limits of the familiar "non-mediocre", that is, of improvisation, prepared through an exercise of slow accumulation of the appropriate *topoi* and the capacity for their proper handling and decorous exposure¹⁴. The "natural" legible tone in the letter equates, thus, with the expectation of a reading by those who would have access to it, supposedly able to identify the rhetorical devices used by the "humanist", who fashioned himself as someone guided by "rule and discipline"¹⁵.

The *exordium* was meant to express this familiarity by recalling the ties affirmed between sender and recipient and the issues they discussed at the time they met¹⁶. Within the routines of the epideictic genre, this agenda intended to satisfy the precepts of "informing, keep an eye, become benevolent" which, while referring to Aristotle¹⁷, were equally close to the Latin rhetors, who defended the reader's disposition as *docilem*, *benivolum*, and *attentum*¹⁸. Thus, the remembering of the dialogue, consecrated from the divine auspices that made it possible, was supported by topics of the discursive production of the "imperial culture", like the risks of ocean navigation and the successive military victories against the infidels:

Having contracted friendship between us in Danzig (of course with the blessing of God) when I was going about my king's business, on often meeting one another, we happened to speak of Lusitanian deeds, that is, of the expeditions to India, Arabia, Persia; of the extent and difficulty of the route to these points, of the risks of the vast ocean, of the constant struggles with the Arabs, the Persians, the Indians this side and beyond the Ganges; of the annual incursions of the Turks, who, with large armadas from the Arabian Gulf to India Minor, harshly, albeit unsuccessfully, attack ours¹⁹.

The "imperial culture" spoken of here saw in the written materials an essential factor for the architecture of cohesion²⁰ between the territories assimilated in the course of the overseas conquest and the metropolitan political structure²¹. Along with this movement, which produced letters like those of Góis, but also maps, topographical descriptions, chorographies, chronicles, genealogies, and other printed instruments or communication manuscripts²², one element stood out: the crucial role of the sixteenth century men of letters in the elaboration of praises for the empire that was going to be formed in the frontiers of the conquest.

It is pertinent to note, following Michel de Certeau, the creation of a true "scriptural economy" in this context, according to which the uses and the circulation of written discourses (which applies to both the neo-Latin and the vernacular production) were ordained, including languages as value for the purpose of dissemination of imperial glories. Thus the perspective is assumed here of the emergence of a writing that "becomes a new mode of production, transformation, and storage of language"²³.

It was as a man of letters enrolled in this regime that Góis found the core argument of the letter, namely the *narratio* of the ambassador's visit, seen and heard (*uiderim et audierim*) by him in childhood. His description, which we can associate primarily with the rhetorical techniques of

ekphrasis, was intended to ensure the account's value and the *auctoritas* of the *auctor*, preparing the reader to receive the set of papers attached to the epistle, particularly the letter from Prester John to d. Manuel:

And, right now, I will explain in a few words how it is that I saw and heard all these things, in order to better emphasize the truth of the facts.

There arrived in Lisbon, in the year of grace 1514, an ambassador of the great emperor of India, Prester John, and of his mother, Queen Helena, by the name of Matthew and from the nation of Armenia, sent to the most Christian king of Portugal, D. Manuel. As a companion in his legation he brought a noble youth, of Abyssinian origin, educated in the imperial palace and called Jácome.[...]

So this Matthew, having initially declared before our King the mission with which he was entrusted, and having delivered to the same the letter from his Emperor, a few days later the sovereign called for him to come into his presence, along with his companion, and before several learned men, with the assembly of nobles in attendance, to interrogate them, through an interpreter, about their faith and rites, as well as the state of the Ethiopian kingdom. I was then twelve years old, one of the royal footmen who, having charge of bringing the food to the table, are called footmen of delicacies, and in that duty I served his Royal Highness for two years. So I witnessed all these things, and simultaneously with the other courtiers, saw and heard everything; and, as that age allowed, also understood²⁴.

While the visit had been seen and heard -“so I witnessed all these things, and simultaneously with the other courtiers, saw and heard everything”²⁵- we can not assume from this that the description by Góis was mere eyewitness testimony of the empirical transposed to the letter²⁶. On the one hand, the public criteria of rhetorical technique prescribed the *ratio* between the material seen rearranged by the criteria of invention and epideictic elocution²⁷. On the other, two aspects of *ethos* need to be considered.

The first concerns what we read in Aristotle's art of rhetoric²⁸, i.e., that confidence in the speaker's character must to be generated primarily by discourse²⁹. From this unfolds the second aspect, namely employing the *captatio benevolentiae* technique of *humilitas*, chosen by Góis in recognizing his inability to remember the events that occurred when he was little more than ten years old. The Catholic recyclings of Aristotle understood the *humilitas* as an apparatus of the discrete scholar³⁰, which lent vigor to the regime of the “shown”, in a translation of the words of Dominique Maingueneau. This prescription indicated that “the *ethos* is shown” without ever being said, placing itself in evidence through the vivacity³¹ that the readers would be supposed to recognize. Thus, the “admission” of the inability to remember is, first of all, calculated pretense oriented toward arousing the reader's affection. In the words of João Adolfo Hansen:

The distinction between discreet and vulgar passes, in this case, through the domain of fiction itself: like the insane, the vulgar does not possess it, unlike the discreet, which, being always ingenious, is also able to feign the lack of ingenuity and prudence, or vulgarity and madness. In the representation of appearance, pretense is the rule; as they said in Venice, “degli effetti nascono gli affeti”³².

The short-circuit potentially triggered by this confession of inability transforms into praise of the written material when Góis explains how he had been able to recover the episodes from the embassy:

But how is it that you - someone will object here - then a boy of such a young age, could pass all these facts to paper or to memory, in order to send them to us, so long afterwards, described step by step? I confess, in response, that I could not. But having already spent ten years in that job, the most Christian King d. Manuel, my protector, gave me a new task, sending me here to Belgium, to deal with his business. Having arrived here, I was fortunate to meet a man not only noble but also sagacious, sharing my orders and position, named Rui Fernandes, who here fulfills the role of chief of royal business or steward, as is commonly said. [...] By chance one day we had alluded to that embassy of theirs in Germany, and the topic of India came up incidentally, being informed he then possessed, courtesy of António Carneiro, a copy of the aforementioned texts, or the letter of the great emperor of India, Prester John, to our King³³.

By rejecting the possibility of “betraying” the reader with memories distorted by temporal distance on behalf of a memory facilitated by packs of paper, Góis introduced another mechanism of persuasion, or *fides*, intending to convince Gothus that his text was *honestum* and *humile*, because true, both by the actual presence of the eyewitness at the events and by the capture of the “admitted” imperfections of memory through a clerk’s recollections. The very brevity of the *narratio* confirms this reading. Brevity was justified by the disposition of the text itself (if there was much to say, the letter would have become inappropriate), and simultaneously, met the requirements of the epideictic genre, especially when it comes to storytelling around known characters or events³⁴.

In addition to the concern about “telling the truth” and presenting the facts honestly suggesting an approach to Aristotelian-Ciceronian *topoi*, the use of similar techniques is evident in the argument of Latin quality. Góis apologized in advance if perhaps he had resorted to some “barbarism” in the writing, for he was a “man of the court and poorly exercised in letters, as well instantly overwhelmed with countless business”³⁵. The topic of concern for the shortness of time to devote oneself to study activities was recurrent among the literati of the 16th century. When writing the prologue of the First Decade, João de Barros noted, for example, the difficulties in writing as a steward of the India House in Lisbon, “[...] tasks that with their weight act to subdue life, because they take up every day, and with the occupation and business of their armadas and commerce, drown and captivate all liberal art”³⁶. One of the old repertoires of this technique was the *De Legibus*, in which the topic appears in Marco’s words, when he argues with Atticus the attributes of those who wanted to take on honest idleness, producer of Letters:

I well understand how long they have requested this work from me, Atticus. I would not refuse, if they gave me some unoccupied and free time. It is that a project of such magnitude can not be done in the midst of such a full activity and with an occupied mind. Two conditions are needed: lack of concerns and spare time³⁷.

We may also approach these speeches to the *Ad Herennium*, when the anonymous author says he hesitated to deliver lessons on rhetoric; after all, he explained, very little time was left for reflection on personal affairs, and the time available, he should rather use it for the learning of philosophy³⁸. The outcome of this statement was *humilitas*, as it referred to the exaltation of consciousness that his efforts in teaching Gaius Herennius would not result in glory, but rather the pure pursuit of a noble task.

On the whole, therefore, it is necessary to consider that, on the one hand, the invocation of the topical lack of laudatory texts in the realm gave rise to the effort to overcome what had weakened Portugal. João Barros, in the prologue of the first Decade, for example, alerts the reader to the carelessness in Portugal with regard to the memory of the deeds³⁹. And adds to his comment the indispensable use of “artificial letters” (as opposed to oral speeches, perishable by nature) – only instrument able to provide events and immortality of men. Care for the use of Latin as outlined would have fed, in addition, the “linguistic imperialism”⁴⁰ now in vogue and the providentialism mainstay contained in the notion of *translatio imperii*. After all, if the Portuguese language would ascend as predicted by Providence, it was still necessary to spread the good news in Latin.

In the epilogue of the letter, Góis admonished Gothus to accept the true contents of the account of the visit of Prester John:

And then pay attention to what this great Emperor of India wrote to our King; pay attention, I repeat, to his letter to our Monarch, not simulated, but true and with all faithfulness translated almost literally, from the Chaldean language, which they primarily use, into Portuguese and finally into Latin⁴¹.

Góis’ declarations met the usual criteria established by *consuetudo*⁴² for the epilogue. This was the device through which he urged the reader to accept the effects displayed throughout the letter one last time. Hence resorting to the formula “pay attention, (...) pay attention” that we could read, with Quintilian, as a prescription of the need to review the key points⁴³ in order to finish the text without losing sight of its main provisions of persuasion.

Aristotle sees four aspects of the epilogue, and two are of particular interest here. First, it would lend itself to “make the listener favorable to the cause of the speaker and unfavorable to the adversary’s”⁴⁴. In our case, only the favorable notice of the case is referred to, because, as was suggested earlier, the ingenious use of the epideictic triggered a process of “showing”, instead of “demonstrating”. No need to argue about the facts narrated, as the text itself produced the tools to make its truthfulness easily recognizable.

What occurs is therefore the use of the second aspect of the epilogue, namely “amplify or minimize”. It is an enhancement of the amplification of the fact that we can see in Góis’ insistence on the narrative’s “not simulated, but true” fashion. Cicero prescribes the amplification of the “good” arguments for the sake of subsequent reduction (*minutio*) of vicious arguments, so that is not surprising that Góis, to exalt the truth of the spoken, referred to the fidelity, produced

“almost to the letter”, regarding the Chaldean language translation into Portuguese and Latin, offspring and mother of imperial destiny. This would be the “fragile part” (the allocation point of view) of the speech, the “gap” that, by evoking the full absence of the Chaldean word, printed in the text the likely presence of the scene described. Góis ingeniously reinforced the commitment to the text, his *auctoritas*, without harming the *humilitas*. He was able to do that by reducing himself to a “mere” court translator and interpreter of past events. We cannot well understand this movement without being mindful that the Epistle to Gothus originally served as a preface to the book containing the papers of the visit of the ambassador of Prester John, published by Góis in 1532 with the title *Legatio Magni Indorum Imperatoris presbyteri Ioannis (...)*⁴⁶. In it, the *auctor* is never linked to any vanity in its composition⁴⁷, leaving the burden of praising his own merits to another scholar. That role was then played by Cornelius Grapheus, editor and former Latin teacher of Góis, who praised his old student at the end the book, with poems dedicated to him⁴⁸. In summary, *auctoritas* is presented as *humilitas* mediated by the ethos of the interpreter.

Auctoritas of the specialist: amplificatio

The technical choices in the letter to Gothus were absolutely consistent with the options that Damião de Góis then had. With no books published and almost unknown in the panorama of the *Respublica litteraria*, it was not possible that Góis posited any *ethos* outside the strictest *humilitas*. His situation had changed quite a bit two decades later, when the second letter that interests us in this study appeared. Góis had already published some texts praising Portugal, as he had maintained epistolary contact with several prestigious scholars⁴⁹.

The letter in question was sent to the *infante* d. Luís in 1548 as a dedication of the book on the Portuguese wars in Cambay. Don Luis was the fourth son of d. Manuel and disciple of Pedro Nunes, scholar who dedicated to him his *Tratado da esfera*, of 1537. Therefore, we are facing a different letter, from the recipient’s point of view, as he was a higher-ranking person in the *Ancien régime* hierarchy⁵⁰.

The *infante* d. Luís was referred to in it after the initial statement, which dismissed the exordial formulas used with Gothus⁵¹. The device employed was, once again, the “true discourse”, this time assured by a letter sent by João Mascarenhas, “first captain of Dio’s fortress”. According to Góis, his text was filled with “evidence of Portuguese triumphs”. Having presented Mascarenhas as someone who, in the face of the glaring evidence of Portuguese successes, had no choice but to “compose the memories of these achievements”⁵², Góis enabled himself to prove his statement on the Portuguese expansion due to Mascarenhas’s truthful testimonial.

But the passage only attains the desired weight as we read the opening statement. Góis accessed the *otium versus negotium* topic, stating that “along with advancing age, and gradually weakening energy, business and work become greater burdens”⁵³. This laxity of his strength to work refers to *captatio benevolentiae*. That is why the result of his work is attributed to superior

forces, such as “any arcane movement of nature” and to “divine inspiration”. Given the supralunar swings, which helped him at times, but now acted to mitigate his forces, there was only one certainty. In his clarification, we perceive the sudden change in emulation that, while reducing the power of Greece, amplified that of Portugal:

What I actually see happening to me is that the more old age approaches, the more it seems me that what is written should survive for eternity, such as surely these glorious deeds of our people, this magnitude and variety of enterprises, this discovery of islands and climates, to the point that, if by chance some Homer had appeared again, he managed effortlessly to find in the Lusitanian deeds an argument of a not fabulous, but actually true *Iliad* and *Odyssey*⁶⁴.

The strategy resembles the amplification used by Góis in 1531, when he referred to Prester John’s letter as “not simulated, but true and with all faithfulness translated”⁵⁵. But if before, the “mere interpreter” could only be limited to ensuring that the translation of the papers of the embassy was going to be properly done, now, as bearer of *auctoritas*, Góis could go further and express his desire to emulate Greek and Latin *auctoritates*. This interest was expressed by the formula “if by chance some Homer appeared again”, which obviously referred to Góis himself, as well by the negative statement (*argumentum non fabulose, sed ex uero*), which led to seeing that only Góis had truthful testimonials to pursue the highest goal of describing the great Portuguese achievements.

Of course, the rhetoric institution was not ruled out by this competition, which was not free from strict rules. The formulation according to which the Greek histories were just fables, as opposed to the Portuguese, true, consisted of a variation of a Roman commonplace. We can identify it in Tacitus’s *Dialogus of oratoribus*, increasingly available in European literati circles after 1530, when the first printing was made of the manuscript rediscovered in 1425 by Poggio. It is possible that Góis had read it in Padua or even in Basel, in the circle of Bonifacius Amerbach and Froben. In any case, the importance of Tacitus for Góis can be evaluated, among other examples, by a letter sent to him by the scholar João Rodrigues de Sá Meneses, who praised him for the *Commentarii* on the Portuguese wars Góis published in 1539. Meneses pointed out, from the rhetorical techniques analyzed here, the description of facts “[...] actually worthy of never being silenced, of always evading oblivion, of never perishing from memory [...]”, useful in the effort of “[...] illustrating and enhancing the homeland, to which before all else we are connected”. Góis’s book would be also useful for justifying *aemulatio* by stating the fact that every era had its “Lívios, Salústios, and Tácitos” to immortalize the great deeds. “But now you -to whom, as it were, God granted it- ventured a service that does you honor, which is, to describe the great deeds of your countrymen, avengers of space and time, these high achievements, interred until today in dreadful obscurity”⁵⁶.

The Tacitus dialogue was situated dramatically around 75 AD, bringing together four characters -Curiatius Maternus, Marcus Aper, Julius Secundus, and Vipstanus Messala. The subject of discussion was the decline of eloquence. Aper tries to convince Maternus to resume speaking, defending poetry as the best career, while Messala compliments the ancient orators. Aper finally exposes the defense of modern oratory. The final speeches attribute the reason for

the decline of eloquence to political conditions. As Fabio Joly well understood, the purpose of the *Dialogus* was constructing the *topos* of the prevalence of the past on the present “contained in the *topos* of the decline of eloquence”. This, in turn, appeared frequently in other rhetors of the Empire: Joly lists Velleius Patérculo, Petronius, Seneca, Pliny the Elder, Quintilian and Pliny the Younger⁵⁷. In the case of Tacitus, the idea was to propose a “fitting art of speech for the imperial regime” in which rhetorical technique and ethical and political principles would have to be harmonized⁵⁸.

As mastery of the techniques related to the deliberative and judicial genres could not bring appropriate rewards within the Catholic monarchies, the epideictic became absolutely central. In a way, this centrality was refracted by the *topoi* around the praise of the Roman Empire, with which the Portuguese was placed in an emulative parallel. It is for this reason that Góis must have carefully observed the commonplace to which Tacitus referred through one of its *dramatis personae*, concerning the status of Greek texts:

You are called to the forum by so many processes of friends and so many clientele in colonies and municipalities, which you would have hardly met, even if you had not brought yourself to this new occupation, i.e., aggregating Domitius and Cato, that is, the Roman names, and also our stories, to the fables these little Greeks wrote⁵⁹.

Criticism of the Greek fables and any “simulations” in general was both a rhetorical ploy of complimentary constitution of the political and prophetic powers of the monarchy as a representation of the ethical effort of epideictic writing, which led the learned to mobilize what Alcir Pécora defined as “poetic power of truth”⁶⁰. Thus, in the eyes of the discrete, the letter of Góis could not have been read in terms of a subjectivity in search of rewards on behalf of a pure personal or psychological interest⁶¹. Praising the king and the empire corresponded, simultaneously and inseparably, to an ethical imperative⁶² and the use of a technique that, if well implemented, would have decorous results.

The expert in the epideictic technique could partake in the immortality providentially ascribed to the empire and the praised king since he adopted the *vita activa* principle, decisive in the modern era. It guided the literati towards *interested* discursive production, in other words, in line with the Ciceronian triad *docere, delectare, movere*, in the sense that all idleness should be for the purposes of knowledge and the cultivation of useful skills, and the centrality of productive meditation about the facts of another’s life, that is to say, use all the resources provided by *historia magistra uitae*; as to *delectare*, it was what placed the epideictic genre above the others, because the learning of the overseas achievements, pleasing and necessary, should inspire virtuous and heroic emulation⁶³.

Roman rhetoric also saw results in this system because, as Cicero had said in his defense of Arquias, there is no immortality without writing, and there could not be an Achilles without a Homer:

How many historians of his exploits is Alexander the Great said to have had with him; and he,

when standing on Cape Sigeum at the grave of Achilles, said, “O happy youth, to find Homer as the panegyrist of your glory!” And he said the truth; for, if the Iliad had not existed, the same tomb which covered his body would have also buried his renown⁶⁴.

These principles, public and anonymously shared, were used by Pietro Bembo in a letter that could serve as a good example of this logic. In 1541, the newly appointed Cardinal Bembo wrote to the Portuguese Jorge Coelho. He was responding to previous contact from Coelho, who had sent him his own texts and Luciano de Samosata’s compilation translated into Latin. After thanking him for the books, Bembo made the following compliment to his friend:

Bright, in fact, are such arts [prose and poetry] and worthy of praise, in both of which the spirits of the learned men willingly found great satisfaction and harvest this most cherished fruit out of the fatigues of their learning: trust to the memory of men and centuries to come their names, their studies, their virtues focusing on the future⁶⁵.

The ethical imperative linked to the epideictic genre made the writing of victories matter for experts. After all, any misstep could result in a terrible loss of the Portuguese achievements, for they would be relegated to oblivion. Using again the terms of Alcir Pécora, one could say that, from a *litterati* point of view, “when the Portuguese captains lowly assess the poets, they end up being less known than the Ancients, though they actually surpassed them”⁶⁶. So, every action taken by the Portuguese must be matched to an equally ingeniously conceived discourse, otherwise no rewards will be conferred in the future, hence no immortality will be achieved whatsoever. Only this equivalence would allow scholars to compete for prestige in the present and in the future. Heroic actions helped the *litterati* in the configuration of a twofold *ethos*, interested in both the peer and the court’s recognition and the permanence of his merits in the future, transformed in *auctoritas* when declared the most reliable and exquisite narratives of the greatest achievements of man’s history.

This *ethos* of the scholar seeking fame and glory was omnipresent in the sixteenth century. Helius Eobanus Hessus, a German humanist, used his professed love for Posteritas to ensure readers of his willingness to achieve immortality:

But you know that, you were always my dearest love, / Oh, you, nearly as dear to me as my own life. / I saw you in my fantasy before I could express it in Latin / [...] / one young man, nearly still a boy, I devoted all my talent to you, / while I expected to be only a small part of your great army of lovers⁶⁷.

Girolamo Cardano expressed the same interest in terms even more eloquent:

Eager to perpetuate my name, it prepared me for this as soon as I had become able to guide myself. Because I understood, without any doubt, that life has two meanings: a material existence, common to animals and plants, and one that is peculiar to the man thirsty for glory and grand undertakings⁶⁸.

In all cases, and especially in the letter by Góis, the essential procedure was the same: to amplify the Portuguese achievements and to ensure his readers that he was the most qualified to become *auctoritas* with them.

Lucia Montefusco maintains that the *amplificatio* (and its opposite, *minutio*) was recognized from the ancient world as one of the greatest tools of rhetoric. Isocrates in his *Panegyricus*, praised the *amplificatio* for its elasticity (make the new old, the old new, imbue the small with greatness, etc.); moreover, considering the fact that one can speak in many ways about the same subject, it was *amplificatio* that made possible the vital surpassing of past discourse. Aristotle, on the other hand, came to relativize its relevance. It is what we see in the *Metaphysics*⁶⁹ when he suggests that its value is debatable, since reducing or amplifying would not necessarily change the nature of the object upon which the technique focused⁷⁰.

In any case, the prevailing opinion ended up being that of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, a book in which the *amplificatio* is decisive. *Amplificatio* is then approached as a tool for comparison, since the practitioner of one of the three genera should keep in mind, as premises, the spaces of the "possible" and the "impossible" in order to show how something could be fair – as opposed to something unfair –, beautiful – as opposed to ugly –, and so on. Similarly, the speaker would need the spaces of the "more" and the "less", the "large" and the "small", that is to say, *amplificatio* and *minutio*, to accommodate his speech properly⁷¹.

Later, Aristotle states that *amplificatio* is markedly characteristic of epideictic speeches, since it is a form of flattery, "because it consists of superiority, and superiority is one of the beautiful things"⁷². This comparison would only be useful when established with "renowned people", since the best amplification is the one that wins over the best there is among the righteous⁷³. In justifying its close relationship with the epideictic, Aristotle refers to the system of "showing", which has already been mentioned in this article:

Among the species common to all speech, amplification is generally most suitable to the epideictic; because they take into account the actions accepted by all, such that it remains only to cover them in greatness and beauty⁷⁴.

Cicero made good use of Aristotle, adding the quality of text beautification to the *amplificatio* (*amplificare rem ornando*). In *De Oratore*⁷⁵, and beautification often assumes a central position. Cicero's definition of *amplificatio* goes beyond the Aristotelian (persuasive weapon specifically employed in epideictic speeches), making it the very core of all rhetorical exercise⁷⁶.

The *amplificatio* could lead the speaker to achieve any effect. Its operating mechanism would be the pathetic capture of the audience, preferably employed at the end of the speeches⁷⁷, but useful elsewhere, provided that the material has been previously exposed or was common knowledge. The fact that Cicero required that the agreement on the matter was settled before employment of *amplificatio* is the umbilical cord that connects his theory to that of Aristotle. Montefusco said, again in line with the logic of "showing", that *amplificatio* is particularly powerful when used in speeches that exhausted other points of view. The speech thus praises what cannot

be reproached, even by the speaker's enemies. A good example would be the *oratio funebris*; it would be outrageous to criticize the dead when he is being buried. *Amplificatio* could generate similar effects for other types of discourse, preventing any criticism from being made. This principle could be summarized as follows: the subject matter is so important and high, and the orator is so competent, that the only reaction to praise should be respectful silence.

The *ethos* of the specialist constructed in the letter by Góis to the *infante* amplifies all the virtues of matter, and, cleverly varying the procedure used in the letter to Gothus, enrolls his own successes, although the *humilitas* keeps blocking direct competition with others. This is why Góis says that initially the military news did not culminate in the work of writing, since he had already discussed similar subjects years before – something that he decided to emphasize “not by boasting of ingenuity, but to give testimony of my labor”. It's just the light of the *engenho* of the “illustrious Prince” that convinced him to change his mind⁷⁸.

Then Góis noted not only his previously-mentioned pamphlet, but all the others that he wrote in previous years in the form of “small treatises”. They could not, however, contain his desire to narrate the feats recently presented by the Portuguese, because the repeated victories meant, in technical terms, an essential opportunity for amplification of the overall effect of the successful overseas endeavors:

Nevertheless, having done enough, so to speak, with these little treatises, it would be fair for me to retire, if not for life, at least temporarily, from this task; however, as new glory of our people emerges, achieved against the Turks, again my soul is lit, and the same novelty stirred me again and made me absolutely yearn to write⁷⁹.

In this step, Góis called attention to the topic from *Pro Archia oratio*, arguing that “if our enthusiasm matched our *engenho* and equal force of eloquence, the best men would recognize the vastness of these heroic exploits, which others, of course, on another occasion will properly describe”. It follows the insistence on the topic of truth when he says that, in his opinion, he would be more than satisfied if he could “report this case with the greatest fidelity, so that the reader, if he did not hear from us how much this victory in looms splendor and grandeur, at least in spirit conceives of and somehow pictures it”⁸⁰. Moreover, the *ethos* of the expert composed Góis's “vulnerability” through the incessant praise for the *infante*, the true link between the overseas successes, which he commissioned, and those of the letters Góis received. And so, by the end of the letter, Góis staged the need for the “mercy” of the *infante* to welcome his book, which, he prayed, would not be denied. Amplification, highlighting the achievements and the benefactor, could not, it is true, ignore the scholar, whose *auctoritas* would accompany them while the domain of the Portuguese empire persisted: forever.

Primary Sources

- Anonymous. *Retórica a Herenio*. Trad. Salvador Nunez. Madrid, Gredos, 1997.
- Aristóteles. *Metafísica*. Trad. Edson Bini. São Paulo, Edipro, 2012.
- Aristóteles. *Retórica*. Trad. Manuel Alexandre Júnior, Paulo F. Alberto e Abel N. Pena. São Paulo, Martins Fontes, 2012.
- Barros, João de. *Ásia de João de Barros: Primeira Década*. Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1998.
- Cardano, Girolamo. *The book of my life*. Trad. Jean Stoner. New York, NYRB, 2002.
- Cícero, Marco Túlio. "De Oratore". Scatolin, Adriano. *A invenção no Do Orador de Cícero: um estudo à luz de Ad familiares*, I, 9, 23. Tese de Doutorado Universidade de São Paulo, de São Paulo, 2009.
- Cícero, Marco Túlio. "Defesa de Árquias". Ramalho, Américo da Costa (org.). Cícero. Trad. Carlos Alberto Louro Fonseca. Lisboa, Verbo, 1974.
- Nunes, Pedro. *Tratado da Sphaera*. Lisboa, Calouste Gulbenkian, 2002.
- Pereira, Maria Helena da Rocha. *Romana: Antologia da Cultura Latina*. 6ª ed. Lisboa, Guimarães, 2010.
- Quintiliano. *Instituição oratória*. Trad. C. V. Ouizille. Paris, C.L.F. Panckoucke, 1829.
- Rotterdam, Erasmo. *Brevíssima e muito resumida fórmula de elaboração epistolar*. Trad. Emerson Tin. Campinas, UNICAMP, 2005.
- Sêneca, Lúcio Aneu. *Cartas a Lucílio*. Trad. J. A. Segurado e Campos. Lisboa, Calouste Gulbenkian, 2007.
- Tácito. *Diálogo dos oradores*. Trad. Antônio Martinez de Rezende e Júlia Batista Castilho de Avellar. Belo Horizonte, Autêntica, 2014.
- Torres, Amadeu. *Damião de Góis: correspondência latina*. Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 2009.

Bibliography

- Auerbach, Erich. "Sermo humilis". *Ensaio de Literatura Ocidental*. São Paulo, Editora 34, 2007.
- Bethencourt, Francisco & Egmond, Florike (ed.). *Correspondence and Cultural Exchange in Europe*. 1400-1700. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Bouza Alvares, Fernando. "Espacios del manuscrito en la Europa Altomoderna". Ventura, Maria das Graças A. Mateus (org.). *Os espaços de sociabilidade na Ibero-América* (sécs. XVI-XIX). Lisboa, Colibri, 2004.
- Curto, Diogo Ramada. *Cultura imperial e projetos coloniais* (séculos XV a XIX). Campinas, UNICAMP, 2009.
- Daher, Andrea. *A oralidade perdida: ensaios de história das práticas letradas*. Rio de Janeiro, Civilização Brasileira, 2012.
- De Sá Júnior, Luiz César. *Uma memória de papel: memória, comunidade e cânone na epistolografia latina goisiana*. Dissertação de Mestrado Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora, 2012.
- Deswarte-Rosa, Sylvie. "Le Portugal et la Méditerranée. Histoires mythiques et images cartographiques". Bethencourt, Francisco (dir.). *Arquivos do centro cultural Calouste Gulbenkian: Le Portugal et la Méditerranée*. V. XLIII. Lisboa, Calouste Gulbenkian, 2002.
- Dias, J. S. *Os descobrimentos e a problemática cultural do século XVI*. Porto, Presença, 1982.
- Elliott, J. H. "A Europe of Composite Monarchies". *Past & Present*. Nº 137, Nov. 1992.
- Enekel, Karl. "In search of fame: self-representation in Neo-Latin". Gersh, Stephen & Roest, Bert. *Medieval and Renaissance Humanism: Rhetoric, Representation and Reform*. Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2003.
- Faria, Francisco Leite. *Estudos bibliográficos sobre Damião de Góis e a sua época*. Lisboa, Secretaria de Estado da Cultura, 1977.
- Fumaroli, Marc. *La République des Lettres*. Paris, Gallimard, 2015.
- Grafton, Anthony. "A Sketch Map of a Lost Continent: The Republic of Letters". Grafton, Anthony. *World Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in Early Modern Wwest*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Hansen, João Adolfo. "Categorias epidíticas da ekphrasis". *Revista USP*. São Paulo, Nº 71, setembro/novembro 2006.
- "Instituição retórica, técnica retórica, discurso". *Matraga*. Rio de Janeiro, Vol. 20, Nº 33, jul/dez. 2013.
- "O discreto". Novaes, Aduardo (org.). *Libertinos Libertários*. São Paulo, Companhia das Letras, 1996.
- Hirsch, Elizabeth F. *Damião de Góis*. Lisboa, Calouste Gulbenkian, 2002.
- Joly, Fábio Duarte. "Ética, Retórica e Poética no Diálogo dos Oradores e a concepção de História em Tácito". *Anos 90, Porto Alegre*, Vol. 16, Nº 30, dez. 2009.
- Koselleck et al. *O conceito de história*. Belo Horizonte, Autêntica, 2013.
- Luz, Guilherme Amaral. *Flores do desengano: poéticas do poder na América portuguesa*. São Paulo, FAP-UNIFESP, 2013.
- Mack, Peter. *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric: 1380-1620*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Maingueneau, Dominique. "Ethos, cenografia, incorporação". Amossy, Ruth. *Imagens de si no discurso: a construção do*

- ethos. São Paulo, Contexto, 2013.
- Marques, A. H. de Oliveira. "Damião de Góis e os mercadores de Danzig". Marques, A. H. de Oliveira. *Portugal Quinhentista. Ensaios*. Lisboa, Quetzal, 1987.
- Montefusco, Lucia Calboli. *Exordium narratio epilogus: studi sulla teoria retorica greca e romana delle parti del discorso*. Bologna, CLUEB, 1988.
- Montefusco, Lucia Calboli. "Stylistic and Argumentative Function of Rhetorical 'Amplificatio'". *Hermes*, Nº 132, 2004.
- Neiva, Saulo. *Em nome do ócio e da amizade: Retórica e moral na carta em versos em língua portuguesa no século XVI*. São Paulo, EdUSP, 2012.
- Pécora, Alcir. *Máquina de gêneros*. São Paulo, EdUSP, 2001.
- Pécora, Alcir. *Teatro do sacramento: A unidade teológico-retórico-política dos sermões de Antônio Vieira*. Campinas, SP, EdUNICAMP, EdUSP, 2008.
- Pérez, Pedro Ruiz. "Sobre el debate de la lengua vulgar en el Renacimiento". *Criticón*. Nº 38, 1987.
- Santos, Leonel Ribeiro dos. *Linguagem, retórica e filosofia no Renascimento*. Lisboa, Colibri, 2004.
- Teixeira, Felipe Charbel. "Uma construção de fatos e palavras: Cícero e a concepção retórica da História". *Varia Historia*, Vol. 24. Belo Horizonte, Jul/Dez. 2008.
- Torres, Amadeu. "Traços prosopográficos de Damião de Góis". Rodrigues, Sónia Maria Correia (org.). *Damião de Góis e o seu tempo (1502-1574)*. Actas do Colóquio. Lisboa, Academia Portuguesa de História, 2002.
- Vickers, Brian. "Epideictic and Epic in the Renaissance". *New Literary History*, Vol. 14, No 3, Spring 1983.

Notes

¹ PhD student in Social History. Research funded by CAPES and based on a master's thesis defended at the Federal University of Juiz de Fora in 2012, under the title "Uma memória de papel: retórica, comunidade e cânone na epistolografia latina de Damião de Góis". I would like to thank the anonymous referees for their keen criticism, and the coordinators of the Graduate Program in Social History of UFRJ, Monica Grin and Marcos Bretas, for supporting the publication of this article in English.

² These biographical elements are found in greater detail in Elizabeth F. Hirsch, *Damião de Góis*, Lisboa, Caluste Gulbenkian, 2002.

³ Torres, Amadeu. "Traços prosopográficos de Damião de Góis", Sónia Maria Correia Rodrigues (org.), *Damião de Góis e o seu tempo (1502-1574)*, Actas do Colóquio, Lisboa, Academia Portuguesa de História, 2002, p. 197.

⁴ Anthony Grafton, "A sketch map of a lost continent: the republic of letters", *World made by words: scholarship and community in early modern west*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2011, pp. 9-10.

⁵ "Fiction se connaissant pour telle, la République des Lettres n'en a pas moins été pendant plusieurs siècles de monarchie et d'aristocratie une démocratie de pairs sinon d'égaux. Fiction, elle a été, dans un monde de cours et d'intrigues, une vaste cité invisible et inébranlable dont le lien civique était alimenté par l'amour intrasigeant de la vérité, mais tempéré par l'amitié, par le respect du savoir et celui du talent." Marc Fumaroli, *La République des Lettres*, Paris, Gallimard, 2015, pp. 28-29.

⁶ "The constant writing and sending of letters was more than a system for collecting and exchanging information. Many citizens of the Republic saw it as a moral duty: at once the only way to show their sympathy and affection for those from whom they were separated by political and religious borders and the only way to enter into a regular relationship with the greats who glittered far away. [...] Erasmus treated the letter as a literary genre in its own right and set down rules for the composition of effective, eloquent letters. In one of his textbooks -the aptly named *On Copiousness in Words and Ideas*- he went farther, listing hundreds of ways to say "As long as I live, I shall remember you", and "Thank you for the letter" in elegant, correct Latin. [...] Erasmus deeply believed both in community of intellectual and literary property ("all the property of friends is held in common", he liked to say, quoting the ancient Greek thinker Pythagoras) and in the connection between the language one used and the state of one's mind and soul." Anthony Grafton, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁷ João Adolfo Hansen, "Autoria, obra e público na poesia colonial luso-brasileira atribuída a Gregório de Matos e Guerra", *Ellipsis*, Vol. 12, 2014, p. 104.

⁸ This will be the edition used for all the letters I discuss below. In some cases, I will quote part of the passive correspondence, totaling 108 letters. All of these were translated by Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis: correspondência latina*, Coimbra, Imprensa da universidade de Coimbra, 2009.

⁹ Saulo Neiva, *Em nome do ócio e da amizade: Retórica e moral na carta em versos em língua portuguesa no século XVI*, São Paulo, EdUSP, 2012, pp. 22-23.

¹⁰ Alcir Pécora, *Teatro do sacramento: A unidade teológico-retórico-política dos sermões de Antônio Vieira*, Campinas, SP, EdUNICAMP, EdUSP, 2008, p. 60.

¹¹ Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 377-378.

¹² Lucia Montefusco sees a parallel between the level of discourse (medium), its function (delight), its genre (epideictic), and its proof/test mechanism (*ethos*). Lucia Calboli Montefusco, *Exordium narratio epilogus: studi sulla teoria retorica greca e romana delle parti del discorso*, Bologna, CLUEB, 1988, p. 7

¹³ Also postulated by Quintilian. *Institutio oratoria*, 4, 1, 54.

¹⁴ "Never will he absolutely successfully imagine, nor appropriately place, nor ornately and politely write, who has not first enjoyed the slow practice in style and reason. The delay, in fact, prepares the best and most sound judgment, and the love of invention cools". Erasmo Rotterdam, *Brevíssima e muito resumida fórmula de elaboração epistolar*, Transl. Emerson Tin, Campinas, UNICAMP, 2005, [1521], p. 115.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

¹⁶ For a description of Góis's itinerary and activities on this trip, cf. A. H. de Oliveira Marques, "Damião de Góis e os mercadores de Danzig". A. H. de Oliveira Marques, *Portugal Quinhentista (ensaio)*. Lisboa, Quetzal, 1987.

¹⁷ Aristóteles. *Retórica*. Trad. Manuel Alexandre Júnior, Paulo F. Alberto e Abel N. Pena. São Paulo, Martins Fontes, 2012, p. 1414b.

¹⁸ Marco Túlio Cícero, "De Oratore", Adriano Scatolin, *A invenção no Do Orador de Cícero: um estudo à luz de Ad familiares*, I, 9, 23, São Paulo, Tese de Doutorado Universidade de São Paulo, 2009, pp. II, 80.

¹⁹ "Contraída amizade entre nós em Danzig (por certo com a bênção de Deus) quando por aí andava em negócios de meu Rei, ao encontrarmo-nos amiúde, aconteceu falarmos das gestas lusitanas, quer dizer, das expedições à Índia, Arábia, Pérsia; da extensão e dificuldade da rota para essa paragens, dos riscos do oceano vastíssimo, das lutas constantes com os árabes, os persas, os indianos de aquém e além-Ganges; das incursões anuais dos turcos, que com grandes armadas desde o Golfo Árábico até à Índia Menor duramente, embora sem êxito, atacam os nossos." Damião de Góis, "Carta a João Magno Gothus" Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

²⁰ As pointed out by John Elliot, the cohesion that would come to foster the emergence of various empires throughout the modern era was not an inevitable consequence of the political and social contexts of the High Modern Age. If there was a tendency that marked the beginning of the sixteenth century, it was the fragmentation of political bodies, which, however, rarely occurred thanks to ongoing negotiations and dynastic arrangements that Elliot came to call "composite monarchies." "Between 1523 and 1707, there were only three successful separations: that of the northern Dutch provinces (Spain - 1570), the separation of Portugal (1640), and what occurred between Sweden and Poland (1599)." J. H. Elliott, "A Europe of Composite Monarchies", *Past & Present*, N° 137, Nov. 1992, pp. 48-52, cit. à p. 68.

²¹ Which makes it possible to say that the interactions between worlds truly separated by huge distances took place in the efforts of a "government by paper" - the expression belongs to John Elliot - particularly in the case of the Iberian monarchies. In other words, aside from the war machine to accompany territorial expansion, what should be considered, with Frank Lestringant and Andrea Daher, is the wide deployment of a "scriptural machine" grounded in the many interchanging genres of the rhetorical institution that were prescribing scholarly productions. Andrea Daher, *A oralidade perdida: ensaios de história das práticas letradas*, Rio de Janeiro, Civilização Brasileira, 2012, pp. 230-231.

²² For some examples, cf. Diogo Ramada Curto, *Cultura imperial e projetos coloniais (séculos XV a XIX)*, Campinas, UNICAMP, 2009; Fernando Bouza Alvares, "Espacios del manuscrito en la Europa Altomoderna", Maria das Graças A. Mateus Ventura (org.), *Os espaços de sociabilidade na Ibero-América (sécs. XVI-XIX)*, Lisboa, Colibri, 2004, pp. 189-201. Moreover, the forms of communication suggested here go beyond the scope of contact between the king and overseas dignitaries, involving the entire social body in its many information-sharing networks. For a compilation concerning this question, cf. Francisco Bethencourt & Florike Egmond (ed.), *Correspondence and Cultural Exchange in Europe: 1400-1700*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007.

²³ Andrea Daher, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20.

²⁴ "E, já agora, vou explicar em poucas palavras como é que vi e ouvi todas estas coisas, a fim de melhor ressaltar a verdade dos factos. Aportou a Lisboa, no ano da graça de 1514, um embaixador do grande imperador das Índias, Preste João, e de sua mãe a rainha Helena, Mateus de nome e arménio de nação, enviado ao rei cristianíssimo de Portugal, D. Manuel. Trazia como companheiro da sua legação um jovenzito nobre, abexim de origem, educado no palácio imperial e chamado Jácome. [...] Pois a este Mateus, declarada inicialmente ante o nosso Rei a missão de que estava incumbido e entregue ao mesmo a carta de seu Imperador, o soberano manda-o vir poucos dias depois à sua presença, mai-lo companheiro, e perante alguns doutos, com a assistência da assembleia dos nobres, interrogá-los, através de um intérprete, acerca de sua fé e ritos, bem como do estado do reino etíope. Tinha eu então doze anos de idade, sendo um dos pagens régios a que, por terem encargo de levar os pratos para a mesa, se chama pagens das iguarias, e nesse ofício servi sua Alteza Real durante dois anos. De modo que presenciei todas estas coisas e, simultaneamente com os restantes cortesãos, vi e ouvi tudo; e, quanto a idade o permitia, também o entendi" *Damião de Góis*, "Carta a João Magno Gothus", Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-39.

²⁵ Damião de Góis, "Carta a João Magno Gothus", Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

²⁶ Although it is necessary to point out the "experience" factor as an authority device in the writings of various Portuguese scholars, especially those involved more directly with the navigations, for example the case of Duarte Pacheco Pereira. Góis seems to have moved away from this model the moment he lost the possibility of replacing João de Barros in the office of treasurer of the *Casa da Índia* in Lisbon. For a more exhaustive analysis of these circumstances, cf. De Sá

Júnior, Luiz César. "Uma memória de papel: retórica, comunidade e cânone na epistolografia latina goisiana", Master's Dissertation Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora, 2012, pp. 78-83. For the relationships between maritime experience and Greco-Latin models of authority, cf. J. S. Dias, *Os descobrimentos e a problemática cultural do século XVI*, Porto, Presença, 1982, pp. 77-137.

²⁷ João Adolfo Hansen, "Categorias epidíticas da ekphrasis", *Revista USP*, São Paulo, N° 71, setembro/novembro 2006, pp. 93-94.

²⁸ Aristóteles, *Retórica...*, *op. cit.*, p. 1356 a.

²⁹ "Acquires persuasive character when the discourse is delivered in such a way that it leaves the impression the speaker is worthy of faith. As we believe more, and far more quickly, in honest people, on all matters in general, but especially on those of which there is no exact knowledge and that leave room for doubt. But it is necessary that this confidence is the result of the discourse and not of a previous public opinion about the speaker's character; so the probity of who is talking should not be considered unimportant for persuasion, as indeed some authors of this art propose, but one might almost say that character is the primary means of persuasion".

³⁰ In the definition by João Adolfo Hansen: "Etymologically, the noun *discreto*, as in 'the discreet', is the past participle form of the verb *discernir* [discern]. The term means the intellectual quality of penetration into subjects, like perspicuity or insight, so it is related to the intellectual talent for invention, the rhetorical-poetic *ingenuity*, and the logical and analytical capacity for assessment, the dialectical *good judgment*." João Adolfo Hansen, "O discreto", Aduato Novaes (org.), *Libertinos Libertários*, São Paulo, Companhia das Letras, 1996, p. 84.

³¹ Dominique Maingueneau, "Ethos, cenografia, incorporação", Ruth Amossy, *Imagens de si no discurso: a construção do ethos*, São Paulo, Contexto, 2013, pp. 70-71.

³² João Adolfo Hansen, "O discreto"..., *op. cit.*, pp. 86-87.

³³ "Mas como é que tu -objectará aqui alguém- então menino de tão pouca idade, pudeste todos estes factos passar ao papel ou à memória, de modo a enviar-no-los, tanto tempo após, descritos ponto por ponto?" Confesso, em resposta, que não o pude. Mas, dez anos passados já naquele ofício, o cristianíssimo Rei d. Manuel, meu protector, dava-me novo cargo mandando-me aqui para a Bélgica, a tratar de seus negócios. Chegado cá, tive a sorte de encontrar um homem não apenas nobre mas também sagaz, participante de minha ordem e cargo, de nome Rui Fernandes, que aqui desempenha a função de chefe dos negócios régios ou feitor, como vulgarmente se diz. [...] Por acaso um dia aludíssemos àquela sua embaixada na Alemanha, veio a talho menção das coisas das Índias, informando-me ele então possuir, por atenção de António Carneiro, cópia quer dos textos susoditos quer da carta do grande imperador das Índias, Preste João, ao nosso Rei." Damião de Góis, Carta a João Magno Gothus, Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

³⁴ Aristóteles, *Retórica...*, *op. cit.*, 1416 b 26 ff.

³⁵ "[...] homem cortesão e pouco exercitado nas letras, além disso instantemente assoberbado de negócios sem conta." Damião de Góis, "Carta a João Magno Gothus", Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

³⁶ João de Barros, *Ásia de João de Barros: Primeira Década*, Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1998. [1552], pp. 3-4 [fl. 1 r.].

³⁷ "Bem compreendo que há muito me solicitam esse trabalho, Ático. Não o recusaria, se me dessem algum tempo desocupado e livre. É que um empreendimento de tanta magnitude não pode fazer-se no meio de uma actividade tão plena e com o espírito ocupado. É preciso duas condições: ausência de cuidados e desocupação." Maria Helena da Rocha Pereira, *Romana: antologia da Cultura Latina*. 6ª ed. (aumentada), Lisboa, Guimaraes, 2010, pp. 61-62.

³⁸ Anonymous, *Retórica a Herenio*, Trad. Salvador Nunez, Madrid, Gredos, 1997, I, pp. 1-2.

³⁹ João de Barros, *op. cit.*, p. 2 [fl. 1 r.].

⁴⁰ As Andrea Daher points out, "[...] a língua aparece como uma espécie de 'produto natural da personalidade nacional', que deve ser 'alijada dos riscos da cultura estrangeirada', nos termos de Asensio, e tornada instrumento político de coesão do império." Andrea Daher, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-61. See also Diogo Ramada Curto, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-55. Leonel Ribeiro dos Santos, *Linguagem, retórica e filosofia no Renascimento*, Lisboa, Colibri, 2004, p. 158. Pedro Ruiz Pérez, "Sobre el debate de la lengua vulgar en el Renacimiento", *Criticón*, N° 38, 1987, pp. 15-44.

⁴¹ "E então reparai no que esse grande Imperador das Índias escreveu ao nosso Rei; reparai, repito, na carta dele ao nosso Monarca, não simulada, mas verdadeira e com toda a fidelidade traduzida, quase à letra, da língua caldaica, que eles principalmente usam, para português e finalmente para latim." Damião de Góis, "Carta a João Magno Gothus", Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁴² According to João Adolfo Hansen, *consuetudo* was the name given to the set of requirements for Greco-Roman auctoritates. Then, "para falar das técnicas retóricas, é preciso pensar na longa duração da 'instituição retórica', que os romanos chamaram de consuetudo, 'costume', e lembrar as multiplicidades incontáveis dos tempos das muitíssimas famílias artísticas e suas amizades e inimizades que coexistem em cada um dos muitos presentes possíveis de inventar na instituição." João Adolfo Hansen, "Instituição retórica, técnica retórica, discurso", *Matraga*, Rio de Janeiro, Vol. 20, N° 33, jul./dez. 2013, p. 14.

⁴³ Quintiliano, *Institutio oratória*, Trad. C. V. Quizille, Paris, C.L.F. Panckoucke, 1829, Vol. I, 1, 1.

⁴⁴ Aristóteles, *Retórica...*, *op. cit.*, p. 1419 b.

⁴⁵ Marco Túlio Cícero, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 292-293.

⁴⁶ Francisco Leite Faria, *Estudos bibliográficos sobre Damião de Góis e a sua época*, Lisboa, Secretaria de Estado da Cultura, 1977, pp. 10-11.

⁴⁷ For another example, see Guilherme Amaral Luz, *Flores do desengano: poéticas do poder na américa portuguesa*, São Paulo, FAP-UNIFESP, 2013, pp. 57-79.

⁴⁸ Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 382. Amadeu Torres, *Traços prosopográficos de Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

⁴⁹ During the time between Gothus d. Luís' letters, Góis corresponded with several scholars, such as Bonifacius Amerbach, Erasmo, cardinals Sadoletto, Bembo, Madrucci and Pole, Nicolau Clenardo, pope Paulo III, infant d. Henrique, among others. Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-131. Regarding his publications, it is worth mentioning the English translation of *Legatio* (1533), and also two translations from classical and biblical texts (Cicero's *Cato Maior* and the book of *Eclesiastes*, both in 1538), a commentarii to the wars in India, translated both in Italian (1539) and German (1540), a book on Ethiopia religion (1540), a description of "Hispania" (1542) and an account of Louvain's siege by French troops when Góis lived there (he was in fact made a prisoner during the invasion). Francisco Leite Faria, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-37.

⁵⁰ Pedro Nunes was well aware of this hierarchy, and used d. Luís' prestige accordingly. In the dedicatory-letter to him, Nunes expressed his auctoritas by saying that only d. Luís could give him the immortality. The qualities of his treatise would mean nothing without the approval that only someone as close to the king as Luís could provide: "[...] E por ter muita confiança & experiência de sua humanidade / que me querera releuar este meu atreuimento: lha dediquey para que leuando o titulo de seu escrarecido nome: pois a obra per si ho não he: possa ficar illustre e ymmortal." Pedro Nunes, *Tratado da Sphera*, Lisboa, Calouste Gulbenkian, 2002, p. 6.

⁵¹ The reduction -or even suppression- of the *exordium* is suggested by several rhetors. Aristotle point out that "A função mais necessária e específica do proêmio é, por conseguinte, pôr em evidência qual a finalidade daquilo sobre que se desenvolve o discurso; é por isso que, se o assunto for óbvio e insignificante, não haverá utilidade no proêmio." Aristoteles, *Retórica...*, *op. cit.*, p. 1415 a. Quintiliano follows the same principle (Instituto oratorio, 4, 1, 72). See Lucia Calboli Montefusco, *Exordium narratio epilogus...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-32.

⁵² Damião de Góis, "Carta ao Infante d. Luís", Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

⁵³ "[...] a par da idade crescem sempre os trabalhos, e, a energias que paulatinamente afrouxam, negócios incumbem maiores."

⁵⁴ "O que a mim na realidade vejo acontecer-me é que, quanto mais a velhice se aproxima, mais coisas se me oferecem que em escritos devam sobreviver para a eternidade, quais com certeza esses atos gloriosos da nossa gente, essa magnitude e variedade de empresas, essa descoberta de ilhas e de climas, a ponto que, se acaso de novo algum Homero surgira, sem esforço alcançara nas gestas lusitanas encontrar argumento de não fabulosas, antes reais *Iliada* e *Odisseia*", Damião de Góis, "Carta ao Infante d. Luís", Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

⁵⁵ Damião de Góis, "Carta a João Magno Gothus", Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁵⁶ "[...] na verdade dignos de jamais ficar em silêncio, de sempre se eximirem ao olvido, de nunca perecerem na memória [...]", úteis no afã de "[...] ilustrar e engrandecer a pátria, a que antes de tudo estamos ligados" [...] "Mas ora tu -a quem, por assim dizer, Deus isto outorgou- abalançaste-te a um serviço que te honra, quais as grandiosas empresas de teus compatriotas, vingadoras do espaço e do tempo, e esses altos feitos, inumados até hoje em ciméria obscuridade". João Rodrigues de Sá Meneses, "Carta a Damião de Góis", Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

⁵⁷ Fábio Duarte Joly, "Ética, Retórica e Poética no *Diálogo dos Oradores* e a concepção de História em Tácito", *Anos 90*, Porto Alegre, Vol. 16, Nº 30, dez. 2009, p. 20.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

⁵⁹ "Chamam-te para o fórum tantos processos de amigos e tantas clientelas de colônias e municípios, aos quais dificilmente terias dado conta de atender, até mesmo se não tivesses tu próprio trazido para ti esta nova ocupação, ou seja, agregar um Domicio [inimigo de César] e um Catão, isto é, os nomes romanos e igualmente as nossas histórias às fábulas desses greguinhos [Graeculorum fabulis] Tácito, *Diálogo dos oradores*, Trad. Antônio Martinez de Rezende e Júlia Batista Castilho de Avellar, Belo Horizonte, Autêntica, 2014, Vol. III, p. 4.

⁶⁰ "Se o Gama derrota seus inimigos do presente e reduz ao âmbito local os feitos dos antigos, Camões, igualmente, tanto vence com a descoberta essencial da virtude heroica o gosto vulgar dos golpes fictícios, quanto supera com a energia poética da verdade o fingimento patriótico dos antigos épicos". Alcir Pécora, *Máquina de gêneros*, São Paulo, EdUSP, 2001, p. 150.

⁶¹ Brian Vickers points out that "There is a one-to-one correlation between character and virtue, which means that the Renaissance reader was accustomed, in theory at least, to seeing each character not as a complex, autonomous personality but as an illustration of a virtue; that is a reading habit which the modern student must strive to acquire. Secondly, it could mean that the Renaissance reader saw only the virtue represented in the character – looked through him, as if using an X ray, to the moral quality and ignored other, less essential aspects of his or her behavior." Brian Vickers, "Epic and Epic in the Renaissance", *New Literary History*, Vol. 14, Nº 3, Spring 1983, p. 522.

⁶² "The common factor in all the channels through which epideictic enjoyed its great prestige in the Renaissance was not its power of being applicable to a wide range of subject matter (praise of cities, rulers, occupations), nor its teachings on style or structure, but its prior and exclusive identification with ethical choices and avoidances." Brian Vickers, *op. cit.*, p. 507.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 509-511.

⁶⁴ Marco Túlio Cícero, "Defesa de Árcuias", Américo da Costa Ramalho (org.), *Cícero*, Trad. Carlos Alberto Louro Fonseca, Lisboa, Verbo, 1974, Vol. X, p. 24.

⁶⁵ "Brilhantes, na verdade, são tais artes [prosa e poesia] e dignas de louvores sumos, em ambas as quais os espíritos dos homens doutos encontraram de muito bom grado satisfação e colhem esse fruto maior das canseiras suportadas em sua aprendizagem: confiar à memória dos homens e séculos vindouros os seus nomes, os seus estudos, as suas virtudes em foco no futuro". Pietro Bembo, "Carta a Jorge Coelho", Amadeu Torres, *Damião de Góis...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 314-315.

⁶⁶ "[...]os capitães portugueses, ao avaliarem baixamente os poetas, acabam tendo suas façanhas menos conhecidas que a dos antigos, embora possam verdadeiramente excedê-los." Alcir Pécora, *Máquina de gêneros...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-148.

⁶⁷ Karl Enekel, "In Search of Fame: Self-Representation in Neo-Latin", Stephen Gersh & Bert Roest, *Medieval and Renaissance Humanism: Rhetoric, Representation and Reform*, Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2003, p. 105.

⁶⁸ Girolamo Cardano, *The Book of My Life*, New York, NYRB, 2002, p. 31.

⁶⁹ Aristóteles, *Metafísica*, Trad. Edson Bini, São Paulo, Edipro, 2012, pp. 1088-17 ff.

⁷⁰ Lucia Calboli Montefusco, "Stylistic and Argumentative Function of Rhetorical 'Amplificatio'", *Hermes*, Nº 132, 2004, pp. 69-81.

⁷¹ Aristóteles, *Retórica...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1359 ff.

⁷² O que não impede a ocorrência de generalizações quanto à *amplificatio* no interior da técnica aristotélica. "Além disso, há um tópico comum a todos os discursos: o que diz respeito à grandeza, dado que todos os oradores fazem uso da diminuição e da amplificação, quando deliberam, elogiam ou censuram e quando acusam ou defendem." Aristóteles, *Retórica...*, *op. cit.*, p. 1391 b.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 1368 a.

⁷⁴ *Idem.*

⁷⁵ Marco Túlio Cícero, *De Oratore...*, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 94, 221; Vol. II, pp. 80, 292, 312.

⁷⁶ Lucia Calboli Montefusco, "Stylistic and Argumentative Function of Rhetorical 'Amplificatio'", *op. cit.*, p. 74.

⁷⁷ Marco Túlio Cícero, *De Oratore...*, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 143; Vol. II, p. 332.

⁷⁸ Damião de Góis, "Carta ao Infante d. Luís", *op. cit.*, p. 123.

⁷⁹ "Não obstante, defesso a bem dizer com estes pequenos tratados, jus me assistisse de para mim exigir dispensa, quando não perpétua, ao menos temporária, todavia, como nova glória da nossa gente, alcançada contra os turcos, outra vez houvesse acendido o meu ânimo, a mesma novidade me insuflou novo e végeto anseio de escrever." Damião de Góis, "Carta ao Infante d. Luís", *op. cit.*, p. 123.

⁸⁰ Damião de Góis, "Carta ao Infante d. Luís", *op. cit.*, p. 123.