Introduction: The Translations of Renaissance Latin*

Andrew Taylor
Churchill College, Cambridge

Neo-Latin was the *lingua franca* of the cosmopolitan intellectual and literary culture of Renaissance Europe, and was the language in which ideas and texts circulated among the Latinate elite. The names given to the profound, interrelated, but sometimes dissonant cultural movements of the early modern period—'Renaissance', 'Reformation', 'Scientific Revolution'—signal the critical turning away from inherited habits of thinking about humankind and its relationship to nature and supernature. Neo-Latin was the language in which newly recovered or discovered ideas tended to contest established and often deeply entrenched and institutionalised modes of interpretation and their linguistic forms.

Humanists from the age of Petrarch onwards sought to reform Latin along the lines of the best classical models, with pedagogy, after a far briefer formal introduction to grammar, focusing on the reading and imitation of these in the pursuit of pure classical usage (see Jensen). Once the teaching of Greek began to establish itself in Italy in the early fifteenth century (see Botley, *Learning Greek*), the practice of imitation and its related exercise in paraphrase from Latin into Latin expanded to include interlingual Greek-Latin transactions. The discussion of these rhetorical exercises for the orator in the treatises of Cicero and Quintilian deeply influenced ideas of humanist translation as a display of eloquence (for example: Cicero's *De finibus* 1.2.6 and 3.4.15; *De oratore* 1.3.155; the pseudo-Ciceronian *De optimo genere oratorum* 4.14; and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* 10.5.9-25. See further Hosington, and Copeland 9-38). In addition, *De optimo genere oratorum* 5.3 asserts that the original's general style and force of language should be preserved, but according to proper Latin usage. Quintilian's student Pliny the Younger considered translation of the best authors into and out of Greek the way to develop 'precision and richness of vocabulary, a wide range of metaphor and power of expression, and, moreover, imitation of the best

Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée
CRCL DECEMBER 2014 DÉCEMBRE RCLC
0319–051x/14/41.4/329

models leads to a like aptitude for original composition' (*Epistulae* 7.9.2: 'Quo genere exercitationis proprietas splendorque verborum, copia figurarum, vis explanandi, praeterea imitatione optimorum similia inveniendi facultas paratur'). Furthermore, the dominant models of Cicero for prose and Virgil for poetry implied debts to the Greek orators and poets on which they had drawn in fashioning their own enduring works. The first phase of translation into neo-Latin was thus dominated by the reception of Greek texts from antiquity, both of pagan writers and then those of the early Church. By the middle of the fifteenth century the attention of humanists had turned to biblical texts in both Greek and Hebrew, signalling that the accuracy of the Vulgate as a translation had begun to be questioned.

Translation of works into neo-Latin contributed forcefully to these new economies of knowledge and their modes of expression, whether from the ancient 'learned' tongues or, beginning slightly later, from the vernacular languages in which some works likely also to appeal to foreign Latinate readerships began to be composed. Some existing works in the vernacular, whether for reasons of historical, political, religious or other interests, also began to attract the attention both of those unable to read them in the original, and others who wished to see such works reach a wider European audience.

Translation from Greek into Latin was one of the characteristic activities of Renaissance humanists, whose recovery of the literature and learning of classical antiquity soon emphasized Rome's debt to Athens. Where Petrarch (1304-74) lamented his deafness to Homer, the chancellor Coluccio Salutati's (1331-1406) transformation of Florence into a centre of humanistic culture was one profoundly committed to engagement with, and translation of, Greek literary civilization. One expression of this, a century later in northern Europe, was the cultivation of literary friendship between Thomas More and Desiderius Erasmus publicly staged in print, first through the publication of their Latin versions of, and competing responses to, Lucian in 1506, and then later in Erasmus's *Encomium moriae* (1511) and More's commensurately Lucianic *Utopia* (1516). Producing versions of authors like Lucian and Plutarch expressed specific literary and ethical commitments to a community to which the translator belonged or aspired to be a member. Conrad Goclenius, the professor of Latin at the Collegium Trilingue at Louvain, prompted by Erasmus, dedicated to More his version of Lucian's *Hermotimus, sive de sectis Philosophorum* (Louvain: Thierry Martens, 1522) as a means of advancing his relationships with both influential humanists. Goclenius, in his epistle, explains that he undertook the translation to exercise his style and skill ('ingenii et styli exercendi gratia'), especially as such studies had been commended by Pliny, Quintilian and Cicero, and indeed all those since then who had pursued a reputation for true learning ('Quod quidem genus studiorum…deinde excultum ac frequentatum ab omnibus, qui ullo unquam saeculo verae eruditionis famam sunt assecuti' (Aii^{r})).

Humanists also used translations to promote their learning outside the scholarly community, and these versions coexisted with vernacular ones, only some of which

they spawned. The eloquence sought by translators promised readers a pleasurable encounter with unfamiliar works. Moreover, the pace and extent of the growth in Greek literacy remains unclear, even once study of the language had become more firmly established in the classroom during the sixteenth century, as does the motivation towards general reading in that language outside any pressing scholarly need to deal with a Greek work in the original. Publication of texts in Greek remained a precarious undertaking even for the most prestigious printers (Maclean 54), which suggests that ownership of these more expensive texts was not a priority for many. Thus neo-Latin versions, both directly and through the vernacular translations made from them, continued to mediate significantly the reception of the writings of Greek antiquity.

Although a huge corpus has been introduced and described over fifty years in the nine-volume *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries* (1960-2011), the critical work on early modern Latin translation undertaken to date—fine studies of Homer (Bizer; Ford, *De Troie à Ithaque*), of neo-Latin/vernacular poetic relations in Renaissance France (Tucker; Ford, *Judgment of Palaemon*), of Plutarch in fifteenth-century Italy (Pade), for instance—has tended to remain relatively narrowly focused. As late as 2004, Paul Botley could note in the opening of his *Latin Translation in the Renaissance* that translation of ancient Greek works into Latin had been left behind in the rise of 'translation studies'. The ancients may be partly responsible, as Hermans has observed: 'In contrast to imitation, with its hallowed status as a traditional rhetorical genre (*imitatio*), literary translation at first has no place as a recognized literary category, a circumstance that renders the relationship between the two concepts problematic' (95-96). Although Leonardo Bruni (1370-1444) composed his *De interpretatione recta* in the mid-1420s, further treatises devoted to translation were slow to appear. Lawrence Humphrey's (Humfrey) *Interpretatio linguarum: seu de ratione convertendi et explicandi autores tam sacros quam prophanos* (1559) is, as Glyn Norton states, 'the only work from this period that approaches an encyclopaedia of doctrine on translation' (11), and it remains one still deserving of greater study (see Rhodes, Kendall and Wilson for a partial translation). Many translators, however, offered prefatory remarks on their aims, or subsequently considered defence of their versions necessary.

Where Renaissance theorists built on the statements closely relating rhetoric and translation found in Cicero's and Quintilian's works, the emphasis on translation as rivalling the original emerged, with the translator working as the eloquent rewriter, or, as Bruni would assert, a kind of second author (see Botley, *Latin Translation* 52-53; Bruni, *De interpretatione recta*, ch. 14). Bruni also used that sense of *secundus auctor* in a slightly different way to praise Poggio for his retrieval and editing of Latin texts (see Gordon 191; Bruni, *Epistolarum* 1: 112). Moreover, the demands of eloquence drew translation towards imitation, a matter scrupled at by some who feared significant distortion or blurring of meaning. In their view, the pursuit of eloquence

in translating—a kind of cultural or domesticating translation—was appropriate for rhetorical, poetic and historical texts, but problematic for philosophical and theological ones, where more was at stake in the precise wording of the original and its representation in a translation *ad verbum*. Yet Bruni, with rather limited justification and authority (although Cicero lent him some support), considered Aristotle eloquent to license his approach. However, the contemporary of Valla's, Giannozzo Manetti (1396-1459) advised—and practised—translation of philosophical and theological works not strictly 'ad verbum', which ran other risks, but rather in a moderated, safe way—'medium et tutum'—instead of fully, rhetorically 'ad sensum'.

Differences both in language and culture presented the translators of ancient texts with many challenges. The deepening philological expertise, which began to confirm the extent of the divide even as it laboured to bridge it, informed the strategies of learned translation. The vernacular had also, in the post-classical period, developed its own vocabulary in response to empirical discoveries, intellectual innovations and cultural forms unknown to the ancients (including, notably, those of Church and court), which presented the translator into neo-Latin with a number of challenges and choices. Those wishing to classicize scrupulously strove to avoid neologisms minted and exploited by eclectic neo-Latinists, instead offering the best ancient equivalents they could; translation here intersects with the 'Ciceronian controversy' (see DellaNeva). Peter Burke has remarked that such rigid classicizing—a complicating third possibility between domestication and foreignization, and one specific to neo-Latin translation from the vernacular—constituted 'a kind of cultural translation in reverse' ('Translations into Latin' 81). Yet, as part of the revivifying of antiquity, it may also be thought of as defying simple temporal directionality. The humanist reformers considered the scholastic method and its analytical and disputational language distorted and corrupting, and so the pursuit of linguistic purity—of putting *verba* before *res*—may not straightforwardly have been seen as an anachronistic retreat tending towards archaism and ossification, but rather a debate about the true nature of 'living' Latin.

The Byzantine diplomat and scholar Manuel Chrysoloras's (c. 1355-1415) pioneering pedagogical mission in Italy was sponsored by Coluccio Salutati in the late 1390s. This has been seen as having contributed to a campaign of cultural politics aimed at enlisting aid for Byzantium (Hankins 244), partly by conveying the jeopardy in which Greek culture and its literary heritage then stood. If what is chosen for translation indicates the interest one culture has in another, the values it recognizes as lacking in its own or in need of confirmation, Plutarch was both one of Chrysolaras's favourite authors and one in whom Salutati had already taken a keen interest, not least as Plutarch was a later Greek 'in Rome'. Plutarch's comparative *Parallel Lives* of eminent Greeks and Romans is emblematic of this interface and his attraction to Renaissance humanists. Chrysoloras taught humanists like Guarino da Verona (1374-1460), the Latin translator of Strabo and several of Plutarch's *Lives*, that word-for-word translation (*conversio ad verbum*) from Greek was to be avoided, although

it could serve usefully as a crib for less advanced learners of that language, and might be suitable for tyro translators. Chrysoloras's warning that a Latin version of greater splendour and clarity than the original tended towards commentary was a conservative view often ignored by such influential translators as Bruni, another of his pupils, and Lorenzo Valla (c. 1407-57), who had, at Pope Nicholas V's request, produced a version of Thucydides as part of the overambitious papal project of translating the entire Greek corpus into Latin. As Valla stated, in the dedicatory preface to his version of Demosthenes's *Pro Ctesiphonte*, the translator only sufficiently honoured the original author if he attempted to surpass him (Valla 2: 139), and here, in the choice of an oration already translated by Bruni, Valla also meant surpass his rival; Bruni and Valla would soon similarly contest the *Iliad* (see Kirchner 73-74).

Although Bruni seems to have considered the excellence of Aristotle's thinking as inseparable from eloquence—the Stagirite's persuasive claim to truth was deemed rhetorical—the freedom of his translation attracted censure from those who considered the close verbal detail of the original compromised. In general it seems that the higher the status of a text, the greater the pressure on the translator to follow the original wording; it was, after all, Jerome, in his 'Letter to Pammachius' (Ep 57.5), who had stated that he translated sense for sense—a Ciceronian or rhetorical approach—all texts except Scripture, where the order of the words was itself a mystery. Such high-status texts also possessed a 'professional' readership less inclined to put the pleasures of an eloquent translation before verbal accuracy. Yet literalism could also imply a sense of inferiority in the target language and the risk of travesty, putting a dignified original in inappropriate dress. Valerie Worth, in her comparative study of the translation into French by Étienne Dolet's (1509-46) contemporaries of Cicero and neo-Latin writing in a similar style, suggests that the neo-Latin writers, unless of considerable reputation, were generally treated more literally. The relative paucity of rhetorical effects sought by the translators, she argues, reflects their sense of the lesser prestige of their neo-Latin counterparts (*Practising Translation* 33). The matter of prestige may also explain why classical Latin works were translated into Greek by the most ostentatious translators, but the exercise of translating neo-Latin works into ancient learned languages tended to be a display confined to bi- or trilingual presentation of commemorative or dedicatory verses. Translation from the vernacular into neo-Latin will be considered later in more detail.

The assumed relative capability of languages, and its impact on translation strategy, was not confined to Latin/vernacular relations. Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459) considered the wordiness of Greek a weakness in comparison with the virtuous efficiency, precision and clarity of Latin, while Valla's amplification of Homer reflected his conviction that Latin possessed, in addition, greater expressive and rhetorical power. Bruni, who was not unquestioning of the true value of Greek abundance, did not wholly share either view. Comparison of Bruni's and Manetti's versions of the *Nicomachean Ethics* shows how Manetti's is more difficult, but in its literalness less misleading than Bruni's, which pursues elegant and clear rendering less likely

to prompt the need for a commentary, through resolving some difficulties which Manetti's version tends faithfully to preserve (Botley, *Latin Translation* 80-82).

Bruni's Latin versions of Aristotle prompted criticism in the succeeding decades, but they remained popular, possibly as a result. For example, his translations of the *Eudemian Ethics* and *Economics* were reprinted in the second part of the Latin *Aristotelis Stagiritae Tripartitae philosophiae opera omnia absolutissima* (Basel: Hervagius, 1563). Its title-page stated that the very best versions of the new translators had been collected, so that Aristotle would be affirmed as teaching most clearly in proper Latin ('Aristotelem…Latinè ac dilucidè docentem'). The third part of this contains the neo-Latin poet and translator Marco Antonio Flaminio's (1498-1550) far more recent *Paraphrasis in duodecim Aristotelis librum de prima philosophia* (1536), his version of Book 12 of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. *Paraphrasis* was also the title he gave his verse translations of the Psalms, which he, as other sixteenth-century humanist poets, classicized to adorn and illuminate David's original, but remote, verbal elegance and metres ('possent ne ea Latinis versibus illustrari', *Paraphrasis in triginta psalmos versibus scripta* (1546), Aii^{r}). Aristotle's rebarbative *Metaphysics* presented an analogous challenge. Flaminio might not quite have agreed with Bruni that all of Aristotle's works were eloquent, especially, in his view, this one, as the discussion of the aims of his translation suggests in his dedication to Pope Paul III. Part of that, which does not include the term *paraphrasis* in the rich figurative language relating his motivations and translation strategy, speaks, with a deprecating glance towards the language of the scholastic tradition, of how offputting the learned commentaries are for those steeped in *bonae litterae*. His stated plan was

> non tam philosophi huius sententias ut enodarem, quàm ut res pulcherrimas, quas ille breviter, atque obscure persecutus fuerat, ego dilucide, ac copiose tractarem, nunquam tamen ab ipsius vestigiis discedens, simulque periculum facerem, num pure, ornate, atque ad rerum dignitatem apte explicari possent ea, quae philosophi latini neque latine, neque eleganter disputare solent… (Aii^{r})

> 'not so much to make plain [literally *free from knots*] the sentences of this philosopher, as to treat clearly and copiously the most beautiful things which he had briefly and obscurely set forth—never however deviating from the tracks of that man—and at the same time to make a trial of whether those things may be set forth in a pure style, elegantly and, according to the dignity of the matter, appropriately, things which Latin philosophers are accustomed to discuss neither in good Latin nor elegantly…'

This precarious balancing act aimed to alleviate the potential displeasures of a more faithful rendering without distorting Aristotle's sense. Although in the 1563 edition Flaminio's version was shorn of his prefatory discourse, the titular distinction between Bruni as *intrepres* and Flaminio's work as *Paraphrasis* might have alerted the reader to potentially different relationships between the Latin translations and the Greek originals. However, in Robert Estienne's *Dictionarium* (1531), the paraphraser (*paraphrastes*) is defined as one who 'non literam e litera, sed sensum e sensu trans-

fert' ('translates not letter for letter, but sense for sense'), which hardly helped clarify the matter (see Hosington 135).

Throughout the Renaissance charges of paraphrasing were levelled against rivals considered to have taken too many liberties, displaying their own eloquence at the expense of verbal accuracy. But where Flaminio had employed paraphrastic translation to unpack elegantly Aristotle's more demanding prose in the *Metaphysics*, this mode could serve otherwise to defend humanist translation of biblical texts from charges of implicit criticism of the version used by the Church, as was the case with the trilingual humanist Joannes Campensis's bestselling and highly regarded *Psalmorum omnium iuxta Hebraicam veritatem paraphrastica interpretatio* (Nuremburg: Joannes Petreius, 1532). Although presenting itself as a paraphrase, the title page of the later parallel-text edition, which yoked Jerome's Hebrew Psalter to Campensis's paraphrase, runs 'Eorundem ex veritate Hebraica versionem, ac Ioannis Campensis è regione paraphrasim' ('of the same [Psalms] the version from the Hebrew truth and the direct paraphrase of Joannes Campensis'); his handling of Ecclesiastes was added to many editions, similarly 'ex Hebraico παραφραστικως traductam' ('translated paraphrastically from the Hebrew'). Campensis, who stated that he 'acts not as a translator but as a paraphraser' ('qui non interpretem ago, sed paraphrasten'), repeatedly stressed his version's proximity to the Hebrew original (for the larger context, see Hobbs). He stated that in his succinct paraphrase of Hebrew, since word could not correspond to word, verses, however, corresponded to verses precisely, following the most precise distinction of the Hebrews ('cum verbum verbo respondere non potuerit, versus tamen versibus secundum Hebraeorum exactissimam distinctionem, exactè respondent' (aii^{r})). Likewise, he declared that his sin, if any, was having translated the many obscurities into clearer words, appropriating Horace's warning to the aspiring poet in the *Ars poetica* to avoid slavish translation ('Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus interpres', *Epistulae* 2.3.133-34) in his own nuanced confession of having been, in such instances, insufficiently faithful ('obscuros locos, eosque non paucos, ob nimis scrupulosam in reddendo verbum verbo fidem explicuisse aliis verbis apertioribus' (aii^{v}-aiii^{r})). But where Horace turns the argument towards literary imitation, here Campensis, like many misusers of these Horatian lines (see Worth, '*Translatio*' 129-30), suggests that the true meaning of the Hebrew can only be represented through this kind of close paraphrase. In doing so, he also registers the pressures on the authority of biblical texts felt by their humanist translators in the early Reformation. The abundance of Psalm paraphrases in the sixteenth century, whether in verse or prose, whether included alongside commentaries or, often more ambiguously, standing alone as works of literary imitation, shows how a text could suddenly be abundantly renegotiated through translation. Moreover, a sense of how the community of neo-Latin poets could be presented as rising above confessional divisions in this context is given by Henri II Estienne's international collection of rival paraphrasers, *Davidis Psalmi aliquot, latino carmine expressi a quatuor illustribus poetis, quos quatuor regiones* ([Geneva]: Henricus Stephanus, 1556), which

celebrated Buchanan's achievement over that of Jean Salmon Macrin, Flaminio, Helius Eobanus Hessus and Jovita Rapicius (Jacopo Ravizza) (on George Buchanan's versions, see Buchanan; McFarlane). The long view of Renaissance Bible translation shows, however, that it was the more literal versions, such as Sanctes Pagninus's *Veteris et Novi Testamenti nova translatio* (1527), which had the deeper influence on later renderings and exegesis.

With the rise of the professional or semi-professional translator, the complete works in translation of classical authors by one hand began to appear, such as Hieronymus Wolf's definitive Demosthenes (1549) and Petrus Nannius's Athanasius (1556). Xylander's *Moralia* of Plutarch (1570) was soon a standard version displacing the previous rattlebags, and was drawn upon by Amyot for his celebrated version, *Les œuvres morales et meslees de Plutarque* (Paris: Michel de Vascosan, 1572), which otherwise shows scrupulous attention to the Greek (Copenhaver 86). These large Latin *opera omnia* in part reflect a market capable of sustaining translators, and also perhaps a sense that what was expected of a translation was becoming more settled. Given that the first edition of Athanasius in Greek appeared as late as 1601, Nannius's version, as with the Latin translations of many of the Greek Fathers known less well or extensively in the Latin West, was important. Greek editions of the medieval writers of Byzantium appeared later still, giving their Latin and vernacular translations a particular longevity. Editors of Greek texts who wished to supply a parallel Latin version could draw on existing humanist translations, which, if sufficiently accomplished, were also surprisingly long-lived. This was far less the case with translations in vernacular tongues, which were mutating rapidly through productive contact with Latin.

Existing Latin translations could be revised by the editors of ancient Greek writers in light of their work on manuscripts in establishing the Greek text. For example, Henri II Estienne's modification of Valla's Thucydides for his parallel editions of 1564 and 1588—'ex interpretatione Laurentii Vallae, ab Henrico Stephano recognita'—was so extensive that it is seen as constituting a fresh translation, and was indeed termed 'nostra interpretatio' by him. Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) is interesting in (as his preface discloses) having considered the translation of his *editio princeps* of Polyaenus's *Stratagematum libro octo* (1589) beneath his dignity—he used unaltered the existing version of Justus Vulteius (1549)—but later reckoned his Polybius (1609) more a work of Latin translation accompanied by the Greek *editio princeps* than *vice versa* (Pattison 223).

Although some would claim that the greater the authority of a text, the greater the need to encounter it in its original language, some translations—especially those from Greek into Latin, whether, for example, of the New Testament or Aristotle—came to stand in for the original text for some reading communities. Furthermore, the Greek *editiones principes* could also be subject to criticism by those having access to superior, or often simply different, manuscripts. Erasmus, in his edition, translation and annotation of the Greek New Testament—*Novum Instrumentum* (1516);

Novum Testamentum (revised editions 1519; 1522; 1527; 1535)—claimed provisionality for his Latin version, but always wished his annotations printed with it, so that the reasons for his translation were there persuasively before the reader. Although such accomplished and monumental translations as Casaubon's Polybius were unlikely to prompt rivals, Burke is right to conclude that, in general, 'translations should be regarded less as a definitive solution to a problem than as a messy compromise involving losses or renunciations and leaving the way open for renegotiation' ('Cultures of Translation' 9). The literalness demanded of Bible translations seems no less related to the proliferation of renegotiated versions.

One strategy for making alien texts intelligible in the target language and culture was to find analogies, and this could work as much at the finer levels of diction and linguistic idiom, as those of larger formal equivalents. Some Greek forms, however, such as the essay, developed so flexibly by Plutarch for his *Moralia*, find few parallels in Latin writers. But if the translator was producing a Latin version of a Greek work which had been imitated by a Roman writer, that ancient work, familiar to the Renaissance readership, could be drawn upon as a model of language, tropes and figures, through which to represent the original Greek one. Yet the very process of imitation or emulation through which the Roman writer was connected to the Greek, for example Virgil's *Aeneid* in relation to Homer's *Iliad*, was one that creatively transformed and domesticated the original, even as Virgil's work achieved its own originality and became the source of subsequent imitation. The Roman model was thus both a facilitating and a distorting lens making Homer in a Virgilised version seem far less distant, and this, more generally, was especially the case when translators relied on a single model.

Conversio ad sensum thus overlaps with imitation. Rhetorical translation in this manner retains, for the most part, relatively continuous contact with the source text, where imitation is freer, following its own creative logic while sustaining some kind of intertextual resemblance or productive comparability with its literary model. Paraphrase—arguably an unhelpfully broad and flexible category—may be seen as mediating between the two, and offering degrees of explanatory expansion that can blur into creative interpretation. If translation and imitation may be seen as operating on a continuous spectrum, it is interesting to observe the ways in which the resulting ambiguity could play out, as, for example, in Bruni's attitude to genre in his encounter with Procopius (see Botley, *Latin Translation* 33-36). Bruni defined Procopius's *Gothic Wars* as *commentaria* (rather than the superior *historia*) in drawing on it for his own *De bello italico apud Gothos gesto historia*. For Bruni, the sixth-century Greek author had provided merely the series of events, rather than offering analysis of their causes and a statement of judgement, both of which he considered fundamental to the genre of *historia* in which he had composed. He repeatedly felt the need to defend his work against charges of plagiarism through translation, arguing that the use of his own discretion and words conferred rights of authorship. These were of course elevated issues for discussion among those capable of judging what Bruni had

actually done with the original Greek text.

Epitome, a more radical reshaping of a work than Bruni's generic manipulation, may also be thought of as a mode of cultural translation attending, but not dependent upon, transfer between languages. An example involving a wider circuit is the progress of Jean Froissart's late fourteenth-century, 'large and laborious' chronicle of the Hundred Years War, first into the neo-Latin compendium of Johann Sleidan, the future Protestant annalist, *Froissardi, nobilissimi scriptoris gallici, historiarum opus omne, iamprimum breviter collectum et latino sermone redditum* (Paris: Simon de Colines, 1537), with the English *An epitome of Frossard*, probably translated by Arthur Golding, appearing in 1608. Sleidan, in his dedicatory epistle to Cardinal Jean Du Bellay, asserted that

> Ingens quidem est opus illud Gallicum, sed quae vel memorabilis, vel cognitu digna sit, historiam à me nullam in hoc libello praetermissam, non dubitem affirmare. Copiose nimirum ille singula deducit, in describendis, aut apparatibus bellicis, aut velitationibus, aut monomachiis, aut locorum oppugnationibus, aut collocutionibus principum, plurimus, ac penè redundans. Ista vero, quoniam summum illud momentum in se non continent, inserenda minime putans, ampliora quaedam, ea nimirum, in quibus dependet is, qui peti debet ex eiusmodi lectione, fructus, omnino secutus sum, id, quod prudentem, et aequum lectorem, facile deprehensurum opinor, atque iudicaturum. (B.ii^{r})

> 'Indeed that French work is huge, but I do not hesitate to affirm that, in this little book, I have not passed over any history either memorable or worthy to be known. He certainly draws out copiously each thing the most, indeed almost excessively, whether in describing the preparations for war, or skirmishes, or single combats, or assaults on positions, or the negotiations of leaders. But I, valuing very little the introduction of those enlargements, because they do not contain that most significant cause in itself, truly pursued those things on which the fruit which ought to be sought from a perusal [*lectio*] of this kind depends, being what I consider the wise and impartial reader would readily grasp and judge.'

This arguably expresses a distinction between chronicle and humanist historiography with which Bruni would have agreed. Given Sleiden's attachment to the French bishop and diplomat (see Kess 23-25), it is perhaps unsurprising to learn of the complaint in the Latin work of the Welsh antiquary and cartographer Humphrey Llwyd, soon Englished:

> Sleydanus dum Frossardum in compendium redactum latinitate donavit, et Gallico nomini nimium faveret, Anglorum nobilissima et fortissima gesta, aut silentio praeteriit, aut ab authore dissentiens, aliter, quàm à Frossardo scriptum est, litteris commendavit. (*Commentarioli Britannicae descriptionis fragmentum* (Cologne: Johann Birckmann, 1572), E3^{r})

> *Sleydan*, while he turneth his abbridgement of *Frossard* into *Latine*, beyng too too muche partiall to the Frencheman: either ouerpasseth with silence the most noble and valiant deedes of the Englishmen: or variynge from his author, reporteth them otherwyse then *Frossard* hath written.' (*The breviary of Britayne*, trans. Thomas Twynne

(London: Richard Johnes, 1573), 31^{v})

Contrary to Llwyd, Golding's son, Percival, who, in the 1611 edition, claimed the English translation of Sleidan as his own, in his address to the reader stressed the appeal of the condensed Froissart to an English readership in 'comprising as it were in an handfull, all the speciall matters of moment therein discoursed. And cheifly the glorious acts and enterprises of our English worthies…All this briefly and succinctly related, and so honourably and sincerely concerning our English nation, as by no forraine writer that I know, the like' (1611, A2^{r-v}). Such patriotism is served by an English translation. But if there is doubt over who actually produced the 'Golding version', at least Sleidan's name appeared modestly on its title page, unlike that of *Recueil… de toute l'Histoire de Iean Froissart…Par François de Belleforest Comingeois* (1572), the work of epitomising Froissart here passed off as Belleforêt's own. The appraisal of Froissart's partiality thus became increasingly occluded as his work was textually reshaped and paratextually reframed. Sleidan, of course, had spared both Belleforêt and Golding the labour of condensing Froissart's *Chroniques* for themselves, but he was at best only momentarily recognised in the vernacular versions, a drift towards invisibility perhaps resulting in part from the conviction that his neo-Latin epitomising of Froissart had not transferred rights of authorship.

Translations of the most accomplished humanists, whose philological knowledge was considerably deeper by the close of the fifteenth century, were increasingly informed by their understanding of the interrelation of Greek and Latin literature in the classical tradition. What Chrysoloras might have condemned as a tendency towards commentary in translation undertaken too freely *ad sensum* may now be reconsidered as a kind of cultural translation, what Peter Burke encapsulates as 'the double process of decontextualization and recontextualization, first reaching out to appropriate something alien and then domesticating it' ('Cultures of Translation' 10). In his *De interpretatione recta*, Bruni was the first to state that the translator should be not merely an expert in both the source and target languages, but also their rhetorical and literary forms, so that (in theory) the total meaning or significance of a text could be transferred from one linguistic and cultural domain to another. Ignorance could inform such decontextualization, incomplete understanding providing the pretext for the translator's appropriation of a work into familiar terms. In such recontextualization, Guarino, for example, intentionally enriched his Plutarch with rhetorical figures, syntactical complexity and *copia* beyond those present in the author's Greek (and as understood in its original literary context), with allusion working further to root the translation in foreign Latin ground. As Guarino's motivation was, as for many humanist translators, to offer political advice through classical example in an appealing literary form, his enhancement of the persuasive qualities of the original is readily understood: efficacy and utility trump verbal accuracy. But in Poliziano (1454-94), the greatest philologist of the Quattrocento, we find a translator acutely aware of the complex literary tradition in which the original author and his

ancient imitators stood. Poliziano's own activities as a translator show a shift from elucidation, typical of his versions of some early books of the *Iliad*, to leaner, more verbally disciplined renderings of others as he moved towards a more 'foreignizing' approach in his handling of Callimachus. The essay in this volume on Poliziano's version of Callimachus's 'Bath of Pallas' explores his trajectory towards rendering that poem's strangeness and remoteness through resisting potentially misleading Roman mediation.

The Renaissance may also be associated with the rise of literary nationalism and the increasingly audible *questione della lingua*, the debate over the vernacular's potential as a medium for the most dignified and serious kinds of writing, whether technical or literary. This extended from the composition of original works, where theories of imitation and language choice are both in play, to the practice (or practices) of translation. In Italy there was, as Tom Deneire has observed, a cultural and linguistic affinity between Italian and Latin that fostered relations between writing in those languages (277); Dante's *De volgari eloquentia* (c. 1303-05) is an early expression of the claims of the vernacular. Yet although Bruni could assert the purity and cultivation of the Florentine vernacular (Mazzocco 30-31), this must be set against Manetti's conviction that accurate translation could only be truly effected between learned languages, as only they possessed comparable linguistic sophistication.

It is in the context of the recent interest in Renaissance bilingualism and the rivalry between neo-Latin and the vernacular that the translations between these languages should thus be readdressed, working towards comparative studies of how the neo-Latin/vernacular dynamic operates in each national setting, for particular kinds of writing, their readerships and markets, and so forth (see Deneire, *Dynamics* and Moss). The opportunity for translation of contemporary works was, after all, predicated by the initial act of language choice by the author, and that determined unintentionally or otherwise some of the conditions of the subsequent cultural and linguistic transformation (on the choice of neo-Latin or the vernacular for different kinds of writing in Renaissance France, see Ford, *Judgment of Palaemon* 1-21). Vulnerability to translation was but another way in which authors lost control over the influence and interpretation of their published work, as translators and publishers perceived opportunities to tap different markets. Or usually so: Joachim Du Bellay, for example, may be seen, in the intricate interplay of his French and neo-Latin poems, as a translator of himself, with the two 'versions' addressing considerably the same educated audience in France and the French-speaking courtly elites of Europe. Moreover, Du Bellay, along with Étienne Dolet, Jacques Peletier du Mans, and others in mid-sixteenth century France and beyond, stressed how each language possessed an irreducible distinctiveness defying close verbal rendering or tidy equivalence. Nor was the vernacular subordinate to neo-Latin. In the case of Du Bellay it is not always clear which language some of his poems were composed in, which his translation. Du Bellay's bilingual reflexivity was but part of a highly developed poetic culture of bilateral exchange between neo-Latin and the vernacular, with translation and imitation

running in both directions (see Tucker; and for the wider context Castor and Cave).

Self-translation of a different, non-literary sort was practised by some religious writers, Protestant and Catholic, or translation of their Latin or vernacular originals undertaken promptly to facilitate near-simultaneous publication for a domestic and international audience; Maclean (56) gives the examples of Philipp Melanchthon (Lutheran), Peter Canisius (Catholic), and Otto Casmann (Reformed). The Lutheran Johannes Brenz's German commentary on Ecclesiastes, *Der Prediger Salomo*, which was addressed to a secular local readership in Schwäbisch Hall in particular, was soon translated into Latin by Hiob Gast as *Ecclesiastes Salomonis, cum commentariis*; the respective epistles are dated January and November 1527. Brenz's work was published separately in German and Latin the following year by Johann Setzer in Haguenau, the Latin version soon engendering an evangelical French translation, and from there material and political elevation into a sumptuous courtly manuscript in English for the future queen, Anne Boleyn, by her brother (see Carley). However, such co-ordination was, for a number of reasons, often not undertaken. This could result in distorted view of an author who alternated between Latin and the vernacular according to the intended audience. Thus the 'Latin' Luther, who wrote for a learned and international readership, was rather different from the 'German' one. Luther's Franciscan opponent Thomas Murner immediately published in Strasbourg his German translation of *De captivitate Babylonica* (1520), one of the three foundational Latin works by Luther of that year, to warn Luther's countrymen of his heresies, but thereby also disseminated Luther's attack on traditional sacramental theology far more widely (see Cummings 38-42).

In various places this volume draws on the work of Peter Burke, especially his essays in *Cultural Translation in Modern Europe* (2007) (see also the series in Kittel *et al.*, section XXI, 'Translation within and between cultures: The European Renaissance'). Of particular interest is Burke's consideration of translation from the vernacular into neo-Latin, which offers an overdue counter to the preponderance of studies concerned with translation into neo-Latin from another 'learned' language, or from neo-Latin into the vernacular. Burke's figures, based on printed works and subject to clear criteria excluding some significant activity, show the trend in translation from the vernacular into neo-Latin: 5 works to 1500; 61 for 1500-49; 220 for 1500-1599; and 387 for 1600-1649 ('Translations into Latin' 66-68). The major categories were, in order of popularity, religion (with Spanish authors dominating devotional source texts), history (including ecclesiastical history and spiritual biography), natural philosophy or science, geography or travel, fiction, and politics (71), with Italian source texts figuring strongly in the last two categories. Burke's analysis can be related to the larger context of the publication of scholarly works explored in, for example, Maclean's *Scholarship, Commerce, Religion: The Learned Book in the Age of Confessions, 1560-1630* (2012, see esp. ch. 3) and Andrew Pettegree's *The Book in the Renaissance* (2010). The Latin book is there approximated to the scholarly one, although Maclean offers the caveat that 'Not all Latin books in this period

are works of scholarship; and not all works of scholarship are in Latin' (56). Studies such as these, and for one country, for instance, Brian Richardson's *Printing, Writers and Readers in Renaissance Italy* (1999), provide deep and finely developed contexts informing narrower case studies. The statistical basis of such work on publication and readerships can only be further enhanced by increasingly complete and structured bibliographical data (see, for example, *The Universal Short-Title Catalogue*).

Burke observes that translation into neo-Latin was focused far more on texts conveying information, rather than literary entertainment. As writers of scientific works began to publish more in the vernacular, the need for neo-Latin translations rose, and continued to do so until the widespread use of Latin began to decline in the later seventeenth century. Nor was there a tidy mapping of practice and theory onto vernacular (middling sort) and neo-Latin (humanist) respectively. Although composing in one's national tongue indicates a domestic audience, it does not always imply popularization. Raising the prestige of the mother tongue or confirming its capability was sometimes the objective. Neo-Latin versions could be prepared as much for elite domestic audiences as aimed at international ones (Pantin 169-70). Moreover, for many readers, Latin was their first 'foreign' language, and one central to grammar school education, where modern languages were generally far less frequently encountered. Furthermore, while Latin-vernacular dictionaries were soon produced for many European languages, those working between vernaculars were far slower to appear, which left many readers requiring a neo-Latin translation, or waiting for such a version to be translated into their tongue (Burke, 'Cultures of Translation' 13-14).

Issues of distribution and readership are explored in a number of essays in this volume, which clearly indicate the opportunities for further work on neo-Latin translations and their place in mutating early modern textual and publishing economies. If publishing in Greek was commercially unattractive, how did the neo-Latin versions fare decade on decade, both as alternatives and in parallel texts? Who were the publishers and what was the market for Latin versions of Greek and vernacular texts belonging to the same intellectual field? Burke concluded that 'the study of translation is or should be central to the practice of cultural history' (38). This applies to the interests of this volume, where the place of translations out of, and perhaps even more so, into neo-Latin contributes significantly to the understanding of the development of the disciplines to which the works translated belong, their translators, and the readerships for the original works and their versions.

As indicated by the preceding discussion, which could only touch on some of the pertinent issues, translation into and out of neo-Latin in the early modern period was a diverse and vibrant phenomenon which contributed very significantly to the transmission of knowledge and the development of literary cultures. The emphasis in this volume is, for the reasons given above, on neo-Latin as the target language, with source texts translated from ancient Greek and the vernacular. Consideration of translation from neo-Latin into the vernacular is addressed mainly in the context of competing versions of the same work. The essays are offered in chronological order,

running from early fifteenth-century Italy to mid-seventeenth-century England, and providing both immediate and broader comparisons. The two essays on the use of Plutarch in translation contrast the political settings of early Renaissance Venice for the *Lives*, against the religious tumult of mid-Tudor England for the *Moralia*. In the study of the cultural translation of a medieval Croatian chronicle in the early sixteenth century, the linguistic priorities for the translation of works for humanist readerships is also considered, while the broader scope of the cultural translation of histories in England between 1540 and 1640 is pursued in another essay drawing on Peter Burke's work. There the focus is on paratextual representation and repackaging of the works as a reflection of new readerships and markets for print. How translation into and out of neo-Latin of medical texts over the same period in France affected both expression and content is the subject of another expansive essay. Although some prestige was often associated with the translation of informative, non-literary vernacular texts into neo-Latin, where translation was more closely associated with literary imitation, a more competitive or emulative sense of translation emerged. This is studied in the two essays focusing on the Latin versions of ancient writers made by leading philologists, whose audiences, whether in late Quattrocento Italy or late sixteenth-century northern Europe, were particularly demanding. It is thus hoped that this volume captures something of the variety of objectives motivating the translation of ancient and contemporary texts into and out of neo-Latin, how genre and audience influenced the translation techniques, and the differing qualities of the resulting versions.

In the opening essay, Marianne Pade focuses on Guarino da Verona's Latin translation of Plutarch's *Dion* (1414) from the *Parallel Lives*, an example of the Plutarchan reception studied so richly in her *The Reception of Plutarch's* Lives *in Fifteenth-Century Italy* (2007). Here Pade foregrounds the ways in which this fifteenth-century humanist attempted to represent aspects of both the content and the style of the original, and to find not merely the verbal but the rhetorical equivalent in the target language and literary culture. The 'tasteful strength of Plutarch's intellect', of which Guarino speaks in the dedicatory letter to his aristocratic pupil and friend Francesco Barbaro, is conveyed to the Latin reader through a far from slavish observance of the Greek's relatively plain prose. Yet if Virgil had imitated Homer and thus provided a Latin model for the translation of Homer, Plutarch had no such straightforward Latin imitator to provide analogous rhetorical and linguistic resources. Exchange between Greek and Latin was however present in Plutarch's quotation of Latin writers, so that their retranslation sustained a kind of stylistic contact. Pade thus shows how Guarino could draw on the Latin versions of stories found in Plutarch, so that, for example, Cicero could provide not just the Latin word or phrase to capture Plutarch's local sense, but also supply extra details for what was in some cases the reappropriation into Latin of something Plutarch himself had borrowed. The domestication of Plutarch achieved through such *imitatio auctorum* embraced Cicero, Virgil, Livy and others, each providing Guarino with allusive richness as well as textual *copia*. Pade's

close analysis of Guarino's version in relation to Plutarch's Greek reveals a series of decisions alienating the Latin from the original in order to reinscribe it in terms well understood and recognised by the humanist readership of the early Quattrocento. For example, Plutarch's secondary tenses are rendered as the historical or dramatic presents or infinitives of classical Latin historiography; indirect speech is recast as direct speech; syntax is rendered more sophisticated through *hyperbaton* and interwoven syntactical units; nouns and verbs descriptively enhanced. The imported Plutarch was thus adorned in the terms of the humanist culture in which he was to be received, and his literary reputation articulated not through strict fidelity to his words, but through representing him eloquently and copiously in 'good' Latin. Pade finally sees this more eloquent Plutarch, an example of rhetorical translation arguably at the limit of his teacher Chrysoloras's prescription, as copied for a Latin readership in Venice who would have been interested in Dion as a proponent of a mixed constitution able to resist both tyranny and democracy. Annotations added to the margins of the dedication copy for Barbaro were paratexts personalizing the cultural translation and further guiding the specific reception of the Latin *Dion*.

Pade has also noted how 'the language of the early humanists seemed uncouth to their late fifteenth-century followers, who were able to write in a much more classical idiom' (99). In Angelo Poliziano we find one of the greatest scholars of the Renaissance, arguably the leading philologist of his day, and a poet accomplished in Italian, Latin and Greek. Jaspreet Singh Boparai's essay offers a detailed account of Politian's version in Latin elegiacs of the 'Bath of Pallas' (Hymn 5: 'In Palladis Lacavrum') by Callimachus, the erudite Alexandrian poet (d. 240 BCE). This appeared with Politian's *editio princeps* of the Greek in his *Miscellanea* (1489). Boparai places Politian's version in the context of his translations of Homer's *Iliad* and Moschus's 'Amor Fugitivus', and his own elegiac poetry. He shows how Politian found a stylistic model through which to explore translation strategies for his demanding Alexandrian in Catullus 66, itself adapted from Callimachus's 'Lock of Berenice' ('Coma Berenices') from his four books of elegiac poems, the *Aetia*. The application of Catullan poetics explains in part the unusual features of the elegiacs of Politian's Latin translation—metre, enjambment, *hyberbata*, elisions, line-endings—but also argues for the inappropriateness of measuring Politian's achievement according to the rules of Golden Latin elegy. If Callimachus's 'Bath of Pallas' is recondite poetry of subtle intertextuality properly appreciated only by those more fully attuned to the Greek tradition in which it arose, Boparai convincingly shows that Politian's translation registers that by remaining alien or 'foreignizing', resisting easy identification with a misleading neoteric Roman equivalent. In this sense, Politian purposefully eschewed a complete cultural translation involving decontextualization and then recontextualization. Boparai's essay thus works to enrich our understanding of the *novitas*, the 'strangeness' or 'rarity', of Callimachus translated faithfully, but lacking conventional elegance. The original poem's ambiguity is understood and preserved in translation, and the desire to be drawn into explanatory expansion (as in Politian's

versions of Books 4 and 5 of the *Iliad*) is resisted. Growing out of the refined word-for-word translation developed in his Moschus translation, Politian's Latin 'Bath of Pallas' could serve those readers of the *Miscellanea* for whom a crib was still useful, yet also satisfy those who would have scrupled at a 'Roman' accommodation of the forbiddingly 'austere Callimachean aesthetic'.

The Croatian humanist Marcus Marulus (Marko Marulić, 1450-1524) is the translator studied in Neven Jovanovic's essay, which turns to the transformation of a medieval chronicle into humanist *historia*. The medieval work, a genealogy of the rulers of the Croatian kingdom ending in the later eleventh century, survives as both the Latin *Gesta regum Sclavorum* and the *Croatian Chronicle*, which is shorter both in length and the period covered. The dates of composition of the Latin and Croatian versions are uncertain (anywhere between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries), as is the direction of influence. In 1500 a manuscript of the *Croatian Chronicle* was brought to Split, the home of Marulić, where ten years later he produced his Latin version, the *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta* (1510). Jovanovic shows how, in the context of the humanistic culture which had developed in Croatia over the course of the fifteenth century, Marulić, one of its leading figures, reshaped the medieval work for the consumption of the classicized local and international audiences. His detailed analysis of Marulić's translation alongside both the *Gesta regum Sclavorum* and *Croatian Chronicle* shows how the humanist prescription that history teach persuasively through examples was met through inter- and intra-lingual cultural translation. To render his *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta* authoritative Marulić corrected and enhanced its factual content—the demand of *fides* informed the handling of geographical, legal and other details—and conformed its language to that of Roman historiography. To support those unfamiliar with Croatian history he added phrases or longer explanations, but sometimes also achieved an elegance of implication through rephrasing and deletion. Marulić made the syntax more condensed and subordinated, and trimmed superfluous detail from the often paratactic, semi-oral narration of the *Chronicle*. He also replaced the medieval idioms with those echoing Livy, Caesar, Cicero; the Croatian rulers are presented in Sallustian terms. Marulić thus strove to draw the original text from the margins of Europe and place it in a humanist tradition. His intended audience would, as Jovanovic notes, have viewed a merely literal translation of the *Chronicle* as barbarous. Aiming for intellectual respectability, historiographical authority and literary pleasure in his humanist national history of the early medieval period, Marulić thus asserted the capability of Croatian humanist culture and its place in the *respublica litterarum* during the years when the renaissance of Christian Europe, and not merely Croatia, seemed threatened by Ottoman advances.

Plutarch in mid-sixteenth century England is addressed in Andrew Taylor's essay, and, as with Poliziano's Callimachus, Greek editions and their Latin translations are on display. This essay explores the use of Latin translation from Greek in the context of mid-Tudor religious politics. Princess Mary, the daughter of Henry VIII

and Catherine of Aragon, was an influential Catholic magnate under the Protestant regime of her half-brother Edward VI. Her household became a focus for scholars wishing to draw on the Greek writings of the early church in defending and reasserting the 'old religion' against Protestant appropriation or deprecation of ancient authority. The Erasmian and religiously conservative humanist John Christopherson published in Antwerp his Latin version of four works by Philo Judaeus in the spring of 1553, the season of Edward's terminal decline. By then he had undertaken, during his extended Edwardian period of academic retreat on the Continent, considerable work on a promised version of Eusebius and the following Greek ecclesiastical historians. Christopherson's Erasmian humanism is also reflected in his translating of pagan writers, including Demosthenes and Plutarch, and it is on the occasion and nature of his Latin version of Plutarch's *De garrulitate* or *De futili loquacitate* that this essay focuses. Christopherson's manuscript gift—the work was never printed—served to introduce him to Mary on the eve of a political crisis, and Taylor's essay examines how subtly Christopherson's offer of service was projected through not only his version of Plutarch's learned and lively discussion of the dangers of talkativeness, but also its interplay with the work's paratexts: a dedicatory epistle and an edition of the original Greek. The extended epistle weaves together classical authority, Erasmian reworkings of Plutarch's themes in classical and biblical contexts, and Christopherson's own humble (and seemingly successful) approach to his potential patron. The edition of Plutarch's Greek projected his editorial labours on manuscripts, alluded to his work on Eusebius, and placed him in the humanist communities abroad which were involved in the study and transmission of both Plutarchan and patristic texts. Christopherson's Plutarch was thus much more than a Latin translation, but a complex material text in which his Ciceronian version is richly articulated by learned paratextual display both for a princess and her scholarly supporters and advisors.

Brenda Hosington's essay looks at the period 1540-1640 and its corpus of eighteen translations of sixteen historical source texts into or out of neo-Latin. Thirteen of these were English translations of neo-Latin histories, two more of French and Italian histories via neo-Latin translations, one from neo-Latin into French, and two from Italian into neo-Latin. Although paratexts addressing the reader and epistles dedicating works to patrons or potential patrons have been studied for the glimpses they afford of translators' anxieties or goals, and the politics of the texts they introduce, they have not been considered more broadly, as they are here, for their articulation of the cultural translation of the original works. Hosington thus engages with the anthropological model applied by Peter Burke in *Cultural Translations* (2007) and elsewhere, through which he drew the conclusion that the dominant regime of history translation was one of domestication. Drawing on Genette's *Seuils* (1987) and more recent work on title-pages, paratexts, illustrations and *mise-en-page*, Hosington explores how the potential of print was exploited in the textual reframing and representation of the neo-Latin translations for a mainly domestic

readership ignorant of the original works' vernacular tongues, or an English readership lacking Latin. However, the retention of neo-Latin verse in the English version of a neo-Latin work, which could be seen as an interruption of cultural transfer, is a reminder that such translations appealed as well to those capable of reading the original. Her wide-ranging essay closes with two contrasting case studies: the neo-Latin translation of Sarpi's *Historia del concilio Tridentino* (1619) for more learned English Protestants, and an English version of a segment of Baronio's monumental *Annales ecclesiastici* (1588-1607) printed in Paris for a recusant readership. The shrewdness of most printers suggests that they understood what was likely to sell, and commercial considerations certainly motivated in part the claims of newness and fidelity, and assertions of authority added to many of the works in this corpus. Interestingly, Grimeston, in his English version (1602) of Meteren's *Historica Belgica* (1598), invoked the 'laws of translation' to justify his supplementation. Counter-intuitively, he offered clarity as the overriding reason for his deviation from strict translation. Altered political or national circumstances often rendered the original dedicatory epistles redundant, prompting their removal, substitution or adaptation. The English versions (Wythers 1563; Darcie 1627) of Sleiden's *De quatuor summis Imperiis* (1556) retained his dedication to Prince Eberhard Duke of Wirtemberg, a well-known supporter of Protestantism, but retitled it 'The Preface' for its discussion of historiography. Paratextual warping of a linguistic rather than generic kind is seen in the shift from Giovio's *Commentario delle cose de' Turchi* (1531) to Negri's Latin version, *Turcicarum rerum commentarios* (1537), the source of Ashton's English translation, *A shorte treatise upon the Turkes chronicles* (1546). Ashton, translating from the Latin, transplanted Giovio's prefatory remark that his use of the Italian had allowed him to write more simply and plainly than Latin would have allowed, to speak of the refinement of the English tongue purged of Chaucerian and inkhorn terms. Such were the unexpected refractions of the original paratextual-textual relations upon their temporal, geographical and linguistic translation.

The next essay looks at the relationship between neo-Latin and French in the sphere of medical writing in the early modern period, specifically that on reproductive medicine and women's health. Valerie Worth-Stylianou, in a series of detailed case studies, explores whether discrete reading communities were addressed by medical works in Latin and the vernacular, how translation modified these works as they were recast in the other language, and why some works available in both French and Latin were reprinted (some repeatedly) in one but not the other. These texts have often left fascinatingly complex trails. Over the course of the sixteenth century humanists in France were increasingly convinced that medical works, both those of Greek and Roman antiquity and contemporary neo-Latin treatises, should be made available in the vernacular. But although medical writers capable of writing in both Latin and French made the initial choice of language, the longevity of their work often depended on the translators and the publishers who saw a commercial opportunity for producing another version of the text, either for a primarily domes-

tic audience in French or a predominatly international one in Latin. For example, Laurent Joubert, an eminent academic physician at Montpellier, chose Latin for some works, French for others, and translated into the vernacular some of his predecessor's work; one of his own bestselling vernacular works was converted into Latin, but failed to sell. Latin was the international language of intellectual exchange, and so when medical treatises were primarily theoretical (one example studied here deals with caesarian sections), such matter tended to endure far longer in Latin, which, as Worth-Stylianou's final example shows, could be claimed apocryphally for a pseudo-translated text in order to confer authority on the published vernacular work. We find that some provincial physicians and most surgeons (who were in general less educated) would have found vernacular versions of Latin treatises more useful or indeed necessary, a market of which the urban humanists and their publishers were far from unaware. Thus Guillaume Chrestian, one of the most active translators of medical works into French, produced a humanistic Latin translation of an ancient Greek work, but then, having left Paris, shifted to French translations of Hippocrates and Galen, and also Latin works on conception, pregnancy and gynaecology by his humanist teacher Jacques Dubois, for surgeons and barber-surgeons, and (especially in the case of Dubois's works) elite lay audiences. Educated lay readers were increasingly well served by medical writers and translators later in the century. But as Worth-Stylianou reminds us, apparent markets could be deceptive and there were vernacular translations of only one edition readily outstripped in popularity by their Latin originals. Concurrent circulation of vernacular and Latin versions, she concludes, suggests that reading communities for these texts on reproductive health, which crossed boundaries of gender and professional-lay interests, co-existed in balance. The vernacular came to dominate only in the later seventeenth century.

We return to ancient works in Paul Botley's essay, where he sets out to review the distinct kinds of translation posited in the conclusion of his *Latin Translation in the Renaissance* (2004): replacements, competitors and supplements. Where that study focused on the theory and practice of Bruni, Manetti and Erasmus, Botley here turns to three later figures: Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609), Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) and Richard Thomson (c. 1570-1613), to consider whether his three categories can be applied to later sixteenth and early seventeenth century translations. In the final consideration of the Authorized Version (1611) of the English Bible, Botley concludes that it seems to evade the tripartite scheme, neither rivalling the original Hebrew and Greek texts, nor substituting for them in the way that the Latin Vulgate did in the Roman Church—the decree of the fourth session of the Council of Trent on 8th August 1546, absolutely confirmed that the Vulgate was the only authentic text of Scripture and 'that no one is to dare, or presume to reject it under any pretext whatever' ('et ut nemo illam reiicere quovis praetextu audeat vel praesumat'). All three translators considered here were extremely accomplished polyglots and philologists, Joseph Scaliger a prodigious polymath, and Casaubon arguably outstripping even him in Greek. As Botley's account demonstrates, Scaliger's hugely ambitious pro-

gramme of translation, not merely of the most demanding ancient Greek poetry and dramatic verse into recondite Latin, but also Latin poetry into the most sophisticated Greek, asserted his abilities in a highly competitive arena. His achievements strongly projected his mastery and consummate assimilation of the literary culture of classical antiquity, while his apparent desire to outstrip the original is reminiscent of Bruni and Valla. Casaubon displayed his learning differently: he came to translation later than Scaliger, having completed a series of monumental commentaries on demanding ancient authors, and an explanatory relationship to the text informed his greatest achievement as a translator, the parallel edition of Polybius (1609). Its very form underscored how he envisaged that translation as supplementary, in contrast to Scaliger's displacing versions and the ambiguous Authorized Version on which Thomson worked under a highly organized regime. Botley concludes that the value of attempting to outdo the original in proving scholarly and literary mastery of the source text was by the early seventeenth century far less clear to translators and the learned audience for which they produced.

Understanding the nature of a readership for a version and the ways in which that readership, which could be broad, might relate the resulting work to the original text is a perennial consideration for both translator and critic. The coda to the volume explores the translation for modern readers of a neo-Latin text. Dominic Baker-Smith, the most recent translator into English of Thomas More's *Utopia*, perhaps the most widely known neo-Latin work, sets his own version in the context of earlier translators' achievements to argue for the need to resist the overfamiliarizing and decontextualizing impulse towards engaging the 'popular' reader. If cultural translation is thought of as a double process of decontextualization followed by recontextualization, here in *Utopia* we find a text that suffers particularly from decontextualization. Yet it is a text that has been repackaged and retranslated on numerous occasions since its publication in 1516. Indeed it was only a matter of months before the playful permeability of the work's fictive boundaries was enhanced by the accretion of donated paratextual materials. Some early translations of *Utopia* are shorn of some of these paratexts, and the whole of Book I was regarded as superfluous by those interested only in Raphael's account of the island: the rest, merely literary honeying of the wormwood cup, was deemed expendable. A recent study has traced how the work was repeatedly reframed and recontextualised as it moved from edition to edition, language to language (see Cave). Yet beyond these sundry structural transformations, *Utopia*'s repeated reinterpretation over the centuries has been stimulated by the unresolved tensions operating far more finely and continuously within the work itself. Like Erasmus's *Moriae encomium*, More's work was purposefully aimed at a sophisticated Latinate readership capable of appreciating its subtle ironies and intellectual playfulness, and also of registering how its ludic ambivalence nevertheless addressed serious matters of political institutions, their corruption, and how those who desired reform had, as *Utopia* seems to reflect, no alternative but to risk contamination through participation. Translation into the vernacular, then as

now, risked fundamental distortion of the work's meaning. Yet *Utopia*'s meaning is elusive, a product of how its ideas are presented in a literary mode of enveloping report, conversation and narration, and the great subtlety of More's vitally colloquial language. Importantly, *Utopia*'s irony draws on the textual tradition that supplied the surplus of signification making such ambivalence possible. Thus one profound challenge facing the translator is how to interpret the source text in relation to that tradition, and another the choice of strategies through which to convey that to the reader. Baker-Smith thus considers the degree to which this should be directed through the translation, and how much left to supporting notes. The overemphasis on the colloquial nature of the work has, moreover, led to a liveliness of language in some translations that upsets the serio-ludic balance in other ways. This essay argues that it is critical to understand the costs of ignoring the historical context which prompted and informed a work's making, a context which may require some effort to reconstruct, and which in part may best be left less accommodated. Where

More calls a Utopian river *Anydros*, for example, the translator has the opportunity to preserve the strangeness of the self-negating cratylic paradoxes in Greek, rather than familiarise them (as the 'River Nowater' and so on). The larger argument arising from this recasts the translator as a guide who leads readers into less familiar reading experiences, rather than a domesticator of the text to their existing capabilities and horizons of understanding. Indeed, More included an explicit discussion of reading habits in *Utopia* to prompt such reflection by readers and translators alike. His goal in writing *Utopia*, it is persuasively argued, was to loosen the shackles of custom to allow at least the possibility of reform, and a translation should try to capture this state of mind. This essay thus prompts us to reflect on the current efflorescence of neo-Latin studies and the burgeoning number of Renaissance Latin texts in modern editions. As these are often presented as parallel texts, and as critical studies increasingly include translations of Latin quotations, Baker-Smith's essay reminds us of the partiality of any given version, and the need to attend to texts in their original languages and historical moments.

The essays in this collection derive from the 2010 Symposium of the Cambridge Society for Neo-Latin Studies. The Society is grateful for the support of the Faculty of Classics, the Department of Italian, Clare College, and Trinity College, Cambridge.

This volume is dedicated to the memory of Professor Philip Ford, FBA (1949-2013), Fellow of Clare College, Professor of French and Neo-Latin at the University of Cambridge, and the generous host and guiding spirit of the seminars and symposia of the Cambridge Society of Neo-Latin Studies for the many years since its founding.

Note

* I am very grateful to Fred Schurink for his helpful comments on the Introduction and many other aspects of the volume.

Works Cited

Bizer, Marc. *Homer and the Politics of Authority in Renaissance France*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.

Botley, Paul. *Latin Translation in the Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.

---. *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396-1529*. Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 2010. Print.

Bruni, Leonardo. *Leonardi Bruni Aretini Epistolarum Libri VIII*. Ed. Lorenzo Mehus. 2 vols. Florence: B. Paperinius, 1741. Print.

---. *Sulla perffeta traduzione* [Latin-Italian]. Ed. and tr. Paolo Viti. Naples: Liguori, 2004. Print.

Buchanan, George. *Psalm Paraphrase of the Psalms*. Ed and tr. Roger P.H. Green. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance. Geneva: Droz, 2011. Print

Burke, Peter. "Cultures of Translation in Early Modern Europe." Burke and Hsia 7-38. Print.

---. "Translations into Latin in Early Modern Europe." Burke and Hsia 65-80. Print.

---. "Translating Histories." Burke and Hsia 125-41. Print.

Burke, Peter and R. Po-chia Hsia, eds. *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

Carley, James P. "'Her moost lovyng and fryndely brother sendeth gretyng': Anne Boleyn's Manuscripts and Their Sources." *Illuminating the Book: Makers and Interpreters: Essays in Honour of Janet Backhouse*. Eds. Michelle P. Brown and Scott McKendrick. London: British Library. 261-80. Print.

Castor, Grahame, and Terence Cave. *Neo-Latin and the Vernacular in Renaissance France*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1984. Print.

Cave, Terence, ed. *Thomas More's* Utopia *in Early Modern Europe: Paratexts and Contexts*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2008. Print.

Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.

Copenhaver, Brian. "Translation, Terminology and Style in Philosophical Discourse." *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*. Eds. Charles B. Schmitt and Quentin Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988. 77-110. Print.

Cummings, Brian. *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.

DellaNeva, JoAnn. *Ciceronian Controversies*. Tr. Brian Duvick. The I Tatti Renaissance Library 26. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2007. Print.

Deneire, Tom. "Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: Methodological Issues." *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*. Eds. Philip Ford, Jan Bloemendal and Charles Fantazzi. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2014. 1: 275-86. Print.

---, ed. *Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular*. Leiden: Brill, 2014. Print.

Ford, Philip. *De Troie à Ithaque: Réception des épopées homériques à la Renaissance*. Geneva: Droz, 2007. Print.

---. *The Judgment of Palaemon: The Contest Between Neo-Latin and Vernacular Poetry in Renaissance France*. Leiden: Brill, 2013. Print.

Gordon, Phyllis Walter Goodhart. *Two Renaissance Book Hunters: The Letters of Poggius Bracciolini to Nicolaus de Niccolis*. New York: Columbia UP, 1974. Print.

Hankins, James. *Humanism and Platonism in the Italian Renaissance I: Humanism*. Storia e Letteratura: Raccolta di Studi e Testi 215. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2003. Print.

Hermans, Theo. "Renaissance Translation between Literalism and Imitation." *Geschichte, System, Literarische Übersetzung/Histories, Systems, Literary Translations*. Ed. Harald Kittel. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1992. 95-116. Print.

Hobbs, R. Gerald. "Pluriformity of Early Reformation Scriptural Interpretation." *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation, Vol. 2: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*. Ed. Magne Sæbø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009. Print.

Hosington, Brenda M. "Translation and Neo-Latin." *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*. Eds. Philip Ford, Jan Bloemendal and Charles Fantazzi. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2014. 1: 127-39. Print.

Jensen, Kristian. "The Humanist Reform of Latin and Latin Teaching." *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. Ed. Jill Kraye. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 63-81. Print.

Kess, Alexandra. *Johann Sleidan and the Protestant Vision of History*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Print.

Kirchner, Timothy. "Wrestling with Ulysses: Humanist Translations of Homeric Epic around 1440." *Neo-Latin and the Humanities: Essays in Honour of Charles E. Fantazzi*. Eds. Luc Deitz, Timothy Kirchner and Jonathan Reid. Essays and Studies 32. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2014. 61-91. Print.

Kittel, Harald, et al., eds. *Übersetzung: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung = Translation: An International Encyclopedia of Translation studies = Traduction: Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*. 2. Teilband = Volume 2. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2007. Print.

Maclean, Ian. *Scholarship, Commerce, Religion: The Learned Book in the Age of Confessions, 1560-1630*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2012. Print.

Mazzocco, Angelo. *Linguistic Theories in Dante and the Humanists: Studies of Language and Intellectual History in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Italy*. Leiden: Brill, 1993. Print.

McFarlane, I.D. *Buchanan*. London: Duckworth, 1981. Print.

Moss, Ann. "Being in Two Minds: The Bilingual Factor in Renaissance Writing." *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Hafniensis*. Eds. Ann Moss et al. Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1994. 61-74. Print.

Norton, Glyn P. *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents*. Geneva: Droz, 1984. Print.

Pade, Marianne. *The Reception of Plutarch's* Lives *in Fifteenth-Century Italy*. 2 vols. Renæssancestudier 14. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum P, 2007. Print.

Pantin, Isabelle. "The Role of Translations in European Scientific Exchanges in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." Burke and Hsia 163-79. Print.

Pattison, Mark. *Isaac Casaubon, 1559-1614*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1875. Print.

Pettegree, Andrew. *The Book in the Renaissance*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2010. Print.

Rhodes, Neil, Gordon Kendall, and Louise Wilson, eds. *English Renaissance Translation Theory*. MHRA Tudor and Stuart Translations 9. London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2013. Print.

Richardson, Brian. *Printing, Writers and Readers in Renaissance Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

Tucker, George Hugo. *The Poet's Odyssey: Joachim Du Bellay and the* Antiquitez de Rome. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1990. Print.

Valla, Lorenzo. *Opera omnia*. Ed. Eugenio Garin. 2 vols. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1962. Print.

Worth, Valerie. *Practising Translation in Renaissance France: The Example of Étienne Dolet*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1988. Print.

Worth-Stylianou, Valerie. "*Translatio* and Translation in the Renaissance: From Italy to France." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume III: The Renaissance*. Ed. Glyn P. Norton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 127-35. Print.