Three Very Different Translators: Joseph Scaliger, Isaac Casaubon and Richard Thomson

Paul Botley
University of Warwick

This essay revisits some ideas on translation which I developed several years ago. They were published as part of a book on Latin translation in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and one of the purposes of the present essay is to discover whether the intervening years have been kind to them.

That book, *Latin Translation in the Renaissance*, examined the work of a number of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century translators, in particular, Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus, and suggested an alternative approach to categorising renaissance translations. It argued that in the fifteenth century ideas about translation became more sophisticated because of the proliferation of different translations of the same text. This was a new phenomenon: by and large, the Middle Ages had been obliged to make do with unique versions of a rather small number of Greek texts, and medieval scholars were seldom in a position to compare the merits of rival versions. In the fifteenth century, a number of versions of the same Greek text became available. As a consequence of this multiplication of renderings, even those who knew nothing of the original language were able to evaluate the differences between versions. Thus, in the fifteenth century, it became possible for a reader with no knowledge of Greek to deepen his understanding of a Greek author by collating a number of Latin translations of the original text. In such circumstances, the relationship of the translation to the other available translations was at least as important as the relationship of the translation to the original, Greek, text.[1]

Thinking about these relationships between these early modern translations led me to suggest that they could be placed into three broad categories, which I called replacements, competitors and supplements. Under this scheme, replacements are those versions which attempt to make the original text redundant by providing Latin readers with everything which they might have wanted from the Greek text;

Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée
CRCL DECEMBER 2014 DÉCEMBRE RCLC
0319–051x/14/41.4/477

competitive translations self-consciously attempt to surpass the versions of their predecessors, either in accuracy or literary polish; and supplementary translations are created to facilitate the reader's access to the original Greek text. The plain prose translations of the Loeb Classical Library, for example, belong to this third category.

This straightforward scheme is open to a number of objections, but two considerations may be cited in its defence. First, it is useful to keep these categories in mind when assessing a Renaissance translation: they draw attention away from the Greek text from which it was made and onto the function envisaged for it by the translator and his readers. Second, and most important, it is a conceptual framework which was at least partly articulated by its practitioners. I believe that Renaissance scholars would have understood the categories and distinctions described below.[2]

This essay will consider how these categories functioned in relation to real translators. As a rule, medieval versions tended to function as replacements of the original Greek text: very few contemporaries could read Greek, and so they were not equipped to take issue with the equations of their translators. Moreover, most medieval translations were of works of Greek science, and of the technical manuals of medicine and philosophy, practical works with no pretensions to literary merit. What follows will deal first with the idea of translations as competitors or supplements. To this end, it will briefly examine two of the early translators (Leonardo Bruni and Giannozzo Manetti) who appeared in my book before turning to the three later translators, Joseph Scaliger, Isaac Casaubon, and Richard Thomson. At the end, I shall suggest that the idea of translations as replacements retained its currency in the sixteenth century, but that it coexisted with an awareness that specific claims about replacement would not survive scrutiny.

Leonardo Bruni and Competitive Translation

Leonardo Bruni (1370-1444) was chancellor and historian of Florence in the first half of the fifteenth century. He was one of the most talented Latinists of his day, and one of the most prolific translators of the century. He was also a characteristic exponent of the competitive mode of translation (Botley, *Latin Translation* 5-62). Bruni's earliest translations were of pieces of ancient oratory. Most notably, he translated the great rhetorical confrontation between Demosthenes and Aeschines, and had it published with the pseudo-Ciceronian preface which circulated under the title *De optimo genere oratorum*. The short preface is one of the most important statements on translation to survive from antiquity, and Bruni recontextualised it for a fifteenth-century readership.[3] Some years later, he turned to the moral works of Aristotle, Greek works which lay at the heart of the intellectual culture of his day. By 1437, he had translated the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the pseudo-Aristotelian *Economics*, and the *Politics*.[4] Subsequently he wrote in defence of his translations, and of his methods as a translator. This work, *De interpretatione recta*, the first treatise on translation produced in

Western Europe since antiquity, has been dated to between 1424 and 1426 by Baron (*Crisis* 554, fn. 25), but Thiermann places it after the *Politics* translation (Bruni, *Die Orationes Homeri* 118-29).[5]

In theory and in practice, Bruni looked back to the great rhetoricians of the ancient world, Cicero and Quintilian, men for whom language was defined by victory in the battle to persuade. Bruni's competitive mode of translation, shaped by his understanding of Cicero, was most appropriate for the literary works of Greek oratory. It is inevitably rhetorical, and Bruni justified its application to the works of Aristotle by redefining Aristotle as an eloquent, rhetorical author. This reorientation of Aristotle involved Bruni in a great deal of controversy, and this controversy ensured that Bruni's ideas on translation reached a wide audience.

The Supplement

By the middle of the fifteenth century a new conception of translation was emerging from the Greek language schools which were becoming established in Italy.[6] In these classrooms, Latin versions were used as supplements to Greek texts, in order to help students to learn the language. Of course, any available version could be used by a student to interpret the text, including the competitive versions made by Bruni and his rivals. More often, though, the word-for-word interpretations made by Greek teachers circulated as student cribs. Students of Greek found that the most useful Latin translations were the most literal, and that these literal translations were not attractive specimens of Latin prose. As such, these translations were regarded as temporary and replaceable accommodations with the Greek text. After all, if they taught their readers how to read the Greek text that they rendered, then they made themselves redundant. A particularly striking illustration of this tendency is found towards the end of the fifteenth century: the Aldine Press in Venice produced parallel Greek-Latin texts which were constructed so that the interleaved pages containing the Latin versions could be removed and discarded once they had served their purpose.[7] Such supplementary translations implicitly acknowledge the permanent value of the original Greek text. This new variety of translation is a modest but distinctive contribution of the fifteenth century to translation practices.

Giannozzo Manetti

The second example of an early translator is Giannozzo Manetti (1396-1459), a younger contemporary of Bruni, who worked at Florence, Rome and Naples. Manetti's learning was substantial—he knew not just Greek but Hebrew too—but his Latin was no match for Bruni's. Manetti created his versions as supplements to existing translations. He translated scriptural texts—the Psalter and the New Testament

—and several of the moral works of Aristotle, including the *Nicomachean Ethics* not many years after Bruni had done so, and, like Bruni, also wrote on translation: his substantial work *Apologeticus*, composed in the 1450s, is the second treatise on translation of the Renaissance.[8]

Manetti translated some of the same works as Bruni from a substantially different theoretical perspective. Bruni came from a rhetorical background and turned Aristotle into something of a rhetorician, an advocate for his own philosophy; Manetti came from a theological background and produced more conservative translations which did not hide his author's difficulties, or his Greekness. Manetti's importance is twofold. First, his treatise on translation dealt at length with the account of the creation of the Septuagint Greek version of the Bible in Ptolemaic Egypt, the so-called Letter of Aristaeus. This account will be considered later, but for now it is enough to say that he reinstated what might be called the foundation myth of the discipline of translation, one which Bruni had deliberately passed over. Second, because Manetti came from a theological context, one in which the *ipsissima verba* (the very words themselves) of the original text were harder to ignore, he treated the philosophical Greek of Aristotle with more reverence.

Manetti's reverence for Aristotle's language had important consequences. To put the matter rather crudely, the medieval versions of Aristotle were not conceived primarily in relation to the Greek text, but in relation to the timeless truths which Aristotle's words were believed to clothe. That is to say, the medieval translators wanted to enable their readers to sidestep the Greek intermediary and attempted to put them directly in contact with Aristotle's thought. The assumption underlying this approach, of course, is that thought is not language dependent. Neither Bruni nor Manetti disagreed with this assumption. However, Bruni by concentrating on the personality of Aristotle, and Manetti by highlighting his foreignness, reoriented the discipline of translation, and began the long process which turned Aristotle from *the* philosopher to just one of a number of ancient voices competing for our attention.

* * *

I now want to move on by a century to consider the three figures of my title. The first is the great renaissance polymath Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609), son of the equally illustrious Julius Caesar Scaliger. The second is Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614), Scaliger's younger contemporary, and one of the most acute Greek scholars of all time. The third is Richard Thomson (c. 1570-1613), an Anglo-Dutch scholar who spent most of his life in Cambridge.

Joseph Scaliger

Joseph Scaliger is not famous for his translations. If he is known today at all, it is for his penetrating textual scholarship, for his ground-breaking work on chronology, or for his messy polemics regarding his ancestry.[9] As a translator, however, he did two unusual things. First, he translated difficult Greek poetry into archaic Latin; second, he translated ancient Latin poetry into accomplished Greek verse. In short, he was, like Bruni, a competitive translator. Scaliger constructed his formidable contemporary reputation by appearing to do difficult things with ease. This is translation as *sprezzatura*.

Much of Scaliger's poetic output was stimulated by his father, Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558), and by his later studies in Paris in the early 1560s, where he knew such established figures as Pierre de Ronsard and Jean Dorat, and his contemporary Florent Chrestien (Quintus Septimius Florens Christianus, 1541-1596).[10] Chrestien's versions of ancient drama are particularly relevant to the present essay. He translated Aristophanes's *Peace* (1588), *Wasps* and *Lysistrata* (1607); Euripides's *Andromache* (1594) and *Cyclops* (1605); Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (1586) and *Trachiniae* (unpublished); and Aeschylus's *Seven Against Thebes* (1585) and *Prometheus* (unpublished, but for which Scaliger wrote a Latin prologue).[11] Scaliger *filius* produced no prose translations, and all his versions are in Latin or Greek. In fact, he scrupulously avoided French, his native language, for literary purposes. His surviving letters show that he could write vigorous French prose, but he seems to have been a little self-conscious about the influence of his Gascon background on his language.[12]

A brief account of the works which Scaliger translated will provide some sense of just how unusual he was. First are his translations from the Greek. Under his father's tutelage at the age of sixteen, he made a version, now lost, of Sophocles's *Oedipus Rex* in 1557, which he later described as 'prima foetura ingenii mei' ('the firstborn of my talents') in a letter printed in his own lifetime.[13] To this same early period we may assign his version of Aeschylus's *Eumenides*, now also lost.[14] Aeschylus had become fashionable in the 1550s: Scaliger's teacher Adrien Turnèbe published an important edition in Paris in 1552, and the first printed Latin translation of the tragedies, by Joannes Sanravius 'ad verbum conversae', appeared in 1555.[15] Jean Dorat had attempted to improve on the Aldine edition of Aeschylus (1518) with his *Aeschyli poetae Prometheus*, published in Paris by Wechel in 1548, and Scaliger preserved several of Dorat's conjectural emendations in his copy of Aeschylus (Taufer 81). By 1562, in Paris, Scaliger had translated the *Hymns* attributed to Orpheus.[16] In the 1560s, perhaps also in Paris, he translated into Latin verse the legendarily difficult poem *Cassandra*, attributed to Lycophron, a member of the Alexandrian *Pleiad*.[17] Scaliger translated into Latin verse Sophocles's *Aiax*, published as an appendix to a substantial volume of his father's poetry in 1574, where the son stands as it were in his father's shadow.[18] He also translated many poems from the *Greek Anthology* throughout his life.[19] Next are his many Greek verse renderings of Latin texts. He translated poetry

by Ennius, Catullus, Tibullus, Horace, Propertius and Statius;[20] he produced versions of the so-called mimes of Publilius Syrus, and the *Distichs of Cato*;[21] he rendered a good part of Martial into Greek;[22] and he translated Virgil's tenth *Eclogue*, not just into Greek, but into Doric Greek.[23] Taken together, Scaliger's is a very audacious programme of translation.

Both the Latin and Greek halves of Scaliger's work as a translator are distinctive. The quality of his Latin set him apart from contemporaries. His version of Lycophron, for example, a difficult enough task in its own right, was made into Latin verse steeped in archaic and recondite vocabulary. His version of the *Orphic Hymns* was composed in a similar style, and his lost version of the *Eumenides* was made 'stylo Pacuviano':

> Illam vero Aeschyli fabulam totam nos vertimus veteri stylo Pacuviano. In quo maxime sunt reprehendendi isti qui in veteribus poetis vertendis eos tam dissimiles sui reddunt ut pudeat me legere Homerum Sillii [*sic*] Italici, Sophoclem Senecae verbis loquentem. Sed de his alias. (Scaliger, *Coniectanea* 135)[24]

> 'I have translated Aeschylus's entire tale in the ancient manner of Pacuvius. In which field, those translators should be sharply rebuked who render the ancient poets unrecognisable, so that I am embarrassed to read Homer speaking like Silius Italicus or Sophocles speaking like Seneca. But these matters are treated elsewhere.'

Scaliger was intimately familiar with the plays of Plautus, and had edited Varro and Festus, so his knowledge of the more obscure branches of Latin lexicography was very thorough.[25] Moreover, he was among the first to collect and closely study the surviving fragments of the lost Latin dramatists. His version of *Aiax*, also written in archaic Latin, grew out of these studies. It is a very curious thing to read: rather like reading a play written in the knockabout Latin of Plautus, but conceived in the high Greek tragic manner. It is quite unlike anything else I know in Latin.[26] Scaliger used translation into Greek and Latin to demonstrate his complete familiarity with both halves of the ancient world; his translations into Greek particularly impressed his learned contemporaries. To demonstrate his mastery of both languages, he sometimes made Greek and Latin versions of the same poem.[27] This brief account indicates that Scaliger was a translator of an intensely competitive cast.

Isaac Casaubon

Isaac Casaubon is known today almost exclusively as a classical scholar, and his reputation has been unfairly tarnished by his association with the sickly and selfish scholar Edward Casaubon in George Eliot's *Middlemarch*.[28] Casaubon began his career at the University of Geneva in the 1580s, before moving to Paris in 1599 at the invitation of the King of France, Henri IV. In Paris he occupied a difficult position as a prominent Protestant intellectual at the heart of an increasingly Catholic court.

In 1610, he took up an offer from James I of a position in England, and on arrival he threw himself into the theological controversies of the day with great enthusiasm. After his death in 1614, a large part of his personal library and papers ended up in Oxford and London.[29]

Casaubon's correspondence with Scaliger is marked by extensive use of Greek among his Latin.[30] His sentences move between the two languages very easily, a habit which allows him a remarkable range of allusion. Casaubon was a great Latinist, and in his hands the language was a very sophisticated tool; but even Scaliger acknowledged Casaubon's superiority in Greek.[31] The combination of both languages produced prose of extraordinary complexity and intimacy, an unusual facility worth emphasising before considering the achievements of Casaubon as a translator.

Casaubon's most enduring contributions to scholarship are his commentaries, and they provide some idea of the range of his interests. In the 1580s, he wrote commentaries on Diogenes Laertius, Theocritus, Strabo and the New Testament;[32] in the 1590s, on Suetonius, Athenaeus of Naucratis, and Theophrastus' *Characters*;[33] and in the following decade he wrote commentaries on the *Augustan History*, on Persius, on Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*, on the tactical writers Polyaenus and Aeneas, and on the history of Polybius.[34] The most remarkable thing about this list is Casaubon's willingness to undertake comprehensive commentaries on voluminous authors. Diogenes and Suetonius are long, Strabo and the *Augustan History* longer still. Most remarkable in this respect is his commentary on the vast *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus. Yet even relatively brief works acquired lengthy commentaries: his commentary on the short *Characters* is long (270 pages), and his commentary on the slender remains of Persius is enormous (522 pages).

Scaliger's translations were made in his youth, but Casaubon did not turn to translation until he was in his thirties. Casaubon's first Latin translation was his version of the *Characters*, printed in 1592. Since this was regularly reprinted with the Greek text until the nineteenth century, it was an auspicious start. He translated a short work by the Church Father Gregory of Nyssa in 1606,[35] but his greatest achievements in the field were published in 1609: the brief treatise of Aeneas and the extensive remains of the history of Polybius. These authors wrote on tactics in technical language, and had long been neglected and misunderstood. Casaubon the translator emerged from Casaubon the commentator, and appears to reflect a belief that a good translation should function as a commentary on the text. Casaubon's version of Polybius is as remarkable as a work of archaeology as it is of translation. It was always intended to be printed alongside the Greek text, and is in this sense supplemental in a way that Manetti would have understood; but it is also a version which throws new light on its original in countless places, and has been greatly admired ever since by the small number of scholars equipped to evaluate its excellences.

Before leaving Casaubon, a lost treatise he wrote on the art of translation must be noticed. Scaliger had encouraged him to write on translation as early as 1605, and it seems that Casaubon's long labours on a complete translation of Polybius stimulated

his ideas about translation more generally.[36] While working on this translation, he was also preparing Scaliger's Greek versions of Martial for the press in Paris in 1607. In a letter sent with a presentation copy of Scaliger's versions, Casaubon explained that he had intended his ideas on translation to form part of his preface to the edition:

> Initio fuerat consilium de recta interpretatione disserere et caussas exponere cur tua tantopere mirer. Sed ubi calamo admovi manum, libellus pro epistola est natus, qui in prolegomenis Polybianis melius, nisi fallor, locum habebit. (Scaliger, *Correspondence* 7: 265-66)[37]

> 'My plan had been to write about translation and to explain why I admire your versions so much. But when I put pen to paper, my prefatory letter turned into a treatise, one which will, I believe, be better placed among the prefatory matter to my edition of Polybius.'

Yet although his Greek-Latin Polybius was given a very long and elaborate preface to Henri IV on the nature and value of history, followed by a shorter essay on the failures of five earlier translators of Polybius, the promised treatise on translation did not materialise. Instead, he announced that it would accompany his forthcoming commentary on Polybius.[38] This commentary was never completed, and the treatise has not come to light. It seems that a substantial portion had been written, and from the published preface to Polybius it appears that Casaubon traced the history of translation in the early modern period back to the patronage of Pope Nicholas V (d. 1455) in Manetti's time:

> Nicolaus Quintus...primus illa aetate libros antiquorum scriptorum sedulo conquirere curae habuit, magnamque earum copiam in Vaticanam intulit; primus cum assiduis hortatibus, tum ingentibus etiam propositis praemiis, ad meliorem literaturam e tenebris oblivionis in lucem revocandam homines Italos stimulavit; primus Graecae linguae auctores, omnis sincerioris doctrinae esse promos condos qui non ignoraret, ut Latino sermone exprimerentur vehementissime optavit et efficere contendit. (Casaubon 63)

> 'Nicholas V was the first of his time who carefully collected the books of the ancient writers and brought a great many of them into the Vatican. He was the first who roused the Italians with regular encouragement and the offer of great rewards to bring fine literature back into the light from the shadows of oblivion. He was the first who, knowing Greek writers to be the storehouse of all pure learning, ardently desired and strove to effect their translation into Latin.'

The loss of Casaubon's treatise on translation is substantial. Some elements may yet be found among Casaubon's notes in Oxford, but for the purposes of the present essay its progress may be traced just a little further.[39]

Richard Thomson

The fortunes of Casaubon's treatise take us to England and to Richard Thomson.

Having first met in Geneva in 1593, they had been friends for many years by the time Casaubon's Polybius was published in 1609.[40] Naturally, Casaubon sent him a copy of the new edition, and Thomson later wrote that he read the preface with enthusiasm.[41] On 14 May 1610 Casaubon's patron Henri IV was assassinated, and within months Casaubon found himself in England.[42] No doubt he took with him his commentary and his essay on translation as works in progress. Thomson had good reason to be very interested in this essay. He has a single translation to his name: he was one of the many translators tasked by King James with producing a new English translation of the Bible, belonging to the half of the Westminster company of translators which worked on the Pentateuch.[43] Published in 1611, this version was well underway by the time Casaubon arrived in London.[44]

While Bruni and Scaliger may be identified as competitive translators, and the versions of Manetti and Casaubon as supplements, the King James version of the Bible sits awkwardly among the categories outlined at the beginning of this essay. As a translation prepared by committees of learned men coordinated by a king, it recalls the story of the creation of the Septuagint version, the so-called Letter of Aristeas, an account which Manetti had set at the heart of his own treatise on translation a century and a half earlier (Botley, *Latin Translation* 105-08). The King James Bible can hardly be described as a competitive translation: it efficiently concealed the personalities of its translators, and it deliberately incorporated the renderings of its predecessors and competitors. Neither is it a supplement to the original versions: certainly, it was not created to be printed alongside the original Hebrew and Greek. And yet it is does not claim to be a replacement: no Protestant translation could ever be conceived of as a replacing the original texts in the way that the Latin Vulgate replaced them for the Roman Church. The Authorised Version, constructed on the basis of the oldest known model of translation, seems to defy tidy categorisation.

If Thomson's role in translating the Pentateuch is invisible, one brief and rather surprising element of his engagement with the text has survived. Last year, in the British Library, I came across a copy of Casaubon's edition of Suetonius, published in Paris in 1610, carried to England by its author, and inscribed there to his friend Thomson.[45] In his commentary, Casaubon recounts how the Roman Emperor Valentinian released his pet bear into the wild.[46] At this point, Thomson wrote in the margin the Hebrew words אילה שלוחה (*ayalah sheluhah*). The words mean 'a hind let loose' and are part of Jacob's dying blessing of his son Naphtali at the end of the book of Genesis (49:21).[47] These enigmatic Hebrew words had evidently stuck in Thomson's mind because although their grammar and vocabulary are clear, their meaning is mysterious. The marginal note shows Thomson grappling with the difficulties of the text he had been asked to translate, and provides a welcome glimpse behind the calculated inscrutability of the version he helped make for his king. This highly individual response to the biblical text reminds us what has been concealed by the sense of corporate responsibility which permeates the King James Version.

* * *

It seems that competitive mode of translation, identified here in the works of Bruni in the fifteenth century, survived and flourished in the works of Scaliger. Yet while Bruni translated large tracts of Greek prose into stately Ciceronian periods, Scaliger chose to translate briefer, more densely freighted, and more complex texts. He selected poetry which had already been translated several times by his predecessors, a decision which inevitably placed him in public competition with these peers. He was also careful to choose works which allowed him to put his formidable linguistic skills on display. Scaliger's translations are in this sense not simply translations, but ostentatious displays of the author's competence as a translator. Bruni, a sober man who felt his translations served a high social purpose, would have disapproved of Scaliger's versions, but he would have understood very clearly what Scaliger was trying to achieve.

Casaubon, on the other hand, a contemporary scholar of comparable linguistic skills, chose an entirely different path. His translations are deft, and built on profound scholarship, but they are not showy, and they are not constructed to stand alone. His masterpiece, the version of Polybius, was always intended to share the page with the original Greek text. His versions were placed beside the Greek they rendered because he conceived them as functioning in relation to that text. Casaubon found congenial the supplementary mode of translation utilised by Manetti because it allowed him to confront his Greek sources without going into battle against them. Casaubon wanted to modify and reorient his Greek texts, not to replace or surpass them.

Neither the competitive nor the supplementary tradition adequately describes the version of the Bible on which Thomson worked. In its conception, it deliberately conjures up the model of translation which is to be found in the Letter of Aristeas: a new vernacular version, inspired by a learned and benign monarch, and executed by committees of the kingdom's finest scholars. The Letter of Aristeas, of course, is the earliest extant statement of the replacement model of translation, recounting the creation of a version intended to supplant the original. By alluding to this model, the creators of the King James Version deliberately constructed an ambiguous status for their text. The King and much of the Protestant establishment wanted the theological and social convenience of a replacement translation, but they knew that no Protestant theology could sustain a formal replacement. The idea of a translation as a replacement, an idea which had guided medieval translators, retained its theoretical attractions and practical advantages throughout the sixteenth century. By the early seventeenth century, however, it had become impossible to lay claim to them specifically.

Notes

1. Multiple versions from antiquity are rare. We have only the different Latin versions of the *Phaenomena* of Aratus, and the two ancient versions of Plato's *Timaeus* by pseudo-Cicero and Chalcidius. There were once a number of ancient versions of Homer, but only the *Ilias Latina* has survived.

2. Some of these ideas were dealt with at greater length in Botley, 'Fifteenth-Century Translators'.

3. Bruni translated Demosthenes's speech *De corona* ('On the crown') in 1406, and had translated Aeschines' speech for the prosecution by 1412: see Botley, *Latin Translation* 17-21.

4. The *Ethics* translation was largely complete by 1416, the *Economics* by 1420, and the *Politics* by 1437: see Botley, *Latin Translation* 42.

5. Nine early copies survive; see Hankins nos 971, 1545, 2015, 2174, 2429, 2601, 2644, 2705, 2729). The *De interpretatione recta* was not printed until the twentieth century. A parallel Latin-Italian text is in Bruni, *Opere letterarie e politiche* 150-93; an English translation is in Bruni, *The Humanism* 217-29.

6. For the Greek classrooms of the period, see Botley, *Learning Greek*.

7. For this technique of interleaving, see Botley, 'Learning Greek in Western Europe'.

8. For Manetti's translations, see Botley, *Latin Translation* 63-114. Bruni's translation of the *Ethics*, complete but unrevised at his death, was published posthumously by his son Agnolo (*ibid*. 73-74). Manetti's *Apologeticus* was not printed until the twentieth century: see Manetti.

9. For Scaliger's life, see Bernays and Grafton, and for his letters, see Scaliger, *The Correspondence*.

10. For Ronsard (1524-85) in this context, see note 23, and Isidore Silver, *Ronsard and the Hellenic Renaissance in France. I: Ronsard and the Greek Epic*, 2nd edn (Geneva: Droz, 1987). For Dorat (1508-88), see Taufer. For Chrestien, see Brigitte Jacobsen, *Florent Chrestien: Ein Protestant und Humanist in Frankreich zur Zeit der Religionskriege* (Munich: W. Fink, 1973).

11. Scaliger's Latin prologue for Chrestien's *Prometheus* is printed in Scaliger, *Poemata* 47-48.

12. For Scaliger's sensitivity to his own 'gasconismes', see his letter of 6 April 1584 to Jacques-Auguste de Thou, printed in Scaliger, *Correspondence* 1: 399-400.

13. See Scaliger's *Epistola de vetustate et splendore gentis Scaligerae*, first published in 1594, and reprinted posthumously in Scaliger, *Epistolae omnes quae reperiri potuerunt, nunc primum collectae ac editae* (Leiden: Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir, 1627), 50.

14. Willem Canter's undated preface to Scaliger's version of Lycophron, printed in 1566, mentions the *Eumenides* translation. The version is also mentioned in the verses of *Johannes Gardesius* prefaced to the *editio princeps* of Scaliger's translation of Sophocles' *Aiax: Sophoclis Aiax Lorarius, carmine translatus per I. Scaligerum, Iulii filium* (Paris: J. Benenatus, 1573), 102. Scaliger sent a manuscript of his translation with a letter to Chrestien around 1585 (*Correspondence* 1: 445-46). For the use made by Dorat of Lycophron's *Cassandra*, see Taufer 176, fn. 21.

15. For the fortunes of Aeschylus in the period, see Monique Mund-Dopchie, *La survie d'Eschyle à la Renaissance: Éditions, traductions, commentaires, et imitations* (Louvain: Peeters, 1984), esp. 379-84.

16. The translation of the *Orphic Hymns* was published posthumously by Isaac Casaubon in *Ios. Iusti Scaligeri Iulii Caesaris a Burden filii opuscula varia antehac non edita* (Paris: Adrien Beys, 1610), 155-209. It was reprinted in Scaliger, *Poemata* 372-410. He claimed to have made it in five days in 1562. The manuscript is extant: Leiden, University Library, Scal. 62, ff. 1^{r} 24^{v}. See Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger* 104, 275, fn. 27. Scaliger's brief notes on his version, printed with the *editio princeps* in 1610, must postdate the version itself, since they mention his notes on Varro, published in 1565 (Scaliger, *Poemata* 409; Scaliger, *Coniectanea in M. Terentium Varronem de lingua Latina. Ad nobilis. et eruditis. iuvenem Ludovicum Castanaeum Rupipozaeum* (Paris: ex officina Rob. Stephani, 1565), and see 212,

under 'Lucumo').

17. It was first printed in 1566, although the printer stated that he had had the work for some time: *Lycophronis Chalcidensis Alexandrae, sive Cassandrae versiones duae: una ad verbum a Gulielmo Cantero, altera carmine expressa per Iosephum Scaligerum Iulii f.* (Basle: Joannes Oporinus and Petrus Perna, 1566). It has been reprinted several times, most recently in Scaliger, *Poemata* 331-72. The version was criticised in Gaspar Schoppe, *Scaliger Hypobolimaeus* (Mainz: apud Iohannem Albinum, 1607), 200^{r}-201^{r}.

18. The version of *Aiax* was first printed in 1573: see note 14. It has been reprinted several times, most recently in Scaliger, *Poemata* 290-331.

19. Latin versions of 134 poems from the *Planudean Anthology* are printed in Scaliger, *Poemata* 258-88. Scaliger supplies two different Latin renderings for six of these.

20. For Ennius, see Scaliger, *Poemata* 162; for Catullus, see 214-18; for Tibullus, see 226-27; for Horace (made in Rome in 1565), see 222-24; for Propertius (made in Paris in 1561), 224-26; for Statius, see 162-63.

21. For Publilius Syrus, see Scaliger, *Poemata* 236-47; for the *Distichs*, see 247-57. Both were first printed in 1598: *Publii Syri Mimi selectae sententiae. Dionysii Catonis disticha de moribus, cum versione Graeca Planudis paribus versibus. Sententiae Publianae totidem versibus Graecis, et quaedam Catonis disticha Graece a Iosepho Scaligero reddita: cum notis eiusdem* (Leiden: ex officina Plantiniana, 1598).

22. The Greek versions of Martial were first published in *Florilegium Epigrammatum Martialis. Iosephus Scaliger Iul. Caesaris f. vertit Graece ad Isaacium Casaubonium* (Paris, ex typographia Roberti Stephani, 1607). They were reprinted in Scaliger, *Poemata* 163-213. For a printed text of 1603, suppressed by its editor Petrus Scriverius, see Botley, *Richard Thomson* (forthcoming), which will include an edition of Thomson's correspondence.

23. This version of Virgil is dated 1600, in Leiden, in Scaliger, *Poemata* 219-22. It was published with Daniel Heinsius' notes on Theocritus in 1603: *Danielis Heinsii emendationes et notae in Theocriti idyllia bucolica. Accesserunt epigrammata eiusdem, et idyllia quaedam ab eodem et Hugone Grotio ita translata ut versus versui respondeat: decima item Maronis ecloga ab eodem et Iosepho Scaligero dorice reddita: alia item non pauca* ([Heidelberg]: in Bibliopolio Commeliniano, 1603). Scaliger had rendered the ps-Virgilian *Moretum* into Greek verse in 1561, and he presented his version to Ronsard in Paris in 1563: see Scaliger, *Poemata* 228-31.

24. Scaliger seems not to speak of these matters elsewhere. He speaks of 'Pacuvius acer' in his prologue to Florent Chrestien's version of Aeschylus's *Prometheus* (Scaliger, *Poemata* 47-48).

25. For Scaliger's edition of Varro, see above, note 16. His edition of Festus is: *Marci Verrii Flacci quae extant. Sex. Pompei Festi de verborum significatione libri XX, et in eos Iosephi Scaligeri Iul. Caesaris filii castigationes nunc primum publicatae*, 3 parts ([?Geneva], Petrus Santandreanus, 1574-75). Scaliger was believed to be preparing an edition of Plautus in the 1570s and 1580s, but none appeared: see *Correspondence* 1: 195-96, fn. 3.

26. Scaliger's text was performed at least once, in Strasbourg in 1587: *Sophoclis Aiax lorarius, stylo tragico a Iosepho Scaligero…translatus: et in theatro Argentinensi publice exhibitus anno M.D.LXXXVII* (Strasbourg: A. Bertramus, 1587). This appears to have been an elaborate production, and the edition records the music for some of the choral passages.

27. For examples of such double versions, see Scaliger, *Poemata* 40-42, 46, 57-60, 110-11. Other translations are less easily categorised: Scaliger translated two poems of Catullus into elegiac verse (Scaliger, *Poemata* 15-17); he translated a portion of the Book of Proverbs into Greek verse (38-39); he made a Latin translation of one poem by Petrarch, and a Greek version of another: see 13-14, 231-33. This last version was made in France in 1563, and presented to Marc-Antoine Muret in Italy in 1565.

28. For Isaac Casaubon and *Middlemarch*, see A.D. Nuttall, *Dead from the Waist Down: Scholars and*

Scholarship in Literature and the Popular Imagination (New Haven, CT and London: Yale UP, 2003).

29. The best available account of Casaubon's life remains Pattison's. A useful summary is John Considine, 'Casaubon, Isaac (1559-1614)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [*ODNB*] (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004), 10: 459-64. I am now preparing for publication Casaubon's correspondence from his time in England, 1610-14, an edition scheduled to appear in 2018.

30. There are 254 extant letters between Casaubon and Scaliger belonging to the years 1594 to 1609. See Scaliger, *The Correspondence*.

31. Scaliger's judgement is recorded in the *Secunda Scaligerana*: 'C'est le plus grand homme que nous ayons en grec: je luy cede. Est doctissimus omnium qui hodie vivunt' (*Scaligerana, Thuana, Perroniana, et Colomesiana*, 2 vols (Amsterdam: chez Covens et Mortier, 1740): 2, 259).

32. *Notae, ad Diogenis Laertii libros de vitis, dictis, et decretis principum philosophorum* (Geneva: I. Sylvius, 1583); *Vetustissimorum authorum Georgica, Bucolica, et Gnomica poemata quae supersunt: accessit huic editioni Is. Hortiboni Theocriticarum lectionum libellus* ([Geneva]: E. Vignon, 1584); *Strabonis rerum geographicarum libri xvii* ([Geneva]: E. Vignon, 1587); *Novi Testamenti libri omnes, recens nunc editi, cum notis Isaaci Casauboni* ([Geneva]: E. Vignon, 1587).

33. *C. Suetoni Tranquilli De XII Caesaribus libri VIII, Isaacus Casaubonus recensuit et animadversionum libros adiecit* ([Geneva]: I. Chouet, 1595); *Animadversionum in Athenaei Dipnosophistas libri XV* (Lyon: apud A. de Harsy, excudebat G. Iullieron, 1600); *Theophrasti characteres ethici, sive descriptiones morum Graece…Isaacus Casaubonus recensuit, in Latinum sermonem vertit, et libro commentario illustravit* (Lyon: F. le Preux, 1592).

34. *Historiae Augustae scriptores sex…Isaacus Casaubonus ex vett. libris recensuit: idemque librum adiecit emendationum ac notarum* (Paris: A. and H. Drouart, 1603); *Auli Persii Flacci Satirarum liber. Isaacus Casaubonus recensuit, et commentario libro illustravit* (Paris: A. and H. Drouart, 1605); *Polyaeni Strategematum libri octo. Is. Casaubonus Graece nunc primum edidit, emendavit, et notis illustravit. Adiecta est etiam Iusti Vulteii Latina versio* (Lyon: I. Tornaesius, 1589). The commentary on Aeneas was published with the translation of Polybius: *Polybii Lycortae F. Megalopolitani Historiarum libri qui supersunt. Isaacus Casaubonus ex antiquis libris emendavit, Latine vertit, et commentariis illustravit…Aeneae, vetustissimi Tactici, Commentarius de toleranda obsidione. Is. Casaubonus primus vulgavit, Latinam interpretationem ac notas adiecit* (Paris: H. Drouard, 1609). What survives of the commentary on Polybius is brief and was published posthumously: *Ad Polybii Historiarum librum primum commentarii* (Paris: A. Stephanus, 1617). The substance of Casaubon's commentary on Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* was not made available until after Casaubon's death: see *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, ed. Eduard Fraenkel, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1950), 1: 62-78.

35. *B. Gregorii Nysseni ad Eustathiam, Ambrosiam et Basilissam epistola. I. Casaubonus nunc primum publicavit, Latine vertit et illustravit notis* (Paris: R. Stephanus, 1606).

36. See Scaliger's letter to Casaubon of 30 September 1605: 'Te a tuis studiis ad meas nugas convertisse ut Publiana nostra emendares, id vero tanti apud me est ut satis dignas grates tibi referre non possim. Sed utinam aliquid de optimo genere convertendi in limine operis posuisses!' (*Correspondence* 6: 182-83). For Scaliger's 'Publiana', see above, note 21.

37. Casaubon's letter to Scaliger of 31 August 1607.

38. The structure of Casaubon's preface to his Polybius is outlined in H. Parenty, *Isaac Casaubon, helléniste: Des studia humanitatis à la philologie* (Geneva: Droz, 2009), 433-46. The prefatory matter of the edition is most conveniently consulted in Casaubon 54-104. In his letter *ad lectorem*, Casaubon writes of a 'Diatriba quam de optimo genere interpretandi ex una in alteram linguam composuimus, et una cum nostris commentariis brevi, Deo faciente, sumus edituri' (97). For Casaubon's commentary on Polybius, see above, note 34.

39. Casaubon's son Meric found no copy of this work among his father's papers in 1621: 'Additurus erat, atque una editurus, librum singularem de vita Polybii, et diatribam de optimo genere interpretandi

ex una in alteram linguam; qua praeterea de omnibus antiquorum ac praecipuis neotericorum versionibus agebat accurate et iudicium suum exponebat. Horum omnium nihil reliquit, nihil ego quidem habeo, praeter indigestarum notarum et excerptorum ad id propositum ex omni fere librorum genere immensam sylvam...' (M. Casaubon, *Pietas contra maledicos patrii nominis et religionis hostes* (London: ex officina bibliopolarum, 1621), 163).

40. See Thomson's letter to Casaubon of 27 December 1593 (London, British Library, Burney 366, f. 235^{r-v}).

41. See Thomson's letter to Casaubon of 21 October 1609 (London, British Library, Burney 366, f. 260^{r-v}).

42. Casaubon arrived in England in October of the same year: see Casaubon 361-62, no. 691.

43. There were six companies of translators, two each at Cambridge, Oxford, and Westminster, each company dedicated to particular books of the Bible.

44. Thomson's biography is briefly sketched in Jonathan D. Moore, 'Thomson, Richard (d. 1613)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* 54: 549 50.

45. *C. Suetonii Tranquilli de XII Caesaribus libri VIII. Eiusdem de inlustribus grammaticis et de claris rhetoribus* (Paris: S. Cramoisy, 1610). The copy inscribed to Thomson on the title page is now London, British Library, shelfmark 1486.gg.2.

46. Casaubon, commenting on Suetonius's life of Julius Caesar, chapter 81, writes 'Valentinianus imperator Innocentiam ursam qua diu fuerit oblectatus, tandem ut bene meritam in sylvas abire dimisit innoxiam' (*C. Suetonii Tranquilli de XII Caesaribus libri VIII* (Paris: S. Cramoisy, 1610), 14). Casaubon derives the story of Valentinian's man-eating bear Innocentia from the history of Ammianus Marcellinus, 29.3.9.

47. Thomson's marginal note reads: 'Genes. XLIX.21. אילה שלוחה de Nephtali. etsi alii aliter'. The King James Bible reads: 'Naphtali is a hinde let loose: he giveth goodly words'. The Bishops' Bible (1568) reads: 'Nephthalim is a hynde sent for a present gevyng goodly wordes'. The Geneva Bible (1587) reads: 'Naphtali shal be a hinde let goe, giving goodly wordes'. The Vulgate reads: 'Nepthalim cervus emissus et dans eloquia pulchritudinis'. The Septuagint text is quite different at this point: Νεφθαλὶ στέλεχος ἀνειμένον, ἐπιδιδοὺς ἐν τῷ γεννήματι κάλλος (Nephthali is a spreading stem, bestowing beauty on its fruit).

Works Cited

Baron, Hans. *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*, 2nd edn. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1966. Print.

Bernays, Jacob. *Joseph Justus Scaliger*. Berlin: A. Bath, 1855. Print.

Botley, Paul. "Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1476-1516." *Literacy, Education and Manuscript Transmission in Byzantium and Beyond*. Eds. Catherine Holmes and Judith Waring. Leiden: Brill, 2002. 199-223. Print.

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

---. "Fifteenth-Century Translators on their Art: Leonardo Bruni and Giannozzo

Manetti." *Übersetzung und Transformation*. Eds. Hartmut Böhme, Christof Rapp, and Wolfgang Rösler. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2007. 61-78. Print.

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

Bruni, Leonardo. *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni: Selected Texts, Translations and Introductions*. Eds. Gordon Griffiths, James Hankins and David Thompson. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies in conjunction with the Renaissance Society of America, 1987. Print.

---. *Die Orationes Homeri des Leonardo Bruni Aretino: Kritische Edition der lateinischen und kastilianischen Übersetzung mit Prolegomena und Kommentar*. Ed. Peter Thiermann. Leiden: Brill, 1993. Print.

---. *Opere letterarie e politiche di Leonardo Bruni*. Ed. Paolo Viti. Turin: Unione tipografico-editrice torinese, 1996. Print.

Casaubon, Isaac. *Isaaci Casauboni epistolae, insertis ad easdem responsionibus, quotquot hactenus reperiri potuerunt, secundum seriem temporis accurate digestae*. Ed. Theodoor Jansson ab Almeloveen. Rotterdam: C. Fritsch and M. Böhm, 1709. Print.

Grafton, Anthony. *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1983. Print.

Hankins, James. *Repertorium Brunianum: A Critical Guide to the Writings of Leonardo Bruni. Volume I: Handlist of Manuscripts*. Rome: Istituto storico italiano, 1997. Print.

Manetti, Giannozzo. *Apologeticus*. Ed. Alfonso de Petris. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1981. Print.

Pattison, Mark. *Isaac Casaubon, 1559-1614*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1892. Print.

Scaliger, Joseph Justus. *Coniectanea in M. Terentium Varronem de lingua Latina*. Paris: ex officina Rob. Stephani, 1565. Print.

---. *Poemata omnia, ex museio Petri Scriverii*. Berlin: A. Bath, 1864. Print.

---. *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*. Eds. Paul Botley and Dirk van Miert. 8 vols. Geneva: Droz, 2012. Print.

Taufer, Matteo. *Jean Dorat editore e interprete di Eschilo*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 2005. Print.