Croatian into Latin in 1510: Marko Marulić and the Cultural Translation of *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta*

Neven Jovanović
University of Zagreb

Source Text and Its Context

Croatia, across the Adriatic from Italy, was in contact with, and influenced by, the cultures of several neighbouring regions. Here the ancient provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia met, and the Eastern Roman Empire was divided from the Western, just as the Eastern Orthodox Church was from the Roman Catholic; and here the Romans (living in Latin cities on the coast) mingled with the Slavs. Catholicism was embraced by rulers of an independent Croatian kingdom, which existed from the 10th until the 12th century. Later the kingdom was forced into a union with Hungary, eventually to be divided among Venice, the Habsburgs, and the Ottoman Empire (only the city state of Dubrovnik, or Ragusa, achieved and retained relative autonomy).[1]

During the Middle Ages, the region had a literature written in three languages: Latin, Old Church Slavonic (a 'common Slavic' liturgical language created from early Byzantine models, using its own Glagolitic script), and, finally, the Croatian vernacular. Texts in Old Church Slavonic and the vernacular were for the most part translations from Latin, Greek, and sometimes Italian, with religious prose (hagiography, exempla, vision literature) predominating. Historical prose narrative is comparatively scant, with a total of only five texts surviving. One of these stands apart from the rest: the anonymous *Gesta regum Sclavorum* (*GRS*), known also as the *Annals of the priest of Doclea*.[2] Whereas other Croatian medieval histories centre

on a particular city or event, the *GRS* is a genealogy of rulers of the Croatian king-dom, and tells of the princes and kings of the Slavs (called Goths in the *GRS*) who invaded Dalmatia and Pannonia 'during the lifetime of St Bernard', and how this people later accepted Christianity and formed a state under the auspices of the pope. Furthermore, the *GRS* includes both the evaluation of the abilities of the rulers as well as their deeds. The chronicle ends in the later eleventh century, at around the time of the Domesday Book. According to the closing narrative of the *GRS*, the Croats, who did not want to participate in the Crusades, murdered their last king, Demetrius Zvonimir in 1089, which resulted in the collapse of Croatian royal power. Before his death the king is said, in this account, to have cursed his people, providing a legend-ary explanation of the loss of Croatian independence.[3]

The *GRS* survives both in Latin and Croatian versions. The Latin *Gesta regum Sclavorum* is longer (47 chapters, some eighty pages in the modern edition[4]) and covers a more extended historical period (the events c. 538-1150), but the shorter, vernacular *Croatian Chronicle* (24 chapters on 27 pages, covering events from c. 538-1079) includes the legend of the murder and the curse of the last Croatian king. The authorship and date of both *Gesta* and *Chronicle* have long been the subject of controversy. The GRS could have been written by a churchman residing in Split or, to the south, Bar (*Antibarium*, as facing Bari across the Adriatic) or both, anytime between the twelfth and fourteenth century. Moreover, the *Chronicle* could have pre-ceded or followed the *Gesta*. Also, there does not seem to be any evidence against the account having been composed in Croatian, rather than being a translation from the Latin *Gesta*; the Latin's dependency on the Croatian is equally unclear. What we know from documentary evidence is that in the year 1500 a manuscript of the *Chronicle* was brought to the Dalmatian city of Split from the so-called Krajina, a nearby coastal region, and that ten years later it was translated into Latin (again), under the title *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatie gesta* (*RDCG*). The translator was a Renaissance humanist from Split, Marko Marulić or Marcus Marulus.[5]

The Translator

Marko Marulić was born in Split in 1450. From the year 1420 his hometown, as well as other Dalmatian cities—including Šibenik, Zadar, Trogir, Hvar, Kotor—were under the rule of Venice, belonging to its *Stato da Mar*. For a time, Venetian rule ensured protection from local warlords and a commercial market for goods *de partibus Sclavoniae*; later, from the First Ottoman-Venetian War (1463-79) onwards, with the steady encroachment of Ottoman power, Dalmatia was gradually turned into a war zone racked by poverty and plague. But during the Quattrocento a prospering economy enabled the wealthy to offer their sons a humanist education, hiring accom-plished teachers, often from Italy. Dozens of students from Venetian Dalmatia and independent Dubrovnik went to study in Italy, mostly at Padua, but also at Ferrara

and Bologna. Some taught as professors at Padua and Florence; several poets laureate came from Dalmatia; Dalmatians exchanged letters with, among others, Ciriaco d'Ancona, Francesco Barbaro, Cassandra Fedele, Angelo Poliziano, Girolamo Avanzi, and Erasmus. They copied Greek and Latin texts, collected Roman inscriptions and composed commentaries on them, translated Greek texts into Latin, started their own publishing enterprises, or served in Italy as editors and correctors. In all, Croatian humanism had firmly taken root by the first decades of the fifteenth century, and Marulić's generation represents the full development of this culture; at that time, we find Croatian authors writing in a broad range of prose and poetic genres on a wide range of themes, showing an elegant command of Latin, Croatian, and Italian, even writing Greek epigrams. Poets with substantial collections of neo-Latin verse included: from Dubrovnik, Ilija Crijević (c. 1460-c.1521), Jakov Bunić (1469-1534), and Damjan Beneša (1477-1539); Juraj Šižgorić (1445-1509) from Šibenik; Pavao Paladinić from Hvar (fl. 1496). In prose, Nikola, bishop of Modruš (1427-80), during his life in Italy wrote on history, philosophy, and produced a textbook on consolation; Koriolan Cipiko from Trogir (1425-93) described a Venetian campaign against the Turks led by Pietro Mocenigo (Koriolan himself commanded a galleon); Ludovik Crijević Tuberon (1458-1527) from Dubrovnik left a history of South-Eastern Europe called *Commentariorum de temporibus suis libri undecim*; Antun Vrančić (1504-73) from Šibenik, archbishop of Esztergom and an important Hungarian politician, collected over 1000 of his public and private letters; Vinko Pribojević from Hvar (fl. 1532) published in Venice a Latin speech on the glorious history of Slavic peoples; and Frane Petrić from Cres (1528-97) was a Neoplatonist philosopher.[6]

As the elderly Marulić set to work translating the *Gesta regum Sclavorum* in 1510, he had already, in 1501, completed the first epic in Croatian, *Judita* (Venice, 1522), a retelling of the biblical story of Judith in six cantos, its 2126 double-rhymed dodecasyllabic verses richly ornamented by humanistic narrative and rhetorical devices such as ecphrases, speeches, similes, catalogues, allusions to Greek and Roman mythology and history. This work, an effort to provide for the Croatian public what Dante had given to Italians, brought Marulić the title of the founding father of Croatian literature (on his expression of ambition, see Marulić and Lučin 266-67). Moreover, by 1510 Marulić had already achieved the first of his international Latin successes, a collection of Christian moral examples under the title *De institutione bene uiuendi per exempla sanctorum*. First published in Venice in 1507, it was reprinted in at least 15 editions during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and also translated, again with numerous reprints, into Italian, German, Portuguese, French, and Czech. Marulić's other main Latin work, the *Euangelistarium*, on practical Christian ethics, was first printed in Venice in 1516, and similarly would go through 15 Latin editions and be translated into Italian, Spanish, Flemish, and French.[7]

By the time he started his version of *Gesta regum Sclavorum* Marulić had also practised translation. In 1507-08 he produced a Croatian version of the Latin *De Imitatione Christi* by Thomas a Kempis (Marulić regarded it as a work of Jean Gerson), and

had also translated into Croatian his own 'Carmen de doctrina domini nostri Iesu Christi pendentis in cruce. Christianus interrogat, Christus respondit', as 'Karstjanin Isukarsta propetoga gledajući pita a on odgovara karstjaninu' ('A Christian, looking at the crucified Christ, asks, and He answers the Christian').[8] Moreover, having completed his *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta*, he went on to compose a version of Petrarch's canzone 'Vergine bella' in Latin elegiac verse (1511), as a supplement to the *Euangelistarium*. We find a similar supplement to Marulić's ambitious, but unpublished (although dedicated to cardinal Domenico Grimani) *Dauidias* (1510-17), a biblical epic in 14 cantos and 6565 Latin hexameters, to which he appended his translation of Canto I from Dante's *Inferno*.[9] Three more of Marulić's Croatian poems, of unknown date, paraphrase works of Latin literature.[10] Marulić also translated two of Petrarch's sonnets into Croatian.[11] As this brief survey shows, Marulić had a sustained interest in translation which was expressed not only in the bilateral conversion of Latin and Croatian, but also involved the production of both Latin and

392 Croatian versions of Italian texts (despite seeming competence in Italian—he wrote private letters and a sonnet in Italian in 1501—he never chose it as a target language). The poet from Split had experience both with what Peter Burke calls 'classicizing' translation from the vernacular into Latin (as shown by, for example, echoes from Roman poets introduced into Marulić's elegiac version of Petrarch's *Vergine bella*), and with the 'cultural' translation required to ensure understanding and appreciation of a classical text in a recipient culture (demonstrated by, for example, turning Seneca's aphorisms into Croatian verse).

The Translation: *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta*

Marulić prefaces his *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta* (*RDCG*) with a short letter addressed to his friend and fellow citizen Dmine Papalić (Dominicus Papalis), who, in 1500, had discovered the manuscript with the Croatian text and then persuaded Marulić to translate it. Marulić's letter gives two reasons for his undertaking:

> Res certe digna relatu et quam non solum nostrae uernaculae linguae gnari, sed etiam Latinae, intelligant. Ex hac enim historia et boni exemplum petere poterunt quod imitentur, et mali per quod sese corrigant. (Marulić 2011, 172)

> 'It is a story definitely worthy to be told, and to be known not only by people who master our vernacular language, but by those who master Latin as well. Because this is a history in which the good will find an example to follow, and the bad an example by which to correct themselves.'

For Marulić, all writing is primarily didactic, and the *RDCG* arises from a two-fold didactic purpose: it is intended to be understood (*quam intelligant*) and also to influence behaviour (*exemplum petere*). This view is in accordance with the tra-

ditional doctrine of the moral utility of *historia*—philosophy teaching by examples —as formulated, for example, by Livy (*Ab urbe condita: Praefatio* 10) and embraced, at least declaratively, by humanist historiographers such as Sabellico in his *Rerum Venetarum decades* (1487) (see further Cochrane, especially 483-85). We know from lists appended to Marulić's will that he owned copies of both classical and Renaissance historical works: Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, Caesar, Sallust, Suetonius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Livy, Valerius Maximus, Plutarch, Pomponio Leto's *Caesares*, Sabellico's *Rhapsodiae*, and Barlezio's *De obsidione Scodrae*. Marulić's writings reveal that he also knew, used, and discussed historical works by Matteo Palmieri, Giacomo Filippo Foresti da Bergamo, and Flavio Biondo (Margetić and Lučin 41; Lučin). We can therefore assume that Marulić was familiar with require- ments of historiographic style, especially when writing in Latin. Moreover, his theological studies and works made Marulić sensitive to the existence of different levels of understanding (or misunderstanding), even among those fluent in a work's language.[13] To facilitate understanding, a text—especially one that is to make an efficient moral point—had to be made not only intelligible, but also aesthetically acceptable. One result of this is acknowledged in a very short afterword to *RDCG*:

393

> Hucusque historiam uernaculo gentis nostrae sermone compositam uidi et quam potui diligenter fideliterque in Latinum transposui, nihil de sententia dimittens, licet aliqua de uerbis, quae superflua uidebantur, mutilans ne lectori oneri essent.
>
> (Marulić 2011, 224)

> 'I have up to this point looked into the history written in the vernacular language of our people and have translated it into Latin as carefully and faithfully as possible, and I left out none of the information [*sententia*], but cut some words which seemed unnecessary, so as not to the burden the reader.'

Marulić, as these final words indicate, knew that the Renaissance Latin readership had different expectations, different habits, from those of the readership for which the *Croatian Chronicle* was originally composed. As we scroll down the parallel ver- sions of the *Chronicle* and *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta* it soon becomes apparent just how extensively Marulić cut his original text as he translated.[14] The fidelity that Marulić strives for is a higher one: because the success, that is utility, of the work depends on its readability in the target culture, it is *sententia* which needs to be conveyed in Latin, rather than the totality of *verba*. Thus Marulić found himself in a situation practically opposite to the earlier Latin translator of Aristotle, whom Leonardo Bruni, in the *De interpretatione recta* (c. 1424), criticised for not having rendered the philosopher sufficiently eloquent. The rhetorical adornment supplied by Bruni for his Latin versions of Aristotle were, however, criticised by contemporaries for obscuring Aristotle's meaning. Marulić, in contrast, was compelled to *add* style to the plain medieval chronicle—that is, he had to provide at least a minimum of aes- thetic pleasure. The translation from Croatian into Latin that Marulić thus produced was again a cultural translation, 'an adaptation to the needs, interests, prejudices and

ways of reading of the target culture, or at least of some groups within it' (Burke 133). This invites a further question, one that, I believe, makes research in Latin translation of the *Croatian Chronicle* most rewarding. When a writer such as Marulić decided to transform a medieval chronicle into something resembling humanist history, what were the choices he had to make? That is, what stylistic and grammatical features did he perceive as characteristic of an aesthetically acceptable, and therefore potentially persuasive, historical narrative in Renaissance Latin?

To provide an answer, I have compared passages from the *Croatian Chronicle* to their equivalents in Marulić's *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta*, and have also included a third point of reference in the *Gesta regum Sclavorum* (the longer Latin version of the *Chronicle*, which for the first third of the text (or 28 chapters out of 47) reads mostly as a literal translation of the Croatian version (or vice versa)). These three texts provide an opportunity to watch the interplay of medieval Croatian and medieval and Renaissance Latin.

394

A Sample Sentence

I will begin the examination of the stylistic shifts that accompany translation by examining in detail the *cola et commata* of the opening sentence from the *GRS*, the *CC* and the *RDCG* (the Croatian text will be accompanied by a word-for-word English translation), commenting on differences.[15] Here is Marulić's Latin version in full:

> Iustiniano partibus Orientis imperante anno Christiane salutis DXXXVIII, quo tempore Germanus et Sabinus episcopi erant, uite sanctitate nobiles, et Benedictus abbas Montis Cassini, Sfiolado rege uita defuncto Brissus inter liberos eius natu maior successit in regno. (Marulić 2011, 175)

> 'When Justinian ruled in the East, in the year of Christian salvation 538, in the time when the bishops were Germanus and Sabinus, renowned for the holiness of their lives, and when Benedict was the abbot of Monte Cassino, the king Sfioladus met his end; Brissus, the oldest of his children, succeeded him to the throne.'

And here is the first clause in each of the three texts:

> [1] *GRS*: Regnante in urbe Constantinopolitana imperatore Anastasio,

> 'When emperor Anastasius ruled in the city of Constantinople'

> *CC*: Kraljujući cesar u gradi basiliji cesarstva,

> Literal translation: 'Ruling—the king—in the city Basilia—of the kingdom'

> *RDCG*: Iustiniano partibus Orientis imperante

> 'When Justinian ruled in the East'

There are four kinds of changes here. First we notice *transposition*, a change of

syntax: the present participle 'kraljujući' (indeclinable in modern Croatian) is transposed into Latin ablative absolute. This change could be seen as necessary, standard, even suggested by Croatian forms (Croatian does not have an equivalent for the ablative absolute). But Marulić's version goes further: the prepositional phrase 'u gradi basiliji cesarstva' turns into a dative object of *imperare* (in the source text, Croatian 'kraljujući' has no object). Accordingly, the perspective has shifted from *where* the emperor rules to the region *over which* he rules. Secondly, the word order has been *recast*. The position of participle and noun is inverted—compare it to the *GRS* version—even though the syntactic unit still encloses its supplements. The third change is one of *explanation and clarification*. Marulić supplies the name of the Roman emperor, trying to make sense of the jumbled phrase that we read in Croatian instead of the name of Constantinople. With a cultured readership in mind, Marulić adapts the wording: he is certain that the intended public would know who Justinian was and where he ruled. And while *partibus Orientis* may sound vague, such turn of phrase has a classical pedigree, going back at least to Cicero (for example, *Epistolae familiares* 12.5.3, To C. Cassius Longinus in Syria), and encountered a number of times in Christian Latin authors (including historians such as Rufinus, in *Historia ecclesiastica*) and those of late antiquity. This change can also be interpreted as *implicitation*: the translator left out information which could be readily inferred from the context.

The second clause of the opening sentence [2] was omitted both from the *Chronicle* and the *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta*, and the third [3] is also absent in the *Chronicle*.

[2] *GRS*: qui se et alios multos Eutychiana haeresi maculaverat

'who defiled himself and many others with Eutychian heresy'

CC, RDCG omit

[3] *GRS*: Romae vero praesidente Gelasio papa [secundo]

'and when the pope Gelasius [the second] presided in Rome'

CC omits (cf. [6] *infra*)

RDCG: anno Christianae salutis DXXXVIII

'in the year of Christian salvation 538'

Marulić reordered the sequence of information (this would again be *recasting*), giving a precise date immediately, unlike the *Chronicle*, which gave first the *relative* dating (by bishops and Saint Benedict). Marulić styled the date as an *accepted translation*—the phrase *anno Christianae salutis* is in his target culture an equivalent to the 'year of Our Lord'—but he did not opt for the more common 'anno Domini' that we moderns would perhaps expect. He also took care to correct the date.

[4] *GRS*: eo tempore praeclaruerunt multa sanctitate in Italia Germanus Capuanus episcopus et Sabinus Canusinae sedis episcopus

'in that time in Italy Germanus, the bishop of Capua, and Sabinus, the bishop of Canosa, shone forth with great holiness'

CC: u vrime u ko se bihu prosvitlili blaženi muži Jerman biskup pristolja Kapitulskoga i pristolja Kanužije Sabin biskup

'in the time—in which—there shone—blessed men—German the bishop—of the see of Kapitul—and of the see of Kanužija—Sabinus the bishop'

RDCG: quo tempore Germanus et Sabinus episcopi erant, uitae sanctitate nobiles,

'in the time when the bishops were Germanus and Sabinus, renowned for the holiness of their lives'

[5] *GRS*: atque venerabilis vir Benedictus apud Cassinum montem;

'and, at Monte Cassino, the venerable Benedict'

CC: i tolikoje počtovani i blaženi muž Benedik blizu gore Cicilijanske pribivaše

'and—the so much honored and blessed man Benedict—near the mountain of Cicilija [sic]—was dwelling'

RDCG: et Benedictus abbas Montis Cassini

'and when Benedict was the abbot of Monte Cassino'

In clauses [4] and [5] Marulić made five kinds of transformations, which include new features: *grammatical transposition* ('in the time when' becomes *quo tempore*) and *reduction* of epithets, verbs and clauses. Both lead to greater *concision*. Two tactical moves have already been encountered: *adaptation* for a different kind of religious readers (for whom Sabinus of Canosa and Germanus of Capua are more important as saints than as bishops, and for whom 'Benedict' and 'Monte Cassino' are connected primarily by the term 'abbot'), and *correction* of geographical mistakes.

[6] *GRS omits*

CC: na lit gospodnjih trista i pedeset i sedam

'in the years of the Lord—three hundred and fifty and seven'

RDCG cf. [3]

[7] *GRS*: exiit quoque gens a septentrionali plaga

'and a people came from the north'

CC: i tada izide niki puk i mnoštvo ljudi od istoka

'and then—there came out some people—and a multitude of men—from the east [sic]')

RDCG omits

In 7–11 two techniques are particularly prominent: *omission* (one motif is transferred to the next sentence, but the three fabular brothers are dropped altogether), and further *recasting* on the narrative level.

[8] *GRS*: quae Gothi nominabantur, gens ferox et indomita,

'called Goths, a wild and fierce people'

CC: ki se zovihu Goti, ljudi tvrdi i golemo ljuti prez zakona kako divji

'who called themselves Goths,—people hard and much vicious—lawless as wildmen'

RDCG omits (moved to the next sentence in text)

397

[9] *GRS*: cui erant tres fratres principes, filii regis Senudslavi.

'their leaders were three brothers, sons of the king Senudslavus'

CC: kim ljudem bihu gospoda tri bratinci, ki bihu sinove kralja Sviholada

'to which people—were lords—the three brothers, who were sons—of the king Sviholad [sic]'

RDCG omits

[10] *GRS*: Quorum nomina sunt haec: primus Brus, secundus Totila, tertius vero Ostroyllus.

'Their names are: the first was Brus, the second Totila, and the third Ostroyllus.'

CC: kim bratincem biše ime: prvomu Bris, drugomu Totila, tretomu Stroil.

'to which brothers—was—the name: the first Bris, the second Totila, the third Stroil'

RDCG omits

[11] *GRS*: Itaque Brus qui maior caeteris erat,

'So Brus, who was older than the others'

CC: Bris, koji biše najstariji,

'Bris, who was the eldest'

RDCG omits (*cf.* [13])

[12] *GRS*: defuncto patre,

'after [their] father died'

CC: umarši otac njih,

'having died—the father—of theirs'

RDCG: Sfiolado rege uita defuncto

'After king Sfioladus met his death'

In *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta* [12] we meet some already familiar transformations: *cohesion and economy* via the ablative absolute; *recasting* once more moves the name to the beginning of the sentence. There is also a *classicizing collocation*: *uita defuncto* is found in Virgil, Ovid, and Aulus Gellius, but the Christian Latin authors use just *defunctus* more often than *uita defunctus* (as in the medieval *Gesta regum Sclavorum*).[16]

[13] *GRS*: Brus sedit in solio eius

'Brus sat in his throne'

CC: sede na pristolje i misto očevo

'sat on the throne and in the place of his father'

RDCG: Brissus inter liberos eius natu maior successit in regno.

'Brissus, oldest of his children, succeeded to the throne'

In [13] there is further grammatical recasting. Marulić uses also *equivalence*, letting a technical term 'successit in regno' replace Croatian descriptive metonymy 'sat on the throne'. There are *reduction* and *expansion*, but *natu maior* is expanded by *inter liberos eius* and not, as in GRS [11], by *ceteris* (cf. also the variation *defunctus/uita defunctus* in [12]). Such choice is again classicizing—it follows the usage of Roman authors—and, at the same time, it makes explicit what was only implicit in the Croatian text.

This comparison of *GRS, CC* and *RDCG* thus clearly indicates how Marulić moves his source towards the eloquence of humanistic Latin through the implementation of *elegant variation* (Marulić avoids repeating the same Latin words), special, usually aphoristic *marking of sentence ends*, classicizing *technical terms* (especially those connected with the military), and *transformation* of narrative and sentence structure (including omissions, additions and changes). The following section of the essay will discuss and illustrate these in turn.

Towards Eloquence: Examples

To start with elegant variation, or the humanistic pursuit of expressive abundance (*copia*): even when the translation keeps close to the original, Marulić alters the wording. For example, a single Croatian verb from the *Chronicle*, 'umrijeti' ('to die'), often needed in the chronicle of regal succession, is rendered in *RDCG* by the following synonyms: *uita defungi; defungi; mori; diem claudere extremum; mortem obire; uita decedere; e uiuis tolli*. At the respective places in the *GRS* we find most often simply *mortuus est* (once it has *defunctus*, once *post mortem* [*eius*], once *in pace quievit*) (see Ramminger for Marulić's wider lexical strategy).

The unjust king Pribislav (*Pridislauus* in the *GRS*, *Pribislauus* in *RDCG*), according to Marulić, 'multa in eos quibus praeerat intoleranda commisisset' ('committed many unsufferable deeds against those whom he led'); the *GRS* here offers a biblical echo: 'multas iniquitates operatus est'. Because of this the king met his end: Bosnians (*magnates Bosnae*, 'barons of Bosnia', in the *GRS*; *Mysi, qui nunc Bosnenses appellantur*, 'Mysians, currently called Bosnians' for Marulić[17]) killed him and threw his body into a river. Marulić seems to have felt that this bald statement of fact was insufficient, and that the short chapter on Pribislav was rather bland, so he added a moralizing *dicolon* interpreting what the murderers did in an epigrammatic and syntactically parallel sequence:[18]

> *GRS* XIX: corpusque eius in flumen proiecerunt.
>
> 'and threw his body in a river'
>
> *CC* XIX: i tilo njegovo u riku vrgoše.
>
> 'and—the body of his—in the river—they threw'
>
> *RDCG* 15: interfecti cadauer in fluuium proiicitur, ut sepultura quoque hominis careret qui ab humanitate alienus erat.
>
> 'The dead body was thrown in a stream, so that he who lacked humanity would also be deprived of a humane burial.'

Describing how the Roman 'king of Dalmatia' and the 'king of Istria' joined forces to meet the Goths on the field of battle, the *GRS* uses a standard medieval expression 'congregantes exercitum' (overtones are again biblical; cf. 1 Samuel 17, 'congregantes vero Philisthim agmina sua in proelium convenerunt in Soccho'). The *CC* has a very close equivalent, 'skupiše vojske' ('they gathered [their] armies'). However, Marulić transforms the participial phrase into an ablative absolute (syntactically not depending on the rest of sentence) and finds for the action of 'congregare exercitum' an idiomatic Latin turn, a military technical term of Roman historiography; see, for example, Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 3.4.11: 'dare Quinctio subitarios milites—ita tum repentina auxilia appellabant—iussi' ('They received an order to supply subi-

tary troops—a designation then applied to hastily raised auxiliary troops').[19] In doing so, Marulić also introduces a new, though subsidiary, idea: that the kings recruited forces hurriedly.

> *GRS* II: Igitur ambo congregantes exercitum gentis suae[20]
>
> 'And so they both gathered an army of their people'

> *CC* II: I takoj oni ova oba rečena kralja skupiše velike vojske
>
> 'And so—they—both these mentioned kings—gathered great armies.'

> *RDCG* 1: Igitur subitario milite comparato
>
> 'And so, having raised subitary troops'

The *Chronicle* goes on to name four Dalmatian cities razed by the Goths. Marulić shortens the list to two and omits the phrase 'and all other famous cities'; the omission probably aligns the story with geographic knowledge of late antiquity, at the same time toning down the emotive and hyperbolical language of the original. Facts (humanist *fides*, truthfulness) take place of drama. Salonae, a Roman city near modern Split, is rendered more specifically as a trading centre, as in Strabo's *Geographica* 7.5: 'dehinc Dalmatarum litus et eorum emporium Salo'. We may also note that the end of sentence in *RDCG* consists of a synonym pair of verbs—'dirruit et euertit'—reminiscent of Cicero (*De officiis* 1.24 (82), 'De *evertendis* autem *diripiendis*que urbibus valde considerandum est'), while the *CC* uses a Croatian idiom meaning literally 'laid [the cities] on the ground'.

> *GRS* II *omits*

> *CC* II: i slize u Dalmaciju i rasu primorske grade: Dalmu, Narun i bogati i lipi Solin, i grad Skardon, i mnoge slavne grade položi na zemlju.
>
> 'and he went down into Dalmatia and razed the coastal cities: Dalma, Narun, and the rich and beautiful Solin, and the city of Skardon, and many famous cities he leveled to the ground.'

> *RDCG* 1: ...in Delmatiam descendit. Vrbes maritimas depraedatus est, Scardonam oppidum et Salonas totius prouinciae emporium, dirruit et euertit[21]
>
> '...he went down into Dalmatia. He pillaged the coastal cities, destroying and ruining the town of Scardona and Salonae, the place of trade for the whole province'

Similar to this treatment of geographical detail is Marulić's handling of legal matters. Budimir, for example, was the first Croatian king recognized by the pope; in return, the king granted the Catholic Church various rights, guaranteeing royal protection of clergy and church property, and declaring that offenders would be treated as guilty of a crime against the crown. The *Croatian Chronicle* has some problems in rendering this idea in the vernacular, and this necessitates a supplementary explanation of the

concept ('against the king and the crown, that is against the kingdom as a whole'). Marulić's response is simply to introduce a person guilty of high treason from Roman law, *laesae maiestatis reus* (*Digesta* 48.4; *Institutiones* 4.18.3; see Lowe):[22]

> *GRS* IX: Qui vero aliter faceret, regiam coronam offenderet.

> 'But who would do otherwise would offend the royal crown.'

> *CC* IX: I tko bi protiva tomu učinio, to je učinio suprotiva kralju i kruni, ča jest suprotiva svemu kraljevstvu.

> 'And who would—against this one—do, would have done this—against the king and the crown—that is against all kingdom.'

> *RDCG* 7: laesae maiestatis reus esset si quis contra attentare auderet

> 'should anyone dare to do [something] opposed to it, he would be guilty of high treason'

As intimated by the examples above of Marulić's translational strategies, both he and the Latin-reading public of his age would have considered a *literal* translation of the *Croatian Chronicle* something barbarian; they would have felt like Augustine, eleven hundred years earlier, when he first encountered Christian texts: '[Scriptura sancta] visa est mihi indigna quam Tullianae dignitati compararem' ('[the holy Scriptures] appeared to me to be unworthy to be compared with the dignity of Tully', *Confessiones* 3.5).

The *Croatian Chronicle*'s lack of dignity couldn't have been remedied merely by the choice of words. We have already seen that Marulić felt the need to add, omit, and transform. Often he does all three at once, also changing the sentence structure and narrative perspective. Where *CC* narrates in a quasi-oral style, relying on the biblical technique of parataxis, *RDCG* condenses a whole event into a single subordinating sentence. In the following quotations the phrases Marulić changed are marked by italics in *GRS*.

> *GRS* II: Totilla vero et Ostroyllus, *ut sibi magnum nomen facerent*, consilio et voluntate *primogeniti* fratris congregantes exercitum magnum valde *et fortem* exierunt de terra sua et venientes *debellaverunt* Pannoniam *provinciam*

> 'But Totilla and Ostroyllus, *to make their name famous*, according to decision and approval of [their] *first-born* brother, gathering an army great *and strong* indeed, left their country, and came and *vanquished the province* of Pannonia'

> *CC*: Totila i Stroil a tada uzgovoriše oni dva: 'Pomislimo kako s pomoćju brata kralja Brisa i mi da bismo gospodstvo i visoko ime dobili' I tako sa svitom i s voljom kralja Brisa, brata svoga, skupista vojsku utom veliku i pojdosta od svoje didine. I najprvo pridosta na kraljevstvo ugarsko...

> 'Totila and Stroil then spoke, the two of them: "Let us think how with the help of our brother king Bris we too could get a lordship and a high name." And so with counsel and approval of king Bris, their brother, they gathered an army great indeed and moved

401

from the land of their grandfathers. And first they came to kingdom of Hungary...'

RDCG 1: Igitur Totila et Stroilus, cum a fratre Brisso subsidia impetrassent, ingentes equitum peditumque copias secum trahentes Occidentis regna inuasere. Et primo quidem infestis armis Pannoniam aggressi

'And so Totila and Stroilus, when they received support from their brother Brissus, leading a vast force of cavalry and infantry, invaded the Western kingdoms. First they entered Pannonia in battle array'

Marulić, in addition to his replacement of the phrase 'exercitum magnum valde et fortem' from *GRS* II with 'equitum peditumque copias', a standard Roman historiographic idiom,[23] also decided to leave out the motivation of Totila and Stroilus (easily guessed by his readers), as well as the direct speech and formulaic repetition of 'king Bris, their brother'. On the other hand, the presentation of Totila's and Stroilus's campaign is made more succinctly dramatic in *RDCG*, when 'leaving the land of their grandfathers' becomes 'invading the kingdoms of the West'.

402

GRS XVIII: Tolimirus filius eius *accepit* regnum, in diebus illis laetata est omnis terra, genuit filios *et filias*, et mortuus est.

'His son Tolimirus took power; in these days the land rejoiced; he had sons and daughters, and he died.'

CC XVIII: I osta na misto njegovo sin u kraljevstvo, *komu biše ime* Tolimir. I u vrime *njegova kraljevstva* prista u veselju sva zemlja. *I imi sinove i umri* kraljevavši lit jedannadesete.

'And on his place was left his son in the kingdom, whose name was Tolimir. And in the time of his reign the whole land remained in joy. And he had sons and he died having ruled for eleven years.'

RDCG 14: *successit* Tolimerus filius. Quo regnante *nihil contigit turbulentum; ocium et pax erat, ab armis quies.* Vndecim regnauit annos.

'Tolimerus, his son, succeeded [him]. In his reign no violent unrest occurred; there were peace and quiet, repose of arms. He ruled for eleven years.'

RDCG omits any mention of Tolimir's offspring (as well as the length of his reign), as it is irrelevant for the narrative; instead the biblical motive of 'laetata est omnis terra' (cf. Psalm 96:8, 'laetata est Sion') is transformed into litotes ('no violent unrest occurred') and expanded by two short clauses involving three synonyms: *ocium, pax,* and *quies.*

Časlav or Seislav, an ungrateful prince, rebels against his father, good king Radoslav, and forces him to flee across the sea (to Rome).

GRS XXII: Ciaslavus praeterea maledictus *a patre* coepit regnare.

'Moreover, Ciaslavus, cursed by his father, began to rule.'

> *CC* XXIII: I Seislav, proklet *od boga, videći da otac njegov ubiže u more, vrati se i uze zemlju i* poče *na očevo misto* kraljevati.

> 'And Seislav, cursed by God, seeing that his father has fled into sea, returned and took the land and began to rule in his father's stead.'

> *RDCG* 18: Interim impius Seislauus *fugato* patre regnum possedit *donec Deo ulciscente hostili manu (ut monstrabimus) interemptus poenas daret.*

> 'Meanwhile, the impious Seislauus, having banished his father, took possession of the kingdom until, God having taken revenge, Seislauus had to pay the penalty, killed (as we shall show) by the hand of the enemy.'

Here the *Croatian Chronicle*, for unknown reasons, makes Seislav cursed by God (*GRS* has him cursed by his father Radoslav, whom he drove into exile). The fullness of the narrative sequence found in *CC*—Seislav observes, returns, takes the land, and begins to rule—is of no interest to Marulić, who condenses it into a technical 'regnum possedit' (preceded by a reminder of Seislav's crime, 'fugato patre'). Marulić compensates for this loss through an expansion, a prolepsis—explained by the first-person voice—which is at the same time an amplification of the 'cursed by God' from the Croatian source text.

403

A similar case of moralizing prolepsis is part of another translator's amplification. In the account of the happy reign of Zvonimir, last king of Croatia, absent in *GRS*, Marulić transforms his source completely, replacing past tense with future, concrete terms with abstract ones, the implicit authorial comment (in form of Biblical quotation) with a combination of an aphorism ('opulence turns to arrogance') and a pronouncement which creates suspense (introducing a crime, stressing its exemplary importance and validity, but not revealing what it is). Thus homely sermonizing is turned into a concise reminder of moralistic value of history:

> *CC* XXVII: I zemlja Zvonimirova biše obilna svakom raskošom, ni se nikogar bojaše, ni jim nitkore mogaše nauditi, razmi gnjiv gospodina Boga, koji dojde svrhu ostatka njih, kako Pismo govori: 'Oci zobaše kiselo grožđe, a sinovom zubi utrnuše.'

> 'And the land of Zvonimir was abundant with every luxury, and was afraid of nobody, and nobody could hurt them, except for wrath of God the lord, who came at the rest of them, as the Scripture says: The fathers ate sour grapes, and the sons' teeth were set on edge.'

> *RDCG* 21: Sed, ut fit, luxuria in superbiam uerti coepit, in summum usque scelus erupturam, quod ex sequenti modo patebit narratione uerumque esse constabit.

> 'But, as it happens, opulence turned to arrogance, to finally break out in a vilest crime, as it will be made clear and shown to be true from the following report.'

For a final example, and one which allows another sustained comparison of all three texts, we can turn to the episode of Časlav's/Seislav's divine punishment (we have already met the ungrateful prince and God's revenge for his deed discussing the pas-

sages *GRS* XXII/*CC* XXIII/*RDCG* 18). There an important, though not entirely clear, role is played by Tehomil/Tycomil, a Hungarian exile who flees his home because he has accidentally killed one of his master's hounds, named Paluša.

> *GRS* XXII: Quadam vero die dum iret venatum Tycomil, nolens, sed casu percutiens *virga, quam manibus gestabat*, unam canem nomine Palusia interfecit eam, unde nimio terrore perterritus, eo quod princeps eam valde diligeret, fugam petiit, et venit ad Ciaslavum, a quo statim susceptus est.

> 'But one day, as Tycomil went hunting, not deliberately, but accidentally striking a bitch-hound called Palusia with a stick that he carried in his hands, he killed that hound; because of that, terrified beyond all measure, because his prince prized her very much, Tycomil took to flight and came to Ciaslavus, who received him at once.'

> *CC* XXIII: I jedan dan *loveći* Tehomil udri jednu vižlicu, ka se zoviše Paluša, ku ne kteći toličma udriti, zgodi se da ju udri *po glavi u takoj misto* da ju ubi *u tom misti*. Cića česa Tehomil pobiže prid strahom koji imaše od gospodina, zašto rečeni mimo sve ine pse *cića dobrote* ovuj vižlicu ljubljaše. I pribiže Tehomil ka kralju Seislavu i on ga *drago* primi.

> 'And one day hunting, Tehomil hit a bitch-hound, whose name was Paluša, whom he did not intend to hit that hard, but it so happened that he hit her in such a place that she was killed on the spot. Because of that Tehomil ran away from fear of his master, because that said master, more than all other dogs, for the sake of her goodness, loved that hound. And Tehomil deserted to the king Seislav and he received him gladly.'

> *RDCG* 18: Caeterum Tecomilus die quodam inter uenandum cum forte *odorisequam domini* canem, quam Pallussam nominabant, *leui* ictu percussisset *eam a se abigendi animo accidissetque ut ipsa in quadam minus firma uerticis parte* percussa statim expiraret, domini iram ueritus effugit; illam enim prae caeteris omnibus *uenaticis* canibus domino gratam esse *nouerat quoniam et narium sagacitate et corporis decore caeteris praestabat*. Hac igitur de causa Tecomilus fugiens transtulit se ad Seislauum regem ab eoque est gratanter susceptus *et inter familiares habitus*.

> 'Now, Tecomilus, one day when he was hunting, happened to strike lightly his master's scent-following bitch-hound whom they called Pallussa, intending to drive her away from himself, and it so happened that she was struck in a certain less hard part of her head, so she perished immediately; fearing his master's wrath, Tecomilus ran away; he knew well that the master cherished her over all other hunting-dogs, because she surpassed others by the keenness of her nose and the beauty of her body. So for that reason Tecomilus, on the run, went over to king Seislavus, who received him gladly and made him a member of his household.'

The *Croatian Chronicle* does not mention that Tehomil had a stick in his hands, but does introduce the information that Paluša was hit on a weak spot on the head; Marulić adds characterizing detail through Tecomilus's intention merely to keep Paluša away. Under Marulić's pen the hound also becomes an 'odorisequa canis', a striking poetic expression which derives from a verse by the Roman poet Laevius (attributed earlier to Livius Andronicus).[24] Later in the passage Paluša's qualities ('narium sagacitas', 'corporis decor')—mentioned only summarily in both *GRS* and

CC—are praised in terms strongly redolent of Seneca (*De beneficiis* 2.29.1: 'sagacitate nos narium canes vincant'; *Phaedra* 378: 'tenerque nitidi corporis cecidit decor'). And here too Marulić finds a way to end the sentence with a dicolon ('gratanter susceptus et inter familiares habitus').

Conclusion

The differences between two medieval versions, whether the Latin *Gesta regum Sclavorum* or the vernacular *Croatian Chronicle*, and the humanistic translation of the latter (*RDCG*) reveal that Marulić attempted to convert his Croatian source into both a more engaging and stylish work and a more convincing story suitable for a refined and educated international readership. It is this goal which suggests that we should understand *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta* as a distinct example of *cultural* translation, in the sense of Peter Burke (9-10), or of cultural shift, as described by Brenda Hosington in her discussion of the 'domesticating' additions, omissions, and modifications in Alexander Barclay's 1509 version (via the Latin) of Sebastian Brant's *Das Narrenschiff* (Hosington). To the Latin humanist readership Marulić presents kings and events from a little-known region with a little-known past, and both need to be made meaningful and, above all, significant. To achieve this, Marulić introduced classicizing equivalents for certain military, legal, and religious terms; he strove to avoid any repetition he found in the source through elegant variation in his vocabulary and phrasing; and he found anaphoric pairs to embellish the ends of sentences and close them with an emphatic moralizing point. Yet these elements of *copia* and style were also accompanied, and indeed supported, by Marulić's condensed Latin syntax, through which he delivered more (and sometimes more accurate) information at a faster pace, typically streamlining the narrative in attempting to make it more coherent.

Although reshaping of the sources into the *Regum Delmatiae atque Croatiae gesta* might be thought of as a predominantly literary undertaking, behind the ostensibly stylistic preoccupations we can sense a multi-layered ideological agenda. Marulić translated the *Croatian Chronicle* during the years of frantic Croatian and Dalmatian appeals for help and European unity in the face of Ottoman advances, when repeated warnings were issued to the Pope, to Italy, and to German lands, that Croatia was a bulwark of Christianity, that it could be forced to surrender to the Turks, and that its fall would leave wide open the way to Italy and German lands. Furthermore, these were the years of the League of Cambrai, when there were initiatives for returning Dalmatia from Venetian rule to the Kingdom of Hungary and Croatia. In these contexts, a history of Croats as a 'gens...bonis itaque dominis molesta, improbis autem et arrogantibus mitis' ('people...unruly under the good masters, and obedient to the bad and the despotic' (Marulić 2011, 208)) might possess not merely moral lessons, but political implications as well. Moreover, as Marulić fashioned Croatian warlords and

kings in terms more associated with the rulers found in Livy and Sallust, he tacitly asserted a degree of continuity between the culture of the Romans and the culture of the Croatians (as suggested also by the prominence of Salona, the ancient Roman urban centre whose successor was Marulić's Split). Such continuity of civilization would be understood by a general reading public of humanistic bent—that is, by most people able to read Latin in Marulić's time. It would itself add credibility to Croatian claims of their rightful place in the culture of Europe and Christianity, and therefore make stronger the case for struggle against the Ottoman Empire.

Finally, a translation into Latin is not necessarily intended to influence only *international* readers. In Croatia and in Dalmatia there were people who read Latin too, people whose reading could have influenced their behaviour, people whose ideas or assumptions or prejudices could have beeen confirmed by seeing them in an authoritative form; that Marulić, as an acclaimed religious author, is himself a figure of authority is also important here.[25] *Croatian* feeling of belonging to European and Christian culture had to be strengthened as well.

Notes

1. For an introduction to medieval and early modern Croatia, see Supičić and Hercigonja.

2. The longer version of the *Gesta regum Sclavorum* exists in two manuscripts: Vat. Lat. 6958 (c. 1650) and Belgrade, National Library of Serbia, R 570 (c. 1648/9). Both manuscripts are the only witnesses for a Croatian text of the shorter version (which was translated by Marulić into Latin). Marulić's Latin translation is transmitted in ten manuscript witnesses (Jovanović). The GRS first appeared in print as a free Italian translation of the longer version in the first larger work of panslavic patriotic history, Mauro Orbini, *Il regno de gli Slavi hoggi corrottamente detti Schiavoni* (Pesaro, 1601). Both Latin versions of *GRS* were first published in 1666, edited and annotated by Ivan Lučić (Ioannes Lucius, Giovanni Lucio, 1604-1679), as part of the collection *Rerum Dalmaticarum scriptores* appended to his work *Ioannis Lucii Dalmatini De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex* (Amsterdam, 1666), pp. 287-309. The shorter version of *GRS* in Croatian was first published in 1874 (Pop Dukljanin, Črnčić and Marulić).

3. For the historical context of this legendary account, see Grgin.

4. For the latest critical edition of the *GRS* in longer version, see Anon., *Gesta Regum Sclavorum* (2009), ed. Kunčer and Živković.

5. For information on Marulić, further bibliography, and an anthology of his texts in Latin, Croatian and English, see *The Marulić Reader* (Marulić and Lučin).

6. For the broader contexts of Croatian humanism and Croatian Latin literature, see Kadić, Gortan and Vratović, Golenishchev-Kutuzov, Birnbaum, Budiša, and Franolić. For Latin works by Croatian writers, see *Croatiae auctores Latini*, ed. Jovanović et al.

7. The *Euangelistarium* would have two important English readers: Henry VIII, whose annotated copy survives, and Thomas More. See Béné, "Henry VIII and Thomas More", and Clarke (articles from *Colloquia Maruliana* are freely accessible online through *Hrčak: Portal znanstvenih časopisa Republike Hrvatske* <http://hrcak.srce.hr/colloquia-maruliana>).

8. See Béné, *Sudbina jedne pjesme*.

9. For a detailed analysis of Marulić's strategies in the translation of Petrarch's *Vergine bella* see Lo Parco and recently Lučin, "La polifonia". The latest critical edition of the translation of *Inferno* I is in *M. Maruli Delmatae Davidias*, ed. Marko Marulić and Miroslav Marcovich (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

10. 'Stumačen'je Kata' ('Cato explained') is a version of the *Disticha Catonis* (3rd or 4th century AD); 'Utiha nesriće' ('A consolation for troubles') turns passages from the pseudo-Senecan *De remediis fortuitorum* (originally in Latin prose) into Croatian verse; 'Od slavića' ('On the nightingale') paraphrases John Pecham's (d. 1292) *Philomena*, amplifying its didactic aspect, and introducing macaronic Croatian–Italian–Latin effects, as well as a translator's literary seal; see Radić.

11. *Rerum vulg. fragm.* 99 ('Poi che voi et io più volte abbiam provato') and 365 ('I' vo piangendo i miei passati tempi'). Marulić's translations are difficult to date; Tomasović supposes they were written before 1500. Tomasović's analysis shows that the translator, in both cases responding to Petrarch's *endecasillabi* with Croatian double-rhymed dodecasyllables, produced a faithful version of *RVF* 99 (except for abandoning the sonnet form, which is absent from Croatian Renaissance poetry), but paraphrased freely and added six verses of his own (with Biblical imagery) in translating *RVF* 365.

12. Both *RDCG* and *CC* are quoted from Marulić 2011. Another modern critical edition of the *RDCG* is Marulić 2009. *RDCG* and other of Marulić's Latin works are also available online through the *Croatiae auctores Latini* digital collection.

407

13. Cf., for example, De institutione bene uiuendi per exempla sanctorum 2.5 (Marulić, *Institucija* 1: 114): 'Nec interim Scripturam ab Ecclesię institutione dissentire putemus, sed nos non intelligere. Et sane melius est aliquid non intelligere quam male intelligendo errare.' ('In the meantime, let us not think that the Scripture disagrees with teachings of the Church; it is us who do not understand. Certainly, it is better to not understand something, than to sin by understanding badly.').

14. A digital comparison of *GRS, CC* and *RDCG*, done with *The Versioning Machine 4.0* software, can be explored at <http://mudrac.ffzg.hr/~njovanov/vm/samples/100823grs-hr-rdcg-incipit.html>.

15. See Newmark for the categorization of the translator's techniques employed here.

16. Classicizing, that is, 'translation of the language of the present into that of the past, justified by the Renaissance project of reviving antiquity', is recognized by Burke (80) as a third option available to translators into Latin, beside 'domestication' (cultural translation) and 'foreignizing' (literal translation).

17. Croatian writings in Latin constantly use *Mysia, Mysii* instead of the correct *Moesia, Moesii*. The origins of this idiosyncrasy have not been identified yet.

18. The respective passages are as follows: *GRS*, XIX: 'Post quem regnavit Pridislauus filius eius, qui multas iniquitates operatus est. Quodam itaque tempore insurrexerunt magnates Bosnae cum aliquantis et interfecerunt regem, corpusque eius in flumen proiecerunt' ('After him ruled Pridislaus, his son, who committed many injustices. So at a certain time the barons of Bosnia rose with some others and murdered the king, and threw his body in a river'). *RDCG*, 15: 'Et in eius locum suffectus est Pribislauus filius, qui cum multa in eos quibus praeerat intoleranda commisisset, a Mysis, qui nunc Bosnenses appellantur, interficitur. Interfecti cadauer in fluuium proiicitur, ut sepultura quoque hominis careret qui ab humanitate alienus erat' ('And in his place the vacancy was filled by his son Pribislavus, who, since he committed many unsufferable deeds against those whom he led, was murdered by the Mysians, currently called Bosnians. The dead body was thrown in a stream, so that he who lacked humanity would also be deprived of a humane burial'). In the *RDCG* passage a classicizing *polyptoton* (*interficitur—interfecti*) should also be noted, picked up later by a *figura etymologica*: *hominis—humanitate*.

19. A copy of Livy from Marulić's library (*Decades*, with Florus's *Epitoma* and a letter by Johannes Andreas de Bossis, bishop of Aleria (Venice: Wendelin von Speyer, 1470)) survives today in the Dominican monastery in Split. The copy, though damaged and incomplete, has a lot of marginal notes in Marulić's hand from different periods. His earliest marginalia note memorable expressions, for example, *seccessione facta, commeatum do, supplementum, conquisitores*. Burke (78) lists similar

classicizing military terms used by Celio Secundo Curione in his translation of Guiccardini in 1566 (*antiguardia* becomes *primum agmen*, *artiglerie—tormenta, stradiotti—Illyrici equites* etc).

20. The *GRS* uses similar expressions elsewhere. See, for example, the passage from *GRS* II quoted later ('Totilla vero et Ostroyllus...'), and also 'Quo audito Myhala, et Saganec, et Radoslavus, fratres eorum, congregantes exercitum venerunt in Tribuniam' (XXXIX).

21. Comparisons with other references to Salona can be made through the *Croatiae auctores Latini* digital collection, especially in its thematic subgroup *Laudationes urbium Dalmaticarum*.

22. Marulić uses the phrase *laesae maiestatis reus* twice in his other works: the commentary on Roman inscriptions (*In epigrammata priscorum commentarius*), and in the sermon on the Judgment Day (*De ultimo Christi iudicio sermo*).

23. The idiom appears eleven times in Livy, twice in Caesar, and once in Cicero (*Ad Atticum* 8. 12. C) and Curtius Rufus.

24. Although Laevius is quoted in the *De metris* by the late second-century grammarian and prosodist Terentianus Maurus, the rare adjective is also mentioned in Servius's *In Vergilii Aeneidos Commentarius* (4. 132): '"odorisecum" quod odorem sequitur'.

408

25. In 1666, bringing Marulić's translation into print for the first time among the supplements to his *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex*, Ivan Lučić (446) commented: 'Sed qualiscumque haec historia sit, ex Maruli versione auctoritatem sumpsit, Marulique vocatur' ('But, whatever the value of this history, it received authority from the translation of Marulić, and it is called Marulić's').

Works Cited

Anon. *Gesta Regum Sclavorum*. Eds. Dragana Kunčer and Tibor Živković. Izvori za srpsku kulturu; knj. 7. Beograd: Istorijski institut; [Nikšić]: manastir Ostrog, 2009. Print.

Béné, Charles. *Sudbina jedne pjesme/Destin d'un poème/Destiny of a Poem. Carmen de doctrina Domini nostri Iesu Christi pendentis in cruce Marci Maruli*. Zagreb: Nacionalna i sveučilišna biblioteka, Split: Književni krug, 1994. Print.

---. "Henry VIII et Thomas More, lecteurs de Marulić." *Colloquia Maruliana* 5 (1996): 87-104. Print.

Birnbaum, Marianne D. *Humanists in a Shattered World: Croatian and Hungarian Latinity in the Sixteenth Century*. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, 1986. Print.

Budiša, Dražen. "Humanism in Croatia." *Renaissance Humanism. Foundations, Forms and Legacy. Vol. II: Humanism Outside Italy*. Ed. A. Rabil, Jr. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1988. 265-92. Print.

Burke, Peter. "Cultures of Translation in Early Modern Europe." *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Eds. Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 7-38. Print.

Clarke, Andrea. "Henry VIII and Marko Marulić's *Evangelistarium*." *Colloquia*

Maruliana 20 (2011): 167-74. Print.

Cochrane, Eric. *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981. Print.

Croatiae auctores Latini. Eds. Neven Jovanović, Yasmin Haskell, Nella Lonza, Bratislav Lučin, Elia Marinova, Darko Novaković, and Terence O. Tunberg. Web. <http://www.ffzg.hr/klafil/croala>

Franolić, Branko. "Latin as a Literary Language Among the Croats." *Works of Croatian Latinists Recorded in the British Library General Catalogue*. Zagreb: Croatian Information Centre, 1998. 5-36. Print.

Gesta Regum Sclavorum. Eds. Dragana Kunčer and Tibor Živković. Beograd: Istorijski institut, 2009. Print.

Golenishchev-Kutuzov, Ilya. *Il Rinascimento italiano e le letterature slave dei secoli XV e XVI*. Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1973. Print.

Gortan, Veljko and Vladimir Vratović. "The Basic Characteristics of Croatian Latinity." *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 20 (1971): 37-67. Print.

Grgin, Borislav. "The Impact of the Crusades on Medieval Croatia." *The Crusades and the Military Orders: Expanding the Frontiers of Medieval Latin Christianity*. Eds. Zsolt Hunyadi and József Laszlovszky. Budapest: Central European UP, 2001. 167-71. Print.

Hosington, Brenda M. "Sebastian Brant's *Das Narrenschiff* in Early Modern England: A Textual Voyage." *Text Based Studies: Lexicography, Terminology, Translation. In Honour of Ingrid Meyer*. Ed. Lynne Bowker. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 2006. 18-29. Print.

Jovanović, Neven. "Rukopisi *Regum Delmatię atque Croatię gesta*" ("The Manuscripts of the *Regum Delmatię atque Croatię gesta*"). *Colloquia Maruliana* 18 (2009): 5-24. Print.

Kadić, Ante. "The Croatian Renaissance." *Slavic Review* 21 (1962): 65-88. Print.

Lo Parco, Francesco. "La canzone alla Vergine di Francesco Petrarca dalla secolare ammirazione al singolo omaggio di Marco Marulo umanista dalmata del secolo XVI." *Archivio storico per la Dalmazia*, 6, fasc. 63-64 (1931): 107-125, 173-89. Print.

Lowe, Kate. "The Political Crime of Conspiracy in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Rome." *Crime, Society and the Law in Renaissance Italy*. Eds. Trevor Dean and K.J.P. Lowe. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. 184-203. Print.

Lučić, Ivan. *Ioannis Lucii Dalmatini De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex*. Amsterdam: Blaeu, 1666. Print.

Lučin, Bratislav. "*Studia humanitatis* u Marulićevoj knjižnici" ("The *Studia Humanitatis* in Marulić's Library"). *Colloquia Maruliana* 6 (1997): 170-201. Print.

---. "La polifonia della libera versione di Marulić della canzone *Vergine bella* di Petrarca." *Petrarca i petrarkizam u hrvatskoj književnosti. Zbornik radova s međunarodnog simpozija održanog od 27. do 29. rujna u Splitu*. Split: Književni krug, 2006. 285-304. Print.

Margetić, Lujo and Bratislav Lučin, eds. *Marulićeva oporuka* (*Marulić's Will*). *Colloquia Maruliana* 14 (2005): 25-71. Print.

Marulić, Marko. *Institucija = De institutione bene uiuendi per exempla sanctorum. Opera omnia Marci Maruli, 5. Vols. I-III*. Ed. B. Glavičić. Split: Književni krug, 1986-87. Print.

---. *Regum Delmatię atque Croatię gesta a Marco Marulo Spalatensi patritio Latinitate donata*. Ed. Neven Jovanović. *Colloquia Maruliana* 18 (2009): 28-61. Print.

---. *Latinska manja djela II (Shorter Latin Works 2). Opera omnia Marci Maruli, 11*. Split: Književni krug, 2011. Print.

Marulić, Marko and Bratislav Lučin. *The Marulić Reader*. Split and Long Island City: Književni Krug Split and Croatian World Congress, 2007. Print.

Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1988. Print.

Pop Dukljanin, Ivan Črnčić and Marko Marulić. *Popa Dukljanina letopis po latinsku i toga nekoliko i još nešto po hrvatsku po prepisu popa Jerolima Kaletića/ razsudjeno dao na svjetlo Ivan Črnčić*. Kraljevica: Primorska Tiskara, 1874. Print.

Radić, Teo. "Od slavića: traduktološka analiza." *Colloquia Maruliana* 21 (2012): 189-205. Print.

Ramminger, Johann. "Marulus as a Neo-Latin Writer." *Colloquia Maruliana* 20 (2011): 123-38. Print.

Supičić, Ivan and Eduard Hercigonja, eds. *Croatia in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance: A Cultural Survey*. London: Philip Wilson; Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2008. Print.

Tomasović, Mirko. "Marulićevi hrvatski prepjevi Petrarke." *Colloquia Maruliana* 7 (1988): 37-45. Print.