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What is exchange? This seemingly straightforward term is part and parcel of the most fundamental, everyday activities that make life possible. It is about how we look, what we look at and what we look like; our language, which even when greeted by silence has already involved a series of exchanges; the chains of supply and demand that enrich the material texture of our worlds with goods from everywhere; and the financial instruments and institutions that facilitate these movements of commodities and people. It extends from acts of reciprocal giving and receiving, commerce, swaps, barter, sacrifices, disposing of, and obtaining, to the institutions created to enable exchange, of stocks, communications, currencies and money itself – which is, of course, simply an index of exchange. Ultimately and most profoundly all exchange is about transformation, an itinerary through space, a crossing, traversing movement and change across a relational continuum. Exchange encloses within it a notion of parity and reciprocity, a mirroring.

The period in question here has been seen as crucial in terms of exchanges, their volume and importance, from the creation of a global trading system and financial instruments (government bonds and letters of exchange), to great revolutions in print, scientific thought, cultural forms and the use of the vernacular. As Hadfield points out (Chapter 7 above), there is no question that a profound and fundamental change did take place in what we dub the Renaissance or early modern period; what exactly this was, however, is and will almost certainly always remain a matter for controversy and debate. Once this might have been thought of in terms of socio-economic structures, the emergence of the marketplace, weakening class hierarchies, or the rediscovery of the classical past emanating from Italy. Now, cartography, contact with the spaces of the wider world, military technology, modern language learning, and a reinvigorated yet contested religious piety might figure more centrally. In any case, the range in terms of diversity and volume of exchanges taking place did transform the centuries we denote early modern.
As has been pointed out in recent theoretical work on empires, the nation has had a notably short, modern history, despite its foundational gesture being a claim to mythic origin and simultaneous assertion of modernity. It is far from being even the most important political structure, perhaps enjoying only a brief predominance from the mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth. This is especially true in relation to the transnational melting pot of early modern European states, where dynasty, mercantile interests and cultures continually traversed borders whose porosity marks the absence of a stable centre. As scholars of the period know, there is no such thing as a national culture. Every vernacular product that might be claimed to represent a country through its language was engaged first and foremost in a relationship with the neo-Latinate culture it was not and with the other influences and models that gave it its urgency within that place, from the Bandello stories inspiring Shakespearean plots to poetry that emulated and competed with classical and Petrarchan forebears. Cultures come into being at their borders, in the spaces between, where intermediaries such as spies, diplomats, merchants, soldiers, ambassadors, and those involved in foreign marriage treaties encountered and negotiated relationships sometimes in their power and at other times beyond their grasp.

In a fundamental sense, exchange is transactional and economic, even where this uncomfortably cuts across the most profound kinds of social relation. Hosington reminds us that the Latin word ‘interpres’ originally signified a ‘broker, factor, or agent between two parties’ (Chapter I above; Lewis and Short). Exchange is at the heart of rituals of sociability and civility, the exchanging of words, ideas, looks, gazes, goods, gifts or pleasantries. But what happens to that which is carried across and that which is given in return? How do these resituations and substitutions affect the meanings and values of that which moves between poles, cultures or people, and how are they changed by these movements, losses and gains? These are some of the themes explored in the essays in this volume, which opens by examining translation as a critical form of cultural exchange. Translation in its broadest sense is crucial to our survival, individually and collectively, due to our dependence on the exchange of information. Our very civilisation, its science and culture, could not have come
into being without translators and the communication of privileged information, political, social, scientific, historical and cultural. At the heart of all exchange lie the most rudimentary forms of translation, of ideas into and out of language; communication rests on the possibility of such interlingual or intralingual rephrasings. The translator crosses boundaries and frontiers, bridging spatial, temporal, linguistic and cultural divides, creating new forms of intellectual communities, sharing ideas, transferring knowledge and creating intellectual property. Metaphor and translation both signify a ‘carrying over’; both involve a transference and substitution.

Translators are always more than eloquent wordsmiths: they are cultural ambassadors, mediators and negotiators, travellers between cultures, existing at borderlands on the frontiers. ‘Cultural translation’ (Burke) involves transformation and adaptation of source to target culture, a decontextualisation and recontextualisation. The metaphor of dress used in numerous prefaces suggests the need to dress a text up in familiar costume for it to gain acceptance. But clothing goes more than skin deep in this period, as a marker of identity, class and even fashion. The act of translation always carries with it a sense of loss or lack, linguistic gaps to be filled with neologism, calque, cultural borrowing or loan words. It also brings something new, a superfluity. This can be an ideological residue that corrupts and endangers or an enriching supplement. The profound link between financial exchange and translation comes across in its metaphorics, uncovering jewels in caskets or buried treasure, the translator as explorer and patriot. An obvious extension from seeing translators as merchants in cultural goods is to figure them as pirates stealing wares from other nations to enrich themselves or their homelands. There is the Ciceronian notion of ‘coining a term’ or the idea of loan words. So extending the metaphorical nexus of traffic and trade, translations enrich. At the same time they threaten to corrupt, by overwhelming a language with ‘inkhorn terms’. While translation was a patriotic imperative, involved in the competition between different kingdoms – emulation as a form of competition – it also ran the risk of underlining a lack. Translation could also be an oppositional activity, making available intelligence about the history, politics, locations, practices, strengths and weaknesses of the enemy, a revealing
and uncovering of coded secrets. Richard Eden was commissioned by the Muscovy Company to translate Martin Cortés’ *Breve compendio de la sphaera* (A Brief Compendium of the Earthly Sphere) or *Arte de navegári* (Art of Navigation), which went through seven editions between 1561 and 1615.

Many scholars have scoffed in recent years at the unimportance of English in the sixteenth century, its lack of prestige as an erudite or culturally important language, and indeed the *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads* database confirms this notion (Hosington et al.). There are only 85 translations out of English as compared to a corpus of over 6,000 translations in total. In other words only 1.5 per cent of translations were exports; the remaining 98.5 per cent were voraciously consumed foreign imports, a vast cultural trade deficit. Translation was part of a project of cultural development, in which the Queen herself was a lifelong participant (see Petrina, Chapter 2 above). Elizabeth I’s translational life is understudied and mysterious, whether the quality of the translations themselves or what they were. In her sixties, she translated Boethiius in six weeks, as if under some form of time pressure. Rendering some pieces in incompetent English so much in contrast to her dominance of the vernacular apparent in her speeches and letters, for the Queen the object of translation was language-learning. Using obscure phrasing and syntax, her ‘inferior English’ when translating reflected the activity as a learning process, as means rather than end; something also apparent from her simultaneous use of intermediary translations like Erasmus’ Latin version of Plutarch’s *De curiositate*. Translating formed part of her cultivation of her kingly status. Her linguistic abilities had been lionised from an early age, her Italian being praised in the 1550s by the Venetian Giovanni Michiel. In terms of the matter she chose, there was a discernible move away from more devotional material with age. The religious subject matter of a 90-line manuscript translation of one of Petrach’s *Trionfi* attributed to her, the ‘triumph of eternity’, indicates that the exercise was about the ‘eternal contemplation of the present’, exploring a philosophical truth, resonating with her need as a monarch to promote ‘the memory of notable things’ (Petrina).
This example of royal *imitatio*, the creative reimagining of a familiar *auctoritas*, is echoed in the literary consideration of Thomas Campion (Manuwald, Chapter 3 above), whose triangulation of Latin, neo-Latin and vernacular translation and composition presents a spectacular example of the flux across national and temporal borders. Catullus was a touchstone for this compositional technique of taking a line from a well-known classical poem and then using it as a spur to a rewriting that depends on knowledge of the original to appreciate the twist and turn it has been given. Literary allusion was a building block and classical languages were the predominant medium of cultural exchange throughout this period. Just under half of translations were from Latin (Hosington et al., *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads*). The educational importance of classics was not eclipsed by the rise of vernacular literature: Greek and Latin remained the foundation of the British educational establishment into the nineteenth century. Campion’s movement between Latin inspiration, neo-Latin, and English rewritings saw him ‘use different parts of a Roman poem in different places, rework the same concept differently in a series of pieces, base only a Latin or only an English poem on a classical conceit or model or juxtapose English and Latin pieces on the same concept’ (Manuwald). The relative claims of the vernacular and the Latinate or neo-Latin were not oppositional for such writers; there was no inexorable rise of vernacular literature, but rather parallel, mutually reinforcing aspects of a single cultural universe.

On the other hand, vernacular writers did influence and imitate each other. Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, who was forced to foreswear her own learning and library, penned a reworking of a *comedia de enredo* (play with tangled love plot) by Calderón. Her *Los empeños de una casa* [*Trials of a Noble House*] feminised his *Los empeños de un acaso* [*The Trials of Chance*], which had been performed in Mexico in 1679, the first known performance of Calderón in the New World. Here, influence between the Old World and the New, Spain and New Spain, is traced in relation to the figure hailed as the first Mexican writer (O’Brien, Chapter 9 above). She might have been a *poetisa Americana* (American poetess), but her cultural models were peninsular. In the second *sainete* (interlude) of her play, one of the characters based on a real-life colonial official remarks ironically: ‘siempre las de España son
mejores’ (‘plays from Spain are always better’) (Juana Inés de la Cruz, ‘Sainete segundo’, 57; O’Brien, Chapter 9 above). Translation in the sense of *translatio* (*translatio studii* especially) was called into action whenever writers made use of *imitatio*, from the mythological rewritings of Garcilaso to the Petrarchan and biblical revisions of Wyatt and Surrey, to Sor Juana’s attempt to create a *criollo* culture. Her creative reimaginings negotiated a burgeoning relationship between imperial metropolis and colonial outpost, as well as regendering a patriarchal form.

Conflicts between political and religious allegiance, so brilliantly explored by Cervantes in his picture of the Elizabethan court’s hidden internal religious exiles in ‘La española inglesa’ (‘The Spanish English Lady’), underlay the case of English religious women in exile. English Catholics lived in exiled religious communities in significant numbers across this period. Bowden (Chapter 10 above) explores how the rule of enclosure contradicted the need for convents to be self-sustaining financially. Without the help of adjoining communities and particularly wealthy patrons, these islands of Englishness abroad could not survive. The cultivation of local patronage and relationships between English foundations and their neighbours was central. Founding clothing ceremonies were major public events that confirm the transnational nature of life in early modern cities like Bruges. Also transgressing the boundaries between the cloister and the world, convents frequently hosted boarders and pensioners, many of whom became major benefactors. Marie Bourlon, Madame de Fontenay, spent the last six years of her life in the English Augustinians’ Paris convent, despite keeping a house nearby. At Bruges, the English community took pity on a ‘fierce Protestant’ known as ‘Aunt Betty’, perhaps hoping to take advantage of her medical expertise, although she ended up being nursed by them in her eighties. When Marie-Gabrielle de Lalaing failed to populate a new foundation at Hoogstraten, she turned to the Prioress Francesca Turner and the English Carmelite community at Antwerp, who provided her with nuns but insisted the foundation should remain English, except for members of the countess’s immediate family. Her daughter became Prioress and the community was evacuated to the nearby Lalaing castle at Mechelen during the wars in 1701. A delicate balance between
integration and separation needed to be maintained. At Valladolid, novitiates were discouraged from assimilating with the local Spanish residents, but also forbidden from speaking English within the confines of the College (Cano-Echevarria et al.).

If literary texts were studied for action, they could at times lead to spectacularly misguided undertakings. One of England’s most important humanist thinkers of the sixteenth century, the woefully neglected Sir Thomas Smith, was ‘a public intellectual, one who influenced political life; shaped public culture in the arts and literature; had a sustained interest in advanced intellectual ideas, from colonialism to house design; and who provided a model for upward mobility for aspiring young intellectuals’ (Hadfield, Chapter 7 above). Enormous faith was placed in verbal exchanges in this period. A debate at Sir Thomas Smith’s French Renaissance house, Hill Hall, in Essex, before an audience of local gentlemen, was an extension of formal debates at universities, bridging the gap between learning and public life by considering the classical figures of Marcellus and Fabius as tacticians and role models for action in Ireland. Smith’s son, who argued against his father in the debate, actively engaged in the colonial endeavour no doubt discussed. Sadly, he ended up with his boiled carcass being fed to dogs by his Irish killers. Smith’s most important work, De republica anglorum (The Commonwealth/Republic of England), takes seriously the idea that political comparison with other states would be beneficial to early modern England. The impetus for travel and exploration derived precisely from this comparative approach. As Sir Philip Sidney suggested in a widely-read letter of travel advice: ‘For ha[d] sure it is to know England … without you know it by comparing it with some other Countrey’ (Millstone, Chapter 6 above). Emulation between states, learning from successful policies elsewhere, was implicit in Thomas Blundeville’s decision in 1570 to translate the Louvain-educated humanist Fadrique Furió Ceriol’s Consejo, i Consejeros del Principe (Counsel and Counsellors for Princes, 1559). Travel was a crucial part of a political education: the ‘wise traveller observeth’ only ‘profitable thinges’, ‘by comparing the straunge countries first one with another, & then all those with his owne, is able to judge of the government of hys owne countrie, howe good or evill it is, and knoweth how to roote out all abuses and evill customes,
and to plant good in their stead’ (Furió Ceriol, H1r). The big question was: when were customs ‘new’ and ‘good’? The notion of ‘cotejar’, comparing or collating strange lands against one another, figured travel as a philological activity. Stop-offs punctuating an itinerary are opportunities for the traveller to collate new experiences with familiar ones, a metaphor that sees the utility of travel in terms of bookish learning.

The growth of news and publicity arose from the notion that lessons could be learned from foreign examples. Traditionally, historiography has linked the growth of the public sphere with the growth of democratic political culture. The evidence of France disproves this simplistic model (Millstone, Chapter 6 above). It is not possible to equate low levels of public politics with absolutism or high levels of publicity with democracy. Richelieu exerted close control over what Renaudot printed in the Gazette, which had been given a privilege over the heads of Parisian printers and displaced the original Martin and Vendsme’s Nouvelles ordinaires. The national publicity incarnated by the Gazette de France and Mercure français despite being a mouthpiece of government was nevertheless consumed voraciously throughout France, a talking point for local elites, an important aspect of a burgeoning sociability. Fynes Morison’s discourse on ideal travel companions advised against ‘flocking together’ with fellow Englishmen (Holmberg, Chapter 8 above), because it both undermined the fundamental purpose of travel – learning new things, including the language – and tended to reinforce native vices, as well as bringing with it dangers for religious and political reasons. Holmberg examines how travellers needed to find new vocabularies for describing companionship on the road since ‘the language of religious or familial brotherhood was not always suited to describing friendly and benevolent relationships with companions of different ethnic affiliations or religious beliefs languages’. The Latin aphorism, ‘A good companion on the road is as good as a lift’, underlines the importance of sociability in travel,

1 ‘cotejando los reinos estranos los unos con los otros, y a todos con el suio; facará este provecho, que terná mejor aparejo de conocer los biones i males que hai en su tierra; terná forma de conservar lo bueno, i desarraigar lo malo; quitar malas costumbres, i introduzir otras nuevas i buenas.’
in order to make the most of the experience of the journey, its challenges, dangers and pleasures.

It was not only people who travelled but also objects that as they went took on new meanings and alternative representative functions. In the context of diplomacy, the portrait possessed enormous symbolic significance. Having someone’s image conveyed loyalty and allegiance. In Moghul India, at the Durbar court of Jahangir in 1616, Thomas Roe was conducted to portraits of James, Anne of Denmark and their daughter Elizabeth (Sowerby, Chapter 5 above). The very fact of the portrait’s display there said something about Jacobean–Moghul relations. Even when awkward audiences and difficult negotiations had to take place, the display of a portrait during an official audience could underline that any temporary disagreement took place in the context of a solid political relationship incarnated in the intimacy and familiarity generated by the portrait. This function of making the absent present, of emphasising a special relationship through the ownership of a portrait, led to the practice of gifting miniatures and small-scale likenesses to ambassadors after their postings came to an end. Then what became significant was the luxuriance and opulence of the setting and jewels that encased the image to be taken home. Similar symbolic power accrued to letters sent directly from the very hand of the monarch him- or herself. The holograph letter was a key tool of executive diplomacy, betokening intimacy and a need to speak unmediated to a fellow royal. The few surviving examples of letters from Mary I to Philip II and from Philip to Elizabeth I speak of their huge symbolic power and significance: Mary’s tentative first contact with her future husband (always ‘Your Highness’) and later defiance of his wishes over Elizabeth’s marriage to Emmanuel Philibert, Duke of Savoy; and Philip’s two letters to ‘a sister whom I love so much’ (Allinson and Parker, Chapter 4 above). While the language is tantalisingly suggestive of the true nature of their relationships, the subtle manipulation of rhetorical tropes and appeals to ‘conscience’ also show how they are profoundly political and calculated at the same time.

Who has gained from an exchange? In any exchange, there is always a suspicion that one party has come off worse while another got the better of the negotiation. Whether a good
deal has been gained depends upon how great was the desire for that which is received, and how much that which was given was valued. The negotiation involved in a translation – what is left behind, what has been carried over – determines whether it enriches or abases, adding to the stock of local cultural riches or corrupting it with pernicious foreign influences. The context of reception, anxieties of influence, the acquisitive instinct and desire for domination all wrestle to determine the meaning of an exchange. In the mock humility of many prologues to translations, their subject matter is downplayed in order to insulate the translator from his or her labour. But this very gesture signals that the translation was risqué. Knowledge and riches are on offer in any exchange, whether it seeks to contain a relationship by following a pre-existing pattern, or to transform it by creating a new one. Whatever the outcome of the myriad of exchanges that trespassed across categories held dear in our world, whoever the winners and losers were, exchange is always dynamic and transformative.
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