Giovanna Di Martino and Cécile Dudouyt

Introduction

The present volume explores the translation of ancient Greek drama into Latin and the vernacular languages from the last decades of the 15th century to the end of the 16th century, in some of the most significant centres of learning in Europe at the time. It combines and integrates the findings of recent publications and conferences on early modern translations of ancient Greek tragedy in Europe[1] with the expanding scholarship on early modern theories of translation. In laying out this rich and colourful mosaic of literary, dramatic, and scholarly activity, this volume also adds an important tile by devoting its entire first section to the translation of ancient Greek comedy. This was a strand of translation that is often forgotten and overlooked, even though it is essential for gaining a full understanding of the literary, dramatic, and scholarly picture.[2]

By combining the scholarship on early modern translation theories with studies of the reception of ancient Greek and Roman texts ('the classics') in this period, the volume inserts itself into both the fields of classical reception and translation studies; it is, in fact, inscribed within the growing interest in translation within classical reception studies, which, as Alexandra Lianeri has recently argued, still lacks 'a book-length survey of debates on translation seen from

The introduction and section 1 are by Giovanna Di Martino; section 2 is by Cécile Dudouyt. We would like to thank the other editors of this volume for making additions to, suggestions, and comments on, earlier drafts of this introduction.

1 Cf., amongst others, Bastin-Hammou 2015; Demetriou and Pollard 2017; Heavey 2020; and the following conferences: *Greek Drama in Latin 1506-1590. Readership, Translation, and Circulation* (King's College London, 2018); *Translating Greek Tragedy in 16th-century Europe* (Oxford, 2018); *Translating Greek Drama in 15th-16th century Europe* (Oxford, 2019); *Renaissance Academic Drama and the Popular Stage* (St Andrews, 2020); *Classical Receptions in Early Modern English Drama* (Verona, 2022).

2 Cf., amongst others, McLaughlin 1996; Botley 2004 and 2010; Gillespie 2011; Furno 2017; Deligiannis 2017; Petrina and Masiero 2020; for further bibliography on translation theories and practices in the Italian context, see Beta, Cuzzotti, Di Martino, Fiore, and Muttini in this volume; on translation theories and practices relevant to translations into Latin, see Baier, Bastin-Hammou, Dedieu, Jackson, and Muttini in this volume; on translation theories and practices in the English context, see Vedelago and Jackson; on translation theories and practices in the French context, see Bastin-Hammou and Dudouyt in this volume; and on translation theories and practices in the Portuguese context, see Resende in this volume.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110719185-001

[this] viewpoint'.[3] Not only does the volume aim at responding to Charles Martindale's call that the reception of an ancient work be at the heart of the study of classics,[4] it also heeds the exhortation of modern literary specialists like Stuart Gillespie that translation needs to become part of literary history.[5]

As is well-documented throughout the various chapters, translation in the period considered here is at the centre of important cultural and linguistic decisions, some of which heavily contribute to the formation of canons as well as the establishment of, or pushback against, literary, linguistic, and translational norms. Thus, a thorough exploration of the different types, aims, and objects of translation in this period is not just tangential to the study of ancient Greek drama, and the classics more generally, but rather forms an essential part of how we read and receive this rich and ancient dramatic corpus today. This volume represents a timely and important step forward into mapping the multiple ways in which early modern cultures, literatures, and languages interacted with, studied, appropriated, and recreated ancient Greek drama.

1 Early Modern Translation Theories and Practices

Whilst it is usually acknowledged that the first half of the 16th century was a time of intense and prolific translation activity from ancient Greek (and Roman) sources, which occurred in step with the increased distribution of printed books, rarely brought to the fore is the fact that this was also a time of intense reflection on, and formalisation of, translation as a practice, coeval with the emergence of proto-national dynamics and the growth of scientific and literary networks throughout Europe. The contributions gathered in this volume describe a wide variety of translation practices, and comment on many methodological treatises which influence translators, shape discourses around translation, and build on landmark translations from ancient Greek drama, such as Erasmus's *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*.

Beyond the varied picture that they paint of the *translated* reception of ancient Greek drama in the late 15th and 16th centuries, the texts and theories commented upon and analysed in the chapters of this volume also pose a terminological challenge. Many contributors (Bastin-Hammou, Di Martino, Dudouyt,

3 Lianeri 2019. For scholarship on the translation of ancient Greek tragedy, see Barbsy 2002; Hardwick 2007, 2010, and 2021; and Macintosh 2013.

4 Martindale 1993, 7.

5 Gillespie 2011, vii.

Jackson, Vedelago) argue that, faced with a continuum of translational practices, it is difficult and even counterproductive to try and draw a clear conceptual line between 'translation proper' and 'not quite translation', even when using terms like 'adaptation'. The various translational choices (verse or prose, Latin or vernacular languages, *ad uerbum*, *ad sententiam*, *ad uersum*, and even *ad spiritum*) deployed by early modern translators and discussed in the paratexts to their translations or in treatises, constitute a rich ecosystem in which there coexists a variety of cumulative functions (emulative, literary, didactic, scholarly, dramatic). Faced with such complexity, sorting out good or bad, 'faithful' or creative translations, misses the mark, whilst also running the risk of projecting conceptions of translation inherited from as early as the 19th century, when translation was (re)defined as the polar opposite of literary creation.

In his chapter 'Cultures of translation in early modern Europe', Peter Burke dates this pivotal shift in translation theories and practices to 1800, which demarcates a clear boundary between early modern and modern practices. The year 1800 is indeed just before Friedrich Schleiermacher's ground-breaking essay *On the Different Methods of Translating* (1813) and Wilhelm Humboldt's preface to his own translation of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (1816); that is, before *Verfremdung* as a translational choice and paradigm, but also before the (post)Romantic idea(l) of originality and the genius.[6] Indeed, early modern engagements with ancient Greek dramatic sources eschew contemporary (and, now, rather outdated) oppositions between 'foreignisation' and 'domestication' in translation, to employ Lawrence Venuti's terms,[7] and show that translational processes *are* also at work in the production of new plays. Translation proves, in fact, pivotal in the appropriation of the ancient theatrical genres, and functions as the cornerstone of early modern reinventions of theatre.

As Even Zohar has argued, definitions of translation, translational norms, questions of canon formation, and the very function of a text are all contingent on the timeframe of the translations being considered. Thus, identifying what translation and translating might mean in this period is necessarily 'dependent on the relations within' the early modern 'cultural system';[8] i.e., any definition relies on a collective set of processes and judgments that assign value to the status of the source and target texts. The status of the translated texts thus reflects the makeup of cultural power and highlights the role of translation in the

6 Burke 2006, 34–35.

7 Venuti 1995, 20. The validity of such terms has now started to be questioned, particularly from the perspective of Comparative Literature and Global/World Literature.

8 Even Zohar 1990, 51.

creation of literature, and — if it is drama translation — the establishment of a theatrical genre along with its repertoire.

The absence of an all-pervasive conceptualisation of translation, and the relative freedom with which early modern scholars, playwrights, and translators dealt with ancient Greek drama, both call for the otherwise seemingly jarring choice of including texts in this volume that were neither born as translations nor considered as such by later scholarship. The volume therefore calls for a widening of the functions, applications, and definitions of translation in this period. The principal criterion for the inclusion of a text in this volume is based on Gérard Genette's visual metaphor of the palimpsest: if a reader can *see* a source text through or within another text, then the text is considered to be a target text and included in the corpus, regardless of how it would be labelled in the 21st century or indeed was labelled in the 15th or 16th century.[9] This distinction is useful on a conceptual plane, according to which translation is meant in the abstract rather than as a label for a given text. It goes without saying that not every work in which one can occasionally see a prior text will be, in its totality, a translation.

Indeed, acts of *translating* can be found in texts that are not necessarily conceived of as translations nor as explicitly drawing on ancient Greek material. This is the case, for example, with Andrea Alciato's *Philargyrus* (1523), analysed here by Bastin-Hammou; Nicholas Grimald's *Archipropheta* (1548), analysed by Jackson; Pierre Le Loyer's *La Néphélococugie* (1578), Robert Garnier's *La Troade* (1579) and *Antigone* (1580), analysed by Dudouyt; Aires Vitória's *Tragédia del Rei Agaménom*, analysed by Resende; and the many Italian tragedies examined by Di Martino, Fiore, and Cuzzotti, in which there is indeed much *translating*, even though these may not have been published or considered as such. *Translating*, in this sense, represents the intertextual reworking of one source, or the fragmentary combination of different ancient Greek and early modern sources, in a dynamic and creative way, typically, though not exclusively, by a playwright or poet. *Translation*, on the other hand, usually features as the production of a full-length target text, often (but not necessarily) the work of a scholar. As acts of norm-creation and opposition, both *translation* and *translating* as practices can become new sites of imitation, as is the case, for example, of Erasmus's ground-breaking translations of Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*.[10]

---

9 Genette 1997.

10 See Dedieu in this volume.

In one of its many applications, as we have heard, *translating* was at the heart of the creation of national theatrical repertoires, a project that went hand-in-hand with 'vernacularization' and the rise of nation-states.[11] It combined translating ancient plays with the creation of treatises setting forth rules that could support, as well as inform, the production of drama. Aristotle was certainly amongst the primary sources chosen and reinterpreted in order to nurture such projects for the tragic genre, whilst the Roman scholar and grammarian Aelius Donatus and his *Commentary on Terence* was pivotal in the development of the comic genre. In addition, Aristotle was also particularly useful in claiming that a literary creation recast previous literature and in justifying imitation aesthetically and ethically.[12]

Translating was also part of a wider programme of establishing the study of Greek and Latin texts as a practice: translation of ancient Greek drama was pivotal in furthering knowledge of the ancient Greek world and a useful tool for exploring the mechanisms and vocabulary of the ancient Greek poetic language, metre *in primis*. Quite uniquely, *translation* and *translating* of ancient Greek drama in this period stand within the realms of philology, pedagogy, and theatre.

A challenge that was unavoidable for early modern translators of drama was how to deal with the plays' varied metres (iambic trimeter, trochaic tetrameter, anapaests, etc.) and complex lyric choral odes. Here, too, we see how practice varies amongst different authors and target cultures. Most translators opted for a pragmatic approach and either ignored the metre or chose iambic trimeter or the more familiar Latin iambic senarius. A few seem to have relished the opportunity to experiment, even drawing on the contemporary song cultures of their own time.[13] What the challenge of dramatic metres offered to all was the opportunity to engage competitively with other translators. The gauntlet was most clearly thrown down by Erasmus, as Dedieu and Vedelago discuss in this volume, and it was clearly a challenge which some wished to tackle head on, as we can see from the paratexts of many subsequent translations, such as those of Naogeorgus.[14] Personal preference and inclination seem to have been para-

11 Cf. Pollock 2000, 592.

12 On the influence of Aristotle on playwriting, see Di Martino, Dudouyt, and Fiore in this volume.

13 Cuzzotti in this volume.

14 Baier in volume. For a less explicit translation of lyric Greek metre into stichic lyric metre (the hendecasyllable), see Jackson in this volume.

mount here, but the aural experience and expectations of the readers of the translations must surely have also played a part.

Similarly, translation theories of the time depend upon the ideological realm in which they were produced and circulated. Theories about translation in the period were as heterogeneous as the various ways of translating in practice, hence the use of 'theories' rather than 'theory' throughout the volume.[15] By the second half of the 16th century, and as part of the general systematisation that was also connected to the (re)creation of national dramatic repertoires, translation was transitioning towards stricter and more limiting definitions. The famous Ciceronian passage, 'and I did not translate as an interpreter, but as an orator' (*nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator*), was understood to suggest that whilst the task of the translator was simply to stay within the same 'ideas, forms, and figures of thought' (*sententiis isdem, earum formis, tamquam figuris*) of the original text, the orator was more concerned with preserving the 'general style' (*genus*) and 'force' (*vim*) of these thoughts and ideas, and 'weighing' words (*appendere*). The translator was charged with reproducing them 'word for word' (*uerbum pro uerbo*) and 'counting' (*adnumerare*) each word (Cic. *De opt.* 14).[16] And if the translator was in no way an imitator or an orator, but rather, a faithful transposer, the rules by which one was to interpret the translator's task belonged to rhetoric, as is evident in some of the translation treatises which had currency at the time.[17]

15 The editors firmly believe that labels such as 'Renaissance' and 'Humanism', often applied liberally at this time, are equally geographically determined: in Italy the 'Renaissance' occurred a full century (at least) before its cultural counterpart in, e.g., England. Likewise 'Humanism' with its secular overtones for modern readers can be confusing when used without further temporal or pedagogical definition. For this reason, we have eschewed both terms throughout this volume and opted instead for 'early modern', a descriptor that is obligingly capacious to encompass the 16th-century translation and scholarly activities.

16 Cf., amongst others, Fausto da Longiano 1556, 77; Toscanella 1575, 34–35; Piccolomini 1575, 213, 216; Catena 1581, 5–6 (and Pierre Daniel Huet 1683, 157 for a reading of this passage influenced by Catena); Castelvetro 1570, 10–11; and Humphrey 1559, 245–246; on the concept of *adnumerare* (*numerositas*) in early modern translation theory, see, for example, Dolet's precept to respect the 'nombres oratoires' (1540, 17ff.). Likewise, Horace's 'and do not render word for word, faithful interpreter' (Hor. *Ars Poet.* 133–134: *nec uerbo uerbum curabis reddere fidus / interpres*) again implied (*a contrario*) that the interpreter/translator's task was in fact to render word for word; Horace was concerned with imitation in this passage, not translation. On the widespread use of Hor. *Ars Poet.* 133–134 for translation matters in the Middle Ages and beyond, see Copeland 2013.

17 Cf., amongst others, Leonardo Bruni's *De interpretatione recta*; Juan Luis Vives' *Versiones seu Interpretationes* (1532); Etienne Dolet's *La manière de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre* (1540); and Fausto Da *Longiano's Dialogo del modo de lo tradurre d'una in altra lingua secondo*

Yet, there co-existed other and opposite visions of translation, which saw it as a creative enterprise grafted onto the imitative nature of literature as well as the 'bettering' nature of imitation itself; i.e., the idea of emulation as inevitably engineered into the imitation process itself. If the French scholar Thomas Sébillet's *Art poétique françois* (1548) openly equated 'translation' with 'poem', with a new literary creation, he also afforded translation the ability to emulate the source in the new language.[18] There are a number of paratexts belonging to treatises on imitation, poetic art, poetics more generally, notwithstanding the translations examined throughout this volume, which can testify to the currency of such an assertion.[19]

Indeed, not only did translation concepts change from one place to another at this time, but they also heavily depended on the genre they were translating and/or writing within. The traditions of translating comedy and tragedy chart overlapping, but separate, courses in literary history. Ancient Greek comedy, for example, had been used to teach Greek to beginners since antiquity, a practice that continued from a very early date in Italy with Aristophanes (Bastin-Hammou, Muttini). The comic playwright was one of the most widely used authors by teachers and students of Greek. The *editio princeps* of the first nine surviving plays was printed by Aldo Manuzio in Venice in 1498, before those of Sophocles (1502), Euripides (1503), and Aeschylus (1518). But the history of the plays' translations had begun almost a century earlier, at a time when reflections upon translation were only just starting to emerge. Translators of Greek comedy were, and still are, faced with issues specific to comedy, such as the presence of obscene language, political attacks, religious disrespect, and, more broadly, the fact that they did not have access to a range of ancient Greek comic texts beyond those of Aristophanes, or a treatise equivalent to Aristotle's *Poetics* that discussed the genre of ancient Greek comedy as a whole.

A final note to add to a volume on the translation of ancient Greek drama concerns the very nature of drama translation. Indeed, translating dramatic texts

---

le regole mostrate da Cicerone (1556). On Bruni and the rhetorical tradition, see Bertolio 2020, 9–60; on the evident influence of the rhetorical tradition on Dolet's treatise, see Norton 1974; see also Juan Luis Vives' section on 'translation' (*Versiones seu interpretationes*) in his 1532 treatise *De ratione dicendi*, which contained an understanding of translation that was wholly grafted onto rhetorical theory (Vives 2018; cf. Bertolio 2020, 45).

18 'la Version ou Traduction est aujourd'huy le Poëme plus fréquent et mieus receu dés estimés Poëtes et dés doctes lecteurs, à cause que chacun d'eus estime grand oeuvre et de grand pris, rendre la pure et argentine invention dés Poëtes dorëe et enrichie de notre langue'; Sébillet 1548, 21.

19 See, in particular, Di Martino, Dudouyt, Fiore, Vedelago, in this volume.

inevitably involves a negotiation of the source's cultural and theatrical conventions with new ones. Such negotiation, which is inherent to this type of translation, renders its process distinctive, regardless of whether a *mise-en-scène* of a translated text actually occurred or not. In other words, there is a dramaturgy of the translated text that is scripted into the process of translation itself because the source is dramatic (and dramaturgical) to begin with. Whether translation is conceived of as a philological endeavour or in view of an actual performance, it implies and includes considerations and problems relating to dramaturgy, which can be consciously addressed or lie dormant, but which inevitably put translation into dialogue with the theatrical and performance culture of the time period into which the source text is being adapted.[20] This is why the volume ends with an exploration of the various dramaturgies contained in three 16th-century translations of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* through the lens of performance practice (Di Martino-Baudou).

2 Description of the volume

Section One: Translating Comedy

The first section of this volume focuses on the translation of Aristophanes' plays and shows just how prolific and wide-ranging this activity was. Until the late 15th century, these target texts were mostly in Latin and aimed at didactic purposes, but 16th-century translations as well as Aristophanes-inspired comedies document a dynamic interplay between translating ancient Greek comedy and recreating the comic genre.

In Chapter One, Micol Muttini addresses the earliest translation analysed in the volume, undertaken just before the first edition of Aristophanes' plays: Lodovico da Poppi's translation of Aristophanes' *Plutus* in Latin verse, dating from the last quarter of the 15th century. Muttini analyses the strategies chosen by the translator in order to reconstruct his implicit norms, showing that this (mostly linear) translation strives to reproduce syntactical as well as stylistic features of the source text, whilst also opting for verse over prose. Finally, compared to the first partial translation of the same play by Leonardo Bruni (ca. 1440), who downplayed scatological or sexual references, Lodovico's text is a remarkably

20 Dramaturgy and translation have often been seen as comparable activities that rest on similar presuppositions; recent contributions to the topic are Versényi 2014 and Trencsényi 2015, 51–66.

frank rendition of Aristophanic obscenity. Beyond oppositions between faithful and free, or *ad uerbum* and *ad sententiam* translation, this close, linear translation also represents a cultural translation, mobilising linguistic and comedic references to Plautus and Terence as target linguistic models, as well as providing relevant information about, and a commentary on, ancient Greek political and religious institutions through marginal glosses. From these translation choices, Muttini derives the implicit functions of the translation: both didactic and poetic, this text gives access to the original Greek both linguistically and culturally, but also produces a valid comedy in Latin following Latin comedic standards.

In Chapter Two, Malika Bastin-Hammou explores the impact of translating ancient Greek comedy on the production of original Latin comedies in the 16th century. The dynamic whereby translation contributes to setting generic, rhetorical, and dramatic standards is often ignored if translations are considered separately from literary and/or dramatic productions. Bastin-Hammou's survey of the Latin translations of Aristophanes' *Plutus* in the early 16th century shows a continuum of translation practices ranging from *ad uerbum*, interlinear translations for students of ancient Greek, to rewritings of the ancient Greek comic material with additions and omissions. She identifies a turning point in the translation of Aristophanic plays in the 1530s, changing from being mostly didactic, meant for students learning the language, to becoming a literary endeavour for an educated audience. She shows that this evolution from *ad uerbum* to *ad uersum* practices produces translations that are at the same time creative and often more complete, with fewer digressions or omissions. Through the case study of the poet and jurist Andrea Alciato's Latin verse translation of *Clouds* (1517) and his later production of an original Latin comedy entitled *Philargyrus* (1523), Bastin-Hammou explores the translation of textual and generic features in the creation of a new comedy, demonstrating that translational practices are at work in the production of early modern Latin drama.

In Chapter Three, Simone Beta analyses and re-evaluates the first Italian translation of Aristophanes' eleven comedies, co-translated by two brothers, the physicians Bartolomeo and Pietro Rostini, and published in 1545. This prose translation has often been decried as a mediocre retranslation of Andreas Divus's Latin complete Aristophanes (1538). However, Beta demonstrates through close analysis of the Rostinis' translation of *Knights* that the translators were in fact familiar with the marginal scholia published in the Aldine edition of Aristophanes' plays (1498), and referred to the Greek text itself to rework and at times improve upon Divus. Beta shows that in spite of their reliance on Divus's Latin version and the heterogeneity of the translation (perhaps to be attributed to the

differences in skill and training between the two brothers), this first translation of Aristophanes' complete plays into the Italian vernacular is often livelier and more accurate than its more 'correct' Latin predecessor.

Section Two: Translating Tragedy

Part One: Scholarly Networks: Translation Models and Functions

The second section of this volume focuses on the different modes of reception of ancient Greek tragedy in early modern Europe. In the first part, contributors explore the European network of scholars that first translated Euripides' and Sophocles' tragedies, as well as their methodologies and reflections of the function(s) of translation. Erasmus's Latin verse translations of Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia at Aulis* (1506) stand out as a powerful translational model, which translators across Europe inevitably grappled with and situated their own translations against.

In Chapter Four, Alexia Dedieu highlights the importance of Erasmus's Latin verse translation of *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia at Aulis* which was first published in 1506 by Josse Bade in Paris, then published again in 1507 by Aldo Manuzio in Venice, where it was reprinted over twenty times until 1567. Dedieu uses Antoine Berman's concept of an 'origin of translation' to describe the influence of Erasmus's translation practice, in between *ad uerbum* and *ad sensum* translation: later translators of the same plays especially position themselves as either followers or rivals of his method. Erasmus anticipated the flush of translations of ancient Greek tragedies in the 1540s by over 30 years, but Dedieu shows that even decades later, he is an explicit model for George Buchanan in the paratexts to his Latin verse translations of Euripides' *Medea* (1544) and *Alcestis* (1556), as well as for Sigismond Gelous's *Orestes* (1551), which openly comments on Erasmus's translation technique and dismissive views on the tragic chorus. Dedieu adds that Erasmus as an 'origin' is not an uncontested model, but that the political, religious, and literary themes he outlines had a long-lasting impact: his influence receded only in the 1560s, when the authority of German scholarship in the persons of Joachim Camerarius and Philip Melanchthon imposed itself on the European context.

In Chapter Five, Angelica Vedelago begins with a survey of early modern treatises on translation and imitation. She shows that, beyond the emulation of a source text, there exists emulation between translations, stressing that translators and imitators do not only compete with the source author but also with each other. Vedelago traces the formulation of this type of emulation back to

Erasmus's paratexts and his biography, but finds its clearest formulation in Laurence Humphrey's *Interpretatio linguarum* (1559). Humphrey contrasts the imitator's emulation of the author of the source text on the one hand, and the translator's emulation of previous translators on the other, thus distinguishing between author and translator. Vedelago argues for the existence of two emulative stances in translators and imitators, defining the first as collaborative and heuristic, that is, following in the footsteps of already established translating norms; and the second as challenging and emulative of such norms. Jane Lumley's English prose translation of *Iphigenia at Aulis* (ca. 1557) provides an illustration of the collaborative and heuristic mode of emulation with regards to Erasmus's Latin verse translation and his methodology, whilst Thomas Watson's Latin verse translation of *Antigone* (1581) is presented as a case of eristic emulation with regards to Thomas Naogeorgus's Latin verse translation of *Antigone* (1558).

In Chapter Six, Thomas Baier explores the conceptions of translation developed by the school of Wittenberg, stressing the strictly ancillary and didactic role they afforded to translation in the teaching of ancient Greek. This position explains Philip Melanchthon's and his disciple Veit Winsheim silence on translation in spite of the latter publishing a complete prose translation of Sophocles into Latin in 1546. Baier demonstrates the collaborative nature of this network of scholars: Winsheim publishing Camerarius's *De autoribus tragoediae* (1534) as a paratext to his translations, and Camerarius postponing his translation of Sophocles' tragedies after the publication of Winsheim's complete plays are presented as examples of this. Through the analysis of the paratexts to Camerarius's commentary on, edition, and translation of Sophocles' plays, Baier delineates the scholar's two methods of translating. The first is exemplified in his interlinear rendition of *Ajax*, which follows the syntax of the source text and is propaedeutic to reading the play in ancient Greek; the second, manifested in his *Electra*, whilst providing a close translation of the content in prose, is intent on adapting it to the rhetorical features of the target language and to the target culture, i.e., to Christian moral values, as a way of rendering the text more accessible to students. Baier then goes on to contrast these two methods of translating developed by Camerarius with Thomas Naogeorgus's Latin verse translation of Sophocles' complete plays (1558), which follows in the footsteps of Erasmus's *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia* (1506).

Section Two, Part Two: Proto-National Dynamics and Vernacular Translating

Part One focuses on the networks of scholars translating ancient Greek tragedies, mostly into Latin, outlining methodologies and defining the function(s) of translation. Part Two questions the distinction between derivative translation and original tragedies in the context of the massive appropriation of the ancient material, which contributes to the development of vernacular literatures, languages, and theatre, and in turn to the construction of national dynamics.

In Chapter Seven, Giovanna Di Martino provides an analysis of the interplay and overlap between translations of ancient Greek tragedy and the creation of new tragedies aimed at establishing the tragic genre in 16th-century Italy. Di Martino first identifies the theoretical roots of imitation in the early modern Italian reception of Aristotle's' *Poetics*, which justifies and grounds the generally free and emulative approach to ancient Greek tragedy. As Di Martino demonstrates in her analysis of the paratexts to the translations and tragedies considered, the playwrights and translators — amongst whom Alessandro Pazzi de' Medici, Lodovico Dolce, Marcantonio Cinuzzi, and Luigi Alamanni — were not only aware of their imitative approach but framed the very freedom with which they imitated the ancients as itself an imitation of how the Romans appropriated Greek literature, thus artfully combining the prestige of imitating the newly 'rediscovered' ancient Greek sources with the celebration of their own invention. Di Martino goes on to uncover the hybridity of these works by examining the very labels attached to them by later scholarship. She focuses on 'volgarizzamento', in particular, in order to question its validity for 16th-century translations of ancient Greek tragedy.

In Chapter Eight, Claudia Cuzzotti focuses on Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger's translation of Euripides' *Hecuba*. She first puts this target text in the context of the other *Hecubas* translated in Italy, from Leonzio Pilato's Latin partial translation of the play in 1362 to Buonarroti's last version of his translation at the end of the 16th century. Cuzzotti identifies six other important engagements with the same play in Italy and by the most prominent translators and tragedians of the time, Lodovico Dolce, Giovan Battista Gelli, Giovanni da Falgano, Giovanni Balcianelli, Matteo Bandello. It is against the translation practices emerging from these target texts that Cuzzotti evaluates and analyses Buonarrotti's own translation technique. She pinpoints some general trends in the translation of Euripides' plays in 16th-century Italy, amongst which the wide use of *amplificatio*, the simplification of mythological and topographical references in the target text, the adoption of unrhymed hendecasyllables and the 'canzone' structure inherited from Petrarch for episodes and choral odes respec-

tively, and the numerous linguistic echoes with the Italian literary tradition, namely Dante and Petrarch. Cuzzotti's analysis of Buonarroti's translation also includes evaluation of the differences between the two most important 'drafts' of his *Ecuba*: the version sent to Maffeo Barberini (the future Pope Urban VIII) in 1599 and the last version of this translation.

In Chapter Nine, Maria Luísa Resende explores the mutual influence between the translation of ancient Greek tragedy and the Portuguese theatrical tradition through her analysis of Aires Vitória's *Tragédia del Rei Agaménom* (1555, though the first edition was probably issued in 1536). Vitória's tragedy does not directly translate an ancient Greek source; it is in fact a verse translation of Fernán Pérez de Oliva's Castilian prose translation of Sophocles' *Electra* (1528). Through a comparison between the two, Resende shows that Vitória's additions to and transformations of his Spanish source can be interpreted as a desire to meet the expectations of his Portuguese audience and, more generally, make ancient Greek tragedy more accessible and known. Pérez de Oliva had already adapted the original structure of the play to the more widely used division into acts and scenes, and had already drastically reduced the importance of the chorus by eliminating most of the lyrical parts. Vitória's further reduction of the chorus to two female confidents, adoption of scenes and acts, and use of rhyming and traditional heptasyllabes (*redondilha maior*), are all choices aimed at inserting his version of the play into the tradition of other contemporary Portuguese plays. Resende also demonstrates that, though Vitória adopts the main cultural and Christianising changes present in his Spanish source, he also deliberately presents the tragedy as Greek, restoring the many mythological references to the pagan gods present in the original, for whom Pérez de Oliva had instead used the monotheistic singular, and adding a layer of mythological references not found in the Greek source text, but familiar to Portuguese readers and spectators through contemporary plays, such as Gil Vincente's.

In Chapter Ten, Cécile Dudouyt explores how translation practices towards ancient Greek drama undergo a patent change in France halfway through the century. The reason for such change is to be identified with a reconceptualization of translation in poetics treatises. Through a detailed analysis of two important treatises on French poetry, one by Thomas Sébillet (1549, *Art Poétique françoys*), and the other one by Joachim du Bellay (1549, *Deffense et illustration de la langue françoyse*), Dudouyt argues that translation shifts from being thought of as a highly creative enterprise, much like writing a poem, to becoming the polar opposite of new literary creation. Such a shift, she argues, is cause for a change in approach to the translation of ancient Greek drama, which, from the 1550s onwards, becomes a much more covert and fragmentary endeavour,

aimed at recasting the (hidden) sources into new 'original' texts so as to contribute to the creation of France's national literature. Stripped of its creative powers and linguistic function as a tool to enrich and widen the French language, *traduction* becomes an ancillary and constrained exercise. However, *translating* still seems to be at play in many post-mid-16th-century target texts, such as Pierre Le Loyer's *La Néphélococugie* (1578), and Robert Garnier's *Antigone ou la piété* (1580) and *La Troade* (published in 1579 and probably performed in 1581). These plays are brought as examples to illustrate the new trend in translation practices, from *translations* to *translating*.

Section Two, Part Three: Beyond Translation

Part Three moves beyond translation and explores the liminal translational practices through which ancient Greek tragedy fuses with early modern scholarship and the writing of new plays.

In Chapter Eleven, Lucy Jackson explores a particular mode of translation of ancient Greek tragedy, one that she defines *ad spiritum*. Building on Marvin Carlson's use of the metaphor of 'haunting' for theatrical allusion, Jackson argues for the presence of Greek tragic 'ghosts' haunting Nicholas Grimald's Latin play *Archipropheta*, on the last days of John the Baptist, published in Cologne in 1548 by Martin Gymnicus and probably performed in Cambridge, where Grimald studied. Jackson first puts Grimald's work into the wider context of the study of the ancient Greek language and the prolific writing of biblical Latin plays in 16th-century England, and Oxford and Cambridge in particular. She then moves on to analyse the lurking presence of Euripides' *Orestes* and Aeschlylus' *Agamemnon* in Grimald's play. Whilst Orestes may be behind the representation of Herod in a scene dramatising a banquet in Herod's palace, the messenger figure of the enslaved Phrygian attendant of Helen's may be haunting the Syrian ancilla attending to Herod and embodying the messenger's function in Grimald's play. But, Jackson argues, the Syrian attendant also resonates with another famous female character in the Greek tragedy tradition, that of Cassandra in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*. Jackson's contribution is an important step forward into charting the subterranean presence of Greek tragedy in the early Latin dramas of the 16th century.

In Chapter Twelve, Giulia Fiore explores the impact of the reception of Aristotle's *Poetics* on tragedies and theoretical debates in 16th-century Italy through analysis of a selection of translations of the term *hamartia*. Building on Hartmut Böhme and Johannes Helmrath's concept of 'mutual transformation' as reception,

which emphasises the interdependency and reciprocity between the ancient and early modern cultures, Fiore's chapter contributes to exploring the mutual influence between ancient Greek tragedy, Aristotle's *Poetics* and 16th-century tragedies and theoretical treatises. Beyond stark oppositions between domestication and foreignisation, Fiore analyses the increasing tendency to translate the term *hamartia* as *peccatum*/*peccato* ('sin') in the mid-16th century. Her analysis ranges from Alessandro Pazzi de' Medici's influential Latin translation of the *Poetics* (1536), where he translates δι'ἁμαρτίαν τινά ('because of a certain fallibility'; Arist. *Poet*. 13, 1453a7–14) as *humano quodam errore* (stressing the protagonist's agency), to Francesco Robortello's commentary (1548), where the protagonist's sin is presented as necessary to validate providential punishment, to Lodovico Castelvetro's first Italian commentary of the *Poetics* (1570), where *hamartia* is explicitly linked to the Christian sin for the first time. Beyond translations of, and commentaries on, the *Poetics*, Fiore also shows the varied facets of this ideological syncretism not only in debates about vernacular tragedies, such as the literary quarrel around Sperone Speroni's *Canace*, but also in early modern *Oedipus* plays, such as Alessandro Pazzi de' Medici's *Edipo Principe* (1525–1526) and Giovanni Andrea dell'Anguillara's *Edippo* (1565).

Section Two, Coda: Dramaturgy and Translation

At the intersection between performance and translation studies, Chapter Thirteen describes and theorises a new methodology which unpacks the latent dramaturgy of drama translation through practice research. In this last chapter, Giovanna Di Martino and Estelle Baudou present the results of two workshops (28th–29th November 2019 and 21st May 2021) which explore lines 1098–1208 (fourth episode) and 1510–1531 (last stasimon) of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* in three translations of the play: Thomas Sébillet's *Iphigénie* (1549), Lodovico Dolce's *Ifigenia* (1551), and Lady Jane Lumley's *The Tragedie of Euripides called Iphigeneia* (ca. 1557). The performing process designed by Baudou and Di Martino relies on actors selecting turning points in the texts and matching words with bodily movements. The theatrical exercises proposed each time serve to investigate the power dynamics between the characters and its evolution within the scene, the place and function of the chorus, and the situation — whether intimate or public — envisaged in the dramaturgy of each translation. As a term emerging in the course of developing their methodology and resting on Derrida's conceptualisation of it, 'contamination' is employed throughout the chapter to capture the complex and mutual influence between the multiple stages

and ‘bodies’ involved in translating for the stage. Not only does the chapter chart new possible ways of investigating drama translation through performance practice; in line with the rest of the chapters in this volume, it also contributes to widening the very meaning of translation, and drama translation in particular, proving that it is necessarily part of, and heavily relies on, a wider dramaturgical process.

Overall, it is the translator’s ‘dancing back and forth between cultural and theatrical languages’, as Adam Versényi so eloquently puts it, that is at the heart of this volume.[21] By exploring translation of the ancient Greek dramatic corpus in important European centres from the last decades of the 15th century to the end of the 16th century, this volume inevitably rewrites an important chapter in the history of the reception of these ancient plays. It strategically puts translation in dialogue with early modern drama, theatre culture, and performance practice. But it also grants translation the importance it deserves: as part of literary history more generally and of the very texture of the plays that we read today.

21 Versényi 2014, 289.