

Laurence Humphrey, Gabriel Harvey, and the Place of Personality in Renaissance Translation Theory

Abstract:

Laurence Humphrey's *Interpretatio linguarum* (1559) is the most extensive treatise on translation written during the Renaissance. This article offers the first reading of the *Interpretatio* in its original context, situating it within a mid sixteenth-century debate that saw the Ciceronian controversy spread into translation theory. In 1540, Joachim Périon initiated this debate, and the article begins by exploring why Périon's work was so provocative. Humphrey's *Interpretatio* was intended as a response to Périon, in which Humphrey dismantles his reading of Cicero and focuses attention on the individual personalities involved in a piece of translation. Following ideas that Erasmus had set forth in *Ciceronianus*, Humphrey develops an interpersonal view of translation and sees it as a form of self-expression. The article then looks at Gabriel Harvey's densely annotated copy of the *Interpretatio*. Writing his annotations in 1570, Harvey perceived the original context and significance of the work, and saw it as an important contribution to English translation culture. A coda then speculates on the applicability of concepts from the *Interpretatio*, and in particular their relevance to Edmund Spenser.

Laurence Humphrey's *Interpretatio linguarum* (1559) is the longest and most comprehensive piece of translation theory that was produced during the European Renaissance. At 622 pages, spanning sacred and secular translation, the *Interpretatio* treats in three books the ideal formation of a translator, the relationship between

translation and imitation, and the best ways to render individual tropes and figures. Humphrey's monumental treatise is, as Glyn P. Norton has written, 'the only work from this period that approaches an encyclopedia of doctrine on translation'.¹ In recent years, the *Interpretatio* has begun to attract more attention. A 2013 volume in the MHRA Tudor and Stuart Translation series included a selection from the *Interpretatio* translated into English by Gordon Kendal—the first attempt to render any of it into a modern language.² In 2015, I used the *Interpretatio* to frame an account of English Renaissance translations of the *Aeneid*.³ And in his 2016 *Geschichte der Neulateinischen Literatur*, Martin Korenjak has brought the text into the spotlight as a high point of Neo-Latin literature, notable for its 'clear and eloquently formulated insight into the fundamental, cultural significance of translation'.⁴

In spite of such recent appeals to Humphrey's treatise, however, the origins and contemporary relevance of the *Interpretatio* have remained obscured by an older tendency to regard the work as a compendium of commonplaces. Earlier historians of translation theory, such as George Steiner and Frederick Renner, have viewed all translation from Cicero until Alexander Fraser Tytler's *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1792) as one phase: an empirical, practical period, before the era of theory proper and hermeneutics sets in with Humboldt and Schleiermacher.⁵ Within this first period, Humphrey's treatise was given a sort of summarizing status. George Steiner thus described it as 'a complete picture of the standard, median approach which the humanists advocated in regard to translation'.⁶ Renner used the *Interpretatio* throughout his study as one of the fullest descriptions of the 'generally accepted code' that supposedly reigned from Cicero until the end of the eighteenth century.⁷ More recent work by scholars such as Rita Copeland, Lawrence Venuti, and Siobhán

McElduff, however, has gone a long ways towards differentiating the approaches to translation in this first period by situating ‘theories’ within their social contexts and drawing out their individual contributions to the tradition.⁸ This article is a continuation of such developments, as it aims to establish the original context for Humphrey’s text and to offer the first reading of the *Interpretatio* as a whole. The aim is to discover how Humphrey fits into the history of translation theory in the sixteenth century, and thus to reveal the significant contribution that his work makes to the ongoing critical debates.

Humphrey’s *Interpretatio* needs to be understood as part of a discussion about translation that was taking place primarily in France and Switzerland, but spilled over into other parts of Europe. This debate was an extension of the Ciceronian controversy that had been raging in imitation theory from the end of the previous century. The Ciceronian controversy in imitation has been explored at great length in classic studies by scholars such as Terence Cave, Marc Fumaroli, Thomas M. Greene, and Martin McLaughlin.⁹ Humphrey himself was well aware of the different phases of this ongoing debate, and he lists the key figures at the beginning of Book 2 of the *Interpretatio*, noting particular disputes between Erasmus and Christophe de Longueuil, Angelo Poliziano and Paolo Cortesi, and Pietro Bembo and Pico della Mirandola.¹⁰ In the mid sixteenth century, however, the Ciceronian controversy came to dominate translation theory as well. The publication of Joachim Périon’s *De optimo genere interpretandi* in 1540 set off a series of retorts, some of which have been noted by Anthony Grafton and John O’Brien.¹¹ Humphrey’s *Interpretatio* is the most substantial and illuminating contribution to this dispute, and, although it has never been examined in this context, it needs to be read as a response to Périon. Just as the Ciceronian imitation controversy forced Erasmus to think intensively about a writer’s

personal relationship to the source text and to develop novel ideas about the authorial persona in *Ciceronianus* (1526), so the Ciceronian controversy in translation led Humphrey to develop new ideas about the role of the translator. The question of the translator's personal relationship with the source author is given attention in later English translation theory—most notably in the cluster of texts from 1684-5, including Lord Roscommon's *Essay on Translated Verse* (1684) and John Dryden's prefaces to his version of Maimbourg (1684) and his collection *Sylvae* (1685).¹² This article will argue that the Ciceronian controversy led Humphrey to develop a vocabulary for thinking about the personality of a translator that is in some way analogous to these later discussions, but constructed in the discourse of Protestant humanism.

Humphrey's treatise is significant because it gives us a rich vocabulary for thinking about the relationship between translator and source author in sixteenth-century Europe. The text is highly applicable to other translators, and it deserves a place in the discussions of Renaissance translation theory. Furthermore, Humphrey's influence in England may have been more substantial than has been previously estimated.¹³ In the concluding section of this article, I will look at the extensive annotations that Gabriel Harvey made in his copy of the *Interpretatio*, which he dated to 1570. Harvey's notes show how an early English reader responded to Humphrey's arguments. These annotations should also attract our attention because it was in 1570 that Harvey moved to Pembroke College, Cambridge, where he met and developed an important friendship with Edmund Spenser.¹⁴

Joachim Périon and the Ciceronian Controversy in Translation Theory

The watershed moment for the Ciceronian translation controversy was the publication of Périon's *De optimo genere interpretandi* in 1540. Périon's text was explosive because of both the extensive theoretical preface and the partial translation, with commentary, of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The commentary to the translation functions as a running guide to the process by which Périon reached his Latin text. Thus while the preface argues that a Ciceronian translation of Aristotle is the only proper approach, the commentary provides a careful breakdown of how to prepare such a version. There had been controversies surrounding the translation of Aristotle before—Bruni and Mannetti, for instance, had written about the challenges of making Aristotle Latin, as Paul Botley has charted in his book *Latin Translation in the Renaissance*.¹⁵ The debate that began with Périon, however, marked a new point of departure. Neither Périon nor any of the other figures involved in this new controversy refer to their fifteenth-century predecessors, and the parameters of the sixteenth-century discussion are different, because the new debate was tied into contemporary developments in French scholarship, as this article will show.

Périon's approach to translation relies on an extreme reading of Cicero's *De optimo genere oratorum*. At its heart is an interpretation of three sentences, in which Cicero writes about his translations of Aeschines and Demosthenes:

I translated the most famous orations of the two most eloquent Attic orators, Aeschines and Demosthenes, orations which they delivered against each other. And I did not translate them as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and the forms, or as one might say, the 'figures' of thought, but in language which conforms to our usage. And in so doing, I did not hold it

necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style and force of the language.¹⁶

These sentences are a seminal statement in translation theory and have attracted attention from Jerome up to the present day. Modern scholars who have worked on Roman theory—especially Rita Copeland and Siobhán McElduff—have recently stressed that Cicero’s comments need to be read in the context of territorial battles between grammarians and rhetoricians.¹⁷ In fact, McElduff has argued, Cicero is not primarily making a point against literal translation—which did not really exist as a literary art in Rome—but rather, first, making a claim as to what true Greek style should be like in Latin and thus taking a side in the Atticism vs. Asianism debates; and, second, positioning himself as the true proprietor of the highest level of Roman education, and thus asserting a social and educational distinction.¹⁸ Périon was blissfully unaware of such cultural implications in Cicero’s statements, however, and instead he came to the conclusion that what these sentences mean is that there should be no distinction between translating and writing. If one is translating as Cicero did, then one will make the task of the *interpretes* into that of the *orator*:

Now since *interpretatio* is *oratio*, and *oratio* ought to be noble, copious, and splendid, *interpretatio* is to be carried out by us in such a way that it does not lack these splendors, or rather so that it is not stripped of them.¹⁹

Périon considers it one of the great triumphs of Cicero’s writing that a reader cannot tell when Cicero is translating a sentence from a Greek source or when he is writing freely. In modern translation terms, this might be described as a radically

domesticating approach to translation.²⁰ Any semblance that the original text is foreign is supposed to be hidden—the very fact that it is a translation is supposed to disappear, until it seems to be nothing less than a piece of original composition. It is notable that the word *fidus*, which is so central to much early modern theory, almost never appears in Périon’s text.

This conflation of interpretation into original composition leads Périon to set out his two key rules:

Now indeed from these few things that I have recalled, it is enough to have understood what was proposed by us, if we want to translate anything eloquently from the Greek, that these two things need to be attended. First, that we do not think to translate word-by-word; second, that we join Greek with Latin of nearly the same kind as Cicero’s.²¹

Rejecting word-for-word translation follows naturally from Périon’s conclusion that translation needs to be the same as *oratio*: nobody would write an original, eloquent composition in the word order or diction of another language, so such literal translation is not permissible. This is a simple claim, and Cicero ostensibly states this directly in his preface. The second part of Périon’s argument, however, is only understandable within the broader context of the Ciceronian controversy. What Périon is suggesting is a Ciceronian addition to the idea that all translation should domesticate. For if translation is to be subsumed into original writing, one must then ask, how should one write? According to Périon, the answer is that if one is writing in Latin, then one should write like Cicero, because Cicero is the best writer in the language. Given the prominence that questions of fidelity have come to play in

discussions of translation, this conclusion may seem an absurdity. But not all translation theories place equal emphasis on fidelity.²² For Périon, the style of the source text is secondary to the pursuit of Ciceronian eloquence, and any act of translation into Latin is to be judged by the translator's ability (or inability) to achieve such eloquence, as if in a novel act of composition.

This interpretation of Cicero would likely have been enough to stir up controversy on its own. However, there is a further reason that Périon troubled his sixteenth-century readers, and that is his sophisticated approach to the problem he set himself. It was precisely Périon's skills in the latest currents of French scholarship that allowed him to undertake his translation in the way he did. As Anthony Grafton has shown, scholarship in the early to mid sixteenth century was divided into two different schools.²³ In simplified terms, the Italian school was based upon rigorous manuscript study as a foundation for textual emendation; the French school made emendations based upon the comparison of Greek and Latin sources. Sophisticated collations of Latin with Greek thus promised a wealth of new scholarly insights to the great French critics of the mid sixteenth century. Horace can serve here as an example. In 1554, Henri Estienne's ground-breaking *editio princeps* of the *Anacreontea* made the case that Horace had imitated these previously unpublished Greek poems. In his 1559 *Variae lectiones*, Marc-Antoine Muret explored Horace's borrowings from Greek poets more generally. In 1561, Denis Lambin then transformed the insights from the comparative method into a new edition of Horace.²⁴ Périon, for one, was convinced that such scholarship also offered a new way forward for translators. Périon was learned in this French system, and the starting point for his translation practice was its comparative method. Through rigorous comparisons of Cicero with Aristotle and other Greek sources, he came to see Ciceronian texts as

webs of translations. Cicero's texts contain many allusions and references to the Greek philosophers. If a scholar-translator had a sufficient knowledge of these moments of allusion and translation, then it might be possible to stitch together not only what it might be imagined a Ciceronian Aristotle would be, but what Cicero actually made of many of the individual words and phrases in Aristotle. In this way, Périon used cutting-edge scholarly techniques to filter Aristotle through Cicero into Latin.

The best way to see how this works is to take a brief excerpt from the translation and commentary. Here is Périon's rendition of the opening sentence of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and the start of his commentary:

[Périon's translation:] 'Every art, every teaching, every action, every study, and every institute is directed [*refertur*] towards some good.' [Aristotle:] 'Every art and every investigation, and likewise every practical pursuit or undertaking, seems to aim at [*ἐπίσθαι δοκεῖ*] some good'. [Périon's commentary:] Cicero seems to me to have translated this sentence, or certainly adumbrated it, with a few words changed. For he writes in nearly these words in Book 5 of *On the Ends of Good and Evil*: 'Therefore all honour, all admiration, all enthusiasm is directed [*refertur*] towards virtue and towards the actions in harmony with virtue.' Indeed this sentence showed me that I should translate τὸ ἐπίσθαι ['to be set on'] as *refertur*, and that I should wholly take out the *δοκεῖ* ['seems'].²⁵

Périon tells us that Aristotle's opening is translated—or if not translated, at least adumbrated—by Cicero in Book 5 of *De finibus*. Cicero's 'adumbration' is then used as the basis of Périon's translation. It offers, for instance, a justification for using the word *refertur* to translate *ἐφίεσθαι*, as well as for leaving out the word *δοκεῖ*. Thus instead of translating *referre videtur*, Périon simply writes *refertur*. His full explanation of this sentence will go on for almost four pages and draw on many more Ciceronian texts and alleged translations of even individual words. But already in these opening lines it is possible to see how a moment of Cicero's reception of Aristotle becomes the basis for disregarding a detail of the Greek in order to write in the same manner as Cicero.

Today Périon is known only to a few specialists in the history of scholarship, but his work was well known in the mid sixteenth century. In England, for example, his name comes up in texts by Roger Ascham and Gabriel Harvey. Their response seems to have been one of admiration for his ability to spot parallels between languages, but of bewilderment at his project. Ascham, in *The Scholemaster*, writes of the 'cold gatherings' of notable scholars, and offers a list that includes Périon alongside Macrobius, Henri Estienne, and Piero Vettori—impressive company.²⁶ Similarly, in Harvey's *Ciceronianus*, Périon is represented as an unusually precise, but also rather abnormal scholar. Harvey jokes that as a youth he had been 'more careful than Perionius himself in the choice of words' and refers to Périon as 'that fastidious translator', since he never let an unCiceronian word slip into his texts.²⁷ In France, where scholars had invested national pride in the success of the French approach to emendation, there was a less generous reaction. Périon's work became a great embarrassment for those who promoted the French method, and, as Anthony Grafton and John O'Brien have documented, there was a backlash against his

translation.²⁸ In some cases, these responses can be traced in letters, but in published form the criticisms often came in commentaries on Aristotle. Thus Denis Lambin, who ‘was pained by the damage that Perionius’ work had done to the reputation of the French’, frequently attacks him in his commentaries.²⁹ In moments of disbelief, Lambin writes, ‘I have never seen anything more perverse’, and complains at how Périon ‘throws in words and entire sentences from Cicero, even though they have nothing to do with Aristotle’s meaning’.³⁰

Laurence Humphrey and Interpersonal Translation

Humphrey’s *Interpretatio* was published in 1559, at the end of a period of five years he had spent in Swiss exile.³¹ Before his exile, Humphrey had been a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and a lecturer in moral philosophy, but he left for Switzerland after the accession of the Catholic Queen Mary. During this time on the continent, Humphrey gained his pay by working ‘as a corrector and translator for the Froben-Episcopius firm’.³² This firm was at the centre of many of the major translation controversies of the early sixteenth century. As a very close friend of Erasmus, for instance, Johann Froben had printed the *Novum Instrumentum* in 1516 and helped establish Basel as a key force in European printing. While working for the Froben press, Humphrey took in this culture of translation, and in the process developed an immense admiration for Erasmus, who became his ideal translator. The *Interpretatio*, which was published after the accession of Elizabeth to the throne of England, is Humphrey’s *magnum opus* from his time in exile. It was a part of his campaign to display his new learning in hope of regaining a post in the universities of England.³³

At the beginning of the *Interpretatio*, Humphrey establishes a genealogy of important writers who have written treatises on translation and whom he intends to follow. Humphrey's list consists of three names. The first two of these might be found in any modern anthology on translation theory, but the third stands out: 'In our memory, a learned and eloquent man, Joachim Périon, in his translations of Aristotle's *Ethics*, followed Jerome and Cicero.'³⁴ In describing Périon as 'disertus', Humphrey uses a word that carries great value in Ciceronian Latin, especially in the context of translation. At *De finibus* 3.15, Cicero rejects the 'interpretes indiserti' ('ineloquent translators'), by which he means those who are uneducated in rhetoric.³⁵ By describing Périon as learned in Ciceronian eloquence, Humphrey is thus paying him a substantial tribute. He is, in fact, much fairer to Périon than most of his detractors would be. The *Interpretatio* shows that Humphrey had read and studied Périon's approach to translation extremely closely. Périon will be one of the most cited modern authors in the *Interpretatio*, second only to Erasmus, and his influence pervades all three books. However, in spite of Humphrey's acknowledgment of Périon's learning, the two will see eye to eye on very little.³⁶

The first and most fundamental difference between Humphrey and Périon is apparent in their interpretations of Cicero's *De optimo genere oratorum*. Like Périon, Humphrey puzzles over Cicero's comments that he 'converted' the text not as an 'interpres' but as an 'orator'. In weighing these words, Humphrey concludes that Périon has grasped at the wrong end of the stick. Indeed, Cicero was not talking about translation at all:

Thus he says, as is also cited by Jerome: 'I converted the most famous orations of the two most eloquent Attic orators, Aeschines and Demosthenes, orations

which they delivered against each other. And I did not convert them as a translator [*interpre*], but as an orator, etc.’ From these things it is clear that Cicero fled and repudiated the name of *interpre*, and that nothing was published, at that time, which translators, by imitating, could orientate themselves with and conform themselves to in all matters.³⁷

For Humphrey, the noun *interpre* is the crucial name for being a translator in Latin, and if Cicero was disowning this title, it must mean that he did not want to be considered a translator at all. As a result, Humphrey emphasizes, ‘Cicero did not leave any full and perfect example of translation for us to imitate, or if he did it no longer exists today.’³⁸ Humphrey thus condemns those who would claim Cicero’s authority for free and liberal translation—these writers are imitators rather than translators. The use of Cicero to defend free translation is a particularly insidious method: ‘Therefore they ineptly imitate Cicero, those who, attempting to translate Greek, vaguely and freely wander and recede from the mind of the author; they protect themselves with the example of Cicero, although he never claimed to translate one by one each sentence in order, as they thus promise and ought to do.’³⁹ Humphrey never discusses the fragment of Cicero’s translation of Plato’s *Timaeus*, and with that one possible exception, his claim that there is no Ciceronian example for ‘faithful translation’ is not unfair.⁴⁰ By eliminating Cicero’s *De optimo genere oratorum* from the context of translation theory, Humphrey both undermines the authority behind Périon’s claims and attempts to reconstruct the boundary between being an *orator* and being an *interpre*.

There are several aspects of Humphrey’s effort to rebuild this boundary that play out over the course of the *Interpretatio*. One of these is the distinction he makes

between emulating and following.⁴¹ Emulating the source author is part of the liberty of the imitator, whereas following is the duty of the translator. Périon breaks this distinction by not following Aristotle, but trying to improve upon him. As Humphrey complains at one point, ‘Périon has emulated Aristotle beautifully here, but he did not want to translate him.’⁴² Périon is thus directly in Humphrey’s cross-hairs throughout his key discussions of imitation. There are, however, two other aspects of Périon’s theory that Humphrey responds to, which are vital to this present discussion.

The first of these is the role French scholarship has to play in the practice of translation. As noted above, French scholars of the mid sixteenth century followed a method that sought to understand Latin texts by looking through them to their Greek sources. Throughout the *Interpretatio*, there is clear evidence that Humphrey too had subscribed to this comparative method of scholarship by the end of his stay in Basel. For instance, he writes, ‘you will not know Cicero thoroughly and intimately unless you read the Greek authors, by which he has been made richer and more Latinate, and unless you have gathered and noted all those places that he imitates.’⁴³ Humphrey’s high praises of Guillaume Budé, who was the great defender of this method in France, also situate him firmly in this tradition.⁴⁴ But Périon too was an advocate of this method, and the dilemma is how it might be applicable to translation. Humphrey develops his theory as to how to apply this type of scholarship most explicitly in the context of biblical translation. Passages in the Greek New Testament would seem to be poor Greek by classical standards, but Humphrey denies this is an issue or that a more eloquent language should be substituted by the Latin translator. Longueil makes this mistake when he transforms the biblical Greek into Ciceronian Latin: his Latin Bible is in many ways a sacred parallel to Périon’s secular translations.⁴⁵ Instead, Humphrey insists that one will only understand the biblical Greek if one sees the

Hebrew behind it and understands that Christ was imitating Hebrew. The result is an extraordinary defense of what critics now call ‘foreignizing’ translation.⁴⁶ Humphrey writes about Christ: ‘Thus he gave us the new law, not in a new way of speaking but in another language: in such a way, however, so that the Greek speech does not have the flavour of its own propriety, but more often that of the Hebrew.’⁴⁷ Christ’s speech contains the glimmers of another language shining through it. In this case, Humphrey concludes, ‘The phrases are to be kept, and the propriety of the Hebrew language is to be imitated, just as Christ taught by his own example in the New Testament, which delivers all in the phrases of the Old Testament.’⁴⁸ The notion that the propriety of a language from a text *before* the source text needs to be preserved gives a remarkable role to comparative scholarship. In this instance, Humphrey is creatively applying the French method of scholarship that was pouring off the presses in Basel, while developing a defense for a type of translation that does not always seek to naturalize the source into a fluent target text. This is an idea that has revolutionary potential in the mid sixteenth century.⁴⁹

The second extraordinary aspect I would like to focus on is Humphrey’s insistence on the role played by the personalities of the original author and the translator. In developing his response to Péron, Humphrey relies extensively on Erasmus. According to Humphrey, Erasmus is the ‘most blessed translator’, who was given a unique nature and capacity in this art and combined this nature with extraordinary diligence.⁵⁰ It is thus not surprising to find Humphrey turning to Erasmus for guidance on matters of imitation and translation, and substantial sections of the *Interpretatio* owe unacknowledged debts to him, most of all to his *Ciceronianus*. In this influential dialogue, Erasmus argues against the folly that everybody should aim to be a Ciceronian. Cicero was a mere human, and the texts

that are extant from him are only the output of a pagan, mortal mind—hence imperfect, marred by transmission, and not even aware of the insights of Christianity. The Cicero that Erasmus portrays in this dialogue is a great orator, but not a figure to be admired in every discipline. For Humphrey, it was surely significant that Erasmus, near the outset of the dialogue, notes that Cicero is not especially to be admired as a translator:

Bulephorus Nor was Marcus Tullius the originator and begetter of the Roman tongue—he was its finest orator, and the one with the most dazzling reputation in civil cases; in other types of case he was inferior to quite a number of speakers; in poetry he was lame; in translating from Greek not particularly happy.⁵¹

Humphrey's argument that Cicero did not really try to be a translator likely takes its impetus from statements such as this one by Erasmus.

Erasmus never discusses translation specifically in *Ciceronianus*. Rather, his concern is with imitation, and whether writers in the sixteenth century should model themselves exclusively upon Cicero. As an 'anti-Ciceronian', he argues that a writer must not attempt to imitate Cicero regardless of circumstances. The particular problem that Erasmus finds with Ciceronianism is that it disregards the individuality of each author:

Bulephorus Every one of us has his own personal inborn characteristics, and these have such force that it is useless for a person fitted by nature for one

style of speaking to strive to achieve a different one. As the Greeks say, no one ever succeeded in battling with the gods.

Nosoponus Quintilian, I know, emphasizes that point.

Bulephorus So the first thing I would say is that no one should endeavour to copy Cicero if his natural bent is totally different from Cicero's. Otherwise he will finish up as some kind of monstrosity, having lost his own natural form and not having acquired anyone else's. It is essential to ask yourself first of all what style of speaking you are fitted for by nature.⁵²

The language Erasmus uses here is reminiscent of Cicero's moral philosophy—something Humphrey, who had been a lecturer in moral philosophy, would surely have noticed. In Book 1 of *De officiis*, Cicero uses the analogy of actors to argue that we must know ourselves and play the parts that nature has assigned to us: 'Everyone, therefore, should make a proper estimate of his own natural ability and show himself a critical judge of his own merits and defects; in this respect we should not let actors display more practical wisdom than we have.'⁵³ What Erasmus does in *Ciceronianus* is to apply such rules of self-knowledge to the subject of rhetorical composition. This is a monumental move, because it means that discourse 'should be a direct counterpart of the inner self'—a suggestion that Terence Cave has argued 'marks a shift the magnitude of which it is hard to measure'.⁵⁴

In the *Interpretatio*, Humphrey applies the notion of an individual nature that is fit only for certain types of speech to the case of translation. As with imitation, in translation two different people are involved: the original author and the translator. The first challenge for the translator is to perceive the different styles and types of writers: 'care about their characters is to be taken, because amongst writers there is

great variety.’⁵⁵ The task of the translator is to reproduce this diversity: ‘surely we will judge it the duty of a translator to maintain this diversity, so that wherever he applies himself, he may fashion, aptly and appropriately, the one whom he has taken up to translate.’⁵⁶ Although Humphrey admires the way in which Périon has made his language so elegant—‘I have always thought that Périon has accomplished very beautiful work in converting Aristotle’⁵⁷—the key problem is that Périon has misread Aristotle, who is not at all like Cicero. In the section on aptitude, Périon becomes the chief example of not respecting the original author’s unique nature, and later Humphrey offers six pages of examples where Périon has misled the reader by presenting Cicero instead of Aristotle.⁵⁸

But Humphrey, following Erasmus, does not stop by stating that there are a variety of ancient writers to imitate. Humphrey also asserts that there is a wide variety of natures amongst translators. The second challenge for a translator is thus the corresponding difficulty of knowing oneself. Borrowing a simile that both Cicero in *De officiis* and Erasmus in *Ciceronianus* had used, Humphrey argues that translators ‘must do as actors do, who choose not the best stories, but the ones that are most suited to themselves’.⁵⁹ The section on *natura* in Book 1 of the *Interpretatio* expands upon this challenge: ‘it is not the same for every person, but as they are born, different individuals have different natures, so that everyone cannot do all things, but each certain things, according as they are called by God, the just dispenser and administrator of goods. And to the task of translation, indeed, nobody brings oneself, unless instructed by the gifts of nature.’⁶⁰ For Humphrey, translation is a calling and an expression of self-knowledge. These are both exciting claims. The first, because it gives translation an unusually noble status in the world of letters; the second, because

it makes translation a part of the emerging writing of the self that has been much discussed in regard to other forms of Renaissance literature.⁶¹

In 1684, the Earl of Roscommon would describe the interpersonal bonds that translators must establish with their source authors in these famous verses:

Examine how your *Humour* is inclin'd,
And which the *Ruling Passion* of your Mind;
Then, seek a *Poet* who *your* way do's bend,
And chuse an *Author* as you chuse a *Friend*.
United by this *Sympathetick Bond*,
You grow *Familiar, Intimate* and *Fond*;
Your *Thoughts*, your *Words*, your *Stiles*, your *Souls* agree,
No Longer his *Interpreter*, but *He*.⁶²

Roscommon's verses on the interpersonal relationships between translators and authors have been put to excellent use by scholars of Augustan translation. There was, however, also a Renaissance vocabulary for thinking about interpersonal relationships in translation and for discussing the role that a translator's self-knowledge needs to play in the process. In the *Interpretatio*, Humphrey became the most eloquent theorist of this type of personalized translation theory for his time, and perhaps even a forerunner of later English theorists—although the connections are yet to be established. Périon's *De optimo genere interpretandi* was a crucial impetus behind Humphrey's text, because it inspired Humphrey to turn to Erasmus's ideas in *Ciceronianus* to counter Périon's extreme Ciceronianism. If we can place Humphrey back into this original context, the novelty of his project becomes clearer. And it is in

this original context that his ideas—on foreignizing translation, on emulation, and on the self-knowledge of the translator—will appear not merely as summarizing statements for a first broad age of translation, but as creative contributions to sixteenth-century literary controversies.

Gabriel Harvey's Annotated *Interpretatio*

Traces of one of Humphrey's early and intensive readers can be found in a copy of the *Interpretatio linguarum* held by Trinity College, Cambridge (shelf-mark III.18.74). This is a copy that was owned by Gabriel Harvey, which he signed and dated '1570'. As Virginia Stern first noted, the copy contains 'copious annotations in Latin and Greek in the three books [of the *Interpretatio*]'.⁶³ The annotations show that Harvey read the full 622 pages, and that he felt it worth his time to make notes on the entirety of Humphrey's text. The fact that the notes do not diminish as the text goes on suggests that Harvey was sufficiently interested in it to remain engaged until the end—this is no small investment of time with a book of this size and scope. Harvey even filled two full flyleaves at the back of the book with additional thoughts about specific problems in translation. Furthermore, the annotations show that Harvey was not only reading linearly, but moving backwards and forwards through the work. For instance, Harvey found page 502 to be of particular importance, and he wrote annotations on page 27 and on the final flyleaves directing himself to consult that page. The earlier note means that he must have returned to the first part of the book in order to complete his notes for future reference.

The copious annotations in his copy of the *Interpretatio* suggest that Harvey took Humphrey seriously, and there is additional evidence to corroborate this. One

note in the book shows that Harvey was not only interested in Humphrey's thoughts on translation but was in fact reading through the entirety of Humphrey's *oeuvre*. On page 250 of the *Interpretatio*, Harvey writes, 'see the third book of *De nobilitate* 317'.⁶⁴ The underlined text on the page corresponds to a passage in Humphrey's *Optimates, sive de nobilitate eiusque antiqua origine, natura, officiis, disciplina, et recta ac Christiana institutione Libri tres*, which was published in Basel in 1560. And in his copy of Livy, which he began annotating in 1568, Harvey also makes a reference to Humphrey's 1559 *De religionis conservatione et reformatione vera*.⁶⁵ All of this adds up to an image of Harvey reading and studying well over a thousand pages of densely argued Latin by his Oxford counterpart in or around 1570.

Harvey is interesting as a reader of the *Interpretatio* because he gives a sense of some of the passages that could catch an English reader's eye. The *Interpretatio* was written when Humphrey was intent upon returning to England, shortly after the accession of Elizabeth. Consequently, Humphrey pays special attention to English contexts at various points. Harvey was particularly drawn to passages in the treatise that deal with what he annotates as 'the illustration of the vernacular language'.⁶⁶ At the beginning of a passage in which Humphrey lists and comments on notable English translators, Harvey draws several large lines in the margin and writes, 'the maternal language of each must be cultivated by constant writing.'⁶⁷ Over the following thirteen pages, Harvey notes each of the English translators that Humphrey mentions by writing out their names in the margins, before drawing further lines on page 529 at the end of the section dealing with the English writers.⁶⁸ Later in his life, around 1598, Harvey would write out lists of English poets in his copy of Chaucer and bemoan the state of English poetry.⁶⁹ The annotations in the *Interpretatio* show him doing something similar in 1570.

When it comes to matters of translation theory specifically, Harvey shows himself to have been a very assiduous reader of Humphrey. He is aware that the *Interpretatio* is part of the controversy surrounding Périon. On page 252, as Humphrey begins his six page list of Périon's misrepresentations of Aristotle, Harvey writes in the margin, 'certain errors of Périon'.⁷⁰ At the end of the book, on one of the flyleaves, Harvey formulates what appears to be a reading list on translation to supplement the *Interpretatio*. The list includes three works:

Item J. Sturmii de amiss. dicendi rat. c. 17. l. 9.

[...]

Perionjii de opt. genere Interpretandi.

Lambin Observatione in Aristotelis Ethica, et Politica.

The first of these, Johann Sturm's *De amissa dicendi ratione*, is included because Harvey sensed a close connection between Sturm's arguments and those of Humphrey. He often notes points of agreement in the margins, for instance on pages 27 and 502. Sturm's translation of Aeschines and Demosthenes is also prominent in Harvey's annotations on the second of the back flyleaves. The latter two texts are Périon's *De optimo genere interpretandi* and Denis Lambin's commentaries on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, which contain, as mentioned above, the fierce attacks on Périon.

As to Humphrey's stance in this controversy, Harvey is clear about a couple of the key points. There are two passages in the text where Harvey has made strong underlines and drawn commonplace markers in the margins, indicating passages to be excerpted and written out in his commonplace book. The first of these comes on page

251, where Harvey has marked out Humphrey's rule about following and not emulating: 'It is the duty of a translator, according to my thought and reason, to equal an author, not to surpass, to follow, not to run ahead, and to study to be alike, not greater than.'⁷¹ I have already stressed the centrality of this principle in Humphrey's thought, as it is one of the bastions of his defense against the conflation of the roles of *interpres* and *orator*. On this theme, it is significant that Harvey notes the passage about emulation on page 536 of the *Interpretatio* as well. This was evidently a topic that he followed throughout his reading.

A further point of interest for Harvey was Humphrey's insistence on the differences between various writers and translators. On the topic of all people being different from one another, Harvey piles up references in the margins of page 10. This page, which Harvey titles 'the dissimilitude of men', is surrounded with quotations from Persius, Terence, Ovid, and Horace, all reinforcing Humphrey's point that people are different from one another. Thus Harvey's notes read:

Persius, in *Satire 5*: 'There are a thousand types of humankind, and their experience of life is variegated—they each have their own desires and no single prayer fits every life.' Terence, in *Phormio*: 'there are as many opinions as there are people; everyone has his own way of looking at things.' Ovid, in the first book of the *Ars Amatoria*: 'Hearts have as many fashions as the world has figures.' Horace, in the first satire of his second book: 'Castor finds joy in horses; his brother, born from the same egg, in boxing. For every thousand living souls, there are as many thousand tastes.'⁷²

Similar annotations on the diversity of people and nations appear later in his copy of the *Interpretatio* as well. Harvey writes a particularly eloquent annotation on the top of page 429, where he summarizes the problem with Périon: 'Périon makes a Cicero out of Aristotle, or rather from Cicero he makes an Aristotle.'⁷³ The annotation captures the curious way in which Périon has created an 'Aristotle' out of a web of Ciceronian texts. In light of the diversity of authors, however, Harvey is also aware of the ridiculousness of the enterprise and the need for each writer to follow both the nature of the original author and their own nature. On this topic, he marks out a second passage for commonplacing: 'For the child will be deformed if nature does not act as midwife'.⁷⁴ It is a brutal phrase to select, but it shows Harvey has picked up on the need for the personal *natura* to act with the translator in Humphrey's vision of the art.

Taken as a whole, Harvey's analysis of the *Interpretatio* provides us with evidence that a contemporary English reader could see in the treatise a contribution to the continental debate about Ciceronian translation. Harvey picks up on many points of Humphrey's dispute with Périon. He notes the importance for Humphrey of drawing boundaries between translation and imitation by considering the role of emulation. He grasps the importance of an apt accordance of personalities, and that if this is disregarded, then 'all labour will be in vain'.⁷⁵ Perhaps most importantly, Harvey's annotations also show that he considered Humphrey a major theorist of their age, standing alongside Johann Sturm and Denis Lambin. With the *Interpretatio*, an English scholar had made a major contribution to an erudite, international controversy. Harvey's learned notes display hints of his national pride and of his own aspiration to reach such a status himself.

Coda: Applying the *Interpretatio* and the Case of Spenser

These annotations are proof of Humphrey's readership amongst English scholars in the early 1570s. They show that the text did have its audience, even if only amongst the most learned and ambitious academics. But the *Interpretatio*'s value does not only rely upon us finding translators who can be proven to know its contents. Instead, the main value of the treatise is twofold. First, it provides a clear and sharp analysis of what precisely might separate a translator from an imitator. Second, it shows how Erasmus's ideas regarding the importance of individual personality in the art of imitation could be applied in the realm of translation as well. The vocabulary that the *Interpretatio* uses in the process of these discussions—on the ethical scandal of emulation in translation, on the importance of individual style, and on the need for aptitude between the author's and the translator's natures—are all eminently applicable concepts that can have a much wider currency.

For one example, we may take the case of Edmund Spenser. Given that Harvey made his annotations in 1570, it is tempting to conclude that Spenser must have known about the *Interpretatio*. It is indeed hard to imagine the two would never have talked about this treatise. Both Harvey and Spenser had longstanding interests in translation. Harvey had just spent considerable time and energy reading this book and making notes in Latin and Greek, which often refer to specific questions about translation that he was working on in other contexts. He also seems to have used translation extensively in his teaching, as is shown by the exercise he describes giving to his younger brother in the Harvey-Spenser *Letters*.⁷⁶ Furthermore, the controversy surrounding Périon seems to have remained in his thoughts well into the 1570s. In his Cambridge lecture *Ciceronianus* (printed 1577), Harvey includes a remorseful

account of the extreme Ciceronianism of his youth. He confesses that he had once been a Ciceronian ‘even more fastidious than that translator from Cormery [i.e. Périion]’.⁷⁷ In time, however, Harvey came to see the folly of an approach that ‘valued words more than content, language more than thought, the one art of speaking more than the thousand subjects of knowledge’.⁷⁸ Harvey does not mention Humphrey by name in this section, but his attack on Périion echoes statements in the *Interpretatio* and would certainly have recalled the treatise to his mind.

When Spenser arrived at Cambridge, the one mark he had already made in the literary community was as a translator. Richard Mulcaster had probably introduced Spenser to the art and created the opportunity for him to contribute translations to *A Theatre for Worldlings*. Mulcaster also likely drew Spenser’s attention to Du Bellay’s theory in *La Deffence et Illustration de la Langue Francoyse*.⁷⁹ This early exposure seems to have left Spenser with a lifelong fascination with the subject, and his youthful translations influenced his writing until the final years of his life. Critics such as Anne Coldiron and Stewart Mottram have shown how Spenser’s contributions to *A Theatre* would prove ‘pivotal in shaping the landscape of his later poetry’.⁸⁰ Coming to Pembroke with such an interest already established, Spenser would very likely have spoken with Harvey about the latest and most sophisticated theories.

Nevertheless, drawing a direct connection between Spenser and the *Interpretatio* must remain speculative, as he never refers to the text. What can be said with certainty is that Humphrey’s treatise offers us a broader theory within which to read some of Spenser’s individual reflections. It seems that Spenser would have agreed with Humphrey about a great deal. For instance, there is the clear separation of the roles of writer and translator. In a commendatory sonnet for William Jones’s 1595 translation, *Nennio, or A Treatise of Nobility*, Spenser writes: ‘But thanks to him that

it deserves behight: | To *Nenna* first, that first this worke created, | And next to *Jones*, that truly it translated.’⁸¹ Emphasizing Nennio’s primacy through the repetition of ‘first’, Spenser establishes a hierarchy that suggests the translator’s duty is to follow, not to overtake the original. This was one of the central lessons Harvey discovered in Humphrey, and corresponds to one of the two passages he selected for quotation. The adverb ‘truly’ carries the same importance that *fidus* has in Humphrey’s treatise.

In addition to this sense of a translator’s duty, Humphrey’s *Interpretatio* can give us a vocabulary to think about how Spenser establishes personal relationships with those he translates. This is most striking in the case of Du Bellay. At the end of the *Ruines of Rome*, Spenser attaches a farewell to Du Bellay, in which he honours the French poet:

Bellay, first garland of free Poësie
That *France* brought forth, though fruitfull of brave wits,
Well worthie thou of immortalitie,
That long hast travelld by thy learned writs,
Olde *Rome* out of her ashes to revive,
And give a second life to dead decayes:
Needes must he all eternitie survive,
That can to other give eternall dayes.⁸²

Anne Lake Prescott has written of Spenser’s close bond with the French poet, noting that ‘what he saw in Du Bellay was [...] central to his own sensibility; indeed it may have helped shape that sensibility.’⁸³ According to Prescott’s analysis, Spenser was attracted to Du Bellay due to their shared sense of mutability, their mutual anguish at

the movement of time, and their ambiguous hopes for renewal. Following Humphrey's vocabulary, one could say that the translations were enabled by the two poets having similar *naturae*. One can even use Humphrey's theory to substantiate reading 'Sonets', *The Visions of Bellay*, and *Ruines of Rome* as parts of Spenser's lifelong attempt at self-expression.

Furthermore, Spenser writes that Du Bellay's special skill was to 'give a second life to dead decays'. This undertaking reflects the challenge for any poet in an act of translation. The second phrase that Harvey selected from the *Interpretatio* to quote was the wisdom that 'the child will be deformed if nature does not act as midwife'. In Spenser's attempt to give new life to the poetry of Du Bellay, there would need to be an alignment of personal natures, or else that creative, reviving dream would be lost. Like the brothers in Book 4 of *The Faerie Queene* who share 'As if but one soule' (4.2.43) and whose lives may consequently be transferred to each other upon death, translators and authors who share a natural bond can effect a rebirth and extension of life. Humphrey's *Interpretatio* is able to offer us a sixteenth-century, humanist vocabulary to capture this particular phenomenon of translation. Whether Spenser knew the *Interpretatio* directly or not, it seems to me there is a rich potential for applying this vocabulary to Renaissance translations and for bringing together the history of translation and the history of the self.

¹ Glyn P. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and their Humanist Antecedents* (Geneva, 1984), 11.

² Neil Rhodes, Gordon Kendal, and Louise Wilson (eds.), *English Renaissance Translation Theory* (London, 2013).

³ Sheldon Brammall, *The English Aeneid: Translations of Virgil, 1555-1646* (Edinburgh, 2015).

⁴ Martin Korenjak, *Die Geschichte der neulateinischen Literatur: Vom Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich, 2016), 144. ‘Einen Gipfelpunkt erreichte diese neue Genre in der über 600 Seiten starken *Interpretatio linguarum* («Übersetzung», 1559) des englischen Theologen Lawrence Humphrey, einem *opus magnum*, das schon aufgrund seiner klar und eloquent formulierten Einsicht in die fundamentale kulturgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Übersetzens bemerkenswert ist.’

⁵ ‘The literature on the theory, practice, and history of translation is large. They can be divided into four periods, though the lines of division are in no sense absolute. The first period would extend from Cicero’s famous precept not to translate *verbum pro verbo*, in his *Libellus de optimo genere oratorum* of 46 B.C. and Horace’s reiteration of this formula in the *Ars poetica* some twenty years later, to Hölderlin’s enigmatic commentary on his own translations from Sophocles (1804). This is the long period in which seminal analyses and pronouncements stem directly from the enterprise of the translator.’ George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, 3rd edn (Oxford, 1998), 248. ‘What disturbs most is the tendency of several scholars to use [in discussions of this age] the word ‘theory’ in the plural. One is thus led to believe that

translators followed not a generally accepted code but rather their own opinions or ‘theories’.’ Frederick Renner, *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler* (Amsterdam, 1989), 3.

⁶ Steiner, *After Babel*, 277.

⁷ Renner, *Interpretatio*, 3 and *passim*.

⁸ Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge, 1991); Siobhán McElduff, *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source* (London, 2013); Lawrence Venuti, ‘Genealogies of Translation Theory: Jerome’, *boundary 2*, 37, (2010), 5-28.

⁹ Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford, 1979); Marc Fumaroli, *L’Age de l’eloquence: Rhétorique et «res literaria» de la Renaissance au seuil de l’époque classique* (Geneva, 1980), 35-135; Thomas Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven, CT, 1982), 171-96; Martin McLaughlin, *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Literary Imitation in Italy from Dante to Bembo* (Oxford, 1996).

¹⁰ Laurence Humphrey, *Interpretatio linguarum* (Basel, 1559), 211.

¹¹ John O’Brien, *Anacreon Redivivus: A Study of Anacreontic Translation in Mid-Sixteenth-Century France* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1995), 54-60; Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1983), 74-5.

¹² For discussions, see David Hopkins, ‘If He Were Living and an Englishman: Translation Theory in the Age of Dryden’, in *Conversing with Antiquity: English Poets and the Classics, from Shakespeare to Pope* (Oxford, 2010), 113-29; James Anderson Winn, *John Dryden and His World* (New Haven, CT, 1987), 396-7.

¹³ Brammall, *English Aeneid*, 9-10.

¹⁴ Hadfield speculates that Spenser served as Harvey's sizar from November 1570.

See Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser: A Life* (Oxford, 2012), 56.

¹⁵ Paul Botley, *Latin Translation in the Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzi Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus* (Cambridge, 2004), 5-82.

¹⁶ See Cicero, *De inventione, De optimo genere oratorum, Topica*, ed. and tr. H. M. Hubbell (Cambridge, 1949), 364-5. 'Converti enim ex Atticis duorum eloquentissimorum nobilissimas orationes inter seque contrarias, Aeschinis et Demosthenis; nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sentiis isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi. Non enim ea me adnumerare lectori putavi oportere, sed tamquam appendere.'

¹⁷ Copeland, *Rhetoric*, 9-35 (on Cicero specifically, see 33-5); Siobhán McElduff, 'Living at the Level of the Word: Cicero's Rejection of the Interpreter as Translator', *Translation Studies*, 2 (2009), 133-46 (138-42); McElduff, *Roman Theories*, 110-16.

¹⁸ McElduff, *Roman Theories*, 110 and 116 respectively.

¹⁹ Joachim Périon, *De optimo genere interpretandi* (Basel, 1542), sig. b1^r. 'Nunc quoniam interpretatio, oratio est: oratio aute[m] illustris esse debet, copiosa[ue] et sple[n]dida, efficiendum nobis est, ut his suis luminibus ne careat, aut spoliatur potius interpretatio.' Périon's text was originally printed in Paris, 1540, but I quote from the much more elegantly printed 1542 Basel edition, which Humphrey is more likely to have seen.

²⁰ The terms 'domesticating' and 'foreignizing' were introduced by Friedrich Schleiermacher and brought to contemporary prominence by Lawrence Venuti. See

Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd edn (London, 2008), 15-16.

²¹ Périon, *De optimo genere*, sig. b2^r. 'Nunc enim ex his paucis quae commemoravi, satis est intelligi, id quod nobis propositum fuit, si diserte quid e graeco interpretari velimus, haec duo tenenda esse necessario: unum, ut verbum ex verbo exprimendum non putemus: alterum, ut graeca cum latinis maxime Ciceronis eiusdem generis fere coniungamus.'

²² McElduff, *Roman Theories*, 10 and *passim*. McElduff argues that fidelity first comes to play an important role in Gellius (182-3).

²³ Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 71-88.

²⁴ See Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 79 and 80-3, and O'Brien, *Anacreon Redivivus*, 6-9.

²⁵ Périon, *De optimo genere*, 1. '“Omnis Ars, omnis doctrina, omnis actio, omne studium et institutum ad bonu[m] aliquod refertur. Πᾶσα τέκνη καὶ πᾶσα μέθοδος, ὁμοίως δὲ πρᾶξις τε καὶ προαίρεσις, ἀγαθοῦ τινὸς ἐφίεσθαι δοκεῖ.”) Hunc mihi videtur locum vel convertisse Cicero, vel certe adumbrasse, paucis verbis mutatis. Scribit enim lib. 5 de Finibus bonorum et malorum his fere verbis: Itaq[ue] omnis honos, omnis admiratio, omne studium ad virtutem et ad eas actiones quae virtuti sunt consentaneae refertur, etc. Qui sane locus me admonuit, primum ut τὸ ἐφίεσθαι coverterem, referter, et ipsum δοκεῖ omnino tollerem.' For *De finibus* 5.60 and its translation, see Cicero, *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, ed. and tr. H. Rackham (Cambridge, MA, 1931), 462-3. For *Nicomachean Ethics* 1.1, see Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, ed. and tr. H. Rackham, rev. edn (Cambridge, MA, 1934), 2-3.

²⁶ Roger Ascham, *The Schoolmaster (1570)*, ed. by Lawrence V. Ryan (Ithaca, NY, 1967), 130.

-
- ²⁷ Gabriel Harvey, *Ciceronianus*, ed. Harold S. Wilson, tr. Clarence A. Forbes (Lincoln, NE, 1945), 64-5 and 66-7 respectively for the Latin and English of these quotations. The original Latin reads ‘Perionio ipso in verborum delectu cautiorem’ and ‘delicatulium illum interpretem’.
- ²⁸ Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 74-5; O’Brien, *Anacreon Redivivus*, 54-60.
- ²⁹ Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 75.
- ³⁰ For a discussion of Lambin’s attacks, see: Jill Kraye, ‘Italy, France and the Classical Tradition: The Origins of the Philological Commentary on Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*’, in Carlo Caruso and Andrew Laird (eds.), *Italy and the Classical Tradition: Language, Thought and Poetry 1300-1600* (London, 2009), 118-40.
- ³¹ On Humphrey’s exile, see Janet Kemp, ‘Laurence Humphrey, Elizabethan Puritan: His Life and Political Theories’ (unpublished PhD thesis, West Virginia University, 1978), 10-15.
- ³² Kemp, ‘Laurence Humphrey’, 11.
- ³³ Brammall, *English Aeneid*, 9-10.
- ³⁴ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 4-5. ‘quos [Hieronymum et Ciceronem] nostra memoria vir doctus et disertus Ioachimus Perionius, in Aristoteleis Moralibus convertendis, est sequutus.’
- ³⁵ Cicero, *De finibus*, 230. For a discussion of this phrase, see McElduff, *Roman Theories of Translation*, 115-16.
- ³⁶ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 233-4. ‘Quem enim imitabimur nisi optimum? Optimum quem alium dicemus praeter Ciceronem? fontem eloquentiae, et patrem Romanae elegantiae.’

³⁷ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 245-6. 'sic ait, ut ab Hieronymo quoq[ue] citatur.

[']Co[n]verti ex Atticis duoru[m] eloquentissimoru[m] nobilissimas orationes inter se co[n]trarias, Æschynis Demosthenisq[ue]: nec converti ut Interpres, sed ut Orator. &c.['] Quibus ex rebus perspicuu[m] est nomen Interpretis refugisse et repudiasse Ciceronem, nec esse quicquam editum hac luce, hoc quidem tempore, ad cuius imitationem Interpretes se componere aut conformare per omnia poterunt.'

³⁸ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 243-4. 'Ille enim nullam speciem Interpretationis integram & perfecta[m] ad imitatione[m] reliquit, aut si reliquerit, non extat hodie.'

³⁹ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 246-7. 'Quocirca inepte Ciceronem imitarentur, qui Graecos interpretaturi, vage et libere expatiarentur, et a mente auctoris recederent, seq[ue] Ciceronis exemplo tuerentur, qui nunquam fere hoc sibi sumpsit, ut sigillatim unamquamque sententiam ordine; sicut illi profitentur et deberent, explicaret.'

⁴⁰ Cf. McElduff, *Roman Theories*, 10. 'As a result, in Rome there was rarely anything we would call faithful translation. The overriding concern of Roman translation was not fidelity or free translation, but control.'

⁴¹ Brammall, *English Aeneid*, 13-15.

⁴² Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 252. 'Pulchre aemulatus est, sed non hoc voluit transferre.'

⁴³ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 293. 'Hu[n]c [Ciceronem] enim intus quod aiunt et incute no[n] cognoveris, nisi Gr[a]ecos auctores, unde ille et locupletior factus est et Latinior, et legas, et locos unde ille sumpsit, collectos animaduersosq[ue] habeas.'

⁴⁴ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 22. See Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, 72-4.

⁴⁵ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 51-5.

⁴⁶ As with 'domestication', see the discussion in Venuti, *Translator's Invisibility*, 15-16.

⁴⁷ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 343. ‘sic nobis legem novam dedit no[n] phrasi nova sed lingua alia: ita tamen alia ut Graeca oratio non suam semper, sed Hebraicam saepius proprietatem resipiat.’

⁴⁸ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 355. ‘Phrases tenendae, et Hebraicae linguae proprietas imitanda, ut etiam Christus suo hic exe[m]plo docuit in hoc Testamento, quod totum phrasibus Testamenti veteris refer[tur].’

⁴⁹ Although the purity and propriety of the target language are important criteria elsewhere in the *Interpretatio*, the revolutionary potential in these statements remains, even if it is not always consistently applied in the treatise.

⁵⁰ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 8 (where he calls Erasmus ‘felicissimus’); for his praise of Erasmus’s unique natural capacity, see 119-22; on Erasmus as an example of diligence, see 189-90.

⁵¹ Erasmus, *Literary and Educational Writings 6: Ciceronianus*, ed. A.H.T. Levi, tr. Betty I. Knott, *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 28 (Toronto, 1986), 390.

⁵² Erasmus, *Literary*, 396-7.

⁵³ Cicero, *On Duties*, tr. Walter Miller (Cambridge, MA, 1913), 116 (1.114). ‘Suum quisque igitur noscat ingenium acremque se et bonorum et vitiorum suorum iudicem praebeat, ne scaenici plus quam nos videantur habere prudentiae.’

⁵⁴ Cave, *Cornucopian Text*, 42.

⁵⁵ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 82. ‘Deinde personarum ratio ducenda est, et in scriptoribus magna est dissimilitudo.’

⁵⁶ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 84. ‘nonne interpretis officium esse existimabimus, hanc diversitatem tenere, ut quocumque se vertat, apte appositeque fingat quem suscepit interpretandum.’

-
- ⁵⁷ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 87. ‘Et Ioach. Perionium pulcherrima[m] operam in Aristotele converte[n]do navasse semper existimavi.’
- ⁵⁸ See esp. *Interpretatio*, 87-8 and 252-7.
- ⁵⁹ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 124. ‘ut histriones faciunt, qui fabulas agu[n]t non optimas sed aptissimas, sic illi libros sibi ad interpretandum deligant accommodatissimos.’
- ⁶⁰ Humphrey, *Interpretatio*, 117. ‘nec eundem uni homini, sed ut orti sunt, dissimiles habent singuli naturas, ut non omnia possint omnes, sed quaedam quisque, prout est a iusto dispensatore et administratore bonorum Deo vocatus. Ad ha[n]c interpretationem vero nemo se recipiat, nisi muneribus naturae ad id instructus.’
- ⁶¹ See, for instance, Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago, IL, 1983).
- ⁶² Earl of Roscommon, *An Essay on Translated Verse* (London, 1684), 7.
- ⁶³ Virginia Stern, *Gabriel Harvey: A Study of His Life, Marginalia, and Library* (Oxford, 1979), 222-3.
- ⁶⁴ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74, 250. ‘vide 3 l. de. nob. 317’.
- ⁶⁵ Princeton, Princeton University Library, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, PA6452.A2 1555q, p. 34. Accessed online, 18 May 2017: <http://archaeologyofreading.org>
- ⁶⁶ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74, 515. ‘Vrunacula[e] lingua[e] illustratio’.
- ⁶⁷ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74, 515. ‘Estq[ue] et sua cuiusq[ue] lingua materna assidua scriptione excolenda.’
- ⁶⁸ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74. The full list includes: 517, ‘Comes Surrejus’; 518, ‘Th. Uialtus’; 519, ‘Chaucerus’, and ‘Uialti, et Houardi Elogia’ with

‘Equitis’ written below Wyatt and ‘Comitis’ written below Howard; 520, ‘Edm. Shefildus’, ‘Th. Challonerus’, ‘Ric. Candisshius’, ‘Taplaeus’, ‘Jo. Eden’; 512, ‘Dux Somersete[n]sis Seimorus’; 522, ‘Th. Eliota’, ‘Marci Aurelij Interpres’, ‘bibliorum interpretes’; p. 523, ‘Edouardus Sextus’, ‘Cat. Parra Regina’, ‘J. Caius.’, ‘N. Vdallus’; 524, Th. Uilsonus’; 525, ‘P. Moruingus’; 527, J. Harlaeus’, ‘Th. Cooperus’.

⁶⁹ See Stern, *Gabriel Harvey*, 125-6.

⁷⁰ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74, 252. ‘errata qua[e]dam Peronij’.

⁷¹ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74, 251. ‘Est autem interpretis officium, mea quidem sententia et ratione, autorem aequare, non superare, assequi non praecurrere, et ut similis esse studeat non superior.’

⁷² Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74, 10. ‘Persius Saty. 5 Mille hominu[m] species et reru[m] discolor vsus. | velle suu[m] cuiq[ue] est, nec uoto viuatur vno. Terent[ius] in Phormio. Quot homines, tot sententia[e]: suus cuiq[ue] mos. Ovid. L. 1. de arte A[matoria] pectoribus mores tot sunt, quot in orbe figura[e]. Hor[atius]. L. 2. Satyr. 1. Castor gaudet equis, ouo prognatus eode[m] pugnis: quot vivu[n]t capitu[m], totidem studioru[m] Millja.’ For Persius, *Satire* 5.52-3, see Juvenal and Persius, *Satires*, ed. and tr. Susanna Morton Braund (Cambridge, MA, 2004), 100-1; for Terence, *Phormio* 445, see Terence, *Phormio, The Mother-in-Law, The Brothers*, ed. and tr. John Barsby (Cambridge, MA, 2001), 60-3; for Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.759, see, Ovid, *The Art of Love and Other Poems*, tr. J. H. Mozley, rev. G. P. Goold, 2nd edn. (Cambridge, MA, 1979), 64-5; for Horace, 2 *Satires* 1.26-8, see Horace, *Satires, Epistles, The Art of Poetry*, tr. H. Rushton Fairclough (Cambridge, MA, 1926), 128-9.

⁷³ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74, 429. ‘Perionius ex Aristotele facit Ciceronem, uel potius ex Cicerone Aristotelem.’

⁷⁴ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74, 123. ‘Deformis enim foetus erit non obstetricante natura.’

⁷⁵ Cambridge, Trinity College Library, III.18.74, 123: ‘repugnante natura, irritus fere omnis labor.’

⁷⁶ ‘In the morning I gave him this Theame out of *Ovid*, to translate, and varie after his best fashion.’ Gabriel Harvey and Edmund Spenser, *Three Proper and Wittie, Familiar Letters* (London, 1580), sig. E3^r.

⁷⁷ Harvey, *Ciceronianus*, 66-7. ‘In caeteris, haud scio an magis etiam fuerim, quam Cormaeriacenus ille Interpres, delicatus.’

⁷⁸ Harvey, *Ciceronianus*, 68-9. ‘Pluris verba, quam res; linguam quam mentem; vnam dicendi artem, quam mille intelligendi doctrinas faciebam.’

⁷⁹ See especially Richard Mulcaster, *The First Part of the Elementarie* (London, 1582), fol. 254^r. On Mulcaster and Du Bellay, see Anne Lake Prescott, *French Poets and the English Renaissance: Studies in Fame and Transformation* (New Haven, CT, 1978), 65-6.

⁸⁰ Stewart Mottram, ‘Spenser’s Dutch Uncles: The Family of Love and the Four Translations of *A Theatre for Worldlings*’, in *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe*, ed. José María Pérez Fernández and Edward Wilson-Lee (Cambridge, 2014), 165; Anne Coldiron, ‘How Spenser Excavates Du Bellay’s *Antiquitez*, or, The Role of the Poet, Lyric Historiography, and the English Sonnet’, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 101 (2002), 41-67.

⁸¹ Spenser, *Shorter Poems*, 774.

⁸² Spenser, *Shorter Poems*, 404-5.

⁸³ Prescott, *French Poets*, 43.