Introduction

José María Pérez Fernández and Edward Wilson-Lee

The national vernacular traditions that grew to self-consciousness during the first century and a half of print were to a considerable extent founded on translations from languages foreign to each of them: classical Greek and Latin. If this fostered the competitive development of translation methods and textual resources, it also created a link between them. Although for decades Latin would continue to be the international common language of diplomacy, scholarship, and science, Europe wavered between this common inheritance and the fragmentation partly brought about both by the new mosaic of enterprising vernaculars and by political and religious division. In a second phase of translation, new works produced within each of these vernacular canons were rendered into the other languages. In weaving together the loose threads that had resulted from these new national and linguistic traditions, translators played a crucial role in defining the early modern European canon and, by extension, its cultural and political ideologies.

The purpose of this book is to approach the material infrastructure upon which this European mosaic – variegated, fragmentary, polyglot – took its early shape through a series of case studies that address specific parts of its infrastructure (such as trade, censorship, and typography) and that reach across national, linguistic, and market boundaries. Our concerns include how the material interests of printers and their pursuit of economic profit interacted with phenomena such as immigration and exile (for economic, political, and religious reasons) and with projects of nation writing; how the book trade produced material texts with physical features that responded to certain values and requirements and addressed communities of readers who were also understood as consumers; and how translators worked hand in hand with authors, patrons, entrepreneurs, printers, and publishers in the creation of a European network of economic, material, and linguistic exchanges that stitched the continent together. In this regard, the concerns

of this book fall in the realm of what Pierre Bourdieu has defined as "the economy of linguistic exchanges."[1]

The figure of "exchange" is a particularly useful one for holding this complex phenomena in mind, not only because it captures the physical, economic, and linguistic transactions that are mingled in the act of translation, but also because it draws attention to the cultural force of acts as well as of things. Vital to the understanding of early modern transnational culture, we contend, is the recognition that it was not only the *possession* of foreign-language objects that was significant to these societies but also the constantly repeated and richly significant gestures of encountering these objects through translation, annotation, framing, typesetting, selling, censoring, and banning. Examining those areas in which book production, translation, and literature come together is part of a more general analysis of what Peter Burke calls the "balance of trade" between the different languages that were current in Europe during this period.[2] But while the balance sheet creates a fiction of sequential and static moments, our approach focuses on fluidity, on the myriad transitional moments at which these exchanges take place.

Traditional Renaissance translation studies have focused on translations of a single work or a single author. In the history of the book, scholarship tends naturally to focus on single national traditions, cities, workshops, or printers. Our volume focuses on *the relationship among* cities, workshops, and national and generic conventions. Each chapter uses one or more of these elements as a central and organizing constant, for the sake of comprehensibility, but all of the studies shed some new light of the radically integrated European market for books and texts. Understanding the readers at whom these printing ventures were targeted is also crucial to this exercise, and this project is sensitive to the great variety of social, material, and linguistic contexts that frame the literacies of these readers. Some early modern books were produced for specialized readerships, and some of those that were produced in large numbers resulted from patronage or monopolies, or from the demand of captive markets – such as those for officially sanctioned devotionals and prayer books, textbooks for university students, or legal compilations for the use of lawyers and courts. Other sectors, notably those that might be described as dealing with recreational literature, and in particular popular prose fiction, required the development of production models that were to a considerable extent determined by the taste of the market.[3]

For this collection we have sought out interdisciplinary perspectives that combine the fields of cultural history, the history of the book, and

translation studies with comparative literature. In doing so, we respond to recent calls for dialogue between translation studies and cultural history, and the study was written with a mind to investigating cultural as well as linguistic translation.[4] This book does not aim to be exhaustive or definitive but rather to provide models for further research using the vast cache of data provided by a number of ambitious projects currently integrating information on European markets for books and translations. So while the first chapter looks at attempts to capitalize on the success of Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff* across several book markets, the second chapter examines the relationship between bestselling sentimental romances in the late fifteenth century and the stylistic philosophy that humanists developed to direct their composition and translation. The third shows the close link among translation practice, printed language manuals, national identity, and the transnational movement of diplomats and exiles. The next three chapters examine border-crossing translations of canonical works (classical and modern epic in Chapter 4, Dante's *Monarchia* in Chapter 5, Boccaccio in Chapter 6), while each making analytical moves of their own: Chapter 4 discusses the development of "publishing genres" for epic and their effect on the reception of these texts in Spain, Chapter 5 considers the appropriation of Dante's authority in mid-century imperial politics, and Chapter 6 provides a history of the differential development of one author's reputation as he is read in distinct (if overlapping) book markets. The seventh and eighth chapters re-read works by Guarini, Sidney, Du Bellay, Van der Noot, and Spenser in light of the book-trade migrants who linked these authors, exposing intellectual and religious currents that flowed through printing houses. Chapter 9 details the censorship policies that defined the landscape of the European book market and discusses some of the strategies employed by translators to adapt to or circumvent these conditions. The final chapter deals with the passage of the phenomenally popular Spanish romances into other European vernaculars.

The gap that lies between the history of the book and translation studies was identified years ago by Peter Burke in his pioneering work on the European reception of *The Courtier*.[5] Our volume combines two of the subsections of the cultural history of the book listed by Burke, to wit, "editions, their geography and chronology and the modifications made to the original text by editors and publishers" and "translations, adaptations and imitations of the original text" (Burke 1995: 6). To Burke's suggested categories, we would like to add an analysis of the material and economic considerations that may have motivated the translation and publication of these books.

These economic considerations come into sharp focus in the bust that followed the boom of workshops all over Europe immediately after the invention of print.[6] During the developmental phase that followed this, only the most professional printers in the strategically best located centers managed to survive. The case of the first English printer is very revealing. Supplying a relatively small vernacular market, and with virtually no export trade, Caxton was forced to use diverse production models and play a variety of roles – translator, printer, importer, bookseller.[7] Although it became less frequent to combine the roles of scholar, translator, printer, and entrepreneur as the market expanded and labor division intensified, there are still figures whose careers usefully capture the continuing interdependence of these fields. The Spaniard Francisco de Enzinas (*ca.* 1518–52) is a case in point. The scion of a prosperous merchant family from Burgos, Enzinas left Castile in 1539 to complete his education in the *Collegium Trilingue* of Louvain, moving to Wittenburg two years later. Here he was taken under the wing of Melanchthon and penned his first translation, the *Breve y compendiosa institución de la religión cristiana* (Antwerp, Matthias Crom, 1541), which included his rendering of Luther's *Tractatus de libertate Christiana* (1524) and Calvin's *Catechismus* (1538). During his time in Wittenburg, he also translated the New Testament into Spanish (Antwerp, 1543) from Erasmus's edition of the original Greek text. In the Netherlands, Enzinas unwisely presented his Spanish Gospels to Charles V, earning him the hatred of the Emperor's Dominican confessor Pedro de Soto and making him – after a short spell in prison – a fugitive for the rest of his life. This did not, however, wholly impair his productivity. In Basel (1546–48) he learned the print trade under the humanist publisher Johannes Oporinus and became associated with a network of scholars that included Conrad Gesner, the Hebraist Konrad Pellican, the lexicographer Johannes Fries, Bibliander, Bullinger, and Calvin himself.[8] Enzinas also established contacts in Oxford, such as the Dutch bookseller Garbrand Harkes, and moved to Cambridge (1548–49) as Reader in Greek at the invitation of Cranmer. Around 1550 Enzinas established his own printing shop in Strasbourg, where he produced a Latin-Spanish dictionary, important translations of classical authors into which (as in his Plutarch and Lucian) he inserted copious amplifications on contemporary concerns, and the important early botanical compendium eventually published as the *Historia de plantas y hierbas*. He also continued to print his Spanish Gospels and to work toward his lifelong (and frustrated) endeavor to translate the whole Bible into Spanish. While Enzinas brings these roles into striking contiguity by pursuing them all himself, this collection demonstrates that these

practices were always incorporated, if not incarnated as they were in Enzinas. This introduction will sketch out the lineaments of the early modern book trade and of its theories of translation in order to draw attention to these intersections.

The Development of the European Book Trade

Sophisticated networks of textual exchange existed before the invention of moveable type in the mid-fifteenth century.[9] Major ecclesiastical centers provided both the required skills and a significant proportion of the market, and the overwhelming majority of *scriptoria* productions served liturgical and educational needs. The centrality of Latin allowed for a manuscript market that was radically transnational, although the flexibility of the copying system also allowed local textual cultures to develop through individual acts of patronage. Though manuscript production by no means disappeared with the coming of print, scribal publication increasingly existed in contradistinction from print and its networks of production and distribution: the manuscript was precisely that which was not printed, and its consumers were selective either by choice (as with the compilers of poetic miscellanies and early traders in newsletters) or by necessity (in the case of outlawed religious and political ideologies). There was a wide grey area between elective privacy and enforced secrecy. The rise of epistolary forms in printed works testifies to the social perception of letters as personal and private, despite continuing cultures of scribal publication, in contradistinction to the publicness of print. Furthermore, if print imitated in its infancy the production models and appearance of manuscript, reversals of this relationship were also soon apparent. The appearance of handwritten facsimile title pages in literary manuscripts in the mid-sixteenth century is a striking example of this.[10]

The speculative excitement, both intellectual and financial, that greeted the arrival of print created a rapid expansion of the market to saturation and beyond, followed by a period of retrenchment in which only those workshops that had found the correct balance between the ambitions that created supply and the demand that made it sustainable managed to survive. The boom that had seen presses established in 200 towns by the end of the fifteenth century gave way to fewer, more intensive printing ventures in major civic centers, contributing to the "civilization" of early modern culture.[11] The new investment models that allowed these businesses to survive had several major consequences for the textual culture of early modern Europe. Most major printing centers were underpinned by an

export trade that continued to use the international currency of Latin but were increasingly reliant on the network of trade routes and fairs to see returns on major printing ventures.[12] The high element of risk involved often meant that many larger projects relied either on captive markets (religious and educational institutions) or patronage. In the majority of workshops, these ambitious ventures were undertaken alongside the production of copious and wildly varied ephemera. These projects – which included proclamations, forms, controversial pamphlets, prognostications, ballads, and recreational literature – required a significantly lower investment though the return was still often guaranteed, either by the sensational nature of the text or by the fact that the print run was produced for a single buyer (or, in some cases, both).[13] These productions also made printers increasingly sensitive to the demands of non-institutional and local readerships, and guaranteed international demand was not always required to recoup investment. Alongside the institutional and authoritative texts that sustained the first printers, a market for novelty slowly evolved, a market that developed its own forms and ideas of authorship and to which we owe many of the works that would later form a European canon. Printers such as Antoine Vérard in Paris, Juan Cromberger in Seville, Gabriele Giolito de' Ferrari in Venice, and William Copland in London invested increasing proportions of their capital in projects designed to capture this market for imaginative literature in the vernacular. Although great prestige came with the rights to print major canonical works, there is evidence that, by the late sixteenth century, most printers could not have survived without ephemeral print.[14] The earliest writers who achieved success in the print market (Savonarola, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin) straddled the divide between the institutional and the novel, but authors survived at increasing removes from the authoritative as the period developed (Rabelais, Guarini, Shakespeare). Concentrating on these texts runs the risk of exaggerating their importance in their own time, but an interest in them need not be delusively teleological: instead, we must locate the genesis of now-central elements in the complex interaction of the social and material contexts of their conception.

The translation of texts into the vernacular provided an attractive hybrid of the authoritative and the novel: texts whose importance was established by longevity or ubiquity held renewed interest in translation. Given the importance of these translations to how national vernacular traditions developed (and their contribution in turn to the flow of texts), the way in which texts in European vernaculars circulated, as materials for private reading and for translation, has received little academic attention and remains largely undocumented. Scholarly concentration on national print

markets has distracted from the enormous investment made by booksellers in books produced abroad. A number of projects now under way – including the *Renaissance Cultural Crossroads* database of translations into English being compiled at the University of Warwick, the *Universal Short Title Catalogue* project at the University of St. Andrews, the *Iberian Books* project at University College, Dublin and the *Early European Books* resource being developed by Proquest – will begin to redress this balance by providing fuller statistics and allowing scholars to study textual migration and translation in previously unthinkable ways. The sketch that can be drawn using currently available evidence, however, confirms the radically integrated and interdependent nature of the European book trade in the early modern period. James Raven points out that, although "we are handicapped in all sorts of ways if we try to estimate specific quantities of book production and rates of productivity," we nevertheless "know that the importation of books fundamentally sustained the English book trade between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries."[15] A substantial proportion of books in Spanish, for the Iberian and New World markets, were produced in the Netherlands and in other cities such as Venice, Lyon, and Toulouse.[16] Scandinavian markets remained dependent on Dutch and German printers for much of the sixteenth century. Geneva, Basel, and Strasbourg exploited their political independence to produce controversial works for all of the major European book markets. Printers often found lucrative markets for books in foreign vernaculars that were banned in their home markets, as John Wolfe did in London from the 1570s to the 1590s. If major print centers were necessarily international because of their reliance on the trade in scholarly Latin texts, smaller print markets were linked by the demand for foreign novelties and the openings in foreign vernacular markets caused by legal or technological obstacles.

The circulation of texts in European vernaculars was also linked to economically and ideologically enforced migration patterns, and to diplomatic networks and transnational affinities, in ways that are only beginning to be uncovered.[17] Knowledge of these will affect not only our understanding of trade patterns and currents of intellectual exchange but will also give nuance to our sense of early modern national, linguistic, and religious identities. In the early part of the period covered by this study, the migration was most often driven by economic opportunism, which caused a diaspora of skilled printers from the first German centers to Paris, Antwerp, and Northern Italy, and from there outwards to Spain, England, the Italian Peninsula, and (eventually) northern and eastern Europe. Important technological colonies were established by Parix and Cromberger in Spain, the

returned Caxton and his protégé de Worde in England, von Hoochstraten in Denmark, and Honter in Hungary.[18] These skilled communities often maintained strong links to their places of origin, as the constant protests of native artisans against the dominance of Dutch and German print laborers throughout the century attest. As the religious tensions of the Reformation increased, however, ideological exile also became a central motive for the migration of printers. French Protestant printers moved to Geneva like Robert Estienne or to London like Stephen Mierdman; Mierdman then fled, with English printers such as Edward Whitchurch, from the Catholic regime of Philip and Mary; and a second wave of Protestants – including Matthias Crom, François Guyot, and John Wolfe – traveled to England after the stronger sanctions that followed the Council of Trent. As Stewart Mottram's chapter in this collection shows, these communities were not only importers of languages and texts and confessional identities: their own character was modified by the conditions of exile, often to be later reintegrated into the culture from which they had once fled.

Though these examples help to illustrate some of the discrete motives for the migration of printers and translators, most migrants were motivated by a combination of factors: a search for intellectual and ideological affinity, the desire to find market openings for their skills, the circumvention of social or economic obstacles in their home markets. An immensely useful example of this – how the interplay of these different factors in the same place often made it difficult to distinguish between them – can be seen in the history of Basel's print trade. The circle of scholars and printers that gathered there around Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini in the 1460s established this free city as an important center of humanism and allowed the movement to exploit Basel's strategic location for trade and travel between Northern Europe and Italy. As one of the first university towns that had a press, it quickly established itself as a key location for humanist textual production. Important works included Petrarch's *Opera omnia*, the works of Juan Luis Vives (fifty-six editions of works by Vives were printed in Basel by 1565), and, perhaps most significantly, the works of Erasmus. According to Pettegree, "Basel accounted for 373 of the 1617 editions of Erasmus's works published during his lifetime, and 569 of the 2576 editions published during the whole century."[19] Basel's political independence made the city a magnet for those considered dissidents in their native countries from the 1540s onwards, and the dynamism of the Basel printing trade was helped by the fact that it was, to a considerable extent, self-regulated. Testimony of the centrality of the city to controversial printing comes from the fact that in the Roman Index of forbidden books – which banned single works and also

the whole production (past and future) of certain printers – there are at least fifteen printers from Basel whose production is subject to a blanket ban. Yet although Basel was immensely important as a location free from many kinds of print censorship, it still retained its character for humanist excellence in the minds of many: when the Italian translator of Aristotle Ludovico Castelvetro was accused of Protestant sympathies after having spent time in the city, he complained (believably or not) that links to Basel were of a scholarly rather than ideological nature. His migration, which may have begun with uncontroversial intellectual ambitions, was transformed by the reputation of Basel into ideological exile.

Transnational connections were not, however, confined to market integration and physical migration. Increasingly complex and permanent diplomatic networks and more frequent international correspondence also made important contributions to the trade in texts. Although book fairs and market research did make printers aware of what was available in other markets and vernaculars, the unarticulated scholarly assumption that texts were chosen for translation from the full range of European texts is largely unfounded. The evidence suggests, rather, that in many cases texts migrated between markets and nations through the agency of diplomats and correspondents not directly related to the book trade. Although the extent of this influence has yet to be documented, anecdotal evidence suggests that a model of a textual "free market" must be revised in favor of a model in which a relatively small number of individuals acted as the main channels of textual exchange, a role that was likely to allow them to exercise a disproportionate and ideological influence upon the pool of translatable texts in their home markets.

Translation and the Linguistic Thought of Humanism

It is often taken for granted that philological humanism and translation go hand in hand, and – save for the translation of Scripture – perhaps not enough attention has been paid to the underlying postulates that relate humanist views on language with contemporary translation theory, and with the practice of translation itself. Translation and philology inform the linguistic epistemology of humanism, and they are both related in unexplored ways with the European network of printers and book merchants.

The first phase in the history of Renaissance translation is to a large extent the history of translations from classical Greek into Latin, and from these two languages into the different vernaculars. It is also the history of translations from Italian, a language that had already accumulated enough

cultural capital to turn it into a model for others. Some of the methods and strategies that Italians had used to render Latin and Greek texts into their own language became, in turn, a model for the translation of these works from the classical canon into other vernaculars.[20] Italian *quattrocento* humanists were also among the first to produce treatises on the theory and practice of translation. As he translated Aristotle and Xenophon into Latin, Leonardo Bruni also penned *De interpretatione recta* (*ca.* 1426), one of the first important texts on translation theory in the early modern period. The heart of Bruni's enterprise as a translator appears in full display within his controversy with Alonso de Cartagena, a fellow translator who had rendered Seneca and Cicero into Castilian but disagreed with Bruni on his method for translating Aristotle. Whereas Bruni conceived of Aristotle as a philosopher-rhetorician, and hence translated him into Ciceronian Latin, Cartagena adhered to the medieval translations, which Bruni disparaged, and defended the use of technical vocabulary in the translation of philosophical texts – even if this made them fall short of the stylistic standards of his opponent.[21] Bruni championed the absolute necessity of mastering both languages, which entailed as a precondition the familiarity of the translator with the great authors in both canons. A good translator, he proclaimed, must internalize whatever informs the style of his original and, after apprehending its universe of discourse, re-create it in the target language. Besides displaying purely semantic and technical abilities, Bruni's ideal translator must also be capable of transferring the persuasive and affective *vis* of the original text.[22]

Giannozzo Manetti (1396–1459) is another important example of early modern awareness of the inherent historicity of language and its relationship with the theory and methodology of translation. Manetti pioneered the application of the philological method of textual analysis to the translation of ancient texts, including Scripture. He composed a direct rendering from the Greek New Testament into Latin and from some of the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament. The *Apologeticus* (*Adversus suae novae Psalterii traductionis obtrectatores libri V*) was Manetti's response to those who criticized his translation of the *Psalms* on the grounds that he had not used the *Vulgate*. With his defense of a return *ad fontes*, Manetti claimed that the translator must always take into careful consideration the pragmatic aspects ingrained in the original text, the contextual concerns of its author, and the historical situation in which they were produced. Consequently, Manetti advocated the kind of translation that managed to re-create the perlocutionary potential latent in the original within the new historical and communicative context of the target language. He applied this method in the three-column