CHAPTER 0

First Attempts and First Principles

0.1 A Greek *Aeneid* in the First Century CE

There are two competing starting points for the translation history of Virgil's poems. One is Rome in the first century CE, the other in Ireland, at the far western edge of Europe some ten centuries later. Both translations are in prose. Seneca the Younger's words in his *Consolatio ad Polybium* indicate that Polybius, the eminent freedman who served the emperor Claudius as secretary and researcher, produced a prose translation of the *Aeneid* in Greek, as well as a Latin translation of Homer.[1] Seneca refers to Homer and Virgil reaching a wider audience thanks to Polybius' initiative (*Ad Polybium* 8.2); the significance of this becomes clear when Seneca praises

> those poems of both authors [Homer and Virgil] [*illa . . . utriusque auctoris carmina*] which have been made famous by the industry of your genius [*ingenii tui labore*] . . . which you rendered in prose, keeping their attractiveness, even though their form disappeared [*quae tu ita resoluisti ut, quamuis structura illorum recesserit, permaneat tamen gratia*], because you achieved that hardest goal of transferring them from one language into another [*illa ex alia lingua in aliam transtulisti*] in such a way that all their fine qualities have followed you into foreign speech [*omnes uirtutes in alienam te orationem secutae sint*]. (*Ad Polybium* 11.5)

There is no other record of this early translation, but it accords with Pliny the Younger's explicit recommendation of translation from Latin into Greek in *Epistles* 7.9, a practice which persisted through the centuries well into the Renaissance, as manifested in three sixteenth-century Greek

[1] I thank Marcus Wilson for first alerting me to this passage. For possible other early translations, see Paschalis 2018: 136–7. On translations of Virgil (excerpts from *Aeneid* 1, 2, 3 and 5 and from *Georgics* 1) into Greek preserved in papyri dating from the fourth to sixth centuries where the texts are presented in columns as teaching aids, see Dickey 2015.

translations of Virgil by English Catholics, for example.[2] It is noteworthy that in this brief mention Seneca raises many of the theoretical questions about translation that persist throughout the translation history of Virgil and indeed in the theorization of translation in general. These include the translator's effort and talent, the choice of prose or verse to translate poetry, the distinction between form and appeal, and the question of what is lost in translation and what qualities of the original can still be conveyed through compensation. These issues will recur often in my discussion.

0.2 The Translation History of Virgil in the Western Tradition: How to Organize Such a Huge Topic

Before I discuss the second possible starting point of the translation history of Virgil, the eleventh-century Irish *Imtheachta Aeniasa* ('Wanderings of Aeneas'), I set out the aims of this introductory chapter. My first aim is to give a sense of the geographical, linguistic and chronological ranges of my study. The translation history of Virgil is, obviously, an enormous topic extending to several thousand existing translations. Witness the number of items in Craig Kallendorf's catalogue, *A Bibliography of the Early Printed Editions of Virgil 1469–1850*: he records about 2,500 translations down to the year 1850.[3] The seventeen decades since then have not seen any slacking in the rate of production, and indeed an ever-wider range of world languages is represented in more recent years. The linguistic scope of my project includes translations in Afrikaans, Argentinian and Colombian Spanish, Basque,

[2] See Chapter 4, pp. 275–6 on the *Aeneid* translations in Greek by John Harpsfield and George Etheridge and Chapter 10, pp. 786–7 for the Greek *Eclogues* by Daniel Halsworth; cf. the competitive versions of *Eclogue* 10 by Scaliger and Heinsius in 1603 and 1604 (Chapter 4, p. 272). The only translation of Virgil into Greek that survives from antiquity is the version of *Eclogue* 4 that is incorporated into the *Oratio Constantini ad sanctorum coetum*, chapters 19–21 and preserved by Eusebius as an appendix to his *Vita Constantini*.

[3] I abbreviate Kallendorf's (2012) study to *BEPEV*; the *BEPEV* number is listed in the Bibliography for every translation I discuss. Updates to *BEPEV* are at https://bibsite.org/Detail/objects/30. Kallendorf includes, first, Latin editions of the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, *Aeneid* and *Appendix Vergiliana*, then translations (organized largely alphabetically by language; within those sections the complete works are followed by the *Eclogues*, then the *Georgics*, then the *Aeneid*), centos, commonplace books, dictionaries and travesties; thus the earliest complete works in Dutch is catalogued as DW1646.1 [= Dutch Works] and William Wordsworth's *Aeneid* 1 as EA1822.1 [= English *Aeneid*]. As Kallendorf explains in his introduction, his work supersedes Giuliano Mambelli's *Gli annali delle edizione virgiliane* (1954) and draws upon computerized databases such as EEBO (Early English Books Online) and similar catalogues in France, Spain, Germany and elsewhere. I have also used other efforts at cataloguing Virgil translations within individual traditions such as, for French, Alice Hulubei's (1931) 'Virgile en France au XVI^{e} siècle', pp. 74–7 and Raymond Cormier's (2012) list from 1160–1897 in *The Methods of Medieval Translators*, pp. 257–74. Kallendorf's catalogue is a classic 'list' of which translation theorist Anthony Pym approves (1998: 38–54). Another important resource is David Wilson-Okamura's website, virgil.org (2010a); see especially Bibliography: Renaissance: Translations.

Bulgarian, Castilian, Catalan, Croatian, Czech (Bohemian), Danish, Dutch, English, Esperanto, Finnish, French, German, Greek (Homeric, Doric and Katharevousa), Hebrew, Hungarian, Icelandic, Irish, Italian, Maltese, Middle Scots, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese (including that of Brazil), Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovenian, Swedish, Turkish, Ukrainian and Welsh; I also mention dialect versions in Agénois, Burgundian, Corsican, Friulian, Narbonnais, Neapolitan, Occitan, Sicilian and Tuscan. While I am aware of translations in Arabic,[4] Armenian,[5] Bengali,[6] Chinese,[7] Farsi[8] and Japanese,[9] these are beyond my range in this study, which deals with the Western tradition of translation produced in European languages in Europe and the Americas.[10] Likewise, I exclude the fascinating question of engagement with non-European languages of the Americas, because this does not constitute translation as such; nonetheless, it is important to acknowledge that Virgil is a critical tool of colonialism, as explored, for example, by Andrew Laird.[11] And not every language tradition of Europe exhibits translations of Virgil: I have searched in vain for a Yiddish Virgil.[12]

It is important to recognize the limitations of even such a big book as this. In his introduction to *Vertere: Un'antropologia della traduzione nella cultura antica* (2012: vii–xvii), Maurizio Bettini does excellent service in unpacking

[4] There are at least three translations of the *Aeneid* into Arabic. The earliest is the 1973 prize-winning translation by the Lebanese feminist Anbara Salam Khalidi (1985), mentioned briefly in Chapter 2, note 200. The translation by Abdelmoty Sharawy and others (Books 1–6, 1971; Books 7–12, 1977) was published by the Egyptian General Organization for Composing and Publishing in Cairo (Egypt). That of the Palestinian translator Mahmoud A. Alghoul was published in 2015 in the series Kalima Translations out of Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates), which is an ambitious initiative launched in 2007 by His Highness Sheikh Mohamed bin Zayed Al Nahyan, Crown Prince of Abu Dhabi, with the aim of reviving the translation movement in the Arab world; see kalima.ae/en/default.aspx. Some details are provided on Usama Gad's blog 'Classics in Arabic': classicsinarabic.blogspot.com.

[5] These are 1845 and 1847, listed by Kallendorf.

[6] This is 1810, listed by Kallendorf.

[7] For an exemplary analysis of Chinese translations of Virgil, see Liu 2018.

[8] There is a Farsi translation of the *Aeneid* by Jalaleddin Kazzazi (1990), which won a 'Book of the Year' prize that year; he also translated Fenelon's *Les aventures de Télémaque* (1989), the *Iliad* (1998), *Odyssey* (2000) and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (2010), and many other French and Italian works. My thanks to Evina Steinova. See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mir_Jalaleddin_Kazzazi and www.kazzazi.com.

[9] Takada (*VE*, 'Japanese Literature') mentions several translations, beginning with those of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* in 1926–7 by Masatoshi Kuroda; of the Japanese *Aeneid*s, only that of Hisanosuke Izui (1965) attempts a metrical version. The most recent *Aeneid* (Michio Oka and Hiroyuki Takahashi, 2001) focusses on content, not form.

[10] Thus I include Hebrew here, since the earliest Virgil translation was made in Lithuania.

[11] Laird 2010b; see, too, Quint 1993: 157–85; Lupher 2003; Laird 2006.

[12] I am informed by Faith Jones (email communication, 2 October 2018) that such a translation would not have meshed with the literary projects of Yiddish modernism, which, besides Shakespeare, focussed mainly on poets and novelists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Thanks to Richard Menkis and Darrel Janzen.

the significance of the words for 'translation' in non-Western traditions, including those in India (ix–xi), in Arabic (xi–xii), in Nigeria (xi–xii) and in China (xii). He argues that the Western preoccupation with the 'fidelity' of translation(s) is not at all replicated in these four traditions, where 'translation' is metaphorized as 'renewal', 'definition', 'narration' or 'disintegration', and 'turning' or 'change', respectively; the Chinese imagery of the source text as the right side of the embroidery and the translation as the reverse is particularly striking. In other words, Bettini offers a salutary reminder of paths not travelled in the Western translation tradition. Moreover, he argues that the Western tradition conceptualized the practice of translation in an economic framework of minting and exchange (xv), which generated a concern with fidelity as the transference of value, a concern which is not an invariable parameter in world translation traditions.

Kallendorf's scholarship is central to my project.[13] His careful recording of reprints and later editions allows the researcher to see patterns in the translation history of Virgil. For example, in the cases of landmark translations such as those of Joachim **Du Bellay** (French, 1552–60), Annibal **Caro** (Italian, 1581) and John **Dryden** (English, 1697), it is easy to discern which translations were repeatedly reissued by publishers over periods of years, decades or even centuries (names in bold have biographical entries in Appendix 1, pp. 827–45). This is doubtless an index of popularity, although without details of print run, format and price, one must be careful not to leap to conclusions. Once we have this added information, we are in a position to measure the relative success of different translations. We can be confident that printers did not go to the trouble and expense of reissuing books that were unlikely to bring them a good return. Kallendorf's material also highlights peculiarities such as the different national tastes, for example, among the poems of the *Appendix Vergiliana*: virtually all the Italian translations from the *Appendix* are of the *Moretum*, while the French prefer the *Culex*, and the English and German traditions effectively ignore this material.[14]

A brief overview will give a sense of the immense potential range of this project. Virgil's poems, especially the *Aeneid*, had been translated many times long before the advent of printing, and they continue to be translated

[13] I am immensely grateful to Craig for all his help in numerous ways as my project has progressed; he was a wonderful interlocutor and generous with materials, advice and support.

[14] Italian 'Moreto' (*Moretum*) translations start as early as 1548 and include Leopardi's 1817 version *La Torta*; in France there is a period of intense translation of *Culex* ('Le moucheron') during the years 1816–35. Du Bellay's 1558 translation of the *Moretum* reflects the influence of Italian literature. The English tradition presents only two versions of the *Culex* and one of the *Ciris*.

to the present day. A word on my definitions is in order here: I use 'translation' in the humanistic sense to denote a version that follows the Latin without significant additions or omissions, and I reserve 'adaptation' for medieval versions that show no such scruples and for later versions that take remarkable liberties with the Latin, including the travesties I discuss briefly in Chapter 4. I generally use the word 'version' as a larger, neutral category that can include translations and adaptations; I sometimes use it interchangeably with 'translation' for variety, and sometimes to indicate my scepticism about whether a particular translation deserves that label.[15] I trust that context will make clear my intentions.

Medieval adaptations of the *Aeneid* include the Middle Irish *Imtheachta Aeniasa* from the eleventh or twelfth century (Section 0.3), the mid-twelfth-century *Roman d'Enéas* in Old French (Section 0.4) and *Eneit* by Heinrich von Veldeke in Middle High German (Section 0.5), and Icelandic versions from the early thirteenth century. Italy produced fourteenth-century prose versions of the *Aeneid*, including one attributed to the Sienese Ciampolo di Meo degli Ugurgieri, written during 1316–21, and a compendium ascribed to the Florentine notary Andrea Lancia, but probably composed by several people during the years 1310–50, which derived not directly from Virgil's text, but from a Latin prose reduction attributed to a monk named as Anastasio (or Nastagio).[16] The first verse translation is that of Tommaso Cambiatore (1430), although we can glimpse earlier versions of the Aeneas story in *ottava rima* in chronicles and narratives of human history starting with that of Armannino, a Florentine judge, written in 1325.[17] At the

[15] In this last sense I see the sense of 'turning' or 'rotating' as active in the word 'version'; cf. Hollander 1959: 220.

[16] See Parodi 1887: 311–22; Parodi mentions a third prose translation from the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, transcribing parts alongside Lancia's (323–8), which appears to reflect the Latin text more closely. See Armstrong 2018: 38–41 on the complicated story of the early Italian manuscript versions and the interconnections with Spain, and, in more depth, Armstrong 2017: 6; he suggests that Ugurgieri's might be considered the first full prose translation of the *Aeneid*.

[17] Parodi's 270-page article 'Rifacimenti' gives us a glimpse of the complex underbelly of medieval Italian adaptations of the story of Aeneas as he surveys versions in prose and verse, Latin and the vernaculars, in manuscript and some of them later printed. He analyses the likely sources – Virgil, Dictys, Dares and one another – and shows how important was the factor of local pride in the focus on particular warriors – hence Turnus' ally Aventinus, claimed by the Italian family Savelli, gets an *aristeia* (i.e. the warrior is in the spotlight) in one of these works (1887: 224–9) – especially as founders of different towns and cities, for example Aeneas as the founder of Arezzo and Silvius Aeneas as the founder of Naples (named for him! – 'Enea polis', 338). The variations in these early versions offer fascinating alternatives to Virgil's narrative: they have Creusa committing suicide (258) or being killed by Aeneas to save her from falling into the hands of the Greeks (244, 288). They have Aeneas staying with Dido for four years and producing a son (302). They have the first casualty of the war in Italy being the son of Turnus (258; evidently a mistake for the son of Tyrrhus, Silvia's father; see *Aen.* 7.484–5 and 531–3). They have Aeneas killed in a conflict with Mezentius, king of Sicily, who

same moment in Spain, Enrique de **Villena** wrote his version in Castilian prose, divided into 366 chapters, while the 'Lancia' version generated a Sicilian *Istoria di Eneas truyanu* by Angilu di Capua di Messina. The earliest printed *Aeneid*, a loose adaptation in the medieval mode, was the printing in 1476 of the 'Lancia' Italian version, which was turned into French in 1483, which in turn was put into English by William **Caxton** in 1490 as *The Eneydos of Vyrgyl*. These versions followed on the heels of the *editio princeps* of the Latin text, which appeared in 1469.[18] These three *remaniements* ('rehandlings') all take striking liberties with the Latin text. For example, in the French *Livre des Eneydes*, printed by Guillaume Le Roy (who is sometimes cited as the translator), the author reorders the episodes into chronological sequence, relocates the journey of Aeneas to have him arrive in Lombardy, includes material not covered in Virgil, such as Aeneas' wedding and Ascanius' succession, organizes the material into chapters, thus obliterating the twelve-book construction, and amplifies the material devoted to Dido.[19]

More rigorous translations of the *Aeneid* – versions recognizable as translations thanks to their hewing more or less closely to the Latin – soon appeared as Renaissance humanism took off: into French in 1500 (Octovien de **Saint-Gelais**, published 1509), into mid-Scots in 1513 (Gavin **Douglas**, published 1553), into German in 1515 (Thomas **Murner**), into Italian in 1534 (Book 4 by Niccolò Liburnio), into English in the 1540s (Books 2 and 4 by Henry Howard, the Earl of Surrey, published 1554 and 1557), into Spanish in 1555 (Gregorio Hernández de **Velasco**), into Dutch in 1556 (Cornelis van Ghistele) and into Polish in 1590 (Andrzej Kochanowski).[20] The first complete *Aeneid* in English is that of Thomas **Phaer** and Thomas **Twyne** (1573). The production of *Aeneid* translations

is himself killed by Ascanius in the ensuing vendetta (321 and 295; in Romanesque dialect: 'Po la morte de Enea Ascanius et Mexentius fecero granne vattalie, et Ascanius occise Mexentius', 'After Aeneas' death Ascanius and Mezentius fought great battles, and Ascanius killed Mezentius').

[18] It is salutary to remind ourselves of the relative popularity of Greek and Latin editions by considering the numbers of incunabula printed: Aristotle 552, Aelius Donatus 457, Cicero 389, Virgil 202, Ovid 181, Homer 25, Plato 18 (Young 2003: 96).

[19] See Singerman 1986 on medieval reworkings of the *Aeneid*, especially Chapter 4 on the *Livre des Eneydes* and Caxton's *Eneydos*. Specifically on medieval French handlings of Virgil and the Aeneas story, see Monfrin 1985; he argues that the *Livre des Eneydes* combines material from the thirteenth-century *Histoire ancienne jusqu'à César* and material on Dido from Boccaccio. The classic study of Virgil in the Middle Ages is Comparetti's *Vergil in the Middle Ages* (1895); Baswell 1995 is also valuable.

[20] On the collapsed timeframe whereby Spanish, perhaps surprisingly, achieves a complete *Aeneid* sooner than Italian, see Armstrong 2017: 18, where he remarks upon 'the synthetic advantage of cultural belatedness: a greater efficiency leading to cultural acceleration'.

remained prodigious, even while Virgil was eclipsed by Homer during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and it continues apace.

Similar, though not identical, narratives apply to the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* too, which, because of their subject matter, move in and out of favour more dramatically. The earliest versions of the *Eclogues* offer a snapshot of the range of possibilities.[21] The Italian translation by Bernardo Pulci, dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici, begun around 1470 and published in Florence in 1481/2, shows precision and concision in its *terzine* – for example, Pulci renders eleven Latin lines in six *terzine* – and is a competent attempt to render the Latin faithfully. This contrasts with the earliest Spanish attempt, that of Juan de Encina in 1496. His *Imitación de las Églogas de Virgilio*, included in his collection of poems called *Cancionero* ('Songbook'), which was dedicated to the Catholic monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella, expands considerably, for example using three strophes of twelve lines for the first seven lines of *Eclogue* 2.[22] His domestications include what he calls 'estilo rústico' ('rustic style'), with his shepherds sometimes using the dialect of Salamanca.[23] In the *argumentos* to the individual poems he applies the content to his own world; for example, in *Eclogue* 1 he interprets Meliboeus as representing rebel landowners displaced for conspiring with the king of Portugal; in *Eclogue* 2 he proposes that Corydon is the poet and Alexis the king, and in *Eclogue* 9 that Menalcas is the dethroned king of Grenada. Encina is typical of his moment: his version shows humanist and Italian elements blending with national Spanish characteristics, but in definitely Hispanized form.[24] The first Italian version of the *Eclogues*, then, looks ahead to Renaissance humanist principles, while the first Spanish version makes Virgil a fifteenth-century *Cancionero*. The first complete French *Eclogues*, published in 1516, mixes these characteristics. The author is Guillaume Michel de Tours, like Octovien de Saint-Gelais, one of the Grands Rhétoriqueurs who are precursors of the Pléiade literary movement.[25] But Michel's book

[21] Gerhardt 1949 explores the Italian, Spanish and French versions.

[22] See discussion by Kallendorf 2020: 106–9; he describes the book as 'an avant garde representative of printing in Salamanca' (122).

[23] The exception is his deployment of *arte mayor* for *Eclogue* 4, reflecting the more elevated material; see Armstrong 2017: 10 on Encina's epicization of bucolic poetry.

[24] Gerhardt 1949: 55: 'Encina nationalise Virgile, avec un aplomb qui a quelque chose de désarmant' ('Encina nativizes Virgil with a somewhat disarming self-confidence'). Cf. the title of Lawrence's 1999 article on Encina, 'imitación clásica e hibridación romancista'.

[25] Clément Marot's translation of *Eclogue* 1 may be earlier: see Chapter 1. The 'Grands Rhétoriqueurs' were a group of poets in northern France, Flanders and the Duchy of Burgundy, who used rich ornamentation including rhyme schemes and assonance.

has a medieval look, with its Gothic characters and woodcuts, as well as a medieval mindset: each poem is followed by commentary offering exposition of its hidden sense. The translation itself, in bumpy decasyllables, is almost incomprehensible, bristling with Latinisms and padding – an example from *Eclogue* 5 shows two Latin lines expanded into seven in the French; without the Latin, which is printed as side notes, one would be lost. The first complete *Eclogues* in German offers yet another model. Johann Adelphus Muling's translation, dating from 1508/9, is explicitly aimed at schoolchildren and adopts the same layout as Latin schoolbooks, presenting a literal prose translation with interlinear paraphrase and marginal commentary in smaller type and supplemented with Sebastian Brant's woodcuts. This translation has no literary pretensions, but aims to be didactically functional within the institutional framework of contemporary schools, making the teaching and learning methods transparent for users.[26]

The earliest *Georgics* are Foresi's Italian version (1482) and Guillaume Michel's French version (1519). The second half of the sixteenth century offers translations of the *Eclogues* in Spanish (1574), English (1575), Polish (1588) and Dutch (1597), and of the *Georgics* in German (1571), Spanish (1586) and English (1589). The earliest collected *Works* that I can identify is the French from 1529, consisting of Guillaume Michel's *Eclogues* and *Georgics* with Octovien de Saint-Gelais' *Aeneid*. The earliest single-authored collected works appear to be by Diego López (Spanish, 1600–1), Joost van den Vondel (Dutch, 1646) and John **Ogilby** (English, 1649). Even this selection of data hints at the dizzying possibilities for research on this topic. So it is proper that I indicate the parameters of my study.

My geographical scope extends from Russia and Ukraine in the east to the Americas in the west, including Brazil, formerly part of the Portuguese Empire, Argentina, formerly part of the Spanish Empire, and America during the era when it was a British colony; and in the north from Iceland, Norway and Finland southwards to North Africa, where a French translation of the *Georgics* was penned by a Parisian farmer in Tunisia. Another *Georgics* translation was undertaken in Changi Gaol and Sime Road Camp in Singapore during World War II. The presence of translations of Virgil in languages and dialects including Basque, Catalan, Neapolitan and Sicilian speaks to the cultural capital residing in Virgil's poetry. Because of the wide geographical spread of my project, I have preferred to refer to individuals often known by Latinized names in their native forms because this reminds

[26] On Muling, see Chapter 7, pp. 538–40.

us of their location and nationality. For example, I refer to the Flemish scholar-printer Ascensius (Jodocus Badius Ascensius) as Bade (his name in French was Josse Bade), and to the Italian Aldus Manutius as Manuzio. Complexities have included the changing geopolitical denomination of territories, for example the interrelationships of the courts of Castile and Aragon with Catalonia, Naples and Sicily in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the fact that the countries we know as 'Germany' and 'Italy' did not exist until the nineteenth century; the encroachments by neighbouring powers that resulted in Poland and Lithuania being removed from the map for 123 years until 1918; the emergence of South Slavic states from 'the former Yugoslavia' in recent years, and so on.

My chronological range embraces the earliest extant adaptations, from the eleventh and twelfth centuries, down to translations of the present day, an era of continuing productivity: since the year 2000 at least eleven new English translations of the *Aeneid* have been published, including three by women, a phenomenon which raises questions of gender that I tackle later.[27] I use this chapter to register and reflect on the earliest adaptations of the *Aeneid*, dating from before printing in the West, but in the body of the book my main concern will be translations produced during the print era down to the present day, because the print era coincides with versions we can recognize as translations rather than adaptations. This will not preclude attention to a few translations that survive only in manuscript; these represent an important but as yet understudied area in which Stuart Gillespie and Sheldon Brammall are pioneers.[28]

My second aim in this chapter is to indicate my framework and methodology (Section 0.6). Essentially, I use a model of reception theory as a development of reader-response theory which values translators as

[27] In addition to A. S. Kline's 2002 translation, available on the website poetryintranslation.com, we have translations by Stanley Lombardo (2005), Robert Fagles (2006), Frederick Ahl (2007), Sarah Ruden (2008), Patricia Johnston (2012), Howard Felperin (2014), Barry Powell (2015), David Ferry (2017) and Shadi Bartsch (2021), along with Ruden's revised translation (2021), on which I collaborated. Jane Wilson Joyce is reported to be working on a translation too (according to www.atrium-media.com/rogueclassicism/Posts/00008683.html, posted 15 October 2008, accessed 13 April 2021).

[28] Gillespie has published articles on translations of ancient texts, including *Anacreontea*, Juvenal, Persius, Horace, Hesiod, Martial, Seneca and Virgil, that survive only in manuscript, including what he calls an 'outstanding' anonymous version of *Georgics* 3 (BL Add. MS 38488A, around 1800: Gillespie 2015). He discusses manuscript translations in *English Translation and Classical Reception* (2011: 104–22); his *Newly Recovered English Classical Translations, 1600–1800* (2018) is accompanied by an online-only annexe available at www.oup.com/nrect, as well as a free-to-view project website at https://nrect.gla.ac.uk. Brammall (2014, 2015) has analysed several Virgil translations that survive only in manuscript and is currently preparing an edition of Heath's complete *Aeneid* for the online appendix to Gillespie's book.

especially close and careful readers. I have learned much from the work of Lorna Hardwick in particular, whose *Translating Words, Translating Cultures* (2000) remains essential reading for anyone concerned with the translation of classical texts.[29] I am convinced of the bidirectionality of the process of classical reception theory, as articulated influentially by Charles Martindale in his seminal 1993 study *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. We can ask questions about the influence of classical texts on later eras, but we must not underestimate the extent to which later remakings of classical texts affect our view and appreciation of those texts. This applies especially to translation.[30] To put it another way, the original text and its reworking in the form of translation operate 'in a fruitful relationship of reciprocal enlightenment'.[31] The case for viewing translation as a crucial element within reception studies is made by Stuart Gillespie and developed by Craig Kallendorf when he argues for the value of 'transformation methodology', which views translation as a transposition from a 'reference culture' into a 'reception culture' that invariably involves fundamental change.[32] Both of these scholars have exercised a fundamental influence on my thinking about translation and both have also offered me enormous help and support. I devote a later part of this chapter to situating my approach theoretically, especially in relation to contemporary translation studies, a field which exhibits a particular concern with issues of ethnicity, gender, colonialism and empire, but also in relation to book history and intellectual history more widely. I shall indicate to what extent these issues are useful in the study of the translation-as-reception of Virgil.

My third aim is to account for the organization of the book by considering what it might have been (and is not), as well as what it is (Section 0.7). This section will indicate the principles of organization I settled upon and will include summaries of the ten following chapters, along with indications of the major and minor translations tackled in each. Already the reader will have gleaned that this book comprises

[29] Especially chapter 1, 'The Battles of Translation' (2000: 9–22), which provides a quick orientation to issues debated in translation studies up to 2000.

[30] See chapter 4 in Martindale 1993: 75–100. Armstrong 2005, an excellent overview of the issues involved in translating classical epic poetry, has some pertinent remarks on bidirectionality.

[31] I owe this phrase to Romani Mistretta 2018: 304. On the term 'original', see Coldiron 2016: 315: she prefers to refer to 'translations and their prior texts' rather than 'translations and originals', which 'may reify a hierarchy of writerly value'. Although I have some sympathy for the motivations that underlie this choice, I have no such qualms.

[32] Gillespie 2011: 1 ('translation should move towards the forefront of the study of reception'); Kallendorf 2020: 111–13.