

**Bartholomew Clerke's Castiglione:
Can a pedant be a gentleman?(1)**

Louis G. Kelly
Univ. of Ottawa

From the early fourteenth century until well into the sixteenth, Italy was setting the tone in the arts of graceful living, in sophistication, good manners and general culture, much to the somewhat reluctant gratitude of other parts of Europe. Baldassare Castiglione's // *Cortegiano* (1528) was one of the major books that taught Italian manners and the arts of sophistication to the rest of Europe. His *Cortegiano* was more than the modern "courtier": he was a statesman who added his social savoir-faire to statecraft, ethics and all the virtues he could put at the service of his sovereign, his friends and, at times, his inferiors. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries // *Cortegiano* was translated into four languages, and each of these translations had a fair market. The first of these versions was the French of Jean Colin revised by Etienne Dolet, published in 1538 and reprinted in 1540 and 1545. The Spanish of Juan Boscán appeared in 1540, and was reprinted until 1569. The 1561 English version by Sir Thomas Hoby had only one printing, being superseded in 1571 by the Latin of Bartholomew Clerke. This had several reprints in England, and in Germany it was reprinted up to 1713. Finally there was a second French version by Gabriel Chapuis (ca 1580), reprinted in 1585.

We are concerned here with Clerke's Latin translation entitled *Balthasaris Castilionis De Curiali sive Aulico Libri quatuor*. Bartholomew Clerke (1537?–90) was a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. At the time of translating Castiglione he was Secretary to Thomas Sackville and Member of Parliament for Bramber, a parliamentary seat in the

south of England, just north of the coastal town of Worthing. Sackville (1536–1608) was also a Cambridge man and at the time was a member of the Privy Council. In the dedication to Queen Elizabeth I prefaced to his Castiglione, Clerke tells us that Sackville had suggested he write a Latin piece of some importance for the honour and delectation of the Queen, a not unusual form of compliment to Royalty by a university man with social connections and aspirations. Clerke and Sackville decided that a Latin version of Castiglione would best reflect the brilliance of the Tudor court. In the letter to Sackville dated 21 September 1571 published in his book Clerke writes that he started work on his version on 13 November 1570. It was finished late in December. Clerke apologises for the time it took, pleading official duties. But, especially in the light of Hoby's English version to which Sackville had contributed a preface, why should an Englishman translate a book like Castiglione's into Latin? And what did Clerke and his circle see as the major linguistic and social issues involved?

The short and glib answer is that Latin was the international standard language as it had been since Roman times. Because vernaculars were still felt to be regional, ill-formed and incapable of intellectual refinement, Latin versions of well known books were often produced to ensure an international reputation for their author or their translator. This was a particular cause for sensitivity for a language like English, which was on the periphery of European culture and was trying to find its place in the sun. But given the international dominance of Italy in cultural matters, this is a rather weak explanation for a Latin version of Castiglione, especially when an English version already existed. Though one can not discount this reason, the basic issue in a Latin version for the Humanist was the Alexandrian view that good style reflected all that was good in the human spirit: Quintilian's definition of the *orator* as *vir bonus dicendi peritus* was very much the ruling principle in the rejection of medieval standards of Latin in favour of the Latin of the "golden age". Hence the peculiar importance of the Petrarchan assumption that vernacular languages could only reach maturity by exposure to the mature standards of Classical Latin. It would hardly have escaped notice that Castiglione's own Italian text was an excellent illustration of this principle: after two centuries of Italian humanism, Italian had gained in flexibility and force under the tutelage of Latin, and had become the second classical language of Europe. Castiglione's image of the courtier owed much to the Roman view of the *vir urbanus*, in whom grace of language was matched by

intellectual and personal probity. This lesson he drives home in his text which cites the Roman orator, Cicero, in a manner quite telling to an educated person of the sixteenth century.

Though there were hopes that the vernaculars would eventually become mature, there was still considerable doubt over whether English could ever have a "golden age" in the classical sense. Hence Clerke's use of Latin was more than just a linguistic transfer: it was an attempt to produce a text that would illustrate the virtues it was trying to teach Tudor society. The whole issue is set out in the forematter he prints in his edition. In the normal manner of the period it consists of six open letters. The first of these letters is Clerke's dedication to Queen Elizabeth I. This is followed by a letter from Clerke to Sackville, and by Sackville's reply. There is a second "reply" to this letter from Edward de Vere, the Earl of Oxford. Vere's letter is followed by a commendatory letter from John Caius, the founder of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and the forematter is rounded off by Clerke's address to the reader. This series of letters, despite the multiplicity of authors, constitutes a single discourse on translation and style.

The social rank of the authors and addressees of these letters is already a guarantee of the importance of Clerke's task. Both forematter and book have to be read within the English campaign to rise above the common European view, shared by some Englishmen that England, a small and rather unimportant nation on the fringes of Europe, was culturally backward, and perhaps unredeemable. The second issue is the principle of "style makyth man". This version intends to exploit the humanist idea that the basic civilising influence in Latin classicism was stylistic, and that good style was both a sign and instrument of culture and morals. The third issue, made much of as a separate issue, but an integral part of the classical and humanist ideology of the *orator*, was the controversy over what constituted Ciceronian style in Latin. There were two schools, the *Ciceroniani*, represented by humanists like Giovanni Garzoni of Bologna who could not conceive of any responsible Latinist not writing like Cicero in all particulars, and the *anticiceroniani* whose major spokesman was Erasmus. He recognised the preeminence of Cicero but argued for flexibility in following Ciceronian norms. Clerke was on Erasmus's side.

Clerke's letter to the Queen begins by telling her that *heros nobilissimus dominus Buckhurst*, i.e. Thomas Sackville, had suggested that he write a little something (*historiola*) about Her Majesty. The flattery following this simple statement, though normal when

addressing the Queen, or indeed any patron, is the beginning of his argumentation on translation. He found it difficult to settle on a task that fittingly honoured the Queen's beauty, virtue and intellectual ability: the solution was to translate that paragon of courtly virtues, Baldassare Castiglione, into Latin. According to classical precedent, the task itself imposed its own standards of elegance: his Latin had to match the tone of the Italian. This claim is reinforced by a sly development of a sentence from the younger Pliny's famous letter on translation (2):

Nam si ego minus latine quam ille Italice scripserim
(quod valde metuo ne fiat), inanis omnis noster
labor, stultumque studium est futurum (3).

This point has a second consequence, that unless his Latin is as elegant as the original Italian, his will miss his purpose of a fitting compliment to the Queen and his wider goal of providing a model of courtly behaviour to the sophisticated society of England. After a display of nicely turned classical compliments to the Queen Clerke sets out his norms of translation:

...illud ausim polliceri, multo pleniorum puriorumque
orationem latinam deinceps fore, cum meam ipse
Minervam verbis aptis & convenientibus insequar
(4):

He then sets the stage for the rest of the forematter with some foretaste of the cultural problems inherent in translating an important modern document into an ancient language. In this case it is the courtly wit of the Italian society Clerke wishes to present to the Queen and her courtiers. There follows a long list of courtly recreations and activities, beginning with *in rebus amatoriiis facetiae et sales* (amatory jokes and wit) and finishing with public spectacle. He then claims that he has done an excellent job in getting around all the problems involved, and will win the Queen's approval. He makes absolutely no mention of the English version by Thomas Hoby, even though Sackville had contributed a preface to it.

The next letter, Clerke's letter to Sackville, dated 21 September from Sackville's London house, shows what he means by *meam Minervam insequi*. The opening sentence is a blatant reworking of Cicero, *De optimo genere oratorum* v.18 (5):

Converti aliquando tandem (heros nobilissime) te hortante quatuor illos Castilionis libros ex Italico sermone in Latinum, & ut *interpres*, & ut *Orator*, sententiis eisdem, vocibus ad nostram consuetudinem accommodatis. In quibus non verbum verbo reddidi, sed genus verborum vimque reservavi (6).

It is significant that Clerke claims in this somewhat free quotation to be both *interpres* and *orator*. He had spent some time in Paris, and had certainly been involved with literary circles there. The translator's role as both *interpres* and *orator* had been of special concern to Etienne Dolet and his circle, for whom formal change in the target text was a necessary element of functional change. According to Norton 1984: 193–95, French critics read Cicero's *De Optimo genere* v.18 as stating that *interpres* and *orator* were complementary rather than contradictory – the *interpres* restores what the translator loses in passing from one language to another, while the *orator* retains the elements of the source text that survive the passage to target text. This may be the reason for Clerke's *ut interpres & ut orator*, not a direct quote. Clerke's attitude on translation is reminiscent of Etienne Dolet's third and fifth rules which can be summed up in the principle that liberty is necessary for fidelity. With his bare-faced borrowing of Cicero's *ad nostram consuetudinem* (according to our conventions), he establishes himself as a speaker of Latin with the proprietary attitude of one who exercises full control over all its resources.

Clerke then details the circumstances under which he came to translate the work, complaining a little about the pressure of time, which may have produced some errors. But this was only a temporary annoyance: he expects trouble from academic colleagues with other ideas on what constitutes Latin style, and calls on Sackville to protect him, as any good patron should. Because his translation appeared at the height of the Ciceronian quarrel, Clerke is afraid that the *morosi et difficiles* among his colleagues will accuse him of passages that "smell of Seneca, Caesar or Livy", or will come running with their Nizolius and sniff out the many words he has used that are not in Cicero. He defends himself by stating the obvious: seeing that a large number of the concepts he has had to deal with are not in Cicero, he has had to use vocabulary not found in Cicero. To show how respectable his precedents are, he draws attention to Cicero's own activities as a translator of Greek philosophy: much of the technical vocabulary there

was coined by Cicero himself, and Clerke is only following his illustrious example.

On the principle that the best is enemy to the good, Cicero's reputation as a prose stylist made of him the preeminent model that excluded all others as far as the humanists were concerned. To give some scholarly backing to Cicero's reputation, Mario Nizzoli, an Italian lawyer, published his *Observationes in M.T. Ciceronem* in 1535. This, a short wordlist of Ciceronian Latin amplified by some purple passages, developed into the *Thesaurus ciceronianus* of 1559, an excellent concordance to Cicero's complete works, which was reprinted for several centuries. It was assumed on good grounds that any word not in Nizolius was not in Cicero. As with all dictionaries, description led to prescription, so that a rigorist writer of Latin prose felt obliged to check that any word he wished to use was in Nizolius, and abstain if it was not. Because the humanists left a long legacy of disapprobation of any style other than Cicero's and the tool to enforce it, anybody who has learnt to write Latin prose will have been affected by Nizolius.

But Clerke's first point is that even Cicero would not have been bound by Nizolius and his norms. His essential point is the second one:

Male igitur & periniquè faciunt qui regula Lesbia
Ciceronem Nizolii stateris semper librant, cum
Ciceronis imitatio non tam in verborum aucupio,
quam iusto quodam sententiarum pondere atque
numero consistat (7).

For Clerke the essence of style is the structure and rhythm of sentences; words are only a part of the business. This can only be gained from close observation of all aspects of Ciceronian prose. A true Ciceronian, therefore, knows his Ciceronian stylistic mannerisms intimately as well as Cicero's vocabulary, and is not afraid to follow his own stylistic judgment.

Clerke's third point is that Nizolius is valuable if used judiciously, which the followers of Nizolius are afraid to do. They have forgotten that the marvellous vocabulary of Cicero is enhanced by a marvellous prose style. Clerke then proclaims his respect for Caesar and Livy, and swears undying loyalty to Cicero, for whom he would die, if possible. He then makes some snide remarks about the *oratio incomposita* of Seneca the Younger, an author much in vogue in his England. The rest of the letter is a plea for Sachville to exercise one of the major duties

of patronage by protecting Clerke from the ill-will of the Nizolian pedants. The letter finishes with a sentence calculated to give academic critics pause. Clerke and Sackville had been at Cambridge together and are old friends and colleagues.

Thus in these two letters Clerke has begun to draw the battle-lines. As both scholar and public figure, he has been asked to give honour to the Queen in a manner normal to University people at the time. He has chosen to translate into Latin a document noted for its sophistication. Not only does this flatter the Queen's already famous scholarship, but it presents a model for further refinement of public life. And there is already the hint that, not only will the Queen appreciate it, but that close to her are courtiers who can be trusted to see Clerke's work is used to good advantage. Clerke shows his choice of Latin as target language was more than an academic conceit. First, both classical Roman and Renaissance Italian prided themselves on matching matter to style, and on the polish of their language. Second, polished language was a guarantee of all the virtues necessary for social and political life. Because few were unaware that many of the qualities of Castiglione's courtier were modeled on the Roman *orator*, Clerke's use of this term in the passage he adapts from Cicero is heavily loaded. Third the complete ignoring of Hoby would indicate that English was not yet polished enough either to pass on his teaching or to demonstrate his virtues.

Sackville's short letter in reply to Clerke's manifesto takes up Clerke's fears of academic attack. Sackville makes two points: first, the excellence of the work is its own protection. Those who persist in attacking it will only discredit themselves. Second, in the face of the Queen's obvious delight in this translation, it would be an extremely rash person who would dare attack Clerke. And he rounds the letter off with the promise of that most prized aspiration of all authors and translators, an immortal reputation.

The most important of these letters for Clerke's case is the fourth one by Edward de Vere (1550–1604), seventeenth Earl of Oxford, Fellow of Queens' College and St John's College, Cambridge, poet, scholar, and prominent in attendance on the Queen. Neither Clerke nor de Vere underestimate his importance to the cause. In listing all his titles at the head of his letter, including that of Lord Chancellor, de Vere puts himself forward as an example of what Castiglione was writing about and what Clerke had reproduced in his Latin. To my eye he rubs the lesson in by writing even better Latin than Clerke. His

letter, an amplification of Sackville's very short promise of patronage, shows why patronage is advantageous to the patron as well as to the client.

De Vere's letter begins with the graceful compliment that though he was in two minds about writing a preface to Clerke's translation, its sheer excellence drove him to write. Indeed given the combination of such a great author, such a competent translator, and so magnificent a patroness, who could resist this book? He then begins the actual meat of his letter with praise of Castiglione's image of the Courtier, the *summus hominum et perfectissimus*. Becoming a courtier requires self-discipline:

Itaque cum natura ipsa nihil omni ex parte perfectum expoliverit: hominum autem mores, eam quam tribuit natura dignitatem pervertunt: & seipsum vicit, qui reliquos vincit: & naturam superavit, quae a nemine unquam superata est (8).

There follows a whole list of the qualities Castiglione ascribes to men and women fit to live in the company of princes: they include social skills, wit, virtue and skills in using language. One is reminded of Shakespeare's description of Hamlet, "the glass of fashion and mould of form" (*Hamlet* Act III.ii). He embarks on the transition to his main argument with what looks like an innocuous compliment to Castiglione:

Quis enim de principibus viris maiori gravitate? Quis de illustribus foeminis dignitate ampliori? (9)

Gravitas and *dignitas* are the central issue in his support for Castiglione. They were the two virtues the Romans had regarded as peculiarly their own, and as the major civilising influence they could teach the provincials in their Empire. De Vere continues building a Roman atmosphere with a series of words standard in Roman criticism of prose, *ornatus*, *aptius*, *concinnitas*, all referring to the various graces of Latin style in classical times. And the praise of Castiglione finishes with:

Huic tantarum rerum Autori, oratori etiam non indiserto, novum lumen orationis accessit (10).

Having prepared his theme by implying Castiglione's debt to the Romans, De Vere turns to Clerke. His main argument is introduced by

a scholar's compliments to Clerke and his Latin style. Castiglione's Courtier in the Latin dress Clerke has given him would not be out of place in ancient Rome; and through his manifest virtues and sense of balance this Latin courtier would grace Elizabeth's court. De Vere's extremely Ciceronian praise of Clerke's Latin then culminates in the greatest of compliments: that de Vere finds himself transported back to the Rome of the great orators, Crassus, Antonius and Hortensius. This evocation of Rome's Golden Age once again drives home the lesson that the polished oratory of the Romans reflected the soundness of their morals, their sense of public duty and the graces of aristocratic life. Hence the transition to the last lesson given in this letter: that the courtier of de Vere's own time would do well to pattern himself on this Latinised Courtier if England is to become as brilliant as Italy was at the time, or as sound and powerful as Rome in its heyday. And to drive home the importance of his message, he dates his letter from the Royal palace on 3 January 1571. As a true Elizabethan, he was obviously still under the spell of the brilliance of the Queen, and coming down to earth after an audience with her.

De Vere's game is transparent. He does not mention Cicero, who was the ideal model for the Courtier, but makes him present by a vocabulary drawn from Cicero's own descriptions of manners. Cicero was a statesman, a scholar and a philosopher, who rightly had much to say on the *vir urbanus*, as De Vere's vocabulary reminds the reader. The sophisticated Roman gentleman (the Latin is *expolitus*) has the virtues of *gravitas* and *dignitas* in full measure: he does nothing to excess; he is at ease in any social situation; he is a cultured polymath, a man who had been educated by both society and school. He had personal charm and wit, and cloaked or sharpened unkindness with a sense of humour:

Maledictio autem si petulantius iactatur, convicium;
 si facetius, urbanitas nominatur (*Pro Caelio* III. vi)
 (11)

An essential element of urbanity was pithiness: one said just enough to make one's point and no more, and one said it in a polished pure Latin. Finally the Roman Gentleman kept the golden mean: if he put effort into doing something, it did not show and was never harped on. In essence it was the use of language that distinguished the Roman statesman and the Italian courtier from the *rusticus et agrestis* (12). Cicero's contrast between the social ideal of the *orator* and the *homo*

rusticus is picked up by de Vere as a pointed lesson to the England of the time which had more *rustici* than *urbani*.

To sum up, in this letter which focusses on the social persona of the Courtier, De Vere argues for the importance of Clerke's work by putting himself forward as an English copy of both the Roman and Italian gentlemen. To illustrate this, de Vere's prose has all the classical *ornatus* typical of the genre. In the best Ciceronian terms he writes *prudenter et dilucide* with the *facetiae* (humour) Cicero would have relished. Indeed the only difference I see between de Vere's visions of himself and of Cicero, was that de Vere was the better poet. It is ironical that in later life he was excluded from Court for ill manners.

After De Vere's virtuoso display comes a fairly mild letter by John Caius (1510–1573), a physician who had studied at Gonville Hall in Cambridge, and after refounding it in 1559 as Gonville and Caius College, had taken up the duties of Master. This letter is a colleague's letter, referring briefly to their days together as students and mentioning to Clerke's stay in Paris, congratulating him on having learnt his lessons well and on wearing his learning lightly. It then praises Clerke's Latin style as doing complete justice to the sophisticated Italian of Castiglione, and as the equal of anything in Europe. Bearing in mind Clerke's position as Member of Parliament, it brings into play another aspect of Roman *urbanitas*, the ability to speak well in public with *suavi pronunciatione, actione decenti, dignitate prope singulari*. The inference is that Clerke himself is a consummate Courtier in Castiglione's sense. And naturally it ends with the usual Elizabethan hyperbole, for a second time promising Clerke immortality as long as the Latin language will live.

Clerke reserves the last word for himself. The question of new coinages was a hot issue, and Clerke discusses his *aulicus* and *curialis* for *cortegiano*. He preempts any opposition by saying that he is only doing what Cicero would have done in his place. His argument is notable for its emphasis on what sounds good, as well as what is etymologically sound. The word, *curialitas* is derived from *curia*, in Classical Latin, "Senate-house", in medieval and Renaissance Latin, "Royal Court". The Italian, *Burla*, to which he gives the English gloss "merry pranks", he translates as *ludicra*, pleading the Latin *ludo*, (I play) as its etymon. This last letter then develops into a sermon on the translator's duty to keep the purity of his target language while accepting it to new concepts, thus rounding out the argumentation of

this set of letters and preparing the reader for what he is going to find in the text itself.

Like the book to which it is a preface, this group of letters is bound by what the poet, Horace called *operis lex* (13). The surface issue is one of translation propriety, stated in the ancient oratorical terms. The argumentation goes in a circle. It begins with the translator's commonplaces relating to equivalence of meaning and style, and passes to the Ciceronian quarrel. De Vere then expatiates on the social dimension of Clerke's task, building on the "professional matters" of the first three letters. The last two letters then pull all the threads together by returning to the opening theme, the responsibilities social and linguistic of the translator. Naturally, as both Clerke and his patrons have established reputations as courtiers, the issues go beyond mere language. In the great days of Rome a piece of oratory had a definite communicative purpose, which was expressed by a fitting relationship between matter and form. Because of his standing and Castiglione's use of Cicero as the figure of a gentleman, any Latinist is bound to prefer his prose style with all its skills, polish and reputation. And praising Clerke's polished Latin in a Latin with all the rhetorical tricks so lovingly detailed by Valla and Erasmus is ample demonstration that English men of the world were as learned and sophisticated as the Italian. The very firm line taken by all concerned on the Ciceronian quarrel is an indication that English classicists were up-to-date, and confident in their own polish. Though there is no hint from Clerke or any of his patrons that this book was meant for the overseas market, it was later sold and printed on the continent of Europe. Perhaps the publication of such a book with all its polish and skill was meant to show the rest of Europe that England was no longer barbarous. This may be why Hoby was supplanted: an English version of Castiglione could not be flaunted overseas to show that England had arrived. The foreigner was not convinced English had the artistic tradition to exemplify the ancient Alexandrian view that polished style reflected everything that was best in a human being. And while English was still a minor language of no international standing, there was no way it could be respected as a cultural force.

But to return to my title, can a pedant be a gentleman? That most tempting of all targets, the rabid Ciceronian, is the pedant Clerke attacks. But, because Clerke attacks him on academic grounds only, it is left to de Vere in particular to address the wider issue of why pedantry had as little place in the cultured life of the Elizabethan court

as he had in an Italian. De Vere puts it this way: the Courtier lacks *vitium aliquod insigne, ridiculum ingenium, mores agrestes et inurbanos* (any prominent fault, a ridiculous use of his abilities, countrified and unpolished habits). The basic element in the make-up of the Courtier is a sense of proportion, so that polish does not become foppishness, physical skills do not become bullying, a sharp tongue does not become vulgar. In essence the country bumpkin's prominent faults, ridiculous behaviour and lack of politeness are all due to the one thing, a lack of sense of proportion.

The humanist distaste for prose that which was self-consciously elegant recalls the medieval theologian's view that vice could rise from an excess of virtue as well as from its absence. It is this foundation that Clerke lays for the other letters in this collection. By focussing on the essential aspect of their *ridiculum ingenium*, an excess of linguistic virtue that is actually stylistic sinning, his attack on the *Nizolistae* actually removes from them the right to judge his work. Their fear of quality and lack of proportion is demonstrated by faulty assessment of the strengths of Cicero's Latin. Cicero was not afraid to use his own judgment, and to defend it, when he found himself up against the deficiencies of his own language. Cicero's pure Latin was based on skill in language and a love of it rather than academic authority. The very thing the *Nizolistae* saw as their major virtue is set against them: fear of using vocabulary not sanctioned by authority could hardly lead to the wit valued so highly by Roman and Renaissance society. Besides, vocabulary is not the entire sum of Cicero's strengths by any means: it is embedded in a stylistic and rhythmic frame which gives it its force. And this central issue was not addressed at all by the *Nizolistae*. Only a fool would fail to perceive these things and praise Cicero for the lesser part of his virtues.

On these grounds, the *Nizolistae*, the frightened pedants, are fools. Where Clerke accuses them of all the faults of pedantry, by implication de Vere and Caius develop this accusation into proof that the *Nizolistae* lack all of the courtly virtues. It follows then, that the pedant, by definition a fool who is blind to everything but the surface of what he sees, who lacks a sense of proportion, who is afraid to use his own judgement before a difficult situation, can never be a Gentleman or a Courtier.

Notes

1. I am grateful to Theo Hermanns for his acute and helpful comments on this paper.
2. *Magna gratulatio si non nulla tu, magnus pudor si cuncta ille melius.* (You will have much to congratulate yourself on if at times you are better; much to be ashamed of if he is always better. Pliny *Ep.* vii.9.3).
3. For if I were to have written Latin not up to the standard of his Italian (which I greatly fear could be the case), all our work would be useless, and our enthusiasm would miss its mark.
4. ...I dare promise this, that the style of the Latin will be more ample and pure if I follow my own educated taste by using apt and suitable words
5. *Converti enim ex atticis duorum eloquentissimorum nobilissimas orationes inter se contrarias, Aeschinis Demosthenisque: nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sentiis eisdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non verbum verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omnium verborum vimque servavi.* (For I translated from the Attic a pair of the most famous speeches by two of the most eloquent Greek orators, Aeschines and Demosthenes, arguing opposite sides of the case. I did not work just as a translator, but as an orator, translating the same opinions, the sentence shapes they are expressed in, the figures of speech, in words suitable to our conventions. In doing this I did not think it necessary to translate word for word, but I kept the force and character of every word)
6. Some time ago, most noble hero, at your insistence I at last translated those four famous books by Castiglione from Italian into Latin. I worked as both translator and orator, using the same sentence shapes and words consonant with the conventions of our language. In so doing I did not render word for word, but kept the nature and force of the words)
7. Those who persist in judging Cicero by unbending rules and weighing him in the balance of Nizolius act wrongly and very unjustly, because Ciceronian imitation consists not so much in word-snatching, but in a certain weight and rhythm in the sentences.
8. And since Nature itself brought nothing to perfection in all its aspects, the manners of men pervert the dignity which Nature gave. And he who conquers others, conquers himself. He who was never overcome by anybody, overcomes Nature
9. Who ever wrote about Princes with more gravity? Who wrote about famous women with more dignity?
10. This author who was writing about such great things, this highly eloquent orator, attained new light in oratory.
11. If an unkind word is thrown at someone rather petulantly, it is called an insult; if it is said with some humour, it is a piece of wit.

12. Homo imperitus morum, agricola, et rusticus (*Pro Roscio Amerino* XLII. 143). (A man of unskilled manners, a farmer, a yokel)
13. See Kelly 1979: 207

Bibliography

- Dolet, Etienne (1540), "Règles de traduire", in P. Rickard *La langue française au seizième siècle*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Kelly, L.G. (1979), *The True Interpreter*. Oxford: Blackwells.
- Norton, Glyn P. (1984), *The Ideology and Language of Translation*. Geneva: Droz.
- Ramage, Edwin S. (1973), *Urbanitas. Ancient Sopicitation and Refinement*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.