



MEDITERRANEAN CHRONICLE



Volume 7, 2017



DIAVLOS



MEDITERRANEAN CHRONICLE

Mediterranean Chronicle

A journal on culture/s in the Mediterranean World

<http://www.mediterraneanchronicle.org/>

ISSN 1791-9266

Volume 7 Corfu 2017

Mediterranean Chronicle is an international refereed journal, working under the aegis of Ionian University.

MC aims at promoting a discussion on culture/s in the Mediterranean world focusing on the Greek and Roman worlds (Medieval-Byzantine culture will also be included). Papers that will present contributions in all the fields of Humanities concerning Mediterranean civilization will be published.

MC will be published provisionally as one volume per year.

Contributions are welcome in one of the following languages: Italian, Greek, French, English, Portuguese, Spanish or German. All articles should be accompanied by an abstract of about 200 words. Topics: Humanities, History, Archaeology, Classical Philology.

La presente pubblicazione è stata realizzata con il contributo dell'Università degli Studi di Urbino Carlo Bo – Dipartimento di Scienze della Comunicazione, Studi Umanistici e Internazionali: Storia, Culture, Lingue, Letterature, Arti, Media (DISCUI).

This publication is realized with the contribution of the University of Urbino Carlo Bo “Dipartimento di scienze della comunicazione, studi umanistici e internazionali Università di Urbino Carlo Bo”.

Former Editors in Chief

† Spyros Asonitis (Ionian University)

† Alfonso Leone (Università Federico II, Napoli)

Editor

Vaios Vaiopoulos (Ionian University)

Editorial Board

Antonio Calabria (University of San Antonio, USA)

Brian A. Catlos (UC Santa Cruz)

Aurelio Cernigliaro (Università Federico II, Napoli)

Flocel Sabaté i Curull (Universidad de Lleida)

Roberto Delle Donne (Università Federico II, Napoli)

Kaiti Diamantakou-Agathou (University of Athens)

Philippo D'Oria (Università Federico II, Napoli)

Giuseppe Giliberti (Università di Urbino “Carlo Bo”)

Nick Gonis (UCL)

Gelina Harlaftis (Ionian University)

Nicolas Karapidakis (Ionian University)

Arnd Kerkhecker (Institut für Klassische Philologie. Universität Bern)

Masako Kido (Kyoritsu University, Tokyo)

Liana Lomiento (Università di Urbino “Carlo Bo”)

Dominique Mulliez (Université de Lille III)

Gerassimos Pagratis (University of Athens)

Theodoros Pappas (Ionian University)

Susan Shapiro (Utah State University)

Dimitrios Tsoungarakis (Ionian University)

Spyridon Tzounakas (University of Cyprus)

Publisher

DIAVLOS PUBLICATIONS

72-74, Mavromichali Str.

10680 Athens Greece

Tel. +302103631169

Fax +302103617473

www.diaulosbooks.com • info@diaulos-books.gr

© Vaios Vaiopoulos

Copyright for the journal as a whole belongs to the editor; however copyright in the individual articles belongs to their authors. Articles and reviews represent the personal views of the author.

For individual or institutional subscriptions please consult the web site

(www.mediterraneanchronicle.org) or contact the publisher (Diavlos publications).

Articles can be submitted electronically to the editor: vaivosvaiopoulos@gmail.com or vvaiop@ionio.gr

CONTENTS

Ioannis Deligiannis: <i>Introduction</i>	7
Giancarlo Abbamonte: <i>Guarino of Verona Translator of Plutarch's De liberis educandis (1411) and the Last Legacy of the Pope Alexander V (Peter Filargis)</i>	15
Garyfallia Athanasiadou: <i>Epigrams on Myron's Cow in Translation: an Example by Taddeo Ugoletto</i>	31
Malika Cécile Bastin-Hammou: <i>Translating Aristophanes' Plutus into Latin during the Renaissance. The Dramatis personae: from Text to Stage</i>	41
Martin M. Bauer: <i>Bad Re-Translations: The Strange Case of Bartholomaeus Picensis de Monte Arduo</i>	55
Ioannis Deligiannis: <i>"Witnessing" a Translator at Work: Observations on Mattia Palmieri's Latin Translation of Herodotus' Histories</i>	69
Roumpini Dimopoulou: <i>Ciriaco d'Ancona, De Septem Mundi Spectaculis: Aspects on His Language</i>	89
Silvia Fiaschi: <i>Translations as Repertoires of Antiquity: the Mythographic Collection of Palaephatus, between Erudition and Greek Learning</i>	101
Adam T. Foley: <i>Saying No to the Pope: Basinio's Refusal to Translate Homer</i>	125
Martine Furno: <i>How Did They Use Lexica? An Overview of Greek-Latin Dictionaries and Their Readerships during the Sixteenth Century (1478-1595)</i>	139
Eleni Gasti & Evangelos Gougoulis: <i>Melanchthon's Latin Translations of Euripides' Bacchae and Orestes</i>	159
Noreen Humble: <i>Translating Ancient Greek: Jacob Kauffmann and Xenophon's Cyropaedia</i>	171
Sophia Kouteri: <i>Bruni as Translator of Aristophanes: Translation Practices and Strategies in Plutus</i>	187
Liana Lomiento: <i>Anacreon and the Anacreontic Odes Translated by Henricus Stephanus and Elie André in an Italian Edition of 1712</i>	199
Vasileios Pappas: <i>Leucippe and Clitophon in Latin: The Translation of Achilles Tatius' Novel by Annibal Cruceius</i>	213
Michael Paschalis: <i>Comparative Challenges: Homer and Theocritus into Latin, Virgil into Greek</i>	227
Maria Luísa Resende: <i>From the Manuscript to the Printed Version: Investigating the Process of Self-Censorship in Jorge Coelho's Latin Translation of De Dea Syria</i>	235
Keith Sidwell: <i>Step by Step and even Verse: Translation of Lucian as a Tool for Greek Learning in the Early Modern Period</i>	247
Fabio Stok: <i>Latin Translations of the Oraculum de Isthmo</i>	269
Indices	287
I. Antiquity (mainly authors, up to c. 600).....	287
II. Middle Ages, Renaissance and Early Modern Period	288
III. Manuscripts	294
Guidelines for authors.....	297

**INVESTIGATING
THE TRANSLATION PROCESS
IN HUMANISTIC LATIN TRANSLATIONS
OF GREEK TEXTS**

*Proceedings of an International Conference
Democritus University of Thrace
Komotini, 28–29 April 2017*

EDITED BY

IOANNIS DELIGIANNIS

Corfu 2017

In memoriam



Paola Tomè

Maria Luísa Resende
Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

**From the Manuscript to the Printed Version: Investigating the Process of
Self-Censorship in Jorge Coelho's Latin Translation of *De Dea Syria****

*Cum adolescens superioribus annis exercendi ingenii gratia Graeca nonnulla in latinum sermonem uerterem, uenit in mentem Luciani opusculum de Dea Syria, ad ea tempora (quod scirem) ab interpretibus intactum, latinitate donare.*¹

The tradition of using Lucian of Samosata's works in the classroom was determinant for its wide dissemination in the European Renaissance. Due to the *breuitas, uarietas* or, more importantly, the moral value of his works, the adequacy of the *corpus luceaneum* to the study of the Greek language prompted the first Latin translations in the West and was further acknowledged by humanists such as Guarino Veronese and Erasmus of Rotterdam.²

Although there is some evidence of the resort to Lucian's *Dialogues* in the context of Greek teaching in Portugal in the sixteenth century, the only extant translation, published in 1540 by Jorge Coelho, was subject to an exhaustive revision, thus being of little help in understanding the use of the sophist's works as school texts.³ Nevertheless, the paratexts of *De Dea Syria* – especially the letter to Lourenço de Cáceres quoted above – reveal the initial phase of the translation as an attempt to develop his linguistic skills. The recent discovery of an earlier version of the translation in Biblioteca Pública de Évora demonstrated that *De Dea Syria* was actually rendered while the Portuguese humanist was studying Greek in Italy, before 1526.⁴ Since it

* This paper was developed within the context of an ongoing PhD dissertation funded by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (SFRH/BD/95419/2013).

¹ Georgij Coelli Lusitani *De Patientia Christiana Liber Vnus. Item nonnulla alia quae in fine uidebis*, apud Ludouicum Rothorigium, [Lisbon] 1540, f. 57v.

² Cf., e.g., C. Lauvergnat-Gagnière, *Lucien de Samosate et le Lucianisme en France au XVI^e siècle. Athéisme et Polémique*, Geneva 1988, pp. 27, 62-66; M. O. Zappala, *Lucian of Samosata in the Two Hesperias. An Essay in Literary and Cultural Translation*, Potomac 1990, pp. 37-39; D. Marsh, *Lucian and the Latins. Humor and Humanism in the Early Renaissance*, Ann Arbor 1998, pp. 7-15; E. Rummel, *Erasmus as a Translator of the Classics*, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2012, pp. 49-51.

³ The translation of Lucian's *De Dea Syria* was published among other works in the book Georgij Coelli Lusitani *De Patientia Christiana*, op. cit., ff. 32v-59r.

⁴ Cf. Évora, BPE, ms. 229, f. 35r: *Cum superioribus annis Florentiae, quae totius Etruriae clarissima ciuitas est, litteris Graecis operam daremus magnorumque authorum exemplo exercitationis gratia Graeca nonnulla latinis redderemus, uenit et nobis in mentem Luciani opusculum de dea Syria, ad ea tempora intactum, e graeco sermone in latinum uertere.* Despite the limited biographical

constitutes an amended version of the scholarly exercise and an earlier variant of the printed translation, the Évora manuscript, produced sometime between 1526 and 1531, discloses that Jorge Coelho continued working on the same text for approximately thirty years.

Even though the loss of the first scholarly exercise inhibits us from analysing Coelho's translation from its inception, the comparison of the manuscript with the translation printed in 1540 provides a valuable insight into its progression, revealing not only a significant development of his skills as a translator and writer of Latin, but also a deliberate attempt to diminish the references to Lucian of Samosata and *De Dea Syria's* satirical tone. The purpose of this paper is therefore to analyse the most significant alterations undertaken by the Portuguese humanist, in order to shed some light on one of the few versions of a Greek author directly rendered from the original,⁵ which, despite its importance for understanding the impact of Greek studies in Portugal, is yet to provoke any academic analysis, even among Portuguese scholars.⁶

information regarding Jorge Coelho, there is evidence that in 1526 he was already in Portugal (ANTT, *Corpo Cronológico*, Parte I, mç. 34, no. 36). Cf. H. Crespo, "O processo da Inquisição de Lisboa contra Duarte Gomes *alias* Salomão Usque: móveis, têxteis e livros na reconstituição da casa de um humanista (1542-1544). Em torno da guarda-roupa, livraria e matearia do rei", *Cadernos de Estudos Sefarditas* 10-11 (2011), pp. 587-688, at 589. For Jorge Coelho's biographical data, see especially S. Terra, "O Humanista Português Jorge Coelho e a sua correspondência com os Cardeais Bembo e Sadoleto", in A. Joucla-Ruau (ed.), *Mélanges à la mémoire d'André Joucla-Ruau*, Aix-en-Provence 1978, pp. 1133-1160; Crespo, op. cit.; id., "André de Resende na Inquisição de Évora e a apologética anti-judaica: ciência teológica, doutrina e castigo (1541). Um autógrafa inédito. Novos documentos para as biografias de André de Resende e Jorge Coelho", in A. Andrade, J. Torrão et al. (eds.), *Humanismo, Diáspora e Ciência (séculos XVI e XVII): Estudos, Catálogo, Exposição*, Porto 2013, pp. 151-212, at 163-164.

⁵ The limited number of philological works produced during the Portuguese Renaissance does not imply a lack of interest in, or as has already been stated, a poor dissemination of the *studia humanitatis*. Indeed, Portuguese libraries contain a rich collection of books imported from the main European printing houses and there is evidence of an intense circulation of humanistic editions, translations and commentaries during the sixteenth century. This was partly possible due to a royal decree which, since 1483, exempted book sellers from paying taxes over the importation and sale of books in order to encourage the dissemination of classical authors. Cf. S. Viterbo, *A Livraria Real especialmente no reinado de D. Manuel: memoria apresentada à Academia Real das Sciencias de Lisboa*, Lisbon 1901, pp. 5-7, and A. Tarrío, *Leitores dos Clássicos. Portugal e Itália, séculos XV e XVI: uma geografia do primeiro Humanismo em Portugal*, Lisbon 2015. For a general survey of Greek studies in Portugal during the sixteenth century, see especially F. de Boaventura, "Do começo, progressos, e decadencia da Literatura Grega em Portugal desde o estabelecimento da Monarquia até o reinado do Senhor D. José I", *Historia e Memórias da Academia Real das Sciencias de Lisboa* 8:1 (1823), pp. 1-55, and S. T. Pinho, *Humanismo em Portugal*, II, Lisbon 2006, pp. 297-322.

⁶ Aside from my ongoing PhD dissertation ("*Studia graeca* em Portugal no século XVI: leitores e tradutores de Luciano de Samósata"), which will provide a critical analysis of Jorge Coelho's translation, only Sena Martins ("Jorge Coelho e a tradução de Luciano, *De dea Syria*", in C. Pimentel, S. Tavares de Pinho (eds.), *O Humanismo Português no Contexto da Europa: no 5º*

1. The Translation

The recognition of the distinction between the scholarly version, developed in Italy and characterised by an excess of verbosity which Jorge Coelho ascribes to his *adulescentiae feruor*,⁷ and the sophist's praised *breuitas* were the main reasons for preventing its dissemination.⁸

Assuming that the first revision was primarily focused on attempting to simplify the Latin version, the same effort must have continued until its eventual publication, which can be seen by comparing it with the manuscript. In this sense, the translation of the adjective ὑδατώδης ("watery") is particularly illustrative.⁹ Its complexity justified, in the manuscript, the reading *ex aqua translucet quaedam uim colorem exprimunt*.¹⁰ However, this long expression was later replaced by the single adjective *caeruleus* which, although failing to translate the reference to the water, is much simpler and produces a more adroitly styled sentence.¹¹ A similar form of literary condensation is visible in the translation of ὀφθαλλοβάτης ("one who mounts on a phallus-shaped pillar")¹² and τὰ νευρόσπαστα ("puppets moved by strings"),¹³ for the clarifying comment which follows in the manuscript was erased from the printed edition.

In addition to the simplification of the Latin version, there is also a discernible attempt to homogenise some Latin and Greek terms, particularly clear in the rendering of the adjective ἀρχαῖος. In the manuscript, the arbitrary translations of *antiquus* or *uetustus* are replaced by just *uetustus*, while *antiquus* is reserved for the translation of πρόσβυς. The only instance in

Centenário do Cícero Lusitanus, Jerónimo Osório (1515-1580), forthcoming) and Zappala (op. cit., pp. 138-139) have previously focused on *De Dea Syria*.

⁷ Évora, BPE, ms. 229, f. 6r-v: *Itaque cursim nonnullis, aut detractis, aut emendatis, quae olim cum haec interpretarer, ut in illo adolescentiae feruore scripta, nimia uerborum luxurie diffluere uidebantur, tibi eam nostram lucubratiunculam, Princeps humanissime, dicare statui.*

⁸ Évora, BPE, ms. 229, f. 35r: *Quo opere iam finito, cum ipse rem accuratius pensitarem, uidebar mihi in huiusmodi conuersione maiore uerborum copia quam Ionicam authoris breuitatem deceret, quasi quodam nimio aestu redundasse, atque intra alueum teneri non potuisse.*

⁹ Luc., *Syr. D.* 32: ἔκτοσθεν δέ οἱ χρυσός τε ἄλλος περικέεται καὶ λίθοι κάρτα πολυτελέες, τῶν οἱ μὲν λευκοί, οἱ δὲ ὑδατώδεις [...]. For the Greek quotations of *De Dea Syria*, we use Lightfoot's critical edition: J. L. Lightfoot, *On the Syrian Goddess*, ed. with intr., transl. & comm., Oxford 2003.

¹⁰ Évora, BPE, ms. 229, f. 27r.

¹¹ Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 51r.

¹² Luc., *Syr. D.* 30: Φαλλοβατέων μὲν δὴ πέρι, τοσάδε ἀρκέει. Cf. Évora, BPE, ms. 229, f. 26r: [...] *et de Phallobatis quidem ipsis, seu malis dicere priapambulis, haec nos tradidisse sufficiat*, and Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 50r: *Et de Phallobatis quidem ipsis haec nos tradidisse sufficiat.*

¹³ Luc., *Syr. D.* 16: καλέεται δὲ τάδε νευρόσπαστα. Cf. Évora, BPE, ms. 229, f. 13r: [...] *quae ipsa neuropasta, id est, nerui statumina uel nerui thalamia, uocant*, and Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 40r: *quae neuropasta uocant.*

the printed version where ἀρχαῖος is translated as *antiquus* seems to have the purpose of simply avoiding the repetition of the same word:

Ad haec ad montem Libanum ascendimus Byblos profecti (abest autem ab eo oppido unius diei iter) quod illic Veneris uetustum templum [ἀρχαῖον ἱερόν] a Cynara quondam constructum esse audiebamus. Ipsum [ἱερόν] igitur uidimus et uetustum [ἀρχαῖον] admodum uisum est. Atque haec quidem sunt fana [ἱερά] quae in Syria tum antiqua [ἀρχαῖα] tum magni nominis habentur.¹⁴

In fact, Coelho's preoccupation with *uarietas* surpasses his pursuit of a standardised translation. The excerpt quoted above reveals that the threefold repetition of ἱερόν is avoided by resorting to the pronoun *ipsum* and to its synonym *fanum*. Indeed, this search for a more varied vocabulary is present throughout the printed version, as ἱερόν is rendered by *sacrum*, *fanum* or *templum*, while in the manuscript, *sacrum* is the prevailing term.¹⁵

Although assuming a preoccupation with Lucian's style, the final version of Jorge Coelho's translation is more of a Humanistic product than an attempt to faithfully render *De Dea Syria*. The clear intention of disseminating his work ultimately supports most of his translation choices, such as the explanation of mythological references,¹⁶ his frequent resort to adjectives absent from the Greek original¹⁷ and, finally, the recreation of Antiochus'

¹⁴ Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 37r. Cf. Luc., *Syr. D.* 9: Ἀνέβην δὲ καὶ ἐς τὸν Λίβανον ἐκ Βύβλου, ὁδὸν ἡμέρης, πυθόμενος αὐτόθι ἀρχαῖον ἱερόν Ἀφροδίτης ἔμμεναι, τὸ Κινύρης εἴσατο, καὶ εἶδον τὸ ἱερόν, καὶ ἀρχαῖον ἦν. Τάδε μὲν ἐστὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Συρίῃ ἀρχαῖα καὶ μεγάλα ἱερά [...].

¹⁵ Cf., e.g., the translation of the following excerpt: ἐρέω δὲ καὶ νόμους τοῖσιν ἐς τὰ ἱερά χρέωνται, καὶ πανηγύριαι τὰς ἄγουσιν, καὶ θυσίας τὰς ἐπιτελέουσιν. ἐρέω δὲ ὀκόσα καὶ περὶ τῶν τὸ ἱερόν εἰσαμένων μυθολογέουσι, καὶ τὸν νηὸν ὅκως ἐγένετο (Luc., *Syr. D.* 1). Although we find in both versions the expression ἐς τὰ ἱερά χρέωνται rendered by *sacra utuntur*, the repetition of *sacrum* in the translation of περὶ τῶν τὸ ἱερόν εἰσαμένων is avoided only in the printed version, which presents *de fani huius inductoribus fabulantur* (Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 35r) instead of *de sacri huius inductoribus fabulantur* (Évora, BPE, ms. 229, f. 7r).

¹⁶ Cf., e.g., the translation of Luc., *Syr. D.* 1 (Ἔστιν ἐν Συρίῃ πόλις οὐ πολλὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐφρόρῃτεω ποταμοῦ, καλέεται δὲ ἱερά, καὶ ἔστιν ἱερά τῆς Ἥρας τῆς Ἀσσυρίης): *Est in Syria ciuitas haud procul ab Euphrate flumine, appellatur autem Hira, id est, sacra, et Hira quidem ab Hera, id est, Iunone Dea Assiria, quae in ea ciuitate colitur* (Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 35r), and also Luc., *Syr. D.* 16 ([...] καὶ φαλλοὶ δὲ ἐστᾶσι ἐν τοῖσι προπυλαίοισι δύο κάρτα μεγάλοι [...]): *Quin et phalli duo (phallus graece uerenda significat) immani quadam et incredibili altitudine in ipsis templi uestibulis spectantur [...]* (Jorge Coelho, op. cit., ff. 39v-40r).

¹⁷ Cf., e.g., the translation of the adjective τραχύς as *ualidus ac status* (Luc. *Syr. D.* 8; Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 36v); ὑβριστής as *iniurius contumeliosusque* (Luc., *Syr. D.* 12; Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 37v); ὀδμὴ ἀμβροσίη as *suauissimus [...]* atque *immortalis plane odor* (Luc., *Syr. D.* 30; Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 50r); ἀπλοῦς as *non una aut simplex* (Luc., *Syr. D.* 31; Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 50v).

episode which, according to Coelho himself, was not fully developed by Lucian.¹⁸

2. *Summus ironiae artifex*: Two Faces of Lucian

Despite the efforts of producing a better translation, which have been synthesised above, the most prominent feature of the Latin version is the modification of the author's image in the prefaces, a result of the profound rewriting of the letter to Lourenço de Cáceres and the elimination of the second preface to D. Henrique, the brother of D. João III to whom the translation was dedicated.

De Dea Syria does not clearly exhibit Lucian's celebrated irony, nevertheless, in the preface eliminated from the printed edition, Coelho characterises its author as *summus ironiae artifex* and presents the treatise as a display of delirious rituals of ancient religions:

*Opusculum Luciani περὶ τῆς συρίας θεοῦ, hoc est de dea Syria, Princeps illustrissime, olim in Italia e graeco in latinum uerteramus, tum quod cognitione dignissimum uidebatur – multa enim uetustatis deliramenta Lucianus, summus ironiae artifex, in eo opusculo nobis aperit – tum etiam quia eo tempore graecis litteris operam dabamus.*¹⁹

Since the authenticity of *De Dea Syria* had not been questioned at the time, accepting the irony of Lucian's language would be the only way to conciliate the disseminated image of the author as a satirist with the rather naïve and ingenuous narrator of the Syrian rites, a perspective still maintained to this day by those who argue for Lucian's authorship.²⁰

The words used to describe the Syrian rituals emphasise this interpretation: when synthesising the major lines of the cult, Coelho refers to them as *commenta mystica* ("pretended mysteries"), and, more obviously, *uetustatis deliramenta* ("delusions of the antiquity"). The detachment displayed in these expressions indicates that he had not, as Zappala argued, an exclusive historiographical interest in the exotic ceremonies and religious practices of Antiquity.²¹ On the contrary, by presenting its author as a master of irony, he seems to interpret the treatise as a parody. The excessive

¹⁸ Évora, BPE, ms. 229, f. 6r: *Atque ne omnia in alieno solo aedificasse uideremur, nonnulla in Antiochi amoribus de nostro <ingenio> adieceramus, quae saluo alioqui authoris sensu iocunditatem inter legendum aliquam afferre possent.* Cf. Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 58r.

¹⁹ Évora, BPE, ms. 229, f. 6r.

²⁰ The doubts regarding the authorship of this treatise were first aired in 1615 by Bourdelot (Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 184). On the authenticity of *De Dea Syria*, see especially L. Dirven, "The Author of *De Dea Syria* and his Cultural Heritage", *Numen* 44 (1997), pp. 153-179, and Lightfoot, op. cit., pp. 184-208.

²¹ Zappala, op. cit., pp. 138-139.

ingenuity of a narrator who, confronted with a logical reason for the changeable colour of a river, prefers instead to rely on mystical explanations, opens the possibility for a sarcastic reading of his words, and thus transforms the whole treatise into a satire of the described cults, to which the incredible stories of Seleucus, Stratonice and Combabus would definitely relate.

This emphasis on Lucian's ironic attitude is consistent with the image of the author that circulated after Erasmus and More's translations. If the first translations of Lucian undertaken by Italian humanists stressed the moral value of his works and presented Lucian as *philosophus moralis*, the translations of Erasmus and Thomas More – responsible for the wide circulation of Lucian's works throughout Europe, and also Portugal²² – largely contributed to the dissemination of Lucian's image as mocker of superstition and authority. As Panizza notices, they “translated two of Lucian's most anti-religious dialogues [...], *Alexander seu pseudomantis* [...] and *Philopseudes* [...], both of them unreserved indictments of the supernatural, of superstition and religious credulity [...]”.²³

The satirical tone of the dialogues is stressed by the humanists themselves: in a letter to Thomas Ruthall,²⁴ More highlights the sophist's witty satire of human vices and his criticism of magic and superstitions in a manner that resembles Erasmus' preface to *Alexander seu pseudomantis*, where the attribution of Lucian's criticism of contemporary society is clearer and the emphasis can be seen in the impostures of *fictae religiones*.²⁵

Considering the framework in which Jorge Coelho developed the first and second versions of *De Dea Syria* and the relative freedom of thought that existed at the time – in contrast to the latter years of the first half of the sixteenth century – the emphasis on Lucian's ironic attitude is revealing of his

²² The popularity of their versions is attested by the number of reprints in the following years. Cf. C. Robinson, “Introduction” in *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami. Recognita et Adnotatione Critica Instructa Notisque Illustrata. Ordinis Primi. Tomus Primus*. Amsterdam 1969, p. 365, and Zappala, op. cit., pp. 125-127.

²³ L. Panizza, “Vernacular Lucian in Renaissance Italy”, in C. Ligota & L. Panizza (eds.), *Lucian of Samosata Vivus et Redivivus*, London-Turin 2007, pp. 71-114, at 74. Cf. C. Robinson, *Lucian and his influence in Europe*, London 1979, p. 96, and Lauvergnot-Gagnière, op. cit., pp. 68-70.

²⁴ T. More, *The Yale Edition of The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, III:I: *Translations of Lucian* (ed. by C. R. Thompson), New Haven-London 1974, p. 2: *Qui & superciliosis abstinens Philosophorum praeceptis, & solutioribus Poetarum lusibus, honestissimis simul & facetissimis salibus, uitia ubique notat atque insectatur mortalium*; p. 5: *Hunc certe fructum nobis offeret iste dialogus, ut neque magicis habeamus praestigiis fidem, & superstitione careamus, quae passim sub specie religionis obrepit, tum uitam ut agamus minus anxiam, minus uidelicet expauescentes tristitia quaequam ac superstitiosa mendacia, quae plerunque tanta cum fide atque autoritate narrantur [...]*.

²⁵ ASD I.1. 449: [...] *Luciani Pseudomantem misi, scelestissimum quidem illum, sed quo nemo sit utilior ad deprahendas coarguendasque quorundam istorum imposturas, qui nunc quoque uel magicis miraculis, uel ficta religione, uel adsimulatis condonationibus aliisque id genus praestigiis, vulgo fucum facere solent.*

views towards the author, being also consistent with the image that circulated after Erasmus' and More's translations.

In the printed edition of 1540, the preface in which Coelho's interpretation is exposed was eliminated. Given the fact that this was a profound revision of his work, we can assume that the omission was intentional. His purpose could have been to avoid the presence of two prefaces; however, *De Patientia Christiana* is also preceded by one poem and one letter to D. Henrique, so this possibility seems unlikely.

The removal of the preface deprives us of Coelho's satirical reading and, although primarily presented as an ironic treatise about ancient rituals, *De Dea Syria* becomes an innocuous exhibit of interesting rites and fantastic myths.²⁶

Moreover, the rewriting of the letter to Lourenço de Cáceres – much longer in the manuscript version than in the printed edition – led to the omission of the laudatory references to Lucian. In the printed version, he is alluded to as the author of *De Dea Syria* and Jorge Coelho's interest for the treatise seems to lie uniquely in the fact that it had not been translated at the time (*ab interpretibus intactum*). Every mention of his sarcasm, eloquence (*homo eloquentissimus*) or rhetorical value (*luculentissimus scriptor*) disappears.²⁷

3. Lucian of Samosata, Erasmus and the Portuguese Inquisition

If in the beginnings of the sixteenth century there was no reason to fear translating Lucian or stressing his satiric verve, the profound ideological changes that occurred in Portugal during the period of his revision (especially the establishment of the Inquisition in 1536 or the increasing control imposed over book sellers and printers) would make Jorge Coelho deal carefully with the implicit parody of ancient religions displayed in *De Dea Syria*.

In this context, the association of Lucian with Erasmus was becoming problematic. Not only did the humanist translate some of the most anti-religious dialogues, he also authored the *Colloquia* and the *Moriae Encomium* – both prohibited in the first Portuguese Index – which were deeply influenced by the Lucianic *corpus*.²⁸ As Zappala stated, the increasing polemic around Erasmus in the Iberian Peninsula deeply influenced the perception of Lucian's

²⁶ Zappala (op. cit., pp. 138-139), who only had access to the printed edition of Jorge Coelho's translation, asserts that "[t]he Portuguese Humanist had probably been influenced by contemporary interest in exotic religion [...]. The presence of Ethiopians in the Latin classes of Clenardus may have interested him in the work for its description of a similarly exotic people and setting".

²⁷ Évora, BPE, ms. 229 ff. 35r-36v. Cf. Jorge Coelho, op. cit., ff. 57v-58r.

²⁸ A. M. de Sá, *Índices dos livros proibidos em Portugal no século XVI*, Lisbon 1983, p. 147. For the relation between Erasmus and the Portuguese Inquisition, see especially J. V. Pina Martins, *Humanismo e Erasmismo na Cultura Portuguesa do século XVI. Estudo e Textos*, Paris 1973, pp. 149-158, and A. M. de Sá, *Três Estudos sobre Erasmo*, Lisbon 1979, pp. 113-174.

works and contributed to the dissemination of the view of the Greek author as an atheist.²⁹ Although inherited from Byzantine scholars, this notion existed together with that of Lucian as a moral philosopher and was perpetuated in the *Vita Luciani*, a biography published in the beginning of every translation and edition of the *Dialogues* and also in Ravisius Textor's *Officina*. Later, the notion of Lucian as an apostate who, being previously Christian, had renounced his faith was added to the biographical note.³⁰

In Portugal, this image is clearly present in an inquisitorial denouncement of Vicente Fabrício, professor of Greek at the University of Coimbra, who was accused of reading Lucian's *Dialogues* during mass:

mte fabricyso lemte de grego na vniversydade de coimbra soya de leuar avera seys annõs & mays quãdo hya ouuyr misa aos domyngos & festas os dialogos de lucyano o ql lucyano he huñ apostata & inimigo da ffee segdo elle denuncyante ouuyo a huñ dõ basylio conego de santa cruz de coimbra [...]. & elle denuncyante segdo sua comcyencya lhe parece que lhe vyo o dito lyuro por vezes na Igreja quãdo estaua a misa.³¹

Even though only *Philopatris* and *De Morte Peregrini* were prohibited by the 1585 Index, the characterisation of Lucian as an “apostata & inimigo da ffee” reveals the circulation of ideas derived from *Vita Luciani* and the assumption of Lucian as an atheist demeaning to religion and Christian faith. Moreover, the accusation of consuming meat on a Friday suggests an attempt to associate Vicente Fabrício with João da Costa, George Buchanan and Diogo de Teive, the professors of Colégio das Artes who were accused of heterodoxy and Lutheranism by the Portuguese Inquisition.³²

It is true that the publication of *De Dea Syria* preceded these ideological controversies, however, the growing mistrust towards those who studied Greek, personified by Diogo de Gouveia Sénior, who would be responsible for the persecution of the Professors of Colégio das Artes and whose influence

²⁹ Zappala, op. cit., p. 39.

³⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 43-45.

³¹ Cit. *ap.* M. Brandão, *O Processo na Inquisição de Mestre João da Costa*, Coimbra 1944, p. 343. Translation provided by the author: “Six or more years ago, Fabricio, professor of Greek at the University of Coimbra, used to take to mass on Sundays or holidays Lucian's *Dialogues*. According to what he, the accuser, had heard from D. Basilio, canon at Santa Cruz de Coimbra, Lucian is an apostate and an enemy of the Christian faith. And he, the accuser, following his own consciousness, believes to have seen the aforementioned book in church during mass”.

³² For the inquisitorial process against the professors of Colégio das Artes, see especially M. Brandão, *A Inquisição e os professores do Colégio das Artes*, Coimbra 1948-1969.

on the Portuguese king was becoming more effective, ultimately explains Coelho's attempt to protect his translation from any possible misreading.³³

Indeed, Coelho's links to the Portuguese Court provided him with a profound awareness of the changes that were occurring in the first years of the 1530s and may therefore, have been responsible for the supplanting of the ironic Lucian with the historiographer Lucian. His insight into the growing ideological control could not have been any deeper: having been at the service of the Royal House since at least 1526, he became the secretary of D. Henrique, the future "Inquisidor-mor", in 1538 and one year later expanded his functions to those of notary of the Inquisition. At the service of D. Henrique, he was responsible for the transcribing of a letter to Luís Rodrigues and Germão Galharde in 1540, prohibiting them of the printing of books without previous authorisation, and one year later, the letter informing Damião de Góis of D. Henrique's prohibition of the circulation of *Fides, religio moresque Aethiopum* due to "cousas da fee" ("faith issues").³⁴

Despite the correspondence he had maintained with Erasmus, which is unfortunately lost,³⁵ in 1536 Coelho was already dissociating himself from the humanist's satirical works, as can be seen by the fact that he wrote the preface-letter to Aires de Barbosa's *Antimoria*, a poem condemning the recourse to Folly in the *Moriae Encomium*.³⁶ While his words of praise are purely circumstantial and never deepen the deprecation of Erasmus' work, nor reveal his true ideas regarding the dialogue, a rupture is probably already in motion at this time.

Seen in this context, the rewriting of the first paragraph of the letter to Lourenço de Cáceres quoted in the beginning of this study acquires a new connotation. The emphasis on the example of *magni authores* in the manuscript version suggests an association with the previous tradition that praised Lucian's adequacy to the classroom and to which his original version of *De Dea Syria* – as the humanist stressed, an *opusculum [...] ad ea tempora intactum* – would ultimately contribute:

Cum superioribus annis Florentiae, quae totius Etruriae clarissima ciuitas est, litteris Graecis operam daremus magnorumque authorum exemplo exercitationis gratia

³³ As revealed by Diogo de Teive in his Inquisitorial process, Diogo de Gouveia Sénior used to describe those who knew Greek as Lutherans; cf. Brandão, op. cit., p. 466. On Diogo de Gouveia Sénior, see J. S. da Silva Dias, *A Política Cultural da Época de D. João III*, Coimbra 1969, I, pp. 65-71.

³⁴ Sá, op. cit., p. 16.

³⁵ Cf. P. S. Allen (ed.), *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, XI (1534-1536), Oxford 1947, pp. 206-207.

³⁶ Jorge Coelho's letter was published in A. Barbosa, *Obra Poética. I. Epigramas. II. Antimória [1495-1536]*, Coimbra 2013, pp. 18-19.

Graeca nonnula latinis redderemus, uenit et nobis in mentem Luciani opusculum de dea Syria, ad ea tempora intactum, e graeco sermone in latinum uertere.

However, the printed version deprived us of this reading. The rewritten letter eliminated the reference to *magni authores*, and instead extolled the influence of St Jerome by implicitly evoking his preface to Eusebius' *Chronicon* through the expression *exercendi ingenii gratia*.³⁷

Even though this subtle supplanting may seem innocuous, seen in the light of all the alterations undertaken by Coelho, it appears as an attempt to avoid any connection to other translators of Lucian (including Erasmus), replacing their possible influence with the *auctoritas* of the translator of the *Vulgate*.

The attempt to conceal the ironic approach to *De Dea Syria* which ultimately presented Lucian as mocker of religion and insisted on his association with Erasmus is thus understood in the light of the epoch: despite publishing the same treatise he had translated in his youth, ironic Lucian had no place in Portugal in 1540. The passage of time between the two versions obligated not only a philological revision of the translation, but most importantly, a change of interpretation to guarantee the circulation of the author in Portugal.

The ambiguity of the Lucianic corpus and its ability to permit different readings was therefore crucial for its continued presence during the second half of the sixteenth century and ultimately insured its use in Jesuit classes. As a translator, Erasmus too was still found in the monastic libraries, although heavily edited, revised and censored, indispensable only as an asset to the understanding of the Greek authors.

Abstract

From the Manuscript to the Printed Version: Investigating the Process of Self-Censorship in Jorge Coelho's Latin Translation of *De Dea Syria*

In 1540, Jorge Coelho published, among other works, a Latin translation of Lucian's *De Dea Syria*. However, the recent discovery of a manuscript at Biblioteca Pública de Évora containing a previous version of the same translation revealed some significant changes which reflect not only his development as a translator, but also an attempt to redress the perception of

³⁷ Cf. Jorge Coelho, op. cit., f. 57v; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus / Hieronymi Chronicon. Eusebius Werke. Siebenter Band*, ed. by R. Helm, Berlin 1956, p. 1: *Vetus iste disertorum mos fuit, ut exercendi ingenii causa Graecos libros Latino sermone absoluerent et, quod plus in se difficultatis habet, poemata inlustrorum uirorum addita metri necessitate transferrent [...]*. On this expression, see P. Botley, *Latin Translation in the Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*, Cambridge 2004, p. 9.

From the Manuscript to the Printed Version: Investigating the Process of Self-Censorship in Jorge Coelho's Latin Translation of *De Dea Syria*

Lucian and to deprive him of his satirical image. Despite the doubts surrounding the original authorship of this treatise, first raised in 1615, this version is of crucial significance when studying the transmission and reception of the sophist in Portugal, not only because it is one of the few versions of a Greek author directly rendered from the original, but also due to the fact that it accompanies the political and social changes during the first half of the sixteenth century and reflects the changing attitudes towards one of the most diverse writers of the Ancient Greek world.

Keywords

Lucian of Samosata; Jorge Coelho; translation; Portuguese Inquisition; Erasmus of Rotterdam

Maria Luísa Resende is an integrated researcher of Centro de Estudos Clássicos (Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa) and has been developing her research in the area of Translation and Reception of Classical Literature in Portuguese Humanism and Literature of the Renaissance. She is currently a PhD candidate at the University of Lisbon, funded by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (SFRH/BD/95419/2013) to write a dissertation on the transmission and reception of Lucian of Samosata in Portuguese Humanism.

Maria Luísa Resende
Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
resendemaria@campus.ul.pt