ANALECTA ROMANA

INSTITUTI DANICI

XL/XLI

2015/16

Contents

Language Change in Humanist Latin:
the case of *traducere* (to translate)[1]

by Johann Ramminger

Abstract. Traducere in the sense of 'to translate' is not classical Latin. It is frequent in Neo-Latin, in the paratexts of translations and in humanist metadiscourse about translation. It first appears in the dedications of Leonardo Bruni's early translations and spreads quickly to the writings of other humanists such as Guarino and Francesco Barbaro. From early on it also is used in the rubrics of humanist manuscripts. By the middle of the fifteenth century it is well established in the semantic field of translation. From the 1420s onwards it appears in Italian, it enters the Romance languages of Spain in the middle of the century, French at the turn of the century. Due to the wealth of the material available we are able to establish the mechanism of lexical change in this case in great detail, and show the importance of individuals as well as the role of different text types as conduits of language innovation.

Introduction

Classical Latin had a series of verbs and periphrastic expressions for 'to translate', amongst them *transferre*, which via medieval *translatare* entered the medieval Romance languages and is still present in English. Modern Romance languages instead have a word that is derived from Latin *traducere* which, however, in classical Latin never had the meaning 'to translate'.[2]

In 1916 Sabbadini showed that this meaning first appeared in a letter by Leonardo Bruni (1,8 M. = 1,1 L.) that he dated to 1400, followed by letters from Guarino (1414) and Francesco Barbaro (c. 1417).[3] The first writer in an Italian vernacular known to Sabbadini (and still to us) to use the word was Domenico da Prato (in a text dated by Sabbadini "not beyond 1420"). Subsequent examples in Italian mentioned by Sabbadini are from the second half of the Quattrocento, whereas his Spanish and French vernacular examples

date only from the next century. The dating of Bruni's letter followed Luiso (1901); the letter itself has only the day and month. In 1955 Baron showed that the date of 1400 was impossible and suggested 1403 or 1404.[4] However, when the question of the Romance language words for 'to translate' was taken up again by Wolf (1971), Folena (1973), and Berman (1988), Luiso's dating – which James Hankins in 1990 definitively corrected to 1404 – persisted.[5] It even seemed to acquire new legitimacy when his unpublished study of Bruni's letters from 1903 (which referred to the 1901-publication) was printed in 1980. The error was not important within Romance language scholarship, which so far has mostly dealt with later examples, but it blocked the reconstruction of early-Quattrocento translation metadiscourse and of the Latin origins of the Romance vocabulary for 'to translate'.

The mechanics of the lexical change

initiated by Bruni in Latin remained unexplored after Sabbadini, and scholars have not reached a consensus regarding the relationship between the Latin and *volgare* developments.[6] It must, however, be admitted that we have had a detailed framework of the development of translation studies in the Quattrocento only since Hankins's *Plato* (1996) and Pade's *Plutarch* (2007); importantly, both studies published large corpora of dated texts that had previously been difficult to access.

Classical precedent for traducere = *'to translate'*
Sabbadini, looking for a classical precedent for Bruni's innovation, suggested that Bruni might have misunderstood Gellius 1,18,1 (there, *traducere* designates the introduction of a Greek loanword into Latin).[7] This has been widely accepted. As an alternative, Folena proposed a conscious expansion of Gellius's use on Bruni's part. Bettini drew attention to Quintilian, *inst.* 2,14, a passage about the transfer of words and concepts from Greek into Latin that uses *transferre* and *ducere* in a way that might foreshadow *traducere*. Botley cited Cicero's *Tusculans* (2,6):[8] "si haec studia traducta erunt ad nostros, ne bibliothecis quidem Graecis egebimus" (if these subjects [i.e. philosophical studies] are transferred to us, we shall not even need libraries of Greek books). Alunni has directed attention to medieval Aristotelian philosophy, where *traductio* is the transfer of form as the operative principle of a being from one matter to another.[9] He suggests that for Bruni translation is similarly an operation of transfer of a form (the work) onto another matter (the language).

Another possibility is that Bruni expanded the usage of *traducere* without a specific point of reference. There are two points in favour of this hypothesis. The first is that this is not a particularly difficult semantic operation. The new meaning was easily produced by a proportional analogy to the common *transferre* (*transferre* 'carry across' > 'translate' || *traducere* 'lead across' > 'translate'). Since the verba

simplicia *ferre* and *ducere* both belonged to the semantic field 'change of place', the new metaphor was well-formed and thus easily understood.[10] Unsurprisingly, it had been formed once before in the eleventh century (by Notker Labeo), though that innovation was short-lived.[11] Secondly, at the time Bruni actually experimented widely with the semantic field of 'to translate'. Many of the words he used were attested poorly or not at all in classical Latin.[12] The lack of classical precedent for *traducere* is thus by no means unusual.

Language change and the humanist Community of Practice
The Latin speech community of any locality in Italy and of Italy as a whole in the Quattrocento was not homogenous:[13] theologians, lawyers, notaries, public administrators etc. used varieties of Latin with differing preferences in lexicon and syntax. In this multifaceted linguistic landscape humanist Latin was distinct, with clear-cut boundaries.[14] Changes perceived as typical of humanist Latin were slow to transition outside even in cases where concepts etc. were common to larger parts of the speech community.[15]

To highlight the mechanisms of language change within humanism separately from the speech community as a whole, I shall use the notion of *Communities of Practice* (CoP) that addresses the role of smaller societal units in informal learning and has recently been taken over by historical sociolinguistics as a framework for language variation and change.[16] A CoP according to Wenger requires mutual engagement, has a joint negotiated enterprise, and over time accumulates a shared repertoire of negotiable resources. Often membership in a CoP presumes the acquisition of a specific sociolinguistic competence.[17] While co-location is the norm, it is not indispensable, if sufficient communication can be established without it.[18] Membership in a CoP is always non-exclusive, thus humanists, theologians, public administrators participated in CoPs with overlapping memberships and switched

between different language standards as necessary. The joint enterprise – in the terms of Wenger – of the humanist CoP was the establishment of a cultural sphere imbued by Roman antiquity; the criterion for membership was any kind of participation in it. Negotiated procedures within the CoP included the on-going development of a variant of Latin, that is, humanist Latin. Its shared resource was a virtual library (or rather canon) of texts containing common knowledge (classical texts, translations, original works), initially in Latin, later also in the vernacular. Only some of the members of the humanist CoP possessed the knowledge necessary to identify classical resources or the linguistic competence to create new ones (even fewer knew sufficient Greek). That same group also had the greatest influence on the development of the language norm within the CoP; a large number of the CoP members participated primarily as consumers of the texts produced. The material production of the resources (manuscripts and, later, printed works) engaged certain members of the CoP, such as scribes or typographers, who thus controlled some aspects of humanist texts crucial for language development (e.g. rubrics, orthography).[19] Because of the constant evolution of humanist Latin in the Quattrocento, linguistic compliance was an on-going concern. There was also a strong awareness of the diachronic component of variation/change in humanist Latin.[20]

Lexical change occurred for three principal reasons. Firstly, it was driven by the humanists themselves, who constantly adjusted the lexicon in tandem with their improving knowledge of antiquity (new classical texts, new lexical aids, etc.).[21] Secondly, external developments – e.g. new technology, societal changes – resulted in lexical gaps. Even though humanists regarded other varieties of Latin as substandard, they often accepted words from the Latin or vernaculars of other CoPs (even soldiers' language for weapons nomenclature).[22] Thirdly, some changes were initiated by humanists without specific points of reference within classical Latin. *Traducere*, 'to translate', belongs, as we have seen, to this category. Amongst the strategies of informal learning common among humanists (i.e., outside of school teaching) two are important for our argument: reading and excerpting texts and normative resources (such as Valla's *Elegantiae* or Perotti's *Cornu copiae*), and exchanging letters, the most important form of mutual engagement. Crucially, they enforced a linguistic consensus, also affecting members of the CoP who otherwise were little engaged in its enterprise. In the following discussion, we shall examine how the cooperative mechanisms of informal language learning worked within the humanist CoP in the case of *traducere*. We shall establish a chronological and geographical progression within certain text types, within the CoP, within the speech community at large, and between different speech communities.

Bruni's innovation

Leonardo Bruni's first translation was of Xenophon's *Hiero* (or *De tyranno*), probably from 1401 or 1402, and dedicated to Niccolò Niccoli.[23] It was followed by Basilius's *Epistola de utilitate studii in libros gentilium*, dedicated to Coluccio Salutati.[24] A translation of Plutarch's *Vita Antonii* was probably finished before September 1404 and was again dedicated to Salutati. In September 1404 Bruni began translating Plato's *Phaedo*.[25] In the dedications he increasingly reflected on the role of the translator and experimented with the Latin terminology for 'translation'.

The first innovation he tried was *transcribere* in the preface to the *Basilius* (1402/3). In the following quotation it is indicated by an asterisk, as are all the synonyms for 'to translate' throughout this essay.

> hunc tibi librum transcripsi* quasi degusta-
> tionem quamdam studiorum meorum. […]
> Quamquam id, quod de muneris parvitate
> supra dixi, non ad librum ipsum, sed ad
> convertendi* laborem referri volo (I have
> transcribed / translated* this book for you

as a sample of my studies. […] What I have said above, however, about the small value of my gift does not refer to the book itself, but to the work of translating*, Brvni *prol Basil adolesc* p.233).

With *transcribere,* meaning 'to copy by translating', Bruni indicates that translation is the copying of a text across languages, the production of an identical specimen that can stand for the exemplar. It appears again in the preface to the *Vita Antonii* of summer 1404:[26]

> Nos igitur, quoniam et Graecis litteris ita operam dedimus, ut illarum non admodum simus ignari, et in Latinis ita laboravimus, ita a te adiuti sumus, ut quaedam iam a nobis transcripta* etiam bene litterati homines non omnino aspernarentur (Since I have put so much effort into Greek that I am well versed in it, and have worked so much on my Latin and have received so much help from you that people of culture do not completely despise some pieces I have transcribed / translated*, Brvni *praef Plutarch vitae* 22,2).

This innovation was afterwards abandoned even by Bruni himself, and it is easy to see why:[27] it collided with another meaning of the word established in the domain of text production: 'to copy', 'to transcribe'. Unless there was some clearly marked contextual information that the text was 'transcribed' from a different language, a phrase would always be misunderstood.

The preface of the *Antonius* shows Bruni's terminology in a state of flux. He uses a wealth of synonyms for 'to translate', *transcribere, traducere, convertere,* and *transferre*; 'translation' is *conversio*;[28] 'translator' is *conversor* (four times, a neologism that did not permanently enter the humanist lexicon),[29] *interpres, translator.*[30] Rather than producing nuances for each term, Bruni uses them together for variety. *Traducere* makes its first appearance in the following passage: "Marci Antonii uitam […] ad te, Salutate, in hoc libro mittimus, e Graeco sermone in Latinum traductam*" (In this book, Salutati, we send you the life of Mark Antony, translated* from the Greek language into Latin, Brvni *praef Plutarch vitae* 22,2). A few weeks later, on the 5 September 1404, having begun translating Plato's *Phaedo*, Bruni makes what became one of his most famous statements on humanist translation:

> [...] prestabo ut Platonem tuum sine molestia legas. Addo etiam, ut cum summa voluptate legas. Quod, ut puto, neque a Calcidio neque ab hoc altero, qui bene atque gnaviter nomen suum suppressit, adhuc tibi prestitum est. Sed illi forsan alia via ingressi sunt, ego autem alia. Illi enim a Platone discedentes syllabas atque tropos secuti sunt: ego autem Platoni adhereo quem ego ipse mihi effinxi et quidem latine scientem, ut iudicare possit, testemque eum adhibeo traductionis* sue, atque ita traduco* ut illi maxime placere intelligo (I will make sure that you read your Plato without any problem, and, in addition, with the greatest satisfaction. This in my opinion has not been offered to you either by Chalcidius or by the other one who has wisely suppressed his name [*i.e. Henricus Aristippus*]. But they chose one path, I a different one. They left Plato and followed their syllables and tropes; I stay with Plato – I have imagined him knowing Latin, so that he can form his own judgement, and I use him as an authoritative witness of his move* [*into Latin*]; and I lead him over [*into Latin, i.e. translate*] as I understand pleases him best, Brvni *ep* 1,8 M. = 1,1 L.)[31]

Here Bruni, with a wealth of geographical metaphors, presents translation as a movement from Greece to Rome: there is a path (*via*) that one has to follow (*ingredi, sequi*), leaving it (*discedere*) means failure; the translator has to stay with his companion (*adhaerere*) to bring him over to his destination (*traducere, traductio*). According to Bruni, the two earlier translators of Plato, Chalcidius and Aristippus, had abandoned the Greek philosopher to

follow their own stylistic ideals.[32] Indeed, both had been pessimistic about translation. Chalcidius in the *Timaeus* preface had couched the relationship between text and translation (he used *transferre*) in Platonic terms: the *simulacrum* of an obscure text (*res*) will only be more obscure; the translation (*interpretatio*) needed a commentary (*explanatio*) – which Chalcidius provided.[33] Henricus Aristippus was equally diffident: since the languages of the original and the target text were not entirely compatible, some losses were unavoidable – "transfusis siquidem in varia vasa poculis gustus acerbior" (if you pour a drink into different containers, it turns more bitter, Aristippus 1979, 6). Bruni, on the other hand, asserts that – with a competent translator like himself – a work can be detached from its original language and transferred into a new one: Chalcidius produced something distant from Plato, Bruni produced "Plato himself". Already *transcribere* had described a translation process which would produce an equivalent of the original.[34] The metaphorical extension of *traducere* and *traductio* (the latter for the first time in the Letter 1,8 M.) emphasized that Plato could, in a manner of speaking, leave the original linguistic environment and take up residence among Latin authors (as opposed to metaphors of involuntary transfer such as being 'carried over', *trans-ferre*, or 'turned towards', *con-vertere*); the philosopher himself stood as guarantor of the new linguistic form.

The metaphor in *traducere*, expressed by the prepositional phrase, was soon optional:[35] instead of *traducere ad Romanos*, Bruni a year later says *traducere in latinum*, thus aligning it with the other *translation* words: "Scis tu profecto […] quanta cum celeritate illa sit a nobis in latinum traducta*" (You know, surely, […] how quickly I translated* it [*the Story of Cato*] into Latin, Bruni *ep* 10,19 M. = 1,20 L.; 1406; translation from Hankins 1990, 374).

From innovation to language change: 1410–1420
For an individual innovation to turn into language change it must be accepted by and spread within the community.[36] The spread of Bruni's term *traducere* in the early Quattrocento is due to a confluence of two factors: the general interest in translations and the particular popularity of Bruni's. Together with his translations of Basilius, Xenophon, and later Aristotle, his *Phaedo* (often accompanied by *ep* 1,8 M.) was amongst his most frequently copied works, with no fewer than 117 manuscripts still extant; the fortune enjoyed by the *Vita Antonii* was no less spectacular; 120 manuscript copies are still extant, most with the dedication.[37] Bruni's *traducere* was from the beginning widely and continuously disseminated throughout the humanist community.

The first to borrow it, as far as we know, was Guarino who writes to Francesco Barbaro in the preface to his translation of Plutarch's *Dion* (Venice 1414):

> Quod cum facere aggressus essem, Dionem Syracusium Brutumue conuertere* coeperam. Vix autem primum absolueram, cum Brutum iampridem nostro interpretatum esse* sermone – familiari quodam renuntiante – cognoui […]. Ceterum, quod omissum fuerat, in dictionem Romanam traduxi* exquisitum et subtile Plutarchi de utroque iudicium peculiariterue collatas de utroque differentias (When I had launched this project, I began to translate* *Dion of Syracuse* and *Brutus*. I had hardly finished the first part when I was informed through the notice of a friend that *Brutus* had been translated* into our language a long time ago […]. Anyway, what was omitted I translated* into the Roman tongue: Plutarch's subtle judgement of both men and the detailed comparison of the differences between the two, Guarino *ep* 21 = *praef Plutarch vitae* 20,1).

It may be possible to identify the source of Guarino's knowledge of Bruni's innovation. Hankins's and Pade's research has brought to light a manuscript containing early Plutarch translations, including the *Antonius* and its dedication, read by Guarino: ms. 136 of the

Biblioteca Riccardiana in Florence, written largely (possibly entirely) by Niccolò Niccoli. It is usually dated 1415/1420 because of its last item, the *Cicero novus*, previously assumed to be finished in 1415, and the fact that Niccoli fell out with Bruni in 1420. Hankins was the first to publish two glosses by Guarino concerning the *Cicero novus,* found in the manuscript, and Pade identified notes by Guarino throughout it.[38] According to Hankins, the *Cicero novus* was written in 1413, which would point to an earlier date for the manuscript. In addition, a note by Guarino about Jacopo Angeli suggests a date closer to 1410, the year of Angeli's death. Guarino may have read and annotated the Riccardianus manuscript before he left for Venice in 1414. The *copia* of synonyms in the *Dion* preface may emulate the same feature in that of Bruni's *Antonius.* Obviously, even if Guarino had a strained relationship with Bruni, this did not extend to a rejection of his vocabulary.[39]

We note in the passage above that the verb *traduxi* is supported by a prepositional phrase, *in dictionem Romanam,* but without Bruni's metaphor. By 1416 Guarino used *traducere* completely matter-of-factly in a letter, again about the *Dion*:

> Quod si qua ex iis quae in latinum verti* concupieris, [...]. Ut autem quid de illis consultes habeas, haec ipsa latina feci*: Calumniam Luciani, [...] Post hos Syracusium Dionem cum Bruto in contentionem adductum traduxi* (If you should wish for any of those I translated* […]. So that you have some basis for your decision, these works I have translated* into Latin myself: *The Calumny* by Lucian, […] after that I translated* *Dion from Syracuse,* who is contrasted with Brutus, GVARINO *ep* 47, 5 February 1416).

This is the first time after Bruni that a prepositional phrase indicating the target language (*in latinum* or sim.) is entirely absent and *traducere* is used as transitive verb (a structure shared with *transferre*). The

transitive use relies on the reader's associating the correct meaning of the verb plus object without further contextual support; thus it assumes that the reader is at least somewhat familiar with the new meaning of the verb. In this, as in many cases of transitive usage, the wider context offers the information necessary for a correct understanding (here the synonyms *in latinum verti* and *latina feci*). We also have examples of absolute or elliptical use (without the accusative) from early on (BRVNI *ep* 1,8 M.; POLENTON *ep* 7 to Bruni, see below); but in these cases, too, the target language, and with it the meaning of *traducere,* usually can be deduced by the reader from the wider context. As with *transferre,* the transitive and absolute uses never become predominant with *traducere.*[40]

The second humanist we know to use *traducere* is Giovanni Campiano, a close acquaintance of Bruni's, in a letter to Aurispa from Bologna 1415: "de Politicorum libro, quem ex graecis ut aiunt litteris in latinitatem traduxisti*" (the *Politics* which you have, as one says, led over/translated* from Greek into Latin, CAMPIANO *Aurispa ep* 6).[41] Campiano seems hesitant about the new word (*ut aiunt*); it may be that he is not sure whether Aurispa, who had been abroad, is as yet acquainted with the neologism.

Bruni: *the* Nicomachean Ethics – *1444*

When Bruni again wrote about translation (1417), he could use *traducere* with the full range of structures of the analogous *transferre,* including the transitive use:

> Aristotelis Ethicorum libros facere Latinos* nuper institui, non quia prius traducti* non essent, sed quia sic traducti* erant, ut barbari magis quam Latini effecti uiderentur. Constat enim illius traductionis* auctorem [...] neque Graecas neque Latinas literas satis sciuisse (I have recently decided to translate* Aristotle's *Ethics* into Latin, not because it had not been translated* before, but because it had been translated* in a way which made it seem more foreign

than Latin. Clearly the author of this trans-
lation* did not know Greek or Latin well,
Bʀᴠɴɪ *praef Aristoteles eth Nicom* p.157).

Examples where we can pinpoint the trail of
transfer between two texts, as with Guarino,
become rarer the more the possible conduits
multiply. Another case is connected with
Bruni's partial translation of Plato's *Phaedrus*.
In the dedication to Antonio Loschi (1424),
Bruni showcases his own contributions as
translator, using his *traducere* no fewer than
three times but *convertere* only once:

> traductis* aliquot Demosthenis Aeschinis-
> que orationibus […] Inde maiora iam ausi,
> Platonis Aristotelisque libri […] per nos tra-
> ducti* ut Latine legerentur, effecimus. […]
> Quae de Graecis hactenus traduximus*, su-
> pra dictum est. Nunc autem librum Plato-
> nis, qui inscribitur Phaedrus […] quadam
> ex parte in Latinum converti* tuoque illum
> nomini dedicavi (Having translated* some
> orations of Demosthenes and Aeschines
> [*we shared the Greek orators with our people*].
> Then we undertook bigger projects and
> translated* Plato and Aristotle, so that they
> could be read in Latin. Now I have partially
> translated* Plato's *Phaedrus* into Latin and
> dedicated it to you, Baron 1928, 126–127).

Ambrogio Traversari read the preface and
translation upon completion and had nothing
good to say about them:

> Leonardus Arretinus Phaedri partem
> quamdam transtulit*, librumque truncum
> Antonio Lusco dedicavit. Vidi fragmentum
> illud; nam ad nos ipse pertulit; mallemque,
> fateor, ipsum non vidisse. Habet haec sua
> extrema traductio* magnos buccinatores,
> atque in primis se ipsum. Ego quid de illa
> sentiam, fateri non audeo (Leonardo Bruni
> translated* a part of the *Phaedrus* and dedi-
> cated the mangled book to Antonio Loschi.
> I saw this fragment, because he himself
> brought it to us. I have to admit I would
> rather not have seen it. This, his latest trans-

lation,* has great trumpeters, and especially
himself. I would rather not say what I think
of it, Tʀᴀᴠᴇʀsᴀʀɪ *ep* 8,8, 1424, to Niccoli).

Traducere was not new for Traversari (see
below). But here he directly alludes to Bruni's
dedication (besides *traductio* also *quadam ex parte
> quamdam partem*) with a slight maliciousness
surely appreciated by Niccoli – who was after
all the recipient of the widely read Letter 1,8
M. that twenty years earlier had launched
traducere and Bruni's career as a translation
theorist.

We have some slight evidence that Bruni
may have reserved *traducere* for Greek-Latin
translations. His short preface to the Latin
translation of the *Tancredo* from Boccaccio's
Decamerone from 1437 has three synonyms
(*vertere, convertere, latinum facere*), but does not
use *traducere*.[42] This stands in contrast to
Bruni's utterances about his translations from
the Greek dating from the same period, where
traducere is predominant.[43]

Spreading lexical change: speakers and places
From the 1420s on, the spread of *traducere*
accelerated significantly. In Florence the word
was used by Traversari in a letter to Francesco
Barbaro in Venice, dated 1417, in 1420 in his
dedication of the Latin translation of Iohannes
Climacus's *Scala paradisi*, and frequently after
that.[44] Francesco Filelfo began to use *traducere*
in the 1430s while in Florence, alluding to its
metaphorical potential (*ad Latinos*);[45] from the
1450s onwards it was common in his Milan
correspondence (see below). Giannozzo
Manetti, while still in Florence and just before
he moved to Naples, paid homage to Bruni's
seminal activity as a translator with Bruni's
own word, as it were, in his funerary oration
of 1444:

> Leonardus […] traducendis* operibus
> graecis operam navare coepit. […] res ab
> initio ita sibi prospere succedebat, ut pri-
> mae ejus traductiones* legentibus omnibus
> adeo elegantes viderentur, ut mirabilem ex
> iis famam consequeretur (Leonardo be-

gan to apply himself to the translation*
of Greek works. […] from the beginning
he was so successful that his first transla-
tions* seemed so elegant to all readers that
he acquired considerable fame from them,
Manetti *or funeb Bruni* p.xciv).

From Florence the new word spread to
northern Italy, as much on account of
contacts through writing as the frequent
displacements of many humanists. When
Guarino transferred to Venice (1414), the
vocabulary he brought with him was taken
over by his students there. Francesco Barbaro
used it in a bravura display of *copia* in his
famous letter to Lorenzo Monaci (c. 1416).[46]
The twelve-year-old Ermolao Barbaro applied
the new word in the dedication of the *Fabulae
Aesopi* to Traversari (1422).[47] After Campiano's
letter (1415) examples from Bologna occur
in the 1450s, in the correspondence of the
Roman humanist Niccolò Perotti (temporarily
transplanted while his employer Bessarion
was papal administrator of Bologna) with
Giovanni Tortelli in Rome.[48] In Ferrara it is
used by Aurispa in a letter to Traversari (1430)
and by the long-time resident Guarino, but also
by a more transient denizen such as Theodore
Gaza, criticising medieval translations of
Aristotle in a university oration (1449).[49] In
Padua Barzizza uses it in his *Vita Ciceronis*
of uncertain date (1416/21), in a reference
to Bruni's *Ctesiphon* translations.[50] Depending
on the exact date, possible sources might be
few (Bruni did not use *traducere* in the preface
to the *Pro Ctesiphonte*);[51] *ex Graecia […] ad
nos traductae* could be an allusion to Bruni's
Letter 1,8 M. Sicco Polenton employs the
new word in a letter to Bruni from 1419 (*ep*
7), again in a bow to the latter's achievements
as a translator.[52] In Milan, the first known
testimony is from the 1430s, from Antonio da
Rho: defending his vernacular translation of
Suetonius against Panormita he subtly insists
on the humanist quality of his product by
using the modern *traducere* (a strategy we will
meet again in Decembrio).[53] By the 1440s we
have examples of *traducere* from Naples and

Rome, often from humanists writing to each
other between the two cities or relocating
from Naples to Rome.[54] It is probably simply
a reflection of the social and economic
realities of the Italian humanists' lives that we
find few examples from the first half of the
Quattrocento outside the big Italian centres
of power; such as there are, all in some way
are connected to Leonardo Bruni.[55]

By the 1440s, *traducere* is used in texts
authored by people only marginally connected
with the humanist CoP. For example, Joan
Olzina, the secretary to King Alfonso, used
traductio and *translatio* as synonyms in a letter
expressing the King's (or rather Lorenzo
Valla's) wish for a Greek dictionary (Capua,
1441):[56]

> valde enim nobis illo esse opus ad absol-
> vendam Homeri Illiados translationem*,
> quam nostro jussu Laurencius Vallensis
> secretarius noster inchoavit, eiusque decem
> libris traductionem* fecit ut vehemencius
> reliquam partem videre cuperemus (for we
> have great need of it [*the Greek dictionary*]
> to finish the translation* of Homer's *Iliad*
> which our secretary Lorenzo Valla has be-
> gun on our command; and he has made a
> translation* of ten books of it so that we
> even more urgently wish to see the rest,
> Olzina *ep publ ed. Calonja* 2 p.115).

A shift of domain has taken place with the
following missive from 1448 'in bureaucratese',
also from the chancellery of King Alfonso,
even though it still concerned humanist text
production and was directed to Guarino:

> Rex Aragonum et utriusque Sicilie etc.
> Spectate vir et orator clarissime, devote
> nobis plurimumque dilecte. Iam per quin-
> quennium anteactum assignavimus vene-
> rabili et eruditissimo viro Iohanni Aurispe
> librum quendam nostrum grece composi-
> tum de machinamentis bellicis, spem nobis
> prebenti quod illum nobis in latinum brevi
> traduceret* (The king of Aragon and both
> Sicilies, etc. Honourable man and most fa-

mous orator, devoted to us and much beloved. Already five years ago we assigned the venerable and most learned man John Aurispa a certain book of ours written in Greek about the conduct of war [*Aelian's Tactica*], as he had given us hope that he would translate* it for us shortly, Figliuolo 2012, 365).

So far no example of *traducere* has come to light that does not refer to humanist text production before Henneberg's mandate discussed below. Even the announcement of the "Opera plutarchi nouiter traducta" on a single sheet by an unnamed Venetian printer (c. 1484) fits this mould.[57] It should be added that there are no discernible currents of norm control working against *traducere*. No major humanist avoids it; Niccolò Perotti, the standard bearer of normative lexicography, mentions it neutrally in his *Cornu copiae* (printed 1489): "Unde etiam traducere* librum ex una lingua in aliam quidam dicunt, hoc est interpretari*" (hence some say 'to lead a book over'* from one language into another, that is 'to translate'*, PEROTTI *ccopiae* 4,76).

The semantic field of 'translation'

According to Lehrer, "to understand lexical meaning it is necessary to look at sets of semantically related words, not simply at each word in isolation".[58] To consider *traducere* from an onomasiological perspective, I will discuss three snapshots of the semantic field of 'translation' in different text types produced within the humanist CoP. I have selected the following verbs used for translating that are frequent in Neo-Latin:[59] *traduco, transfero, converto, verto, interpretor, latinum facio, latinum/e reddo.*[60] These also often occur as synonymic pairs or triplets.[61]

Whether there were semantic differences between these translation verbs in classical Latin (with the exception of *traducere*) and if so, which ones, has often been discussed.[62] Although they were based on different metaphors (*vertere*/'turn', *ferre*/'carry'), attempts to relate them to different qualities of translation have not succeeded.[63] Fuhrmann

convincingly argued that in Antiquity there was no fixed terminology corresponding to the theory/ies of translation. Humanists inherited a lexicon of translation with functional synonyms. They could not be distinguished semasiologically, but only differed chronologically; the generally used *transferre* was not even Ciceronian (late first century AD).[64]

There are only two substantives for 'translator' used by classical authors, *interpres,* from Cicero onwards, and *translator*, found in Jerome.[65] For 'translation' (the process or the result) the dictionaries have *interpretamentum, interpretatio, mutatio, translatio*, all seldomly used. The situation remains the same in Neo-Latin. There are few synonyms for 'translator' and 'translation' and examples are scarce; probably because of the small sample sizes the data usually appear quite lopsided. I will discuss them in relation to the data for verbs, but they will not be part of the statistics.

Ambrogio Traversari

In Traversari's letters and the *Itinerarium* (the *orationes* have no examples) I have identified 176 instances reaching from 1417 to 1438 (Table 1):

Traversari, Letters and *Itinerarium*	total: 142 verbs	excl. dedications: 105 verbs	letters of dedication: 37 verbs
traduco	56	49 = 46 %	7 = 19 %
transfero	40	24 = 23 %	16 = 43 %
converto	31	21 = 20 %	10 = 27 %
verto	1	1 = 1 %	0 = 0 %
interpretor	1	0 = 0 %	1 = 3 %
latinum facio	12	9 = 9 %	3 = 8 %
latinum/e reddo	1	1 = 1 %	0 = 0 %

Table 1: The semantic field of 'to translate' (verbs) in Traversari's letters and prefaces.

Traversari widely uses *traducere* (56 examples), the conventional *transferre* (40) and *convertere*

(31). The others, aside from *Latinum facere* (12), are practically absent. Exceptionally, Traversari's innovative use also extends to the substantives for 'translation', with *traductio* (17) leading, *translatio* and *interpretatio* (both 4); 'translator' is mostly *interpres* (8), once *traductor*.

The overall numbers do not tell us whether the distribution of synonyms is uniform throughout different types of Traversari's letters. To get a more granular result I have looked seperately at one group of texts, the dedications of his translations (book XXIII of Canneto's edition, eleven letters; table 1). All humanist letters are to some degree directed, not only at the named recipient, but also at a larger public (and some had a wide circulation). Dedications amplify this dynamic: they are a priori formulated for a public ensuring the visibility of both the author/translator and the dedicatee. Traversari's dedications do show a subtle stylistic difference from the other letters. The new *traducere* is still present, but much reduced (7, + *traductio* 2), the majority of examples are from *transferre* (16 + *translatio* 1), *interpretari* (11) or *convertere* (10). This suggests that Traversari in his letters 'to the public' used a more classical vocabulary than in letters to a more restricted readership.

Prefaces to Plutarch's Lives

To see whether this pattern is valid for dedications more generally, I looked at the Plutarch prefaces in Pade 2007, written by different authors.

Dedications	Plutarch dedications: 81 verbs	Traversari dedications: 37 verbs
traduco	8 =	9 %	7 =	19 %
transfero	10 =	12 %	16 =	43 %
converto	13 =	16 %	10 =	27 %
verto	12 =	15 %	0 =	0 %
interpretor	25 =	31 %	1 =	3 %
latinum facio	9 =	11 %	3 =	8 %
latinum/e reddo	4 =	5 %	0 =	0 %

Table 2: 'to translate' in Prefaces to Plutarch's *Lives* and Traversari's dedications.

In the 81 examples identified, *interpretor* is the most frequent word (25), then follow *converto* (13, Bruni 3), *verto* (12), *transfero* (10, Bruni 5), *traduco* (8, Bruni 2), *latinum facio* (9), and *latinum/e reddo* (4). The predominance of *interpretari* is due to Lapo da Castiglionchio (9), otherwise it would have the same frequency as several others. As far as *traduco* is concerned, the pattern seen in Traversari's dedications (less frequent use of *traduco* than of other synonyms) is confirmed. The substantives (not in table 2) are few: 'translation' is *interpretatio* (5), *conversio* (2, only in Bruni's *Antonius* preface), and *traductio* (1), while 'translator' is *interpres* (4), *conversor* (4, only in Bruni, see above) or *traductor* (1).

Francesco Filelfo's Letters

As a comparison with Traversari's letters, I have chosen those by Francesco Filelfo;[66] they are from the same genre, but from a different author and mostly written considerably later.

	Filelfo: 142 verbs	Traversari: 142 verbs
traduco	24 =	13 %	56 =	39 %
transfero	8 =	6 %	40 =	28 %
converto	43 =	30 %	31 =	22 %
verto	6 =	4 %	1 =	1 %
interpretor	37 =	26 %	1 =	1 %
latinum facio	9 =	6 %	12 =	9 %
latinum/e reddo	15 =	11 %	1 =	1 %

Table 3: 'to translate' – distribution in Filelfo and Traversari

If Traversari preferred *traduco*, Filelfo uses *converto* (43) and *interpretor* (37).[67] *Traduco* is not rare, but nor is it predominant (24), *transfero* (7) and *verto* (6) are used only incidentally. Filelfo also likes *latinum/e reddere* (15) and *latinum facere* (9). Concerning the substantives, the situation is similar to the corpora discussed above: the only nomen actoris is *interpres* (14), 'translation' is mostly *interpretatio* (11), *traductio* has three examples, *translatio* one, *(con)versio* is absent.

Rubrics
As a category of text the rubrics are different from the texts discussed so far in several respects: they are as a rule anonymous;[68] they may be reformulated with every reproduction of the text;[69] they are attached to texts which (in the best case) circulate widely; they employ formulas repeated within a manuscript with little variation (even the manuscripts and prints of Plutarch's collected *Lives* with their great number of *incipit*-formulas tend towards few phrases repeated throughout); they stand at the beginning or end, thus in prominent positions; and their Latin is easily understood, no matter how difficult the text that follows. Folena highlighted their importance in shaping the lexical field of 'to translate'.[70] If they mention the translator, they *perforce* add a *translate* verb.[71] The earliest known examples of *traducere* in rubrics date from 1420 and 1424, but since rubrics are generally undated, no chronological or geographical distribution can be established.[72]

cannot be doubted; we will see their traces in the early material from Germany.

Leaving Italy: Germany
Wolfgang Winthager, a Benedictine monk in the monastery of Klosterneuburg today at the outskirts of Vienna, was probably the first to use *traducere* within nascent Southern German humanism. A student at Vienna University, he held some humanist interests dear from an early date. In 1452 he wrote a *Defensio Terentii*, where twice he used *traducere*, 'to translate':[74]

> Sed animadvertendum est, ex Greco in Latinum comedias Terencii traductas* fuisse, Terenciumque non sentencias, sed uerba mutasse* (But one has to keep in mind that the comedies of Terence were translated* from Greek into Latin, and that Terence did not change* the story line, but the words, WINTHAGER *def Ter* p.79).

> At uero si quisquam magis cupiat cogno-

	rubrics ed. Pade: 22 verbs	rubrics ed. Kristeller: Incipit ... : 34 verbs	Iter I: 72	Traversari + Filelfo: 284 verbs
traduco	13 = 59 %	18 = 53 %	31 = 43 %	80 = 28 %
transfero	1 = 4 %	6 = 18 %	20 = 28 %	48 = 14 %
converto	3 = 14 %	6 = 18 %	10 = 14 %	74 = 26 %
verto	4 = 18 %	1 = 3 %	5 = 7 %	7 = 1 %
interpretor	1 = 4 %	0 = 0 %	1 = 1 %	38 = 13 %
latinum facio	0 = 0 %	3 = 9 %	5 = 7 %	21 = 7 %
latinum/e reddo	0 = 0 %	0 = 0 %	0 = 0 %	16 = 6 %

Table 4: 'to translate' distribution in rubrics and comparison with epistolary Latin[73]

From Table 4: 'to translate' distribution in rubrics and comparison with epistolary Latin73 one fact emerges clearly: rubrics have a much stronger preference for *traducere* than the texts they are attached to. For *transfero* and *verto* the results are not clear. Interestingly, *interpretor* and the two periphrastic expressions are not used (in the latter case this may be sheer writing economy). The importance of the rubrics for the spread of the innovation

scere, quare poetis incumbendum sit, […] Magni Basilij volumen ex Greco in Latinum elegantissime traductum* per Leonardum Aretinum legat diligenter (But truly, if anybody wants to know more about why one should engage with poets, one should attentively read the book by Basil the Great, which has been elegantly translated* from Greek into Latin by Leonardo Bruni, WINTHAGER *def Ter* p.85).

How did Winthager acquire *traducere* from Italian humanist Latin? Two humanists can be suggested as intermediaries. One is Lorenzo Guglielmo Traversagni (c. 1425–1503), who resided in Vienna at that period and with whom Winthager was in contact.[75] At the beginning of the 1450s *traducere* in Italy was universally used in the new meaning and since Winthager and Traversagni presumably communicated in Latin (their shared language), the Italian humanist could have passed on the new word. The other possibility is of course Enea Silvio Piccolomini, in the employ of the emperor since 1443, whose influence – according to the editor of the *Defensio* – is discernible in the work. The second quotation above suggests a third possibility: Winthager claims to have read Basilius, obviously in Bruni's translation and obviously in manuscript. We actually have copies of the Basilius with rubrics corresponding closely to Winthager's phrasing: "ex greco in latinum traduxit", "e greco in latinum traductus".[76]

This is only circumstantial, but suggestive evidence. We have the same set of possible influences in the correspondence of Niclas de Wyle (1461): "Mitto tibi hic, vir prestans, tris oraciones in triplici genere dicendi per Leonardum Aretinum e greco in latinum traductas*" (I send to you, my dear friend, three speeches in three styles, translated* by Leonardo Bruni from Greek into Latin, Wyle *ep* 15). Wyle, the friend of Piccolomini and an avid translator into German, had of course many resources at his disposal. Still, published rubrics of the *Three speeches* (from Homer) contain the same formula.[77]

For the generation after Winthager and Wyle, access to Italian humanism was easier, since a residency in Italy became the norm. Also, with the spread of printing, translations by Italian humanists, with their prefaces, became more widely available, and points of access for language learning multiplied.[78] Thus it is not surprising that Regiomontanus used *traducere* rather matter-of-factly in a letter written after his return from Italy, relating a discussion about the discrepancies between

astronomical texts and reality (1471):[79]

Ego autem ex improviso respondere coactus […] huiuscemodi erroris causam codicibus inpixi vel minus bene traductis*, vel indocte expositis, vel alio id genus vicio labefactis (I was unexpectedly obliged to answer and […] imputed the reason for that kind of error to the manuscripts which either contained errors of translation*, had been badly understood, or were suffering from another defect of that kind, Regio-montanvs *ep ed. Curtze* 9).

Awareness of the history of a text – as proudly shown off by Regiomontanus – was a hallmark of humanist textual criticism. Regiomontanus's choice of *traducere* fits well into this discourse. Significantly, he expected the addressee, Christian Roder, professor at the University of Erfurt, to understand the verb even without a helping 'e Graeco in Latinum'.

In our next instance *traducere* and *traductio* are used in a legal-administrative text regulating the dissemination of translations; the perpetrators of the described offences were obviously expected to understand the text. It is the famous ordinance of censorship issued by the archbishop of Mainz, Berthold von Henneberg, in 1485.[80] Henneberg expresses his concern about the increased accessibility by "the common people" of (especially religious) texts in translation:

Vidimus enim ipsi libros missarum officia continentes et preterea de diuinis rebus et apicibus nostrae religionis scriptos e latina in germanicam linguam traductos* nec sine religionis dedecore versari per manus vulgi (We have seen ourselves that books containing the offices of the mass, and furthermore concerning sacred things and the greatest aspects of our religion, were translated* from Latin into German and read to the dishonour of religion by the common people).

None of the translations Henneberg criticises in the following has been identified. Still, his statement is a testament to Italian humanist scholarship, as it replicates for German arguments that Italian humanists had developed concerning Latin's supposed richness or poverty and its ability to render Greek texts adequately. He straightforwardly questions whether German is able to capture with precision Greek and Latin writings "about the deepest insights of the Christian religion and about general knowledge":

> Huius artis volumina stulti quidam temerarij atque indocti in vulgarem linguam traducere* audent. quorum traductionem* multi etiam docti viri videntes confessi sunt, se propter maximam verborum impropriationem et abusum minime intellexisse. […] Dicant translatores* tales, […] an ne lingua germanica capax sit eorum, que tum greci tum et Latini egregij scriptores de summis speculationibus religionis christiane et rerum scientia accuratissime argutissimeque scripserunt (Some thoughtless stupid idiots have dared to translate* these books [*the sacred canons*] into the language of the people; many, even learned people, saw this translation* and admitted that they did not understand it at all on account of the extremely improper use and misapplication of the words. […] Let that kind of translator* explain […] whether German can really capture what excellent Greek and Latin authors have written with the greatest precision and subtlety about the deepest insights of the Christian religion and about general knowledge).

The stylistic aspirations in the passage are noteworthy. There are bi- and tricola: *stulti / temerarii / indocti*; *impropriationem / abusum*, *accuratissime / argutissime*. The reproaches of temerity and lack of learning are standard humanist ones, as is the praise of arguing precisely and subtly. In addition there is a neologism (*impropriatio*) – even if rather inept – for the somewhat more frequent

improprietas (from Gellius), introducing the humanists' concern with the adequate rendering of the *proprietas verborum* in another language and their abhorrence of the *abusus*, i.e. the semantic expansion of a word against classical precedent. The humanist *traducere* fits well into this context. Also it reflects Italian speech habits (ensuring *copia*) that the conjoined substantive (*translator*) is from a different lexem. *Traducere* is used again when Henneberg talks about implementation:

> […] mandamus, ne aliqua opera cuiuscunque scientie, artis vel notitie e greco, latino vel alio sermone in vulgare germanicum traducant*, aut traducta* quouis commutationis genere vel titulo distrahant […] nisi […] (we order that no works of any science, art or knowledge be translated* from Greek, Latin or another language into the vulgar German nor, if translated*, be sold, regardless of any change in content or title, […] unless […]).

This little collection of texts allows us an insight into how humanist language change spread to texts produced outside the humanist CoP. Henneberg (or one of his secretaries) may have brought the word from Italy, for he had studied in Italy earlier and stayed at the curia in 1466; or – since the ordinance mentions fake attributions to increase sales and translations from the Greek – this may again be the influence of the omnipresent rubrics. For 'to translate', Henneberg exclusively uses *traducere* (five times), and once each *traductio* and *translator*. Given the authority of his text, his choice of words would also appear in derived texts, as we can see in Scherenberg's own ordinance (*traducere* twice).[81] But the 'normal' *transferre* was not easily displaced (three examples in Scherenberg). Also Henneberg's chancellery reverted to the traditional vocabulary in the two accompanying missives (*transferre* 4; *translator* 1). *Traducere* occurs only once: "si forte ad rectum sensum non facile traduci* poterunt" (if they cannot be translated* according to their correct sense, Gudenus 1758, no. 223 p. 474),

in a reference to the limitations of translation discussed in the edict itself.

Leaving Latin: The vernaculars

As Sabbadini observed, *traductione* for translation was used around 1420 in a polemical *volgare* text defending the *tre corone*. There, Bruni was made to ask with disbelief: "Tu non hai adunque lecte le traductioni* che delle opere greche d'Aristotele e di Plutarco ho facte in latino?".[82] Here a prominent member of the humanist CoP is attacked with his own word by an outsider who looked with disdain at humanist practices; Bruni's *traductioni* were prestigious within the humanist CoP, but risible outside. While this once more shows how widely Bruni's innovation had been noticed, the transition into the *volgare* was not a matter of course (Sabbadini's further examples were only from the 1460s):[83] there was no lexical gap (medieval Latin *translatare* in its vernacular language variants had the same meaning) and, unlike Latin, none of the Romance languages permitted synonyms to coexist in the long run (*tradurre* eventually replaced *translatare* in Italian).[84]

In the dedication to Filippo Maria Visconti of the first part of the *Corpus Caesarianum* from 1438 Decembrio writes of "questi libri che de presente traduco* in vulgare",[85] and again in the dedication of the *Curtius*: "l'opere et historie ambedue da me in uulgare per ordine tradotte*".[86] and in a later dedication to Nuno de Guzmán from the 1450s: "per che prima da mi queli libri de latino in uulgare erano traducti* e intitulati alo illustrissimo principo Philippo Maria ducha de Milano".[87] Decembrio knew that his vernacular works were held in low esteem by other humanists;[88] he inverted Domenico's strategy – the humanist *tradurre* put his translations of Latin works into the vernacular on a par with the more prestigious Greek into Latin translations of his peers.

The new word also entered *volgare* rubrics. One example is a subscription in the vernacular version of Traversari's translation of Climacus, giving the date of 1444 and referring to the earlier Greek-to-Latin translation: "E frate Ambrosio […] lo tradusse* di greco in latino […]".[89] The rubrics of Decembrio's Lombard translation of *Curtius* in BAV Barb. lat. 4044 contain *traduct-* e.g. f. 85r: "Incomincia el sexto (*sc. libro*) scripto da Quinto Curcio Ruffo historico eloquentissimo e traducto* in uulgare da P. Candido felicemente".[90] It also followed the text into other dialects. The Tuscan version (in ms. Magl. XXIII 45) has the rubric (fol.1v): "In questo libro si contiene lastoria dalesandro magno composta da Quinto Curtio Rufo in latino di poi tradocta* in volgare lombardo da Candido ed emendato in Firenze e ridocto in lingua toscana".[91]

In the Iberian peninsula Bruni's texts, and with them *traducere,* circulated from an early date.[92] The oldest 'local' Latin example is in a translation of a medical tract from Arabic into both the vernacular and Latin in a note by an unknown scribe from 1463/64.[93] The first known example in an Iberian vernacular is in the 1455 preface of the translation of Bruni's *Phaedo* by Pero Diaz de Toledo. There we see both verb and noun: "E por consiguiente menos podré yo guardar, en aquesta mi indocta rude tradución*, la elegante e curiosa manera de fablar en la qual Leonardo el dicho libro traduxo* en la lengua latina" (Consequently I have not been entirely able to respect in this my unskilled and ignorant translation* the elegant and learned manner of expression in which Leonardo has translated* the said book into Latin).[94] Slightly later we find a translation of Bruni's *Ethics* by Carlos de Aragón, made during his stay in Naples (1457–58); the preface uses *tradución* several times ("mi presente traducíon*", etc.).[95]

In France the earliest examples of *traducere* in Neo-Latin occur in the colophons of Paris-printed works from the 1490s, though, again, Italian Neo-Latin texts circulated earlier.[96] The oldest use in French is in the title of the translation of *Salomonis et Marcolphi dialogus* (late twelfth century) printed in Paris in 1509: "Le Catalogue de Salomon et de Marcolphus translate* du latin en francois, avec les ditz des sept sages et dautres philosophes de grece traduits* de grec en francois p(ar) maistre Jehan diuery".[97]

Conclusion – Lexical change in Neo-Latin and beyond

To sum up, we can identify the following stages in the process of lexical change that we have been discussing.

1) Preparatory stage: the 'ecological' conditions for language change.[98] With the acquisition of a new skill, namely the knowledge of Greek, by some members of the humanist CoP in around 1400, translation became possible as an activity by which to create new resources. Production of translations put increased emphasis on translation theory, which was initially articulated mostly in the paratexts accompanying the translations or in letters. The increased production of translation theory, in turn, led to a revival of functionally synonymous terms for 'to translate', which in antiquity had flourished in different periods.

2) Invention and earliest spread. Semantic innovation is one area where linguistics has admitted the importance of the individual for language change as innovator and/or early adopter, even when he or she cannot be identified for lack of sources.[99] We see this confirmed in our case. Bruni wanted to develop an approach to translation that reflected the humanists' understanding of antiquity and emphasized their competence in classical Latin. To distinguish his theoretical approach from earlier theory, he began to experiment with the terminology of translation. He coined a series of new words and usages, amongst them *traducere*. Its early distribution is connected to individual early adopters, such as Guarino, who picked it up from a Bruni manuscript. Guarino was a very effective transmitter of the term as he was a widely read translator, correspondent, and teacher who influenced his students' use of Latin.

3) Distribution: paratexts. The first comprehensive statement of humanist translation theory and terminology (including the word *traducere*) was Bruni's *ep* 1,8 M., originally a letter and thus restricted to an audience comprising only a recipient and a small circle of friends. Its audience was significantly

enlarged when it became a paratext prefacing the widely copied translation of the *Phaedo*. In this form it could have already been read by Guarino, the first we know to have adopted it. Bruni's *Nicomachean Ethics* reinforced the new terminology at a point when it slowly began to spread. The dedication outlined a theory of translation that sharply distinguished it from translations used outside the humanist CoP. Due to their wide circulation, these texts firmly anchored the new *traducere* in humanist Neo-Latin and within a range of synonyms used to designate humanist translating.

4) Distribution: rubrics. Rubrics could be changed with each new copy of a text, thus they could easily adopt language changes which semantically fell within their range. Going back at least to the 1420s, *traducere* appears in rubrics, either under the influence of scribes or of other members of the humanist CoP involved in the design of manuscripts. Due to their ubiquity (a complete Plutarch needs forty-eight rubrics at the beginning of the *Lives* alone and additional ones for the prefaces, comparisons, etc.) and their prominent position, they served as a vehicle for lexical change unmatched in quantity and reach. Moreover, since they were easily understandable, they conveyed the innovation also to Latin speakers who were less attuned to innovation and they ensured the new standards in areas where humanist practice was still in its early stages.

5) Distribution: letters. Humanist letters had different distribution patterns from the texts mentioned above. Many were read by fewer people (before they entered letter collections with a wider circulation); on the other hand, they could also reach an audience that might not yet have actively sought out the texts that developed translation terminology (Campiano-Aurispa, Regiomontanus-Roder). If written by respected early adopters within the CoP, they gave a 'stamp of approval' to a new word or usage.[100] For the modern researcher they have another advantage. They are much more numerous than dedications and, unlike rubrics, they are chronologically

and geographically well defined. Therefore they serve as a barometer of language change, since they give a detailed picture of the state of the Neo-Latin lexicon at a given point in time and place.

6) Geography and timeframe of wider circulation. The word *traducere* spread north from Florence, probably following humanist networks of letter writing as well as the frequent displacement of the humanists themselves. By 1420, humanists in the Tuscany-Veneto-Lombardy region were using it regularly, then it followed them to the newly established court in Naples and, with the return of the *curia,* to Rome. Outside Italy the spread may be due to humanists residing abroad as well as to the reception of Italian humanist writings and their rubrics.

7) Diffusion outside the humanist CoP. Even in administrative texts *traducere* is initially used to signify humanist text production. Only in the 1480s and in an area where humanism is as yet little felt it is applied to translations of ecclesiastical and legal texts. In this case, too, it might have been rubrics that had mediated the new vocabulary.

8) Semantic field. In accordance with the stylistic ideal of *copia*, humanists used a range of functional synonyms concurrently, with stylistic differences between authors and between text types. Preliminary statistics seem to indicate that the more public and prestigious text types such as dedications employed a vocabulary with less emphasis on innovation (i.e. *traducere* is used less often). Rubrics, on the other hand, overwhelmingly preferred *traducere.*

9) Other languages. Concerning our initial question of how Latin and the various vernaculars interacted, a number of observations have been made. A) The first Italian example presupposes not only Bruni's initial theoretical texts, but a number of further developments within humanist Latin and humanist text production (e.g., loss of metaphor, existence of a number of copies of humanist translations with their rubrics). B) After this first example, there is no continuous development in Italian independently of Latin. On the contrary, the prestige of humanist Greek-Latin translation is appropriated for Latin-vernacular translations by applying a word used for the former genre to the latter. Furthermore, in the vernacular, *tradurre* is also initially used for Greek-Latin humanist translations. C) Only from the 1460s on is there a continuous use of *tradurre* that no longer depends on the continuing input from Latin. D) The development of *traducir* in the Iberian vernaculars (Castilian, Catalan) rests upon the early circulation of Bruni's Latin translations and their further translations into Castilian and Catalan. E) For *traduire* in French we have so far no indications that – as has been claimed – Italian vernacular texts played a significant role. On the other hand, we can point to the early printing of Bruni's translations north of the Alps as easily accessible sources for the Latin translation theory and terminology of Italian humanism. The initial French development was based on the state of Neo-Latin in the late Quattrocento (e.g., widespread use in rubrics, application also to non-humanist translations).

This article has discussed an instance of lexical change which equally affected Neo-Latin and many other modern European languages, and it has introduced into Neo-Latin research concepts from historical sociolinguistics to view information new and old in a larger context. The concept of *Communities of Practice* as a theory of informal learning helped define the humanist community within the larger Latin speech community as the locus of language change. Equally, it offered a framework for describing the distributed humanist CoP with its specific means of internal communication as a highly efficient social structure for the distribution of shared knowledge and the spread of shared language norms. Still, Neo-Latin language change does not always fit into the mould of theories developed for other languages. *Innovation theory* as conceptualized by Rogers has contributed useful categories, but as a

whole could not be applied to a change which was only actuated over several generations of Latin speakers/writers. Similarly, a mechanism like *native-language synonym displacement*, which has made our word *traducere* so prominent in Romance languages by eliminating its closest synonym, does not have an equivalent in Neo-Latin. Thus, the description of the relevant semantic field in Neo-Latin dealt with an onomasiological situation unusual in other modern languages. Clearly, while modern linguistic theories cannot be applied indiscriminately to problems of Neo-Latin language development, they can – as in our case – help reframe and resolve questions that have been discussed for more than a century.

Johann Ramminger
Institute for the Study of Ancient Culture
Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna
Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Munich
j.ramminger@gmail.com

ABBREVIATIONS

CoP: Community of practice
Iter: Kristeller 1963–1997.
OLD: *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 2nd ed. Oxford 2012.
TLL: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig & Stuttgart 1900–.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aguiar Aguilar, M. & González Marrero, J. A.
2005　"Johannes Bonie, médico y traductor en la Valencia del Siglo XV", *Historia, instituciones, documentos* 32, 9–16.

Alunni, C.
2004 "Tradizione-transmissione-traduzione. L'azione di un functore universale". In: Minazzi, F. & Ria, D. (eds.), *Realismo, Illuminismo ed Ermeneutica. Percorsi della ricerca filosofica attuale*, Milano, 155–178.

Andersen, H.
2008　"Grammaticalization in a speaker-oriented theory of change". In: Eythórsson, T. (ed.), *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory: The Rosendal Papers*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, 11–44.

Aristippus, H.
1979　*Meno interprete Henrico Aristippo edidit Victor Kordeuter*, Labowsky, C. (ed.), (*Plato Latinus* 1), Nendeln, Liechtenstein. [repr. of Londonii 1940]

Averçó, L. de
1956　*«Torcimany» de Luis de Averçó. Tratado retórico gramatical y diccionario de rimas. Siglos XIV-XV*, Casas Homs, J. M. (ed.), 2 vols., Barcelona.

Baker, P.
2016   Review of Maxson 2014, *H-Soz-Kult* 06.07.2016, <www.hsozkult.de/publicationreview/id/rezbuecher-24811.> Website accessed 26 September 2016

Barbaro, E.
1994   *Aesopi Fabulae Hermolao Barbaro Seniore Interprete*, Cocco, C. (ed.), (*Il Ritorno dei Classici nell'Umanesimo* III.4), Firenze.

Baron, H.
1928   *Leonardo Bruni Aretino, Humanistisch-philosophische Schriften mit einer Chronologie seiner Werke und Briefe*, Leipzig.

Baron, H.
1981   "Progress in Bruni Scholarship: Apropos of F. P. Luiso's *Studi su l'Epistolario di Leonardo Bruni*", *Speculum* 56, 831–839.

Barton, D. & Hamilton, M.
2005   "Literacy, reification and the dynamics of social interaction". In: Barton & Tusting (eds.), 14–35.

Barton, D. & Tusting, K. (eds.)
2005   *Beyond communities of practice: Language, power and social context*, Cambridge.

Bergs, A.
2005   "The Role of the Individual in Language Change from the Point of View of Social Network Analysis", *Logos and Language* 6/1, 30–54.

Berman, A.
1988   "De la translation à la traduction", *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 1, 23–40.

Bertalot, L.
1990   *Initia humanistica Latina: Initienverzeichnis lateinischer Prosa und Poesie aus der Zeit des 14. bis 16. Jahrhunderts* Bd. 2. Prosa. 1. A–M, (ed. Jaitner-Hahner, U.), Tübingen.

Berti, E.
1978   "La traduzione di Leonardo Bruni del Fedone di Platone ed un codice greco della Bibliotheca Bodmeriana", *Museum Helveticum* 35, 125–148.

Bescós Prat, P.
2007   *Humanisme i traducció catalana durant la segona meitat del segle xv: Ferran Valentí, Arnau d'Alfarràs, Francesc Alegre i Aleix de Barcelona*. Doctorat Universitat Pompeu Gabra. <https://repositori.upf.edu/bitstream/handle/10230/1268/PereBescos.pdf.> Website accessed 19 June 2016

Bettini, M.
2012   *Vertere. Un'antropologia della traduzione nella cultura antica*, Torino.

Bigi, E.
1962   "Aurispa, Giovanni". In: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 4, 593–5.

Bock, E.
1955   "Berthold von Henneberg". In: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 2, 156–157.

Botley, P.
2004   *Latin Translation in the Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*, Cambridge.

Brunet, J.-Ch.
1860–1865 *Manuel du libraire et de l'amateur de livres*, Paris.

Bruni, L.
1741   *Leonardi Bruni Arretini Epistolarum libri VIII*, (ed. Mehus, L.), Florentiae.

Bruni, L.
2004   *Sulla perfetta traduzione*, (ed. Viti, P.), (*Sileni* 10), Napoli.

Bruni, L.
2014   *Lettres familières*, (ed. Bernard-Pradelle, L.), Montpellier.

Calcidius
2011   *Commentaire au Timée de Platon*, (ed. & trs. Bakhouche, B. avec Brisson, L.), I–II, Paris.

Černik, B.
1908   "Die Anfänge des Humanismus im Chorherrenstift Klosterneuburg", *Jahrbuch des Stiftes Klosterneuburg* 1, 57–94.

Chambers, P. T. & Schilling-Estes, N. (eds.)
2002   *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, Oxford.

Chavy, P.
1982   "Depuis quand traduit-on en français?", *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 44, 361–362.

Conches, Guillaume de (Guillelmus de Conchis)
2006   *Glossae super Platonem*, (ed. Jeauneau, E. A.), (*Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 203), Turnhout.

Coromines, J.
1980–91 *Diccionari etimològic i complementari de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona.

Coupland, N.
2010   "The Authentic Speaker and the Speech Community". In: Llamas & Watt (eds.), 99–112.

Diaz de Toledo, P.
1993   *Libro Llamado Fedrón: Plato's Phaedo translated by Pero Diaz de Toledo*, (ed. Round, G. N.), London & Madrid.

Dini, P. U.
2009   "'Translation' and Theories of Literary Translation: The Contribution of Comparative Historical Semantics", *Interlitteraria* 14, 383–398. <htt­ps://www.academia.edu.> Website accessed on 19 June 2016.

Domenico da Prato
1993   *Le Rime*, (ed. Gentile, R.), Anzio.

Dubé, L. *et al.*
2005   "The impact of structuring characteristics on the launching of virtual communities of practice", *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 18, 145–166.

Dutton, P. E.
2003   "Mediaeval Approaches to Calcidius". In: Reydams-Schils, Gr. (ed.), *Plato's 'Timaeus' as Cultural Icon*, Notre Dame, 183–205.

Eisermann, F.
2004   *Verzeichnis der typographischen Einblattdrucke des 15. Jahrhunderts im Heiligen Römischen Reich Deutscher Nation*, Wiesbaden.

Fernández López, J.
2002   "Carlos de Aragón, príncipe de Viana y su traducción de la *Ética Nicomáquea*", *Alazet* 14, 223–232.

Ferrando i Francés, A.
2013   "Joan Olzina, secretari d'Alfons el Magnànim, autor del *Curial e Güelfa*?", *Estudis Romànics* 35, 443–463. <http://publicacions.iec.cat/reposi­tory/pdf/00000197%5C00000010.pdf.> Website visited on 6 June 2016.

Figliuolo, B.
2012   "Notizie su traduzioni e traduttori greci alla corte di Alfonso Il Magnanimo in documenti dell'Archivo de la corona de Aragón", *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 53, 359–374.

Fischer, G.
2001   "Communities of Interest: Learning through the Interaction of Multiple Knowledge Systems", *24th Annual Information Systems Research Seminar In Scandinavia (IRIS'24) (Ulvik, Norway), Department of Information Science, Bergen, Norway.* <http://www.cs.colorado.edu/~gerhard/pa­pers/iris24.pdf.> Website accessed on 26 June 2016.

Folena, G.
1973   "'Volgarizzare' e 'tradurre': idea e terminologia della traduzione dal Medio Evo italiano e romanzo all'Umanesimo europeo". In: *La traduzione: saggi e studi*, Trieste, 57–120 [repr. with introduction Torino 1991].

Forcellini, E. & Furlanetto G.
1940   Lexicon Totius Latinitatis, Patavii.

Ford, Ph. *et al.* (eds.)
2014   *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*, Leiden & Boston.

Fried, M.
2010   "Introduction. From instances of change to explanations of change". In: Fried *et al.* (eds.), 1–16.

Fried, M. *et al.* (eds.)
2010   *Variation and Change: Pragmatic Perspectives*, (*Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights* 6), Amsterdam & Philadelphia.

Fuhrmann, M.
1961   Review of Reiff 1959, *Gnomon* 33, 445–448.

Gamberale, L.
1969   *La traduzione in Gellio*, Roma.

Garin, E.
1955   "Ricerche sulle traduzioni da Platone nella prima metà del secolo XV". In: *Medioevo e Rinascimento. Studi in onore di B. Nardi*, Firenze, 339–374.

Gee, J. P.
2005   "Semiotic Social Spaces and Affinity Spaces: From The Age of Mythology to Today's Schools". In: Barton & Tusting (eds.), 214–232.

Giustiniani, V. R.
1961   "Sulle traduzioni latine delle 'Vite' di Plutarco nel Quattrocento", *Rinascimento* 2. ser., 1, 3–62.

Gliozzo, A. & Strapparava, C.
2009   *Semantic Domains in Computational Linguistics*, Berlin & Heidelberg.

Griggio, C.
2000   "La lettera di Francesco Barbaro a Lorenzo Monaci. Prodromi del progetto di traduzioni dal greco di Niccolò V". In: Bonatti, F. & Manfredi, A. (eds.), *Niccolò V nel sesto centenario della nascita. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi Sarzana, 8-10 ottobre 1998*, (*Studi e Testi* 397), Città del Vaticano, 199–214.

Gualdo Rosa, L.
1994   "Due nuove lettere del Bruni e il ritrovamento del 'materiale Bertalot'", *Rinascimento* 34, 115–141.

Gudenus, V. F.
1758   *Codex diplomaticus anecdotorum, res Moguntinas, Francicas, Trevirenses, Hassicas, finitimarumque regionum […] illustrantium* IV, Francofurti & Lipsiae.

Haiman, J.
1980 "The Iconicity of Grammar: Isomorphism and Motivation", *Language* 56, 515–540.

Hankins, J.
1990 *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, (*Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition* XVII), Leiden.

Hankins, J.
2002 "Chrysoloras and the Greek Studies of Leonardo Bruni". In: Maisano R. & Rollo A. (eds.), *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in occidente, Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 26-29 giugno 1997)*, Napoli, 175-203. [Reprinted in Hankins 2003, 243–272]

Hankins, J.
2003 *Humanism and Platonism in the Italian Renaissance* I: *Humanism*, Roma.

Hankins, J.
2006 "Humanism in the vernacular: the case of Leonardo Bruni". In: Celenza, C. S. & Gouwens, K. (eds.), *Humanism and Creativity in the Renaissance. Essays in Honor of Ronald G. Witt*, Leiden & Boston, 11–29.

Haspelmath, M.
2009 "Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues". In: Haspelmath, M. & Tadmor, U. (eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: a comparative handbook*, Berlin, 35–45.

Hazen, K.
2002 "The Family". In: Chambers & Schilling-Estes (eds.), 500–525.

Hernández-Campoy, J. M. & Conde-Silvestre, J. C. (eds.)
2012 *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*, Chichester.

Hickey, R.
2010 "Language change". In: Fried *et al.* (eds.), 171–202.

Hoenig, Ch.
2013 "Εἰκὼς λόγος: Plato in Translation(s)", *Pratiques de l'interprétation. Methodos savoirs et textes* 13. <http://methodos.revues.org/2994.> Website accessed 18 February 2016.

Hosington, B.
2014 "Translation and Neo-Latin". In: Ford *et al.* (eds.), I, 127–139.

Hoven, R.
2006 *Lexique de la prose latine de la Renaissance. Dictionary of Renaissance Latin from prose sources*, (2nd ed. with Grailet, L.), Leiden & Boston.

Jacobsohn, H.
1907a "conversio", *TLL*, IV, 853,65 – 856,32.

Jacobsohn, H.
1907b "converto", *TLL*, IV, 858,25 – 869,79.

Jiménez San Cristóbal, M.
2011 "Del latín al vernáculo: La difusión manuscrita de la obra de Leonardo Bruni en la Castilla del Siglo XV", *Revista de literatura medieval* 23, 179–193.

Jucker, A. & Kopaczyk, J.
2013 "Communities of practice as a locus of language change". In: Jucker & Kopaczyk (eds.), 1–16.

Jucker, A. & Kopaczyk, J. (eds.)
2013 *Communities of Practice in the History of English*, (*Pragmatics & Beyond* n.s. 235), Amsterdam.

Keller, R.
1994/2005 *On Language Change. The invisible hand in language*. Nerlich, B. (transl.), London & New York. [first printed 1994]

Kittay, E. F.
1987 *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure*, Oxford.

Klötzer, W.
1994–1996 *Frankfurter Biographie*, Frankfurt.

Kopaczyk, J.
2013 "How a community of practice creates a text community. Middle Scots legal and administrative discourse". In: Jucker & Kopaczyk (eds.), 225–250.

Kristeller, P. O.
1963–1997 *Iter Italicum. A finding list of uncatalogued or incompletely catalogued humanistic manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and other libraries*, London & Leiden.

Kuhlmann, P.
2012 "Übersetzungstheorie und *latinitas* in der Renaissance am Beispiel des Leonardo Bruni". In: Volt, I. & Päll, J. (eds.), *Morgensterni Seltsi toimetised IV-V. Acta Societatis Morgensternianae IV-V. Quattuor Lustra Papers celebrating the 20th anniversary of the re-establishment of classical studies at the University of Tartu*, Tartu, 257–272.

Kühnen, F. J.
1964a "interpres", *TLL*, VII,1,2250, 43 – 2253,45

Kühnen, F. J.
1964b "interpretor", *TLL*, VII,1,2257, 67–2263,6.

Kytzler, B.
1993 "*Fidus Interpres*: The Theory and Practice of Translation in Classical Antiquity", *Antichthon* 23, 42–50.

Laurenti, F.
2015 *Tradurre. Storie, Teorie, Pratiche dall'Antichità al XIX secolo*, Roma.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E.
1991 *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge.

Lehrer, A.
1985 "The influence of semantic fields on semantic change". In: Fisiak, J. (ed.), *Historical Semantics – Historical Word-Formation*, Berlin *et al.*, 283–296.

Lev-Ari, Sh. & Peperkamp, Sh.
2014 "An experimental study of the role of social factors in language change: The case of loanword adaptations", *Laboratory Phonology* 5, 379–401.

Llamas, C. & Watt, D. (eds.)
2010 *Language and Identities*, Edinburgh.

Luiso, F. P.
1901 "Commento a una lettera di L. Bruni e cronologia di alcune sue opere". In: *Raccolta di studii critici dedicata ad Alessandro D'Ancona festeggiandosi il XL anniversario del suo insegnamento,* Firenze, 85–95.

Luiso, F. P.
1980 *Studi sull'epistolario di Leonardo Bruni*, (ed. Gualdo Rosa, L.), Roma.

Luraghi, S.
2010/2013 "Causes of Language Change". In: Luraghi, S. & Bubenik, V. (eds.), *Bloomsbury Companion to Historical Linguistics*, London & New York, 358-370 [first published 2010].

Marcelli, N.
2003 "La novella di Seleuco e Antioco. Introduzione, testo e commento", *Interpres* 22, 7–183.

Marsh, D.
1992 "Xenophon". In: Brown, V. *et al.* (eds.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries. Annotated lists and guides* VII, Washington, 75–196.

Martelli, M.
1989 "Considerazioni sulla tradizione della novella spicciolata". In: *La novella italiana*, I, Salerno, 215–244.

Mattiazzo, S.
2015 *Di mia propria mano. Le sottoscrizioni dei copisti "italiani" del Quattrocento nei codici della Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze*. U. di Padova, Corso di Laurea Magistrale in Filologia Moderna, Padova. <http://tesi.cab.unipd.it/48989/1/SISSI_MATTIAZZO_2015.pdf.> Website visited on 10 July 2016.

Maxson, B. J.
2014 *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence*, Cambridge [reviewed by Baker 2016].

McMahon, A.
1995 *Understanding Language Change*, Cambridge [first publ. 1994].

Meurmann-Solin, A.
2012 "Dialects". In: Bergs, A. & Brinton, L. J. (eds.), *English Historical Linguistics: An International Handbook* 1, Berlin & Boston, 668–684 (ch. 42).

Meyer, W.
1885 "Bücheranzeigen des 15. Jahrhunderts", *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 2, 437–463.

Meyerhoff, M.
2002 "Communities of Practice". In: Chambers & Schilling-Estes (eds.), 526–548.

Migliorini, B.
1956 "The Contribution of the Individual to Language". In: *Id., Saggi Linguistici*, Firenze, 318–330 [first published 1952].

Mioni, E.
1950 "Le 'Vitae Patrum' nella traduzione di Ambrogio Traversari", *Aevum* 24, 319–331.

Montella, C.
1993 "Etimologia e traduzione. Le parole latine del tradurre", *AIΩN. Annali dell'Università degli studi di Napoli «L'Orientale». Dipartimento di studi del mondo classico e del mediterraneo antico. Sezione linguistica* 15, 313–321.

Morel-Fatio, A.
1894 "La traduction des commentaires de César par Pier Candido Decembrio", *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 55, 343–348.

Norton, G. P.
1984 *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and their Humanist Antecedents*, Genève.

Notker Labeo
1996 *Die kleineren Schriften*, (eds. King, J. C. & Tax, P. W.), Tübingen.

Pade, M.
1998 "Curzio Rufo e Plutarco nell'«Istoria d'Alexandro Magno»: volgarizzamento e compilazione in un testo di Pier Candido Decembrio", *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 18, 101–113.

Pade, M.
2007   *The Reception of Plutarch's* Lives *in Fifteenth-Century Italy,* (*Renæssancestudier* 14), Copenhagen.

Pade, M.
2013   *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Vita Dionis et Comparatio et de Bruto ac Dione Iudicium Guarino Veronensi interprete,* (*Edizione nazionale delle traduzioni dei testi greci in età umanistica e rinascimentale* 8), Firenze.

Pade, M.
2014a   "From Medieaeval Latin to Neo-Latin". In: Ford *et al.* (eds.), I, 5–19.

Pade, M.
2014b   "Translation as a Source for Neologisms". In: Ford *et al.* (eds.), II, 1188–90.

Pallmann, H.
1884   "Des Erzbischofs Berthold von Mainz ältestes Censuredict", *Archiv für Geschichte des Deutschen Buchhandels* 9, 238–241.

Perottus, N.
2014   *Vita Martialis*, Ramminger, J. (ed.). In: *Repertorium Pomponianum.* <http://www.repertorium-pomponianum.it/textus/perotti_vita_martialis.htm> Website consulted 17 July 2016.

Pöckl, W.
1996–1997 "Apuntes para la historia de 'traducere' / 'traducir'". In: *Hieronymus Complutensis. El mundo de la Traducción* 4–5, 9–15. <cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/hieronymus/pdf/04_05/04_05_009.pdf> Website consulted 8 June 2009.

Polt, C. B.
2007   *Latin Literary Translation in the Late Roman Republic.* MA Thesis U. of North Carolina. Chapel Hill. <https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/indexablecontent/uuid:33b9be2f-a3e3-4a06-916a-2fea0a6b0219> Website consulted 7 June 2016.

Ponzú Donato, P.
2012–13 "Il *Bellum Alexandrinum* e il *Bellum Africanum* volgarizzati da Pier Candido Decembrio per Inigo d'Avalos", *Interpres* 31, 97–149.

Poplack, S. & Meechan, M.
1995   "Patterns of language mixture: nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French bilingual discourse". In: Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.), *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, Cambridge, 199–232.

Poplack, S. & Sankoff, D.
1984   "Borrowing: the synchrony of integration", *Linguistics* 22, 99–135.

Ramminger, J.
2001   "Die 'Irrtümer Perottis' von Ermolao Barbaro d.

J. Ausgabe und Kommentar von Brief 135", *Festschrift für A. Primmer. Wiener Studien* 114, 677–700.

Ramminger, J.
2003–   *Neulateinische Wortliste. Ein Wörterbuch des Lateinischen von Petrarca bis 1700.* <http://www.neulatein.de>.

Ramminger, J.
2010   "Humanists and the Vernacular: Creating the Terminology for a Bilingual Universe". In: Hass, T. & Ramminger, J. (eds.), *Latin and the Vernaculars in Early Modern Europe. Renæssanceforum* 6, 1–22. <http://www.renaessanceforum.dk/rf_6_2010.htm.> Website consulted on 3 July 2016.

Ramminger, J.
2012   "Niccolò Perotti und die Entwicklung des Neulateins am Anfang der Neuzeit: Zu einigen Lemmata des Cornu copiae", *Studi Umanistici Piceni* 32, 29–38.

Ramminger, J.
2014   "Neo-Latin: Character and Development". In: Ford *et al.* (eds.), I, 21–36.

Ramminger, J.
2016   "*Consuetudo vetervm – mos Italorum*: Vos and tu in the Latin letters of early German humanism", *Renæssanceforum* 11, 63-86 (forthcoming) <http://www.renaessanceforum.dk>

Reeve, M. D.
1983   "Cicero, *De optimo genere oratorum*". In: Reynolds, L.D. (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford, 100–102.

Reiff, A.
1959   *Interpretatio, imitatio, aemulatio: Begriff und Vorstellung literarischer Abhängigkeit bei den Römern.* Phil. Diss. Universität Köln [reviewed by Fuhrmann 1961].

Resta, G.
1962   *Le epitomi di Plutarco nel Quattrocento*, Padova.

Reydams-Schils, G. J.
2007   "Meta-Discourse: Plato's *Timaeus* according to Calcidius", *Phronesis* 52, 301–327.

Richter, H.
1938   *Uebersetzen und Uebersetzungen in der römischen Literatur,* [Phil. Diss. Erlangen], Coburg.

Rizzo, S.
1973   *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti,* (*Sussidi eruditi* 26), Roma. [rist. anast. 1984]

Rochette, B.
2000   "A propos du nom de l'interprète en latin", *Glotta* 76, 83–93.

Rogers, E. M.
1983   *Diffusion of Innovations*. Third revised edition, New York & London, [first published 1962].

Röhricht, R.
1893   "Le pelerinage du moine augustin Jacques de Vérone (1335)", *Revue de l'Orient Latin* 3, 155–302.

Rotondò, A.
1958   "Nicolò Tignosi da Foligno. Polemiche aristoteliche di un maestro del Ficino", *Rinascimento* 9, 217–255.

Round, N.
2005   "Translation and its Metaphors: the (N+1) Wise Men and the Elephant", *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* 1, 47– 69. <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI01/doc_pdf/05.pdf.> Website accessed on 7 June 2016.

Sabbadini, R.
1900   "Del tradurre i classici antichi in Italia", *Atene e Roma* 3, 201–217.

Sabbadini, R.
1916   "*Maccheroni* e *tradurre* (per la Crusca)", *Rendiconti Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere*, s. II, 49, 221–224.

Santini, E.
1912   "La produzione volgare di Leonardo Bruni Aretino e il suo culto per 'le tre corone florentine'", *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 60, 289–339.

Schiegg, M.
2015   Review of Jucker & Kopaczyk (eds.) 2013, *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics* 1, 135–138.

Schucan, L.
1973   *Das Nachleben von Basilius Magnus* ad adolescentes, (*Travaux d'humanisme et renaissance* 133), Genève.

Scipioni, S.
2003   *I codici umanistici di Gellio*, (*Edizioni di storia e letteratura*), Roma.

Sonderegger, S.
1987   "Notkers des Deutschen Terminologie des Übersetzungsvorgangs", *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 106, 15–24.

Spitzer, L.
1956   "Individual Factor in Linguistic Innovations", *Cultura neolatina* 16, 71–89.

Stuart-Smith, J. & Timmins, C.
2010   "The Role of the Individual in Language Variation and Change". In: Llamas & Watt (eds.) 2010, 39–54.

Tanganelli, M. L.
2011   "Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Riccardiano, Ricc. 136". In: *Censimento dei manoscritti della Biblioteca Riccardiana, Firenze*. CNMS\0000135813. <http://manus.iccu.sbn.it/opac_SchedaScheda.php?ID=191488.> Website accessed on 12 May 2016.

Traina, A.
1970   "Commento alle traduzioni poetiche di Cicerone". In: *Id.*, *Vortit barbare: Le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone*, Roma, 55–89. [First published 1961]

Traina, A.
1989   "Le traduzioni". In: Cavallo, G. *et al.* (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*, II, Roma, 93–123.

Trapp, J. B.
2004   "Traversagni, Lorenzo Guglielmo (c.1425–1503)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.odnb.emedia1.bsb-muenchen.de/view/article/24748.> Website accessed on 16 July 2016.

Wenger, E.
1998   *Communities of Practice*, Cambridge.

Wolf, L.
1971   "Fr. *traduire*, lat. *traducere* und die kulturelle Hegemonie Italiens zur Zeit der Renaissance", *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 87, 99–105.

NOTES

[1] I would like to thank Lene Schøsler and Brenda Hosington for suggesting countless improvements to the contents and style of this paper, and the anonymous peer reviewer for a painstaking reading that ferreted out a number of mistakes and added literature not known to me (esp. Maxson 2014). The meaning of *sententia* in the first Winthager quotation was suggested to me by Marianne Pade, with whom I also discussed numerous other questions. The remaining infelicities and mistakes are due to my own stubbornness. All translations are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

[2] References to *traducere* in the following will be to the meaning 'to translate', if not stated otherwise. Further examples not used in this essay can be found in Ramminger 2003–, s.v. *Traducere* has of course many other senses in antiquity as well as in Neo-Latin (see e.g. Ramminger 2001, 687).

[3] Sabbadini 1916. An earlier study by Sabbadini (1900) had less material, but discussed it in a broad classical Latin and Italian context; also it dated (before Luiso) Bruni's letter to 1405. Bruni's letters will be cited with the numberings from Mehus 1741 (M.) and Luiso 1980 (L.). Where possible I shall use the sigla of the *Neulateinische Wortliste* (Ramminger 2003–); bibliographical information that can be found there is not repeated.

[4] See Baron 1981, 837–839. The erronous dating is still repeated in Bertalot 1990, 341–2 no.6276; Botley 2004, 12 n.41 and 22 n.87; and Bettini 2012, viii n.2.

[5] Hankins 1990, II, 367–371.

[6] Folena 1973, 104; Bettini 2012, vii; Viti in Bruni 2004, 186. Chavy 1982, 361. Alunni 2004, 155 asserts that Bruni introduced *traducere/tradurre* simultaneously in Latin and the *volgare*. I did not find any instance of *tradurre* in the sense of 'to translate' in Bruni's vernacular texts. Cf. Santini 1912; Hankins 2006. While Bruni produced a number of vernacular texts, from Hankins's overview (esp. pp.25–27) it appears that he did not himself make any Latin–*volgare* translations (*pace* Laurenti 2015, 97).

[7] "[…] vocabulum Graecum vetus traductum in linguam Romanam" (Sabbadini 1916, 222). Gellius discusses translation in 17,20 (cp. Gamberale 1969, 13). We have no reason to assume that Bruni was well acquainted with Gellius at this early date. In 1428 he owned a ms. of Gellius (see Botley 2004, 13 n.47; no mention in Scipioni 2003). The only Gellius citation I have been able to discover in Bruni is in *ep* 8,2 M. = 8,9 L. (1438/39), where he mentions that at the time of Cicero the standard orthography was *caussa* and *iusus*, "ut Agellius testatur". Bruni misremembered or relied on a faulty intermediary text; the source is Quintilian *inst.* 1,7,20–21. Botley suggests that Bruni had found *discerniculum* (in *ep* 10,24 M. = 8,2 L.; 1438) in Gellius.

[8] Botley 2004, 165; translation modified.

[9] Alunni 2004, 164. E.g. Thomas Aquinas 2 sent. 18. 2. 1 c: "traductio proprie dicitur in generatione animatorum". In this context Kuhlmann's (2012, 263–265) claim should be noted that Bruni was acquainted with Roger Bacon's reflections on translation (Bacon uses *transferre*).

[10] Hickey 2010, 190.

[11] Notker Labeo (Notker of St Gall), *Epistula* (c. 1015; text in Notker Labeo 1996, 348). See Sonderegger 1987 and Pöckl 1996/97, 9–10.

[12] See below (*transcribere*), and nn. 28, 29, 30, 60.

[13] I use the term 'speech community' for a group comprising all persons at a given locale who (are able to) use Latin, however imperfectly. See the critical remarks of Coupland 2010, 100–104.

[14] See the discussion in Fried 2010. The self-contained status of the humanist (as of any) CoP was criticised, for example, by Domenico da Prato: "quali pertanto sono l'opere di questi tali spernitori fuori della loro loquacitade? Manifestinle ad altri che ad se medesimi, acciò che soli essi non siano giudici et di loro et delli altri" (what are the works of these who despise the others, beyond their chatter? Let them show them to people other than themselves, so that they are not the sole judges of themselves and of others; Domenico da Prato 1993, 69).

[15] A case in point is letter writing, where rival norms coexisted for long periods. See Ramminger 2016.

[16] Kopaczyk 2013. For the applicability of the CoP-concept on language change see also Meyerhoff 2002; Jucker & Kopaczyk 2013, 14; Schiegg 2015, 138. For the observation of language variation in speech communities versus CoPs see Meurman-Solin 2012, esp. p.673. The CoP concept was first formulated by Lave & Wenger 1991. The terms 'community' and 'membership' here do not indicate permanent or harmonious participation. Also, as has been variously stressed, CoP is not a conceptual tool well suited to the description of social interrelations with a weak or no common enterprise (see Barton & Hamilton 2005 and Gee 2005). A classification of the structure of the humanist community in relations to its role in (Florentine) society was proposed by Maxson 2014 (see the review by Baker 2016).

[17] Wenger 1998, 125-6; Hazen 2002, 506.

[18] See the virtual CoP discussed by e.g. Dubé *et al.* 2005.

[19] A case of interaction between author and scribe concerning orthography is noted by Ramminger in Perottus 2014.

[20] See Pade 2014a.

[21] Ramminger 2010; Ramminger 2012; Pade 2014b.

[22] See the famous case of the *bombarda* which pained Biondo (Ramminger 2014, 22–23).

[23] See Marsh 1992, 149–155.

[24] On the translation see Schucan 1973, 57–76.

[25] I follow the dates proposed by Hankins 1990, II, 367–378.

[26] For the context of Plutarch studies, see Pade 2007, I, 127–132; the preface is published in *ibid.*, II, 153–156.

[27] Whether Angelo Decembrio's use of *transcribere*, 'to translate', in the *Politia litteraria* has any connection to Bruni's is impossible to say. See Ramminger 2003–, s. v., esp. Decembrio-A *pol* 7,82,3: "Sic k, quae littera Graeca sit, in sermonibus Graecis Latine transcriptis inepte transcribunt", where copying and translation are not distinguished semantically. Rizzo 1973, 200–201, quotes a passage from Angelo Decembrio, where he rejects *transcriptor* for 'copyist' on the grounds that *scriptor* can only be used for 'author'; rather, the 'copyist' is a *librarius* (Decembrio-A *pol* 3,27,3).

[28] For *conversio* as 'translation' the *TLL* has only Qvint. *inst.* 10, 5, 4: "illa ex latinis conversio (*sc. in graeca*)" (Jacobsohn 1907a, 856, 24–26). Quintilian here talks about *paraphrasis*, a loose rendering of a text.

[29] The two later examples known so far are certainly independent of Bruni. See Hoven 2006, Ramminger 2003–.

[30] For *translator* in this sense Forcellini 1940 has examples from Jerome (4) and Ambrose (1). It actually occurs three times in Jerome's famous letter to Pammachius (57).

[31] Text from Garin 1955, 362–363; cf. Berti 1978, 134. Mehus has *adhibebo traductioni. gnaviter* instead of the commonly printed *graviter* was convincingly suggested by Botley 2004, 12 n.41 from Cic. *fam.* 5,12,3. Bernard-Pradelle's text is a mixture of Mehus's and Garin's (Bruni 2014, I, 137–138).

[32] Bruni's assessment of Chalcidius and Aristippus was probably triggered by a manuscript of Salutati's that contained these two translations. It is now BAV, Vat. lat. 2063 and is the only one known in which the Aristippus translation is anonymous (see Hankins 1990, II, 371 n.15). Salutati made it available to Bruni (Botley 2004, 12).

[33] For *simulacrum* see Hoenig 2013 §§26–27, and Reydams-Schils 2007, 303–306. Chalcidius's *interpretatio* was paraphrased as *translatio* 'translation' by William of Conches, *Glosae super prooemium Calcidii* (Conches 2006, 19). The term *simulacrum* drew the attention of many medieval glossators, see Bakhouche in Chalcidius 2011, II, 590 with reference to Dutton 2003, 188–189. Bruni thus could proceed from a settled interpretive tradition.

[34] Translation as a replacement of the original text is discussed by Botley 2004, 165–167.

[35] Bruni returns to the travel metaphor, for example, in a letter to Niccoli from 1407 (*ep* 2,6 L.): "Orationem Demosthenis 'pro Ctesiphonte' totam converti*, sed antequam prodire sinam, volo diligenter mundetur. Ex Graecia enim in Latium longa est via; quod igitur pulveris coenique peregrinando contraxerit, volo abstergere" (I have completed translating* the oration of Demosthenes, 'For Ctesiphon', but before I let it go forth, I want it to be cleaned thoroughly. The way from Greece to Rome is long; whatever dust and dirt it contracted on the way needs to be scraped off). A later example is Rinvcivs Aretinvs *praef graec* p.96 (1440/43): "traduxi* in Latium ut sic dicam e Graecia Luciani dialogum qui inscribitur Caron" (I have – so to speak – transferred* Lucian's dialogue *Charon* from Greece to Latium).

[36] Cf. Andersen 2008.

[37] Hankins 2003, 191–192. Pade 2007, II, 155–6.

[38] I would like to thank Marianne Pade who verified this (mentioned in passing in Pade 2007, II, 202 n. 64) from her notes.

[39] Hankins 2002, 184 and n. 23.

[40] Guarino uses a prepositional phrase to indicate the target language in *ep* 52 some months later (27 June 1416): "Suscipio autem legem illam bonam et iustam, videlicet si aliquam ex illis <vitam> in latinam traduxero* dictionem, sibi illam remittam" (I submit to the good and rightful agreement that, should I translate* one of those lives into Latin, I will send it to him).

[41] The letter is undated. It mentions a return by Aurispa from Greece to Italy and contains a quotation from Bruni's *Cicero novus*. Aurispa was in Greece twice, returning in 1414 and 1424 (for Aurispa's life see Bigi 1962). If, as formerly assumed, the first version of the *Cicero novus* was published in October 1415, this letter belongs to 1424 (as dated by Sabbadini). The dating to 1415 follows a suggestion kindly made by L. Gualdo Rosa by email in 2015. She listed the following reasons: (1) In the ms. Cracow, Iagell. 519, which was in Campiano's possession and dated to 1414, all of Bruni's letters are in the precanonical version predating 1410. (2) Campiano was in a certain sense Bruni's commercial agent and consequently already possessed a copy of the *Cicero novus* in the first version. (3) In 1424 Aurispa was already famous; at that point Campiano could never have called him 'Pichuneri' as he does here. The dating of the *Cicero novus* to 1413 makes this unproblematic. Also *ut aiunt* signals the novelty in 1415 of *traducere*, 'to translate'; nine years later this had become common usage. About Campiano see Gualdo Rosa 1994, 122–125. I have understood *ut aiunt* to refer to the verb (or the whole phrase) and not solely to *ex Graecis litteris* (from – as one says – Greek literature).

[42] Martelli 1989 (text on p. 216). The rubrics of the Tancredo mss. use the synonyms indifferently; Marcelli 2003, 44 (*traducta de vulgari in latinum*), 55 (*translata*), 71 (*versum*).

[43] Brvni *ep* 9,4 M. = 9,5 L. (Florence, 1441, to Niccolò Ceba in Pera): "[…] Laudas traductiones* meas – multo plura traduxi* – ad traductionem* librorum Platonis – libros illos […] latinos facere*".

[44] Traversari *ep* 6,16 (to F. Barbaro, 1417): "Par illud ex Plutarcho traductum*" (i.e. Aristides and Cato). *ep* 23,7 (*Climacus*, to Matteo di Guido, prior of S. Maria degli Angeli, 1420). *ep* 8,36 (to Niccoli, 1431): "Dionysium […] traducere* – traductionem* meam – Dionsium ipsum latinum facere* – partem Ecclesiasticae traduxeram*". *ep* 23,2 (to pope Eugene IV, 1431) "volumen de Vitis Sanctorum Patrum a me traductum*". *ep* 8,37 (to Niccoli, 1431): "studiis vel legendi vel traducendi* – ut […] nihil omnino traduxerim*".

[45] Filelfo-F *Xenophon Ages praef* (Florence, c. 1433): "ut et Agesilai laudationem […] ad Latinos traducerem*". *Xenophon rep praef* (Florence, c. 1433): "Xenophon […] apud Graecos scripserat. Nos ut potuimus ad Latinos traduximus*". He uses the directional phrase again in a letter to Malatesta Novello, *ep* 11,59 (Milan, 1454): "Galbae et Othonis Caesarum uitas ex Plutarcho ad Latinos traduxi*".

[46] Barbaro-F *ep* II 1 (p.12): "fabulas latinas ad verbum […] expressas* – in latinum […] convertit* – traducere* greca

in latinum – (p.13) latinos fecit* – ex hebreo et greco transtulit* – in hoc interpretandi* […] munere – (p.14) ea que convertissent* – (p.15) Hec […] splendide conversa* sunt – ab interpretis* officio – latine facta* sunt – (p.18) optimum interpretandi* genus". Mention of Bruni's and Guarino's translations on p.15. See Griggio 2000.

47　"cum […] nonnullas a Guarino Aesopi fabulas Graecas percepissem et in Latinum sermonem […] traduxissem*" (ed. Barbaro 1994, 88). For Guarino's role see Folena 1973, 103–104.

48　PEROTTI *ep ed. Cessi* 3 p.77 (Bologna, 1552): "incepi vertere* Polibii historiam de primo bello punico – quod Leonardus Arretinus […] de verbo ad verbum traduxit* – (p.78) Post traductionem* Polybii". *ep ed. Cessi* 4 p.78 (1452): "quinterniones traductionis* mee". *ep ed. Cessi* 9 p.84 (1454/1455): "dedit mihi Arrianum traducendum* – alias traductiones* – traductionem* illam Arriani ineptam".

49　AVRISPA *ep* 55 (1430): "quos *libros* […] in latinum traduces". GVARINO *ep* 980 (1430): "in latinum ex Plutarcho vitae traductae". *ep* 888,15 (1455): "quin bonam traducam partem [*sc. Strabonis*] […] pluresque esse quinternos traductos". GAZA *or* p.257 (1449): "non traduxisse Aristotelem, sed potius invertisse".

50　BARZIZZA-G *vita Ciceronis* p.55–56: "[*Cicero*] Platonis Timaeum ex graecis litteris in latinas vertit*, item Protagoram, […] Demosthenis et Aeschinis orationes duas pro Ctesiphonte et in Ctesiphontem, quarum copia nulla haberetur nisi beneficio Aretini ambae iterum essent ex Graecia […] litteris latinis ad nos traductae*" (Cicero turned* Plato's *Timaeus* from Greek into Latin, also the *Protagoras* and the speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines for and against Ctesiphon, which would not be available to us, had they not again been taken from Greece and brought* to us in Latin, through Bruni's good graces). Cp. Bruni's *Cicero novus*: "Demosthenis et Eschinis orationes illas famosissimas in causa Ctesiphontis, que cum apud nostros negligenter custodite iampridem ex Italia tamquam peregrine alieneque aufugissent, nos Ciceronem imitati eas ex Grecia in latinum nostra manu reduximus" (BRVNI *Cic* p.472).

51　Viti in Bruni 2004, 242–243.

52　POLENTON *ep* 7 (Padua, 1419): "qui alter in dicendo Cicero, alter in traducendo* Hieronymus […] sit" (who writes like a second Cicero and translates like a second Jerome).

53　RHO *Philipp* p.62 (1432): "quod Suetonium […] maternam in linguam traduxerim*" – "id traductionis* munus" (*traductio* = the act of translating).

54　Naples: VALLA-L *ep* 23 (1443, to Aurispa in Ferrara): "Feram ad te preterea sedecim Iliados libros a me prosa oratione traductos*". FACIVS *in Vall* I p.93 (1446). VALLA-L *in Facium* p.374 (1447). MANETTI *apol* 1,1 (Naples, 1456/9) and often in the same work. — Rome: AVRISPA *ep* 84 (1444, to Panormita in Naples): "me […] Disciplinam illam militarem ex graeco in latinum […] traducturum*". POGGIO *ep* III 2,7 (1447, to Facio in Naples): "Si tamen traductio* placet vobis". VALLA-L *coll* p.15 (1453). GAZA *Theophrast hist plant praef* p.267 (c. 1453).

55　MARRASIO *angel* 1,17 (Siena, 1429). ALONSO DE CARTAGENA *ep Decembrio* p.213 (Basel, 1437). PICCOLOMINI *ep* I-85 (Vienna 1443, to Giovanni Campisio in Rome): "Politicorum libros ex Aretini traductione* conscriptos".

56　For Olzina, see Ferrando i Francés 2013, 449–455.

57　Meyer 1885, 460 (Einblattdrucke VIII, 5^d).

58　Lehrer 1985, 283. See also Kittay 1987, 214–257, and Gliozzo & Strapparava 2009, 13–32.

59　As a starting point I used the following texts: BRVNI preface to Plutarch, *Vita Antonii* (1404/5), TRAVERSARI *ep* 23,7 (dedication of Climacus, *Scala Paradisi*, 1420), TORTELLI, dedication of the *Analytica posteriora* (c. 1445, ed. Rotondò 1958, 221), FILELFO-F *ep* 34,6 (1471, about Campano's *Plutarch*, ed. Giustiniani 1961, 15).

60　I left out the following verbs that are rare in early modern Latin: *Transponere*, despite a famous passage in Jerome (*ep*. 57,6,2: "[…] transposui, ut nihil desit ex sensu, cum aliquid desit ex uerbis"); see Ramminger 2003–, s.v. (one example before 1500). Medieval examples are Jacobus Veronensis, *peregrinatio*: "Item, scola beati Jheronimi, ubi Bibliam de judayca in | latinam transposuit" (Röhricht 1893, 166); *Analecta Hymnica* 33 p.91: "Ex Hebraeo quam Latine | Discrete transposuit." — *Transvertere*: from the preface of Dares ("in latinitatem transvertere"). Medieval example in Henricus Aristippus, preface to *Meno* ("in Ytalicas transvertere sillabas", Aristippus 1979, 6). Dares is quoted by DECEMBRIO-PC *ep iuv* 25 p.203 (1427). I have found no Neo-Latin examples. — *Transcribere*: see above and n. 27. — *Reducere* occurs in isolated examples: "Hoc opus reductum fuit de vulgari in latinum per […]" (rubric dated 1466, *Iter* I p.332). "Johannis Chrisostomi … epistola […] e greco in latinum reducta" (undated rubric, *Iter* IV p.661). — Binomial expressions could of course be multiplied (e.g. *latine exprimere, latinitate donare*).

61　Following the "commonly accepted axiom that no true synonyms exist, i.e. that different forms must have different meanings" (Haiman 1980, 516), differences of meaning/usage can mostly be drawn from chronology (*traducere*!) or etymology. Just as with the verbs for 'to translate' in classical Latin, no fixed or recurring differences in meaning can be identified.

62　Richter 1938, 10–15; Reiff 1959 (review by Fuhrmann 1961, esp. 446–447); Traina 1970, 55–65; Norton 1984, 191–195 (reference from Hosington 2014, 135); Traina 1989, 96–99, bibliography 117–118; Kytzler 1993, 44–45 (*interpres*); Montella 1993 (*interpretor, uerto, conuerto*); Rochette 2000; Polt 2007, 13–19. As far as these publications discuss the *De optimo genere oratorum*, they treat the pseudo-Ciceronian work as a genuine text of Cicero (see Reeve 1983, 100). See also the lemmata in the *TLL*: Jacobsohn 1907b, 869,42–60 (*convertere*); Kühnen 1964b, 2261,19–2263,3 (*interpretari*).

63　See Round 2005, esp. 50–53.

64　See *OLD*, 1963–1964, s. v. under 6a. The first unequivocal examples are from Seneca the Younger (*dial*. 11,11,5) and Pliny the Elder (e.g. *nat*. 6,111). *OLD* also quotes CIC. *fin*. 1,7; but *ad cognitionem transferre* here means 'to make aware of', 'bring to the knowledge of'. I am inclined to understand *transferre* as a combination of 'to take over' + 'to translate' already in CIC. *Att*. 6,2,3: "istum ego locum totidem verbis a Dicaearcho transtuli" (see Polt 2007, 19).

65　Kühnen 1964a, 2252,61–2253,24.

66　I used a transcript from 2012 generously offered by Jeroen De Keyser, whose edition is now in press.

67　Filelfo often uses *interpretari* to indicate a combined meaning of 'to translate' and 'to explain as' (a Greek word in Latin) especially in the case of single words; I have (subjectively) selected those examples which do not fit well into

the second category. The same applies to *interpres* and *interpretatio*.

68 Named colophons, however, became more frequent in the course of the century (Mattiazzo 2005, 9 with further literature).

69 Berti 1978, 165, cites the rubrics of thirteen mss for his text, seven mention translation: *dialogus* etc. *uersus* (3), *traductus* (2), *translatus* (1), *conuersus* (1).

70 Folena indicated no source for the rubrics he cited. They coincide with those mentioned in the editions in Baron 1928.

71 This function of the rubrics was already mentioned by Domenico da Prato: "di queste restargli piccolissima fama, non ostante che per le rubriche in esso siano vanamente intitulate, imperò che la fama è delli inventori delle opere e non delli traductori" (he will accrue little fame from these [*translations of the works of others*], even though [*the translators*] are ostentatiously named in the rubrics, since the fame goes to the authors of the works and not to the translators, Domenico da Prato 1993, 70, see the commentary *ibid.* 202).

72 BAV Archivio di San Pietro E 33: "Comparatio et diligens de bruto ac dione iuditium Plutarchi ex Guarino traducta" (Pade 2013, 128). Venice, Museo Civico Correr, Cicogna 245 (26) (f. 69r): "Explicit foeliciter Gorgias Platonis a Leonardo Aretino in latinum traductus [*ras.*] absoluit anno Chrysti MCCCCXXIIII Kal. Novembris" (Hankins 1990, II, 733, no.369). See also n. 14.

73 The numbers in Table 4 concerning rubrics are very approximative, since rubrics, not being part of the text proper, are edited only incidentally. As sources I used the dedications in Pade 2007 and Kristeller's *Iter*. From them I extracted three sets of data: 1) Rubrics from Pade 2007. 2) Rubrics from *Iter*, all volumes, with the formula *Incipit liber/dialogus/*etc. ... *traductus/translatus/*etc. ... . 3) All rubrics from *Iter* vol. I containing a verb from the semantic field as defined above (data in cols. 2 and 3 overlap for *Iter* vol. I). In all cases I have counted only the rubrics that introduce a text, not those that conclude them (which often repeat the phrase). In Kristeller I counted only mss. dating from the fifteenth century and omitted the few mss. not written in Italy according to Kristeller. For the comparison with humanist letters I combined the data from Traversari and Filelfo to level out individual preferences and chronological disparity. A greater number of authors and rubrics would of course have resulted in a more reliable picture.

74 About Winthager and this text see Černik 1908.

75 See Trapp 2004.

76 Cp. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, cod. 8611 (*Iter* 4 p.557): "Leonardus Aretinus ... hunc librum ex greco in latinum traduxit* ad quorundam vituperationem qui humanitatis studia vituperabant"; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library M. 408 (*Iter* 5 p.332): "Magni Basilii liber explicit per Leonardum Aretinum […] e greco in latinum traductus* […]"; Florence, Riccardianus 704 (1453; Baron 1928, 99, cited without source by Folena 1973, 103): "Prologus in Basilii Epistolam ad nepotes de utilitate studii in libros gentilium traductam* per Leonardum Aretinum".

77 Paris, BN, Nouv. acq. lat. 1282 (*Iter* 3 p.288): "Leonardi Aretini orationes tres in triplici genere dicendi e greco in latinum traducte*"; identical rubrics are in Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Theol. et Philos. Q. 171 (*Iter* 2 p.705) and Toledo, Archivo y Bibliotheca Capitolares, cod. 27,8 (*Iter* 4 p.641).

78 Wolf 1971, 103 mistakenly cites as an example of the German humanists' Latin what in reality is a passage from Bruni's preface in a print of his *Ethics* translation (Strassbourg, c. 1469). The passage, however, underlines the importance of Bruni's translations for the spread of Neo-Latin in a transalpine context.

79 Regiomontanus used the *traducere* vocabulary in the *Fragmenta quaedam annotationum in errores quos Iacobus Angelus in translatione Ptolemaei commisit*, printed with Pirckheimer's translation of Ptolemaeus's *Geography*, Strassbourg 1525, sig. P1r–Q8r; they are undated, but probably written earlier than the letter quoted here.

80 For Henneberg see Bock 1955. Despite its often acclaimed importance, this edict was last edited in 1884, and neither its textual history nor its actual text has been established. I know of three versions. (1) A handwritten copy in the Stadtarchiv Frankfurt, ed. Pallmann 1884; it is addressed to Conrad Hensel (for whom see Klötzer 1994–1996, I, 318) and dated 22 March 1485. (2) The same letter sent to Rudolf von Scherenberg, bishop of Würzburg, with the same date. Scherenberg inserted it (leaving off the address, if any) into his own ordinance of censorship published on 1 May 1485 (printed as a single sheet, ISTC ir00349600, GW M39102). (3) Henneberg (re?)issued his ordinance on 4 January 1486; this text names the Erfurt professors appointed as censors and regulates censorship at the Frankfurt book fair, but is otherwise largely the same (ed. Gudenus 1758, 469–471, no. 222). No addressee is named. We know that the text was distributed throughout the diocese from the accompanying letter (ed. Gudenus no. 224); it is also alluded to in a letter to the Erfurt professors which instructs them in their duties as censors (ed. Gudenus no. 223). There is what purports to be a transcription of Henneberg's text in the Scherenberg-print by F. Kawohl on the website *Primary Sources on Copyright (1450-1900)*, eds. L. Bently & M. Kretschmer, under "Censorship Edict of the Archbishop of Mainz, Würzburg (1485)" (<www.copyrighthistory.org/cam/tools/request/showRepresentation?id=representation_d_1485>; website accessed on 4 June 2016); it shares many wrong readings with Pallmann's text, discernible from the clearly readable original reproduced on the same site (copy of the Stadtarchiv Iphofen). I will quote the text from the Scherenberg-print as reproduced in Eisermann 2004, R-31 and plate 78, with updated punctuation. My text diverges in several points from Pallmann's.

81 "ex librorum impressione e latino in germanicam linguam improuide et inconsulte traductorum*" (on account of the printing of books translated* from Latin into German imprudently and unadvisedly) – "ad […] supprimendum libros qui sic e latino in germanicam linguam traducerentur* imprimerenturque" (to suppress books which thus are translated* from Latin into German and are printed).

82 Domenico da Prato 1993, 70 (no. 21); commentary *ibid.* p. 201–4. See Folena 1973, 105 on Domenico's knowledge of Bruni's translations.

83 The word itself existed already previously in Italian dialects, see e.g. *TLIO Tesoro della Lingua Italiana delle Origini* s.v. *tradurre* (<http://tlio.ovi.cnr.it/TLIO/>, website accessed 16 July 2016). The example with the meaning 'to translate' cited from Guido da Pisa, *Fiore d'Italia* (1321/37) in *TLIO* is a rubric from the print of Bologna 1490 (HCR

84 7117, GW 11839, ISTC if00171000). Further examples (starting in 1457) are given by Folena 1973, 106.
    The loan of meaning between languages is discussed by Lev-Ari & Peperkamp 2014, 381 (with earlier literature);
    Haspelmath 2009. About native-language synonym displacement see Poplack & Sankoff 1984, 103–104 and Pop-
    lack & Meechan 1995, 200. For the displacement in Catalan see Bescós Prat 2007; in French Berman 1988, 30–31.
85 Morel-Fatio 1894, 345.
86 I cite from the printed version (Venice, 1531); the quotation in Resta 1961, 32 has "tradocte".
87 Information from Pade 1998, the quotation on p.108.
88 Ponzú Donato 2012–2013, 98–99.
89 Mioni 950, 326.
90 Transcription generously put at my disposal by Marianne Pade.
91 *Iter* I, 139. For *ridocto*/*reductum* see n. 60. Marcelli 2003, 56.
92 The *Ethics* was read in Bruni's translation at the University of Salamanca as of 1422 (Jiménez San Cristóbal 2011,
    185). We have an example of the circulation of Bruni from the 1430s in a passage which Pöckl mistakenly attrib-
    uted to Alonso de Cartagena (Pöckl 1996–97, 11). Also the supposedly earliest examples from Spain from 1478
    and c. 1479 given by Wolf 1971, 102, are not Spanish Neo-Latin, but the beginning of Bruni's preface to the *Ethics*
    (see also n. 78 above).
93 Paris Bib. nat. Par. lat. 7416A, fol.57v (from Aguiar Aguilar & González Marrero 2005, 13): "[…] et quidam in
    romanam linguam, omnium preclarissimam, nunc traduxit*" ("and somebody has translated* it [the *Sexagenarium*]
    recently into the Roman language, the most renowned of all").
94 Diaz de Toledo 1993, 225. For the semantic field of 'to translate' in Catalan see Bescós Prat 2007, esp. p.30. The
    example of Catalan *traduccio* referenced by Dini 2009, 385 from Coromines 1980–91, III, 220, from the *Torcymany*
    by Luis de Averçó (c.1350–1412/15) does not belong to 'translation'. Here *traducció* is a rhetorical colour similar to
    polipteton, cf. Averçó 1956, I, 3,1,106 p. 237. Further Iberian examples in Wolf 1971, 103 n.20.
95 Fernández López 2002, 231.
96 Wolf 1971, 101.
97 Quotation from Chavy 1982, 362. The orthography of the title is different in Brunet 1860–65, V, 95–96. The only
    known copy is in the Bibliothèque Méjanes in Aix-en-Provence.
98 Keller 1994/2005, 88–89.
99 Luraghi 2010/2013, 361; Migliorini 1956; Spitzer 1956; Bergs 2005.
100 Stuart-Smith & Timmins 2010, 44, applying the terminology from Rogers's theory of innovation (see Rogers 1983).