

The diffusion of vernacularism through translation in late fifteenth and early sixteenth century France is a literary and historical fact well documented in the prefaces of contemporary works and confirmed by the findings of countless scholars.¹ Well before such vernacular apologists as Geoffroy Tory and Joachim Du Bellay, Claude de Seyssel, in a Prologue addressed to Louis XII (1509), calls for the founding of a national literature through the medium of translation.² By royal decree, Valois monarchs from Francis I to Henry III make glorification of the vernacular a matter of public policy. Translators, as well as grammarians and poets, are enlisted in a self-conscious national cause, under the "enlightened guidance" of their royal patrons.³ As theoreticians and apologists begin to seek analogical links between the vernacular idiom and classical languages, translation is seen less and less as a craft of betrayal (conveyed in the Italian proverb "traduttore traditore"). If, indeed, French is capable of the same expressive functions as its classical predecessors, why, people begin to ask, cannot the style and thought of Greece and Rome also be transmitted accurately into the vulgar tongue? Not only is translation, then, a means of literary dissemination to the masses, but more vitally, an agent of linguistic illustration. For this reason, translation theory is often inseparably bound to the greater question of how to imitate classical authors in the vernacular idiom.

While occasionally taking into account this broader function of translation, scholarly approaches to translation theory in Renaissance France have generally failed to examine these theoretical questions within the framework of cultural change. Prologues and prefatory epistles are frequently resurrected by scholars to support differing viewpoints, but without any corresponding effort to see these writings as extensions of Humanist currents. The one speculative treatise on the art of translation, Etienne Dolet's *La Maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre* (1540), is studied as a literary weathervane by which to judge all subsequent theory and its application in specific works. Remarks on translation by the poetic theorists are compared, in turn, to other remarks made either by Dolet or individual translators. In short, certain fundamental questions have been overlooked in the desire to explain these three textual sources – preface, treatise, and poetic arts – as part of a single continuum of theoretical writing abstracted from the context of the new learning and from classical traditions.

Almost without exception, scholars have underscored the special role of Dolet's treatise as a pivotal document of both historical and literary significance, but whose influence is by no means certain.⁴ Indeed, Du Bellay is one of the few contemporary writers to even make reference to the work.⁵ Its function as a practical guide for the good translator is, at best, difficult to assess. Beyond its skeletal, five-part draft of broad principles, it proposes no set of criteria for the faithful rendering of classical Diction. Even as a theoretical tract it is sketchy and tentative, admitting scarcely any elaboration on its general proposals. It is not, in fact, a work to which the professional translator could turn for specific advice on technical matters. While it does delineate certain basic ideals, its importance would appear then to lie elsewhere.

In his preface to the French people, Dolet tells us that the *Maniere de bien traduire* is one of three tracts prepared as part of an unfinished work entitled *L'Orateur François*. As an attempted "illustration" of the French language, this projected work is to include nine tracts, the last three being the treatise on translation, an "Art Oratoire" and an "Art Poétique."⁶ From his opening remarks it is clear that the work represents not so much a short-term concentration of creative effort but the longer, sporadic attention of a classical scholar occasionally distracted by vernacular concerns: "Depuis six ans (ô peuple François) desrobant quelques heures de mon estude principale (qui est en la lecture de la langue Latine et Grecque), te voulant aussy illustrer par tous moyens ..." (9).

Whatever the preparations, either written or conceived by Dolet in 1534, six years before the publication of his tract, it is highly improbable that this great Latinist not be in touch with the intellectual revival going on around him. It is generally agreed that the third decade of the sixteenth century is marked by the coming of age of French Humanism, and with this maturity, by the conversion of classical ideals into vernacular functions.⁷ An otherwise fervent Latinist such as Guillaume Budé, in *De l'institution du Prince* (1529), describes the transposition of the "perfect orator" into the person of the monarch. Those elements of a pedagogical program already formulated by Cicero and Quintilian, and appropriated by fifteenth-century Italian theorists (Guarino, Vittorino da Feltre, Bruni, and Piccolomini), are thus seen in a new light. While still never more than an abstraction, the orator is cast in a contemporary mold, speaking and writing a vernacular eloquence. The subject of classical Latin imitation, arising in the context of Greek rhetorical models, is transcribed to a modern setting.⁸ John Palsgrave (1530), Jacques Dubois (1531), and Charles de Bovelles (1533) each attempt to treat the question of vernacular imitation, especially as it relates to the problem of reducing the French language to an ordered system.⁹ In the same year as Budé's treatise, Geoffroy Tory's *Champ Fleury* advocates a goal of linguistic codification in the vernacular while retaining the exemplary status of classical rhetoricians and grammarians: "Pleust a Dieu que quelque Noble cuer s'employast a mettre & ordôner par Reigle nostre Lāgage Francois ... iespere q̄ au plaisir de Dieu quelque Noble Prisciā quelque Donat, ou quelque Quintilien Francois naistra de Bref, sil nest desia tout edifie."¹⁰

This special esteem for the rhetorical ideals of Cicero and Quintilian is, of course, by no means new to France during this period.¹¹ The ideological fires, however, are well stoked by the appearance in 1528 of Erasmus' *Ciceronianus*, a dialogue deriding the current fad of slavish imitation based exclusively on Ciceronian models. Battle lines are immediately drawn by such pious defenders of classical rhetoric as Scaliger and Dolet, the latter publishing his own anti-Erasmian apology (1535) in behalf of the Ciceronian scholar, Longueuil.¹² Royal sanction of the Ciceronians' cause has already been expressed in the appointment (c. 1534) of Barthélemy Latomus as the first Royal Reader in Latin eloquence at the Collège des Lecteurs royaux.¹³ Through his course on Cicero, he establishes an important channel for the dissemination of rhetorical doctrine to contemporary scholars.

It is precisely during this period of Ciceronian frenzy and vernacular defensiveness that Renaissance translation theory in France undergoes a subtle change.¹⁴ After 1530, translation is rarely labeled as simply a craft of servile imitation, but is granted more practical and lofty functions. While word-for-word versions and loose paraphrase had traditionally served to teach Latin grammar skills in the Humanist pedagogy, the importance of these exercises for early Renaissance France is confirmed by the publication of numerous bi-

lingual manuals treating the conversion of Latin diction into French.¹⁵ Indeed, the very foundation of Mathurin Cordier's *De Corrupti Sermonis Emendatione Libellus* (1530) lies in the teaching of Latin rudiments through literal and free vernacular equivalents. Occasionally, this pedagogical role is even verbalized in such prefatory remarks as the printer's address to the reader at the head of Dolet's bilingual version of Cicero: "Et ce pour l'utilité tant de ceux qui trauaillent pour apprendre la langue Latine, sachant la Françoisse, que de ceux qu'apprennent la Françoisse par le moyen du langage Latin."¹⁶

It is thus within the Humanist educational structure that the French Renaissance translator first makes contact with the theoretical principles of his craft. He shares with the Humanist educator the view that classical eloquence can be transmitted from one idiom into another, and that the rendering of style-for-style and thought-for-thought is his higher mission.¹⁷ In his prefaces he refers increasingly to the "sententia"/"verbum" opposition discussed by Cicero and Quintilian and used to defend the transmission of style and thought against the rendering of lexical order. In the preface to his version of a Ciceronian oration (1534), Antoine Macault asserts, in much the same way as Cicero in *De Finibus* (I, ii, 6), that a servile, word-for-word duplication of the original diction must be supplanted by fidelity to the "sententia" and by *approximate* rendering of the original style.¹⁸ Etienne Le Blanc, during the same period, seeks to represent "en la lague Francoyse, lart, facunde eloquence, & persuasive maniere de parler de ce grand orateur entre les latins, M. T. Cicero."¹⁹ Echoing similar thoughts in a later version of Cicero (1539), Jean Colin proposes the ideal of translating both style and meaning despite a professed ability to convey only the "sens": "la haulte & difficile matiere qui est icy traictée, n'advient facillemēt grād ornement & exorné langaige ioinct qu'il y a plusieurs lieux que l'ō eut peu dire a iuste cause, estre mal tournez, si l'ō eut plus tost voulu s'amuser a la diction, qu'a rendre fidelement le sens."²⁰ There is little doubt that such translators of classical eloquence regard themselves as collaborators in the Ciceronian revival, but it remains for Etienne Dolet to lend his double voice of Ciceronian scholar and translator to the polemic struggle of vernacularism. His *Orateur François* will be then an implicit vindication of the ideals of Budé and Tory, and of the labors of Macault, Le Blanc, and Colin. Not surprisingly, it will be to the Latin rhetoricians themselves that he will turn for the notion of a higher form of translator-orator who, like Tory's "Qintilien Francois," is a sum total of vernacular and rhetorical expertise. Dolet is therefore using those sources available to him as a student of the oratorical school program laid down by Cicero and Quintilian.

Scholars have been generally slow to acknowledge Dolet's treatise on translation as the natural extension of his Latinist activities and interests. Yet it is inconceivable that in preparing the tract he not be aware of the principal *loci classici* related to translation and its role in the orator's training. In the *Dialogus de Ciceroniana Imitatione*, his defense of Cicero as a translator of verse is a precise recollection of the "sententia" ideal expressed in *De Finibus* and elsewhere.²¹ Furthermore, the juxtaposition of his rules for effective translation with their rhetorical antecedents seems to confirm the above judgment.²²

He knows, for instance, there is no more thoughtful a defense of the literary program than that of Quintilian's Book X (*Institutio Oratoria*) in which translation occupies a major position. In an earlier passage the author had dwelt briefly on the value of reading (especially that of the poets) in the orator's rhetorical formation: "Denique credamus summis oratoribus, qui veterum poemata vel ad fidem causarum vel ad ornamentum elo-

quentiae adsumunt" (I, viii, 10). The stylistic principles forming the greater part of the first nine books are, however, only propaedeutic, theoretical precepts not in themselves sufficient to provide a mastery of oratory ("ita non satis ad vim dicendi valent ..." [X, i, 1]). The gap between theory and practice must be bridged by a kind of *facilitas* based on the Greek concept of *ἐξίς*. In turn, this rhetorical *facilitas* is an acquisition made possible only through the cultivation of Reading, Composition, and Speaking, the inseparable triad which gives flesh and bones to the abstraction of the ideal orator (X, i, 1). It is here that the association between poetry and translation becomes a practical vehicle in the orator's literary program, thereby casting light on the subject of poets and translators to be later developed in the poetic treatises of Renaissance France.

The Homeric ideal, formulated in Quintilian's remarks on Reading, is the poetic-rhetorical substratum for all further literary studies, but Reading alone is no guarantor of the future orator's desired *facilitas*.²³ From the subject of model authors, then, the path to the ideal passes through a transitional discussion of Invention and Imitation (X, ii, 1-28) to the intermediate stage of Composition (X, iii-v). The question of reading and imitation of appropriate models has thereby given rise to the problem of what forms of written exercise the future orator should practice and how best to utilize the initial stage of the literary program. This, briefly, is the context of Quintilian's discussion of translation (X, v, 1-10): not only is it a primary exercise of rhetorical composition, but also the natural extension of literary models and imitative theory.

Well aware of translation's role in the history of classical literature, Quintilian is especially sensitive to its function among the early orators: "Vertere Graeca in Latinum veteres nostri oratores optimum iudicabant" (X, v, 2). He knows, for example, that Cicero's works, specifically *De Oratore* (I, xxxiv, 154-55), contain their own defense of translation as an exercise in composition, as well as important discussions of nuances in translation theory. In these works, Cicero makes certain generic distinctions to be taken up later by Quintilian and transmitted to the Renaissance theoreticians. Crassus, in the *De Oratore*, distinguishes between the school exercise of *παράφρασις* and the stricter meaning of translation.²⁴ In the first instance, he chooses a Latin poetic text ("quam maxime gravibus" [I, xxxiv, 154]), transposing its subject matter into his own words, but noting also that he is condemned to repeat the Latin expressions of the original. The Latin-to-Latin paraphrase is therefore later supplanted by a Greek-to-Latin free rendering of certain oratorical works: "Postea mihi placuit, eoque sum usus adolescens, ut summorum oratorum graecae orationes explicarem" (X, xxxiv, 155). Only in this latter exercise does the pupil have greater freedom to formulate his own rhetorical elegance based on familiar idiom as well as neologism (X, xxxiv, 155). After all, he is not trying now to re-create the elegant Latin of a superior model, but rather to render ("reddere") the thoughts of a foreign text into his native tongue. By avoiding the necessity to repeat the usage of the Latin model and by converting Greek to Latin, he is free to create a less slavish equivalent of the original. Crassus appears, then, to be making a significant distinction between slavish paraphrase and free translation, between literalness and looseness in the translator's craft.

It is appropriate that Cicero take up this notion once again in the prefatory remarks to his own translation of Demosthenes and Aeschines: *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*. Although the opposition here, however, is between the translator and orator, there is a similar underlying theme of word-for-word versus philosophical and stylistic equivalent: "nec

converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiâ isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui redere, sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi" (IV, 14). As a translator-orator, Cicero is concerned with the rendering of the original "sententiâ" rather than the strict order of the "verbum," no less a preoccupation of his Renaissance counterpart. The arguments he raises over the "orator" versus the "interpres" seem, then, to relate to a more basic question of *what* to translate: verse or prose? Posed more directly, the question is one of contemporary tastes; translations of verse are more readily accepted than those of eloquence and philosophy: "Quod igitur est eorum in orationibus e Graeco conversis fastidium, nullum cum sit in versibus?" (VI, 18). In *De Finibus*, the argument is essentially unchanged: why do certain critics oppose the translation of serious (that is, philosophical and oratorical) works when they are content to read the more literal, "ad verbum" renderings of Greek plays (I, ii, 4)? Cicero is therefore creating the rationale for a particular kind of translator, as much of an abstraction as his ideal orator. Since textual fidelity is preserved with respect to ideas, and independence with respect to words, the translator is free to concentrate on stylistic elegance in his own idiom, which after all, is one of the ends of this pedagogical system.²⁵

In summary, then, Cicero transmits to Quintilian several basic notions on translation theory: the predominance of "sententiâ" over "verbum" and of looseness over literalness; the exercise, through translation, of stylistic skills in one's own idiom; a defensiveness based on the feeling that translations of poetic texts are more acceptable than those of oratorical and philosophical ones; the crucial distinction, albeit incomplete, between paraphrase from Latin and translation from Greek; and finally, the concept of translation as a rhetorical exercise and of the orator as the potential transmitter of classical knowledge and expression.

Having found in Cicero an apologist for translation, Quintilian is quick to follow the same generic distinctions between translation and paraphrase found in the *De Oratore*, but with differing emphasis. While the possibilities for rhetorical excellence in one's own idiom are maximized by Greek-to-Latin translation (X, v, 3), the use of paraphrase has its own special value superior to Cicero's concept of slavish paraphrase from Latin-to-Latin and more akin to the concept of model translation contained in *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* and *De Finibus*.²⁶ The most striking aspect of paraphrase, then, for Quintilian, is its literary ascendancy over the mere word-for-word adaptation of an original text: "Neque ego paraphrasim esse interpretationem" (X, v, 5). Paraphrase thereby transcends the copier's craft, vying with the model for artistic excellence and conveying to French Renaissance theoreticians the notion of translation as an independent, generic form of literary activity.

It is here that the contact between translation and the poetic-rhetorical tradition becomes most explicit. Referring to the example of Sulpicius, Quintilian defends the practical value not only of paraphrase based on poetic texts, but of verse-to-prose equivalents of the original (X, v, 4).²⁷ Thus, the paraphrast must bring to his version the power of oratory and take from his model the "sublimus spiritus" of poetic expression (X, v, 4). By extracting the quintessential "sententiâ" from the text and freeing himself from the lexical order, he may use his rhetorical faculties to even improve on his model: "Sed et ipsis sententiis adiicere licet oratorium robur et omissa supplere, effusa substringere" (X, v, 4). This textual refinement through paraphrase has a dual aspect. It seeks both to abridge and embellish, transformations prescribed in earlier references to the "brevitas" and "exornatio" of paraphrase (I, ix, 2).

As Cicero has already done in *De Finibus*, Quintilian now raises the question of contemporary tastes. Is not the orator-translator as equipped to apply himself to oratorical texts as to poetic ones? Indeed, common prejudice seems to dictate that paraphrase of the orators, inasmuch as it strives for expressions superior to those of the model, is a futile exercise. Not so, says Quintilian; discovery of new and even superior modes of expression is always possible for the diligent translator-orator: "Nam neque semper est desperandum, aliquid illis, quae dicta sunt, melius posse resperiri ..." (X, v, 5). There is not one, but a multitude of rhetorical paths to formulation of the same "sententia." The translator, in seeking his own path, is therefore free to put to use the "brevitas" and "exornatio," and achieve his own rhetorical creation. The difficulty of the exercise is ultimately the measure of its pedagogical value: "Ipsa denique utilissima est exercitationi difficultas" (X, v, 8). There is, in fact, no better way to penetrate and comprehend the writings of model authors, despite the translator's crucial sense of their inimitability (X, v, 8).

Not inappropriately, given the fact of Etienne Dolet's Ciceronian training and bias, the setting of his treatise on translation reveals a clear justification for the transmission of these oratorical values into the vernacular tongue. Although broken into much broader and traditionally rhetorical categories than the *Deffence et Illustration de la langue françoise* (1549), Dolet's manifesto was to have been an unquestionable anticipation of Du Bellay's later, more celebrated apology for the French language. By placing himself in the company of such classical giants as Demosthenes, Homer, Cicero, and Virgil, Dolet is formulating a not infrequent stand taken by other vernacular apologists: after the example of our Greek and Latin models, we must not desert our native tongue in order to gain renown in another. On the contrary, we should work to reduce our vernacular to a cohesive system: "... et peu à peu par le moyen et trauail des gens doctes elle [la langue française] pourra estre reduite en telle perfection que les langues dessusdictes" (6). Despite the work's unfinished state, it is nevertheless clear the creation of linguistic regularity for the French language depends, in Dolet's mind, on the application of classical rhetorical doctrines to vernacular goals. Those same verbal faculties developed by the perfect orator of Cicero and Quintilian are no less those to be acquired by "L'Orateur François." Within this pedagogical scheme, it is thus fitting that a tract on translation theory take its place alongside those treating poetic and oratorical techniques.

In this context, Dolet's *Maniere de bien traduire* is much more than a simple guide for the good translator, abstracted from its rhetorical framework and used to gauge the application of theory to specific contemporary translations. Rather it confirms translation's function as that pedagogical exercise already alluded to in Cicero and Quintilian. Just as the classical rhetorician sees translation as one of a series of acquisitions for the maturing orator, Dolet's remarks are not directed at translation as a self-contained end. Were his only concern that of preparing a translator's manual, crammed with bilingual examples for the rendering of Latin diction, he might well have followed the pattern of earlier treatises by Robert Estienne.²⁸ His task is that of the generalist, laying out broad, theoretical rules. He seeks not to mold a professional translator, but to guide his French orator to a more intelligent reading and understanding of model authors in much the same way as Cicero and Quintilian had already done. His five rules for effective translation are, then, formulaistic precepts aimed at the creation of a total individual, and not at the narrow professionalism of a specialist.

Dolet's rules are an unequivocal extension of that higher form of translation-paraphrase discussed by Cicero and Quintilian. They illustrate, in sum, the very definition of paraphrast (drawn up by Dolet's contemporary, Robert Estienne) as a translator who renders not word-for-word, but sense-for-sense, almost in the manner of speech.²⁹ It is to the meaning of his model text, then, that the translator must first address himself: "il fault que le traducteur entende parfaitement le sens et matiere de l'auteur qu'il traduit" (13). Like Cicero's perfect orator and Quintilian's translator-paraphrast, Dolet's translator performs this exercise *ut orator* rather than *ut interpres*. Only upon close scrutiny of the model text and the application of his intelligence can he hope to enlighten his reader. Occasionally, he may, as prescribed by Quintilian, improve on his model through textual transformation: "si l'auteur le quel il traduit est aucunement scabreux, il le pourra rendre facile et du tout intelligible" (13). Dolet goes on to cite an example of "exornatio" he himself has used in rendering a difficult passage of Cicero's *Tusculanae Disputationes*.³⁰ Slavish imitation is thus unthinkable for the translator-orator; he must create his own aesthetic identity within the framework of the model's "sententia."

If the importance of textual understanding seems to belabor the obvious, the second rule is no less self-evident: "c'est que le traducteur ait parfaite congnoissance de la langue de l'auteur qu'il traduit: et soit pareillement excellent en la langue en laquelle il se met à traduire" (14-15).³¹ This requirement of linguistic proficiency hides, however, its own well-defined rationale. Each language is a single entity, possessing a particular set of properties, figurative expressions, and locutions. In the case of the ignorant translator unschooled in either the model language or his native idiom, he cannot avoid betraying either medium. Dolet appears, in fact, to suggest that this attention to linguistic proficiency should be a major consideration of the translator grappling with the most challenging of texts – the Ciceronian oration: "Cuydes tu que si un homme n'est parfait en la langue Latine et François, qu'il puisse bien traduire en François quelque oraison de Cicéron?" (15). By extension, no text makes more stringent demands on the translator, calling on him to be aware of linguistic particularities and the untranslatable nature of certain passages.³² To what specific end, then, should he direct his energies?

From his preceding remarks, Dolet formulates the third, and perhaps central rule of his treatise: "il ne se fault pas asservir iusques à la que l'on rende mot pour mot. ... Car, s'il a les qualitez dessusdictes ... sans auoir esgard à l'ordre des mots, il s'arrestera aux sentences, et fera en sorte que l'intention de l'auteur sera exprimée, gardant curieusement la propriété de l'une et l'autre langue" (15).³³ The rhetorical source of these words is, of course, unmistakable; indeed, the "verbum"/"sententia" opposition of Cicero and Quintilian could hardly be stated more explicitly. As his classical predecessors had done, Dolet sees two classes of translators: the slavish imitators who, in their ignorance and folly, "se submettent à servitude" (16), and the translator-orators whose attention is drawn to transmitting the idea ("sentence") while preserving the integrity and grace of both languages. It follows that if each language is seen as a system of distinct properties, it is quite likely that among certain of these properties there can be no interchangeability and thereby no word-for-word equivalent. Fidelity to the idea over lexical order also presupposes a fidelity to linguistic integrity.

With this in mind, Dolet turns his attention to the special problem of usage: "il te fault garder d'usurper mots trop approchans du Latin, et peu usitez par le passé: mais contente

toy du commun, sans innouer aucunes dictions follement, et par curiosité reprehensible” (16-17). As the fourth rule for effective translation, these remarks, while directed explicitly at vernacular idioms (“langues non reduictes en art” [16]), closely parallel similar concerns of the classical rhetoricians. The ideal of common usage, for instance, is formulated by Cicero in precisely the same passage of *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* treating the “verbum”/“sententia” opposition.³⁴ At the extremes of common usage, one finds either Latinisms or neologisms, forms to be used sparingly, but nevertheless not entirely out of bounds for the intelligent translator-orator. Common usage, for Dolet, thus represents the middle ground of the ideal translator, but is not the hard and fast rule proposed by certain scholars.³⁵ Indeed, Cicero is quick to offer his translator the option of neologism if it is practiced judiciously.³⁶ The words “trop,” “follement,” and “par curiosité,” used in the above passage, describe then the excesses of the ignorant translator. Functioning much like Cicero’s “dummodo essent idonea,” they imply a caveat rather than an absolute interdiction. For Dolet, in keeping with his model rhetoricians, knows well that certain words do not submit to translation and that neologisms as well as Latinisms are frequently unavoidable.³⁷ Contrary to the categorical application of this rule suggested by Lebègue, a careful reading of the text confirms our more relative interpretation: “Pour cela n’entends pas que ie die que le traducteur s’abstienne totalement de mots qui sont hors de l’usage commun ...” (17). The danger of using the tract as an absolute gauge for contemporary translation practice is apparent: its rhetorical setting, purpose, and inspiration necessarily bind its functions to the greater corpus of Dolet’s nine-part thesis. At any rate, the rule is sufficiently important in the author’s mind to warrant independent treatment in *L’Orateur François*.³⁸

Having been amply treated by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian,³⁹ Dolet’s fifth rule – on the use of euphony and rhythm – is the most explicitly rhetorical precept of his treatise on translation: “l’obseruation des nombres oratoires: c’est asscauoir une liaison et assemblément des dictions avec telle douceur, que non seulement l’ame s’en contente, mais aussi les oreilles ... et ne se faschent iamais d’une telle harmonie de langage” (17-18). While its specific role in translation theory is never more than implied by Cicero and Quintilian, its importance cannot be overlooked by the translator-orator intent on matching the style of his model.⁴⁰ Dolet is therefore re-stating a rule familiar to every young student of rhetoric and by no means new to translation theory.⁴¹ Its role is further confirmed by several contemporary rhetoricians, although not in the context of translation.⁴² There is also little doubt that, like the preceding rule, Dolet intends to treat the subject in depth and separately in his projected work (18). What does seem notable, then, is the author’s desire to incorporate in his theory an increasing preoccupation of his fellow translators: the transmission of classical style into vernacular expression.

It is upon this rule that all the others appear to hinge. Without euphony and rhythm the “sentence” is deprived of vital gravity and the diction of propriety and elegance: “et sans yceulx les sentences ne peuuent estra graues et auoir leur poids requis et legitime. Car penses tu que ce soit assés d’auoir la diction propre et elegante sans une bonne copulation des mots?” (18). Of the five precepts for the good translator, only this last applies with equal force to the translator-orator as well as to the general author. Its relevance extends universally as a rhetorical principle for all vernacular writing: “sans grande obseruation des nombres un autheur n’est rien” (19).

In the course of his treatise, Dolet has broadened his concerns, moving from a purely mechanical phase of linguistic proficiency and its role in textual understanding to the greater problem of stylistic elegance in the vernacular. His fifth rule aims not so much at the particular faculties to be exercised by the ordinary translator, but rather at the deeper concerns of how to train the extraordinary translator-orator. The tract's significance strikes ultimately beyond the immediate functionalism of a technical manual. As with the classical rhetoricians, it shares in a broader moral and intellectual scheme – the shaping of the perfect orator. From its classical counterpart Dolet seeks to forge a vernacular ideal. His final words thus bind his tract to a work never to be concluded and a perfection never to be realized: “sans grande obseruation des nombres un autheur n'est rien: et avec yceulx il ne peult faillir à auoir bruict en eloquence, si pareillement il est propre en diction, et graue en sentences: et en arguments subtil. Qui sont les poincts d'un orateur parfait ...” (19).⁴³

Etienne Dolet is by no means the first of his generation to treat translation according to rhetorical theories. We have seen that Antoine Macault, Etienne Le Blanc, and Jean Colin had verbalized in their prefatory writings important aspects of the classical doctrine. As an exercise of composition frequently prescribed by the Renaissance educator, translation is already firmly based in the school programs of France and Italy. The *Maniere de bien traduire* does, however, represent the first attempt by a French theoretician to codify the principles of effective translation. If scholars have generally examined the work apart from its rhetorical framework, such oversights may be attributed solely to one factor: the tendency to look for its causal rather than symptomatic role. It proposes, of course, no stock of radically fresh ideas to inspire a new generation of translators. Neither is it a technical manual replete with specific formulae and examples. Its roots are more conventional, from the standpoint not only of classical theory, but perhaps more fundamentally, of the vulgarization of rhetorical ideals. The Renaissance translator, in his higher rhetorical form, is thereby encouraged to take his place alongside the poets, orators, grammarians, and other participants in the quest for a national literary and linguistic identity. As with Cicero and Quintilian, Dolet's theory of translation is the fractional part of a greater pedagogical scheme – a scheme entirely within the Humanistic currents of new learning.

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park

Notes

- 1 The following works are among the most significant theoretical treatments of French Renaissance translation: A. de Balignières, *Essai sur Amyot et les traducteurs français au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Durant, 1851); Paul Herbert Larwill, *La Théorie de la traduction au début de la Renaissance*, diss. (Munich: Wolf, 1934); Raymond Lebègue, “Les traductions en France pendant la Renaissance,” *Association Guillaume Budé, Actes du Congrès, Congrès de Strasbourg* (1938), (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1939), pp. 362-77; Jean Porcher, “La Théologie naturelle et les théories de la traduction au XVI^e siècle” in *Oeuvres*

complètes of Montaigne, ed. A. Armaingaud, vol. 10 (Paris: Conard, 1935), pp. 447-79; René Sturel, *Jacques Amyot, traducteur des Vies parallèles de Plutarque* (Paris: Champion, 1908).

- 2 See the “Prologue de messire Claude de Seyssel, evesque de Marseille,” in *La trāslation de Justin, abbreviation des Histoires de Trogue Pōpee* (Paris, 1509), as well as the important essay of Ferdinand Brunot, “Un projet d'enrichir, magnifier et publier la langue française en 1509,” *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1 (1894), 27-37. While there are earlier French apologists for the vernacular, Seyssel is one of the first to

- promulgate the founding of a "litterature en françois." Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900*, II, "Le seizième siècle" (Paris: Colin, 1906), p. 29.
- 3 See especially Brunot, *Histoire*, II, 27-35; and Hubert Gillot, *La Querelle des anciens et des modernes en France* (Paris: Champion, 1914), pp. 3-29.
 - 4 With varying degrees of qualification, the following studies treat the work's importance: Hennebert, *Histoire des traductions*, pp. 37-40; Lebègue, "Les traductions en France," pp. 364-76; Porcher, "La Théologie naturelle," pp. 453-56; Peter Rickard, *La Langue française au seizième siècle* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968), pp. 8-9; Sturel, *Jacques Amyot*, pp. 187-89; Richard C. Christie, *Etienne Dolet: the Martyr of the Renaissance (1508-1546)*, new ed. revised and corrected (London: Macmillan, 1899), pp. 353-64.
 - 5 In the *Defence et Illustration de la langue françoise* (I:12), he makes passing reference to *L'Orateur François*. On the other hand, six reprintings of the *Maniere* between 1540 and 1550 attest to its relatively wide circulation.
 - 6 The nine tracts are listed in the following order: "La Grammaire," "L'Orthographe," "Les accents" (published with the *Maniere*), "La Punctuation" (published with the *Maniere*), "La Pronunciation," "L'Origine d'aucunes Dictions," "La Maniere de bien traduire," "L'Art Oratoire," "L'Art Poétique." *La Maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en autre* (1540; rpt. Paris: Techner, 1830), pp. 9-10; all other references will be to this edition.
 - 7 The founding of the Collège des Lecteurs royaux (c.1530) is generally considered the pivotal event of this period because it establishes the autonomy of the literary program from matters of theological reform: see R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries From the Carolingian Age to the End of the Renaissance* (1954; rpt. New York: Harper, 1964), pp. 309-10; and Henry Hornik, "Three Interpretations of the French Renaissance," *Studies in the Renaissance*, VII (1960), p. 61.
 - 8 On this analogical connection, see Jacques Peletier's Preface to his translation of the *Ars Poetica* (Paris, 1545).
 - 9 Cf. John Palsgrave, *L'Eclaircissement de la langue française* (London, 1530); Jacques Dubois, *In Linguam Gallicam Isagoge* (Paris, 1531); and Charles de Bovelles, *De Differentia Vulgarium Linguarum et Gallici Sermonis Varietate* (Paris, 1533).
 - 10 See the Prologue "Aux Lecteurs."
 - 11 Following the recovery of the *De Oratore* and the *Institutio Oratoria* in the early fifteenth century, Padua and Florence quickly became the principle centers of Ciceronianism. The movement, however, was by no means the exclusive domain of Italian Humanists. As a disciple of Petrarch, Jean de Montreuil was also undoubtedly inspired by Ciceronian imitation. His friend, Nicholas de Clémenges, gave up the monastic life in 1425 to teach Ciceronian rhetoric at the Collège de Navarre. Throughout the fifteenth century, in fact, Cicero and Quintilian were well ensconced in the school programs of both France and Italy. In the case of Dolet and his fellow Ciceronians, Longueuil and Villeneuve, Padua continued to exert its traditional influence. For a broader view of the problem, see: Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage*, pp. 265-379; Augustin Renaudet, *Préréforme et Humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494-1517)*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Librairie d'Argences, 1953), p. 77 and passim; Christie, *Etienne Dolet*, pp. 18-37; 195-228; Izora Scott, *Controversies over the Imitation of Cicero* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1910), no. 35, pp. 3-23.
 - 12 See the *Dialogus de Ciceroniana Imitatione pro C. Longolio* (Lyon, 1535).
 - 13 See Abel Lefranc, *Histoire du Collège de France* (Paris: Hachette, 1893), pp. 183-84.
 - 14 Porcher attaches special importance to the role of Latomus in this development. "La Théologie naturelle," pp. 450-51.
 - 15 As early as 1528, Robert Estienne published a treatise on the rendering of Latin verbs into French: *La Maniere de tourner en langue françoise les verbes actifz, passifz, gerundifz, supins & participes* ... (Paris, 1528), followed later by: a systematic study of Latin nouns accompanied by their French equivalents (*La Maniere de tourner toutes especes de noms Latins, en nostre langue françoise* [Paris, 1537]; a manual on the translation of Latin verbs (*Coniugaisons latines et françoises de verbes Actifz avec Passifz* ... [Paris, 1540]); a bilingual text on the declension of Latin and French verbs (*De Gallica verborum declinatione* [Paris, 1540]). Although these tracts indicate that Latin-to-French translation is considered a means of teaching Latin grammar, this in no way diminishes their availability as technical manuals for the translator. On this important, but little explored problem, see Brunot, *Histoire*, II, 6-14. Humanistic/pedagogical

- approaches to translation are to be found in Piccolomini's *De Liberorum Educatione* (1450); Guarino's *De Ordine Docendi et Studendi* (1458); Sadoletto's *De Liberis Recte Instituendi* (1530); Erasmus' *De Ratione Studii* (1511); Elyot's *The Governour* (1531). References to the role of bilingualism in the Humanist system can be found throughout two basic works of William H. Woodward: *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600*, ed. Lawrence Stone (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967); and *Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1912).
- 16 Found in *Les epistres familières de M. T. Cicéron* (Paris, 1564), and first published at Paris in 1542. Bilingual translations are not uncommon in Renaissance France and would appear to fulfill those functions described by the Humanist pedagogical theorists. No scholars to my knowledge, however, have examined the role of such versions in light of Humanist theory.
 - 17 On this Humanist ideal, see Battista Guarino's *De Ordine*, cited in Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre*, pp.167-68. In his treatise, Guarino calls many times on the pedagogical authority of Cicero and Quintilian. His remarks on translation are no less directly reminiscent of these two classical rhetoricians. It should also be noted that as early as the 12th century analysis of words ("littera"), superficial meaning ("sensus"), and deeper meaning ("sententia") was part of the textual "expositio" in the school program. G. Paré, A. Brunet, P. Tremblay, *La Renaissance du XII^e siècle, les écoles et l'enseignement* (Paris: Vrin, 1933), pp.116-18; and p. 267ff.
 - 18 *L'Oraison que fist Cicéron à Cesar pour le raptel de Marcus Marcellus, senateur romain* (Paris, 1534).
 - 19 *Troys oraisons, traduites de la langue latine en la françoise* (Paris, c.1534). In his important study, L. Delisle has shown that at least three sets of Le Blanc's Cicero translations were circulating in manuscript form well before their first printing: 1) between 1526 and 1531, the translator was preparing a collection of twelve orations to be presented to Francis I; 2) in 1531, he compiled a manuscript of four orations for Anne de Montmorency, three of which (for Marcellus, Pompey, and Ligarius) were printed in the above-mentioned 1534 edition; 3) between 1529 and 1531, he was also preparing a third set of orations for presentation to the Chancellor Antoine Du Prat. "Traductions d'auteurs grecs et latins offertes à François I^{er} et à Anne de Montmorency par Estienne Le Blanc et Antoine Macault," *Journal des Savants* (août, 1900), pp. 476-92; 520-34. While Delisle fails, as does Lanson, to cite the 1534 edition of the *Troys oraisons*, he does mention that a number of now rare printings of these manuscripts achieved wide circulation. The copy of the *Troys oraisons*, in the possession of Harvard's Houghton Library, would appear to be just such an edition. In the work's prefatory address, Le Blanc, in fact, reminds Francis that prior to this printed edition he had already read for the royal Court a set of twelve orations – a probable reference to the first of the forenamed manuscripts. From these data, one can begin to see, then, further confirmation of the synchronism between two important cultural movements in the 1530s: on the one hand, the Ciceronian revival; on the other, the vulgarization of oratorical texts.
 - 20 See Colin's address "au lecteur" at the head of Cicero's "Le Songe de Scipio," *Les oeuvres de M.-T. Cicero, père d'éloquence latine* (Paris, 1539). This work is not to be confused with *Les Oraisons de M. T. Cicero, père d'éloquence latine* (Paris, 1541), a compilation of translations by Le Blanc, Macault, Claude de Cuzzy, and Pierre Saliat.
 - 21 See Scott, *Controversies*, pp.74 and 78, for these specific passages. Dolet also shows familiarity with Quintilian's views on imitation, concepts developed peripherally to the remarks on translation theory in the *Institutio Oratoria*. Scott, p. 69.
 - 22 As this study will show, Cicero (*De Oratoria*, *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, and *De Finibus*) and Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria*) are the principal sources of the doctrine. Less important references, however, may be found in Horace's *Ars Poetica* (vv.133-34); and Boethius' *In Isagogen Porphyrii Commentorum*, ed. Samuel Brandt (Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1906), p.135. Other than the treatments given by Cicero and Quintilian, the most extensive pre-Renaissance discussion of "verbum"/"sententia" is contained in Saint Jerome's letter to Pammachius, entitled *De Optimo Genere Interpretandi*. The association of the letter's title with Cicero's Preface, *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, is not fortuitous; the rhetorical context and sources of Jerome's words are quite clear. While the formula is also found scattered among certain French vernacular translations of the late fifteenth century (see

- Larwill, *La théorie*, pp.7-34), only later is it taken up in a less conventional way by the Ciceronian apologists in the early sixteenth century. See also St. Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*.
- 23 Quintilian ascribes to Homer the dual, contingent powers of poetry and oratory ("nec poetica modo sed oratoria virtute eminentissimus" [X, i, 46]), a duality by no means new to Renaissance theoreticians, but already transmitted to the Middle Ages which held that poetry was simply a subdivision of rhetoric. See Ernst Robert Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und Lateinisches Mittelalter*, 6th ed. (Bern: Francke, 1967), pp.155-62.
- 24 In the Greek schools of the third and second century, pupils perform two exercises akin to the translation of poetry from one language into another: 1) a literal, word-for-word paraphrase of the poem into everyday language; 2) a free, rhetorical equivalent based on oratorical rather than spoken style. Roman schools later adopt these exercises, employing both Greek and Latin texts, but in order to counter the mounting criticism of paraphrase from Greek, translation theoreticians begin to raise, as does Quintilian (X, v, 5), the notion that the paraphrast is capable of improving on the model text. Cf. H. D. Jocelyn, ed., *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967), pp. 25-28; Giuseppe Giangrande, "On the Origins of the Greek Romances: the Birth of a Literary Form," *Erano*, LX (1962), 132-59; H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), pp.255; 263-64. On the use of paraphrase in Christian poetry, see Curtius, *Europäische Literatur*, pp.157-58.
- 25 At the end of *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, Cicero summarizes concisely this fidelity, stating his intention to translate all the textual virtues of his model authors while utilizing the rhetorical powers of his own idiom: "id est sententiis et earum figuris et rerum ordine, verba persequens eatenus, ut ea non abhorreant a more nostro ..." (VII, 23).
- 26 It should be noted that although Quintilian's remarks on paraphrase in Book X relate primarily to the rendering of Latin texts, an earlier discussion (I, ix, 2) describes the nuances of Greek-to-Latin paraphrase based on Aesop's fables. This dual use of paraphrase therefore confirms Jocelyn's findings outlined above (see n.24). Even the double form of paraphrase – literal and free – described by Giangrande ("On the Origins," p.153) is also formulated by Quintilian: "versus primo solve, mox mutatis verbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et brevior quaedam et exornare salvo modo poetae sensu permittitur" (X, ix, 2). Since there is clearly no discrepancy between the statements of Books I and X, the later remarks on Latin-to-Latin paraphrase will apply with equal force to the paraphrase of Greek texts. Significantly, Robert Estienne confirms this reading for Renaissance scholars. In his *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae thesaurus* (Paris, 1531), he in no way asserts that paraphrase is a strictly Latin-to-Latin exercise, despite a direct citation from Quintilian's Book X: "Neque ego paraphrasim esse interpretationem tantum volo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem" (X, v, 5). Instead, he portrays the paraphrast simply as a translator "qui non litteram ex littera, sed sensum et sensu transferat, quasi iuxta loquens" (vol. II, p.610). In his *Dictionarium Latinogallicum* (Paris, 1546), he defines "paraphrasis" as an "exposition et interpretation qui ne se fait point de mot pour mot, ains de sentence pour sentence" (p.905). Such is the notion of the ideal translator-paraphrast to be later taken up by Du Bellay.
- 27 While most late fifteenth and early sixteenth century French translations from poetic texts are verse-to-verse equivalents (see Larwill, *La Théorie*, p.41), there are occasional examples of prose version, the most notable being a combination verse-prose rendering of Terence which appeared at Paris between 1500 and 1503 (see Harold Lawton, *Térence en France au XVI^e siècle* [Paris: Jouve, 1926], p.45). Even within the corpus of verse-to-verse translation, there is a theoretical split between the partisans of literalness ("mot à mot" and "vers pour vers") and looseness ("sentence pour sentence"). Towards 1530, the upsurge of French Ciceronianism and the oratorical vogue appear to weigh this opposition heavily in favor of the non-literalists. See Porcher, "La Théologie naturelle," p.449.
- 28 See above, n.15.
- 29 See above, n.26. This definition is also born out by Charles Estienne in his translation of Terence's *Andria* (Paris, 1542): "[paraphraste] qui rend le sens, la phrase et l'esprit d'un matiere, sans contrainte du langage"; and Du Bellay, *Deffence*, 1:10.
- 30 This is not unlike Cicero's assertion in *De Finibus*: "equidem soleo etiam, quod uno Graeci, si

- aliter non possum, idem pluribus verbis exponere" (III, iv, 15).
- 31 For other references to this dictum, see Lebègue, "Les traductions en France" (p. 364).
- 32 The difficulty of translating oratorical texts was already the principal concern of Colin in his prefaces to the *Paradoxes* and the *Songe de Scipio* (1538). *Les oeuvres de M.-T. Cicero, père d'éloquence latine* (Paris, 1539).
- 33 Lebègue is undoubtedly correct in seeing here an attack by Dolet on such servile translators as Erasmus and Lazare de Baïf who attempted to render Greek tragedies "versum versui, verbum paene verbo" ("Les traductions en France," pp. 364-65). However, in his passing mention of the Horatian source for these words, he overlooks the more important treatments of Cicero and Quintilian. Furthermore, it is clear that like Cicero, Dolet makes specific reference to the servile translators of poetic texts who are content to render "vers pour vers" (16).
- 34 "verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis" (IV, v, 14); and in *De Oratore* (I, xxxiv, 155): "non solum optimis verbis uter, et tamen usitatis."
- 35 Dolet is clearly attacking the same latinizing mania derided in Rabelais' parody of the "escholier Limosin" (*Pantagruel*: VI). Lebègue and others appear to accept Dolet's words as an unswerving rule which, in reality, is never followed by sixteenth century translators, even by Dolet himself. "Les traductions en France," p. 371.
- 36 "... sed etiam exprimerem quaedam verba imitando, quae nova nostris essent, dummodo essent idonea" (*De Oratore* [I, xxxiv, 155]).
- 37 For specific examples, see Dolet's Preface of Cicero's *Epistres familiales* (Paris, 1542) and Lebègue, "Les traductions en France," for an in-depth treatment of the question. In *De Finibus* (III, iv, 15-16), Cicero treats the problem of converting Stoic terminology from Greek to Latin, concluding that a Greek form may sometimes be used where there is no Latin equivalent.
- 38 "En mon Orateur François ie traicteray ce point plus amplement, et avec plus grand' demonstration" (17).
- 39 Cf. Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Book III; Cicero's *De Oratoria*, Book III passim; Quintilian, Book IX.
- 40 Cicero, for instance, reasons that the absence of word-for-word rendering frees the translator to transmit the stylistic values of his model text: "sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi" (*De Optimo Genere Oratorum* [IV, 14]). The well-cadenced phrase would certainly be among these stylistic values. For Quintilian, the function of poetic and oratorical paraphrase would undoubtedly call on the paraphrast to also convey certain metrical forms.
- 41 See Lazare de Baïf's Prologue to his version of Sophocles' *Electra* (Paris, 1537): "J'ay observé les nombres de ses mettres...." René Sturel is therefore mistaken in limiting its first importance to the period 1542-46. Jacques Amyot, p. 245.
- 42 Cf. Jacques Amyot's *Projet d'Eloquence royale*, Chapter 13 (n.d.); Antoine Foclin, *La Rhetorique françoise* (Paris, 1555); Omer Talon's *Rhetorica* (Paris, 1552), chapter 15 and 17; and an anonymous, incomplete treatise ("Precetti di rettorica scritti per Enrico III, re di Francia") written for Henri III and edited by Giulio Camus in *Memorie della Regia Academia di Modena* (1887). See also Sturel, Jacques Amyot, pp. 423-33.
- 43 Shortly before his remarks on translation in *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, Cicero makes a series of strikingly similar points: 1) on the propriety of diction: "Nam quoniam eloquentia constat ex verbis et ex sententiis, perficiendum est, ut pure et emendate loquentes ..."; 2) on the gravity of "sententia": "commovendi graves"; 3) on the role of "nombres": "Sed et verborum est structura quaedam duas res efficiens, numerum et levitatem"; 4) on the arrangement of "arguments": "et sententiae suam compositionem habent et ad probandam rem accommodatum ordinem"; 5) and finally, on the fusion of these qualities in the perfect orator: "Ea igitur omnia in quo summa erunt, erit perfectissimus orator" (II, 4-5).