

Parallel Lives: Plutarch's *Lives*, Lapo da Castiglionchio the Younger (1405–1438) and the Art of Italian Renaissance Translation¹

CHRISTOPHER S. CELENZA

Before his premature death in 1438 of an outbreak of plague in Ferrara, the Florentine humanist and follower of the papal curia Lapo da Castiglionchio the Younger left behind three main bodies of work in Latin, all still either unedited or incompletely edited: his own self-collected letters, a small number of prose treatises, and a sizeable corpus of Greek-to-Latin translations. This paper concerns primarily the last of these three aspects of his work and has as its evidentiary focus two autograph manuscripts that contain *inter alia* final versions of Lapo's Latin translations of Plutarch's *Lives* of Themistocles, Artaxerxes, and Aratus. In addition, however, to studying Lapo's translating techniques, this paper will address chiefly the complexities of motivation surrounding Lapo's choice of dedicatees for these translations. The range of circumstances will demonstrate, I hope, the lengths to which a young, little-known humanist had to go to support himself in an environment where there was as yet no real fixed, institutional place for a newly created discipline.

Lapo and Translation: Patronage, Theory, and Practice

Of the three areas mentioned, Lapo's translations represent the most voluminous part of his oeuvre and in fact it is to his translations that he owes his modern reputation. But why did this young humanist devote so much energy to translating? And why were Plutarch's *Lives* such an important part of his effort?

¹ An earlier version of this paper was delivered as an Oldfather Lecture at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign on 8 November 1996. I thank Prof. William M. Calder III for the invitation and the audience for the helpful and stimulating discussion which ensued. In addition I would like to thank John Monfasani, Joseph Scholten, Ronald G. Witt, and the readers of this journal for helpful suggestions. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own. The following sigla will be used:

R = MS Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 142

F = MS Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Magl. XXIII, 126

The answer to these questions lies in the length of the works translated and the place they filled in the patronage process for humanists. The humanist movement was at this time still a world of disenfranchised intellectuals—at least for its lesser lights—who had to carve out a place in society for their still somewhat newly-created intellectual discipline; and Plutarch's *Lives*, individually speaking, were short. In practical terms, this meant that, for a relatively small (if, certainly, concerted) effort, the humanist translator would have a literary production suitable to send to a patron or, more importantly, to a prospective patron. The preponderance of Lapo's translating work consisted of translations of individual *Lives* of Plutarch; the other works he turned into Latin (of Isocrates, Lucian, and Flavius Josephus, *inter alios*) were either of the same size, more or less, or smaller.

As far as the popularity of Plutarch's *Lives* went, the process drove itself. In addition to dealing with relatively short works, the humanists also had a captive and multi-levelled audience. They translated not only for their own relatively small community of fellow scholars interested in the systematic appropriation of Hellas, but also for all those of whom the fast-evolving vogue for moralizing works of historical literature was taking hold, people who were not scholars, but enlightened, informed readers, from cardinals, to well-to-do merchants, to *primi inter pares*, to despots. Plutarch was perfect. As one modern critic of Plutarch's *Themistocles* has put it, "Plutarch is unique in his ability to be inoffensive without being dull."²

The *Lives* opened an historical window to the Greek and Roman past and delighted readers, all with a fashionable but not oppressive moralizing tone centered on the practice of voguish virtues, such as prudence. In a well-known passage Plutarch himself says that the works of biography are a different sort of history. In his biographies he aims at revealing the "signs of the soul," as he calls them (τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς σημεῖα), of the subject under consideration, not an exhaustive accounting of facts.³

² F. J. Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles: A Historical Commentary* (Princeton 1980) 41. Montaigne would write: "But I cannot free myself from Plutarch so easily. He is so all-embracing, so rich that for all occasions, no matter how extravagant a subject you have chosen, he insinuates himself into your work, lending you a hand generous with riches, an unailing source of adornments . . . I cannot spend the slightest time in his company without walking off with a slice of breast or wing." (From "On Some Lines of Virgil," III:5 in Montaigne, *The Complete Essays*, trans. by M. A. Screech [London 1987] 987.) In the world of the French Renaissance, the translations of Plutarch's *Lives* and *Moralia* into French by Bishop Jacques Amyot—much beloved by Montaigne (see *Essays* II:10)—greatly increased the availability and intellectual currency of Plutarch in general; see R. Aulotte, *Amyot et Plutarque* (Geneva 1967) and R. Sturel, *Jacques Amyot, traducteur des Vies parallèles de Plutarque* (Paris 1908). On Plutarch in the English Renaissance, see M. H. Shackford, *Plutarch in Renaissance England, with Special Reference to Shakespeare* (Wellesley College 1929).

³ *Alex.* 1. 3. Plutarch also says (*Galb.* 2. 5) that precise narration καθ' ἕκαστα is τῆς πραγματικῆς ἱστορίας, thus contrasting πραγματικὴ ἱστορία with the business of writing his type of biographies. These are concerned less with the hero's place in history than with his character, and are thus complements to the *Moralia*; see J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch. Alexander: A Commentary* (Oxford 1969) xxxviii and his source for this observation, A. W. Gomme, *A*

Moreover, when it came to Greek-to-Latin translations of historical and literary works, the humanists were on safer ground than when they came to philosophical literature. Episodes of polemic such as those which succeeded Leonardo Bruni's translation of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* would have been unthinkable with works of non-philosophical literature. The issue there had centered on the breaking of tradition. Alonso Garcia da Cartagena and others criticized Bruni because he had toyed with the medieval Latin version of the *Ethics*, around which almost two centuries of commentary and debate had taken place, often focussing on the interpretation of specific terms. Bruni had replaced any number of these terms with *res novae* and in the process had changed radically the prospect of analyzing Aristotle.⁴ Plutarch's *Lives*, though, had no such Latin medieval tradition and the humanists, in translating Greek history and oratory, were fully within their own, newly-revived domain of disciplines, the *studia humanitatis*.⁵

Last but not least, translating served the obvious but important pedagogical purpose of learning Greek.⁶ Manuel Chrysoloras, the supremely important Greek teacher of a generation of Florentines in the last years of the fourteenth century, had been faced with a severe problem when he came on commission to Florence from Constantinople: the absolute ignorance of the language on the part of the enthusiastic but Greekless Florentines. Thus, after quickly immersing his students in the most basic elements of vocabulary and grammar, Chrysoloras made translation the next step in solidifying their developing knowledge.⁷ For that purpose, too, the average length of the *Lives* made them ideal candidates when humanists were casting about for whetstones on which to sharpen their knowledge of the Greek language.

Historical Commentary on Thucydides I (Oxford 1945) 54–55; see also J. Buckler, "Plutarch and Autopsy," in *ANRW II* 33.6 (1992) 4788–4830, at 4789–90.

⁴ See E. Garin, "Le traduzioni umanistiche di Aristotele nel secolo XV," *Atti dell'Accademia fiorentina di scienze morali "La Colombaria"* 16 (1951) 55–104, esp. 62–68; A. Birkenmajer, "Der Streit des Alonso von Cartagena mit Leonardo Bruni Aretino," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* 20.5 (Münster 1922) 129–210; and J. Hankins, "The Ethics Controversy," in *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni*, ed. by G. Griffiths, J. Hankins, and D. Thompson (Binghamton 1987) 201–08.

⁵ I.e. grammar, rhetoric, history, poetry, and moral philosophy. This is not to suggest that humanists could not disagree *inter se* about translation. On the humanist cultural program, see P. O. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and its Sources*, ed. by M. Mooney (New York 1979) and, for recent studies and bibliography, see A. Rabil, Jr. (ed.), *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy* (Philadelphia 1988). For the medieval Plutarch and the fourteenth-century revival at Avignon, see R. Weiss, "Lo studio di Plutarco nel Trecento," *PP* 8 (1953) 321–42; and G. de Stefano, *La découverte de Plutarque en occident: Aspects de la vie intellectuelle en Avignon au XIV^e siècle*, *Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, classe di scienze morali, storiche, e filologiche*, serie 4a, 18 (Turin 1968).

⁶ See R. Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Veronese* (Catania 1896) 124.

⁷ G. Cammelli, *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell'umanesimo* (Florence 1941–54) I 82–83. See also the comprehensive study of M. Cortesi, "Umanesimo greco," in *Lo spazio letterario del medioevo. 1: Il medioevo latino III: La ricezione del testo* (Rome 1995) 457–507, esp. 462–70 for intriguing observations on the actual *praxis* of learning Greek.

Many humanists tried their hand at translating some of the *Lives*; as with so much else, the early impetus came from Coluccio Salutati and his circle.⁸ Salutati himself had become interested in an Aragonese version of the *Lives*, and then in anti-pope Benedict XIII's newly-acquired Latin translation of them in 1395.⁹ But it was Jacopo degli Angeli who produced the first known humanist Latin Plutarchan translation, namely, the *Vita Bruti*, in 1400.¹⁰ Others would follow, including Angeli's translation of the *Life of Cicero* a year later,¹¹ and thereafter a spate of translations by Bruni, Guarino, Giustiniani, and Filelfo.¹² By Lapo's day, we can say with confidence that he was operating within an already clearly-established context.

Italian Renaissance ideas of translation in the 1430s were shaped both by the small corpus of theoretical statements on translation then available, and by the exigencies and circumstances surrounding the *praxis* of the art.¹³ The most important views on the subject for humanists of Lapo's generation would have been those of Cicero, St. Jerome, Manuel Chrysoloras, and Leonardo Bruni, all of whom were, in their own way, formative figures for the humanist movement in the first half of the Quattrocento.

The pseudo-Ciceronian text, the *Libellus de optimo genere oratorum*, was known to Lapo's generation of humanists as a genuinely Ciceronian work.¹⁴ "Cicero," then, had stated that he translated the oration of Aeschines against Ctesiphon and Demosthenes' reply to this work not as an *interpres* but rather as an *orator*; he strove for the same sentiments, forms,

⁸ On Salutati and Plutarch, see R. G. Witt, "Salutati and Plutarch," in S. Bertelli and G. Ramakus (eds.), *Essays Presented to Myron P. Gilmore* (Florence 1978) 1335–46.

⁹ Salutati's enthusiasm in the early 1390s for the *Lives* was due in all likelihood to the contact of his disciple Roberto de Rossi with Manuel Chrysoloras in Constantinople; see Witt (previous note) 342 and, more generally, idem, *Hercules at the Crossroads: The Life, Works, and Thought of Coluccio Salutati* (Durham, NC 1983) 302–03; cf. V. R. Giustiniani, "Sulle traduzioni delle 'Vite' di Plutarco nel Quattrocento," *Rinascimento* 1 (1961) 3–62, at 3. Certainly, it is also possible that the seeds of western interest in Plutarch were sown even in the days of the Paduan "prehumanists," as Pace of Ferrara's ownership of a Greek codex of one of Planudes' redactions of the *Moralia* demonstrates. For this possibility see P. A. Stadler, "Planudes, Plutarch, and Pace of Ferrara," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 16 (1973) 137–62.

¹⁰ Giustiniani (previous note) 37; see there also for a list of manuscripts. It is true that Simone Autumano's 1373 translation of the *De cohibenda ira* (done at the behest of Cardinal Piero Corsini) was the first known Latin translation of a work of Plutarch in the later middle ages, but it is possessed of none of the humanist passion for Latin eloquence. See Weiss (above, note 5) 326 and de Stefano (above, note 5), where (91–129) Autumano's translation is edited.

¹¹ Giustiniani (above, note 9) 38.

¹² Giustiniani (above, note 9) *passim*.

¹³ Many issues surrounding translations of philosophical texts in the Renaissance have been addressed in B. P. Copenhaver, "Translation, Terminology and Style in Philosophical Discourse," in C. B. Schmitt, et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge 1988) 77–110; J. Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance* (Leiden 1990); and J. Monfasani, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of his Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden 1976). See also Cortesi (above, note 7) 470–84.

¹⁴ On its spuriousness, see M. D. Reeve in *Texts and Transmission*, ed. by L. D. Reynolds (Oxford 1983) 100–02 and the literature cited there.

or “figures” and used words suited to Latin custom; in doing so he “did not believe it necessary to translate word for word, but [preserved] the entire manner and force of the language.”¹⁵ Horace would briefly restate this principle in his *Ars poetica*.¹⁶

St. Jerome dealt with similar issues in his *Epistula LVII ad Pammachium de optimo genere interpretandi*, a title inspired by Cicero’s work.¹⁷ There Jerome makes a distinction between translating scripture on the one hand and everything else on the other (5. 2). In scripture “the order of the words is [part of the divine] mystery” and thus there is justification for translating word for word. But in translating other, non-scriptural varieties of Greek literature, Jerome avers that he has given back sense for sense. He cites Cicero as an authority for this practice.¹⁸

In his Greek instruction, Chrysoloras stressed the importance of translating *ad sententiam*. It should be done, he said, in such a way that the Greek *proprietas* went unchanged. Were one to do any differently, one would fulfill the function only of an “expositor,” not of a true *interpres*.¹⁹ The first generation of his students could not always follow his counsel, as the example of Uberto Decembrio’s excessively *ad verbum* translation of Plato’s *Republic* demonstrates,²⁰ but Chrysoloras’ approach did bear fruit in Quattrocento Italy in the work of Leonardo Bruni.

Bruni (who would die in 1444) made an important statement which codified the highest theoretical ideals of translation in the 1420s. In defending his translation of Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, a translation

¹⁵ Ps.-Cic. *Opt. gen. or.* 14: “nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sentiis isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. in quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi.”

¹⁶ Hor. *Ars* 131–34: “publica materies privati iuris erit, si / non circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem, / nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus / interpres . . .” Other Ciceronian legacies included the belief in the adequacy of Latin to represent philosophical Greek, the belief that transliterations of Greek words should be avoided if traditional Latin vocabulary was available, and the notion that translations should be comparable on an artistic level, including attention to prose rhythm. See Hankins (above, note 4) 210; see also the references to Cic. *Fin.* 3. 5 and 3. 15; *Acad.* 1. 5, 1. 10, 1. 25; *Leg.* 2. 17; *De Or.* 13–14 and 23 and the literature cited in his n. 35.

¹⁷ Hieronymus, *Liber de optimo genere interpretandi* (*Epist.* 57), with commentary of G. J. M. Bartelink (Leiden 1980); on the title, see 25–26.

¹⁸ 5. 2: “ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteor me in interpretatione Graecorum absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu. habeoque huius rei magistrum Tullium, qui Protagoram Platonis et Oeconomicum Xenophontis et Aeschini et Demosthenis duas contra se orationes pulcherrimas transtulit. quanta in illis praetermisit, quanta addiderit, quanta mutaverit, ut proprietates alterius linguae suis proprietatibus explicaret, non est huius temporis dicere.” Jerome also cites Horace’s *Ars Poetica*; see 5. 5. For Jerome’s reputation within Quattrocento humanism, see E. F. Rice, Jr., *St. Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore and London 1985) 84–99.

¹⁹ “Sed ad sententiam transferre opus esse aiebat hoc pacto, ut ii, qui huiusmodi rebus operam darent, legem sibi ipsis indicerent, ut nullo modo proprietas graeca immutaretur; nam si quispiam, quo luculentius apertiusque suis hominibus loquatur, aliquid graecae proprietatis immutavit, cum non interpretis sed exponentis officio uti” (cited in Cortesi [above, note 7] 471).

²⁰ See Cortesi (above, note 7) 471–74, who offers a bibliographically rich discussion of Uberto.

which was at that time under attack, he adopted in his *De interpretatione recta* a number of the ideas of Cicero, Jerome, and Chrysoloras and produced thereby the first more or less systematic statement in the Latin west on the proper aims of translation. He paid attention to the need of the translator to be thoroughly familiar with both languages, to respect prose rhythm when it exists, and to translate so that the final product is comparable in art and elegance to the original. "The best translator," Bruni wrote, "will turn his whole mind, heart and will to his original author, and in a sense transform him, considering how he may express the shape, attitude and stance of his speech, and all his lines and colors."²¹ Given Bruni's towering stature in the evolving humanist community, this treatise must have had a considerable influence, and certainly the young Lapo would have been no exception to this phenomenon.

Lapo, in fact, turned out to be quite a gifted translator, adopting, as we shall see, Brunian theory, and he produced works of very high quality. Lapo's teacher, Francesco Filelfo, was highly impressed with his former student's *latinitas*. About Lapo's translations of Plutarch's *Lives* of Theseus and Romulus Filelfo wrote:

I have read those *Lives* of Theseus and Romulus of Plutarch which you have translated into Latin; over and over, as far as elegance of speech goes, I was delighted by their beauty. For the language flows and glimmers [*fluit enim oratio ac nitet*].²²

And after Lapo was long dead, Filelfo remembered Lapo's abilities with fondness and admiration. The massive 1470 Rome edition of the Latin Plutarch included a series of Plutarch's *Lives* translated into Latin by a number of different humanist translators.²³ In the volume the translations were often misattributed and, in a letter of the 1470s, Filelfo wanted to clear things up. First of all, he denied having ever translated the *Lives* of Theseus and Romulus and gave the credit (incorrectly, as it turns out) to Lapo: "I wouldn't want," Filelfo said, "the work of another to be ascribed to me." Filelfo goes on:

²¹ Hankins' translation; see "On the Correct Way to Translate," in *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni* (above, note 4) 217–29, at 220; see also "On the Correct Way to Translate" passim as well as Hankins' discussion, at 208–10. For the Latin text, see Leonardo Bruni, *Humanistisch-philosophische Schriften*, ed. by H. Baron (Leipzig 1928) 81–96.

²² "Legi quas in latinum ex Plutarcho Thesei Romulique vitas convertisti, et semel et iterum eisque sum, quantum ad orationis elegantiam attinet, perbelle delectatus. fluit enim oratio ac nitet." (Letter edited in C. De'Rosmini, *Vita di Francesco Filelfo da Tolentino* [Milan 1808] I 131–32, also partially cited in F. P. Luiso, "Studi su l'epistolario e le traduzioni di Lapo da Castiglionchio juniore," *SIFC* 8 (1899) 205–99, at 268–69 n. 2.) To Filelfo's praise of Lapo's translating style may be added the warm praise of a much more recent Italian critic, Remigio Sabbadini (above, note 6) 134, on Lapo's translation of Plutarch's *Life of Themistocles*: "Lapo dà prova nel *Temistocle* di saper conciliare la fedeltà della traduzione con l'eleganza; mende di senso non mancano, ma non son tali di guastare l'insieme. La lingua è pura, il periodare slanciato e largo, la frase scelta: un vero modello di stile latino."

²³ L. Hain, *Repertorium bibliographicum* (Stuttgart 1826–38) #13125.

Moreover, my student, Lapo the Florentine, translated those *Lives*; and the index ascribes certain other *Lives* to Antonio Tudertino [Antonio Pacino da Todì]; but even though he too was my student, nevertheless he was far inferior to Lapo in intelligence and learning as well as in his power and facility of speech.²⁴

Turning to Lapo's translations of Plutarch's *Lives*, it will be best to examine the circumstances surrounding three of his translations, those of the *Lives* of Themistocles, Artaxerxes, and Aratus; this will help illustrate Lapo's search for a patron. After this, we shall move on to a brief examination of some features of Lapo's translating technique. First, however, we should get to know Lapo and learn what we can about his views regarding translation.

Lapo would, after his death, acquire a reputation as "manincoico, di natura che rade volte rideva"—"melancholic," that is, "and of a nature that rarely laughed"—according to the gossipy fifteenth-century biographer of famous Florentines, Vespasiano da Bisticci.²⁵ But there were, in his life, reasons for his melancholia, and Lapo does not hesitate to tell us about them, both implicitly and explicitly. His style of discourse is one clue and is reflective of his personality. At first glance this literary *modus procedendi* might seem to be authorial ambiguity; on second glance it might seem to be malicious cleverness; but on final reflection it is really no more than literary window-dressing revealing the conflicts raging in Lapo's melancholic and discontented mind. It is dialectical and self-reflective, and proceeds by a continuous, multi-layered counter-positioning of opinions, and is best illustrated in his final prose work, the *De curiae commodis*, or, *On the Benefits of the Curia*.²⁶

Lapo wrote the *De curiae commodis* in 1438, the year of his death, and at a time in his life when he was particularly dissatisfied with his own position in relation to the papal court. From 1435 on, Lapo had been a

²⁴ "Erant autem primae Thesei et Romuli vitae, quas index ostendebat ab me conversas. at illas ego nunquam sum interpretatus. itaque nolim mihi ascribi laborem alienum. traduxit autem illas auditor noster Lapus florentinus, ut [et?, at?] alias item nonnullas quas vitarum index ascribit Antonio Tudertino; qui etsi ipse quoque auditor fuit meus, erat tamen Lapo longe inferior et ingenio et doctrina et dicendi vi ac facilitate." (Filelfo, *Epistolae* [Venice 1502] 238, cited by Luiso [above, note 22] 261 n. 5.) Later, in a letter of 1465 to Donato Acciaiuoli, Ammanati would judge Antonio Pacino da Todì's translating as having been so bad that it would be better to read nothing at all rather than his translations: "Antonius Tudertinus, quem nosti, ita inepte plures traduxit ut nullas legere praestet quam illas." He goes on to say that the translations of Bruni, Francesco Barbaro, and Acciaiuoli himself are laudable; he does not, however, include Lapo in his praises. See the letter in Pius II, *Commentarii rerum memorabilium . . . quibus accedunt Jacobi Piccolominei Rerum gestarum sui temporis . . . commentarii . . . eiusdemque Epistolae* (Frankfurt 1614) 539; cited in Giustiniani (above, note 9) 8 n. 2.

²⁵ Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Le vite*, ed. by A. Greco (Florence 1970) I 582.

²⁶ There is a critical edition and annotated English translation of this work in C. S. Celenza, *Renaissance Humanism and the Papal Curia: Lapo da Castiglionchio the Younger's De curiae commodis* (forthcoming, University of Michigan Press); the following brief discussion relies on the more extensive discussion of the dialogue there.

hanger-on of the curia, having had a succession of positions in the service of various prelates. In the summer of 1438, when he wrote this work, he clearly believed—and we can see this from his letters—that he should have earned by this point a more permanent position, appropriate to his learning, and was probably quite serious when he had his interlocutors tell us that he was thinking of leaving the curia. He could have been thinking only of the post of apostolic secretary, which would have been, pragmatically speaking, the only major curial post suitable for a humanist.²⁷

The treatise, dedicated to Francesco Condulmer, the nephew of then Pope Eugenius IV, reflects these tensions, since often, when Lapo and Angelo, the two interlocutors of the dialogue, enumerate the curia's "benefits," they transmit by implication rather more information about its moral and sapiential disadvantages. Yet, on the other hand, there is also a sincere respect, awe almost, for the grandness of the curia, its internationalism, and the various opportunities it offers its denizens. The dialogue has been notoriously difficult to interpret and seems often to prevaricate. A close examination of this work reveals, however, that Lapo wrote as a well-informed but liminal figure in the socio-cultural environment of the papal curia, as an outsider who desired to become a full-fledged insider. The work, in fact, is not the cleverly couched parting shot of a fed-up hanger-on; it is instead Lapo's last-ditch, highly critical but nonetheless sincere attempt to find a patron who would allow him to join a cultural ambient at which he marvelled but from which he felt himself unjustly excluded. The circumstances surrounding his translations—their dedications, their content—all of them earlier than the *De curiae commodis*, reflect these pressures. They reflect, that is, Lapo's frustrating, continuous search for a permanent patron, one that would afford him the *otium*, the intellectual leisure, necessary to pursue his humanistic studies fully and comfortably. As we turn to the translations, our first step will be to pause briefly and take note of Lapo's ideas about the enterprise and operation of translation.

Lapo produced no grandiloquent theoretical statements on translation, but he did have some interesting thoughts on the problem. First, he justifiably considered himself in good company, busying himself with Greek-to-Latin translation. In making this step to learn Greek well enough to be able to translate, he joined an elite which was comparatively small, if compared to the growing humanist rank and file. In a preface (to the *Lives* of Theseus and Romulus) directed to Cardinal Prospero Colonna, Lapo put himself in the company of Francesco Filelfo, Leonardo Bruni, Giovanni Aurispa, Guarino da Verona, and Francesco Barbaro. He also conceded there that the praise owed to the translator was not on the same level as that

²⁷ Still, it was a long shot. Of the eighty-eight apostolic secretaries appointed in the seventy years following Martin V's 1417 accession, only about ten were humanists who came from undistinguished families. See P. Partner, *The Pope's Men: The Papal Civil Service in the Renaissance* (Oxford 1990) 15.

owed to the original author, but he believed that the two seemed nonetheless to be similar in spirit and will.²⁸

For the translations under discussion here, the best sources are two autograph manuscripts: Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 142 (= R) and Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Magl. XXIII, 126 (= F). They shed light on Lapo's technique as a translator, since they are both final copy-books, of a sort, in which we can observe him at work. Oftentimes he has in these works large, scratched-out sections, which, however, are still visible to the reader. In addition, we are treated in both manuscripts to sections of Greek texts in the margins, all in Lapo's own hand.²⁹ There we can see Lapo directly wrestling with the Greek, trying one translation, scrapping it, and moving to another. We have the unparalleled opportunity, codicologically speaking, of observing a humanist at work.³⁰

²⁸ Ed. Luiso (above, note 22) 269–70: “quamobrem cum multa iam alia, mea industria et labore, de graecis translata a nostris hominibus legerentur, perindignum esse statui, si non Plutarchi ac reliquorum imitatione in hoc quoque genere quaedam meis litteris extarent, praesertim cum hoc ipsum ab eloquentissimo viro Francesco Philelpho praeceptore meo, Leonardo Aretino, Johanne Aurispa, Guarino Veronensi, Francesco Barbaro ceterisque huius aetatis clarissimis viris factitatum esset. in quo, si non par laus debetur scriptori et interpreti, tamen animo similes et voluntate fuisse videbuntur.”

²⁹ For Lapo's Greek hand, see the Greek *Schriftprobe* of Lapo in P. Eleuteri and P. Canart, “Lapo da Castiglione il Giovane (c. 1406–1438),” no. LXXIV in their *Scrittura greca nell'umanesimo italiano* (Milan 1991). See also P. Eleuteri, “Francesco Filelfo copista,” in D. Harlfinger and G. Prato (eds.), *Paleografia e codicologia greca: Atti del II Colloquio internazionale (Berlino–Wolfenbüttel, 17–21 ottobre 1983)* (Alessandria 1991) I 163–79, esp. 166.

³⁰ The lack of scholarly attention to Lapo's translating techniques was pointed out by Massimo Miglio in his “Una lettera di Lapo da Castiglione il Giovane a Flavio Biondo: Storia e storiografia nel Quattrocento,” in *HumLov* 23 (1974) 1–30, at 5: “. . . finora non si è posta attenzione alla sua maniera di lavoro, come traduttore, anche se si continua a ripetere che nel primo quattrocento fu tra i migliori, se non il migliore.” Fubini suggests the possibility of a systematic plan of translation on Lapo's part; this is based on Fubini's assessment of Lapo's conviction of the superiority of Greek to Latin culture and promises of future translations given in his various dedications. See R. Fubini, “Castiglione, Lapo da, detto il Giovane,” in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* XXII (Rome 1979) 44–51, at 50. For a start on the translations, see K. Müllner, “Zur humanistischen Übersetzungsliteratur,” *WS* 23 (1901) 276–99 (includes a short general discussion [276–79] and editions of Lapo's translation, with preface to Prospero Colonna, of Isocrates' *Oratio ad Demonicum* [280–89] and Guarino's translation, with preface to Leonello D'Este, of Isocrates' *Oratio ad Nicoclem* [289–99]); the Lapo edition is based on MS Florence, Bibl. Laurenz., cod. 34, plut. 90 sup., ff. 193–95 and MS Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. 256, ff. 1–11); idem, “Zur humanistischen Übersetzungsliteratur: Fortsetzung,” *WS* 24 (1902) 216–30 (an edition of Lapo's translation, with preface to Franciscus Patavinus, of Theophrastus' *De impressionibus*, based on MS Florence, Bibl. Laurenz., cod. 13, plut. 89 inf., ff. 153–62^v and MS Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. 199, ff. 4–16^v); and idem, “Zur humanistischen Übersetzungsliteratur: Schluß,” *WS* 25 (1903) 110–26 (an edition of Lapo's translation, with preface to Gaspar Villanovensis Tudertinus, of Xenophon's *Praefectus equitum*, based on MS Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, cod. 178, ff. 37–55^v, MS Florence, Bibl. Laurenz. 42, plut. 76, ff. 107^v–33, and Bibl. Laurenz., 13, plut. 89 inf., ff. 82–95^v); L. G. Rosa, *La fede nella “Paideia”*: *Aspetti della fortuna europea di Isocrate nei secoli XV e XVI* (Rome 1984) 32–35 et passim; A. Carlini, “Appunti sulle traduzioni latine di Isocrate di Lapo da Castiglione,” *SCO* 19–20 (1970–71) 302–09 (in this article Carlini discusses the Greek codices Lapo may have used for his translations of Isocrates' *Ad Demonicum*, *Ad Nicoclem*, and *Nicocles*); and G. Resta, *Le epitomi di Plutarco nel Quattrocento*, *Miscellanea erudita* 5 (Padua 1962).

Three Episodes

Of the three *Lives* to be examined here, those of Themistocles, Artaxerxes, and Aratus, the *Life of Themistocles* is a convenient starting point, since it is first chronologically, having been finished by Lapo probably sometime in 1435.³¹ Thus the translation of the *Life of Themistocles* finds Lapo at a fairly early point in his career as a translator and humanist, before he had committed himself to a full-time job search at the papal curia and was instead casting about for patronage in his *patria*, Florence. At the outset it should be noted that it is obvious from various bits of internal data in both manuscripts under consideration that Lapo's usual practice was to translate a work first and write the preface later.³² In this case, the preface to Cosimo de' Medici is remarkably clean and shows very few changes on Lapo's part, suggesting that Lapo either had largely planned what he wanted to say or, more probably, had worked on an earlier draft somewhere else. We had best begin with an historical discussion, though, concerning the circumstances surrounding Lapo's dedication of this work to Cosimo, since they are somewhat unusual.

Why, that is, did Lapo decide to dedicate this work to Cosimo? After all, Lapo had been in all practicality cut off from Medici patronage after his mentor, the brilliant but contentious Francesco Filelfo, himself ran afoul of the Medici after a bitter and oft-studied controversy at the University of Florence.³³ When the dust had settled and Cosimo de' Medici had returned from exile in 1434, Filelfo found it prudent to relocate to Siena. It was just after this point in the story, in 1435, when Lapo decided to dedicate the *Life of Themistocles* to Cosimo.³⁴ How can this seemingly odd choice be explained?

The *Life of Themistocles* contains a number of parallels to both positive and negative perceptions of Cosimo in the Florence of the early 1430s. Plutarch, in the Thucydidean tradition (as opposed, one might say, to the Herodotean tradition), depicts Themistocles as one who could skillfully manipulate popular opinion to achieve the ends of his own carefully-aimed ambitions (thus accentuating Themistocles' *pleonexia*—his ambition-

³¹ References to the *Lives* are to the Teubner edition by K. Ziegler, *Plutarchi vitae parallelae* (Leipzig 1960–80). For the chronology of Lapo's translation, see Luiso (above, note 22) 255–56.

³² Lapo tells us as much in his dedication to Cardinal Cesarini of the *Life of Aratus* (here in Appendix II) 1: "After I had translated into Latin Plutarch's account of the peacetime affairs and military deeds of the most famous leader Aratus the Sicyonian, I determined—in line with my customary practice—to send it to some prince . . ." In addition, in both F and R, Lapo leaves himself a predetermined number of pages in the book for the preface, sometimes filling them, sometimes not.

³³ On Filelfo, see below (note 38).

³⁴ Lapo recognizes at the end of his preface that his work might indeed be *minus gratus* to Cosimo but suggests that, even if this is the case, Cosimo could profitably read the *Life of Themistocles*. See the preface (here in Appendix I), at 29.

oriented greediness) but who was also a fundamentally sound source of good counsel (thus accentuating his *euboulia*).³⁵

The Medici—and Cosimo in the eyes of his detractors was no exception—had had a populist reputation at least since the late 1370s, when Salvestro de' Medici, then a *gonfaloniere*, acted in a manner consistent with the goals of the rebelling wool-carders, the Ciompi.³⁶ Indeed it is a commonplace among historians of Florence that the abiding genius of the Medici politicians was that they were able tenuously to maintain their reputation as populists, even as the oligarchical realities of Quattrocento Florence were taking shape. Yet when Cosimo was exiled by the Albizzi-controlled Signoria in 1434, he was blamed, among many other things, for secretly nourishing the ambition to gain more power than was due any citizen of a republic.³⁷

In addition, after Cosimo returned, he was instrumental in exiling the Albizzi and creating a climate hostile to Medici opponents. Among those forced to leave was Francesco Filelfo, Lapo's teacher.³⁸ In the *Life of Themistocles*, Plutarch describes the manner in which Themistocles, making himself popular in the eyes of the public, effected the ostracism of Aristides by skillfully manipulating factional support (5. 7). Later in the *Life* we learn that Themistocles, seeing the prudence of allowing Aristides back into the game, introduced a bill, a ψήφισμα, allowing all exiles to return home and devote their services to Hellas (11. 1).

Analogies with the Quattrocento political system of the "Athens on the Arno" could certainly be drawn and Lapo's dedication of the treatise to Cosimo could be interpreted in many ways. But without delving too deeply into the realm of speculation, could Lapo perhaps, in directing this *Life* to Cosimo's attention, have been hinting that Cosimo call Filelfo (and by extension Lapo himself) into the fold of Medici patronage? Of course, another reading is also possible: that Lapo wished to show Cosimo an honorable ancient figure, Themistocles, who had, like Cosimo, suffered exile, and maintained all the while his integrity. Cosimo can be seen as

³⁵ Cf. Frost (above, note 2) 3–39.

³⁶ Cf. D. Kent, *The Rise of the Medici: Faction in Florence, 1426–1434* (Oxford 1978) 221.

³⁷ Cf. the act of the Signoria expelling Cosimo in A. Fabroni, *Magni Cosmi Medicei Vita* (Pisa 1788–89) II 75–79; J. Hankins, "Cosimo de' Medici as a Patron of Humanistic Literature," in F. Ames-Lewis (ed.), *Cosimo "il Vecchio" de' Medici, 1389–1464* (Oxford 1992) 69–94, at 86 n. 58; and Kent (previous note) 245–46.

³⁸ After his Florentine period came to its end with Cosimo's return, Filelfo moved to Siena. He was there until 1439. Thereafter he went on to become perhaps the single dominant personality in the humanist culture of Milan. Only in 1481 was he reconciled to the Medici, dying in Florence in July of that year. See in general A. Rabil, Jr., "Humanism in Milan," in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, ed. by A. Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia 1988) III 235–63, at 249–52. For Filelfo's life, see C. de' Rosmini, *Vita di Francesco Filelfo da Tolentino* (Milan 1808); and D. Robin, *Filelfo in Milan: 1451–1477* (Princeton 1991); eadem, "A Reassessment of the Character of Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481)," *Renaissance Quarterly* 36 (1983) 202–24. On Milanese culture in the second half of the fifteenth century, see E. Garin "L'età sforzesca dal 1450 al 1500," in *Storia di Milano* (Milan 1955–56) VII.4 540–97.

even more honorable, in a way, since he came back to Florence whereas Themistocles never did come back to Athens.³⁹ Given Lapo's style of discourse, one is compelled to admit that both interpretations are possible, and not mutually exclusive.

There are other suggestive resonances present in the *Life of Themistocles*. Perhaps the most notable of these is that along with the often unadorned bluntness of Plutarch's assessment of Themistocles' personality, there is a sincere admiration for the more positive attributes of Themistocles' character, including, as mentioned above, his gift for *euboulia*, sound judgment. Plutarch counts as Themistocles' greatest achievement his success in putting an end to the Hellenic wars and uniting Hellas against her foreign enemies (6. 4–5 and 7. 4). Although Lapo of course died long before the 1454 Peace of Lodi (which did more or less ensure stability on the Italian peninsula until 1494 and which Cosimo was instrumental in engineering), Lapo's choice of the *Life of Themistocles* for Cosimo was eerily prophetic as it hit the nail squarely on the head when it came to Cosimo's diplomatic gifts. Lapo's dedication of the *Life of Themistocles* to Cosimo, then, in a larger sense, shows the ideological texts and subtexts which could be attached to an act as seemingly conflict-neutral as translation.⁴⁰

In December of 1437 we find Lapo in Bologna, teaching the nephews and later managing the household of Giacomo Venier, a *clericus camerae*, or cleric of the papal chamber.⁴¹ During this period, and certainly toward the end of his stay at the house of Venier, Lapo must have been thinking of making international, specifically English, contacts. It was not unknown among humanists in the 1430s that Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, was willing in various ways to patronize Italian humanists.⁴² Indeed, it was in 1437 that Leonardo Bruni completed his translation of Aristotle's *Politics* for the Duke.⁴³ Tito Livio Frulovisi (by late 1436 or early 1437) and Antonio Beccaria (by October 1438 at the latest) had actually been able to find work in England with the Duke.⁴⁴

³⁹ See Lapo's preface to Cosimo (here in Appendix I), at 23–24. Themistocles, rather than betraying the Hellenes when asked by the Persian king to work actively against them, committed suicide (*Them.* 31. 5–7).

⁴⁰ The attempt to win patronage from Cosimo was ultimately unsuccessful, and Lapo would later turn his back on Cosimo when the Medici ruler came to Ferrara in 1438; see Fubini (above, note 30) 46.

⁴¹ Fubini (above, note 30) 48.

⁴² See A. Sammut, *Unfredo Duca di Gloucester e gli umanisti italiani*, *Umanesimo* 4 (Padua 1981); R. Weiss, *Humanism in England During the Fifteenth Century*, second ed. (Oxford 1957) esp. chapters III and IV on Humphrey; still useful is K. H. Vickers, *Humphrey Duke of Gloucester* (London 1907).

⁴³ Weiss (previous note) 46–49. The association of Bruni and Humphrey would not last long and did not bloom into a lengthy patron–client relationship. With the translation of the *Politics*, the story came to an end (*ibid.*).

⁴⁴ See R. Sabbadini, "Tito Livio Frulovisio: Umanista del sec. XV," in *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 103 (1934) 55–81; see also the edition of Tito Livio's works, *T. Livii de Frulovisiis de Ferraria Opera hactenus inedita*, ed. by C. W. Previtè-Orton (Cambridge

Lapo heard of the Duke's generosity in 1437 in Bologna. This was due to the praises of the Duke by Zanone da Castiglione, the Bishop of Bayeux since 1432, who was signally impressed by the Duke's patronage.⁴⁵ Directly encouraged by Zanone, and perhaps indirectly inspired by Bruni's slight contact with the Duke, Lapo was certainly aware of the Duke's leanings toward Italian humanists. Sometime during the year 1437 Lapo sent the Duke as samples of his work the *Comparatio inter rem militarem et studia litterarum* together with some translations of Isocrates.⁴⁶ Then, in December 1437, Lapo, still in Bologna, put the finishing touches on his translation of Plutarch's *Life of Artaxerxes*, which he dedicated to the Duke.⁴⁷

The preface is illustrative, if only in its typicality. Lapo begins by telling the Duke how bishop Zanone is accustomed to praise the Duke whenever Lapo and Zanone have come into conversation.⁴⁸ Lapo goes on to recount a conversation they had about the deeds and virtues of princes of antiquity, something, Lapo tells us, that often happens. They wound up, unsurprisingly, praising the deeds and virtues of the ancients and deploring the horrible condition and fortune of the modern age. Things are so bad that not only in princes but also among private men any vestige of the discipline of the ancients is lost. And even if someone is outstanding in one type of virtue, nevertheless one finds in him a whole host of vices. Thus among their own, i.e., among Italians, there is no prince who can be compared to the ancients (we see here, perhaps, Lapo appealing to the prince's British pride).

Both of them agreed on these things, but then Zanone brought up Duke Humphrey as an exception. He has all the qualities one needs, perfectly and absolutely, to be the wisest of men, the most famous of princes, and the greatest leader in war. And it is not only that the prince practices all the virtues, it is that he incites others to virtue. The prince has waged and won wars all over, has brought home impressive trophies and spoils, and in so doing has guided not only the flourishing glory of England but has also brought under his sway many cities and regions. The reputation of his name has thus spread to every corner of the west, *usque occidentis terminos*.

1932), cited in Sabbadini 56; on the dramas, see W. Ludwig, *Schriften zur neulateinischen Literatur*, ed. by L. Braun (Munich 1989) 70–97. For Beccaria, in addition to Weiss (above, note 42) ad indicem, see idem, "Per la biografia di Antonio Beccaria in Inghilterra," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 110 (1937) 344–46. The presence of Frulovisi and Beccaria in England was owed largely to the intervention of Piero del Monte: Weiss, "Per la biografia."

⁴⁵ See Weiss (above, note 42) 49–50 and the literature cited there; Zanone was a student of the famous pedagogue Gasparino Barzizza, on whom see R. G. G. Mercer, *The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza* (London 1979) and G. Martellotti, "Barzizza, Gasparino," in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* VII (Rome 1965) 34–39.

⁴⁶ Weiss (above, note 42) 50–51.

⁴⁷ The preface is edited from F, fols. 1–2^v in Sammut (above, note 42) 168–71.

⁴⁸ "Zanonus . . . mecum in colloquium veniens multa mihi de te narrare solitus est."

Yet, in addition to possessing military virtues, the prince also possesses the virtues of gentleness and clemency and, here's the rub, *liberalitas* and *beneficentia* in giving out money and helping those without wealth. The prince also has all the attributes of an ideal prince, which Lapo would outline about nine months later in his *De curiae commodis*. And on top of all this, finally, the prince is interested in the humanities, *in iis [studiis] quae vocantur humanitatis*.

Beyond the preface, however, there is the salient fact that, of Plutarch's *Lives*, the *Life of Artaxerxes* is the only one depicting the life of neither a Roman nor a Greek. And Lapo specifically points to Humphrey's status as someone who is not one of "ours"—not an Italian, that is—as we have seen in the analysis of the preface. In addition, the flattery a propos the Duke's military exploits in Lapo's preface matches up well with Plutarch's accounts of Artaxerxes' military derring-do, as Artaxerxes' heroism in suppressing the rebellion of Cyrus and then the Spartans is recounted in graphic detail in the *Life*.⁴⁹ Finally, Plutarch depicts Artaxerxes as having been weakened politically by being slavishly devoted to the whims of his mother and of his wife. The Duke, too, was known to have had marital problems and indeed wound up divorcing his first wife, the spirited Jacqueline of Hainault.⁵⁰ Again, then, various aspects of the content of the translated material turn out to be important, and show, perhaps, Lapo reading (and even commenting on) contemporary history with the aid of the classics.

No immediate success, however, followed this attempt to win the Duke's patronage and it cannot be said for certain that Lapo attracted the prince's attention.⁵¹ It is difficult to say whether Lapo would have had success; unfortunately Lapo caught the Duke at the twilight of his political power, and in any case Lapo himself would die about nine months after sending this material off to the Duke.

Lapo opens a window for us on early modern patronage in his dedication to his translation of Plutarch's *Life of Aratus*, directed to Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini. He writes that it is "in line with [his] customary practice" after he finishes a work of translation to send it "to some prince." Certain conditions attending Lapo's translation of the *Life of Aratus*, in fact, can give us a lens through which to view the mechanisms of patronage. But to understand this mechanism fully some background is necessary.

In 1431 Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini had assumed the leading role in the Council of Basel and in the ensuing years he and Pope Eugenius IV came

⁴⁹ E.g. *Artax.* 8–13.

⁵⁰ Favoring instead one of her ladies-in-waiting, Eleanor Cobham; see Vickers (above, note 42) 165.

⁵¹ There is no record of a correspondence between the two men, although the fact that Lapo sent along the *Life of Artaxerxes* almost a year after sending the Duke his first literary offering (the *Comparatio*, et al.) suggests that Lapo somehow considered himself encouraged. See Vickers (above, note 42) 374 and Sammut (above, note 42) 27.

increasingly to find themselves on opposite sides of the conciliarism issue.⁵² Cesarini favored the conciliarist position, that is that all authority in the church with respect to matters of faith, heresy, and reform, derived from a properly convoked council and that all Christians, including the Pope, were subject to this absolute, conciliar authority.⁵³ The Pope, naturally enough, was no enthusiast of the conciliarist position, and Cesarini and Eugenius would only be reconciled in 1438, at the start of the Council of Ferrara–Florence.

Lapo's first appeal to Cesarini for support occurred in a letter of 1436, two years before the writing of the *De curiae commodis*.⁵⁴ His first petition to Cesarini, then, was made at a time when the Cardinal was still at loggerheads with Pope Eugenius IV. Yet two years later, with the beginning of the Council at Ferrara and the arrival of the Greeks, Cesarini had reconciled himself to the papacy.⁵⁵ Indeed, at the Council he would be one of the most important actors in the Latin cast of characters.

After the Council was successfully underway in the summer of 1438 and Cesarini was obviously actively working for papal interests, Lapo chose to dedicate his translation of Plutarch's *Life of Aratus* to Cardinal Cesarini.⁵⁶ The translation itself was a work which he had completed in October of 1437.⁵⁷ He waited, therefore, almost a year to choose a dedicatee, if Lapo's own dating in our autograph manuscript can be trusted.⁵⁸ It might seem that

⁵² See J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge 1959); idem, *Personalities of the Council of Florence* (Oxford 1964); K. A. Fink, "Eugene IV and the Council of Basel–Ferrara–Florence," in H. Jedin (ed.), *Handbook of Church History IV* (New York 1970) 473–87 (the *Handbook* originally appeared in German [Freiburg im Breisgau 1968]); and, for further bibliography on the council, P. Viti, "Leonardo Bruni e il concilio del 1439," in P. Viti (ed.), *Firenze e il concilio del 1439*, Biblioteca storica toscana 29 (Florence 1994) II 509–75, at 510 n. 3. For an interesting examination of the roles and status of cardinals at the Council, see C. Bianca, "I cardinali al concilio di Firenze," in *Firenze e il concilio I* 147–73.

⁵³ The Council of Basel renewed aspects of Constance's *Haec sancta* and *Frequens*, including the provisions concerning the subordination of all authority, including papal authority, to conciliar authority. See J. W. Stieber, *Pope Eugenius IV, The Council of Basel, and the Secular and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Empire: The Conflict over Supreme Authority and Power in the Church* (Leiden 1978) 10–57.

⁵⁴ For the dating, see Fubini (above, note 30) 48.

⁵⁵ The first, principal Greek delegation arrived in Ferrara on 4 March 1438: Gill, *Personalities* (above, note 52) 4.

⁵⁶ On 15 July 1438, precisely; see F, f. 18 (Luiso [above, note 22] 275 n. 3 erroneously reports f. 19).

⁵⁷ This dating is possible because of Lapo's Greek *explicit* formula on f. 46 of F, where the translation itself ends (ed. Luiso [above, note 22] 276 n. 2).

⁵⁸ Lapo alludes to an unspecified period of deliberation in choosing a dedicatee in his preface to the translation; see the preface (here in Appendix II), at 1: "After I had translated into Latin Plutarch's account of the peacetime affairs and military deeds of the most famous leader Aratus of Sicyon, I determined—in line with my customary practice—to send it to some prince. For quite a while I was in doubt and was wondering to which prince I would like most of all to dedicate this little lamplight work of mine. But both in terms of understanding, prudence, greatness, integrity, and constancy and in terms of the deeds of war and military glory, nobody really occurred to me whose life seemed to agree with the life of Aratus." Lapo goes on to say that Aratus appeared to him in a dream; after conversing with Aratus in the dream and later considering the dream encounter (as well as some choice words from a sermon

his choice to appeal to Cesarini two years earlier had been somewhat unwise, given the opposition which existed at that time between Cesarini and the papacy. But one of Lapo's favorite virtues, prudence, must have guided him in 1438 in choosing Cesarini as his dedicatee, secure in the knowledge that everybody was then on the same side.⁵⁹ Yet, even here, Lapo's choice of material is not as simple as it might seem.

Once again, the substance of the *Life* itself comes into relief. How could it not, when Plutarch describes Aratus as a natural statesman and a great hater of tyrants who "seems to have proved not so much a strict friend, as a considerate and mild enemy, changing his ground in either direction according to the exigencies of the state, loving concord between nations, community of cities, and unanimity of council and assembly beyond all other blessings" (Plut. *Arat.* 10. 2; Perrin trans.). Elsewhere Plutarch describes Aratus as being heroic without regard to personal gain, as he leads the rag-tag expedition capturing the citadel of Acrocorinth (*Arat.* 18–24). Plutarch goes so far as to express wonder at Aratus' selfless magnanimity directed toward the common good (19. 4).

Lapo could not have overlooked the relevance of these descriptions of Aratus' character to the circumstances of Cesarini's own life. Cesarini was universally admired for his integrity, even as he opposed the most powerful ruler in Christendom. And he never really gave up his conciliarist position, even as he worked side by side with Pope Eugenius in the Council of Ferrara–Florence.⁶⁰ Indeed Lapo, uncharacteristically, heavily stresses both of the above-mentioned passages in the margins of our autograph final copy-book, almost as if lightbulbs were going on in his head as he translated them or reviewed the already translated passages.⁶¹ And in the dedicatory preface to his translation of the *Life of Aratus* Lapo finds a way to appeal to Cesarini's continued sense of mission and concern over the plight of the church, a subject on which Lapo himself was writing contemporaneously, often using much of the same terminology as he does here:

[33] But if in matters of war you are not like Aratus, certainly you are someone who has zealously engaged yourself in better activities from the time of your youth. Even so, Aratus, armed and oppressed by tyrants, did not benefit Greece more than you, clad, so to speak, in the *toga virilis* and weakened by the counsel of the wicked, have benefited the suffering Roman church; for so many years now you have tried, against its enemies, to watch over the church's status and worth, and at no small risk to

of Ambrogio Traversari), Lapo decided on Cesarini as a dedicatee (see Appendix II, *passim*). Lapo received the Greek codex in which the *Life of Aratus* was contained from Ambrogio Traversari; see L. Mehus, *Historia litteraria florentina* (Florence 1769; repr. with introduction by E. Kessler, Munich 1968) 8.

⁵⁹ For Lapo's feelings about the virtue of prudence, see his *De curiae commodis*, in Celenza (above, note 26) sec. IV.

⁶⁰ Cf. Gill, *Personalities* (above, note 52) 99 and Vespasiano's *Life of the Cardinal*, in ed. Greco (above, note 25) I 137–58.

⁶¹ F, fol. 25. See Figure 1 (opposite).

& tranquilla pax foret: adhuc prudenti aliquo ducere
 uteretur, qui ^{liberis} errorum potestate non portante:
 ut condixit uel ^{inimicis} obtineret: & ex una
 ciuitate ut pro inco statu tempore in potestas clara
 ac nobili simul omnes essent, nec freti uiribus: sed co
 filio, non inuidio p̄moribus sed parando & obsequendo,
 nō faciam modo cui ciuicibus: potētatibus, tyrannidibz
 undique circumscripti libertatem retinuerat: uerū etiā
 ab eo q̄ eorum plurimos in libertate uindicta uel incole me f̄
 feruierat. Fuit autem Arius natura ciuicis admodū
 p̄lata semp̄q; audax sp̄tans publicis in rebus, q̄
 impudētia curiosior delictiorq;. Capitalissimus hostis
 tyrannici nominis Amicitias atq; inimicitias ex res p̄
 uoluntate gerebat. Ex quo nō uideatur tam diligēs
 amicus fuisse q̄m iūctis & placabilis in inimicis: tunc
 itaq; mutatione opportunitati ac temporis seruicis.
 Vno atq; eadem q̄ omnium gentium, ciuitatū, col
 legy obsecari uox erat, illum nullius p̄ter q̄ bonoz
 uirorum amicum esse. Manifesto autē in bella ap̄tā
 cētaminibus obuidis, remissi & diffidentis animi
 p̄disimulando suaq; facta occultando, tum incipendis etiam
 uribus tyrannisque opprimendis efficacissimus p̄missus
 consiliū fuit. Quare cum in multis ex insperato rem optime
 ductis suo administrasset: haud pauciora que saluo possi
 bilia erant offensionis metu relinxisse uideretur. Et cum
 non fore modo quidam p̄ nocte in acri ac p̄spirati sicut
 uisū: in terribili defecatione tenuitate q̄ humoris q̄ circū
 pat̄ oritur, & lucis compem ferre non potest, luminibz
 bus capientur: sed hominis quoq; ac prudentia ma
 ni a nifestis impetibus & indolis turbetur: nec sibi ipsi consistere

Nota optime necis inge
uere

re p̄ postulaturo

Que in me fore nō uide
dit recipiant

huiusmodi natura est: ut

Figure 1

MS Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Magl. XXIII, 126 (= F), fol. 25.

yourself. [34] Because of this, I think you have risen to this highest of ranks most deservedly (and thus in the company of the few), and that you have pursued this not with foreign wealth but by your own powers. Because of those very same powers I predict I know not what for the future.⁶²

Without explicitly condoning Cesarini's conciliarism, Lapo does applaud his continued efforts at church reform, arguing that Cesarini has benefited the church as much as Aratus benefited Greece—Aratus, the real engineer of a unified Achaean league and stalwart opponent of Macedonian hegemony.⁶³

One could even, were one so inclined, read some subversiveness into the situation. Plutarch reports the early episode in Aratus' career when he decided to overthrow Nicocles the tyrant of Sicyon, by his own efforts (ἔγνω δι' αὐτοῦ καταλύειν τὸν τύραννον [4. 3], or, as Lapo translates [f. 22], *statuit per se ipsum tyrannum opprimere*).⁶⁴ Might this, along with the subtleties of the preface, be a subliminal suggestion to Cesarini, insinuating what he might be able to do now that he is back with the Roman curia? Yet even stating the question this explicitly goes too far. What is important about these episodes is the manner in which messages are transmitted: psychological buttons are pushed without anything ever being made explicit. It is a mode of discourse, of thought, which is the complete antithesis of *apodeixis*.⁶⁵

Lapo and the Practice of Translation

There are various questions which come into relief when examining manuscripts and texts of this sort. What were the versions of the Greek texts Lapo was using? Since Lapo sometimes provides us with snippets of Greek, can we ascertain whether his text resembles any of the known redactions in the traditional stemmata of the work under consideration? The process of translation and the choices inherent in that process also come into play. In various ways, that is, we can observe the art of Renaissance

⁶² See Appendix II.

⁶³ Nor is this to suggest that Lapo himself at this time was a partisan of the conciliarist position; almost contemporaneously with this preface, he would write in punning fashion in the *De curiae commodis* that the Pope "has been given power not by human counsel but in a divine fashion"—a formulation where the pun has the same valence in Latin (*consilium/concilium*) as it has in English (counsel/council); of course, the treatise was dedicated to Francesco Condulmaro, the nephew of Pope Eugenius. See Celenza (above, note 26) III 22.

⁶⁴ This was due to a lack of aid from Egypt, in the person of Ptolemy, on the one hand, and from Macedon, in the person of Antigonos, on the other.

⁶⁵ Cf. R. G. Witt's "tertiary rhetoric," in his "Medieval Italian Culture and the Origins of Humanism as a Stylistic Ideal," in Rabil, *Renaissance Humanism* (above, note 38) I 29–70, at 32. This is Witt's suggested addition to George Kennedy's distinction between "primary" and "secondary" rhetoric. For these, see G. A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill 1980) 4 f.

translation. The intention of this final section, then, is to provide a brief selection of examples illustrating some of these issues. It makes no pretension to completeness and is highly impressionistic.

In order to gain comparative perspective, attention will also be given to another, later Renaissance translator who dealt with the same passages, the sixteenth-century Dutch Hellenist Hermann Crusier (1510–1575).⁶⁶ One thing that will emerge is that Sabbadini's provisional conclusion about Lapo's translating style was certainly correct: Lapo did know well how to reconcile a concern for Latin elegance with the literal, lexical meaning of the Greek.⁶⁷ Without being overliteral, Lapo does follow Bruni's advice:

The translator should be carried away by the power of the original's style. He cannot possibly preserve the sense to advantage unless he insinuates and twists himself into the original's word order and periodic structure with verbal propriety and stylistic faithfulness.⁶⁸

Another general aspect we can observe is that translating Greek verse gave Lapo pause. It was something he thought about quite a bit, occasionally leaving verses out in his translation, occasionally paraphrasing them. From the autograph manuscript one can see, too, that he wrote the Greek in the margins often when it came to verse, perhaps saving those passages to be translated later, after he had had more time to consider them.

We can observe some of this even at the very beginning of *Themistocles*, in the first sentence. The passage under consideration is (1. 1):

Θεμιστοκλεῖ δὲ τὰ μὲν ἐκ γένους ἀμαυρότερα πρὸς δόξαν ὑπῆρχε·
πατὴρ γὰρ ἦν Νεοκλέους οὐ τῶν ἄγαν ἐπιφανῶν Ἀθηνησι, Φρεαρρίου
τῶν δῆμων ἐκ τῆς Λεωντίδος φυλῆς, νόθος δὲ πρὸς μητρός, ὡς λέγουσιν·
Ἄβρότονον Θρήισσα γυνὴ γένος· ἀλλὰ τεκέσθαι
τὸν μέγαν Ἑλλησίν φημι Θεμιστοκλέα.

That is:

Now for Themistocles, certainly, it has been accepted that the circumstances of his birth were somewhat obscure for glory. For his father, Neocles, was certainly not one of the most famous men in Athens, but of the deme of the Phrearrhi, and of the tribe Leontis; and on his mother's side he was illegitimate, as it is reported:

I am Abrotonon, a Thracian woman by birth
But I say that, for the Greeks, I gave birth to the great
Themistocles.

⁶⁶ I use the Basel (1564) edition, *Plutarchi Chaeronei . . . vitae comparatae . . . Hermanno Crusiero . . . interprete . . .*, published by Thomas Guarinus. In addition to Plutarch's *Lives*, Crusier also translated much of the *Moralia*, as well as certain works of Hippocrates and Galen. See G. Bers, *Die Schriften des niederländischen Humanisten Dr. Hermann Crusier*, *Bibliographies of Dutch Humanists* 3 (Nieuwkoop 1971).

⁶⁷ See above (note 22).

⁶⁸ See Bruni, trans. Hankins (above, note 21) 221.

Cruser translates:

Themistocles obscurioribus ad gloriam natalibus fuit. patrem enim habuit Nicoclem minus clarum civem Atheniensem, Phrearium curia, tribu Leontide. genere materno nothum ferunt, ut ostendunt hi versus:

Abrotonum sum Thressa quidem, Graecis tamen illud
Dico Themistoclem me genuisse decus.

Lapo translates:

Themistocli initia generis parum sane gloriosa fuere. patre enim ipsum Neocle haud claro quidem homine ex populo Phreario tribuque Leontide ex non iusta matre natum perhibent eamque Threiciam genere Abrotonum nuncupatam, sed magnum graecis, ut mihi videor dicere, Themistoclem peperit.

A number of things become clear on first glance. Here, as elsewhere, Lapo makes an attempt to remain faithful to the overall structure of the Greek prose, while rendering the material into elegant, periodic Latin.⁶⁹ Where Lapo uses an ablative absolute embedded in indirect discourse to express the notion that Neocles was Themistocles' father, Cruser writes simply "patrem enim habuit . . ." to get the point across. Cruser translates the Greek νόθος by *nothus*; even though this word is attested in sources Lapo would have known (e.g., Virgil, *Aen.* 7. 283 and 9. 697), still, the use of anything resembling a transliteration seems to have struck Lapo as poor form.⁷⁰ Lapo is willing to rephrase things and here makes no attempt, as Cruser does, to replicate the verse. Lapo mixes the verse quotation into the discourse. In his version, the end of the passage (from *ex non* to *peperit*) would read:

They say that he was born illegitimately [*ex non iusta matre*], and that she, a Thracian woman by birth, was named Abrotonon. But, as it seems right to me to say, she did give birth to the great Themistocles, for the benefit of the Greeks.

It could indeed be the case that the text in the Greek manuscript Lapo had before him was similar, but few of the reported variants resemble this.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Still, Lapo does not in general go as far in faithfulness to the letter as his teacher, Filelfo, who was perhaps overscrupulous. See Sabbadini (above, note 6) 134.

⁷⁰ This is especially so in the wake of Bruni's arguments, expanded from Cicero's. See, e.g., Bruni, trans. Hankins (above, note 21) 228: "And yet there has never been anything said in Greek that cannot be said in Latin."

⁷¹ For 'Αβρότονον . . . τεκέσθαι MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 1673 has ἀβροτόνου θρήσσης γένος· αὐτήν. See C. Carena, M. Manfredini, and L. Piccirilli (eds.), *Le vite di Temistocle e di Camillo* (Milan 1983) ad loc. Manfredini argues for an affinity between this Parisinus and "il perduto codice q," which is MS Vatican City, Vat. Pal. 286. This latter is itself a twin of MS Madrid, Bibl. Escor. Φ II 7. See M. Manfredini, "Note sulla tradizione manoscritta delle 'Vite Thesei-Romuli' e 'Themistoclis-Camilli' di Plutarco," CCC 4 (1983) 401-07, at 407. Perhaps Lapo used a text which at this point resembled one of these manuscripts.

Problems of translation can also sometimes shed light on the question of Lapo's Greek texts. Lapo's first major marginal Greek quotation in his translation of the *Life of Themistocles* occurs at 7. 5, and is as follows:

ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῖς ἀφέταις τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ στόλου προσμίξαντος

That is:

When the barbarian armament had arrived at Aphetæ . . .

Lapo translates:

Sed cum iam barbarorum classe se ad aphe//120//tas inferente

Lapo's Greek hand is unsurprisingly very similar to the hand of his teacher Filelfo (which is itself in the tradition of Manuel Chrysoloras), and as far as the Greek orthography itself goes, it is a rare instance when one sees Lapo make a mistake in his accentuation; here is one of two cases in this manuscript, as Lapo writes ἀφέταις for ἀφεταῖς.⁷² In addition, Lapo's Greek text would seem not to have been infected by the variant τοῖς, which some manuscripts have instead of ταῖς.⁷³ We can tell from the manuscript at this point, too, that Lapo probably had trouble with ἀφεταῖς, since he seems to have left a blank space (for his Latin translation) and filled it in later; perhaps his confusion caused him to leave out the name of Eurybiades, which follows in the text of Plutarch. In translating Lapo employs an ablative absolute for the Greek genitive absolute and considers the meaning of the Greek verb προσμείγνυμι to be adequately represented by the Latin *se inferre*. As far as the translation goes, once again, Cruser prefers to represent things as simply as possible. His version is: "ut vero classis Barbarorum Aphetas applicuit." In other words, instead of replicating the Greek genitive absolute with an ablative absolute, he uses a finite verb.

A passage where translating style is apparent occurs at *Themistocles* 8. 1–2. The passage is as follows:

... ἀλλὰ δεῖ τῶν τοιούτων καταφρονοῦντας ἐπ' αὐτὰ τὰ σώματα
 φέρεσθαι καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνα διαγωνίζεσθαι συμπλακέντας. ὃ δὴ καὶ
 Πίνδαρος οὐ κακῶς ἔοικε συνιδῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν Ἀρτεμισίῳ μάχης εἰπεῖν
 ὅθι παῖδες Ἀθαναίων ἐβάλοντο φαεννὰν
 κρηπίδ' ἐλευθερίας·

ἀρχὴ γὰρ ὄντως τοῦ νικᾶν τὸ θαρρεῖν. ἔστι δὲ τῆς Εὐβοίας τὸ
 Ἀρτεμισίον ὑπὲρ τὴν Ἑστίαιαν αἰγιαλὸς εἰς βορρᾶν ἀναπεπταμένος,

⁷² R, fol. 119^v. See Figure 2 (on the following page). On Lapo's Greek hand see above (note 29). Not only is his Greek hand similar to Filelfo's, but one suspects that he must have inherited Filelfo's innovations (which went beyond Chrysoloras) when it came to things like phonetics, diphthongs, and the proper use of aspiration and accents. See Cortesi (above, note 7) 467–68, and eadem, "Aspetti linguistici della cultura greca di Francesco Filelfo," in *Francesco Filelfo nel V centenario della morte. Atti del XVII Convegno di studi maceratesi (Tolentino, 27–30 settembre 1981)* (Padua 1986) 163–206.

⁷³ See ed. Ziegler (above, note 31) ad loc.

adhortantis valuit auctoritas. Itaque
 missus est in partem sinum manibus
 eius loci angustias presidio habuimus.
 quo in loco euribiadi grecis maximeque
 laedemonijs impium demandanti-
 bus: atheniensibus vero: quod reliquos
 simul omnes namque numero ante-
 ret. indignum putantibus a his cedere
 themistocles cognito periculo ipse im-
 pium euribiadi eradicat lenitque
 atheniensium animos affirmans
 ut si ad bellum strenuos se viros
 ostenderent: grecorum ⁱⁿ se studia
 & voluntates in posterum ~~emend-~~
 firmos esse. Quae una re: apparet eum
 unum omnium maxime auctoritate
 saluum grecis exiisse. effecisseque
 ut athenienses fortitudine hostes
 mansuetudine aut & facultate
 socios vincere viderentur. sed cum
 iam barbarorum classe se ad aphe-

ἐν τῷ ἰσθμῷ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ βασιλευσίου τοῦ ἀρχαίου ἔλαττο

Figure 2

MS Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Ricc. 142 (= R), fol. 119^v.

May not be reproduced.

ἀνταίρει δ' αὐτῷ μάλιστα τῆς ὑπὸ Φιλοκτῆτη γενομένης χώρας
Ὀλιζῶν.

That is (Perrin's translation):

... but that they must despise all such things, rush upon the very persons of their foes, grapple with them, and fight it out to the bitter end. Of this Pindar seems to have been well aware when he said of the battle of Artemisium:

"Where Athenians' valiant sons set in radiance eternal
Liberty's corner-stone."

For verily the foundation of victory is courage. Artemisium is a part of Euboea above Hestiaea—a sea-beach stretching away to the north—and just about opposite to it lies Olizon, in the territory once subject to Philoctetes.

Cruser translates (at p. 106):

... verum oportere istis contemptis ipsa petere corpora collatisque manibus adversus illa dimicare. quod intelligens Pindarus recte de pugna ad Artemisium commissa videtur dixisse: Cecropidae clarum libertatis posuere fundamentum. quippe pars est audacia victoriae. Artemisium autem Euboeae est supra Hestieam ad Boream expansum litus, cuius ex adverso maxime est ex ditione, quae paruit Philocteti Olizon.

Lapo's version is as follows (f. 121):

... verum iis omnibus contemptis in ipsa corpora invadendum esse et cum ipsis consertis manibus decernendum, quam sententiam Pindarus in Artemisii praelio secutus videtur, cum diceret Atheniensium liberos manifesta libertatis fundamenta iecisse. vincendi enim initium fiducia est. est autem Artemisium Euboeae supra Hestieam littus ad Boream versum, cui Olizonum gens e regione opposita est, quae sub Philoctete quondam fuit.

Again, Lapo is more of a stylist. He expresses the necessity denoted by δει with gerunds, whereas Cruser uses *oportere*. For ὁ δὲ καὶ Πίνδαρος οὐ κακῶς ἔοικε συνιδῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν Ἀρτεμισίῳ μάχης εἰπεῖν, Lapo stays close to the structure of the Greek and manages to avoid the awkward *quod*-construction which Cruser employs. In addition, in translating the title, Lapo's *in Artemisii praelio* is closer to the Greek and less plodding than Cruser's *de pugna ad Artemisium commissa*.

But Lapo's caution when it comes to verse is once again apparent. While both translators were loath to translate ὄθι as *quod*, Lapo chose to render the Pindaric passage in indirect statement (correctly, given the Greek construction of ἔοικε plus the participle συνιδῶν), and runs it all together, uncertain, perhaps, whether the line was actually of Pindar or simply a report of a Pindaric *sententia*.⁷⁴ In Cruser's version, the verse is, once

⁷⁴ For the *sententia*, see Pindar, fr. 77, in ed. H. Maehler (Leipzig 1989).

again, translated as verse, and is set off from the text, printed on its own line and in italics in the printed edition. At the end of the passage Lapo stays close to the Greek, translating ὑπὸ Φιλοκτήτη as *sub Philoctete*.

At *Themistocles* 8. 5 (f. 121^v, *margin. inf.*), Lapo quotes in Greek the four-line verse inscription present on one of the slabs of stone at the temple of Artemis (the Proseoea), which commemorated Greek victory at the battle of Artemisium. The quoted lines differ once and even then only very slightly from the scholarly consensus of the best of texts, reading ἄσις for ἄσις in the first line. Lapo's Greek text is therefore similar to that represented by the UMA group, a conclusion which is also borne out by other examples.⁷⁵ Lapo does choose to translate the lines here, as does Crusier. A comparison of the two versions shows the difficulties of Renaissance translation. First, the Greek:

παντοδαπῶν ἀνδρῶν γενεὰς Ἄσις ἀπὸ χώρας
παῖδες Ἀθηναίων τῷδ' ἐποτ' ἐν πελάγει
ναυμαχίᾳ δαμάσαντες, ἐπεὶ στρατὸς ὄλετο Μήδων,
σημάτα ταῦτ' ἔθεσαν παρθένῳ Ἀρτέμιδι.

That is (Perrin's translation):

Nations of all sorts of men from Asia's boundaries coming,
Sons of the Athenians once, here on this arm of the sea,
Whelmed in a battle of ships, and the host of the Medes was destroyed;
These are the tokens thereof, built for the maid Artemis.

Then, Lapo's version (from R, f. 121^v):

Innumeros Asiae populos ex finibus actos
Cecropidum soboles fudit in hoc pelago
Ac ubi Medorum bello cecidere cohortes
Haec, Phoebe, statuit, virgo, <t>rophea⁷⁶ tibi.

Now, Crusier's version (pp. 106–07):

Diversas Asiae gentes certamine quondam
Navali hoc fudit ventisono⁷⁷ in pelago
Victor Cecropidum populus, Medisque peremptis
Dictynna, haec posuit, clara, trophea tibi.

On the whole, Lapo's translation is somewhat more fluid than Crusier's, yet both lose something when compared with the Greek. With his *certamine*

⁷⁵ U = MS Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Gr. 138; M = MS Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, 385; A = MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1671. See also Lapo's version of the quotation from Aeschylus on f. 128 (at 14. 1).

⁷⁶ The printed edition (ed. Campano [1470], at p. 89) repeats the mistake here, printing *rophea* instead of *trophea*, further corroborating the notion that R represents a final redaction, which was perhaps even later used as the *Druckexemplar*.

⁷⁷ Is *ventisonus* a neologism on Crusier's part? Or perhaps he uses it on analogy with *ventisonax* (*Anth. Lat.* 682. 1. 7). Otherwise, I have been unable to find an attestation of this word.

. . . *navali*, Cruser manages to transmit the idea of a naval battle, i.e. a ναυμαχία, which Lapo misses. Lapo, on the other hand, transmits the full meaning of στρατὸς Μήδων with his *Medorum . . . cohortes*; Cruser's *Medisque peremptis* does not go as far.

In another case dealing with verse, at *Themistocles* 21. 7, Lapo is missing five lines, possibly because his Greek exemplar did not have them, although there are no reported variants lacking these lines.⁷⁸ Perhaps once again Lapo's reticence concerning verse is apparent.

An interesting example of translation comes at *Themistocles* 22. 2. Plutarch describes Themistocles offending the multitude by building a temple dedicated to Artemis, which he named Aristoboule, thus giving the impression that it was he who had given the best counsel to the city and to the Hellenes. In Greek the passage runs:

ἠνίασε δὲ τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ τὸ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν εἰσάμενος, ἦν Ἀριστοβούλην μὲν προσηγόρευσεν, ὡς ἄριστα τῇ πόλει καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι βουλευσάμενος.

That is:

And he offended the multitude, even causing a temple of Artemis to be built, which he called "Aristoboule," as if he had given the best counsel to the city and to the Greeks.

Lapo's original translation is as follows:

offendit autem vehementer multitudinis animos cum Dianae templum dedicavit, quam Aristobulam appellavit, qui optime civitatis graecorumque saluti consulisset.

He revises it by means of marginal and interlinear additions only slightly:

offendit autem vehementer multitudinis animos cum Dianae templum dedicavit, quam Aristobulam, *idest optime consulentem*, appellavit, *ut* qui optime civitatis graecorumque saluti consulisset.

We see, then, that Lapo believed that the Latin reader needed some explanation for the meaning of the word *Aristoboule* and thus glosses it in his translation. But that is not to say that he is not possessed of the soul of a philologist, and in his concern to represent as precisely as possible the Greek, he adds an *ut* to replicate the Greek ὡς. Cruser's version is interesting:

momordit etiam multitudinem aede extruenda Dianae, quam Aristobulen, quasi optima consilia ipse civitati et Graecis dedisset, appellavit.

His use of a gerundive construction, *aede extruenda*, to replace the aorist participle εἰσάμενος, loses some of the subtlety of the Greek. But on the other hand, *entia non praeter necessitatem multiplicanda sunt*: Cruser's

⁷⁸ *Them.* 21. 7 (p. 183, lines 15–19, Ziegler ed.). For Lapo, see R, 135^v.

embedded clause, from *quasi* to *dedisset*, explains by implication the meaning inherent in the name Ἀριστοβούλη, without resorting to adding words, as Lapo felt compelled to do.

Occasionally Lapo will paraphrase, or add to the text in order to clarify. One example of this occurs in the *Life of Aratus*, at 15. 5. Here Plutarch relates the public attempts of Antigonos Gonatas, the king of Macedonia, to win Aratus' favor. Envious, malevolent folk seized on these attempts and wrote about them to Ptolemy in Egypt in an effort to stain Aratus' reputation. (Ptolemy was, at this point, an enemy of Antigonos, but an ally of Aratus.) In a dense passage, Plutarch comments on these intrigues:

ταῖς μὲν οὖν περιμαχῆτοις καὶ διαπύροις τοξευομέναις ἔρωτι φιλείας βασιλέων καὶ τυράννων τοσοῦτον προσῆν φθόνου καὶ κακοηθείας.

That is:

So much envy, then, and distastefulness is attendant upon the passionately sought-after friendships of kings and tyrants which [are sought] from all over by fiery men.

Lapo translates:

Sic igitur amicitiae regum et tyrannorum ferventes ac repentine [perhaps read *repentini*, on analogy with Cic. *Brut.* 69. 242: *ignoti homines et repentini*] sunt et ardore //27v// quodam amoris subito incenduntur; sed labefactari expugnarique quam facile possunt, et veluti ventis invidiae atque calumniae flatibus, assidue agitantur.

That is:

So are those men, then, hot and hungry for the friendship of kings and tyrants, and they are swiftly set on fire with a certain ardor of love; but they can be shaken away [from it] and overcome, and, as it were, tossed about by the winds of envy and the breezes of calumny.

Lapo finds a way to get around the awkwardness of the beginning of the passage and then adds from *sed labefactari* to *assidue agitantur*, thus providing the reader with the comment that those overly desirous of the friendship of the powerful "can be shaken away [from their ardor] and overcome, agitated just like the winds of envy and the haughtiness of false accusation." Perhaps Lapo coupled in his mind the adjective *repentinus* with the word *ventus*; this would be then a Ciceronian remembrance, not uncommon, from the *De officiis* (1. 49):

Multi enim faciunt multa temeritate quadam sine iudicio vel morbo in omnes vel *repentini* quodam quasi vento impetu animi incitati.

We can see, too, from the autograph, that the passage was important to Lapo, since the rare marginal bracketing is present as well as a *notabile* in the right margin of f. 27, at the beginning of the passage. It reads: "De

amicitia regum et tyrannorum.” Could Lapo have been thinking at that moment of Cesarini and Pope Eugenius IV?⁷⁹

Lapo’s experience is significant as much for what he did achieve in his short life as for what he did not. In his attempt to win patronage from Cosimo we saw a door close for him: The opportunity to live and work in his native city, Florence, ended. We also saw Lapo, in his choice of the *Life of Themistocles*, use the opportunity of dedicating a translation to advance an agenda—a research agenda, one is tempted to say—or even, perhaps, to level the playing field somewhat with Cosimo. Indeed, one could imagine no other way in which Lapo, given his social position, could have raised issues of exile with Cosimo. Lapo’s efforts to find support as far away as England show not only the lengths to which one had to go to find employment as a young humanist, they also demonstrate the evolution of the papal curia into what amounted to a Europe-wide intellectual brokerage house for humanists. Finally, the episode of the *Life of Aratus* shows Lapo once again subtly aware of the character of the dedicatee, matching the substance of the translated work with the real or imagined characteristics he perceived in Cardinal Cesarini. In all three cases, the content of the translations turns out to be just as important as, if not moreso than, the prefaces in conjecturing the intentions Lapo may have had when he chose dedicatees.

Appendices: Lapo’s Prefaces to the *Life of Themistocles* and *Life of Aratus*

The intention of both appendices is to provide coherent and authoritative texts of Lapo’s dedicatory prefaces to his translations of Plutarch’s *Lives of Themistocles* and *Aratus*, both of which have been discussed above. (The preface to *Artaxerxes* has been edited from F by Sammut [see above, notes 42 and 47]). They are not editions based on all known manuscripts, but on F and R, both of which are autographs and are done in the style which for Lapo in particular represents a final, authoritative, authorial redaction.⁸⁰ I have added section numbers for convenience and in general have punctuated for the sense as I understand it.

⁷⁹ Crusier’s version follows in this case the structure of the Greek (p. 717): “atque exoptatis his et flagrantibus, ad quas magno ardore contenditur, regum et tyrannorum amicitiiis tantum coniunctum erat livoris et malignitatis.”

⁸⁰ This has been argued more extensively in Celenza (above, note 26), “Introduction to the Latin Text.”

Appendix I: Lapo's Preface to Plutarch's *Life of Themistocles*
Dedicated to Cosimo de' Medici

When reading this preface, especially sections 6–24, it is difficult not to think of the famous twenty-fifth chapter of Machiavelli's *The Prince*, "Quantum fortuna in rebus humanis possit et quomodo illi sit occurrendum." Lapo's argument is that fortune is far inferior to virtue (9) and that fortune really has very little power in human affairs, if people react correctly (10–14). Machiavelli would maintain that fortune at most has control of one half of our affairs, and would even go so far as to say that, if one could change one's nature to suit the times and circumstances, fortune would not change anything.⁸¹ There is also a structural similarity in the beginnings of the two writings. Both wind up asserting the author's opinion that fortune has a limited place in human affairs, and lead up to this by offering, first, a brief exposition of the opposing position, i.e. that there are "those" who say fortune controls most of human affairs. Both then go on to limit the place of fortune.⁸² We know that Machiavelli read Plutarch's *Lives*,⁸³ and if he read *Themistocles*, it is not unlikely that he read it in Lapo's translation, since Lapo's was the translation included in the 1470 Campano printed edition of the *Lives*, along with its preface to Cosimo.

Another link between Lapo and Machiavelli, however, could come from the work of Leon Batista Alberti, who was himself a friend and contemporary of Lapo and wrote, among many other things, an *Intercoenae* on the theme of *Fatum et fortuna* around 1440, five years or so after Lapo's redaction of the *Themistocles* preface.⁸⁴ In an involved allegory, Alberti has an interlocutor, the *Philosophus*, set forth in dialogue form a dream-vision he had with the shades, the *umbrae*, of a great crowd of the departed. From the top of a mountain as a vantage point, the shades show him a wild and raging river surrounding the mountain.⁸⁵ The first position to be set forth (and it is done by the shades) is that the lives of human beings are tossed about on this raging river and that the bigger the ship, the greater the danger of damage in time of dangerous waters. The people best prepared to deal with the caprices of the river are those who realize the dangers prior to embarkation. But even among those people, no one is really safe.⁸⁶

⁸¹ Ed. G. Sasso (Florence 1963) 211: "... se si mutassi di natura con li tempi e con le cose, non si muterebbe fortuna."

⁸² As Machiavelli puts it ([previous note] 206): "nondimanco, perché il nostro libero arbitrio non sia spento, iudico potere essere vero che la fortuna sia arbitra della metà delle azioni nostre, ma che etiam lei ne lasci governare l'altra metà, o presso, a noi."

⁸³ Cf. R. Hirzel, *Plutarch* (Leipzig 1912) 58 and 109 and K. Ziegler, "Plutarchos von Chaironeia," in *RE XXI* (1951) col. 953 and printed separately (Waldsee 1949) col. 316.

⁸⁴ In E. Garin (ed.), *Prosatori latini del Quattrocento* (Milan and Naples 1952) 644–57. On the contacts between Lapo and Alberti, see Fubini (above, note 30); Celenza (above, note 26); and Luiso (above, note 22), *ad indicem*.

⁸⁵ Ed. Garin (previous note) 646: "hunc montem circum in se ipsum rediens ambibat fluvius omnium rapidissimus atque turbulentissimus . . ."

⁸⁶ Ed. Garin (above, note 84) 648–50.

The philosopher protests: "Isn't it the case," he asks, "that, with virtue at one's side, it is better to stand steadfastly by one's ship and face all dangers . . . ?"⁸⁷ The shades go on to explain that the person of "free and peaceful disposition" will wisely flee the task of guiding the big ships, since among all the people with whom one is compelled to deal in standing at the head of a ship, it is *durum sane difficileque* to preserve *dulce otium*.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, it is the task of a leader to do so, and to deal along the way with all the inconveniences that might result.

A number of observations can be made. The first is that the dream imagery in Alberti's *Fatum et fortuna* is similar in genre to the dream Lapo reports in the preface to the *Life of Aratus*.⁸⁹ In addition, the imagery of a leader being one who stands at the head of a ship, although certainly not without precedent, is common to Lapo's preface to *Themistocles* and Alberti's work. Lapo and Alberti share the notion (again, common enough) that a public leader is often deprived of *otium*. Both Lapo and Alberti make use of the idea, leaned on much more heavily by Lapo, that *virtus* can serve as an effective counterweight to *fortuna*, a position which, in his own way, Machiavelli would later take up in *Il Principe*, chapter 25. Finally, common to Alberti and Machiavelli, of course, is the metaphorical use of a raging river as a literary device to examine the vicissitudes of fortune. At the very least, then, these ideas were in the air in the humanist movement during the middle to late 1430s and early 1440s, and remained in the air long enough for Machiavelli to make use of them in *The Prince*. But it is also not out of the question that the connections are more direct and that Machiavelli knew the work of Lapo and/or Alberti.⁹⁰

AD CL<A>RISSIMUM VIRUM ET SAPIENTISSIMUM CIVEM
COSMAM MEDICEM LAPI CASTELLIUNCULI PROOEMIUM IN
THEMISTOCLIS VITAM INCIPIT FELICITER.

[1] THEMISTOCLIS Atheniensis clarissimi et sapientissimi ducis vitam latine interpretatus ad te missurus eram, humanissime Cosma, cum eius exilii recenti memoria multorum ducum et principum civitatum cladibus in mentem mihi revocatis, [2] in eam sum, quam saepe soleo, dubitationem compulsus, fortuna ne magis an virtute consilioque opus esset iis qui in florentissimis rebus publicis administrandis sine periculo vellent et cum dignitate versari.

⁸⁷ Ed. Garin (above, note 84) 650: "nonne praestat, virtute comite, navigiis recte assidere, omniaque pericula subire . . . ?"

⁸⁸ Ed. Garin (above, note 84) 650–52.

⁸⁹ Here in Appendix II. I know of no study on the oneiric literature of the Renaissance, but for late antiquity and the early Middle Ages, see J. Le Goff, *The Medieval Imagination*, trans. by A. Goldhammer (Chicago 1988) 193–231.

⁹⁰ The text that follows is from MS Florence, Bibl. Ricc. 142 (= R), fols. 108–11^v.

[3] Nam cum me ad graecorum summos viros—malo enim externa in tali re commemorare quam nostra—mente et cogitatione converto, video paene innumerabiles in quibus iudicio omnium summa dignitas, summa virtus //108^v// fuisset, quique in rebus perditis suo consilio et sapientia a gravissimis periculis ac prope interitu patriam vendicassent, [4] partim inter<r>eptos esse a suis civibus, partim eiectos, quosdam etiam privatos honoribus misere atque ignominiose vixisse. quo in loco huius ipsius quem dico Themistoclis fuga et persecutio et Miltiadis carcer, aliorumque complurium omni dignitate principum non dissimiles exitus subeunt. [5] quae quidem ego saepe numero mecum repetens, vehementer indignari soleo qui maximis laboribus periculisque suis salutem et incolumitatem caeteris peperissent—tantum abfuisse ut digna suis virtutibus praemia reportarent, ut quibus saluti fuissent, et a quibus ornandi erant, ab iis, ut scelerati et impii, plecterentur.

[6] Itaque interdum facile adducor ut opiner ex fortuna hominibus pendere omnia, ita et ab ea sine virtute res maximas confici et eandem cum virtute coniunctam nimium posse, at sine fortuna virtutem nihil valere, sed esse //109// nomen vacuum et inane; [7] nec non illos sapientissimos iudicem qui ea de causa a re publica et a negociis animo abhorrentes, quo tempore florere in iis plurimum poterant, magno quodam iudicio et consilio contemptis honoribus et magistratibus se in ocium solitudinemque contulerunt, [8] malueruntque, remoti ab omni contentione civili, obscuri et incogniti vivere quam se fortunae committere, cuius furentis impetum humana ope sustinere se posse diffident. haec igitur, nisi exquisitius disputentur, poterunt quibusdam vera fortasse videri.

[9] Verum ego, cum a communi intelligentia et a vulgi opinione abducere animum et ad veras rationes revocare instituo, sic intelligo ac iudico fortunam longe virtute inferiorem esse, nec cum ea ullo modo conferendam esse, [10] et hanc imperitorum opinionem ab imbecillitate hominum desidiaque proficisci, qui, cum ipsi virtute deficiant, siquid interdum imprudentia sua offenderint, cul//109^v//pam omnem in fortunam iriiciunt eamque veluti magnum aliquod et infestum numen perhorrescunt quam, si perfecta virtute forent, contemnerent et pro nihilo ducerent. [11] neque ego hoc dico in rebus humanis non permaximum in utranque partem momentum habere fortunam; verum si qui ita virtute se arment atque instruant ut possint adversa ferre constanter et secundis moderate uti, [12] his profecto non video cur aut adversa fortuna metuenda sit aut secunda magnopere expetenda, quae si eis sociam se praestiterit, praeclare secum actum minusque sibi laborandum putabunt, [13] sin minus, haud tamen a mente consilioque desciscent, sed in se tantum atque in sua virtute omnia praesidia locabunt et eo acriori ac praesentiori animo ad rem gerendam incumbunt, quo minus sibi externae opis adesse cognoscent. [14] est enim virtus eiusmodi ut tranquillis et ad voluntatem nostram fluentibus rebus languescat, asperis vero //110// et incommodis, si adhibet, magis eluceat.

[15] Nec vero id me magnopere commovet, si qui clarissimi viri, cum ad ampliximos dignitatis gradus evasisent, postea conciderunt nec eum quem suis laboribus consecuti erant, statum retinere potuerunt. [16] nam si quis recte et diligenter consyderet, facile perspiciat eos omnis inflatos opinione, cum impii cupiditate flagrant, et cum quibus pares libertate esse debebant iis vi superiores esse niterentur, debitas et meritas temeritatis poenas dedisse. [17] quod si quibusdam eiusmodi casus inimicorum calumnia inciderunt eos aut, cum aequae tulissent, ad postremos esse restitutos aut, cum fracto animo abiectoque forent et ob levitatem naturae sibi ipsis constare non possent sed desperatione rerum ad hostes confugissent, [18] consilii inopia, non fortuna in maximam se ac suos cladem et ignominiam coniecisse effecisseque ut, obscurata priori innocentia, posterioribus delictis, iuste omnia pati //110^v// putarentur, qui quidem nec magni viri nec sapientes habendi sunt. [19] quid est enim stultius quam, si in navi sis, imminente procella, abicere gubernaculum et te, contempta salute, fluctibus obruendum permittere? [20] nam acer et diligens gubernator nihil expavescit, sed fortius contra vim tempestatis insurgit, etsi eum quem coeperat cursum tenere non potest, mutata navigatione qua facultas datur in portum pervenire contendit, ut, si perierit, non negligentia sua perisse; sin evaserit, non forte, sed consilio evasisse videatur. [21] quem sapientem egregiumque [aegregiumque R] civem proponere sibi in re publica decet, siquid indigne patitur, non se abicere, sed fortunae et tempori cedere, et ad aliam oportunitatem se et suas vires reservare, qualem Athenis Aristidem fuisse accepimus et e nostris Furium Camillum, qui et pulsi irae civium concesserunt et, cum oportuna res cecidit, saluti non defuerunt. [22] itaque talium virorum quotidie //111// magis gloria claret. a quorum institutis nihil tu mihi aberrasse videris, qui nulla tua culpa seditioibus et quasi fluctibus civitatis eiectus, patriae iniurias ita tulisti ut in ea exilii calamitate fortunam tuam indolerent omnes, constantiam probarent, sapientiam mirarentur. [23] itaque meritissimo communi civium consensu et voluntate, summa cum gloria in patriam revocatus, perspicue declarasti, [24] tibi eiusmodi casum non delicti supplicium, sed illustrandae virtutis materiem extitisse, quae una ex omnibus virtutibus Themistocli defuit, caeteris tamen ita excelluit ut eum cunctis Graeciae ducibus anteferre non dubitem. [25] quare etsi non me latet quam imprudenter agam, qui tibi in hac tanta occupatione vitae atque urbis meis scriptis obstrepere audeam, [26] praesertim cum tibi quotidie assit Leonardus Arretinus, princeps eloquentiae huius aetatis, decus et ornamentum latinae linguae, Ambrosius abbas, Nicolaus Nicolus, Poggius, Carolus Arretinus—[27] doctissimi et eloquentissimi viri qui te suis scriptis teneant, quorum sermonibus tuae //111^v// assidue mulceant aures—decevi tamen meorum laborum ac vigiliarum tibi aliquid impartiri, haud nescius ad summorum principum colloquia tenuissimos interdum homines admitti solere. [28] fretus igitur tua humanitate, Themistoclis res gestas a me nuper ex Plutarcho in latinum versas, quae [quid R] praeclarae mihi visae sunt atque imitatione in primis

dignae, ad te mitto, ut ex iis, siquid ad tuum usum pertinebit, deligere possis, et te eum virum pietate simul et felicitate superasse laeteris; [29] in quo, si minus tibi meus labor gratus erit, debebis tamen eas et Themistoclis nomine et Plutarchi auctoritate libenter legere. itaque ut facias te et oro et obsecro, et me, si haec probari abste percepero, plura ac maiora tuo nomine aggressurum esse profiteor. Vale. FINIS.

Appendix II: Lapo's Preface to Plutarch's *Life of Aratus* Dedicated to Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini⁹¹

AD CLEMENTISSIMUM PATREM JULIANUM CESARINUM SACROSANCTAE ROMANAE ECCLESIAE PRESBYTERUM CARDINALEM, LAPI CASTELLIUNCULI PR<O>OEMIUM IN ARATI VITAM INCIPIT FELICITER.

[1] CUM Arati Sicyonii clarissimi ducis res domi militiaeque gestas ex Plutarcho latine interpretatus essem, easque ad aliquem principem—pro mea consuetudine—mittere statuissem. dubitanti mihi diu ac deliberanti cuinam nostrorum principum potissimum dedicarem has lucubratiunculas meas, nullus sane occurrebat cui consilio prudentia cum magnitudine, integritate, constantia, tum bellicis rebus et gloria militari Arati vita convenire videretur.

[2] Nocte igitur quadam in hac cogitatione ac meditatione defixus serius in cubiculum discessi, ubi, cum accubissem et, ut assolet, homines ex longa ac vehementi animi intentione fatigatos, altior solito me somnus invasit. [3] ecce continuo, ut de Homero Ennius tradit de quo solebat vigilans saepissime cogitare et loqui, dormienti mihi se Aratus obtulit; siquidem somnus illud fuit, non divinatio quaedam animi et certa ac vera visio. [4] erat enim imago eius et simulacrum homine maius atque augustius, forma ipsa et figura corporis, ut apparebat, excellenti quadam et admirabili dignitate ac veneratione, quales prisci illi heroes ac semidei fuisse perhibentur, [5] ornatu vero et habitu militari quo usum illum tum arbitror esse, cum Macedonas procul a patriae finibus arcebat, cum eiiciebat tyrannos et ad libertatem Graeciam excitabat, ut me quidem, cum torve ac minaciter aspexisset, vehementer exterruerit et, loqui conantem eiusque adventus causam percontari, prae horrore vox ac verba defecerint. [6] tum //19^v// ille, vel quod ante re cognita ita paratus venisset, vel quid tum mihi esset animi divinasset, hunc in modum me prior alloqui cepit.

[7] “Quid tu, homo stulte, agis? quid moliris? quo pergis? quo tam longa deliberatio, quo tuus hic labor spectat? quid autem a me vis? quid quaeris? quid postulas? dic, obsecro, cur nunc me ab inferis excitas? cur denuo <me> in lucem revocas? [8] nonne satis tibi esse videtur, me semel

⁹¹ From MS Florence, Magl. XXIII, 126 (= F), fols. 19–20^v.

vitae huius quam vivitis labores, molestias, sollicitudinesque esse perpeſsum, ſemel hominum inſidias, fraudes, fallacias pertuliſſe, ſemel crudelem ac nefariam oppetiſſe mortem Macedoniſque regis crudelitatem meo funere ſatiſſe, ut me, cum morte omnia haec incommoda declinarim atque effugerim, etiam reviviſcere velis atque eadem rursus mala calamitatesque experiſſe, quo mihi paulo poſt acerbius et contumelioſius moriundum ſit? [9] qua es igitur tanta a me iniuria provocatus ut me quietum et curis omnibus ſolutum et liberum ſollicitare, lacceſſere, vexare, measque umbras ac manes fruſtra exagitare coneris? [10] ſive enim id inimico in me animo agis iniquum te eſſe, quid inſontem violes, fateare neceſſe eſt, ſive mei illuſtrandi nominis cauſa, longe in hoc tua te fallit opinio, cum ex eo plus ad me probri ac dedecoris quam ſplendoris et gloriae perventurum ſit, ſive quaetus ac lucri cauſa, ſciam te nec in eo quidem quippiam profecturum. [11] tunc ut me afficias gloria, principis aulae accedere, tu limen introire, tu eius bibliothecam ne dicam officinam ſclerum et flagitiorum ſentinam veluti carcere obcluſum incolere atque habitare iubeas, [12] ubi perpetuo futurus ſim pulvere, ſitu, ſqualore, et ſordibus obſitus, ubi neminem oblectem, nemini prober, nemini placeam, nunquam niſi exalandae [i.e. exhalandae] crapulae reverendique ſomni gratia legar, [13] nunquam eruditas vel etiam ſatis ſobrias lectoris aures habeam, nunquam ipſe lucem aſpiciam, ubi denique ante, ut de caeteris ſileam quae ne dicam pudore impediatur, nihil honeſti fiat, nullum pudicum aut principe dignum proferatur verbum? [14] quibus haec tu me oculis aſpicere, quibus auribus audire poſſe exiſtimas? at tibi credo hoc, ſumpto labore, merces aliqua permagna paratus? [15] haud quaquam, ſi id ſperas. principum ſatis tibi mores cogniti ſunt, qui, cum ipſi ſint eiſmodi, tum ſui ſimiles appetunt, his delectantur, his fruuntur, hos honoribus et opibus augent, qui prope quibus ſua omnia conſilia ſequere totos crediderint, nec ad ſuas explendas libidines illorum opera carere ullo modo poſſint. [16] diſertos autem atque eruditos, tum probos, ſanctos, religioſos viros domi quidem quaſi ad ludum et ad iocum habere //20// ſtudent, non ut ab iis boni aliquid ediſcant, [17] ſed ut tales et ipſi habeantur illorumque exiſtimatione ſuam infamiam et turpitudinem tegant, eadem freti maiorem peccandi facultatem aſſequuntur quos tamen clam aderunt et depreſſos extinctosque cupiunt; [18] nec uſquam emergere aut ſe attollere patiuntur, nec alloquuntur fere unquam niſi coacti (quod arbitror) illorum ſe congreſſu et ſermone indignos cenſent, reprehentioneque ab iis ſuorum ſclerum pertimeſcunt. [19] cogita igitur tecum antea diligenter quid agas, neu quo temere prodeas. ſiquid enim de me incautus ſtatuſeris, haud impune erit, ipſe te in ſomniis praetererebo, nec mente conſiſtere unquam aut requieſcere ſinam."

[20] His equidem ita ab initio ſum commotus atque adeo metu conſternatus ut quo progredere incertus animi eſſem, poſtea vero quam paulum me collegi, mihi illius reprimere audaciam ac maledicta refellere ſum viſus; [21] cum dicerem haec, ipſum de ſuis, ut rebar, principibus vera loqui, quibus ea fortasſe Lycurgi aut Draconis Soloniſve legibus permiſſa

erant, sed de nostris impudens mendacium esse, et sive invidia et malevolentia eum ita loqui, [22] sive eorum facta ignorare, demum enervatis compluribus huius aetatis principibus teque in illis, qui et secum et cum reliquis aequalibus maioribusque suis omni virtutis genere contendere possent. [23] potestatem ei optionemque feci ut ad quem potissimum mitti vellet eligeret, quibus ille acquievit parumper et letatus eo munere ex omni numero unum te elegit, de cuius apud inferos virtutibus et ab aliis et ab iis qui tui ordinis e vita nuperrime commigrassent multa se ac divina audisse referebat.

[24] Haec mihi tum in somno visa et audita sic infixi animo impressaque sunt ut, solutus somno, vera ne an falsa forent diu mecum multumque dubitarim. [25] ac nunc quidem Arati mortui de te iudicium tantum abest ut improbem ut ne ipsum quidem si reviviscat prudentius, nec melius facturum existimem. [26] et enim, si in summo principe eoque qui caeteris principibus praefuturus sit animi magnificentiam, si sapientiam, consilium, industriam, solertiam in maximis pulcherrimisque muneribus gerendis atque administrandis quaerimus, [27] si fortitudinem, constantiam, patientiam in subeundis periculis perferendisque laboribus aut haec in te sunt omnia, aut in nullo alio profecto principe reperiri unquam poterunt, [28] si in iure dicendo puniendis improbis, bene meritis orandis, iustitiam et aequitatem, si fidem praeterea gravitatem desideramus, ubinam ea, si in te defuerint, requiremus? [29] iam vero in eodem, si iustitiam, temperantiam, frugalitatemque laudamus, harum nobis omnium exempla virtutum abste uno maxime repetenda sunt? [30] denique //20v//, si liberalitatem, beneficentiam, humanitatemque, si bonarum artium rectorumque studiorum peritiam praecipueque eorum quae appellantur humanitatis esse dicimus oportere, parum te cognitum habeat, [31] siquis haec non in te cuncta perfecta et cumulata esse concesserit, nec vero existimes velim haec a me assentandi gratia dicta, nec ex meo tantum sensu esse deprompta.

[32] Nam haec ipsa de te pluraque alia ab eruditissimo ac religiosissimo viro Ambrosio amicissimo tuo,⁹² cuius testimonium puto gravissimum saepissime praedicari et divinis laudibus ad caelum ferri audivi. [33] quod si bellicis in rebus ut Aratus versatus non es, quippe qui te ad meliora studia ab adolescentia contulisti,⁹³ non tamen ille plus armatus oppresse [*lege* oppressus?] tyrannis Graeciae profuit quam tu, ut ita dixerim, togatus, improborum consiliis afflictus, et laboranti romanae ecclesiae profuisti cuius tu statum et dignitatem tot iam per annos adversus nefarios illorum conatus, non sine maximis tuis periculis tutatus es. [34] ex quo in altissimum istum ordinem cum paucis meritissimo ascendisse arbitror quem es non alienis opibus sed tuis virtutibus assecutus et iisdem artibus nescio quid maius futurum auguror.

⁹² I.e. Ambrogio Traversari.

⁹³ Lapo shows himself aware of Plutarch's remarks about Aratus' less-than-optimal education in oratory at Plut. *Arat.* 3. 3.

[35] Sed iam quo intendit eo conferatur oratio mea. ut igitur, pater humanissime, tibi quod a me iam pridem deberi statui munus persolvatur, Aratum ipsum ad te legendum et colendum mitto, nec iam in mittendo, te fretus, illius iram minasque perhorresco, quem, te obsecro, ultro ac sponte sua ad te proficiscentem, ut soles alios eiusmodi viros humane benigneque excipias, eiusque res gestas diligenter legas. [36] ego, si in iis legendis te delectatum esse aut meum studium non aspernatum [esse *canc.*] sensero, plura ac maiora, cum voles, editurum me tuo nomine esse profiteor. Vale.

Finis ex Ferraria xviii kalendas augusti 1438.

Michigan State University